

HOW TO MAKE REVOLUTION

Developing the Fourth People's Power

Joost van Steenis

veteran activist from Amsterdam, The Netherlands

downwithelite@gmail.com



**Taking the power and the money away from the 1%
Foundation Power & Elite
Amsterdam 2014**

Towards a world without a 1%

Why is there no Revolution?

Because we, activists, do something wrong.

Why did past revolutions fail?

Because we, activists, did something wrong.

Let's do it better!



The Golden Rule for Actions

**Damage to the 99% should be minimal,
pressure on the 1% ever increasing**

Autonomous Clubs

**control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate
the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99%**

The target is the 1%

We must destroy the power and money pyramid

Towards a world without a 1%

Towards a world without a 1%

Free downloadable books

by **[Joost van Steenis](#)**

veteran activist from Amsterdam, The Netherlands

downwithelite@gmail.com

How to make Revolution,

developing the Fourth People's Power

[From Chaos to Change,](#)

entering a new era

[The Power of the Autonomous Human,](#)

theory and practice of attacks on humans

[About Violence and Democracy,](#)

in search for an alternative to democracy

[The Scarists,](#)

contemplations about a society beyond democracy

[The Power of the Family-Capital](#)

(only in Dutch)

Blog [downwithelite](#)

Each follower of my blog receives an email when I publish a new article

Site [Down with any elite](#)

Twitter [downwithelite](#)

Facebook Group [Occupy the 1%](#)

**The dominant role of money in all decisions should be replaced by
the idea that all people have the same status**

Towards a world without a 1%

CONTENTS

Preface	7
Why is there no revolution?	
Part A. Chapters 1-14	9
How to make revolution and why did past revolutions fail	
Part B. Chapters 15-21	50
The 1% are the prime target, they have most power and money	
Part C. Chapters 22-25	73
Actions of the past have not changed the world	
Part D. Chapters 26-34	85
For a revolution we need movements not organisations	
Part E. Chapters 35-39	114
By using guerrilla tactics in a War of the Flea the powerless Many can defeat the seemingly powerful Few	
Part F. Chapters 40-45	131
Individual actions give more power than mass actions	
Part G. Chapters 46-50	150
Democracy is approaching its end, the future will be beautiful	

Towards a world without a 1%

Preface

Why is there no revolution

Only a revolution changes the idea that money dominates all decisions in the idea that all people have the same status. For a Humane Society we must take the power and the money away from the 1%. The separated and extravagant world of the 1% should be made uninhabitable.

Why do we allow the greedy and corrupt rich to amass still more money? In the revolution the 99% learn how to chase away the old 1% and how to prevent that a new 1% arises again. Therefore they need an independent power to correct leaders who take decisions for their own benefit.

One of the revolutionary instruments of this Fourth People's Power are small, leaderless and temporarily Autonomous Clubs of which the members decide where, when, how, about what, with whom and against whom actions are carried out. Small is beautiful in the extended War of the Flea of now powerless 99% against the powerful and extreme wealthy 1%.

Actions should comply with the Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% is minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing. The second Golden Rule is that all actions should be directed against the 1%.

Actions are inspired by the guiding paradigm that all people have the same status. Activists control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99%. Not institutions, corporations, banks, governments, buildings or other dead entities are action targets but living people who belong to the selfish 1%.

My more than fifty years of action experience has shown that revolution is not possible by using old-fashioned actions methods in which activists only beg or ask leaders to change decisions and not force them to change. All past actions did not prevent that the power and wealth of the 1% increased while the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99% went down. We need something completely different to get a Humane World.

The greedy and corrupt grabbers at the top destroy our world but are hardly pressured by the 99%. They are responsible for financial and economic crises and for most of the misery in the world including the horrifying fact that nearly ten million kids die each year before they are five years old. They are the principal target in the fight for a better world. We can change their minds by many small guerrilla-like actions, guided by the slogan "Spending 200.000 euro in one year should be the limit", that prevent they can spend their ill-gotten money for their own extravagant well-being.

Towards a world without a 1%

While they have a privileged, exclusive and prosperous life, billions of people have no future and live miserably at the edge of the world.

Amassing money becomes useless when the super-rich cannot spend their surplus money on goods and services that can only be acquired by 200,000-plus people and that are out of reach of common citizens. We cannot prevent that the top earns too much but we can creatively disturb their private living situation in such a way they cannot spend their unfair gotten money. In the end their exclusive eliteworld becomes uninhabitable so they have to descend to our world and all people will have the same status.

When the reason to amass money disappears our world becomes more decent. The action tactic Creative Disturbance only hurts the greedy top with actions that intrude in their privileged world. The top has never been attacked but is vulnerable. The 99% can change our inhuman world by taking the power and the money away from the 1%.

Each chapter can be read separately as an article.

Blog [downwithelite](#)

Twitter [downwithelite](#)

Facebook Group [Occupy the 1%](#)

Joost van Steenis

[Who is Joost van Steenis?](#)

Foundation Power and Elite

Amsterdam, 2014

PART A

How to make revolution and why did past revolutions fail

The goal is a world without a 1% in which money as the dominating factor in all decisions is replaced by the idea that all people have the same status. Action targets are living people and not dead systems, corporations, buildings, institutions or governments.

