

Politics and Ideology: Deviousness vs. Decencies

Saeed Shoja Shafthi

Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry New York USA

*Correspondence Author: Saeed Shoja Shafthi, Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry New York USA

Received Date: September 02, 2024| Accepted Date: September 12, 2024| Published Date: September 20, 2024

Citation: Saeed S. Shafthi, (2024), Politics and Ideology: Deviousness vs. Decencies., *Clinical Genetic Research*, 3(5); Doi:10.31579/2834-8532/044

Copyright: © 2024, Saeed Shoja Shafthi. 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.

Abstract

There are a lot of academics, who often ask themselves how socialist regimes, capitalist systems and fundamental administrations may collaborate with each other, whether diplomatically, fiscally or militarily, while they are commonsensically and diametrically contrasting with each other. For instance, while one pole may proclaim modernism and broadmindedness, another pole may declare complete orthodoxy or conservatism. Accordingly, and rationally, no genuine political alliance may be supposed among them. But while such a partnership is in fact discernable, some idealistic individuals or bystanders may experience it as a kind of cognitive dissociation, which means incongruity in a person's beliefs, thoughts, or actions, which may cause an uncomfortable inner tension or perplexity. Therefore, if philosophy or ethics does not have anything to do with sociopolitical relationships, then why or how they may be appreciated as important or useful hypothetical or academic perspectives. Nevertheless, while compromise may be a fitting problem-solving strategy, ideology was never an indissoluble barricade between philosophical opponents because basic needs may determine the applicability of ideology, not ethical or theoretical considerations. Anyhow, though presently many scholars may believe that the epoch of ideology is over, ideology is not limited to Marxism or fundamentalism, and liberalism, conservatism, globalization, nationalism or fascism, too, may be acknowledged as different kinds of ideology. Principally, every financial or sociopolitical doctrine that becomes compulsive, according to its believers or doctrinaires, and turns into an over-valued idea, may be known as a kind of ideology. In the present article, the relationship between ideology, politics, economics and ethics has been, briefly, probed.

Keywords: marxism; fundamentalism; capitalism; politics; philosophy; ethics

Introduction

There are a lot of academics, who often ask themselves how socialist regimes, capitalist systems and fundamental administrations may collaborate with each other, whether diplomatically, fiscally or militarily, while they are commonsensically and diametrically contrasting with each other. For instance, while one pole may proclaim modernism and broadmindedness, another pole may declare complete orthodoxy or conservatism. Accordingly, and rationally, while their philosophical paradoxes are so extensive, no genuine political alliance may be supposed among them. Thus, because such a partnership is in fact discernable, some idealistic individuals or bystanders may experience it as a kind of cognitive dissociation, which means incongruity in a person's beliefs, thoughts, or actions, which may cause an uncomfortable inner tension or perplexity (1). In any case, what is the shared point that connects these, theoretically and conflicting political dispositions, with each other? Is it provisional or perpetual teamwork? Is it a beneficial or harmful coalition? Is it a sophisticated or gauche partnership? What is its historical leftover, and is such a residue rewarding or disappointing? What is its impact on human beings' civil rights or civilization? If philosophy or ethics does not have anything to do with sociopolitical relationships, then why or how they may be appreciated as important or useful hypothetical or academic perspectives. For clarification of the core of the present debate, let's start with a brief description of some of the most important philosophies of the said perspectives.

Ideology, as a systemized categorization of viewpoints:

Karl Marx was a German philosopher and political economist who talked about alienation and exploitation of the working class, the capitalist mode of production and historical materialism (2). As stated by him, the history of humans' societies is the history of class struggles, and so he analyzed the history in terms of class struggle (3). Therefore, Marxism is a scheme of socioeconomic analysis that uses a materialist explanation of historical development to understand class relations and social conflict, as well as a dialectical outlook to understand social changes (4). Since Marxism has developed over time into various divisions and subdivisions, there is presently no solitary definitive Marxist philosophy (Table 1). In this regard, while some Marxian schools place greater emphasis on certain aspects of classical Marxism and reject or modify other aspects, some others have sought to combine Marxian ideas and non-Marxian theories, which have then led to incongruous inferences. Anyhow, many scholars believe that historical and dialectical materialism are the fundamental conceptions of all Marxist schools of thought (5). Marxism assumes that the arrangement of an economic system, or mode of production, impacts all other social phenomena, like social relationships, political foundations, lawful systems, cultural schemes, aesthetics, and philosophies. These social relationships, with the economic system, form a base and superstructure (6). The base and superstructure metaphor designates the sum of social associations by which humans produce and re-produce their social existence. As powers of production (i.e., technology) progress, current forms of shaping production become outdated and deter more advancement (7). At a certain phase of advancement, the productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or with the property dealings within the

