

THE ANATOMY OF ELITIST DEMOCRACY

Pedja Milosavljevich

Duga Design

Pedja Milosavljevic

THE ANATOMY OF ELITIST DEMOCRACY

The Library: MISAO

Duga design, 2018

Pedja Milosavljevic
The Anatomy of Elitist Democracy

Publisher:
‘Duga’ design, Belgrade

For the Publisher:
Srdjan Velichkovich

Editor:
Darko Tadich

Lector:
Ljiljana Cholovich

Number of books printed:
100

Printed by:
‘Skripta International’ Belgrade

First Edition, 2018

Content:

Foreword	7
Political ideologies of capitalism	9
Legal strategies of liberalism	12
‘Demos’ as the political class	18
Political class in the elitist democracy	23
The rule of law in the elitist democracy	29
Economic growth and democratic practices	38
The Old Age and introduction of democracy	46
The Old Age and break with direct democracy	51
Feudalism and remains of direct democracy	57
Supposed forms of direct democracy in capitalism, or a complete break with democracy	63
Elitist democracy as a form of the oligarchic regime	71
False alternative to liberal capitalism	79
Causes of conflict between capitalism and direct democracy	85
Virtual reality of liberal capitalism	93
Passive or active resistance to indirect democracy	97
Theoretical and ideological base for a demand for direct democracy	98
Function of the state in the reaffirmed idea of democracy	100
Triple devolution	107

Property right and free market economy	110
The will of the people as the most important goal of direct democracy	113
Afterword	120
Literature	122

Foreword

Democracy is one of those philosophical ideas which has preoccupied the human mind probably more than any other ideas in the last two thousand years. Born in Ancient Greece, this idea about achieving the perfect form of a society presents the stepping stone in defining the human destiny; that up to this day has not lost any of its significance. How should The Man live? How should the civilization improve? Is there any ideal form of the society designed according to The Man's (the society's) needs?

Today, in the IT digital age of the 21st century, it appears that this inquiry about democracy is more relevant than ever before. In this extraordinary book written by Mr. Pedja Milosavljevic, which presents a form of the anatomy of democracy of liberal capitalism, being itself the dominant regime of modern civilization, we do feel a real desire within ourselves to deeply think about all these questions; try to better understand their complex nature, and hopefully find answers to them.

Author of this book analyses the relationship between an idea of democracy and the contemporary neo-liberal form of capitalism in which majority of people in the West live today. Practicing lawyer by profession; the humanist by nature, Mr. Prdja Milosavljevic takes us all through the history of democracy, by using a simple and very clear way of writing; as well as an interesting way of presenting the content, when he analyses democracy starting from its natural roots in ancient Greece. Author further asks a question about the purpose of democracy, and consequences of the impact of liberal capitalism on the world in the last two centuries. These questions are difficult, often painful to answer.

With his brilliant critical stance, supported by numerous proofs of ideas and deceptions from the past, author presents us with a picture which shows often tragic attempts to match democracy designed by the measure of The Man's needs, with his economic, legal and living needs, into one more-or-less harmonious, ideal whole.

The book is divided into three parts. In the first part, author introduces us to the essence of liberal capitalism and its contemporary forms of functioning, as representatives of modern Western civilization. In the second part, we are presented with a short historical overview of direct democracy development, the way it was defined by old antique philosophers, and its development until the beginning of the modern era. The third part of this book presents the key idea of this anatomy: we see the fall of one original idea, that is, its transformation and deterioration into its opposite. Author uses clear and effective ways of focusing our attention on the relationship between democracy and liberalism; which has, by the way, shown its ugly face through the phenomenon of globalization.

In that sense, in the conclusion of his book Mr. Milosavljević accentuates the incompatibility between the original idea of direct democracy and its present co-existence with capitalism, the ideological system in which a modern man lives today. *The Anatomy of Elitist Democracy* asks questions that demand clear answers; and also a need for all of us to think about the author's questions and try to answer them, not only verbally, but through our progressive actions, so as to win our ultimate, crucial and legitimate right to the happier and better world.

Dr. Darko Tadić

PART I

DEMOCRACY IN THE LIBERAL MODEL OF CAPITALISM

Political ideologies of capitalism

At the end of the 15th century the process of change from economic production of feudalism to capitalist economy was starting to take place on the historical scene. Then, two mutually conflicting political ideologies – liberalism and conservatism became the core of capitalist production relationships; and sometime later the socialism emerged, which further conflicted with both those ideologies. Before the French Revolution took place, conservatives were against a new situation which was the result of modernism at that time. It was about an idea according to which the King's rulership, characterized by absolutism and totalitarianism, suddenly became replaceable. After French Revolution, the conservatives changed their attitude in regards to the idea of overthrowing the King from his throne, and started accepting new reality that King's absolute power did not come from the God, but from another kind of sovereignty. With such drastic change in attitude, conservatives then became equal with liberals.

However, there became a dispute between these two ideologies in regards to where exactly that core of sovereignty was coming from. Eventually, two ideologies agreed that the supreme power was not coming from the will of the Gods, but it was still not quite clear then who the people should have been looking up to, since "the sky" had stopped being their main source of admiration and inspiration.

From this key difference in opinion between liberals and conservatives, as to who was then in charge of sovereignty, other differences in beliefs between them emerged. For example, while conservatives in capitalism, after the final defeat of feudalism, believed that traditional social groups and guilds were key leaders of the sovereignty, the liberal political thought declared the individual citizen, who, being a part of a society he belonged to, carried the whole power of sovereignty. Here, the society is understood to be a group of its individual citizens. Socialism, which appeared on the political scene relatively late, in the mid-19th century, similar to liberalism, understood society to be the leader of sovereignty, except that it did not “see” society as consisting of its individual citizens, but it was the society ‘*in abstract*’, that is, being the one whole entity which had the supreme power over its people.

From its very inception, the liberal version of capitalism had an advantage over the other two ideologies (conservatism and socialism); and over time it made them completely incapable of competing with it in order to conquer it on the scene of political ideas and strategies. On the contrary, liberalism achieved that the above named ideologies completely merged with it, thus ‘refreshing’ it and providing it with additional strength and legitimacy. This is how, over time, the terms such as *left and right center* emerged as euphemisms for a situation on the political scene where, in reality, there is only one functioning ideology, that one of liberalism.

Every single one of these three traditional political ideologies creates the whole system of legal regulations and procedures, whose main goal is to protect the most powerful carrier of ‘the torch of sovereignty’. Therefore, liberalism, as a winning paradigm, and with the help of elitist democracy, declares itself as the protector of each individual human being-of each citizen, who is also a partial bearer of sovereignty. Therefore, the goal of all legal strategies of liberalism, at the beginning, was to protect every single citizen of every country on the planet, because of understanding that all people individually partially contributed to sovereignty.

This goal experienced a change over time, so the system of legal and political strategies, evolutionary, changed the focus of its responsibility towards fully protecting the ruling class only, instead of its initial goal – protection of all its citizens individually, being partial bearers of sovereignty. In this book we will try to answer the question as to why the initial, the most ethical attitude of all, and publicly proclaimed goal was replaced by the new and secret goal, which, by the way, the political and economic elites have been effectively accomplishing in their everyday practices from that time onwards. As well as that, we will try to highlight ways in which democratic processes and direct democratic practices can be realized in the future, in order to benefit the people and not harm them (anymore).

In this process of change of goals, which a new historical stage had presented for the leading ideology, the key role has been played by the elitist democracy, which political philosophy euphemistically calls *the liberal democracy*. The science of law with all its ethical rules and regulations, however, completely unethically and wrongly embraced this elitist democracy with its liberal paradigm; and even went further to declare the idea of human rights as its central and most important agenda. The elitist, liberal political ideology, with its newly formed vision of social classes and their relationships, had a full authority to decide the scope and scale of those, so called human rights, and how far they were allowed to spread and operate. Here we are talking about the new social reality formed after the French revolution.

The unavoidable consequence of such social set up is false and completely distorted vision of equality between people. This further leads to legal regulations which start exclusively protecting accumulated wealth held in hands of a very small number of people. On the other side, ironically, dominant political philosophy uses this “social arrangement” to call it liberalism in its original meaning of the word, which places all people on the planet in the same starting position.

This is now obviously about liberalism being nothing else than a lie or deception, whom the elitist democracy also fully belongs to, considering that it is just another falsely presented alternative to the real, antique model of democracy.

Legal strategies of liberalism

Considering that from the war of political parties only one party can survive, the whole system of its legal regulations and theoretical ideas then become fully established and operational. This also includes the rule of the law, human rights and freedoms combined with the idea of natural laws, independence of the courts, free market economy and similar.

The idea of globalism gets proclaimed, whose aim, according to the political philosophy, should be to create one unique international economy from national economies of many world countries. Therefore, this is, above all, about the economic globalization, and to be more precise, about understanding of globalization exclusively in economic terms. Fast connection and unification of local economies into one unique international economy happened at the end of the 19th century because of the infrastructure development of roads, which led to faster communication between people. Apart from already developed naval routes, the railway transport was also developing, so that the continental part of the planet did not present an unimaginable obstacle anymore, for conducting the international trade.

This integrative process of combining national economies of various countries into one unique international economy implied the loss of all essential historical characteristics of the specific national economy of that country. That was achieved by legal, political and theoretical strategies such as the free information flow, technology, capital flow of goods, services and similar. However, according to the liberal paradigm, this kind of increased international mobility did not include working class and their freedom of movement across international borders.

The freedom of movement of the working class is not acceptable from the liberal elitist democracy's point of view, because of the fact that there is the capitalist nucleus on one side, and the capitalist periphery on the other. If the free movement of the workers was to be allowed, then the periphery would be left without the cheap labor, which is necessary for the existence of the whole system according to the liberal elitist paradigm. In other words, the highest number of workers from poor periphery would emigrate into the rich capitalist nucleus, which would completely discredit the whole capitalist global system.

On the other side, the free capital flow presents a necessary support to legal structures of the liberal capitalism, and enables safe transport and protection of the acquired capital, into its temporary or future country, that is the protector of financial monopolies. Countries that currently dominate financial monopolies are these, which we historically recognize as the most powerful nations that used to lead, or still lead the mankind. These countries do not maintain their leading status forever, but change it on the political scene, in more or less the same time periods, because of the natural process of the rise and fall of their state power. Saying that, this whole phenomenon of globalization creates a sense of security for an individual owner of the accumulated capital; regardless of these periods, and regardless of which other country will economically dominate in the future. The principle is the same – the movement of capital is an inviolable and fully accepted idea. The owner of the capital is protected in every time period, in every country which follows the liberal ideological paradigm, because there is the generally accepted principle of globalization everywhere today, as well as the principle of capital inviolability, and legal protection of the owner's right to property ownership.

This means that, from the perspective of liberal capitalism, the whole planet should be placed under the rulership of the elitist democracy of Western European type, in order for the principle of globalism to be practically achieved. Therefore, in the liberal doctrine, there is no place for passive behavior for those countries that protect their financial monopolies. Colonialism is the necessary process in order for the ruling class to be completely protected.

The period from the 15th century to the World Wars meant colonization of territories, imposition of governance by the colonizing country, and its exploitation of the natural resources of those poor regions, destined for a complete destruction during that process. After the end of the World Wars, colonizing countries worked as lenders of those same poor regions they had previously colonized, without the need to confiscate their territories this time, except in cases when they desperately needed raw materials from them.

Liberal theory differentiates two critiques of globalism. According to the opinion of Mr. Jagdish Bhagwati expressed in his book titled: “*In defense of globalization*”, the first critique is based on a deeply felt resentment of the process of international economic integration. This critique exclusively defines the phenomenon of globalization as nothing else but the spread of capitalism across the whole world. Liberal agenda does not accept a debate with this type of critique, because it considers it to be subversive and against the benefits of the whole system. This type of critique identifies itself with the critique of the process of globalization explained in this book. The second critique of globalization understands this process as being a major cause of several plagues of the society as a whole, the most sinister one being the economic inequality between nations. In this case, liberal agenda accepts the debate with this type of critique.

The main goal of all these legal and theoretical structures, as it was explained above, is to protect those in charge of sovereignty (*de jure*), while their other goal is to defend ruling class from all those social groups who may try to challenge its authority, and the real legitimacy of its rule in any way (*de facto*). This further means that the ruling class has full power of authority which stretches above the borders of any nation; and that its legal and economic power is not bound by any restrictions to any specific territory of the world. These characteristics provide it with the absolute power to act as an organization of its members in controlling and ruling the whole planet, thus creating the unified system of “planetary economy” which dictates the law to the whole world. In this way the oligarchy definitely secures its existence in the capitalist economy.

As legal and political structures of the liberal capitalism become part of the cultural system after a certain period of time, they then start producing great impact on people's collective social conscience, as a result of which the society starts believing in full legitimacy of the law, and its government as the real founder of democracy. This is about adding to the legitimacy of the state power. According to the belief of the winning paradigm, one of the basic definitions of democracy is that the government is legitimate because its society fully trusts it. It seems that the liberal political thought is not concerned about beliefs of the society which in fact are completely opposite to those which liberal paradigm imposes on people. Since the rule of the law is nothing else than the legal creation of liberalism, it, therefore, does not contain a starting point in itself, which we could recognize and clearly separate from its opposite.

The same is with democracy. Some people think that in democracy the conceptual starting point should not even be looked for, considering that it is only a collection of various democratic procedures – a simple form. Therefore, Hans Kelsen in his book: *"The essence and value of democracy"*, and Joseph Schumpeter in his book: *"Capitalism, socialism and democracy"*, define the term 'democracy' in its formal sense. This means that, the fundamental decider on whether a certain ideology can be called 'the democracy' or not, is a type of form and procedure where 'democracy' appears as a term only; and that essential conditions for it to be able to bear the real importance and significance of its title, are, unfortunately, nothing more than simple fabrications of the law.

According to the thinking of liberal writers, the rule of law exists when the power of the state government is controlled by the law. Law is not only what the state government formulates in its legislation, but also all that is fundamental to the society as a whole, and to every individual human being on this planet. This is about the natural laws and their structure.

It seems that the legislative liberal thought thinks that, in a situation, where there is a conflict between the rule and will of the government, as defined by its legislative form, and the natural law; the winner has to be the natural law because it represents the nature of all human beings, and therefore definite and unquestionable foundation of the science of law.

Adding to that, the law of one country is part of the culture of its people, and it seems that there is enough proof for conclusion that this latest statement is not too far away from the truth. This further means that the level of realization of human rights and freedoms is proportional to the level of culture of those people living in a particular territory. In other words, the individual human being will experience as much freedom as the society he belongs to, culturally progressed at that particular moment in time. It is assumed that economically rich countries have developed high level of culture compared with poor countries where, on the contrary, low level of cultural development, together with cultural deterioration is continuously taking place.

On foundations of liberal political ideas of rich countries their very strong cultural values created a whole political system which we know and live in today. We believe that it is very natural that there are human freedoms and rights in the society; as well as free, general and direct elections for peoples' representatives in legislature and the executive roles. We also fully believe in the importance of independent courts; together with the mechanism of force which a country uses to defend its legislature; its free market economy; and many other legal and political structures of the system in which we are born and live in. The only world we know, we see through the lens of the liberal version of capitalism. This is our frame of mind which we are incarcerated in, and beyond that our ideas cannot progress any further. Every our decision and attitude are only the result of the historical context in which we exist.

Maybe we could go considerably further with this analysis and say that even our own feelings may not be completely free from this determinism. Sometimes it seems that nuances of our feelings are only the result of different cultural influences. This means that people from one culture may not have the same capacity to feel things as do the people belonging to another culture. It is possible then, that liberalism took account of this important difference when a new strategy of globalism was in its process of creation, because the goal of globalization is an attempt at producing the effect of all people feeling the same, and consequently understanding things in the same way. This further leads to people following a prescribed pattern for making individual decisions, which then, at the end of this process, make them completely lose their authenticity and originality and utterly become products of the system's 'mind control' over them and their society as a whole. It is clear how this could influence political science and our understanding of the nature of political system in which we live, and which we most often do not see and feel. We do not see it because we unconsciously accept all limitations that it imposes on us, as a result of which we, again unconsciously, internalize the belief that these limitations are parts of our true selves, of our own personal beliefs. Conclusively, they cannot present compulsory limitations. They are not compulsory because they are in harmony with our understanding of morality. We do not feel them as limitations of our freedom or our sense of equality between people. As the final consequence of this process, it becomes much easier to manipulate people on a global level. Therefore, a very interesting observation comes to mind, which is that for the oligarchic regime in liberal democracy in this globalized world today it is so much easier to manipulate human feelings and understandings than it was in any other oligarchic political regime before liberalism came into the scene.

The system of liberal capitalism, through its legislation and the institutes of law, as well as through its dominant cultural pattern, imposes the thesis on society that elitist democracy is the necessary part of the capitalist society; and that today's form of democracy is the successor of the original, antique form of democracy.

Even more so, it seems that this main thesis of democracy, apart from also being defined as the foundation of the capitalist economy, is considered to be deeply in the roots of the liberal political thought as well.

Of course, there should not be any illusion that, if any other ideology born in capitalism won; the situation would be any different, in this regard. There is enough proof for conclusion that every above mentioned ideology would declare elitist democracy to be the successor of antique democracy as its founder. In order to prove the argument that direct democracy is indeed very important for the society, it is vital to explain its real significance for all of us today, so that we do never allow ourselves the arrogance of rejecting it as being old-fashioned or unnecessary. Its great importance lies in its ultimate legitimacy, which then gets transferred, in a way, to elitist democracy, thus giving it legitimacy; despite the obvious fact that elitist democracy does not have any connections with antique democracy, since in its model people have never ruled over anything.

The challenge that everyone, who tries to describe the mechanism of democratic practices faces today, mostly consists of trying to explain this phenomenon. This is about the fraudulent nature of liberal capitalism and production mechanisms of a new kind of virtual reality, which consumers simply just take for granted.

‘Demos’ as the political class

Contrary to the modern elitist governing, which is euphemistically called *liberal democracy* or *western democracy*, in direct democracy of antique type all citizens can participate in making public decisions, and do so without any intermediaries such as directly or indirectly elected rulers. It is assumed that over time greater majority of citizens can participate in making the most important political decisions.

This is because the skill of governing gets improved with practice, like any other skill. Therefore, the more the citizen publicly practices politics, the more he learns and knows about it. As the final result, it becomes much easier for the citizen to conduct politics and public services in antique state. It seems that there is enough proof to say that this is not just a pure speculation.

Therefore, speaking about direct democracy, the main thesis is that citizens should be deciding about public issues directly, while the individual citizen should be making decisions about his own private issues, by himself entirely. This is the perfect example of direct democracy, and the only possible attempt at measuring real democratic practices. Regardless of how this kind of measuring is an insufficient attempt to exactly define the concept of direct democracy, still we cannot find any more precise definition of it as a form of direct state governing. This is not accidental when we take into account that the whole history of capitalism has been focused on destroying all proofs which would have allowed people to properly and clearly understand the meaning of direct democracy and its importance for them. Instead of that, people were consciously manipulated by their governments to learn more about the elitist democracy as a form of government in which they have “that honor” to choose one oligarchic group that will rule them and the society they belong to.

Democracy originated in the Greek *polis* between the end of the 6th century BC and the beginning of the 5th century BC after the governmental reforms in Athens; from which, completely accidentally, the whole spectrum of direct democratic practices and procedures emerged.

The most frequent criticism of antique direct democracy from the elitist democracy point of view, under the liberal paradigm, is the fact that people such as slaves, strangers, women and children were excluded from it. This exclusion is unacceptable from the liberal point of view.

This is the logical consequence of the main assumption of liberalism, which is the thesis that there is the natural law inherent to all human beings, which all people feel inside themselves. Natural law is about the basic human rights to life, freedom and property ownership, as well as the right to free speech and thinking.

Liberal writers are not too much concerned about the fact that antique time was not aware of those theoretical beliefs. Antique political and legal thought was not familiar with the idea of natural laws and individual freedoms. Their idea of freedom was strictly connected to the status of citizenship, or to the territorial belonging to the *polis*. Only the male citizens had been guaranteed a complete right to practise law through functioning of institutions of the *polis*. *Polis* protected its citizens and not the capital “*in abstracto*”. The second question is how one becomes the citizen of the *polis*. Here, it is very important to keep in mind the fact that human rights in antique *polis* strictly depended on whether a male person belonged to the particular territory. Just because the male was born, he did not automatically acquire any single legal right, from the point of view of the antique polis, nor was the *polis* in any way obligated to provide him with any legal protection either. Only when the birth of the male got connected to his territorial belonging to the *polis*, that male received the complete spectrum of state’s rights; which further protected him through procedures and institutions of the system that the *polis* was founded on. This theoretical stance was the necessary consequence of the slave labor economy, which, compared to all other ways of producing goods and services, proved to be the longest lasting of them all.