The Golden Rule for Actions should minimise damage to the 99% and ever increase pressure on the 1%. Leftists and rightists are all 99% and any secondary division in the 99% weakens the struggle against the 1%. The Fourth People's Power of many Autonomous Clubs controls, vetoes and eventually punishes faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99% (Jean-Paul Marat)

Chapter 1..... 11

How to make revolution and why did past revolutions fail

Activists should develop the autonomous Fourth People's Power

Chapter 2..... 13

Revolutions only succeed when the 1% are dethroned

Then we get a world without a dominating 1%

Chapter 3..... 16

The Golden Rule for Actions

Damage to the 99% should be minimal, pressure on the 1% ever increasing

Chapter 4..... 18

Autonomous Clubs

The independent Fourth People's Power to make and safeguard the revolution

Chapter 5..... 22

Jean-Paul Marat (1743-1793), revolutionary

Forgotten ideas about how the 99% can get power

Chapter 6..... 25

I am autonomous, not leftist nor rightist

The difference between the 99% and the 1% is the most important problem

Towards a world without a 1%

Chapter 7..... 28

What is power?

How the mafia and the 1% use power and how the 99% can become powerful

Chapter 8..... 31

The Fourth People's Power

The autonomous power instrument of the 99%

Chapter 9..... 34

A revolution needs a paradigm shift, new basic ideas for a new society

The idea that everyone has the same status should replace the dominant role of money

Chapter 10..... 37

Revolution is about living people

Not about dead systems, corporations, institutions, banks, buildings or governments

Chapter 11..... 39

People stand central, also in actions

Not what is wrong but who is wrong

Chapter 12..... 42

Autonomous Clubs pressure leading people

They control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate our freedom, privacy and well-being

Chapter 13..... 44

Resistance instead of protest

Forcing and not asking or begging leaders to take better decisions

Chapter 14..... 47

Chaos and Catastrophes

Necessary conditions to get a Humane World in which the 99% have power and the same status

Chapter 1

How to make revolution and why did past revolutions fail

Activists should develop the autonomous Fourth People's Power

Why is there no revolution?

Because we, activists, do something wrong.

Why were successful revolutions turned around?

Because we, activists, did something wrong.

Let's do it better!

All revolutions have been bloody – the blood of the 99%.

The next revolution should only see blood – if any – of the 1%.

The 1% ruled in the past, rule in the present and continue to rule in the future when there is no fundamental change, when the 99% do not find ways to take the money and power away from the 1%. Revolution is taking the road towards a world without a 1%. Past revolutions did not change society fundamentally because a 1% continued to exist. Most actions aim to improve the present society and not to change it. But the 1% restrict more and more the life of the 99% while the privileged and extravagant eliteworld continues to expand. When actions do not try to dethrone the 1% it leads to nothing, the 99% remain inferior and subordinated. Revolution is taking the road towards a world without a 1%.

Revolutions sometimes seemed successful, sometimes failing miserable but damage to the 99% was always greater than damage to the 1%. After all revolutions a new 1% established themselves at the top of society and the 99% remained at the bottom of the power pyramid. Sometimes the situation of the 99% improved but the wealth and power remained unequally distributed. The next revolution must be different.

In the pre-revolutionary period new action methods should be used that pressure leading people. These action methods also can be used in the period after the revolution to prevent that a new 1% arise who again rule the country for their own benefit. Then society returns to the old situation with a Powerful Few at the top and the Powerless Many at the bottom. A Humane World does not have a 1%, it is based on active, involved and interested citizens who have the same status and who care for it that greed, corruption, big crime but also discrimination, hunger, wars, poverty and much more misery raise its ugly head.

Towards a world without a 1%

The pre-revolutionary period will last some time. The mind of the 99% has to change, they must become self-conscious, aware that they have the power to defeat any suppressor. They must learn new action tactics to undermine power relations based on intruding the private living sphere of the 1%. All actions should comply with the Golden Rule for Actions, damage to the 99% should be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing.

Four factors increase the chance on a revolution that opens hat the road to a Humane World without a 1%.

The first factor concerns the movement and activity of the 99%.

The second factor concerns the movement and behaviour of the 1%.

The third factor concerns the development of new ideas and paradigms.

The fourth factor concerns the use of new action methods to take the power and the money away from the 1%.

Analysing past people's uprisings with these factors explains why the French Revolution succeeded and why after this revolution a new 1% arose who again dominated society. New ideas and paradigms were discarded and the new greedy 1% was not anymore pressured. It shows why the Arab Spring is not a revolution but a revolt, leading at the most to small improvements for the 99% who remain inferior to the 1%. The 1% was during the revolt hardly pressured and great ideas for a new society were failing. It shows why all revolutions failed in getting a world without a 1%, a world in which all people have the same status. It shows that revolutions succeeded when the first three factors were intensified but failed in the aftermath because the fourth factor was neglected. That factor gives the 99% an independent power that prevents that a 1% ever arise again. In all revolutions damage to the 99% has been too severe because actions did not comply with the Golden Rule for Actions.

An independent Fourth People's Power hardly existed during the French, Russian, Chinese, Cuban etc. revolutions. Any independent power of the 99% disappeared quickly after the revolution. Therefore a new 1% could arise. This Fourth People's Power of small temporary Autonomous Clubs of interested, involved and active 99% should control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of common citizens.

To get a Humane Society another way of thinking and acting is needed. The new paradigm that all people have the same status is a guide for the 99% to determine what kind of actions is needed. Actions that do not contribute to a revolutionary change should not be carried out. It is spilled energy and influences negatively the hope on a better future because it does not bring real improvement. Any action should undermine the power and money pyramid.

Chapter 2

Revolutions only succeed when the 1% is dethroned

Then we get a world without a dominant 1%

“One of the symptoms of revolution is the sudden increase in the number of ordinary people who take an active interest in politics” (Lenin). Revolutions do not fall from the skies. Four factors promote revolutions and prevent that ever a new 1% get power and most of the money. The situation of the 99%, the situation of the 1%, new inspiring ideas and new action ideas to challenge powerful people. When the situation is ripe many 99% who were inactive before become forerunners in unruly revolutionary times.

