



# Minority, Majority and Integrity of a Community: A Debate in the Field of Political Psychology

Saeed Shoja Shafti\*

*Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry, New York, USA*

**\*Corresponding author:** Saeed Shoja Shafti, Emeritus Professor of Psychiatry, New York, USA

**Received:**  March 15, 2023

**Published:**  April 26, 2023

## Opinion

No doubt, every community includes a few crowds, which have, concomitantly, similar characteristics, which attach them together, and unlike physiognomies, which may differentiate them culturally or ethnically. So, while different ethnicities may have similar rights or experiences in the same territory, they may have unlike languages, religions, customs, or principles. Among the said parameters, history may be accounted as one of the most inclusive factors that joins most different people with each other in the frame of a single country or nation. On the other hand, though the definition of "nation" may encounter more conceptual challenges by separatists, radicals or sociopolitical activists, the concept of country, which encompasses specific geopolitical dimensions, seems to be more comprehensive and less problematic. So, like a child, who may be designated based on the identities of its parents, nations, too, may be identified by their shared experiences, events, sympathy, cooperation, history, ideals, and cultural values. Alternatively, every country has a nation, and every nation has a few people that may be divided into minorities or majorities, based on their philosophies, races, sociocultural characteristics, sexuality or else.

On the other hand, while in recent decades, globalization is, supposedly, trying to wipe out the geographical borders and increase universalization of the globe, astonishing separations have occurred among some great societies in the last years, which were not devoid of unhappy clashes, as well [1,2]. In general, separatism, which is usually based on ethnical or sociocultural difference, are usually accompanied, or instigated by claims like organized unfairness, discrimination, and exploitation; allegations, which, according to secessionists, are being applied systematically by majorities, as the dominant groups, against minorities. Similarly, minorities may believe that other inhabitants, who are outside of their cluster, cannot understand their troubles or sufferings and, so, they are justified for gaining or inaugurating a new national identity

and self-governing government; otherwise, according to them, no valuable solution, respect or auspicious prospect is convincing for them. Moreover, they habitually believe that even if there are shared sociopolitical or financial problems for all nationals in the same empire, they have suffered more than other ones due to said orderly injustice, which has been widespread customarily in the associated realm [3,4].

Therefore, they are in search of a utopia for repayment of their mercilessly and purposefully induced hitches or deficiencies. As said before, many of them may find such a utopia in an innovative nation and a self-determining kingdom, which may be established after separation from the previous system; a system which, according to them, has prohibited them from getting the benefits of their own resources and has abused their efforts and assets for the sake of majority's comfort. On the other hand, though domestic division of organizations, especially in large countries, may facilitate executive processes, such a division in the shape of separation may not always guarantee a better future and development, or higher prosperity, especially if it is going to be faced with civil wars between previous nationals and present enemies. In line with existing facts, many previous minorities and present independents have only detached from an earlier majority and have hung on to a new majority, which is usually an additional overriding supremacy. On the other hand, many of such separations are not possible without an outsider's intervention, inspiration, or support, or even may not be energized without geopolitical struggles [5].

It is not deniable that, usually, financial, and industrial development of weak states, especially if they lack enough natural resources or expert human capital, is not possible without finding a new, strong, and wealthy mastermind, investor or supporter. Monetary and technical dominance is usually accompanied by political dominance and importing them by weak countries cannot happen without losing some part of their political independence,

because in the realm of political affairs, generally, nothing is totally free or as a charity, and it usually demands, immediately or later, some kind of recompense. On the other hand, if there is serious conflict between previous nationals and present enemies, which may demand military operations, additional forms of exploitation may appear, which are enforced by gun providers or related mediators. Anyhow, since larger lands may provide more resources and more people may guarantee tougher defensive forces, a weak and small country, based on demographic or economic indexes, may remain vulnerable forever, if no meaningful alteration in the said parameters is possible in the upcoming periods. Therefore, separation per se is not automatically equal to upgrading, justice or comfort. Furthermore, sometimes minority or majority are concepts which are being crystallized by some agitated sociopolitical activists for unconscious projection or conscious induction of a sense of discrimination in *hoi polloi*.

Similarly, low collective self-esteem, which may have different sociocultural backgrounds, by turning logical judgement into emotional misjudgment, may analyze ordinary shared difficulties as a series of sufferings, which have been loaded pitilessly by dominant groups on minor groups [6]. Among different accusations, distribution of poverty by dominant groups among minor groups may be accounted as one of the most serious ones. According to such a group of accusers or agitators, the major and dominant groups usually exploit the minor groups by concentrating the assets and benefits in their possession and, by means of a centralized system, deprive, deliberately and systematically, groups of valuable advantages. Accordingly, the resulting poverty blocks further advancement in the activities of minor groups and causes a morbid cycle in favor of dominant groups and against minor groups. On the other hand, while some of such minor groups live on the border of their countries, and, traditionally, many states have conservative views regarding too much progression of their borders or margins, which are accessible easily to outsiders and may be damaged heavily during possible geopolitical conflicts with neighbor countries, clashes and unsafety in the said regions, which usually are being instigated by the same minor group's agitators or militants, frequently prevent governments from sensible rebuilding of infrastructures or apt investments [7].