Similar to its followers, the slave labor economy designed its own specific legal and theoretical structures, whose main purpose was to defend ‘the highest values’ of that kind of production. ‘Those values’ constituted foundations of the slave labor economy in antique direct democracy. The slave was a thing, and not a man in a sense of belonging to the membership of *demos*. Positive law and its whole system of values, was the one defining those possible and socially acceptable ways of treating slaves.

Slaves were a public property of the *polis*, or a private property of their slaveholders; whom not only they obviously worked for, but also served as their vital production asset. The slaveholder did not have a legal right to do whatever he wanted with his slaves, but had to behave according to the specifically designed restrictive laws of the polis. Since he was the main working force behind any production in slaveholder economy, the slave, therefore, had a specific price on the market, just like the expensive machines, which are necessary parts of the industrial production today. This further means that the slaveholder was not allowed to abuse his slaves by harming their health and lives, because that would be unjustified from the economic production point of view. Also, from the slaveholder's perspective, that would also mean reduction in his personal wealth and assets. The slaveholder could trade products which were results of his slave labor, and so increase his profits. Further on, taking into account that for certain production processes the specific skills and knowledge were required, there were slaves who possessed those skills and abilities. The assumption is that their price was higher than average on the market, and that their work was considerably increasing the slaveholder's wealth.

The whole system of positive law of antique polis supported this kind of business running, by creating its own legal structures. In its real nature, every ideology that is created "under the umbrella" of the superior economic production system, has every right to define its political and legal structures which will justify and secure durability and permanence of that existing profit making production system.

As it was emphasized before, the way we comprehend things is only the result of a particular historical context in which we try to understand the specific social situation or its process. From this starting point we should analyze these unjustified but still natural objections of the liberal capitalist dogma towards antique type of democracy.

In other words, every time period carries in itself its own ideological set of values, which, eventually, triumphs in a fight against similar ideologies. This winning ideology is dominated only by the level of efficiency of the economic production, which dictates this ideological set of values at that particular moment when the certain social process occurs.

From perspective of the winning ideology, the fight between conflicting ideologies as well as interpretation of former historical periods are legitimate and even necessary, from the point of view of the present dogma. Therefore, Ancient Greeks will never reach an agreement with the liberal ideology in respect to their belief that the born male can only become a citizen of the *polis* if, at birth, he is allocated to its particular territory. Liberal ideology says that every male, as soon as he is born; and regardless of where and in which set of conditions he was born in, becomes fully entitled to the whole spectrum of natural laws, that can never be taken away from him. It is then assumed, that, when looking at ideologies in this way, the one who analyses things by focusing on the later historical period is at the slight advantage, because the older ideological dogma cannot argue negative criticisms of the historically younger ideological paradigm aimed at its predecessor. Therefore, taking into account that the citizen in antique democracy gets his legal rights exclusively and only by belonging to the territory of the *polis* he was born in, *demos* is a group of carefully selected citizens which meet this key condition; and not just any group of random people. Only such *demos* can practise the law, and it does that directly, that is, without a mediator. This means that *demos* also presents the political class in antique type of democracy.

The nature of liberal criticism of such a society is not quite clear. The question is whether an exclusion of specific categories of people (slaves, strangers, women and children) from the political decision making gives “a bad name” to the term ‘elitism’? Another question is whether the fact that there are no political mediators between citizens and the government of the *polis*, serves as an accusation of the absence of ‘elitism’? Is there a problem in existence or in non-existence of the political party?

It seems that accusation of *the polis* is about exclusion of the mentioned specific categories of people, which further leads to paradoxical thinking, because the liberal democracy bears that same kind of accusation, which is that in it, just as in the antique democracy, a common person is completely excluded from the process of political decision making. Therefore, the critique is about exclusion of certain categories of people from the political process, while at the same time it is also about the complete exclusion of all people from the same process. To make things even worse, this last statement is considered to be the only durable solution for the elitist democratic system. One more paradox of the elitist ideology is today's firm belief that its democracy is better, more superior version of the antique democracy. It goes even further to say that elitist ideology is the only ideology capable of and willing to completely protect the individual human being, because, according to its dogma, people play a part in the state's sovereignty. In the conclusion, it comes out as being necessary for me to further fully investigate all characteristics and aspects of the elitist democracy.

Political class in elitist democracy

According to the liberal theory, it is emphasized that democracy changed its character as a consequence of colonization: acquiring of new territories, together with broadening of the number of people that goes with it. As a direct result of that, direct democracy became impossible to realize in practice, so it gave way to a formation of the indirect democracy. This should mean that indirect democracy is a descendant of the direct one, which could not have been practically realized anymore, due to the sizes of newly formed colonized states. The value and weight of such statement are seriously compromised by the fact that ancient Athens, being a cradle of direct democracy, was not a small city in itself at that same time. Even more so, it had 300 000 people out of whom 40 000 were considered to be the citizens who directly participated in lawmaking practices, as well as in making executive and judicial decisions.

Therefore, there were methods for direct democracy to be practically exercised in pre-Internet times.

A great number of people in the antique parliament did not present any obstacle to the perfect functioning of direct democracy, despite the fact that people then could not do it the way they practise direct democracy today: by using the Internet to discuss the law proposals and vote by pressing the button on their computers and in the comfort of their homes. Compared to ancient times, today people can also utilize the abundance of information on the Internet to get quickly informed about the voting topic. Further on, when the liberal agenda says that today's countries are too big for practical implementation of direct democracy, the question that comes up is this: what about those countries, federal states, provinces, towns and municipalities which are smaller than Athens was during the beginning of democratic practices? Why are they practically forbidden to conduct direct democratic practices using the system of international law and its practices, which have been developed for centuries under the watchful eye of liberal teachings? In other words, why is the global unification of elitist democracy so important for liberalism that it has to destroy every single bit of direct democracy at the local level? Today's fast communication in the Internet era only further underlines the importance of these questions. As far as liberalism is concerned, there are no answers to them.

According to democracy in the liberal paradigm, the main idea is that people have right to decide who will rule them. They make this decision on direct, general elections, where they choose members of the parliament as legislative part of the government. In presidential systems, apart from choosing the legislative body of the government, people also use elections in order to choose their president, who has the highest executive power; and that choice can be indirect (as in the USA) or a direct one, which is typical today for countries with liberal democracies. In parliamentary systems executive body is chosen in the parliament.

Democracy is, therefore, a form of rulership where those who rule are elected by their people.

In the next chapters we will seriously question the legitimacy of elections, and bring out enough proof which defies the thesis that people are really those who elect their representatives in the parliament. However, for now we will discuss ways in which oligarchies justify their legitimacy in order to further legalize their importance in the paradigm of elitist democracy.

So, as far as liberal agenda of the ruling oligarchic system is concerned, its legitimacy comes from the people and not from the God; as it was the case in feudal period. However, just like in feudalism, in this type of government it is not the people who rule but political parties or oligarchies, which create laws and design their implementation in practice. It is assumed that the content of those laws is designed to match all their oligarchic needs. Just like in feudal period, people are not asked anything about the public issues. In other words, in the liberal elitist democracy people do not make the law just as it was the case with the feudal paradigm, and in regards to this essential issue nothing has changed, despite moving to the higher level of production relationships. When analyzing it from the foundation of democratic practices, the only change is in the source of actual legitimacy the oligarchic power uses to justify its rule, which is of very little importance for an average citizen because to him or her it is probably completely irrelevant whether that power comes from the God or from poor suburbs of the big cities.

Therefore, it seems that in liberal capitalism the question is not whether the people should rule directly but the main theme is that people have the right to decide who will rule them. The liberal theory and practice generously give that right to the man who is, from their perspective, the citizen because he can choose his leaders. When doing that, the very important fact is being overlooked which is that the citizen chooses those who had already been elected. The freedom to choose his rulers from groups of leading oligarchies defines the level of democracy given to people by liberal agenda. Despite the possibility that this *differentia specifica* (specific difference) of the elitist democracy does not provide enough proof for its exact definition, we cannot do better except to say that there is no more precise measure of democracy understood through the liberal-capitalist agenda that allows the citizen to choose his leaders among those who are already chosen.

At the same time, the citizen is a victim in this relationship between him and the whole oligarchic ruling system. He, as we can see, does not rule his society together with other citizens, but only has the right to participate in choosing the future rulers which the system itself had already chosen. The liberal model of virtual reality this position euphemistically calls – *the civic responsibility*. It seems that the liberal doctrine this position regards as being the right one, as well as the responsibility of each and every citizen.

This is the perfect example of hypocrisy of liberal capitalism. The citizen is obligated to pass on the political legitimacy to oligarchies. This is about the “holy responsibility” of the citizen to completely annihilate himself. At the end of this “holy process” the political party, apparently, has legitimacy to create its own version of reality through its rulership.

Feudalism, with its demand for people to believe that rulers received their power from the God was less hypocritical than a demand of liberal capitalism for the citizen to use elections to completely destroy his own power to rule, and with that action “throw one more handful of soil into the grave” of direct democracy of antiquity.

That was the unique form of human political organizing where the citizen was asked about public issues in a way which did not disrespect his political power and influence on public and final political decision making processes. This is why in antique direct democracy the thesis was that the man was indeed a political creature, and that only those people with intellectual disabilities could not be politically active and effective. Everything that happened before this particular historical point (end of the 6th century BC, the reforms of Cleisthenes which created direct democracy in Athens) and everything that followed after that point, can be assessed as periods when the man was asked nothing about public issues, or the period when he did not rule his society and his country. These are periods when the citizen has not existed as a “political creature.” The only period when “the citizen” emerges, shapes his political influence and politically exists in the real sense of this word is that period of direct democratic practices in Athens in the 5th century BC.

The often mentioned thesis of liberal democracy is that people of solid democracies fully believe that this is the best of all socio-political systems. Those people are ready to sacrifice a lot for democracy, while they expect fulfillment of their expectations from their governments, in return. Their expectations are directed towards preservation of their elementary human needs and natural laws which they acquire by birth; while the state requires their sacrifice in a form of paying the bills in a peaceful period, and going to war when asked to do so.

It seems that this is about a permanent exchange between the state and its citizen. For his contributions to the state the citizen gains equivalent benefits, which the state provides such as the above named rule of the law. This state of perpetual trading is called “democracy” in the liberal thought. This means that if there is no rule of the law there, then this is not a democracy. This is why the rule of the law is of unusual importance for every democracy. The rule of the law, in liberal concept, means that the power of the state must be limited by the law, so that nobody can be above it. It seems that in liberal model the rule of the law does mean that certain class of oligarchy can be above the lawmaker.

In other words, the ruling class, who is consisted of political elite on one side and financial elite on the other side, presented by its managers of big corporations and owners of the big capital, truly does not need to try hard in order to be above the written law. This class only needs to create conditions of being above the rule-maker in a sense of imposing its own set of rules that completely match its own needs, to the legislator, and by doing that fully realize its own ambition, which really consists of completely achieving its particular financial goals. Upon such imposition, every attempt of the average citizen not to respect it is considered to be the highest form of heresy in liberal capitalist paradigm. There is enough proof for the thesis that such rule of the law is a real *sine qua non* (an indispensable condition) of the democracy in the liberal paradigm sense of the word.

Therefore, people do not write laws because there can be no word about free will here whatsoever.

Law is written by the elites united into the ruling class which in this book we sometimes call 'political class' as well, because of its "right" to design law, which must be obeyed by all, or otherwise the state will use a military force if necessary, in order to protect it. In other words, the political class is very ready to seriously punish anybody who dares to disobey the "fundamental principle of democratic society" which says that nobody is above the law. As we can see, the principle "nobody is above the law" in liberal paradigm definitely does not fit the practice according to which the ruling political class, or the so called "elite", is certainly above the rule-maker, so that ironically, it can appear on the surface that the state power is controlled and limited by the law, while in fact, the ruling elite is the only one that really is above it.

In relation to this, and to prove the above mentioned thesis, there is a very well developed practice of lobbying in parliaments of the richest countries in the world. Lobbying has succeeded in being brought into the laws as a completely legal and legitimate social practice in those countries. It is assumed that in lobbying conditions where small social groups share the same interests, there can be no talk about the people's opinion in general because interests and desires of lobbyists are always against interests and desires of the vast majority of people.

According to the data from the book: "*Our Revolution – The Future to Believe in*", by Bernie Sanders, three leading industries spent vast amounts of money during election campaign in year 2012 in the USA in order to secure themselves the win in future legislative battles. For example, the pharmaceutical industry invested more than US\$ 50 million by giving that money to members of both leading parties (republican and democratic), while US\$ 240 million went to lobbying practices alone. The military industry did not fall too much behind with its own contributions and lobbying expenditure of US\$ 164 million; while the petrol companies invested US\$ 250 million in these same practices.

When people of future generations start reading about the historical period in which elitist democracy was developing, they will have to take into account the ability of leading ideology to present lies as truths, and the interests of a small number of elite as interests of the whole mankind.

This ability is also a key to understanding the fact that this system of liberal elitist democracy has lasted for a very long time now; and it is a system which we know and live in today. It is, in essence, deceptive and focused on inventing reality through legal constructions.

The rule of law in elitist democracy

In order for law to exist and be considered valid by the people, similar to the belief into the legitimacy of government, it is vital for people to believe that the government is bound by that law; is limited by it and is connected to it through legislation. In other words, there has to be legal equality between the people and the law, because that enables citizens to trust the law, and further on, it creates a consistent, solid and self-sustained society. If people did not trust the rule of the law in their country, then it would not exist. This is about demand for the belief into something which in itself does not exist actually, and does not even have to exist. This is the kind of religious belief which assumes that people have faith in existence of the social state that is controlled by the law in a way that nobody is, or ever can be. In other words, the rule of law is presented here in its material or fundamental sense. Since the former chapter explained that elitist democracy does not allow formation of such a state, we choose to be very reserved about authenticity of such definition.

Just like in democracy, the rule of the law can be analyzed in its formal sense which is the compatibility of administrative and judicial practices. Here it is important that state establishments make identical decisions about subjective, individual rights of its citizens. It does not matter whether the final decision is right or wrong; nor does its content matter.

What actually matters is that both above named practices work together in making that decision, because this is what gives the law its credibility, and makes citizens trust it – trust the rule of the law with its legislature. That credibility sustained over a long period of time creates a strong sense of trust in the rule of law in people. This is about the trust which the government of a country wants to build between it and its people over a long period of time. It is assumed that any kind of a mismatch between the administrative and judicial practices can seriously damage the hard won trust between the government and its people.

The liberal paradigm cannot agree more with this “compatibility design” between administrative and judicial practices that work together to create a sense of trust between people and the law of the state they live in. In other words, according to the liberals, the only conceptual starting point for something to be considered “the rule of the law” is nothing else but people’s own trust in it; their own belief in the power of the law to guarantee them their subjective citizen’s rights. This is a very poor starting point because its thesis cannot be proven. Liberal thought, therefore, does not provide a solid foundation for the people’s belief in the rule of the law, and so in this paradigm of capitalist economy the whole “people trust the law” topic can therefore be reduced to pure religious dogma; and further on, it makes it difficult to clearly separate this belief (“people trust the law”) from its opposite (“people do not trust the law”).

On the brighter side, however, the mentioned compatibility between the administrative practice and the judicial practice from strictly formal perspective can be partially checked, which then provides people with a more solid foundation for their belief in law, and that it will guarantee them their subjective rights. Therefore, the only criterion for citizens’ belief in the rule of the law must be the compatibility of administrative and judicial practices. The more judicial practice is in harmony with administrative one, the stronger the rule of the law is. This means that it is possible that the rule of the law does not exist at all in some states, while in others it exists only partially.

Therefore, it is logical that the first situation applies to countries of the capitalist periphery while the second applies to those belonging to the capitalist middle-periphery. This further means that the rule of the law performing at its full capacity is reserved only for those countries of the capitalist nucleus, taking into account that only those few of them are culturally developed highly enough, so that they can enable the institutions of the law to fully and completely function.

It should be mentioned that the states of capitalist nucleus completed their process of formation of their countries in the 19th century, which was parallel to their colonial conquests of the natural resources of the rest of the world, and which in reality meant conquering all places on the planet by making them parts of capitalist economy of those liberal Western European countries. From this combination of two parallel processes those colonizing countries became very rich in resources which further led to opening of institutions of their governing systems such as development of economy, development of their technological processes. That further led to divergence of those Westerns European countries and their Anglo-Saxon successors from the rest of the world.

Since the capitalist system is not homogeneous in economic sense as well as in cultural sense, it seems that there is not enough proof for thesis that this divergence will be overcome in the future, with evolutionary development of system as a whole. On the contrary, there are too many indicators that the correct thesis will actually be completely the opposite. There are simply too many differences which cannot be overcome, and which are going to exist for as long as the system that created them “lives.”

Since its differences are serious, we define three rings of the capitalist system: the capitalist nucleus, the capitalist middle-periphery and the capitalist periphery. The capitalist nucleus, thanks to its highly developed technological production processes, creates complex products and sells them to outside rings for high prices.

The goal of countries belonging to middle-periphery and the periphery is to provide countries in capitalist nucleus with raw material and cheap, domestic labor force, so that the final production of complex products inside the nucleus countries, and sometimes outside of them, can even be possible.

It is assumed that the periphery is pressured to sell its final products for cheap prices, and to buy expensive final products of the nucleus countries in return. It also has to be taken into account that the middle-periphery countries serve as nucleus for those countries in the periphery, as the author Immanuel Wellerstein convincingly proved in his book “*After Liberalism*.”

The result of this situation is deep and insurmountable divergence between the rich and the poor countries, which we can also observe as the outer divergence. This economic inequality obviously goes from the nucleus towards the periphery of the capitalist model of reality. It is further obvious that there is a very prominent economic inequality inside the countries of middle-periphery and periphery, where there is a small number of people in each of them who are very rich and own almost the whole capital of that periphery because of their ties to, and their financial and economic contributions to the governments of nucleus countries. The real rulers of those countries belong to the economic elite of the nucleus countries, and are also their naturalized citizens as well.

This fact in itself has no much weight considering that the ruling class is not territorially connected and therefore has “above-national” character, so to say. The process of buying economic resources of the periphery occurs through different ways of taking over of those resources in the public sector, which, in essence, leads to the constant, “crazed” and very unjust privatization practice.

It is nothing else than taking the rest of the world under the rulership of capitalist economy of Western European liberal type, with all this happening under “the watchful eye” of multinational corporations and their leaders of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

As a result of these processes the capitalist periphery chronically stagnates in every aspect of its existence. It is obvious that this situation is totally acceptable for the capitalist nucleus because it solves its problem of finding a cheap labor force. However, it seems that this state of affairs also creates the state of economic inequality in the actual nucleus. Naturally, the leading class pays dutiful attention to this situation because, contrary to the previous one, this can escalate into disruption of the functioning of the whole system.

Since this type of inequality is also very deep and insurmountable, the question is how to control it, that is, how to deal with it effectively so that it preserves social peace and does not create violent public unrests of people who feel ignored and disrespected by their governments.

To that is has to be added the fact that capitalist way of production carries in itself a seed of various types of deep economic crisis, which occur in predictable time cycles, and which, sometimes, in the worst case scenario, can lead to stagflations, especially in the situation when they are combined with insurmountable and chronic inner social inequality. This means that such economy starts entering the downward spiral of the growth of all prices, growth of unemployment, as well as the sudden and continuous fall in production efficiency. In such spirals, the question of how to give an efficient vent to that stagflation becomes a paramount for every country’s government who finds itself in such a situation.

The proven way of conquering stagflations that lead to social unrests and organizing abused people against their oligarchies throughout the history consisted of formation of the solitary and isolated, so called “war department”, and starting of the big wars, which would then activate all economic resources and eventually save the country’s economy from those destructive spirals.

The first part of Napoleon Bonaparte’s rule is the real indicator of how activation of all economic resources of one society brings economic recovery, after the 100 year period of stagflation France was in, just before their big revolution.

Difficult economic crisis started in the 18th century during the rule of Louis the XIV, lasted throughout the rule of Louis the XV in order to be continued after the fall of the rule and the head of Louis the XVI. Only then, the rulership of the country went into the hands of General Bonaparte, and when he started wars with all rich and important European countries, the economic recovery of France started to happen.

After the World War II it became impossible to have wars at the global level because of the nuclear war arsenal of many countries. Then, the question was asked as to how to give a vent to the pressure, and solve the problem of inner economic inequality in the capitalist nucleus countries.