We cannot force the 99% to become political active, we do not have the power to reach the masses. We don't have the propaganda apparatus and the media to influence the minds of the 99%. We can however give a push in the right direction by showing new successful action means. Actions that during and after the revolution safeguard our freedom, privacy and well-being. We can promote ideas on which a new society is built, the idea that all people have the same status replacing the domination of money in all decisions. When successes and small victories accumulate suddenly the moment arrives that a revolution takes place. But only when the 99% know how to make revolution a success.

Occupy tried to use the dissatisfaction of The People. Many became politically interested but the movement withered away by lack of successes and because nobody knew what the activated masses should do, occupying squares was not sufficient, there were no great guiding ideas.

The French Revolution succeeded because the 99% became active, the power of the 1% went down and the new paradigm, Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood, inspired the 99%. After the revolution the situation soon changed. The People became less active and a new leading group again controlled them. The new 1% was not pressured anymore and could regain power. The new inspiring ideas about freedom, equality and brotherhood were discarded as the basis on which the new society could be built. After the revolution the four factors were turned around. A new power pyramid came into being and again the Few ruled over the Many. The 99% did not develop an own autonomous power.

Towards a world without a 1%

A self-immolation in Tunisia triggered the activity of the 99% in the Arab Spring. Obviously the 99% were waiting for a revolution, for a better future. But the Arab Spring was not a revolution, it was not a fundamental change towards a world without a 1%. The 1% was only partly attacked and most of the top remained untouched. The revolt had no inspiring ideas as Fraternity, Equality and Brotherhood. Soon religious ideas started to split up the 99% and the old 1% regained power with the help of the army that was untouched by the uprising. The 99% did not develop an own power and did not develop new means of actions. The same happened in the Ukraine and in mass uprisings in many other countries. Only some of the factors that lead to a revolution were activated.

Four factors influence the coming and the success of a revolution.

First. The situation of the 99%.

Growing dissatisfaction, rising participation in movements, more self-consciousness because of successful actions and the idea that we ourselves can independently accomplish something.

Second. The situation of the 1%.

Growing pressure on and decreasing power of the 1%, feeling of uncertainty, increasing internal contradictions and internal divisions.

Third. New ideas on which the new society should be built.

The new paradigm that all people have the same status, the idea that a new future is looming, the idea that people stand central in life and in actions, not what is wrong but who is wrong, the idea of small, temporary Autonomous Clubs as the action instrument, the idea that all actions must be directed at the 1%.

Fourth. A new kind of actions to pressure and control leading persons.

The Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% must be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing, creating chaos and unpredictability to undermine centralist powers, the use of Autonomous Clubs to control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99%.

The first two factors are connected with the situation in the present society, the last two to the future, the possibility to get a new Humane Society.

The 99% can hardly influence the first two factors, it is mostly a spontaneous development. To make revolution the situation must be ripe. You can tell people that the present society is wretched but the power of the 1% counters these efforts. The underlying and hidden dissatisfaction is promoted by daily experiences in the life of the 99%, their economic situation, their powerlessness and their feeling to be inferior and subordinated but that leads hardly to more political activity. Successes are needed based on new guiding and inspiring ideas. That can be accomplished by the

Towards a world without a 1%

other two factors by propagating guiding ideas and achieving some small victories by putting pressure on the 1%. When the revolution comes the 99% have already examples what they can do in the turbulent times on the way to a fundamentally different society. Then people know what to do and who to attack to defend their new gained freedom and their well-being and to preserve their equality and privacy after the revolution.

The mutual focus for all 99% is putting pressure on the private living sphere of individual members of the 1%, to destroy the power and money pyramid and to open the road towards a society in which all people have the same status.

The first factor shows the unrest under the 99%, the second the growing unrest under the 1%. These factors lead to uprisings and revolts.

Adding factor three turns revolts in revolutions that only succeed when the fourth factor is activated, new actions ideas directed at the power of the 1% who want to preserve the present society. A revolution is a movement towards a fundamental change, it has nothing to do with the contradiction left-right that divides the 99% but with the struggle to solve the principal contradiction that makes our world a wretched one, the contradiction between the 99% and the 1%.

The fourth factor includes the building of a Fourth People's Power, an independent power of the 99% that prevents that ever a new 1% arise and that society returns to the present situation with a 1% at the top and the 99% at the bottom. Factor four prevents a counter-revolution that occurred after all past revolutions. When the action world does not use new guiding and inspiring ideas, nothing will change.

Chapter 3

The Golden Rule for Actions

Damage to the 99% should be minimal, pressure on the 1% ever increasing

Actions that hurt too much the 99% should not be organised or carried out. In the last fifty years too many activists have been damaged in actions and successes were scarce. We need a new kind of actions with more positive results and less damage to our people. Actions that care for the safety of the 99% and the activists, though any activity has some risks. Less damage to the 99% and a series of small victories prevent that activists become disillusioned and withdraw from the movement.

In the Arab Spring, The Ukraine, Thailand, Brazil or Turkey but also in our countries protesters from the 99% are arrested, imprisoned, wounded or even killed. The revolt of The People in town centres often ends in clashes with security forces, also part of the 99%. Leaders, the 1% and their political servants, are hardly disturbed. They can afford to wait. After a short time revolts die down and then they regain their privileged positions.

In Egypt some of the highest top were arrested but the rest of the 1% continued to live in their safe, extravagant and exclusive mansions and money continued to stream into their pockets. The power relations were not challenged. The 1% kept their power and money because actions did not contribute to the ultimate goal, taking the power and the money away from the 1%.

Actions that do not comply with the Golden Rule for Actions should not be organised or carried out. Most fruitless protest actions as demonstrations, strikes, boycotts, petitions, civil disobedience, etc. are based on the belief that rulers can be trusted and will listen to The People. The old actions should be replaced by more powerful actions in the private living sphere of leaders to force them to change their decisions. These actions learn the 99% how to develop the Fourth People's Power to prevent that any 1% uses power for their own benefit. After the revolution the 99% have power over leaders, now only the 1% have an incontestable power over the 99%.