Also, since in a centralized (non-federal) system, progression of various states or locations is assumed to be the central government's duty, some political or social activists from agitated minor groups may ignore their own obliviousness, sluggishness or meddlesome, which may have reinforced the assumed negligence. On the other hand, in developing countries, federalism may not be applicable, like developed countries, which may have enough assets, knowledge and economy for filling gaps between different groups and states, in comparison with developing countries, which may expectedly lack necessary money or tools for satisfying faultfinders. So, federalism in weak systems may reinforce concrete comparisons or unfair judgements and may lead to more conflicts or distrust between majorities and minorities. For example, an uneven welfare among self-governing states, which cannot be managed

fittingly or fairly by federal resources, may automatically instigate separatism among challenging activists or groups. Similarly, and accordingly, the ominous influence of outsiders on irritated minor groups is more plausible in developing countries than in developed states. Also, such an influence, may have an important political or cultural impact on desperate or uninformed minor groups or individuals, who may find their subjective ideals or phantasies in outsiders' standards, promises or propaganda, especially if there are political activists or radical groups, who are familiar to local people, though they may be linked overtly or covertly to outsiders.

The said process makes governing systems of developing countries more vulnerable to internal pressures, in comparison with developed countries. Anyhow, for nationals, separatism is equal to insulting or damaging the homeland, which is important for their independence and survival, like a body, which can be incapacitated following amputation of its limbs or obliteration of its vital organs, separation of some parts of the homeland, as well, may cause innovative and unresolvable problems for remained inhabitants, who may think that they are losing their dignity, resources and human capital, due to delusional formulations of some riotous agitators. Therefore, they have the right to defend their motherland, fatherland or homeland mercilessly. On the other hand, according to some thinkers of dominant groups, separatism may be encouraged by some outsiders who demand new annexations, but by encouraging separatism, instead of military invasion, which is more expensive and problematic than investment and political pacts, they provide further allies or accomplices for their forthcoming geopolitical plans. Anyhow, dealing with smaller and weaker states is much easier than dealing with larger and stronger kingdoms, though regional factors or political rivals, as well, have determining importance, in this regard.

But, with disregard ethnical or cultural conflicts, there are other minor groups, as well, like groups with abnormal sexual inclinations or orientations, radical political groups or spiritual cults, who may believe in the existence of some kind of unfairness, injustice or obliviousness against themselves, which is applied by the dominant groups or administrative systems. According to them, the majority groups see them as an inflamed appendix, which is detrimental to healthiness and should be managed heartlessly. Among them, radical political groups, who may believe in the necessity of systematic changes in the administrative structure or form of dominant regime, like Marxist activists in capitalist systems, may behave so radically that it may cause serious sociopolitical challenges or clashes, especially in developing countries with despotic systems. In addition, minority groups with aberrant sexual inclinations or behaviors, as well, may demand social freedom and amendment of rubrics amid current challenges between conservatism and liberalism. For example, while they believe that their aberrant sexual inclinations may not interfere with their constructive function in society as a helpful fellow citizen, traditional, social or legal discrimination against such kinds of inclinations may undermine their liberty with respect to selection of their preferred sex-object or sexual orientation.

Also, according to them, their sexual relationship or activity should not irritate other inhabitants because it is a personal right, not a social subject. Anyway, though every social interaction, challenge or regulation may reflect some kind of necessity for solving a problem or finding a better solution for a chronic condition, it seems that groups, which may enhance the survival of a community, by expanding it, quantitatively, or strengthening it, qualitatively, have a traditional right to be active or dominant. Conversely, groups whose expansion or activity may endanger the strength or survival of a community may reflexively encounter ceaseless challenges. Therefore, conventionally, separatists, by decreasing or stealing their homeland's resources and human capital, radical political groups by disturbing national solidarity, aberrant sexuality by decreasing the chance of effective reproduction, may be supposed as troublesome and may not be allowed to have their favorable freedom. Though the "rule of law", in modern systems, and sociocultural values, in traditional societies may be accounted as the main problem-solving strategies for making a balance between individual freedom and social tolerance, or between private habits of families and social rubrics of a community, the real challenges between personal freedom and social restrictions in all societies is an everlasting issue, because human beings are innately selfish and may demand absolute lack of restrictions.

Though management of sociocultural, financial, and political challenges in every nation and provision of a friendly milieu is one of the most important tasks of every government, realization of such a duty or mission is not always easy, because social psychology of minor groups is not always as like as social psychology of major groups and may involve complications that make smooth management of existent clashes difficult. As said before, since people of minor groups may see themselves as victims of discrimination and neglected residents of an ignorant system, which may be an objective or subjective supposition, their self-confidence is usually suffering some complications. So, the said injured self-esteem may cause a paranoid state, misjudgment and hostility towards the dominant groups' purposes and organizations. Therefore, a dominant group of people may become unable to convince the said minor groups regarding its benevolent objectives, excuses, or plans, because every official attempt may be regarded as a trick or tactic for cheating and controlling minor groups, especially separatist or radical groups. Along with cognitive psychology, basic assumptions are the main sources for the generation of cognitive distortions and subsequent emotional or behavioral misconduct.