The solution was found in reaffirmation of the liberal idea of the rule of law, as well as insisting on inviolability of human rights through the international institutionalization of that rule of law, so that it could replace economic inequality in capitalist nucleus. Therefore, in the second half of the 20th century the whole international system of institutions was starting to get formed, together with law institutes which were part of international contracts. This was mostly done at the multilateral level whose intention was to create legal equality among people of the capitalist nucleus, regardless of their class level. In other words, the goal of those legal structures was to create in people an illusion that they could improve their social status if they work hard.

Massive implementation of this “illusion” is otherwise especially useful in periods of economic stagnation when the importance of inherited capital dominates.

From historical perspective, as insufficient as it may look, in the second decade of the 21st century we can quite accurately conclude that people’s equality in front of the law as replacement of *de facto* equality did not bring long term results. Inequality inside the capitalist nucleus is indisputable. Since wars cannot be used anymore to solve this problem, question is which kind of cure the system will have to come up with, in order to reduce this big gap between the small number of the richest people and the poor majority of people in the capitalist nucleus.

This problem is much more difficult to solve than deep inequality between people in three rings of capitalist economic system, taking into account that outer inequality has not shown a capacity to harm the foundations of this system. Therefore this hopeless deepening of inequality between the rich and the poor people in the nucleus creates a real danger of survival of liberal capitalism.

We saw before that the legal system is developed proportional to the cultural development of one society, which is a direct consequence of how economically rich that society is. In other words, law is the part of the culture, and culture can only be found in rich countries as opposed to the poor ones.

The countries of capitalist nucleus possess technological knowledge which the countries belonging to middle-periphery and periphery do not, nor they ever will, and this is the only reason why those rich countries established the rule of law in its full capacity everywhere.

It is fully understood that this whole situation is a direct consequence of the colonialism of nucleus countries, which ravaged poor countries by taking their territories in the past, and by putting them into a financial debt at present time of neoliberalism. Formally this means that the rule of the law can only be exercised by the rich, and that the law itself in reality does not exist in material sense of the liberal political doctrine. This is because there is no such social state where the power of the government is controlled by the legal system so that nobody is above the law, since, as we saw before, the whole ruling class is above the legislator and therefore, essentially, above the law itself. Such a state of affairs has been going on since the very beginning of the capitalist way of production.

From the beginning of the 21st century there have been around 15 countries where the rule of law exists in its formal sense, however, there is not a single country that can pride itself with the rule of law in context of the liberal capitalist paradigm, and, in particular, the way this paradigm officially proclaims it.

The whole tragedy of capitalist system is that for it to survive the rule of the law just by itself - or understood in any way we want - is not enough. Something more than just the illusion of justice expressed through the rule of law is required for our system to sustain itself or progress into something higher, without completely destroying itself.

The question is whether other countries can reach the formal rule of the law, the way societies of those 15 countries mentioned above enjoy, because they are under the protection of those holders of world's financial monopolies? If the answer to this question is positive, then all transitions which the countries of middle-periphery and periphery are going through may have a deeper meaning or purpose, instead of being only "the slaves" of the Western European liberal model of economy and their countries' representatives.

Obviously, if this is not the case, then we have to ask ourselves what the purpose is of all these transitional processes which defined a period between the 20th and the 21st century.

Well, apart from achieving global unification of elitist democracy for the purpose of easier rulership of oligarchies, nothing else comes to mind. The rule of law is considerably different from democracy. According to liberalism, democracy is the rulership of majority over the minority of people, while it defines the rule of law as being the state in which the country's government is controlled by the law and nobody can be above it. These two social concepts are intrinsically bound together in a model of liberal capitalism, and only in such a state they can exist, but this is only one perspective of looking at things. When we start looking deeper into the analysis of the relationship between these two concepts; when we remove the outer layer of it and free them from all political ideologies, we could notice that the democracy and the rule of law are not necessarily so close together.

If we assume that democracy does not exist at all, as the starting assumption was, then we cannot deny that the rule of the law does exist in its formal sense only, however, in much smaller number of countries, which are members of the United Nations. This means that the opposite situation is now possible, which is the ancient type of direct democracy without the rule of law, that is, without the unity of judicial and administrative practices.

There cannot be the rule of law in its essential, formal and material sense of the word, without the simultaneous existence of direct democracy because the law itself can only exist if it dominates and controls the society ("nobody is above the law" statement), and the only way for that to be achieved is if that law is direct reflection and expression of the general will of its citizens.

We have already seen that in the elitist democracy there cannot be any discussion about the rule of the law as direct expression of the will of its people, because in this paradigm law is created by the ruling political class without any influence from the citizens (who would otherwise give it the strength or the “fresh breath” of their own will, and, obviously, make it much more relevant and beneficial to all, and not just to the ruling class).

Economic growth and democratic practices

There is a certain disproportion between the rule of law and democracy in the sense that proper application of the law can only be achieved in economically rich countries with their high cultural awareness which goes with that, while democracy has a tendency to develop opposite of the economic growth.

According to assumptions partially based on the data provided by the author Thomas Piketty in his book: “*Capital in the twenty first century*” (the BC period is not included) we can conclude that the production in the old age was nonexistent or very close to zero while direct democracy was going strong. The same applies to the middle age, the feudal period, where economic production was also close to zero while remains of direct democracy were going in the opposite direction, on the local level: direct democracy was “very stubborn” and solid in its presence there.

However, with the Industrial Revolution, it seemed that all chances for direct democracy became reduced to zero or close to it, and in direct opposition to the economic growth. In other words, while economic growth was going ever stronger, direct democratic practices were reaching consistently lower points, and even fell close to zero. Conclusively, with the emergence and development of Industrial Revolution, with its sudden and fast production growth, democracy became wiped out from the face of the Earth, and it was never restored again.

Since direct democracy can only be established if the economic growth suddenly starts stagnating at a global level in the close future, the question is whether this rule called “economy up – democracy down” is created only by accident? If the answer to this question is negative, then the following question is whether the stagnation of economic growth on a global level, which is predicted for the future, can increase historical chances for restoration of direct democracy?

According to liberal capitalism, its answer would be that, the richer the country is, the higher the chances for development of democracy. This attitude is the necessary consequence of understanding that the rule of law is an indisputable part (*sine qua non*) of democracy. Considering that the rule of law is only possible in rich countries which have developed system of cultural values as opposed to poor countries whose cultural system is not developed enough in order to secure the compatibility of judicial and administrative practices, therefore, according to liberals, the connection between economic prosperity and development of democratic practices is firm and clear.

According to the liberal theory, a great number of institutions of the system have to be well developed and function well, in order for social progress to continue. So, part of the contemporary liberal theory emphasizes progress of institutions from the “limited access” to the model of “open access” as being the main reason for the so called “big divergence”, which actually means considerable falling of the rest of the world behind the Western Europe and its Anglo-Saxon successors, after the year 1500. This is the attitude of the author Niall Ferguson in his book: *“The great degeneration.”*

The “limited model” would therefore belong to those countries with centralized rulership (authoritarian states for whom the opinion of its people does not count), and a small number of non-government types of institutions, which as a consequence has a slow or non-existent economic growth.

On the other side, the model of “open access” brings economic growth because of its decentralized rulership which actually means political victory of tradesmen over the feudal aristocracy, and establishment of control over the royal power through the institution of parliament. This means that the reason for the change also partly came from people being partial bearers of sovereignty. Authenticity of such analysis of historical processes is questionable, but one thing, out of all this, stays for certain. The “open” model of development of institutions truly brings better and more progressive capital growth because many non-government types of institutions start to emerge, and they convert the accumulated capital into a variety of business enterprises. This necessary further leads to a spiral of accelerated development of the whole society, that is, to a very fast capital production and economic prosperity. The question is now what exactly caused such social process to happen.

Without any intention of negating the importance of the process of development of inclusive institutions of the system in any society, we also have to pay attention to the chronological development of certain social processes and important periods in history. Liberal doctrine often mentions the year 1688 as the turning point in development of the so called “open access” in development of the institutions of the political system. In that year the “Famous Revolution” took place in England, after which the royal power became subservient to the parliament in many ways. This historical moment is considered to be a historical turning point from decentralized perspective of state government ruler ship, as a consequence of which the whole new system of historical processes emerged. These were the Agricultural Reform and the Industrial Revolution, the way it was explained in author Ferguson’s book mentioned above. In other words, it is possible that the liberal thesis from that moment on was that state ruler ship had to receive its approval from people whom it ruled, which further follows that up to that moment it did not have such approval.

This further means that the state power received some kind of legitimacy “from the bottom up”, and that it has continuously kept up this legitimacy up and including today in order to serve as its foundation in a model of liberal elitist democracy.

However, it seems that the mentioned liberal thesis does not take into account the class character of this political struggle which initiated, that is, which came before this as well as before all later significant historical events. To some liberal writers it does not seem authentic and real that, in order for society to become rich and the rule of law to well and truly rule, it is necessary for citizens to fight a very hard struggle against “the crown” in order for people to take part of the power from it. After that struggle, the entrepreneurial process can begin. It consists of opening of new institutions of the system, and the maximum exploitation of the saved capital in a form of its investment into various profitable business enterprises. As a result of this process, according to these authors, the richer society emerges, which is controlled by the law that is called “democracy.”

However, it should be clear that the complex historical process of destroying the royal political influence, whose legitimacy comes from the God, and whose power cannot be replaced by anything or anybody, cannot simply be explained and justified by the “fight of the people” for what they consider to be the just and right thing to do. Further on, it seems that the societies of Western and Northern Europe, the thesis above relates to, had considerably accumulated their capital in comparison to the rest of the world, at those turning points and very significant events in human history. This capital is a direct consequence of their imperialistic politics which includes depriving all those poor countries of their basic human, natural rights; those same rights that are deeply engraved into the foundations of Western European liberal elitist democracies. Finally, the fact that stays completely overlooked is that the capitalist nucleus countries do not show any interest in broadening their territories to include the middle-periphery and periphery countries.

In other words, rich countries of the Western European type will never allow the rest of the world to use the same, inclusive process of forming their institutions in order to enter “the club of rich countries” like themselves. This is because that club is of an exclusive character which does not get any bigger over time in any evolutionary way. It seems that the fact the a small number of Eastern Asian countries, who achieved considerable economic growth in the second half of the 20th century, does not present any exception to this rule, taking into account that the countries of capitalist nucleus silently approved transition of those Asian countries from middle-periphery to the nucleus.

As far as the analysis of the modern liberal doctrine about causes of degeneration of modern Western European institutions is concerned, there is enough proof for accuracy of this thesis. This is because it is obvious that Western economies deteriorated in comparison to the Eastern ones of the capitalist nucleus; especially when we take into account that Eastern economies used to be middle-peripheries in relation to the nucleus in earlier historical periods, while they seemed to be the nucleus in relation to underdeveloped countries back then.

This is not accidental, and explanation of this historical process that happens in front of our eyes is authentic. In other words, degeneration of system’s institutions in Western capitalist nucleus is the reason why the Western economy deteriorated, and thus caused reduction of differences between the East and the West. The question is now how a reduction of the big divergence between the East and the West will impact development of democratic practices in the future. Whether degeneration of institutions of Western countries and weakening of Western economies as a necessary consequence of this, can invert the process of global unification of elitist democracy? Another question is whether ruling classes of Eastern economies in expansion will just continue with this process as some kind of inherited cultural heritage.

If we start from the fundamental thesis of this book which is that political classes are neither nationally nor territorially defined, and that the idea of globalization is deeply embodied in cultural systems of countries today, this thesis should then provide the same answer which is that globally unified system is vital and necessary to be continued.

Consequently, the process of unification of elitist democracy must be continued, because Eastern economies must rely on the free capital flow. In order for that to happen, it is fundamental for the globally unified system of values and beliefs to exist because it is the strongest weapon in preserving the *status quo*, just like what the Western European economies had been doing for centuries.

From everything mentioned above, it can be concluded that there is not enough material to prove the thesis that democratic practices will be significantly improved at the global level, due to Eastern economies getting closer to or even overcoming the Western economies in the future. Therefore the necessity of careful political preparation for future changes by means of future economic stagnation must be emphasized.

Equality and freedom 'de facto' and 'de jure'

It seems that the liberal capitalist thought takes for granted that all citizens of modern systems of capitalist countries have equal right to vote in elections as well as possessing their natural rights.

These are the basic human rights and freedoms: right to live, to have freedom, property, freedom of speech and press, religious freedom, freedom of public gathering and organizing, right to equal protection in front of the law, and right to a fair trial within a reasonable period. According to the liberal theory, these rights are universal and unalienable.

Today, international law recognizes them through international contracts, and especially through European Convention of Protection of Human Rights and Basic Liberties.

Here it is obvious that liberal thought does not make any difference between countries belonging to the capitalist nucleus and those belonging to the periphery, but makes the same rules for the capitalist system as a whole by using the parole: equality and freedom for all.

For liberals, even before the French Revolution and up to now, the final political goal was freedom in equality. From this comes the conclusion that the bigger part of liberal thought assumes that this goal has been achieved, which is exactly when we start having problems with exact definition of the concept of equality. Liberalism interprets equality in a strictly formal-legal sense, and to be more specific, as equality of citizens in front of the law. In other words, in order for equality between people to be declared, so to say, it is enough for the law to guarantee the same protection of the same rights to each citizen. The fact that in human rush for achieving financial security, not everybody begins from the same financial starting point seems to be completely irrelevant to liberals. For them the only thing that is important is that the law treats both the rich and the poor citizens in the same way. Considering that the equality between people in societies can only be achieved if they are of the similar socio-economic status, the liberal political thought uses legal constructions as an alternative to the fact above, as well as to justify its own interpretation of equality. In other words, if there is no real equality there, liberal thought offers us a false definition of equality in order to preserve social peace and stability, which is the equality in front of the law. Conclusively, for liberal model of capitalism, equality of all in front of the law is important, while economic equality is not important because it cannot be achieved.

It seems that the liberal version of capitalism understands the rule of law in democracy as the state of social order as opposed to the social chaos.

According to the theory of 'Social Contract' the citizen receives freedom for possession of his property and formal citizenship rights in exchange for his natural rights specified before. This is illustrated in the book called "The Social Contract" by Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Therefore, the society gets order instead of chaos, as well as security and predictability instead of insecurity and unpredictability. Such a state for liberal writers means the state of freedom. The citizens are free because they acquired 'the freedom of citizenship', and at the same time they also acquired equality because they are all equal in front of the law.

PART II

THE SHORT HISTORY OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY

The Old Age and introduction of democracy

Direct democracy started developing in Athenian polis as a consequence of the state reform completed during the rulership of Cleisthenes, and on foundations of former reforms started during the rulership of Solon, who completed Agricultural Reform and codification of the civic law in Athens. That literally enabled the reforms of Cleisthenes to take place. He created constitutional reforms in Athens at the end of the VI century BC as direct state reaction to attempts at re-establishing the domination of oligarchy in Athens. Those constitutional reforms really represented one whole project of new state and political organization. Their fundamental goal was to strengthen the central power while reducing the power of oligarchy in the Athenian government.

Some theorists believe that the second goal of state reforms was to provide Athenian citizens such as tradesmen and craftsmen with the political power and dominance. It seems that the strengthening of crafts and trades caused Cleisthenes' reforms as a consequential reaction to that; in other words, as tradesmen's desire to combine their newly established economic influence with the political power, so that they can have both. At the time when mentioned reforms took place, Athenian society was going through the process of commodity exchange to currency exchange in their inner trade; which was encouraging the influence of rich tradesmen and craftsmen on the central government.

Therefore, reforms were the necessary consequence of strengthening of trade and craft, as well as of the accumulation of capital. These reforms led to emergence of direct democracy as their final result, whose creators could not be aware of its real significance at the time. Democracy, in its final form emerged half a century after the reforms of Cleisthenes, as its logical consequence. It seems that his reform “was not aware” of the term ‘democracy’ at the time, and neither did the creators of constitutional reform have a primal goal of the citizens to take over the political power.

Through centuries to come, continuous strengthening of tradesmen’s and craftsmen’s businesses and persistent accumulation of their capital caused a completely different outcome to the one explained above. Direct democracy eventually started deteriorating until final traces of it completely disappeared. French Revolution formally ended feudal production relationships and initiated the beginning of capitalist way of production, and with it a complete disappearance of democracy. In other words, the same social process of strengthening of certain professional groups (craftsmen and tradesmen) that caused flourishing of direct democracy in the ancient time, in 18th century AD became the initiator of its complete destruction and disappearance.

New constitution born out of Cleisthenes’ reforms consisted of a change of territorial division from the old one to the new one. The newly divided territory consisted of the ten biggest territorial units (*phyle*). Every *phyle* was further divided into three smaller units (*tritty*), which were further divided into even smaller units (*deme*).

After the reforms of Cleisthenes *deme* became a purely territorial unit, which means that its citizens were belonging to a particular area of that territory and not to any tribal, that is, familial community. In case of relocating to any other part of Athens, the citizen continued to belong to the *deme* where he was born and whose name he carried as his surname.

This means that tribal connections were weakening over time, opposite to “the sense” of territorial belonging which was strengthening at that same time. As a consequence of that, the state developed power and monopoly over citizens of a certain territory.

The sense of belonging to a particular territory led to strengthening of the central power. This is quite paradoxical since *demes* were having their local jurisdiction at the same time for the first time in history, because every *deme* was not only territorial but also a self-governing unit. Each *deme* had its own government (*agora*) which consisted of all free citizens of its territory. This was the revolutionary idea brought up by Cleisthenes’ reforms. Up to this point in history, there is no proof that the citizen had been allowed to make decisions about his own destiny ever before. *Deme* had an ownership over the land and profits; it had its own finances and it was making decisions related to public issues on its territory. This means that the smallest unit of local self-government had fundamental responsibilities and autonomous financing in the ancient Athenian *polis*.

These two cumulative facts, together with direct democratic practices illustrated through another fact that all free citizens of the *deme* were also the members of its parliament, defined the self-governing character of the *deme* as the smallest unit of the local government. According to Herodotus, the overall number of those *demes* was 100. Later on, that number gradually grew.

Translated into today’s language, every suburban area of Athens had its own parliament consisted of all its citizens, who were deciding laws and used dice to form their temporary judicial, executive and administrative governing bodies. Such government had its own individual responsibilities assigned to it by Cleisthenes’ reform, and they related exclusively to that particular suburban area.

This is why those suburbs were called 'self-governing units', but also because they completely financed their own government. In other words, these smallest territorial units could create profit as well as effectively deal with their own expenses, all thanks to the authority given to them by this reform.

This all means that the Athenian polis was some kind of independent (*sui generis*) alliance between state's townships and areas of the town all connected through direct democracy as the highest form of social organization. In this pyramid of responsibilities the township's government was at the peak and ruled by using direct democratic practices exclusively. In this kind of government organization the average Athenian citizen was raised up to the pedestal of the legislator which is what made this structure extraordinarily stable in return. It seems that, at that moment, the man was closest to the real ruler than it had ever been possible before. The only serious problem with this was that such government organization did not last for long.

In order for future possible separatist tensions to be avoided, smaller territorial units, *trittyes*, were not separate territories in a sense that they were not bordering on each other within each *phyle*, even though there was one in each of those ten largest territorial units, as mentioned before. Athenian national assembly (*eklesia*) had the highest governing power, which means that all other legislations were subordinate to it. Therefore, the governing assembly was above the executive and judicial assemblies. Executive assembly consisted of 500 male citizens while the judicial assembly consisted of small traditional courts and bigger national courts which had their important juries.

Every *phyle* had to give an equal number of its representatives to the most important executive organ of the state - the assembly of 500 citizens called *boule*. Executive organ had a responsibility to choose the material that went to the national assembly for final approval, while the national assembly had the responsibility to choose members of the executive organ, while taking into account equality between ten *phyles*.

Therefore, it can be concluded that there was a system of balance between the legislative and executive assemblies in ancient Athens, similar to our modern legislative systems of government organization. The national assembly was choosing state clerks by throwing the dice and their responsibility was to take care about technical things related to the functioning of the system. On the other side, a number of mandates of those clerks were strictly limited to two, according to constitutional rules of Cleisthenes' reforms in Athens. This is very different from neoliberal constitutional decisions that we have today, which have a strong tendency not to change the governing political class for long periods of time. Political class today has a permanent employment through a whole net of bureaucratic institutions from both a country's and international perspectives, and a way of government operating today.

In golden period of Athens the rule made by Pericles said that every single citizen was capable of making political decisions, and even more so, in the 5th century BC *demos* was making decisions not only in regards to legislative issues but also in regards to executive and administrative rulership as well. This means that antique type of democracy was much bigger in its scope than any other type of democratic rule which came after it. If we accept the liberal thesis that there is some kind of democracy in existence in our society, we cannot deny that such democracy is of a significantly narrower scope compared to the antique one, because in our democracy people only indirectly participate in legislative power while they do not have any influence on judicial and administrative rulership, which is, again, completely opposite to the antique type of democratic practices. In our time, the executive and judicial rulership derivatively come from the legislative rule, which does not come from citizens themselves. In that sense, today's liberal version of democracy is theoretically a narrower model of democratic practices compared to the Athenian direct democracy.