Self-appointed leaders still call on activists to risk their life in out-dated actions on the streets in town centres while they know successes are rare because nobody in the top listens to demonstrations. They propagate short-term actions against "small" injustices instead of long-term actions against persons who cause most of the misery in the world. They refuse to change tactics. In Occupy mass street actions were propagated and the initial slogan "Occupy the Financial Centres" that pointed to the real culprits of the misery and the crisis, was soon replaced by slogans that did not disturb the top.

Towards a world without a 1%

A new kind of actions is needed. Mass actions are dangerous for activists because of possible clashes with security forces and do not pressure the 1% who live elsewhere. Also classical guerrilla actions should not be undertaken. These fights soon change into a war between two armies in which only the 99% is damaged. We should avoid getting any dead revolutionaries. The safety of activists and the 99% stands central in the Golden Rule for Actions.

Autonomous Clubs of common citizens should carry out surprising, unexpected small actions against leaders. Small is beautiful and emphasizes the individuality and creativity of humans. In these Clubs all people have the same status while mass actions have leaders and demonstrators. The new paradigm that all people have the same status is in contradiction to the present situation that money dominates all decisions. It should be applied in all actions. The old-fashioned idea that “together we are strong” (but controlled by self-appointed leaders) is wrong. Many small leaderless Autonomous Clubs are much stronger. Thousand people in a demonstration make less impact than hundred rocks thrown through hundred windows of a 1% by hundred activists.

The new paradigm emphasizes that people are important and that actions should be carried out against living people and not against dead buildings, corporations, institutions or other dead entities. The strength of individual actions grows when more Autonomous Clubs pressure the 1% by controlling, vetoing and eventually punishing faulty leaders who violate our freedom, privacy and well-being. We avoid damage to the 99% by *“attacking the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used. This means that we can deprive the enemy of all his advantages”* (Jean-Paul Marat). In this struggle a new kind of independent people comes into being that gives the new society a different basis.

In mass actions humans are reduced to beings without any own contribution. They are like obedient soldiers in a battle, carrying out orders from leaders who are not directly involved in the fight. Generals mostly die in bed. Autonomous Clubs care for many small successes and convince and inspire the 99% they get power when they directly pressure the 1%. Individual activists decide how, where, when, with whom and against whom actions should be carried out to disturb the private, privileged and cosy life of power bearers.

New action ideas spring forward by taking into account the Golden Rule for Actions, by judging action proposals first and for all by the idea that actions must minimise damage to the 99% and maximise pressure on the 1%. Arrested, wounded or dead activists cannot anymore participate in actions. The well-being of activists stands central. Actions that do not comply with the Golden Rule should be abandoned. The 99% have suffered too much in street actions. It becomes time the 1% become the target and are forced to give up their excessive amounts of money and power. That is thus the second Golden Rule: Attack only the 1%.

Chapter 4

Autonomous Clubs

The independent Fourth People's Power to make and safeguard the revolution

Autonomous Clubs are small, temporary, alternating, leaderless groups of independent, interested and active people who are involved in the same subject or the same problem. They control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders in their private living sphere when these leaders violate the freedom, safety or well-being of the 99%. They force them to take the arguments of the 99% into account. Members of the Clubs exercise their moral right to use power against powerful people who misuse their power for their own benefit, disregarding the interests of The People.

People are often organised in small circles, in the family, their work, their hobbies etc. But in political questions they only act in mass actions. People know they are only a small element in the big society. They do not expect too much from their small activities. Their actions are hardly visible, it are small pin pricks against mighty leaders. When the number of pricks grows over time pressure mounts and suddenly the pricks become very painful. It causes a jump in the social situation, it brings about a small revolution in the privileged life of the attacked 1%. When activists see the result of their actions their self-consciousness increases. They have achieved something that they never should have achieved when they had been active as a small element in a big demonstration.

Small is beautiful. Society is dominated by big entities. Private corporations and public institutions have grown tremendously in the last fifty years and obscure how the 1% take decisions, making it more difficult to control what they do, making it less transparent. The centralised control by the 1% restricts the creativity and the individuality of the 99%.

The action world copies what happens in the big world. Centralised control is strengthened and makes it more difficult for activists to control what action leaders do. Trade unions have become huge organisations on which individual members have hardly influence. Environmental groups have also taken this path. Leaders of these organisations are embedded in the system and real change cannot be expected from these organisations. The income of leaders depends too much on money that is provided by the sitting powers. When they demand too much they may lose their place and their income. Their first task is controlling the 99%, caring for it that common citizens do not become too dangerous for the rule of the 1%.

Towards a world without a 1%

The influence of rank and file activists in huge political meetings or demonstrations is minimal, everyone has to agree with guidelines issued by seemingly all-knowing action leaders. Discussions about action tactics in Occupy (when the order came from above that all actions must be non-violent) were one of the reasons that the movement fell apart. Small organisations in which activists control their own activities promote the creativity and individuality. *“Let hundred flowers bloom and let hundred schools of thoughts contend”* (Mao Tse-tung). The basic idea should be the same, a revolution towards a world without a 1%. The safety of activists should also stand central and is reached when activists themselves decide how and where they are active. In demonstrations and other mass actions leaders decide in backrooms about the place and the method that must be used.

There are many different action methods, tactics and targets dependent on the ideas and the possibilities of activists. Trust the masses, they do it right, in each case not worse than selfish leaders. Mass people can be trusted more than greedy leaders in public, private and political sectors who think in first place of safeguarding their place in the top of society.