context of which they have worked until then (8). The said process can be turned into an ultimate social revolution, because under the capitalist style of production, the aforesaid conflict occurs between the minority who own the resources of production (the bourgeoisie) and the majority of the people who produce merchandise and amenities (the proletariat) (9). So, capitalism will predictably lead to a proletarian revolution. In a socialist society, private belongings - as the means of production - would be supplanted by co-operative proprietorship (10). Accordingly, a socialist economy would not base production on the making of private earnings, but on the principle of satisfying human requirements - that is, production would be accomplished directly for usage (11). According to Marxian theory, socialism is not a favorite optimal, but an economic obligation (12). The base embraces the material forces of production: the labor, means of production, and relations of production, i.e., the political and social arrangements that legalize production and distribution. From this base rises a superstructure, including legal and political establishments and the dominant ideology of a society. Changes in the economic base led to the transformation of the superstructure (13). Accordingly, Marx designated human history as encompassing four stages of development in relations of production, which include: primitive communism, slave society, feudalism; and capitalism, which, ultimately and determinately, would be substituted by socialism (14, 15 and 16). On the other hand, while the principles of liberal democracy (democratic capitalism), namely liberality and free market, the acknowledged anti-Marxian doctrines, and social democracy as a revisionist school of Marxism, which tries to provide accommodations between capitalism and socialism, are other modern sociopolitical approaches, especially during the globalization era (17), with its neoliberal model of economy, digitalized

communication, facilitated relocation of work forces and global investment, administrative fundamentalism, in general, is often associated with conservative spiritual beliefs across empires, and may be found in different civilizations like Christian, Jewish, Sikh, Hindu, and Islamic (18). Though, philosophically, fundamentalism usually has a pious implication that indicates unwavering attachment to a set of irreducible principles, sometimes it has come to be applied to a tendency among certain groups that is characterized by a markedly strict pedantry, as it is applied to certain specific doctrines, scriptures, or ideologies, and a strong sense of the importance of maintaining in-group and out-group peculiarities, which may lead to an emphasis on purity and the wish to return to a former model from which sponsors believe fans have drifted (19, 20). Thus, refusal of multiplicity of opinion and rejection of criticism regarding their established standpoints and interpretations within the group often results from this inclination (21). Presently, depending on the situation and like careless usage of terms, like "right-wing" or "left-wing", the label "fundamentalism", as well, may occasionally be a derisive, and not an impartial, categorization (22, 23). Moreover, the word fundamentalism is occasionally applied to mean a counter-cultural loyalty to a code or set of values, as in the depreciatory term "market fundamentalism", which is used to show hyperbolic faith in the capability of unrestrained free-market or capitalism for resolution of socioeconomic complications (24, 25). On the other hand, some academics believe that it is a mistake to refer to a Christian, Jewish, or Muslim, fundamentalist, because, for a radical fundamentalist, his or her own beliefs and judgments, and coercing others to succumb to those principles, is the primary concern (26), while most believers consider their beliefs a private matter.

- A) Communism:** Castroism, Anarchist communism, Christian communism, Council communism, Eurocommunism, Guevarism, Hoxhaism, Juche, Left communism, Luxemburgism, Maoism, National communism, Primitive communism, Religious communism, Scientific communism, Stateless communism, Titoism, World communism, Frankfurt School.
- B) Socialism:** Democratic socialism, Agrarian socialism, Eco-socialism, Guild socialism, Liberal socialism, Libertarian socialism, Mutualism (economic theory), Religious socialism, Revolutionary socialism, Scientific socialism, Social anarchism, State socialism, Syndicalism, Utopian socialism, Religious socialism.
- C) Social democracy:** Nordic model, Third Way.
- D) Theoretical Marxism:** Humanistic Marxism, Structural Marxism, Open Marxism, Neo-Marxism, Analytical Marxism, Post-structuralism Marxism, Post-Marxist Theory, Parametric determinism, Critical Theory, Neo-Marxian Economic Sociology, Historically Oriented Marxism, Neo-Marxian Spatial Analysis, Hegelian Marxism, Young Marx.