With the growing power of self-governing units in direct democracy of ancient Athens, different levels of government reached a mutual synergy.

For example, this means that the growth of units of local self-government also meant the growth of its central power. Direct democracy made Athenian state stronger than ever before. The person was not part of his tribe anymore, but the citizen of his *deme* instead, and through it, the citizen of Athens as well. This meant that the citizen's own sacrifice in the name of the state continuously grew. The citizen was readier for sacrificing because he was making decisions in the assembly of his *deme*, and, through delegating of his candidates into state organs; he also individually participated in the state's politics. In such a system, the citizen did not have a feeling that he had been underestimated in any way because he was the political person in every sense of the word.

It is up to us to contemplate how things would have developed if, instead of devolution of democracy, its evolution had followed. There is enough proof for the statement that today's man, because he learned to make political decisions before, would become more perfect and significantly more skilled at making decisions about destiny of his own society and his own family. By taking a full responsibility for himself, the citizen would have been able to make humanity stronger throughout the history. This would have meant a true social evolution, that is, the man's political descent from the tree of governorship to the ground of taking his destiny into his own hands.

The Old Age and break with direct democracy

Reasons behind needs of most significant Greek philosophers to be against direct democracy were the same as today's needs of our writers to criticize the complete opposite of it – liberal democracy. It is about the need of intellectuals to speak against the system. The need to act against the system is inherent to anybody who thinks for himself about social relationships because not a single socio-political regime was ever good enough to be fully accepted by everybody throughout the history of mankind. This need grows stronger with gradual diminishment of good political practices of the particular socio-political state, so attitudes and actions of antique philosophers should be analyzed from that angle.

Those people grew up in Athenian direct democracy and formed their ideas according to its political regime and values.

Although today's neo-liberal writers, who are traditionally close to the highest political classes of the most powerful countries in the world say the opposite, things are the very same today. They are just presented in a very cunning way because today's political elites hold nuclear weapons of mass destruction "in their hands", the way the antique political elite could not even imagine; and so it happens that some authors declare the worst socio-political system in the history of mankind as being the best. Since it is, according to their opinion "the best" in a sense that better socio-political system cannot be formed, this means that the end of history should be declared. It seems that from antiquity until today's time nothing much has changed in terms of imperfections of political systems, and therefore, there can be no talk about the end of history, realistically speaking.

The big Greek philosophical trio positioned themselves as the intellectual elite in their critique of democracy. Their task was to accuse the political regime for deteriorating of the system's institutions. The end of history does not exist considering that the man will never have perfect socio-political system, which will fully develop all people's potentials, and which will, because of that, close the book of history once and for all. This is the impossible concept, and the most significant critics of democracy from its "golden period" knew this very well. They just could not predict that all future socio-political systems that came after direct democracy were going to be unbelievably worse for the psychological development of the man, and that the citizen will eventually become the consumer.

Socrates was killed because of the government's decision to punish him for rejecting the generally accepted values. Some thinkers believe that Socrates' trial was according to the laws of that time, therefore the death of famous Greek philosopher is not a consequence of bad functioning of direct democracy.

However, the opinion of historians won over, and it said that the trial, which took place in year 399 BC was only a farce, and that Socrates was accused and condemned to death because of the “blasphemy” and “attempts to morally corrupt Athenian youth.” The reason for conducting a judicial process was probably contained in the fact that by criticizing the most influential Athenian politicians Socrates presented himself as being their direct opponent. This means that political elitism also existed in direct democracy. During the rule of the *demos*, there were both political elitism and financial elite in existence. Up to this point, the elitist democracy is no different to direct democracy.

However, from this point on, there should be a clear line of separation of the two, and exclusively to the antique type of democracy, it should be emphasized that it, nevertheless, did not lead up to the rulership of oligarchy. Here, that rulership means the mutual government of both political and financial elites, from which law is “extracted”, as well as its practical implementation, thus making freedom in equality (*isonomia*) completely impossible.

The philosophical successor of Socrates was Plato who suggested the rulership of some kind of aristocracy, to be more precise, of the smartest people instead of the rulership of people in general, in his literature work called “*The republic*”. After that, he corrected himself by stating that the law should rule, in his subsequent literature work: “*The laws*.” The assumption is that the tragic faith of his teacher Socrates had a profound influence on his attitude towards direct democracy. Aristotle goes one step further than Plato by stating that the state should be ruled by an independent government.

It seems that cultural systems of today constitute successors of the cultural system which was defined during the time of direct democracy, and despite the fact that there are fundamental differences between the Christian and the Antique cultures. The first one was completely anthropocentric during direct democracy, while the Christian culture was theocentric overall. If the assumption that western civilization stands on the ruins of Christianity is accepted, then the argument of those ruins having the antique anthropocentric foundations is very strong.

It has to be taken into account that everyday direct democratic practices of average people created antique foundations of science, philosophical schools, as well as the antique interpretation of art. The reason behind such intense development of science and art at that particular time was for the purpose of those average people to gain knowledge and abilities, so that they could serve multiple roles such as legislators, judges and administrative clerks in their government. Only when Athenian direct democracy started to decline, demand of Socrates for moral instead of immoral to re-establish itself as a fundamental part of the politics started to come up. Therefore we can conclude that the refusal of Socrates to accept new democratic practices was really a reaction to a decline and diminishment of the fundamental values of the *polis*. The '*paideia*' of Socrates (acquiring education and culture together; meaning inclusion of culture and development of moral integrity of young people together with educating them) presents, in essence, the response to the political decline of Athens. That decline had a heavy negative impact on further development of philosophical thought and education in Athens: instead of educating young people to fully sacrifice themselves to their *polis* and be blindly obedient to it, the philosophical teaching starts going into the opposite direction of educating them to become self-centered and morally focused on themselves first. Sophists will further develop those ideas through teaching of Protagoras about not being obedient to the state, or in other words, of educating and "preparing" people to enter the new "cultural system" of political paradigm of direct democracy.

Taking everything mentioned above into consideration, parallels with today's present time are clear; and the necessity of reaffirmation of everything that stands in foundations of our cultural system is vital. Today's time requires bringing up the person to become the citizen of the system and not its slave; to become focused on individualism and not consumerism. Civic disobedience and refusal to obey elitist vision of democracy are responsibilities of each and every individual today. Demand for development of moral integrity must not mean educating young people to become blindly obedient to governments of their countries.

Quite the opposite is true: '*paideia*' must be restored through demand that education of today's person also becomes his or her cultural uplifting to the level of the citizen, that is, to the level of direct democracy type of political existence, because blind obedience to elitist democracy should actually be blind obedience to people's own individual moral integrity.

In antique *polis* there was a strong connection between these ideas and the politics. Truly, it could be said that art, philosophy and science from the period of antique *polis* found their foundations in political practices which were of direct nature at that time, considering that all *demos* was a political class. Today as we understand that we inherited parts of antique cultural heritage; we also therefore understand that in foundations of modern cultural systems there are direct democratic practices of the ancient citizen.

These foundations of the modern man are located at deeper levels of our cultural system because there are frauds and illusions of liberalism and its false alternative on the surface. Discovery of our foundations is going to be a long term process which will not take place in the same way in each part of the world. However, the change of cultural ideal will necessarily happen together with the change of political system since, as we saw in the antique example, when the politics change the cultural system changes too.

Development of democracy coincides with introduction of money as a form of payment inside the territory of Attica (in outside trade Athenian tradesmen were already using foreign money as a way of payment for some time now). As a 'cause and effect' type of reaction to money exchange, and as a new way of trading inside of Attica which came up as a new phenomenon, social classes of tradesmen and craftsmen became stronger and more powerful. The accumulation of money was starting to happen. Money did not lose its value because in antique time it was made from precious metals such as gold and silver, which never lose their value. Taking into account that direct democracy lasted for a relatively short time, not longer than one century or so, one thesis should be analyzed, which relates to social processes that inspired its emergence in the first place.

In other words, social processes that gave direct democracy its life at the start were also its 'death penalty' in later phase of its development. Accumulation of money in hands of tradesmen and craftsmen could certainly have various consequences for development of democracy.

In conditions of slow or nonexistent economic growth in antique time, the piling up of wealth of small number of families in a small territory could have considerable political consequences. For example, it could have led to abolishment of unpredictable governing of the *demos* in order to secure the future of that wealth. Where there is no significant and continuous economic growth, then the importance of inherited wealth becomes massive because there is no chance for one generation alone to accumulate considerable capital. Then a person can only count on the inherited wealth being the basis of his social status, as it is convincingly proven in Thomas Piketty's book "*Capital in the twenty first century*." Considering that direct rulership of the people is nevertheless unstable compared to the rulership of smaller groups - even compared to the rulership of one person - from the perspective of owning the big capital, the conclusion comes up that, apart from other historical points, this fact could have influenced decline of direct democratic practices of Cleisthenes's reform.

Introduction of money into trade in Athens could also have had an influence on development of democratic practices, taking into account that these two processes were happening at the same time. Accumulation of money in hands of slave owners, combined with accumulation of slaves, goods, animal stock, and land as a fundamental resource in conditions of primitive, minimal production, could also have influenced bringing familial and tribal communities under the governorship of the *polis*, as well as diminishment of democratic practices in a moment when they completed their historical task of strengthening of the central power. In hands of the financial elite direct democracy became an efficient weapon against unpredictable tribal communities. Therefore, direct democracy was used as a weapon of financial elite for establishment of its control over certain communities, and in that regard direct democracy is historically no different to indirect democracy.

Customs of the past gave way to modernity, like many times before. These facts could form a thesis that direct democracy was an ‘unstable institution’ and therefore, it was not sustainable for a longer period of time in combination with accumulation of money and in conditions of slow general economic growth. It can also be said that direct democracy is not compatible with fast, general economic growth either, which appeared later on with capitalism. The question is then, which social conditions are the most acceptable for this ‘fragile phenomenon.’

In Athenian *polis* during direct democracy *demos* was a political class but it was not a financial elite. For the first time in the history of Attica strengthening of the idea of using money to trade inside of it opened a possibility of physically easy accumulation of the capital. This could have led to strengthening of demands of financial elite for narrowing down of the political class (*demos*) since smaller number of those belonging to the political class could mean higher predictability of political movements in relation to the accumulated capital. With disappearance of *polis* from the historical scene and with strengthening of the central power of Macedonian rulers, democracy also disappeared from the political scene. From that point on, we can only talk about fragments of democratic practices unequally spread across the old and middle ages.

Feudalism and remains of direct democracy

Generally speaking, from the perspective of democratic practices, a feudal way of production did not present a dark age, the way it is often said in liberal doctrine for everything ever to do with the middle age. Quite the contrary in fact: feudalism preserved and developed democratic practices at the level of rural local self-governing units in Western Europe.

If we conclude that the concept of antique direct democracy meant governorship of free citizens who constituted the assembly, and made the most important decisions on their behalf, then, in regards to the feudal system, it has to be said that the remains of direct democracy were still very strong in rural self-governing assemblies of Western European countries. Of course, this is about only the remains of this kind of democracy because the central government was consciously giving responsibilities to the smallest rural local assemblies, so as to allow them some kind of a “vent” in a sense of helping them “deal better” with their own hatred of that government. The power to self-govern gave rural communities superiority over local feudal masters because it limited their own power and influence, as well as relieved the central government and its bureaucracy of additional work and responsibilities. Therefore, reasons for preservation and reaffirmation of direct democratic practices in the Middle Age were predominantly of practical and political nature. Further on, in feudal way of production there is nothing so specific which would lead us to conclude that direct democratic practices and feudalism go ‘hand in hand’ in a sense that one state necessarily assumes the existence of another. The rural self-governing Western European assemblies consisted of the oldest men from every house, who were making decisions about public issues of a concern for all, while private problems were responsibilities of each individual to deal with. This is similar to the antique model of direct democracy. Rural assemblies gained considerable autonomy because they were making decisions about the most important issues related to their rural community. They were responsible for taxation and were choosing their own executive power, whose task was to practically implement decisions made at the assembly. Those democratic practices suddenly ended just before the French Revolution when, under pressure of the growing power of bourgeoisie, the principle of indirect democracy was introduced by the royal decree, as explained by the author Massimo Fini in his work *“The dark habit of the West: manifest of anti-modernity”*. The book completely “moves the shackles away from liberal paradigm” and in a unique way places things in a completely new perspective. From that moment on, only the selected representatives of villagers could enter rural assemblies; the practice which continued up to the present time. Elitist democracy won the final battle because it was a perfect fit for the new reality that took place.

It became the strongest weapon and the biggest fraud and illusion of liberalism. Elitist democracy enabled liberalism to create an attractive package out of all legal and political constructs it was founded on; and, with the French Revolution further allowed the new bourgeoisie to add to their already acquired economic power the political power as well. In this way the bourgeoisie class gained an absolute power, so that it could then place itself above the legislator and create such a law which nobody was allowed to disrespect. Of course that this whole thing was achieved under a parole that the whole society agreed with it because people supposedly elected their government representatives in elections, so that as a result, every decision of those representatives would match the will of the people who elected them. So, will of the God was replaced by the supposed “will of the people” in the Middle Age. The “will of the people” was as real, ironically, as the “will of the God” was real before it, so not at all. This way of thinking does not effectively take into account what this book is really about, which is finding an alternative way of understanding the social reality, by thinking above and beyond the ruling liberal capitalist paradigm.

Similar situation with the local autonomy in relation to the central power, but not in a sense of reminds of direct democratic practices, was in the Western European towns in the Middle Age. A significant difference between the town and the village in that period was in the social structure and local government while in regards to the central power, some institutions were more autonomous and others were less so in relation to it; so in that respect the situation was similar if not identical to that in rural communities. Contrary to the village, the town’s assembly in Western Europe was characterized by powerful craftsmen’s and tradesmen’s economic practices, as well as special courts which operated as partially independent municipalities in relation to the central power. In other words, the courts could have lower or higher level of autonomy in regards to the central power. Self-government in towns did not mean direct democratic practices, as it was the case with villages. The social structure in towns during the Middle Age in Western Europe was very different from the structure of an antique town. The town of the Middle Age in Western Europe was characterized by substantial branching out of various independent guilds as opposed to the ancient town where there were no guilds.

This difference came as a result of the fact that the slave owner's way of production characterized the antique town, where there was not any place for establishment of guilds, that is, for institutionalized unification of tradesmen and craftsmen. As opposed to that, the town with its powerful guilds existed in feudal paradigm of economic production, which could not allow the slave labor simply because that labor was free and therefore an unloyal competition to craftsmen and tradesmen. Author Max Weber explained that in his book "*The city*" that presents a kind of anatomy of Middle Age towns.

Therefore, we can really talk about the local self-government in a period of feudalism rather than about the same in today's time, and not only from the perspective of Western European villages, but towns as well. If central power accepted the fact that local population was deciding on facts related to their own communities, then the question is whether the feudal system of production generally approved democracy at the local level.

Here it has to be emphasized that there is no proof that central power in feudal period declared these remains of direct democratic practices as some kind of ideal for which individuals have to sacrifice anything when the system required it. Contrary to that, liberal doctrine has been declaring for centuries that elitist democracy requires sacrifice from each individual through paying taxes during peace times, and through working as participants in war efforts during the times of war. Calling upon patriotism and defense of democracy is particularly noticed in the richest countries in the period of capitalism. However, there cannot be a talk about patriotism and defense of democracy here for a simple reason which is that democracy does not exist in capitalism. As we will see soon, it seems that it cannot even exist in the liberal model of capitalism.

Therefore motives of modern states for their requirement that people should sacrifice themselves for the state are false. They do exist though, but do not consist of patriotism in defense of democracy, but in attempts of political elites that though physical conflicts, euphemistically called wars, win over economies as well as sources of energy of countries they are at war with. We have to remember that theories and abstract thinking about the law and politics obviously cannot wage wars, which then makes physical conflict inevitable.

This is how the richest capitalist countries create their economic monopolies and provide their own capital with the most effective protection. This need for creation of the “save heaven” for the world’s capital has been the cause of all major wars between people and countries where soldiers sacrificed their lives under the false pretense of fighting for democracy and defense of values.

As we saw before, feudalism was effectively implementing direct democracy at the local level, but was not systematically “suffocating” it because it did not have the same premises like its successor, the capitalism. Feudalism did not believe that economic growth was the highest goal of all, which can disrupt something so banal such as the unpredictability of people’s will. Even more so, it seems that there was no economic growth in feudalism, which could mean that there was no social awareness of necessity of its growth and progress into something that is vital for all (*‘sine qua non’*), as it was analytically and concisely explained in Thomas Piketty’s book: “*Capital in the twenty first century*.” Contrary to capitalism, feudalism was not declaring the non-existent social values to be true, real and the highest values of all. Is it so strange to expect from capitalism not to idealize democracy when it does not even exist in this historical period? Why does not capitalism declare the continuous economic growth to be the highest social value and the most important goal which must be reached at any cost, even if it means a complete destruction of democracy? Instead of declaring its real objectives, the liberal capitalist doctrine with a help of elitist democratic practice as its weapon, formally declares “clear” theories of the law and its abstract constructions to be the highest social values. Instead of declaring infinite economic growth as its fundamental goal, liberal capitalism formally emphasizes the rule of the law in connection with the elitist democracy. Everything that the liberal capitalist paradigm has been silent about for centuries now has become obvious to everybody who dares to look outside the “frame” of the ruling ideology. It has become clear today that the rule of the law is only a substitution for equality. Real goals are, of course, always kept hidden from the people because this is the nature of elitist democracy being a liberal weapon. What should really happen is that old weapon should be replaced by direct democratic practices at the level of smallest units of local self-government.

This process must be global in scale in order to realize its full potential, and bring out desired and necessary changes of political reality towards which we are all very much inclined.

Therefore paradoxically, this demand necessarily requires a continuation of the process of development of modernity which is the foundation of liberalism; all up to the point when the system will become more perfect so as to better match desires and needs of the human nature. This will indicate the ending of a natural cycle of its existence and will conclude with evolutionary jump of humanity to the next level of reality. As we have seen before, feudalism partly relied on direct democracy as reminder of the past that should be cherished, and also as a practically good solution, which for this reason as well should be kept “alive.” The question is now whether such reliance on direct democratic practices is possible in capitalism, and if it is, under what conditions?

PART III

MANIFEST OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY

Supposed forms of direct democracy in capitalism or a complete break with democracy

The measure of democracy

Contrary to the feudal political systems of the Western Europe, present constitutions of capitalist states are familiar with the tiny reminds of direct democracy which gradually completely disappears over time in practical implementation of the elitist democracy. On the other side, the liberal doctrine declares reminds of direct democracy in some institutes which actually have nothing to do with it, such as, for example, the case of general elections for members of the parliament as legislative body.

It is a common sense to understand thesis that the only way for democracy to be called so is for people themselves to make laws and legislation. In every system through all historical periods this principle should be the only measure of democracy. Therefore, if, as the reader of this book, you do not directly participate in the law making in place where you were born, then you do not live in democracy. Every thesis that states to the contrary is not reasonable and directly functions to rob the man off his freedom by reducing him from being the citizen to being the servant. The goal is for man to evolve into the politically active citizen, and this is possible only through democratic practices that last for centuries.

According to liberal thinkers, institutes of liberal constitutions of modern elitist democracies know about the referendum, the plebiscite, the people's initiative as well as about general and direct elections to be all the forms of "direct democracy." Maybe such thinking is exaggerated. We should be rather talking about unrecognizable fragments, from which some are not even that; as we will see by analyzing the example of general and direct elections for legislative power of the central government.

Reminds of direct democracy

As it was mentioned before, modern legal systems provide false alternative to direct democracy. It is certain that referendum and plebiscite are not and can never be 'weapons' of real democracy because they did not prove to be the 'tools' that were efficient enough in order to prevent the state for taking all the power away from the people, and giving it into the hands of political elites of capitalist indirect democracy. This is because in practice citizens do not create political themes at the referendum and plebiscite themselves; further on, they also do not create referendum's questions; and, which is probably the most important thing of all, they do not have any influence on making of referendum's decisions. They also do not have instruments to practically implement their own opinion in regards to a certain issue, in a way which would not disrespect their collective will and opinion. It should particularly be emphasized that citizens in no way participate in political events which lead to formation of questions asked at the referendum or plebiscite, but are given the final decision instead, which is a product of the whole stream of earlier political decisions made by political oligarchy, and based on the nature of indirect democracy and the way it works.