The 99% have not yet the means to exercise direct power on decision-takers. They transfer their power to elected people who are immune for any influence from the masses. Elected representatives live far from The People and represent the interests of the top of society. Most leaders are not elected and the influence of the 99% on their decisions is close to zero. That is why measures to solve the financial crisis have severely hit the 99% while the position and the wealth of the 1% has improved.

Mass actions hardly impress political leaders. Not-elected leaders do not listen to what happens in the world of the 99%. They live comfortable in their privileged and extravagant world and are not interested in what happens down under where the 99% produce the articles the 1% want. Autonomous Clubs are a new means to end the inequality in power and money.

The failing successes of mass actions force the 99% to look for new means to increase their power and to prevent that the top enriches itself still more. In mass actions all people act in the same way, in a multitude of Autonomous Clubs masses act on many different ways using their initiative and creativity. Many Clubs exert together a big pressure on faulty leaders. Autonomous Clubs penetrate in the eliteworld and make that world uninhabitable. It forces the 1% to descend to our world so that all people have the same status.

The wealth distribution has deteriorated in the last fifty years – the 1% got more wealth. Also in other fields differences are growing. In education, the possibility to be on a prime place in big events (sky boxes), high subventions for classical music and other elitist recreation activities, the knowledge to have a life-long high income, getting more money by corrupt means (corruption of the top is hardly prosecuted), the treatment in courts (there is hardly punishment for stealing public or private money by the top), etc. Two different worlds exist, the often harsh world of the 99%

Towards a world without a 1%

and the safe, exclusive world of the 1% where decisions are taken over the 99%. The 99% cannot take decisions that influence the world of the 1%. Another inequality! The central question is how The People can get more power, how the 99% can take the power and the money away from the 1%. Therefore we need the second Golden Rule for Actions: "Attack only the 1%!"

Democracy restricts and even blockades people to become active. They propagate that people should trust that elected representatives defend their interests but the 99% have hardly influence on what elected do. CEO's and owners of corporations in the private and directors of institutions in the public sector are never elected. The 99% have no power instruments to influence these people. Something else is needed for common citizens to protect their freedom and well-being against decisions from people higher-up. Something that gives The People an independent power.

Actions of the past have been proven insufficient. About victories Jean-Paul Marat said: *"Despite their defeats, the princes do not lose anything"*. The successful guerrilla wars in countries like China, Vietnam and Cuba point in another direction. They had however one important shortcoming, after the victory people were again controlled by privileged circles and did not use the guerrilla method against the new 1% that resembled the Western 1%. Guerrilla tactics, a War of the Flea, should be used but have to be refined and improved. In past revolutions guerrilla became a war between two centrally organised armies and leaders on both sides were hardly targeted. The old guerrilla wars violated the Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% must be minimal and pressure on the 1% maximal.

Jean-Paul Marat propagated in the French Revolution small clubs: *"Patriotic Clubs will only pay attention to people in the civil services and unite the forces of the people in order to make up for the grievances of citizens. They will punish the agents of the authorities who are guilty, stop the continuation of their bad deeds and safeguard the well-being of the people but we will never be a club that is involved in the process of making decisions. That should be a serious mistake: a free union of citizens is not allowed to meddle in public affairs, to govern or to administrate. That must be clear: a club has only the simple and pure right to make propositions, to give advice and to ask questions. But when the freedom and the safety of the people is attacked it is not only advisor but also agitator, censor, punisher and even killer"*

Patriotic Clubs, I call them Autonomous Clubs, are a new instrument to change power relations. The members of the Club choose themselves how, where, when, about what, with whom and against whom they become active. Many Clubs generate a constant stream of small unexpected and effective actions against targets who are forced to take the activities of the Clubs into account. The Clubs pressure people who take wrong decisions for their own benefit. Clubs dissolve after they have had some success. Former members can join another Club or return to their private life. The People do not need permanent structures, they need a possibility to move when they

Towards a world without a 1%

want to move. In a Humane Society Autonomous Clubs are the Fourth People's Power that controls, vetoes and punishes faulty leaders to stop corruption and other crimes of the leading class that cause too much misery.

In my book "[The Power of the Autonomous Human](#), theory and practice of attacks on persons" I describe several actions and some (small) successes. People, including me, who participated in those actions got more self-esteem because they know they had become less dependent on the caprices of the people up there.

The action method is called Political Stalking, Small Violence or Creative Disturbance. (see Chapter 19 of "[About Violence and Democracy](#), in search for an alternative for democracy"). It is an original method to impress your opinions on decision-takers. Political parties are obstacles and exist in the first place to control the masses. The media are only important in conflicts inside the elite. In conflicts between elite and masses they side with the elite because they are owned by the 1%.

Autonomous Clubs must never degenerate into political organisations. Then they become, as Roberto Michels already remarked a hundred years ago, institutions that obey the Iron Law of Oligarchy. After some time an elite controls the organisation. The dynamics of many active and unpredictable Clubs fundamentally changes society. Then a Humane World comes into existence where all people have the same status and have influence when they want it.

Chapter 5

Jean-Paul Marat (1743-1793), revolutionary

Forgotten ideas about how the 99% can get power

Jean-Paul Marat (1743-1793), one of the leaders in the French Revolution, was murdered while taking a bath. He was in poor health because for two years he had been kept on the run by anti-revolutionary forces and had to live in very bad circumstances. "Revolution is a natural right of The People", he said and in March 1789 he proclaimed the violent revolution. "Violence by The People is legitimate, it remains always far inferior to the sum of all injustices by the despots over the centuries".

He propagated that the *"revolution will be a kind of guerrilla in which we can attack the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used. This means that we can deprive the enemy of all his advantages"*. He edited the "L' Ami du Peuple", "The People's Friend" a famous journal in the name of the sans-culottes, street-fighting revolutionaries. He trusted the masses because his basic idea was *"to let the masses participate, the only people who really cheer freedom"*.