Table 1 – Diversities of Political Marxism.

Subjects	Democratic Capitalism	Political Marxism	Governmental Fundamentalism
General Approach	Modernism	Progressivism	Conservatism
Political Economy	Free-market	Anti-capitalism	Pro-capitalism
Stance Re Class Structure	Unconcerned	Restructuring	Uninterested
Philosophical Perspective	Idealistic ; Secular	Materialistic	Idealistic ; Non-secular
Analysis of History is Based On	Historical Events	Historical Materialism & Dialectical Outlook	Celestial Traditions & narrations
Hang on	Humanism	Radical Humanism	Destiny
Gizmo of Study	Tangible Evidences	Tangible Evidences	Tangible Evidences & Emphyrean Chronicles
Objectives of life	Here-and-now & Socially Determined	Here-and-now & Socially Determined	There-and-then & Celestially Determined
Valuing Balloting	Greatly	To Some Extent	To Some Extent
Democracy means	Free-thinking	Fair Distribution of Basic Needs	Emancipation of Aficionados
Struggling Against	Lawbreaking	Bourgeoisie	Hegemony
Struggling On behalf of	Free-market	Working Class (Proletariat)	Prophecy

Table 2- An Overall Comparison between Current Administrative Systems.

Matters	Democratic Capitalism	Political Marxism	Governmental Fundamentalism
Administrative Centralism	+/-	+	+
Ideological Egotism	-	+	+
Intolerance Re Criticizers	-	+	+

Machiavellianism	+/-	+	+
Confide in Sense of Duty	+/-	+	+
Trust in Abstract & Hyper-abstract Formulations	-	+	+
Distinctive Attitudes Re Human Freedom & Rebirth	-	+	+
Emphasizing on Specific Social Groups	-	+	+
Struggling against Particular Societal Crowds	-	+	+
Idiosyncratic Construal of Autonomy	-	+	+
Historical or Transcendent Determinism	-	+	+/-
Own Scheme of Social Order	+	+	-
Specific Outline of Nation-State Configuration	+/-	+	-
Characteristic Pattern for Collective Objectives	-	+	+
Political Militarism	-	+	+
Antagonism to Imperialism or Colonization	-	+	+

Abbreviations: + = commonly; - = unusually; +/- = maybe

Table 3- An Approximate Circumstantial Contrast between Existing Managerial Structures.

Discussion:

As stated by Freud, Marxism and, metaphorically, radical fundamentalism are among the intellectual constructions which claim that they can solve all the problems of our existence uniformly on the basis of one overriding hypothesis, which, so, leaves no question unanswered and where everything that interests us finds its fixed place, and by believing in it one can feel secure in life, and one can know what to strive for, and how one can deal most expediently with one's emotions and interests (27). But, by clinging to the impression of being able to present a coherent and comprehensive picture of the universe, they have created a prohibition of thought by forbidding their critical assessment, and determining punishment for any doubt regarding their correctness (28). Meanwhile, they have diverted the aggressive tendencies which threaten all human communities to the outside and find support in the hostility of the poor against the rich, or powerless people against the sovereigns. On the other hand, both of them try to prepare their disciples for the sufferings and scarcities of their present life by promises of a better future in which there will be no injustice or unfulfilled need (27). However, according to them, and in reply to frequent objections, so long as men's nature has not yet been altered, it is necessary to make use of the resources which affect them to comply, like compulsory cultural edification, prohibition of thought, and employment of force up to the point of violence. The said agendas will be continued till the awakening of desired impressions in target groups, because they are men of action, unshakable in their convictions, inaccessible to doubt and without sympathy for others' sufferings, if they decide to attain their intentions (27). Anyhow, as said by Marx, history is generated by human beings. Creatures' deeds, labors, wars, peace, alliances, competitions, moralities, deceptions, marriages and divorces shape the settings and history. Persons are full of internal conflicts, which have originated, evolutionary, from inconsistencies between subjective yearnings and real world's demands, or in line with psychoanalytic terms, between Id and Ego. Superego, namely the sense of right and wrong or conscience, as well, supervises Ego, for the achievement of better stability and extension of the organism's survival. On the other hand, projection of the said inner struggles, which is an endless process and may originate, in the words of Freud, from death instinct, as well, creates external conflicts, which so produces wars (29), exploitations, brutalities, hostilities and unevenness (30). Politics, as the mirror image of Ego's struggles for guaranteeing wish-fulfilment and survival of an organism and its kinfolks, is a multidimensional effort which is established on hegemonic, economic and cooperative balances (31). Accordingly, while mannerly political affairs can save peace, ill-mannered policy can create warfare. Similarly, unfixable discrepancies in the above-mentioned concerns can lead to bad-mannered policies. As is obvious, large deductions, interpretations or reforms being observable in Marxian literature (Table 1), which have resulted in different party-political Marxist organizations around the world. Some of them, like social democracy and Liberal socialism, theoretically and pragmatically, follow the mixed model of economy, including capitalistic construction and free-market strategy, along with progressive rules for promising equal opportunity, and accessibility to vital social services, like health and education, for all social classes, especially the working class. But, while, at least hypothetically, they wish fairness and justice for all human