Liberal theory tells us that there is an institution of so called "people's initiative" as a partial solution to these problems, which is written in some modern constitutions.

Liberal theory, however, does not tell us that there is no spontaneous organizing of citizens in order for the “people’s initiative” to even work in practice. In the history of mankind, citizens have never spontaneously organized themselves in regards to an important political and national question. Their spontaneous and direct organizing got “exhausted” through antique direct democratic practices. Everything else after that period became elitist practice with democratic facade; with citizens getting organized through political parties, which were led by a small circle of people who were part of that political elite. It is clear that this anti-democratic practice destroyed the ‘general will’ of the people being the final goal of all democratic practices created over a long historical period, because it transferred the power of political decision making from the majority of free citizens to an insignificantly small number of well-organized members of oligarchy. This is about the class of professional politicians, who use all their individual potentials in order to progress through hierarchy of political parties. When they reach the top of their own political organization, they start connecting with other politicians at the horizontal level, and with the whole net of other vertical political organizations, as well as with international and inner bureaucratic institutions of the system. After that, they most often stay in politics as mercenaries until the end of their working career; and this is not the end, taking into account a strong tendency of their successors to enter the political elite by “jumping over the steps” of a bureaucratic vertical. This means that belonging to political elites in liberal capitalist paradigm is in big part a hereditary social situation. These privileged citizens are not interested in development of democracy, which is why they use all their intellectual strength to defend the system they belong to. How many ridiculous institutions of the modern capitalist systems are there? How many unnecessary piles of legal rules are there, that complicate lives of a modern citizen to the point where he or she does require expert legal knowledge in their everyday lives? The obvious reason behind this is a need for bureaucratic system to keep “developing”, and by doing that it shows tendency to completely forget the fact that it takes all legitimacy from the people, and that it is not and must not be the goal in itself. Legal system should be there to make the everyday citizen’s life easier, and not to complicate it. The law should not be a goal in itself. It should serve the needs of the people instead.

What we see in practice, unfortunately, is exactly opposite to this. The positive law gets “piled up” so that overregulation occurs in every aspect of social life which concerns “little people” and their everyday existence. Contrary to that, in regards to the banking business and existence of multinational companies, the opposite process noticeably takes place. This deregulation traditionally makes movement of the capital easier, but at the same time leads to a serious economic crisis that repeats itself cyclically. This crisis further creates conditions for emergence of extremist attitudes towards the political ideology, which is understood to be the political strategy of adaptability to newly formed social conditions. In other words, every time a global economic crisis occurs, it carries in itself stronger feelings of discord and misunderstanding between social groups and even countries themselves. When this misunderstanding progresses into a chronic state, then it becomes a potentially dangerous situation for the global society. This strife that momentarily exists between the north and the south is just as hopeless as the strife that exists between different social groups and their religious interpretations in all three rings of the capitalist economy. This is about such a huge misunderstanding which carries in itself a big potential and real danger of mass destruction of the whole society.

There are no proofs which support neoliberal theory about spontaneous peoples’ initiative, but there are plenty of proofs that the institution of people’s initiative, just like constitutional institutes of referendum and plebiscite, does not function as a form of direct democracy in reality. Instead, it is cleverly used as a facade of democracy by the political class. Theorists of neoliberalism emphasize functioning of the Swiss constitutional system in a sense that it effectively practices the mentioned constitutional institutes of direct democracy; but it seems that this isolated example still has not got ‘the weight’ or significance which neoliberal writers are prescribing it; and it certainly does not have such an important influence on the global system.

Direct elections as false alternative to direct democracy

Even periodical participation of citizens in parliamentary or presidential elections in reality is senseless. Here it has to be emphasized that in practice certain candidates on election lists for the parliament are imposed on citizens, and these are the people whom political oligarchies have placed there. Therefore these candidates have no legitimacy to be on those lists. This is more emphasized in proportional election systems, even though in practice of general election systems the whole election process is illegitimate because oligarchic political parties are placing their most obedient candidates to high governmental positions, even though these candidates have no personal political strategy whatsoever. This is why such candidates fit the neoliberal cliché extremely well, where both left side and right side eventually finish in the center. Political oligarchies are organized through political parties and they fight each other for the rule and power but only up to a certain point. Considering that they share the same interest, there is a natural silent pact between political oligarchies “not to play their mutual game to the very end”, because this would suit nobody. This means that the interest of the class always defeats every other interest, as Massimo Fini shows us in his book. It is obvious now that in such “constellation of affairs” it becomes completely ridiculous to vote on elections because they are neither general nor direct, and most definitely of all, they are not based on the same right to vote.

It is not about general elections where people get to express their general political preference because, unfortunately, it is not enough for every citizen to be able to physically go and vote on the Election Day. For general will of the people to be expressed, it is important that each citizen makes a decision as an individual. To be able to make a decision that is politically significant as an individual, means being able to be completely free in expression of that will, which further means not being connected to political parties and their opinions, but at the same time to be informed enough about the theme that citizen is ready to vote for.

Not being connected to political parties means that attitudes of political interest groups do not influence the citizens, that is, that citizens are not influenced by political attitudes of those political subjects in the slightest of terms. Further on, in order for the election process to be called 'general elections', it is vital that every citizen is informed in detail about who he is voting for and why, instead of being misinformed in detail. In practice, the latest news about social happenings is accessible only to the major political parties, who keep them and then use them selectively for their own political goals. When the news reaches citizens through public channels of information, it means that it is too late for them to change anything. There is a permanent delay in passing on important information to the people and pedantic precision in passing on misinformation, which is why it is impossible to talk about general elections in elitist democracy. As we have seen before, elections are not direct because it is not enough that people simply circle a number on a paper on the Election Day. In order for elections to be called direct, it is vital that the citizen directly makes decisions about public issues in regards to their place of birth, which is not the case in democratic liberal paradigm.

Finally, in the model of elitist democracy, elections are not based on every citizen's equal right to vote since unfortunately, for that kind of equality to be achieved it is not enough that every election slip that is correctly completed is considered to be one vote in mathematical sense of the term. For real direct democratic equality it is vital that every citizen provides one vote when performing his function as the legislator, while in indirect democratic practices equality is achieved by electing citizens into judicial and executive roles. There it is very important that every candidate is placed in the same starting position at the very start of the election process. This arrangement can only be changed through free will of those who vote, and not through the will of political oligarchies. This is important for equality of the right to vote the way it is understood in liberal capitalism, but such equality to vote is not possible to be achieved in this model, as explained above. The equality of the right to vote cannot even be discussed here because in practice of elitist democracy political oligarchies place their chosen candidates on the positions of power and overthrow them as they please, and then use public ways of communication to inform the society of their governmental changes.

Even more so, the mere existence of political groups wipes out any idea of equality in its roots. Common sense is enough in order for us to realize that not all candidates are in the same political position of power and influence at the start of their pre-election campaigns. This applies to candidates who are representatives of political oligarchies. It is taken by default that a political candidate who comes from the society and is not part of any political oligarchy is a pure exhibitionist in a model of elitist democracy that exists everywhere in the world. This means that equality of the right to vote absolutely does not exist under the parole of elitist democracy about direct and general elections. This idea successfully survives only because people lack the will and courage to call things for what they really are.

Overall, if the author Massimo Fini was right, then there are much deeper reasons behind the present facade of the elections' ritual than it is officially proclaimed. The first is of the ritual nature and presents an idea of eternity of oligarchic rulership. It is about symbolic practices which have their examples in rituals of the Middle Age which further symbolize transfer of responsibility from the God to the ruler. Taking it now to the present time, this legitimacy comes from the people and not from above. The second reason is a lie about a change of rulership. Of course that it can never be a talk about the real change of rulership because one part of oligarchy always rules, and only its different departments exchange their roles. This makes the power "less oligarchic", by providing people with a false sense of peaceful change of governorship and by doing that, it contributes to securing social peace.

Truly, as a replacement of direct democracy a convenient term called "direct elections" was invented in the "hell of the nucleus of liberal paradigm", and the title should mean exactly that. Is this quite so in reality? The question is whether it is the same for the citizen to choose his or her favorite professional politician in order to protect their interests, or maybe the social health is rather about the citizen who alone directly participates in workings of the government he or she belongs to, and makes decisions that relate to their own lives and lives of all those they love.

Why do we need political mediators? Do they really better understand our desires than us, and are they more responsible towards our families than we are? From already presented counter-arguments it is clear that the answer to this question is negative. How could the clerks chosen by political parties be more responsible for our destinies than we are? In fact, we, the citizens have not even chosen them through our free will. They were imposed on us through mechanisms described above. We are only forced to believe that we selected them. This is, again, about the fraudulent nature of liberal capitalism.

From this it is clear that liberal theory unjustifiably and often emphasizes the positive influence of “direct democracy” in forms of “direct elections”, “people’s initiative”, “referendum”, and “plebiscite” on people, while in fact they have not found a common ground with reality. Instead, they are used to preserve the rulership of political classes. It is not true that direct elections, people’s initiative, referendum and plebiscite are forms of direct democracy. What is true, however, is that these institutes of law are falsely represented as those that create our reality. The real question is why this is so.

Why should we believe in referendum and plebiscite to be “corrections” of indirect democracy, instead of believing in organizing people through local assemblies of areas where they live? Are members of assemblies of the smallest units of local self-government ‘servants’ or ‘citizens’, and is their progress towards ‘citizens’ through direct political actions something that political oligarchies are most afraid of ? To reduce citizens’ participation in politics by only allowing them to vote at elections means keeping them in the status of ‘servants.’

Elitist democracy as a form of oligarchic regime

In a system where the political parties and interest groups dominate, there cannot be a talk about people's general will, considering that individual interests and political will, which represents these interests, completely destroy every possibility of the power of citizens. This means that the fact that political parties exist, diminishes every possibility for indirect democracy to contain even a very small amount of democracy understood as being the rule of the people, that is, the expression of the general will of the people. Political parties so become historical gravediggers of every opportunity for today's political life to present direct democratic practices. At the same time, political parties confirm thesis of many anti-systems oriented political and law philosophers according to whom liberal democracy is just another expression of oligarchic class, which the history of mankind is overfilled with. Realistically speaking, our history is indeed the history of oligarchic political regimes. There are various versions of them, but common to all is that people are excluded from dealing with public issues, while in regards to private ones, people are only partially included in discussing them. We saw earlier that with direct democracy the principle was completely the opposite: *demos* was directly deciding on all public issues, while private issues were the responsibility of an individual to whom they related to. If we as citizens today do not make direct decisions about our place of birth, then we can with complete certainty conclude that we are not living in democracy and that the system, for some reason, imposes on us virtual instead of true, authentic reality.

Therefore, liberal democracy is just one more form of the same political regime, which has continually existed for millenniums in all production ways. This leads us to conclude that liberal capitalist paradigm has not succeeded in providing us with '*differentia specifica*' (specific difference) in relation to ideological thesis of former production ways. In the end, everything came down to the ruling of oligarchies yet again.

Liberalism, like its more perfect follower neoliberalism, has not succeeded in filling up the gap in content of theoretical and legislative constructs. Even the idea of globalism, as some kind of connective material between these constructs, has not succeeded in inspiring liberalism to fill that gap with a good quality content which would then create a clear boundary between democracy and its opposite. Instead of that, liberalism has relied on propaganda and invention of reality. Liberalism failed at the test of history. It has not managed to justify its own existence. Liberalism was created in order to change reality of various oligarchic regimes; however, it ended up being its opposite. Liberalism was designed to provide people with the truth, however, it turned itself to be the most hypocritical system and a lie that humanity ever invented, in “rich treasury of our similar fabrications.” The idea of changing reality by converting the servant into the citizen was what stimulated creation of liberalism; which was supposed to give people a chance to fight for freedom in equality, however, it turned out to become the slave of a political class, the loyal Cerberus that presents inequality and spiritual slavery.

It seems that from the very beginning, liberalism contained in itself the seed of vice from which it was supposed to protect humanity. Its contamination started in its embryo state, as was the case with all other big ideologies. From the very beginning liberalism did not have any chance, just like many other political strategies before it. It was destined to create one more oligarchic regime. It is now obvious that every historical period gives its own unique shape to the oligarchic system, and that fact does not make this regime any less oligarchic in comparison to any other oligarchy which we have recognized through history.

The future will place this model of elitist democracy into the folder of political regimes of oligarchic character because this is what liberalism is in its essence, taking into account that it contains all elements which define the term ‘oligarchy’. Oligarchy is about combining two kinds of power. The first is power of political decision making, and the second derives from accumulated capital which we could call the financial power.

The combination of these two powers has been ruling humanity from the emergence of first *polises* (towns-countries) up to today, with the exception of one incident that took place at the transition from the VI century BC to the V century BC in ancient Greece, and which presents a qualitative exception to this rule.

In other words, today's form of government, which like a kind of dangerous virus spread across the whole planet through colonialism of different kinds, in reality masks the regime which presents the opposition to democracy. Elitist democracy is nothing else but a form of autocratic rulership of oligarchies, even though liberal political ideology is trying to give her higher significance by inventing legislative and political constructs which only represent a facade, but never the essence of democracy. Since autocratic rulership is characterized by ruling of a small number of people over the majority, it is clear that the elitist democracy of liberal or neoliberal type in capitalist paradigm of production cannot be anything else but a very straightforward authoritarian political regime. This is especially so if we take into account the fact that in indirect democracy it is completely acceptable for the whole political elite to be significantly separated from the people and still rule those people. Supposedly and ironically those people are the ones who give this elite legitimacy through their voting at elections. We have already seen that in case of liberal capitalist paradigm elections are neither general nor direct, and in these elections not everybody has the same right to vote. We also saw that we cannot define today's man as "political creature" because he is not that in most cases. This fact is a direct consequence of omission of original democratic practices in the last few centuries. It then leads to the conclusion that a consumer cannot give legitimacy to the political class even if elections were direct and general, with people having the same right to vote.

Since in authoritarian political systems the competition between political ideologies is not allowed, the left side and the right side do not exist in practice but only create an illusion of existence so that they could reinforce dominant political pattern and give it even more legitimacy.

By doing that, they are at the same time creating another illusion of competition between ideologies. The real question is why putting such an effort into covering up the real truth since people are helpless to change things in order to serve their interests anyway. This leads us to conclusion that it is necessary for people to be active in gaining their freedom and equality because real change can only come from the way we understand the reality we are living in.

The best proof for the thesis that the left side and the right side in liberal elitist democracy are virtual or fictitious can be seen in Cultural Revolution that took place all over the world in year 1968. It essentially represented recognition of the ideological betrayal and revolt against it, which socio-democratic political elites committed; and there was also revolt against the constant merging of elites with the political center of liberal ideological orientation; a practice which has continued up to today. David Harvey in his book: "*A brief history of neoliberalism*" and Immanuel Wellerstein in his book: "*After liberalism*" in convincing way present the anatomy of liberal political ideology by 'dissecting its connective tissues.' According to these authors, revolution was important because it disclosed and publicly alerted people to the phenomenon of simulation of the left side in political life of the capitalist nucleus. However, that cultural movement born in 1968 was not homogeneous. It consisted of two groups of citizens, who apparently aimed to achieve different political goals. Labor movements had a goal of achieving equality in a society of obvious inequality. On the other side, students' protests wanted more freedom. Those two goals apparently confronted each other when placed in context of liberal capitalist paradigm, because if we decided to have more equality that would inevitably mean limited rights and freedoms for each individual. If our most important political goal is life of people in equality, and true equality means economic equality, how is then possible to reconcile this goal with natural laws of each individual such as the property law and right to its enjoyment. This law also includes individual property protection in a sense of perpetuation of wealth creation in hands of only few hundred people on the entire planet. In other words, the question is how to reconcile economic equality with people's freedom to individually accumulate wealth through property law being part of the natural law.

How to destroy initial injustice which allowed a small number of people to accumulate wealth, which led to placing the majority of others into financially unequal position, and further provoked deepening of that situation in conditions of economic stagnations, while, at the same time, showing respect towards each individual's natural right to protect his property ? It came out that in ideological and historical context in which that movement took place, its homogenization through reconciliation of those two goals was impossible. The liberal establishment correctly predicted this conflict within that movement. Again, it was proven that fighting the liberal ideological paradigm was impossible. Ruling class protected itself with the idea of inviolability of human rights and freedoms as some kind of religious cloak. Legal construct of human rights and liberties was part of the rule of law and was combined with the idea of natural laws, long time before the year of 1968. Then, that idea was fully accepted and inviolable. Therefore, the only hope of reconciliation between equality and freedom within that cultural movement was moving over that particular historical frame, within which that problem emerged. Any other idea opposite to that would not solve the problem. Just as innumerable times before that, it was proven that our decisions are to a huge degree determined by our understanding, and it emerged as a consequence of ideological contamination of liberal capitalism.

Despite its failure to turn the political system of slavery and inequality into its opposites, the revolutionary movement of 1968 provoked numerous positive developments, which, among some, included abandonment of a few traditional Marxist theories, according to opinions of some political philosophers such as Immanuel Wellerstein. Above all, the new idea was that those people who were exploited by the system could not take over the rulership of the country, and then transform the society. In essence, the question was whether the state power was still important or, in other words, whether it made any sense to take over the government through revolution in order to build the society which represented equality in freedom. History has shown that overthrowing of the government does not mean anything more than a cosmetic coating.

It is certain that the next move of the government, after it has been conquered, is not and cannot be for it to impoverish itself and give all legislative power to the people. This is not how it works in reality. Therefore, alternative strategy to those old-fashioned and classical strategies of revolution from XIX century is required. Frequent demands for affirmation of the principle of direct democracy seem to be one of the possible solutions on every level. Consequently, the traditional Marxist idea that democracy is a political concept of bourgeoisie, whose goal is to prevent revolutionary takeover of the government, has been abandoned. This means that according to modern understanding, an idea of 'left avant-garde' has lost confidence in 'left political movements and ideas' because of its bad experience with the socialist experiment in Eastern Europe in XX century. The new idea of another type of elitism finally gets abandoned. The whole idea of elitism gets immediately thrown away, similar to a kind of a seed which, under particular historical conditions germinates, and then becomes the enemy of what its original purpose was, which was to protect democratic practices and the general will of the people as its product. This further means that the idea of organizing one whole political activity into one unique political party, which would naturally be cohesive and guarded by social avant-garde, also gets abandoned.

Still, the biggest significance of the Cultural Revolution of 1968 is that it disclosed the causes of problems, and called those truths for what they really were. Liberal elitist democracy is nothing else any more than the rulership of oligarchies which we have had in different formations for millenniums before capitalism came, and which we will have for future millenniums as well, if we do not effectively implement the force of an argument and take our destiny into our own hands. It is about the rulership of always the same group of people (oligarchy) where only personal decisions of those in power change. The fact that in oligarchic rulership the "head" is only seen sometimes, while at other times we can see the "tail" only, does not mean that this is about the change of power. In fact, that power is irreplaceable and nothing has changed in that respect.

Therefore, liberalism with political ideologies of capitalism ended up without its foundation and its fundamental purpose of existence. At the beginning, there was a need for adjustment to a new period because there was a group of new ideas connected into united whole which made sense. This was the time of modernity that happened because the idea of change of power came up as a new phenomenon. Even before that idea came into existence, dynasties were changing or the head of monarchy would amend decisions, however, only when that idea was adopted, there came a momentum when it became normal for monarchy to be replaced by the rule of the people. Taking into account that at the end of this process we can see clearly that the rule of the people did not happen, but that oligarchy of one kind was replaced with the oligarchy of another kind, which, similar to its predecessor invented its source of legitimacy, we can conclude that ideologies of capitalism have not fulfilled the basic goal of their existence. Their goal was to create political strategies which would allow the change of power to happen, just like it did during the historically innovative period of French Revolution. In other words, the oligarchic power has not become replaceable, but on the contrary, its propaganda has become incomparably stronger and capable of imposing the elitist democracy on us, as their answer to our millennial prayers. Today's political elite takes its legitimacy from the people instead from the God. As if people always wanted to be ruled by insatiable and greedy oligarchies which create ever larger inequality in a society, and who are continuously inventing new political and legal constructs as false alternatives to one and only freedom; the freedom that comes from direct, painful and frustrating democratic rulership of the people which lasts for centuries, and which is in a continuous state of improvement. As if equality and freedom are not one and the same thing. Equality and freedom have to complement each other. Contrary to democracy and the rule of the law which only virtually exist, freedom cannot sustain itself without equality and vice versa. The belief that sees freedom and equality, these two final goals of every political and social action, to be in collision with each other, is "wrapped up in shackles" of elitist democracy of liberal political ideology, and as such, it should definitely be rejected.