He stood behind the poor in the struggle against rich people. Later he was revered in leftist circles for his revolutionary attitude but his ideas were hardly used. In his time the artificial division of the 99% in leftists and rightists did not exist. Marat concentrated on the fight against the 1% by a unified 99%. He put people central, the 99% who attack and the 1% who should be pressured. Later revolutionaries emphasized a change in systems and not how common citizens could get power against any oppressor. Marat emphasized the importance of the struggle against powerful persons and introduced the forming of Patriotic Clubs to control representatives. I call them Autonomous Clubs. One of the clubs was the "Société des Vengeurs de la Loi", "the Club of Avengers of the Law". The Clubs are an important element in a permanent revolution by continuously controlling representatives and the 1%. That did never happen in the past, *"despite their defeats, the princes do not lose anything"*.

His idea of independent clubs is direct democracy in which common citizens have the power to veto, control and punish faulty leaders when they want it. The Clubs should use new action methods directed against powerful persons and not against institutions. *"Their goal is to pursue the punishment of all crimes that attack the security and the liberty be it public or individual"*.

His revolutionary "People's Friend" was time and again disturbed by magazines with the same name that propagated different policies. But Marat wrote that *"it was easy to distinguish the sham magazines from the true "People's Friend" because their*

Towards a world without a 1%

authors (humbugs) always preached peace, tolerance, patience, submission to laws, obedience etc". "The 'Friend of the People' has never been directed against common citizens. It has only attacked people in the civil service, unreliable bookkeepers, magistrates who neglected their duties, representatives of the people who forgot their obligations and betrayed their principals. And its respect for justice was so high that the paper even found laudable exceptions in the most corrupt circles".

"Don't be deceived when they tell you things are better now. Even if there's no poverty to be seen because the poverty's been hidden. Even if you ever got more wages and could afford to buy more of these new and useless goods which industries foist on you and even if it seems to you that you never had so much, that is only the slogan of those who still have much more than you. Don't be taken in when they paternally pat you on the shoulder and say that there's no inequality worth speaking of and no more reason to fight because if you believe them they will be completely in charge in their marble homes and granite banks from which they rob the people of the world under the pretence of bringing them culture. Watch out, for as soon as it pleases them they'll send you out to protect their gold in wars whose weapons, rapidly developed by servile scientists, will become more and more deadly until they can with a flick of the finger tear a million of you to pieces."

Marat did not want to use only words against people at the top. His Patriotic Clubs should analyse and examine the deeds of leading people and then take action:

"Patriotic Clubs will only pay attention to people in the civil services and unite the forces of the people in order to make up for the grievances of citizens. They will punish the agents of the authorities who are guilty, stop the continuation of their bad deeds and safeguard the well-being of the people but we will never be a club that is involved in the process of making decisions. That should be a serious mistake: a free union of citizens is not allowed to meddle in public affairs, to govern or to administrate. That must be clear: a club has only the simple and pure right to make propositions, to give advice and to ask questions. But when the freedom and the safety of the people is attacked it is not only advisor but also agitator, censor, punisher and even killer"

"The only goal is the punishment of the perpetrators of crimes against public and individual freedom and safety. Therefore the clubs are not open for people who are attached to the Royal Court, for Queens' Commissioners, for members of leading academic clubs, for gentlemen of independent means, for captains of finance, for speculators on the bourse, for attorney-generals, for members of the Parisian military police and for members of the town council. And one should be very careful to admit noblemen, members of the judicature or high army officers....."

Marat did not want the misdeeds of members of the leading class to be judged and tried by other members of that class. He did not limit the height of the punishments: *"When now some heads are spared then in the future much more blood will have to ran in the streets...."*

Towards a world without a 1%

“Five or six hundred heads would have guaranteed your freedom and happiness but a false humanity has restrained your arms and stopped your blows. If you don’t strike now, millions of your brothers will die, your enemies will triumph and your blood will flood the streets. They’ll slit your throats without mercy and disembowel your wives. And their bloody hands will rip out your children’s entrails to erase your love of liberty forever”.

Because of this, Marat has been portrayed as one of the most bloodthirsty characters of the French Revolution but the Napoleonic wars in which millions of 99% died and Napoleon was only imprisoned proved him right. His goal was simple, *“to stop corruption and other crimes of the leading class that caused too much misery and also too many dead common citizens from the lower regions of society”*. He was very close to an idea common in many revolutionary movements: *“punish one in order to educate a hundred”*.

Marat proposed an attack on two fronts. *“Between the clan of the privileged and The People, between the small number and the masses, reconciliation is not possible. But also is needed a fight against the apathetic people who are also called reasonable”*. Marat claimed the right of the oppressed on violent actions.

In those turbulent times Marat wanted to protect the achievements of the French Revolution with his Patriotic Clubs by preventing that the old leading class should regain the power they lost to the 99%. The current situation in rich Western countries is not very turbulent. But the organisation of society does not differ principally from the organisation of society in the time of Marat. Our democracy has his roots in the French Revolution and the ideas of Montesquieu about the Trias Politica. There exists a deep separation between the 1% and the 99%. The Trias Politica regulates conflicts inside the 1%. The influence of the 99% was small and is two hundred years after the French Revolution still negligible.

Only powerless masspeople can belong to the Autonomous Clubs of Marat. A multitude of such Clubs forms the new controlling Fourth People’s Power next to the Trias Politica. The 1% may not have any influence on this new power. The three separated powers of Montesquieu increased the freedom of the leading class, the new autonomous Fourth People’s Power increases the freedom of common citizens.