beings, practically, like capitalist systems, their monetary and commercial collaboration with any system is admissible, if their needs and politics demand that. Such an attitude is visible with respect to Marxist systems, too, whose dealings, theoretically or ostensibly, should not be managed without ideological concerns with respect to workers' miseries. On the other hand, as is clear, no radical revolution, consistent with Marx's classical outlooks and anticipations, has ever occurred, which, while it may denote a hypothetical solecism in Marxian theories, may have resulted in the creation of heretical doctrines or ignorance. Anyhow, an immediate result of such a process, at least hypothetically, may be continuous forgetting of the objectives of socialistic organizations and conferences. Anyhow, political alliance, like any other type of interface, between capitalist, socialist and fundamental officeholders or systems, for the sake of monetary, military, or hegemonic benefits demands, principally, renunciation of alleged universal and historical goalmouths, because such a process is not a unidirectional dealing, and deep interaction with systems, which are philosophically, willingly, explicitly, and outspokenly antagonist modernism, democracy or egalitarianism, may not be accomplished without humanistic sacrifices, too. Alternatively, and academically, assuming the enemy of an enemy as a friend, in the political domain, is not always a sensible justification, when it is not unescapable and disregards core standards. If economic or political proceeds are allowable, whatever happens, then capitalism, as well, could not be liable for the establishment of imperialism, expansionism or globalization, because neither of them is without historical justifications, at least for empire-builders (32), rationalizations that possibly were the basis of Social-Imperialism, which have been applied by some Marxist regimes, too, during the last decades. So, it may be, practically, formulated that while philosophy may not promise contentment of a mandatory or disturbing requirement, power may grantee the realization of will, if it is compelling. But, such teamwork may not be entirely groundless. For example, while, hypothetically, party-political Marxism and governmental fundamentalism are diametrically opposed (Table 2), they have some shared features, too, which may make them, in some way, understandable to each other (Table 3). Thus, such speculative or practical joint features may, determinedly or intuitively, rationalize the said unexpected teamwork. Nonetheless, idealist or inexperienced followers expect that, like evolution, which is constantly ongoing, or like science, which is ceaselessly growing, principles should always direct political affairs, because without that there is no difference between avaricious capitalism, in the word of Marxists, nasty proletarian dictatorship, as stated by capitalistic doctrinaires, or frantic fundamentalism, as said by modernists. Therefore, if proletarian internationalism is just a fairytale, not an all-inclusive idea, then it is no more than a passing trumpeting. Similarly, wishing fairness for the world is not achievable by closing your eyes to others' sufferings. So, maybe, Marx was right when he was critiquing self-proclaimed Marxist Paul Lafargue by saying that if Lafargue's opinions were considered Marxism, then "one thing is certain and that is that I am not a Marxist" (33). But, it seems that the priority of the real world's needs, in comparison with aspiring epitomes and codes, is a rule rather than an exception, disregard to declared principles or rubrics. Deficiency of resources, merchandise or practiced human capital, limited space for commercial interactions, abundant competitors, who relentlessly try to attain