From everything said above, it is clear that liberalism failed the test of history because of its inability to fill legal and political constructs with content; those constructs which it created for the purpose of '*de jure*' (the rule of the law, the proclaimed protector of sovereignty) and '*de facto*' (in reality, that is, the proclaimed protector of leading political class). The real question is whether other political paradigms would show same results. Every suggested way of analyzing the concept of modernity that capitalism "brought into the surface" would present, in essence the frame for rulership of oligarchic regimes. In history nothing has changed in regards to this question, and neither so in relation to production ways, therefore there are no indications that the win of another capitalist ideology would bring different results. Of course that this fact does not give any excuse to liberalism in regards to its committed crimes "under the watch of history"; on the contrary in fact: it helps us to better understand the vital importance of development of direct democracy.

Participation has to be totally abandoned in favor of a complete takeover of people's political initiative. Taking over the political initiative means evolutionary maturity and progress from the servant to the citizen, which is what we all would like to become, even when we are not completely aware of this game.

False alternative to liberal capitalism

Indirect democracy versus direct democracy

As it was mentioned before, indirect democracy is the natural successor of direct democracy according to the liberal paradigm. Direct democracy, apparently, is not possible anymore, due to objective reasons of technical nature. Since there are too many people living on this planet, and since modern countries are too big, it has become technically impossible to establish political practices of direct democracy of antique type and apply them in everyday and political lives.

This further means that liberal theory establishes indirect democracy as an alternative to direct democracy. This alternative is false and destined for a historical defeat, taking into account that technical reasons are only excuses for rulership of oligarchy instead of direct rule of the people. Final goal of every political activity should be direct rulership of the people in classless society. Only such setup could guarantee equality in freedom.

French thinker Rousseau in his famous work: “*The social contract*” stands by direct democracy and is against indirect one. According to his opinion, people should be directly involved in making laws in order to be free, since they falsely believe that they are free when they elect mediators into the parliament, and do not take into account that after elections they become servants again. This applied to England, but there is no reason for it not to be applied to the whole paradigm of indirect democracy. We also cannot ignore the fact that, starting from the French Revolution and up to today, people have been consistently dispossessed of their rights by gradual development of the whole system of international and state laws, and such state of affairs has been declared as “natural continuation” of democracy.

In a chapter that talks about mediators or members of the parliament Rousseau does not accept arguments in favor of stating technical impossibility for applying direct democracy in practice. He also does not accept excuses for bringing in indirect democracy, and provides an example of antique Rome as spacious country in which a huge number of people lived, and where those people in one historical period regularly conducted direct democratic practices. Arguments in favor of elitist democracy were not “stable” during the period of Enlightenment, so therefore they cannot form foundations of modern civilization. The excuse of “technical problems” when implementing direct democracy was simply not convincing to Rousseau, just as it is not convincing to the modern man, who is connected with other people and the world via the Internet in every moment, and regardless of where he is located on this planet. Of course that in present conditions of very fast exchange of information this argument of elitist democracy seems ridiculous. Today it is possible to organize direct democracy without any trouble on the scale of whole countries and their central legislative power, as well as on the scale of local self-government. The fact that in these conditions people would not be discussing law proposals in a direct talk as in the assembly does not in any way reduce the effectiveness of such democratic practice. On the contrary, maybe this is the way to completely realize Rousseau’s demand for the law as expression of the general will of the people because in this setting citizens would not have to declare their own opinion as being somebody else’s. In other words, the need for organizing political groupings would be extinguished, which are in this historical period characterized as political parties of liberal elitist democracies. Of course that such realization of direct democracy is even easier when organizing it at the level of local self-government. The reaffirmation of direct democratic practices definitely has to start from the bottom-up, since its full and effective realization in practice is only possible if such set up exists, considering the present historical circumstances.

Modern conditions generally do not recognize local areas and communities to be the smallest units of local self-government as well as carriers of public power; and they also do not assign basic responsibilities to them, which those communities would fulfill through assemblies of their local self-government.

Members of these assemblies would not present anyone else's interests but exclusively their own. Also they would not be elected by anybody but would automatically become members after their 18th birthday, when they formally become adults in their place of birth. Is this idea really so difficult to achieve? Would such a picture of the world be so dangerous for the survival of capitalism?

It seems that it is very wrong to assume that strengthening of direct democracy would harm the survival of capitalist way of production. Furthermore, it also seems that introduction of direct democracy into capitalist system will soon become the imperative in context of finding ways of responding to all economic challenges of the future. Therefore, what is considered to be the poison of capitalist system in this historical moment may very soon be regarded as its cure and a way of performing in a context of consolidation of this same system.

From its inception up to today democracy has made two steps backwards. We could say that from the moment of the beginning of capitalist system of production democracy gradually disappears, so that from the end of the 18th century there can be no talk whatsoever about democracy, but only about its simulation through using the same term that actually means a completely different thing. As it was mentioned before, this is not accidental. What we in our modern time of 'neoliberal democracy' call 'indirect democracy' is something completely different from the content and essential meaning of the term 'democracy'. It is not only that the contents of these two democracies do not match, but they are also deeply and irreconcilably different from each other.

Equality 'de jure' versus equality 'de facto'

This approach to theoretical creation of the false alternative is frequent in liberalism considering that this political ideology has proven over time to be very skilled at inventing law and political constructions so that it could justify '*de facto*' inequality between people, which is, unfortunately, unavoidable and necessary in capitalism.

It is important to emphasize that essential equality between people comes from equal disposal of social wealth so that everybody has enough but nobody has too much. Unfortunately, in reality of capitalism possible are only those periods when the inequality is more or less emphasized, but there are no periods when inequality does not exist. Therefore, from today's perspective, we can see clearly that periods after World Wars were bringing bigger equality at the inside level in countries of the capitalist nucleus; while the periods before big conflicts were characterized by growing inequality, which threatened to destroy essential foundations of the capitalist world. This further means that when theoretical and legal constructions cannot prevent growing inequality in reality, then states have no other options but to be forced to use wars in order to maximally engage their own economic resources. That then further leads to the process of reduction of economic inequalities. In this way wars appear to be corrections of legal constructions which in peaceful times have no power to preserve the illusion of equality between people. The problem with capitalism is that these corrections are only of a temporary nature.

Taking into account that equality is an economic and not a legal term, therefore equality between people cannot be established by pure legal constructions, and this is exactly what liberal paradigm has been trying to do all these centuries by engaging the rule of law, social laws and, supposedly, independent courts.

However, since democracy of liberal type does not exist except when connected with the rule of the law, the question is whether this kind of connection really makes sense, or can be considered sufficient in terms of its practical efficiency.

Reason for this theoretical construction, which is deeply built into foundations of all modern societies, came out as a need for alternative to real equality between people. Since capitalism actually does not tolerate real equality between people – because of its potential to prevent imagined limitless economic growth, which the system is essentially founded on – the alternative to the state of equality had to be found. It seems that liberal capitalism cleverly succeeded in establishing an illusion of alternative to people's equality by solidifying the rule of the law, of human rights and freedoms, as well as of independent courts, since today there is a highly accepted opinion (however not the general one) that these legal constructs lead to a state of social equality.

Liberals oriented left from the center, who their ideological position define as being socio-democratic, apply economic ideas of deciding and correcting the minimal wages, initially defined by the central power. The reason for that is for destructive inequality in society to be reduced. Essential idea of such approach is that the economic problem should be solved through legal constructs. Final result of these actions is reduction of inequality in specific periods of development of one economy, but not creation of equality and freedom in the society. According to the data provided by the United States Congressman Mr. Bernie Sanders from his book: *“Our revolution: a future to believe in”*, in decades after the World War II American economy entered the period of sudden expansion and enabled their working class high employment as well as high earnings. However, in the period of neoliberal practice, when individual interests won over general interests, following examples of economic destabilization occurred: deregulation of the financial market, organizing of the free trade, cancelling of syndicates and reduction in investment enterprises.

Consequently this led to the fall of employment together with the fall in earnings of middle and working classes. Real average earning of a fully employed citizen, according to Sanders is lower for USD 2.144 today in comparison to four or five centuries ago. Adding to that, it has been noticed that the working time '*de facto*' increased, so that workers in the most powerful economy of the world work longer hours than workers in any other economy of the capitalist nucleus. If we add to this data another fact mentioned by Sanders, which says that, according to formal statistics and analysis of unemployment rate, which does not include people who gave up looking for work or people who are only temporarily employed in various kinds of temporary contracts, then his conclusion is not surprising. It finally concludes that today around 20 million citizens of the United States who do not have a permanent job are not formally unemployed.

For decades in the United States there has been a political discussion going on about necessity of increasing the minimal wage per working hour. The President Barack Obama decided the minimal wage per working hour to be USD 10.10 by a single drop of his pen, which happened in year 2014. Using those measures the liberal agenda had been trying to establish a fragile balance with the idea that increased wage will create higher spending power, which will consequently lead to higher general demand, as well as higher production. Liberal agenda generally tries these attempts in periods of strong inner inequalities between the rich and the poor people. This philosophy of solving social inequalities cannot pass over the barriers imposed by the ideological paradigm, and presents only a temporary solution. Everything that can be created with one drop of the pen can also be deleted. Maybe this example says enough about the necessity of change of the whole system, as well as the necessity of rejection of the idea that in elitist democracy the legislator can simply write numbers on the piece of paper, use legal institutes and constructs, and with them wipe out all inequality in the society. My opinion is that such a way of attempting to establish equality is false, and that in practice it has not produced positive results sustained over a longer period of time. Therefore, it has to be completely rejected together with the rulership of the law in favor of the rulership of the people as the only way for achieving equality in a free society. In other words, equality in freedom we can only achieve through rulership of the people and not of the law.

Also, it seems that the state of social freedom declared through '*The social contract*' is only a false alternative to people's real liberty, which the man can achieve only through centuries long participation in making political decisions. This means that there cannot be the freedom without direct democracy, and that there is no equality without equal distribution of social wealth. Only when the long- term and sustainable direct democracy is established, the humanity can think about freedom in equality, and not about the false alternative to these social states.

Causes of conflict between capitalism and direct democracy

It seems that the direct democracy in capitalist system of production of liberal paradigm is not possible because of a few reasons from which the less obvious one should be emphasized first. Capitalism cannot function without the continuous production growth, and this means that constant centuries long economic growth conducted through unpredictable will of the people must not be endangered. In capitalism of liberal type the production growth is its own highest goal. This means that people are buying and making expenses so that companies could produce, which is a kind of paradox. Without the continuous economic growth capitalism cannot exist.

A more obvious reason can be found in a fact that through centuries of development of capitalist system, a bureaucratic network has gradually been very highly developing and has existed for itself only, even up to today. This network of invisible delicate connections connects the whole planet today into one big, bureaucratic organism which, like everything that is alive, shows tendency to fight with the whole power, for its own survival. Therefore once it has been created, the political class does everything to continue its existence, and by doing that, it spreads over the whole humanity, and so becomes stronger and ever more present in life of every individual.

Few left oriented thinkers believe that neoliberalism, as a more perfect form of colonialism, has two biggest natural “enemies” which are all kinds of authoritarian socio-political systems, where one independent department has all the power. The second enemy is the government of the people. This is about the fear being one more reason for the conflict between liberal capitalism and democracy.

Liberal (neoliberal) political class uses nondemocratic institutions which do not fall under the authority of control of other institutions of the system, as it is convincingly explained in David Harvey’s book: “*A brief history of neoliberalism*”, which discusses the function of International Monetary Fund in every political “jigsaw puzzle”. In these institutions of the system, decisions are made secretly; however, they have huge consequences for the whole humanity, so that they consequently lead to the rulership of elites and so called “experts.” The problem is that these experts never consider interests of the people during their decision making process, but are only concerned with protection of the system and its stabilization instead. Corruption of the system is here at its highest level. Supposedly, the transparent democratic process leads to the rulership of the people who were never even elected from the list of political elites. Here, this is going even further than the concept of people “having an honor” to choose those that are already elected. The new element of complete secrecy is introduced into the creation of the whole system of international practices, which creates strictly controlled conditions for transfer of the strongest part of economy of poor and indebted counties into the hands of ever smaller number of rich capitalists.

The goal of these schemes is protection of investment of financial monopolies taking into account that countries in debt will never be capable of returning the borrowed money. This is about a new kind of imperialism which is realized in a “soft way” taking into account that in this historical period it is not necessary to physically control territories. It is necessary to control financial transactions, which means defining the amount of credit and designing ways of paying it back by those poor countries.

Of course that in case of non-liquidation, the compensation for taking over complete economies of poor countries has to be created by multinational corporations. The essential difference between neoliberalism and its predecessor is about the fact that neoliberalism found a more convenient way of charging the credit than liberalism used to do. While liberalism used to take all the risks, the way it was traditionally done by the banks, its successor, neoliberalism places that risk on the indebted countries, and does that through international institutions whose creation and functioning the indebted countries, who are their “victims”, agreed with.

It seems that the big petrol crisis of 1973 meant the beginning point of restoration of the class power, and creation of conditions for practical implementation of new credit characterized as the form of neoliberal model of neocolonialism. These practices had to be controlled by the new practice of supervision and achievement of colonial conquests of exploited countries and their economic systems. Through this practice of crediting exploited countries, nontransparent international organizations were formed in order to make decisions exclusively for the purpose of placing the whole world under capitalist economy of Western European liberal type. This goal was no different to the final goal of all other previous colonial conquests from the period of classical colonialism. The difference was only in a way of its implementation in practice. From the petrol embargo which led to the increase of petrol prices by OPEC, the crisis was created which initiated the root of new and more efficient colonial politics of rich countries towards resources of the poor ones. It is clear that this process leads to the further deepening of the gap in economic differences between the rich north and the poor south, which then becomes hopeless and insurmountable in this model of social reality.

The government of the United States in 1973 succeeded in turning complicated and difficult situation, which emerged because of the increase in petrol prices on a global level and because of the USA conflict with the Middle East, into its own advantage as well as into the advantage of financial monopolies.

The solution was reached by forming an agreement with Middle East countries whereby those countries had to pay their petrol debt to investment banks of New York. Those banks further acted as a weapon in hands of the world's oligarchy, and the money they received for petrol they used to give credits to poor countries of capitalist periphery. It has been taken by default that those poor countries would never be able to return back those credits, so they were entering the spiral of ever more accumulated debt from which they could not get out by their free will. Of course that the whole process of crediting was conducted under the watchful eye of international nontransparent organizations, above all, under the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, who, through their economic practices and the "so called legal rules" created a new model of reality. That model included obligations of those economies in debt to restructure themselves in such a way so that they can implement legal institutional reforms into their legal systems in order to lead and control their own economic processes such as total privatization, deregulation of financial market, reduction of social functions of the state, and cancelling of syndical organizing, which consequently led to reduction in importance of workers' rights and further diminishment of the working class. Everything was ready for a new, more perfect beginning of the colonization of neoliberal type. It goes without saying that behind this whole process, and the one that guaranteed its implementation was the monopoly of the richest economy in the world, the one of the United States of America.

Therefore the world is ruled by a group of people who make nontransparent decisions completely free of any premise of democracy in their form and content. Here we should remember Plato's idea from the period of direct democracy, which says that the rulership of sages is the best one of all.

Taking into account that there is no a fundamental, substantial starting point of democracy, this is then about the authoritarian regime on a global level realized through the project of neoliberalism. It seems that the only difference between

Plato's and Aristotle's thinking is that Plato believed that sages should be ruling the country; while Aristotle was convinced that only one man should rule. Therefore, there is not fundamental difference in these two propositions because both types of rulership are authoritarian and dictatorial, and in any case they are anti-democratic.

It can be concluded that liberal doctrine is mortally afraid of not just democracy but also of antidemocratic elements of liberalism. Therefore this is about fear of small differences of the system similar to another one; about fear that the global bureaucratic apparatus feels in relation to the rulership of one person. It seems that in social reality that fear is real and a reason for such a reaction when we are talking about social conditions and events. These social relationships fully support those that exist in nature among animal species. Taking this perspective into account, we can analyze political conflicts in economies of countries of capitalist nucleus which dominate the second decade of the 21st century. These conflicts start because the establishment has no confidence in election win of political candidates of the right center since these candidates show tendency for partial independent decision making. In some cases that can be in discord with decisions that come from non-transparent centers of power. As a consequential reaction to that, there comes a very strong resistance of the broad bureaucratic system towards the governorship of this charismatic candidate which is called the "deep state." This candidate wins an election which gives him the power to rule, and he wins by using the rhetoric of populism, and by relying on a big dissatisfaction of common people who take part in elections and whose common cause of that frustration is the chronic economic inequality in a society they live in. The bureaucratic system recognizes these situations as anomalies which demand an adjustment. The goal is to adjust an element of unpredictability with the system. This is how balance gets reinstituted and a step out of the liberal capitalism gets prevented.

It seems that the final result in a fight between the nontransparent bureaucratic entity and the charismatic leader of the right center is not something decisive and significant in context of future democratic debates, considering that both types of oligarchic rulership at the same time present anti-democratic political forms in which there are no direct democratic practices.

Further on, liberal capitalism is very skeptical towards all other types of authoritarian systems, which are different from liberal autocracy. That skepticism is based on real fear which liberalism “feels” when a word is about any kind of social turbulence, in particular the fear of prevention of global economic growth. Every other kind of “competitive threat” liberal capitalism would probably be able to survive except the one which has a potential to stop the economic growth. When shopping and production stop, the system will end by itself. The solution of liberal practice is cultivation of consumers’ society and creation of a man who is a consumer of goods and services instead of being a politically active citizen. The problem can occur if the economic growth is of the objective nature instead of the subjective one. For such a scenario the liberal capitalist paradigm has not found a solution yet. This is not by accident, taking into account that every other possible solution leads to destruction of liberal capitalism by allowing another different system to take over its place on the historical scene. Possible answer is in demand for return to the principle of direct democracy; without any guarantees that the thing will work out; but with a clear idea put in place that some kind of compromise is necessary.

In regards to the above, it is important to remind ourselves of difference and conflict between capitalism and democracy which is more interesting than discussing autocratic regimes where rulers have natural tendency to rule forever together with political classes they belong to.

In other words, it is very wrong to believe that continuous and permanent economic growth cannot happen without brutal autocratic political classes who rule and without the imposition of virtual reality to common people. On the contrary, it seems that the growth of capitalist economy is going to slow down very fast instead of continuing to grow indefinitely. In fact, in following centuries there is going to be negative growth, which will cause new challenges for the political class and probably will discredit the whole idea of indirect democracy as a way of rulership. Piketty's book: "*Capital in the twenty first century*" can help us in analyzing this problem which confirms thesis of rapid decline in economic growth in close future, as well as the negative trend that expects us in following centuries.

Of course that, before real problem fully emerges and people become aware of it, the first thing to be criticized will be capitalist way of production, taking into account that this system comes first chronologically speaking when it comes down to critique and the general losing of the trust in the system. Since there is already a very elaborate theory of negative criticism of liberal capitalism and globalism in general, it is clear where the majority of people's sentiment will go when chronic stagflations start to take place. People will start feeling enormous pressure which will not be released through world wars but through conversion into the new ideology.

According to predictions of the Organization of United Nations (UN) it is expected that the population growth will significantly drop down from present 1.4% to under 0.1 % in next decades of the 21st century as well as in the following century. This demographic situation existed in the period of feudalism and up until the Industrial Revolution. Considering that the production growth in general equals the sum of population growth and the production growth per each citizen, we can therefore conclude that the main condition for survival of liberal capitalism (constant and consistent economic growth) has already failed it, and that the system will soon end.

Therefore, the basic principle of capitalism will be naturally compromised because economic growth will not carry on forever, which means that the system will get destroyed from within itself. The question is now what society has to do in order to prevent the system from falling down, and whether it should do anything about it at all.

Even though we can conclude that democracy in capitalism is impossible because it potentially damages its fundamental principle of constant economic growth, we can still find a solution by adjusting the capitalist system through affirmation of direct democracy at levels of smallest units of local self-government.

This is particularly significant when we take into account today's constant presence of the Internet in people's lives, which defies the argument of leading ideology which says that it is impossible to achieve direct democracy in practice because of too many people that would constitute local assemblies. In other words, it is not true that direct democracy cannot be achieved because of too many people in today's modern countries.

In time that is coming, big challenges for the global economy should be expected. It seems that dangers are not coming from demands for direct democracy, but from the fact that demographic growth is slowing down; will continue to stagnate and eventually will reach a negative point. As a result of that, economic stagnation will happen, and it will be a long lasting one with very difficult consequences for society as a whole.