Chapter 6

I am autonomous, not leftist nor rightist

The difference between the 99% and the 1% is the most important problem

I am autonomous. The words left and right are created to divide the 99%. People hardly talk anymore about why the world is wretched, why there is a greedy extreme wealthy 1%, why money dominates all decisions and what we can do to change this. They talk about the differences between leftists and rightists. Leftists nor rightists ever succeeded getting a world without a 1% where all people have the same status. That cannot happen when the 99% continue to allow the 1% to split the 99% up in warring factions. The third dog walks away with the bone. One of the tasks of the political stooges is to dived and rule, divide the 99% so the 1% can continue to rule.

The only way to unite the 99% is to concentrate on a simple and single target, the 1%. Most actions around partial political demands divide the 99%. These actions are permitted because they are mostly powerless begging and are not dangerous for the sitting powers. Even more important, they distract people from giving attention to the basic reason why our society is so wretched, the existence of a 1% who live in another cosy and privileged world.

Politicians promote the left-right contradiction. By attacking rightist politicians you alienate the 99% who think they are rightist, by attacking leftist politicians it is the other way around. The 1% are not right or left, they stand above the plebs, they are "Our Kind of People", quite different from "That Kind of People", the 99%. Politicians can be attacked on subjects that have nothing to do with left versus right. Corruption, lying, cheating, sexual and other debaucheries and their unreliability are opposed by all 99%. But they should hardly become targets, they are servants who carry out the guidelines of the 1%. Direct attacks on the 1% do not divide the 99%.

Most politicians do not belong to the 1%. They are often in the beginning of their career and still have ties with the 99%. They are more resistant to attacks in their private living sphere. The 1% have never been pressured. Most were born in a secluded, safe world, far above the sorrows and the pressure the 99% have to endure. They are vulnerable.

The 1% are the prime target. Unknown, very rich and powerful people should be attacked. After some time the attacked 1% react in the media. Then the 99% become informed about actions that have nothing to do with the left-right contradiction but about their involvement with greed, corruption and other crimes for which they are seldom punished. Minimal ten billion euro streams each year in The Netherlands by

Towards a world without a 1%

corruption to the top and hardly anyone is prosecuted. But small manipulations connected with the social security net by the 99% are severely punished. Not one 1% has been punished for causing the financial crisis for the own benefit. Their wealth has grown while the income of the 99% went down and the number of poor 99% rose sharply.

Over the centuries the 1% has divided the 99%. Ethnic or tribal groups against each other, monarchists against republicans, Shiites against Sunnites, Protestants against Catholics etc. Sometimes this division was broken as in the French and Russian Revolutions. In Egypt the struggle against Mubarak was carried out by a unified population. Rightist football hooligans joined leftist activists in street battles, secular and religious Egyptians fought side by side. After the victory old divisions resurged. The 1% (minus Mubarak) again stressed with the help of the secular army the internal differences in the 99% and so secured their leadership. The 99% stopped fighting the 1% who continued to rule.

In the French Revolution Jean-Paul Marat pointed to this division when people with money wanted to hinder his inflammatory newspaper "The People's Friend" by publishing papers with the same name: *"it was easy to distinguish the sham magazines from the true "People's Friend" because their authors (humbugs) always preached peace, tolerance, patience, submission to laws, obedience etc"*. After all revolutions also in France a 1% again rose to power and money.

Solutions of internal contradictions in the 99% as left-right, racism or religious differences must be postponed to the new society. The prime task of the 99% is to remove the 1% from their money and power. Internal contradictions divide the 99% and weakens any attack on the top. The masses should fight together against the greedy top. Leftist nor rightist actions have ever brought a revolution that could solve the divisions inside the 99%. Elections intensify the left-right division. Demonstrations or strikes also create divisions because they hinder some 99% who do not want to participate and do certainly not hinder the 1% who live elsewhere. Most actions are fruitless and restricted to whining, complaining and crying out loud and then it stops. Ideas how to change society have been scarce.

Racism is a big problem but does not only exist in rightist circles. The 1% continue to import foreigners to exploit their skill and knowledge for less money than original inhabitants and create new divisions. But not in the secluded world of the 1% that is a racist world only open for Our Kind of People where That Kind of People only may enter as servants.

Taking the power and the money away from the 1% never succeeds when the 99% are fighting each other. When leftist and rightist armies confront each other or security forces only the 99% suffer and the position of the 1% is not undermined. The Golden Rule for Actions must be maintained, damage to the 99% must be minimal and pressure on the 99% ever increasing.

Towards a world without a 1%

Jean-Paul Marat gave a simple advice: *“Revolution will be a kind of guerrilla in which we can attack the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used. This means that we can deprive the enemy of all his advantages”*. But leftist and rightist activists confront mostly other 99% while the 1% remains out of range.

Leftist and rightist activists use roughly the same action methods. During mass gatherings both fight the police and in both camps some activists use violence against dead objects as banks or government buildings. Both want another society and both have more trust in leaders than in the creativity of individual activists. Both sides are centrally organised with leaders and soldiers. Only leaderless movements have room for individualism.

Both sides are split up in many small groups that fight each other instead of the 1%. Both sides prefer to attack political lackeys and thus strengthen the left-right divide. Both should stay far from the political game because politicians only please the bosses by splitting up and controlling the 99% with lies and deceit. Rightist as well as leftist activists do not understand that another society is not possible when the power of the 1% is not undermined. Both sides miss great leading ideas for a new society as the idea that all people have the same status. They prefer to improve a little the present society though that has hardly positive results.

Contradictions between leftists and rightists cannot be solved before the contradiction between the 1% and the 99% is solved. When there is no common goal this contradiction blocks any progress.