Therefore, even industrial, social, or educational development may not be able to alleviate or eradicate the inner discontent which has been developed culturally and historically, whether on a logical basis or on an illogical foundation. On the other hand, experienced radical activists know how to instigate, reflexively, public hostility against imaginary enemies by distorted narration of suspicious happenings. Unfortunately, contrary to scientists, who are supposed to analyze everything objectively, *hoi polloi* usually believes whatever they want to believe, and their emotions are more valuable for them than existent evidence or official explanations.

In such circumstances, like hate crime, which exists permanently despite prohibiting laws and advice, racial or political hate, as well, may endure permanently, till annihilation of a supposed victim or enemy, or finding any discharging, destructive, constructive, sublimating, or revolutionary channels. Moreover, administrative mistakes, negligence or weaknesses may cause or reinforce radical protests, which may exist in a silent or passive style. On the other hand, rivalry is an innate motivation which may not end with a new identity or nationality, because it usually involves players who cannot survive without endless efforts to get a better position or assets for more satisfaction of their narcissistic drives and more guaranteed survival of their own family, relatives, tribe, or group.

While throughout the last decades no radical movement or evolutionary philosophy could have assured stability of its main objectives, no minor group, as well, may guarantee fairness of its blames against major groups, because after gaining self-governance the said accusation may be directed to them by new minorities who are obliged to fight again for their apparently missed rights. Anyhow, it seems that application of the "rule of law", which may be updated or upgraded based on environmental facts, may prevent, or decrease, remarkably, unfair anger, retaliation or accusation against dominant group or officials. But, since, usually in the masses, emotional reflexes are more exciting than logical analysis, prevention of misjudgment is not always an easy commission. On the other hand, it is the duty of every government to be alert regarding overt or covert social discrimination or unfairness, which may turn into mayhem, if it occurs frequently or deliberately unnoticed. Likewise, minor groups are usually more sensitive to sociopolitical disturbances and see themselves more vulnerable to existing problems; like a child who may believe that he has been neglected by his oblivious parents. Such a child, though he is initially complaining regarding the perceived ignorance, may later abuse it, consciously or unconsciously, as a ground for further misconduct.

Similarly, like management of antisocial personality disorder (sociopathy, psychopathy), which is usually known as a difficult task for mental health specialists, management of social mayhem, which is usually based on a messy combination of causes and effects, is not a stress-free undertaking. Therefore, any deliberate or unconscious ignorance of resented groups, which suppose themselves as ignored, abused, or maltreated, may end in unwanted sociopolitical complications that may not be controllable by unaccountable or debilitated systems. The social psychology of minor groups may sometimes be comparable to cogitation of hopeless and helpless persons, who are desperately in search of a solution to their stresses; persons who may resort secretly to alternative solutions, which are less safe or guaranteed, if the expected or standard solutions are not available or satisfying. No doubt, a stable system, with apt administrative structure, fair officials, enough resources, updated knowledge, and trustable media may be able to manage plausible sociopolitical agitations more successfully. Anyhow, every system should know that, like psychopathology, which is not completely eradicable even with the best available methods, management of social complications, as well, are not completely attainable, though

they may be controllable if analyzed thoughtfully and prevented prospectively. Sometimes a combination of logic and empathy may turn a seemingly unavoidable harsh conflict into favorable communication for saving the integrity of the community; a process which is more acceptable than the morbid cycle of hatred, fight and retaliation.

## References

1. Shoja Shafati S (2022) Why War? Parallel with Freud's Reply to Einstein's Query. In J Fore Res 3(2): 121-125.
2. Saeed Shoja S (2023) Mayhem vs. Transformation: Reexamination of a Perplexing Attitude. LOJ Sci 1(1): 1-4.
3. Shoja Shafati S (2022) Class Struggle: A Critical Review in the Field of Political Psychology. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res 45(2): 199-207.
4. Shoja Shafati S (2022) Political Economy and Mental Health: A Reconsideration in Modern Era. Clinical Research Notes 3(4): 1-5.
5. Shoja Shafati S (2022) Deep State and Attuned Democracy: Political Affairs vs Political Psychology. J Clin & Commun Med 4(3): 41-43.
6. Shoja Shafati S (2022) Psychosocial Dynamism of Public Mass Shooting: A Reevaluation. J Clin Case Rep, Med Images and Health Sci 2(3): 1-7.
7. Shoja Shafati S (2021) Jung as a Fascist Theorist or Philanthropic Victim: A Second Look. Biomed J Sci & Tech Res 38(2): 160-167.