The question is whether the affirmation of idea of direct democracy can soften negative effects of centuries long economic stagnation that awaits us all? Whether active and direct participation of the citizen in political life of the place he lives in can mitigate economic and ecological catastrophe which will happen in the future? Whether the rulership of the people instead of oligarchies can indicate qualitative jump into new, higher level of reality of social organizing in which tyranny will lose importance and be replaced with the imperative of free and equal society so that the goal of achievement of all people's potential can become a reality?

In such society where people live free in equality, economic data will not become an indicator of death penalties but of pure statistics.

Virtual reality of liberal capitalism

Frauds of liberal capitalism

Liberal capitalism convinced us that democracy is not only an integral part of our reality but that it is the highest value we should all be sacrificing ourselves for. Therefore, the idea is to sacrifice for something that does not exist but which guarantees the social '*status quo*'. Is this acceptable for the modern citizen? The idea of sacrificing for democracy is necessary for the system of indirect democracy to be able to justify its existence and extend its already long duration time. The fact that it is long lasting is because it has been proven that it is very easy to manipulate people who are not well informed and who do not show enough interest in ever changing the way things are ('*status quo*').

In Eastern European countries of foreign socialist block the function of a political opponent and one that wrote and spoke against the system was very much pronounced. Writers and fighters against the prevailing system at the time were the most educated and influential citizens in their countries. In modern capitalist societies the importance of intellectuals who are oriented against the system has completely disappeared. The system created the consumer who has completely different priorities from that of understanding of the world in which he lives. The consumer does not want to make political decisions. He only wants to choose the product that suits him the best among those offered, just as when voting, he only wants to choose from the list of few candidates. When doing that, for the consumer it is not important that he is actually not participating in choosing neither the list of candidates nor the actual candidates.

The consumer is happy to have the choice imposed on him, and at the same time, he is not worried that this choice is so very limited. He is not worried because the system teaches him that this is called “the free economic market” with free, direct elections. Free from what? These processes are actually free from the people’s direct choice in any of those matters. The question is now not whether but why this is so.

Therefore, the government of the political class takes its strength from our ignorance. This realization alone is a very good starting point for deep revolt of an individual against the system which produces virtual reality, and which delivers it as something prescribed and necessary to the man. As if the caveman always wanted the capitalist way of production; the option of choosing among various products of the same manufacturer on shelves of its cave, as well as indirect democracy and human rights externally imposed on him. Liberalism this latest abstraction connects with human beings and humanity overall, and so declares natural laws as being the necessary part of human nature from the very beginning of first societies, on their most basic level. Those are the same human rights that powerful economies use as excuses to bombard weaker countries than themselves, in order to gain resources of those countries and extend their own economic domination for another decade or so; and all this until the natural cycle of decline wipes them out of the scene of the world’s leading capital countries. Those are the same rights which are in foundations of liberal ideas about the rule of the law in economically rich countries, that is, the former colonial powers.

Idea of the essence of these laws lies in foundations of corrupt laws of systems and societies of countries belonging to middle periphery and periphery of capitalism, and the law of those countries will never progress into the rule of the law the way it is in countries of the capitalist nucleus. Therefore, those countries will never progress to the level of their “idols”, that is, countries of the capitalist nucleus, because in regards to the natural law, apart from its content, its reach is also very important. That reach is always decided by the governing ideologies of capitalist nucleus countries.

Anyhow, legal experts and politicians from rich countries of the capitalist nucleus will say that human rights and freedoms are necessary conditions for peripheries to become part of the nucleus in these senseless and fraudulent integration processes. How is this possible? As if richness, progress and stability of a country are results of the well-organized legal system and not the vice versa?!

To say this is as if to say that by looking into the sky we can invite rain. This is just another false premise of capitalism which is offered to us “on the shelves” of virtual reality in a cave of liberal paradigm.

Illusions of indirect democracy

Indirect democracy borrows its name from a completely different social state with which it has nothing in common. In other words, direct and indirect democracies are not in any relationship, and every opposite statement to that is in direct interest of the political class. Elementary fact is that the elitist democracy did not emerge from Greek democracy. This is a historical fact which simple rhetoric of liberalism cannot deny.

Fundamental principle of direct democracy is based on the fact that *demos* exclusively makes decisions about all public issues. It can do that by making laws or by directly participating in executive and judicial decision making. In any case, one thing that is identical to all direct democratic practices is the fact that people are lawmakers and that the parliament consists of each citizen individually. This is the basic definition of direct democracy and cannot be simplified anymore because we cannot have “a little bit” of it. We can only go above this definition by allowing the citizen to conduct administrative and judicial duties as well. Then we are talking about full democracy of Athenian antique type, which existed in the 5th century BC.

What is the relationship between a parliament of any modern country today and this antique ideal which only in one period in history from ideal turned into the reality? This ideal was the product of creative and practical thinking of the antique man; it happened only once in the history of humanity; it lived a very short life in order to become the longest lasting legend, which has been talked about in all parts of the world on a daily basis for millenniums and up to this day. The question is also whether this ideal is the highest product of the human mind.

Whether it was misused or wrongly applied simply because of its great value and significance? Once it was born, it had nowhere to go and still lives today, at least as an unrealized ideal.

Therefore, the main idea is that the capitalist system will adjust itself to economic stagnation which will come in the future, by affirmation, adoption and practical application of the principle of direct democracy through smallest units of local self-government. Capitalism will thus achieve 'elasticity' and 'resilience' which it is obviously not having at the moment. On the other side, people's direct participation in making political decisions could contribute to the system becoming more 'human' which it lacks today. This would definitely contribute to ideas making a stronger impact, which at present time are condemned as communist and anarchist in this historical period. Finally, a demand for the sacrifice of an individual will become legitimate, and this will happen for the very first time since the period of direct democracy of antiquity. In other words, humanity will move away from the liberal-capitalist paradigm without any guarantees that the man will achieve all his potentials in the new paradigm, but always with that goal in mind.

Passive or active resistance to indirect democracy

We cannot define a modern man as being a political person because, unlike in antiquity, he does not participate in making political decisions and not even at the level units of local self-government. Conclusively, many citizens in every society of neoliberal democracy are disinterested in elections, which is considered legitimate. However, this is not considered favorable if the goal is to change the system and adjust to the challenges of the future. Why would the citizen participate in elections if the political class is “serving” him with their own selected list of candidates? Citizens here do not feel anti-political but helpless in this situation which is why a vast majority of them do not participate in elections in countries today.

This is a silent indicator that, despite centuries of production of virtual reality by their creators, the man has refused to become the slave of false ideals. Despite the biggest ideological propaganda in the last two centuries that the humanity has ever seen before, there are fragments of time in all of us when there had been hope and when people felt in control of their own destinies. That seed once sowed simply waits to start growing again in favorable social conditions.

Therefore, not participating in elections in neoliberal democracies does not mean that somebody is anti-political, but on the contrary: it means that such person has a very clear political attitude. In fact, that attitude is much clearer than those of some parts of the working class and middle class people who stubbornly vote for governorship of the political elite; even if that means continuation of their exploitation by those they vote for. This is why not participating in elections constitutes a clear message to the political elites which is that our vote will not bring legitimacy to their rulership. There are ever more voices that we should all start from this attitude, and then, if circumstances allow, every person should express their moral obligation not to respect institutions of the system which demand exploitation from them.

According to the data from Bernie Sanders' book, in year 2014 the number of people who voted at elections for the Congress and for one third of the Senate in the USA, the most powerful economy in the world, reached its record low. In fact, 63% of Americans did not come to vote at those elections, despite the formal importance of elections for the most powerful legislative organs of the country. The citizens simply recognized and understood the way political system works, which is the reason for the lowest number of them attending those elections since the World War II. Even more depressing statistics for liberal agenda is that even 80% of young people boycotted those elections. Further statistics to be added is that there were those people with lowest wages who also refrained from voting.

It seems that the historical moment of decision making is coming close when humanity will come to the intersection and when each person individually will have to decide whether they see themselves as being servants – consumers, or the citizens – political beings. Of course, this still does not mean that humanity will make a correct decision since if it was so, no such political initiative would be necessary. Things would take their turn naturally by the principle of determinism since they are meant to develop in such a way. Since there are those people who do not completely believe in arguments in favor of social determinism, it is vital to argue that active fight is necessary in order for that seed to get activated and start growing in every human being. After that, the man has a higher chance to make correct decision, when historical conditions become right.

Theoretical and ideological base for a demand for direct democracy

This book is not about the critique of capitalism. Today we are flooded with books which confirm thesis that liberal capitalism is the thing of the past, because it causes the insurmountable social inequalities. There is nothing new for us in that regard.

It is up to the people to decide whether direct democracy provides the best conditions for economic development in the future, but that also depends on whether political will can be used for making decisions in regards to the most effective economic growth.

Here the word is also not about political ideologies either. Free national assemblies will include all three ideologies of modern capitalism in its performance: conservatism, liberalism and socialism. The purpose of direct democracy will be to organize their mutual contest and they will compete on much fairer grounds than in the present era of indirect democracy where liberal political strategy is dominant ideology and the other two always gravitate towards that center, so that in practice they only simulate ideological conflict.

This book is also not about anarchism because direct democracy gets protected and secured by the monopoly of the state which uses force for that particular purpose. Some political philosophers say that in direct democracy there is no state because, according to them, these two terms contradict each other, but this kind of thinking is wrong. There are not enough elements for the proof that antique Greek polices were not also states as well. This conclusion is wrong and is closely connected to experiencing democracy from the liberal-capitalist perspective. Democracy that is fully realized cannot be the negation of the state. By using an example from Athens at the time of reforms of Cleisthenes we can clearly see that stable and long-lasting state is founded on direct democratic practice.

Here the thing is about a simple request that the state power is given to the people so that state can completely come out of the paradigm of liberal ideology of capitalist way of production. Authoritarian political systems feed themselves with fear in ignorance. Liberal capitalism implanted in people fear from the unpredictable which individual political decision carries in itself.

This fear is something that people will have to free themselves off, firstly by their direct participation in local political decision making, and then, when historical conditions are ready, by direct participation in all aspects of political decision making on a larger scale.

Demand for people to govern instead of political classes at the same time presents a demand for historical discontinuity. It is clear that capitalism has brought the world the economic growth in multi-century long continuity and richness earlier generations could not even dream about. However, it is also clear that this way of production in combination with the elitist democracy, and, as a logical consequence, has created the largest socio-economic inequality the world has ever seen. The gap between the rich people and the rest of the world has become so deep and obvious that future will continue to emphasize the necessity of a separation between capitalism and elitist democracy.

Such discontinuity, by the way, will not lead towards further, uncontrollable piling up of the wealth, but it will influence prevention of its further fragmentation, and will positively impact on fairer wealth distribution which will further reduce inequality that is tearing apart the capitalist society at the moment. In other words, change into a new social state will improve capitalism and bring a very slow and unnoticeable shift into a new way of production. The exact structure of that new system of production will depend on the will of the people.

Function of the state in the reaffirmed idea of democracy

The state, as it was explained before, understood through liberal democratic model, is nothing more than the protector of financial monopolies and this is her most important function. Big and rich countries constantly compete amongst themselves in a fight for gaining new monopolies and become their dominant rulers in more or less predictable cycles.

This is explained in the text called: “*Kontratiev’s cycles*”, which are as thesis contained in a book: “*The long waves in economic life*” by the Soviet Union economist Nikolai Kontratiev.

It is clear that in practice, protection of human rights and freedoms is secondary to this primary function of every country. Their proclaimed protection of human rights is just a cheap demagoguery. Every war is nothing else but a conflict between big and rich countries while wars between small and “insignificant” countries are only a reflection of those wars big countries wage. Wars between small countries take place together with wars between big countries or as substitutes for open wars between them, taking into account that weak (and poor countries) are not necessarily fully independent.

This is best illustrated by two World Wars of the 20th century. In regards to these themes the most accurate is the belief of author Immanuel Wallerstein according to whom both wars were nothing else but the “probate hearings” and fight between the United Kingdom, Germany and the USA for control of financial monopolies. The USA came out as the ultimate winner of that fight.

Also, when we are talking about real reasons for big wars we must not overlook the fact that big war enterprises engage all economic resources of one country, which then leads to rapid economic growth, which, in its beginning phases of development creates reduction of social inequalities as a consequence. Therefore, we can analyze big wars through history as “temporary exhaust valves of overheated economies” which stagnate and in which the huge social inequality starts to emerge. When those wars are over, the countries’ “overheated economies” from the beginning of each war are now capable again for massive production growth, economic growth as well as of reorganizing and using human resources, the people, for various kinds of new jobs and business enterprises.

This means that the individual gets an opportunity to earn through hard work and separate himself from the lower socio-economic group which he was born in.

That was impossible to achieve in a period preceding the world war because of a very slow or non-existent economic growth, and also because of massive inherited capital in hands of the few, together with deep, insurmountable social inequality between the rich and the poor in relation to it. Taking into account that only the equal distribution of capital wealth can bring social equality, this means that all common legal constructs with the rule of the law and freedom in equality achieved through these constructs are useless, and just another illusion of the liberal elitist democracy.

It is understood that every war between two or more countries is a consequence of many causes, but here only the most important ones are mentioned. This does not mean that in conditions of direct democracy wars between countries are impossible to wage.

On the contrary, this only means that reasons for waging them would be completely different to those mentioned before. Virtual reality of the liberal vision of democracy should be placed aside and analyze the function of the state in imagined historical period of direct democracy of the future, instead.

Purpose of the state as monopoly of power in this historical period should finally be directed towards the man and not towards the capital; in other words, the purpose of the state could become much more socially useful and positive. If we think about the future in which direct democracy functions at units of local self-government in full capacity, then we should also think about how this affects its relationship with the state government, and what the real character of the state is in such social conditions. Further to that, the question is what the function of the state is in such conditions.

If we define the future country as the monopoly of power which protects the confederation of that country's towns and villages, and if we divide them into smallest units of the local self-government, this means that direct democracy of the future is achieved through those local assemblies. This also means that assemblies of towns and countries are consisted of delegated representatives of smallest units of local self-government.

Therefore, democratic practice comes from ‘the bottom up’, from the common people and not from ‘the top down’, or from corrupt political parties whose only goal is to protect financial interests of big capitalists with whom they create a ruling class.

While waiting for democracy to come to him ‘from above’ the man has not become a citizen but a servant of the state power that is ruled by oligarchies. If this waiting continues, things will not change in favor of the people because democracy cannot and will not come from the ‘top down’ that is, ‘from above.’ In order for democracy to become ‘alive’ and truly exist, every single citizen has to directly participate in it for a long time and work very hard in daily political decision making. Another road to real democracy does not exist.

Democracy gets born and develops like a live organism. Its growth and development mean engagement of big effort and experience of many failures until it is reached as a ‘light at the end of a big, long and dark tunnel.’ At today’s historical point direct democracy does not exist even in its embryo stage. It is just an idea which can begin in practice providing historical conditions allow that, and providing the people are ready to abandon their “status quo” and overcome their ideological prejudice.

This further means that direct elections would give way to direct democracy on the historical stage, in other words, one phase would actually give way to another. In such circumstances, the country would represent the only guarantee of direct democracy, which would state the principle of its inviolability to be the foundation of the constitution.

Countries would declare essential responsibilities of its towns through the constitution. Those responsibilities would be broad and would include all aspects of living in the local area. They would also never try to influence the monopoly of the state power, which would stay in hands of the central government because the goal of these adjustments must never be the creation of new states, but creation and strengthening of a self-sustainable society.

Such society shares its passion and dedication to direct democracy with other countries and societies. The central power would guarantee functioning of direct democracy in return, since it would set up all spectrums of laws and guarantee sanctioning of every attack on the highest social value – the principle of direct democracy.

In order for direct democracy to work in practice the following are necessary: it is vital for the constitution to precisely define the right of local self-governing units to own public property, as well as their right to organize communal duties without which the life of a modern man cannot be imagined.

Also, the states would have to constitutionally define the principle of independent fiscal politics of the local governing units. It is assumed that the principle of fiscal and financial independence of local self-governing units must be compliant with social politics of the state in a sense of allocation of resources. In other words, the smallest self-governing units in direct democracy must have their own autonomous financing, which means that they are legally entitled to collect taxes from people of their local areas, and right to use those taxes according to the prescribed legislation written by the central government. It is also taken by default that the central power fully represents direct democracy and not some kind of elitist body of oligarchic political nature, as has so far been the case.

As far as developed countries of liberal paradigm are concerned, they already have a rich and diverse experience on a level of their local self-government, in particular, in regards to the legal regulation and practice, compared to the countries “in transition.” In other words, in rich and more developed European countries local self-government is in charge of much more money and property compared to other poorer countries of the Eastern block, most of which are “in transition.” This is the result of countries’ own understanding of liberalism as being part of their national identity.

In regards to all Eastern bloc countries in particular, after they abandoned their socialist practices, and in their desire to fit into the liberal capitalist paradigm, they started that process by ensuring their full awareness of their own national identity first, because this question is important.

Starting from that position, there was not much space for development of ideas of strengthening of local self-government; not even in the liberal-capitalist way, let alone in its real way through development of an idea of legal governorship of the people. Countries first had to prove themselves by strengthening of their own central power while at the same time taking away the power from local self-governing units; while patriotism was “feeding itself” by destroying every idea that the local community should express democratic practices.

Further on, these themes present the subject of an international contract at a multilateral level where there is the European Charter about local self-government conveyed in Strasbourg in year 1985 which constitutes a legal foundation for this particular issue. However, it is clear that in liberal version of capitalism the term ‘local self-government’ does not mean the smallest self-governing unit of the local government where people rule directly through their individual participation in its workings. Just as in every other international legal document which is written in the model of liberal direct democracy, so it happens with the European Charter too: it is filled with elitist democratic views expressed in a liberal way with legal mechanisms for protection of indirect democracy that are very noticeable. So, a regulation which defines the content of the term “local self-government” says: “Local self-government means right and capability of the local government to conduct businesses and govern the important parts of public jobs, which are all under their responsibility as well as covered by the legislation and in interests of the local society.” However, from another regulation which follows, all the logic of the government of political elites can be understood. These political elites consist of the finance elite of managers and big corporate business owners who constitute the ruling class, and who firmly hold in their hands all legal and economic instruments for their long term rulership.

So, in another regulation the norm is essentially limited only to local parliaments which are consisted of members of the political elite, and it says: “This law will be exercised by advisory committees or assemblies consisted of members that are selected through secret voting based on direct, just and general voting rights, which can have executive organs who answer to those committees. This regulation does not in any way prevent the possibility of assemblies, referendum or any other form of direct participation where they are allowed by the statute.” Therefore, from these quoted regulations we can conclude that the concept of local self-government relates to parliaments or advisory committees which are products of elitist democracy; and that for governing bodies which are products of direct democracy, such as ‘the parliament of the people’ there is an additional condition which is the statute. In other words, direct democratic rulership is limited by the statute and whether or not it allows certain direct democratic practices to be exercised. The following can also be concluded from the quote above which is that ‘the parliament of the people’ as a form of direct democracy is very vaguely defined.

This is just one of the countless of examples which show how oligarchies create law at the international level, thus making their position stronger while marginalizing the individual. Oligarchies thus make any form of direct democracy through gathering of the people ridiculous, and reduce it to dimension that has no premise of politics in its base. According to the international law, the citizens have the right to join in together into chess clubs, but not to create their local people’s assemblies in areas where they live, and so independently govern their own lives. This is how legal constructions get created which are eloquent and very human at the outside while their inner essence is completely pointless. When oligarchies in an important legal act proclaim rights that serve the people, that always means the complete opposite to that proclamation.

The central thesis of this chapter is that the principle of direct democracy must be recognized and constitutionally protected via the state monopoly of power, while establishing further principles whose goal is to create social conditions to justify instead of stultifying the proclaimed basic principle.

In such conditions democracy could develop quickly. The blind servitude to political elites through the idea of consumerism would be replaced by the idea of individualism. The consumer would become the citizen. The citizen would maybe even become a political person after a long period of developing of this idea in practice.

Therefore capitalism is possible without indirect democracy as well as without complete rulership of the political class. This interruption would, by the way, mean continuation of evolutionary development of capitalist way of production all up to the point when capitalism would gain its new, more perfect form. Capitalism would, instead of the sad end, experience its full evolutionary way at the end of which it would evolve into something more humane and righteous. To choose the second between these two ways means to complete the life circle of capitalism that would serve as the starting point for happier vision of humanity.

Triple devolution

In present time the humanity experiences triple devolution – of democracy and man as a political creature, as well as of capitalism itself, as the most successful way of production which enables gradual growth of global economy and accumulation of wealth. Term ‘devolution’ here means opposite to the term ‘evolution’ in Charles Darwin’s sense of the term, and it is not related to the transfer of property ownership which is the legal definition of the term.