hegemony, security hitches and geopolitical concerns are the influential factors that may force empires to break their own values with no trouble. Anyways, the necessities or difficulties of the real world have inevitably reduced standards of systematic ideologies into somewhat literary poems and wannabe desires. Then again, unavoidable and unending sociopolitical conflicts have broken the backbone of philosophical sympathy and have paved the way for inattentiveness and taking advantage. Collapse of the state socialistic economy (34) and the appearance of new financial schemes like market socialism, in conjunction with neoliberalism and globalization, could have an important message for all administrations around the world, that is, the national political economy, though may be configured according to an international economic schema, cannot be designed simultaneously in line with ideological conjectures, because such a planning may not guarantee enough revenues, and without earnings no more advancement is conceivable. In brief, industrial progression, safety, food and lodging demands, emblematically, cash, in addition to other factors and efforts, and such cash is obtainable via trading with anything that has it, whether a capitalist, socialist, modern or fundamental individual, group, organization or state. This is funding and knowledge that may determine the hierarchy of hegemony in the global political order, not philosophy, which may only regulate internal rubrics of production and distribution. So, in politics, granting and grabbing are not constantly separated from each other. Like an actor who knows how to conquer audiences' sympathy by pretending to play simulated roles, a smart politician, too, may grab more favorable advantages, while pretending to be overgenerous. On the other hand, if, for example, antagonism to imperialism can be a foundation for coalition between party-political Marxism and governmental fundamentalism, while empire-building is an effect, not a cause, and every regime may turn into an empire-builder if the basic stipulations become attainable, then such an alliance may not be deep-rooted because it is principally based on animosity, not empathy, and emotiveness is not a suitable basis in politics or economics. Anyway, it seems that in contrast to theoretical sympathies or formulaic sociopolitical mottos, even the most radical ideologies may be in service of statesmen's benefits, deals or ambitions. So, while no antagonism is unbreakable, no ideology, too, is shatterproof, particularly when ordinary or hand-made geopolitical trigger zones may make incessant skirmishes or pandemonium available for hegemonic rivalries or paybacks.

Conclusion:

While Consciousness and Ego may not be against the Unconscious and Id, respectively, they have been evolved, allegorically, for the sake of suppression or repression of their drives. Nevertheless, while compromise may be a fitting problem-solving strategy, and a capitalist may smile at a communalist, and a socialist may blink at a fundamentalist, and a pious may flirt with a secular, skeptic or profane, manifest manners are not constantly echoing hidden drives. While Lenin was almost the first Marxist leader and theoretician who acknowledged the necessity of peaceful co-existence between socialism and capitalism, due to his concerns regarding balance of power, ideology was never an indissoluble barricade between philosophical opponents. This may show that ideology, as a systematic categorization of standpoints, may be in the service of human beings, not vice versa. Similarly, basic needs may determine the applicability of ideology, not ethical or theoretical considerations. Anyhow, though presently many scholars may believe that the epoch of ideology is over, ideology is not limited to Marxism or fundamentalism, and liberalism, neo-liberalism, conservatism, neo-conservatism, globalization, expansionism, nationalism or fascism (34), too, may be acknowledged as different kinds of ideology. Principally, every financial or sociopolitical doctrine that becomes compulsive, according to its believers or doctrinaires, and turns into an over-valued idea, may be known as a kind of ideology. Therefore, challenges between different ideologies may be acknowledged as still ongoing, which depends on the stratagems of contenders, winners or losers. Occasionally, lack of ideology may be comparable to an unaware or confused person, who does not know why and how to claim his or her civil rights (35). Sometimes, national solidarity, as well, may not be attained without some kind of ideology (36).

References:

1. Skovholt TM. (2012). *Becoming a therapist: On the Path to Mastery*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New Jersey, 57.
2. Bottomore TB. (1983). *A Dictionary of Marxist thought*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
3. Marx K. (1847). *The Communist Manifesto* Chapter one.
4. Gennady E. (2019). *Communism: The Great Misunderstanding*.
5. Stuart S. (2001). *Post-marxism: an intellectual history*. Routledge.
6. Screpanti E. (2007). *Libertarian Communism: Marx Engels and the Political Economy of Freedom*. London: Palgrave Macmillan,.
7. Paul GR., Stuart RC. (2003). "Marx's Theory of Change." In *Comparing Economic Systems in the Twenty-First Century* (7);62.
8. McCarney J. (2005). *Ideology and False Consciousness*. Ch. 16 in *Marx Myths and Legends*, edited by R. Lucas and A. Blunden,
9. Sheehan H. *Marxism and Science Studies. International Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 2007; 21(2): 197-210.
10. McLellan DT, Henri C. (1975). *Historical materialism | Marxism*. Encyclopedia Britannica.
11. O'Laughlin B. *Marxist Approaches in Anthropology. Annual Review of Anthropology* ; 4:341-370.
12. Richard W, Resnick S (1987). *Economics: Marxian versus \Neoclassical. The Johns Hopkins University Press*. 130.
13. Roseberry W. (1984). *Marx and Anthropology. Annual Review of Anthropology* 1997; 26:25-46.
14. Becker SL. *Marxist Approaches to Media Studies: The British Experience. Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 1(1):66-80.
15. Shoja Shafte S. (2022). *Political Economy and Mental Health: A Reconsideration in Modern Era. J. Clinical Research Notes*; 3 (4): 1-5.
16. Shoja Shafte S. (2022). *Class Struggle: A Critical Review in the Field of Political Psychology. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res*; 45 (2): 36199 - 36207.
17. Shoja Shafte S. *Clash of Theories in the Realm of Behavioral Sciences: Globalization VS. Pop Sociobiology. American Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 2021; 12: 11-22.
18. Nagata J. *Beyond Theology: (2001). Toward an Anthropology of Fundamentalism. American Anthropologist*; 103(2): 481-498.
19. Ruthven M. "Fundamentalism: (2005). *The Search for Meaning*". Oxford: Oxford University Press.
20. Torrey RA. (1909). *The Fundamentals*. Los Angeles: Biola University,.
21. Altemeyer B, Hunsberger B. (1992). *Authoritarianism, religious fundamentalism, quest, and prejudice. International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 2 (2): 113-133.
22. Harris H. (2008). *Fundamentalism and Evangelicals. Oxford: Oxford University Press*,
23. Armstrong K. (2001). *The Battle for God: A History of Fundamentalism*. New York: Ballantine Books.
24. Brasher, Brenda E. (2001). *The Encyclopedia of Fundamentalism*. New York: Routledge.
25. Marty M, Appleby RS. (1993). *Fundamentalisms and the State: Remaking Politics, Economies, and Militance*. Garvey JH, Kuran T, and Rapoport DC, associate editors, Vol 3, *The Fundamentalism Project*. University of Chicago Press.
26. Brekke F. (1991). *Fundamentalism: Prophecy and Protest in an Age of Globalization. Cambridge University Press*,127.
27. Freud. (1933.). *The Question of a Weltanschauung*, in: *New Introductory Lectures On Psycho-Analysis. Lecture XXXV*,
28. Calinescu M. (1987). *"Five Faces of Modernity: Modernism, Avant-garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism"*. Durham: Duke University Press.
29. Shoja Shafte S. (2022). *Why War? Parallel with Freud's Reply to Einstein's Query. In J Fore Res*; 3(2), 121-125.

30. Saeed Shoja S. (2023). Modernization, Anarchy and Evolving Societies: Reconsideration of a Challenging Stance. *International Journal of Psychiatry and Mental Health*; 5: 17-22.
31. Shoja Shafti S. (2023). Psychosocial Silhouette of Manipulation and Manipulator. *Online Journal of Neurology and Brain Disorders*; 6 (4): 588 - 592.
32. Shoja Shafti S. (2022). Psychosocial Dynamism of Public Mass Shooting: A Reevaluation. *Journal of Clinical Case Reports, Medical Images and Health Sciences*; 2 (3): 1 -7.
33. Gregory PR, Robert CS. (2003). Marx's Theory of Change. In *Comparing Economic Systems in the Twenty-First Century* (7th Ed.). 62.
34. D'Encausse HC. (1993). *The End of the Soviet Empire: The Triumph of the Nations*, New York: The New Republic, 16.
35. Shoja Shafti S. (2023). Hostile Radicalness: A Second Look. *Clinical Research Notes*; 4(4): 1- 6.
36. Shoja Shafti S. (2023). Motherland, Immigrant and Clinical Psychiatry: A Reconsideration. *Online Journal of Neurology and Brain Disorders*; 6 (5): 596 - 598.

Ready to submit your research? Choose ClinicSearch 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 ClinicSearch, research is always in progress.

Learn more <https://clinicsearchonline.org/journals/clinical-research-and-reviews>



© The Author(s) 2024. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.