Indirect democracy came from devolution of true and only real democracy of antique type and dragged the man as a political creature in the abyss with itself. Also, it is important to mention that the spiritual development of man was not able to follow the speed of technical and technological development, and from this fact all other troubles have emerged which the humanity is facing today.

The man of antiquity was at the higher level of spiritual development than today's man - the consumer, because the system of direct democracy created a more perfect human being out of him, by enabling him to partially realize his intellectual potentials through direct political participation in duties related to his local community.

As soon as democratic practices stopped, the man started his declining devolutionary path in order to drop down to the level of intellectual primate, a servant – a consumer which is never asked about the nature of society in which he lives. He is never asked because through centuries he had been taught that political and social topics are too complicated for him to be able to deal with them individually. In order to make matters even worse, that thesis is probably correct even today, which is exactly the consequence of man's devolutionary decline as the political creature.

Question is whether the situation would have been different had the man dealt with his own politics every day throughout the history, thereby solving problems that were happening in practice. Would the man of today be of the broader knowledge and understanding, and especially, would he have the sensitivity and a higher sense of responsibility to solve problems of his own local community?

The ability to think abstractly means that the man analysis things from the 'top down' approach, and that he can understand the cause-and-effect of events, which from the 'bottom up' perspective do not have any mutual connection with each other, and seem like an accidental flow of happenings.

The modern consumer is not very capable of analyzing things from this angle and it suits him the most to “absorb political phrases” from the comfort of an armchair in his home environment. This is the result of a very long rulership of political classes and systematic destruction of “political creature” in the man. Maybe the time has come for people to finally take responsibility for their own destiny.

The cause-and-effect connection between devolution of democracy and devolution of the man as political, intellectual and spiritual being is very logical and obvious. Further on, it also seems that indirect democracy, apart from the man has also drawn into degeneration the capitalism itself, as seen in deterioration and degeneration of its institutions and its downgrading to a pure joke and a farce, so that today we can truly talk about the triple devolution.

This stagnation, just like devaluation of capitalist way of production, happened recently and relates to the second half of the 20th century, which means that this deterioration can be stopped by adjustments of the sociopolitical system as a whole. The imperative of stopping this process of deterioration does not mean that deep love for capitalism is really there; but the belief that it is possible for the more humane and perfect form of production and distribution of goods and services to emerge out of this imperfect, however, deeply stable and useful capitalist system.

In fact, we should not despair over the liberal version of capitalism because it is as liberal in reality as much as democracy is truly democratic, which is none of it. There is no need for man of the future to miss the time when every social situation had its euphemistic liberal expression. Behind terms such as *human rights and freedoms, the rule of the law, political correctness, globalism, transition, integrations, democracy and fiscal economy* there are their exact opposites expressed through very brutal practices. Soft words of political correctness are just a cover under which these brutal practices flourish with their main focus being to rob the man of his freedom in favor of piling up of the capital in hands of political and financial elites.

Property right and free market economy

Cooperation between these two terms is vital for understanding of today's society. Political class works for the benefit of the financial elite so that it can continue its capital accumulation. Connection between a political decision and financial potential lies in foundations of oligarchic systems. Members of the political elite, naturally, desire to become members of the financial elite, while the financial elites want to control political decisions so that they can broaden and enrich their capital. Their mutual partnership and resulting synergy constitute the rulership of oligarchy. Taking into account that financial elites are neither nationally nor territorially defined, the ruling class is not limited by borders of any country but can project its interests to the entire planet. The main goal of liberal countries is not to help achieve all man's potentials through the rule of the law, but to protect financial monopolies. The best way to support this thesis is invention of legal construct of natural, basic and human property right.

Creation of this legal construct and, in particular, its placement in a corpus of the natural law is all for the purpose of obtaining a big capital and ensuring its domination in political reality through rulership of political elites.

If the protection of the civic law accidentally happens, it is more the case of collateral benefit than for the real purpose for which each country should exist. Property law is "a weapon" which elitist democracy uses effectively. The goal has been achieved – the man has accepted that his right to the property ownership has been existing forever and for his own sake, and not for the sake of rich capitalists and their properties.

Since this law is natural in a sense that it is immanent to human nature because it is its product, therefore it must never be forbidden by taking the property from rich people and distributing it equally to the rest of the population of the planet.

In Eastern Europe where such an experiment was conducted in the mid 20th century, its effects were annulled in following decades under the pressure of the liberal agenda during processes of restitution of property that was taken away from their owners. This constitutes a return to the winning principle of respect for basic human rights, and at the same time, the principle of non-infringement of stolen rights. According to the liberal elitist paradigm, a stolen property or right must never be questioned and this is the only condition of human right to a property and its inviolability. Of course, the basic condition is that the stolen property comes out of the colonial conquests, that is, from credited colonialism. All interstate crimes conducted outside of this model are considered as law-breaking activities in relation to the property right.

Here it is clear that there is a controversy between the main theses of liberalism. It is not clear how the robbing of colonies can be considered legal and legitimate if human property right is the natural right, that is, since it exists from the time of the very first human settlements. Which moment should serve as a point after which robbery does not have any legality and legitimacy? It is clear that every answer to this question is completely random, and that it depends on the person who is in possession of the accumulated capital in his hands at the moment, because he is the only one who gets asked this in conditions of the liberal direct democracy.

Therefore the theses of liberal writers about the nature of the trade between the state and the individual is not correct because the state does not give that individual the rule of the law so that it can make him happy and help him realize all his potentials. The goal of the rule of the law in liberal paradigm is protection of financial monopolies which is why the state exists in such a paradigm. It has been successfully achieving this goal for centuries. This success is impressive because it seems that the majority of people are convinced that the state provides them with the rule of the law in order to protect their properties and their lives.

There are two constructs of liberal capitalism which are mutually connected. Firstly, it has to be realized that the inviolability of the property right is contained within the rule of the law as its indispensable part.

On the other side, the idea of free market economy is contained within the construct of economic globalism. Both constructs use these ideas in order to successfully function in everyday practice of capitalist economy.

These two constructs, as well as the ideas they use, are mutually connected and culminate in the final goal of protection of the financial elite which is neither nationally nor territorially bound. Such setup is a consequence of the property law and free market economy that financial elite should be thankful to.

Even some liberal theorists, after realizing the uselessness of efforts put into the free market economy, had to correct their own liberal attitudes by accepting that some dose of reserve and cautiousness is important in relation to the initial idea. They had to understand and accept that there is a certain dose of danger in too fast release and sales of the capital without them having clearer and more efficient legislation to back it up. Of course that this cautiousness was explained by reasons of economic character, such as the possibility of massive draining of profits from funds of short lasting capital, because of which economies can experience significant problems. On the other side, as noted by the economist Bhagwati, too fast sales of goods and services cannot cause similar negative consequences for economy.

If we accept the beginning theses of the necessity of a long term economic stagnation which is expected to happen in the future, and connect it with the theses that the main postulate of capitalism is constant and ever more progressive economic growth, as affirmed by monumental work: “*Capital*” by Carl Marx or from his interpretation of the book by author Terry Eagleton called “*Why Marx was right*”, then we can confidently conclude that we are about to experience very uncertain and exciting times in the future. Humanity will have to find solution to solving those problems, and it seems that this solution cannot be found in indirect democracy understood through rulership of political oligarchies. This is because the members of oligarchies are not any more capable than the average man since they come from members of average society itself. It is then natural for servants – consumers to elect those similar to themselves. The problem is that this servant – consumer has not evolutionary matured into the citizen which is why his choice of those who will rule him will always be mediocre.

This further means that the rulership of political elites can never be smarter than the rulership of the people, but can be equal to it in its mediocrity or even worse than it.

This will always be the case in practice because the implementation of direct democracy over a longer period of time increases the level of spiritual development of the average man; and together with that, the general level of capability of the political class, which in democracy consists of all citizens. In relation to all that is mentioned above, it is clear that centuries long rulership of the political oligarchy did not bring a higher level of capability of that class. On the contrary, from this present perspective, it is obvious that political elite did not manage to increase its quality of performance and its general level of ability for centuries now. This means that capitalism as a way of economic production will not be able to rely on rulership of political elites in periods of economic stagnation at the global level in the future, and so alternative solutions are now becoming an imperative.

There is one more reason why the judgment of the political elite can never be more accurate than the same of the whole society as a political body. This is because decisions of the political elite can never reflect the will of the people as a whole.

The will of the people as the most important goal of direct democracy

For the purpose of this discussion we will assume that the general will of the people is the most secure way towards achieving the wisest political decision. Therefore, we will assume that the general will is always right because it is always and without exception beneficial to the whole society. We will also assume that it should make a result of every individual citizen's will and decision about certain social issue, under the condition that the citizen is well informed in regards to it. Freedom of his political decision making in regards to the certain issue means that the citizen makes his decision completely individually, regardless of any other political groups; that is, that the citizen makes decision without his political consultations which result in unification of a political opinion.

Such unification in regards to the particular issue is naturally created chronologically, only after the voting for the topic in question. Of key importance is that it does not and cannot exist before the citizen votes about that issue, because otherwise we would be talking about political groupings which create various individual opinions or one individual opinion as a result. Taking into account that here the topic is achieving the general will of the people as a whole, such unification of political opinion is not desirable and creates danger for functioning of democratic practices. For this reason, it is recommended that the citizen during his or her decision making, votes exclusively by relying on his or her consciousness and belief of what is good for the whole society, and all this to be in harmony with Pericles' main principle which says that every human being is capable of voting about the law, even when he or she is not able to create that law. In this Internet era this possibility is becoming our reality which should be used for the benefit of the mankind. It is taken into account that the citizen has improved his or her political decision making through decades long political work, so that over time every individual who wants to participate in political life of direct democracy gets to become more capable of making political decisions than any other member of the political elite from the period of elitist democracy of liberal capitalism. This is because people make decisions based on their individual knowledge and consciousness, and take into account all that is good for the community they live in.

On the other side, a member of the political elite does not have his or her opinion and they do not make decisions for the benefit of the social community they represent. They only pass on interests of the big capital and nothing other than that. The member of the political elite is some kind of a sophist of the modern time which mastered a political rhetoric so that his speech creates a pleasant feeling in average listener, and for that duty alone that member is extremely well compensated by his political party. His words sound wonderful on the surface but in reality they are useless and have no deeper meaning whatsoever. He is rhetorically educated to carry on his political life but has no accumulated knowledge and culture.

He is the modern sophist instead of being the modern Socrates. Modern followers of the Athenian philosopher Socrates cannot exist without direct democracy. Anyhow, maybe the period when famous antique philosophers came into the scene says a lot about the meaning of this thesis.

In relation to this, we cannot ignore the fact that in historical period of elitist democracy the best and the wisest political decision could never be made. This is because the sheer existence of political parties annuls the will of the people, taking into account that it weakens that will to the point when decisions of political parties do not have a single premise of people's will in them. Instead, that will becomes only the will of that political party which cannot be the socially acceptable outcome since it only serves the interests of that oligarchy which are always completely opposite to the will of the people and social goals they represent.

From everything mentioned above, it is clear that neoliberalism as a "more perfect machine" created the biggest social inequality that has ever been recorded in human history. It was also expected to happen, and therefore nobody has the right today to be surprised by its results. Injustice expressed through social inequality is not the theme here, but the imperative that every individual political decision of the ruler finally becomes expression of the will of the people considering that, as we have seen before, that will is always right.

Therefore a demand for reintegration of direct democracy into social reality is actually a request for realization and expression of the general will of the people as the final goal of this discussion. This means that direct democracy is not a goal in itself. It is only a way of expressing the general will of the people in the best way possible.

Rousseau in his "*Social contract*" said: "If citizens as people who are informed enough, vote, they would not communicate in any way with each other, and then, from the big number of small differences in opinion the general will of the people will always come out and decision will always be right."

However, when fractions start being created, that is, special groups, those groups become an individual expression of the general will in relation to its members as well as an individual group in relation to the state: therefore it can be concluded that it cannot be more voters than people, but only as many as there are political groups. Differences in opinion are reduced to the smaller number and therefore produce limited general result. Finally, when one of those groups becomes so big, it also becomes superior to others and then as a result, we do not have the sum of small differences in opinion anymore, but one big difference: the general will of the people disappears, and the thinking that dominates is the one of that biggest group, that is, the individual thinking becomes the dominate one. Therefore, in order for the general will of the people to win, it is vital that separate social groups do not exist, and that every citizen expresses only his or her own opinion.”

From these very clear thoughts we can conclude that existence of political parties is bad for democracy because it destroys the general will of the people, which is the only way and direction towards the most accurate political decision. The presence of political parties keeps us imprisoned in a thick fog on the ship which sails between dangerous rocks. The end of this sailing is very predictable unless we return to the principles of direct democracy.

It is clear that political and philosophical attitudes of people who founded the liberal political ideology and inspired the French Revolution were not directed towards taking over the power by political parties the way it happened in practice in a very short time frame, according to the citation above. This means that things, in a way, started happening without much control so that now they have their own separate existence which the founders could not predict. It is clear that Rousseau fought for development of direct democratic practices, despite the fact that later liberal theory tried to prove the opposite.

It is very clear that the most powerful and richest countries in the world have much better and more capable people compared to their political leaders, who are products of political parties who make them so that they can publicly present political ideas. Membership of the political party is hereditary and they show tendency to mix with the people less as time goes by; therefore creation of hereditary political dynasties in most powerful countries of the world should not come as a surprise. This tendency will certainly continue and grow together with the growth of importance of hereditary wealth and with reduction of possibility of wealth creation by an average individual due to slowing down of economic growth at the global level, which will last for centuries. Therefore, together with stagnation of economic growth we should expect the strengthening of the political class. It is up to us to prevent the expected economic stagnation and turn it around by reaffirming democratic practices at the global level.

Of course, there should be no illusion that in conditions of direct democracy there will not be political and financial elitism. It existed in a period of direct democracy in antique *polis*. However, in conditions of stable and long term direct democratic practices there will not be a complete governorship of such elites with their oligarchic synergistic connections.

In order for this goal to be achieved in practice we have to use accessible knowledge from social sciences. In lack of better recipe for explanation of natural desire of elites to unite themselves into oligarchic political regime of rulership, we have to use a half a century old advice from the female activist for human equality Ms. Jo Freeman.

In her book: “*The tyranny of structurelessness*” she presented her proposals for overruling the elites regardless of the socio-economic group that applies direct democratic practices during their decision making; regardless of whether those proposals are structural, in a sense that their order is institutionalized, or they are non-structural in a sense that the proposals do not have any formal structure. It is important to remember that there is always that informal structure created by the elite. The belief is that Ms. Freeman’s proposals are still equally attractive, and since they are very simple and practical, it is worthwhile to mention them in this part of the book.

In the first place it has to be emphasized the fundamental proposal of Jo Freeman for every organization of people who makes decisions using the principle of direct democracy. That proposal says that such organization must have a defined and institutionalized formal structure, because without it there will emerge an informal structure which is much harder to control and manage because it is founded on friendships and therefore “hidden away” from legal regulations. We are reminded that the final goal of direct democratic practices is expression of the general will of the people, and not creation of innumerable new local elites, which will use the rules of direct democracy and create a fraudulent competition of political elites again, instead of the rulership of the people.

When this basic condition for the structure of the group, which will apply direct democratic practices, is fulfilled; that is, when that structure is formally legally defined, then other principles can be implemented. With their help *demos* can always overrule the informal elite, as Jo Freeman presented in years 1970/71 and which say the following:

- According to the previously defined procedure the group assigns tasks to each individual
- Each individual is responsible to the group at any given moment
- The group assigns tasks to as many individuals in it as it is possible
- The group rotates tasks between individuals
- The main condition for tasks assignment must be the individual's ability and interest in the task
- Consistent and accurate spread of information to all members of the group because the quality of work lies precisely in consistency and accuracy of the information passed. This is the point which Rousseau also emphasized when he was talking about the importance of every individual being informed as a condition for political will to become of general character, and
- Consistent application of the principle of accessibility to a key tool, which would in present time of direct democratic practices be computer with the full Internet access

In order for *demos* to gain a real political power in conditions of direct democracy it is necessary to apply the above mentioned principles, but this is not enough. Without long term participation of the citizen in practice of making political decisions and his or her participation in education for effectively conducting direct democratic practices, there are no big chances that mentioned principles will survive in the long term. This is why it must be always kept in mind that the citizen must be provided with education which includes not only the scientific facts, but also education that teaches him or her not to be the blind servant to the economy and the political elite, since such obedience never really existed, nor will it ever be a measure of man's own dedication to his local community.

Afterword

In this book the way in which liberal capitalist doctrine understands democracy is what has been presented, together with social processes and situations tightly connected with the concept of democracy. Liberal paradigm establishes axiom according to which democracy exists at the present moment all around us. It is of elitist nature because, according to liberal doctrine, political and financial elites have legitimacy to rule instead of the people who are nothing more than bearers of legal sovereignty, and who that right pass on to the elites through direct and general elections.

Elitist democracy is tightly connected to the rule of the law understood in the material sense of liberal paradigm and only in such arrangement it can exist in this model of social reality. On the other side, the rule of the law has the function to create the false alternative to human equality. It is the substitution to *de facto* equality considering that people are equal with each other only if they are equally rich in material sense of the word. At the same time there is a thesis which says that indirect democracy is the necessary follower of the direct one, from reasons which are debated in this book.

It has to be emphasized that there is understanding according to which there are political practices of direct democracy today legalized through liberal constitutions which are direct and general elections, people's referendum, plebiscite and people's initiative. Liberals believe that these legal institutions are reminds of direct democracy, and that liberal capitalism is founded on democracy.

Finally, liberal doctrine believes that economic growth goes together with democratic progress. Liberal theorists do not accept the thesis which says that the growth of democratic practices is counter proportional to consistent and stable economic growth in a long term globally.

This means that liberals understand present time as the highest point where the prescribed goal has been reached, which is the society that is equal and free. In other words, the present time is the highest point in a long history of human organizing at the level of political organizing. Everything that preceded this point was only an introduction to it, and everything that follows after this point could be the general decline of civilization and with that a decline of democratic practices.

Unfortunately, nothing can be further from the truth in regards to this thesis. Today, the citizen is different from the consumer because of his ability, willingness and freedom to tell the truth about reality we live in. In relation to reality of democratic practices at the global level, we can say that democracy from its beginnings in Greek *polises* has been constantly going towards negative development which has been counter proportional to technical-technological development, so that instead of evolution it has been experiencing devolution, which is not by any means accidental.

Literature

- Aristotle. (1988). Politics. Zagreb: Globus
- Bhagwati, J. (2008). In defense of globalization. Belgrade: JP Official Newsletter.
- Eagleton, T. (2016). Why Marx was right. Belgrade: Plato.
- Ferguson, N. (2016). The great degeneration. Belgrade: Plato.
- Fini, M. (2007). The dark habit of the West: manifesto of anti-modernity. Belgrade: Ukronija.
- Harvey, D. (2013). A brief history of neoliberalism. Zagreb: VBZ.d.o.o
- Herodotus. (1988). Histories, Book I. Novi Sad: Serbian National Library.
- Kelsen, H. (2005). The essence and value of democracy. Belgrade: Official Newsletter.
- Kondratiev, D. N. (1984). The long wave cycle. New York: Richardson & Snyder.
- Kondratiev, D. N. (2014). The long waves in economic life. Martino Fine Books.
- Marx, C. (1947). Capital. Belgrade: Culture.
- Piketty, T. (2015). Capital in the twenty first century. Novi Sad: Academic Book.
- Plato. (2013). The republic. Belgrade: Dereta.
- Plato. (2004). The laws. Belgrade: Dereta.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1993). The social contract. Belgrade: Philip Vishnich.
- Sanders, B. (2016). Our revolution: the future to believe in. Belgrade: Contrast.
- Schumpeter, J. (1960). Capitalism, socialism and democracy. Belgrade: Culture.
- Wallerstein, I. (2005). After liberalism. Belgrade: JP Official Newsletter.
- Weber, M. (2014). The city. Novi Sad: Mediterran Publishing.

Website:

Retrieved from: <http://slobodnifilozofski.com/2010/07/jo-freeman-tiranija-nestrukturiranosti.html>

CIP – Cataloging in publication
National Library of Serbia, Belgrade

321.7
321.01
141.7

MILOSAVLJEVICH, Pedja, 1974 –
The anatomy of elitist democracy / Pedja Milosavljevich. – Belgrade:
Duga design, 2018 (Belgrade: Skripta Internacional). - 123 pgs. ; 21 cm

Number of books printed: 100. – Pgs. 7 – 8 Foreward / Darko Tadich. –
Literature: pg. 122

ISBN 978-86-900379-1-9

a) Democracy b) Philosophy of the politics
COBISS.SR-ID 263311372