Many leftists have ideas that also fit in rightist circles and many rightists ideas that belong to leftist circles. That was shown by people living in corporatist countries as Portugal or Italy or in leftist countries as Russia or Cuba. Leftists became rightist and rightists leftist. In Germany there were many beefsteak socialists, brown on the outside, red on the inside. The differences between left and right are not very big, people can change sides. Differences are encouraged and promoted by the 1%. One of the most important ideas is that money dominates all decisions. Dead money has replaced living people, therefore we should strive to get a world in which people stand central, in which all people have the same status.

Contradictions between right and left should be inferior to the contradiction between the 99% and the 1%. But that does not mean that rightist and leftist activists should be active at the same place and on the same time. People are different and should not act in masses in which all participants must follow the same action methods and ideas. The target is the same, the 1% who dominate this world. One of the advantages of actions of small Autonomous Clubs is that conflicts inside the 99% are avoided and that everyone contributes on his own autonomous way to take the power and the money away from the 1%.

I am not left, I am not right, I am Autonomous!

Chapter 7

What is power?

How the mafia and the 1% use power and how the 99% can become powerful

“Power never takes a back step, only in the face of more power”. (Malcolm X) In a Humane World in which all people have the same status, all people should have the same power. The top of the mafia has a lot of power but takes not all decisions. Most decisions are taken on a lower level by capos but the top knows which decisions are taken. When the money stream to the top falters they interfere with their power based on money and violence. The godfathers determine the general guidelines for the kind of decisions that has to be taken. The reasons to interfere concern the safety of the top leaders and the organisation, the amount of money that streams to the top or the kind of products that is sold. As in the big society everything turns around money, not about the interests of buyers, sellers or common citizens.

Only godfathers determine the general guidelines and have the power to impose these rules on lower echelons. Lower leaders take decisions based on what they think the top wants. The top controls, vetoes and eventually punishes capos who do not comply with the general guidelines, who violate the well-being of the top. In the mafia the application of power goes from the top to the lower echelons, never the other way around. In the bigger society it works the same way. The 1% has power, decision-takers on lower levels and the 99% are expected to comply.

Power has two sides, the possibility to draw up general guidelines and to have the means to implement them and the possibility to correct decisions from lower levels that are not compatible with the general guidelines.

The godfathers of the mafia are as unassailable as the 1%. They do not have to listen to arguments from beneath, they have an army of lawyers and experts to defend their decisions and they have a security apparatus to control and pacify dangerous opponents. This apparatus cost money but decisions-makers have enough money at their disposal to secure their positions and their decisions.

Just as in the mafia family ties are important in the 1%. Just as in the mafia, money and violence are important instruments for the power of the 1%. The threat to use violence is often more important than the use of violence.

The 1% control the money stream to the top. Mark Zuckerberg, owner and CEO of Facebook, changed his ideas about advertising on Facebook because of the dubious introduction of Facebook on the Stock Exchange. Stockholders had the power to force Zuckerberg to change his policy and to take different decisions. The 99% was

Towards a world without a 1%

not involved in this process that was determined by getting more money for the stockholders. If the 99% liked or disliked the new policy was of no importance, some money people who preferred a more profitable advertisement policy had more status and power than the many 99% who use Facebook.

Also violence and the threat of violence is used. This is obvious in conflicts between countries. Investment money can be withheld but when lower countries do not listen violence is used. The bosses of countries as Vietnam or Iraq were not allowed to pursue their own policy, they had to listen to the highest bosses from rich Western countries. Some leaders who wanted a new policy for their country as Lumumba of The Congo or Allende of Chili were even murdered.

The use of violence against strikers or protesters is wide-spread. The imprisonment of millions of people because they do not obey the laws that are favourable for the top is direct violence. People on higher levels are differently judged than people down under. Prisons are full of people who only want to have some more money and who even comply with the money paradigm. Or with drugs users who buy drugs that are prohibited to keep prices and thus profits high. Hundreds of billions of drugs money enter each year via "legal" banks the economy, a stream that stops when drugs become free available. Bankers are not imprisoned.

The 99% need power to defend their freedom and well-being when that is violated by selfish leaders. In a Humane Society where all people have the same status power is available for everyone, not dependent on the amount of money someone has. The top of the power pyramid uses power to protect their decisions. Critics are silenced, they may lose their job and thus their income, a money factor. When the 99% have also power they can force decisions-takers to pay attention to the interests of all people and not in the first place to the interests of the already privileged. The Fourth People's Power should control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of common citizens.

The 99% should strive for a society in which everyone has the same status. The basis for their judgement and their power is not the money paradigm but the same status paradigm. The 99% only judge if decisions violate their freedom and well-being. They do not have the skill, the expertise and the knowledge to propose new decisions. Also the godfathers or the 1% do not have the skill and the knowledge to make correct decisions. They only control if decisions are not hurting the money stream. When the money stream falters they use their power to get different decisions. Then they judge again the new decisions. There is no need for discussions between the top and the lower echelons, the top looks at the result of decisions, not at the decisions themselves.

Jean-Paul Marat said two hundred years ago: *"we will never be a club that is involved in the process of making decisions. That should be a serious mistake: a free union of citizens is not allowed to meddle in public affairs, to govern or to administrate. That must be clear: a club has only the simple and pure right to make propositions, to give*

Towards a world without a 1%

advice and to ask questions. But when the freedom and the safety of the people is attacked it is not only advisor but also agitator, censor, punisher and even killer"

The 99% cannot design, plan and build aeroplanes but they can judge if a plane complies with their wishes. They should not govern or administrate but only make propositions, give advice and ask questions. When these demands are not taken into account they should use their power to punish faulty leaders.

Concerning the second point of the power definition, correcting wrong decisions, the 99% should do the same as mafia leaders or the 1%: control, veto and punish leaders who take decisions that hurt the interests of the 99%. In this way everyone gets the same status and the same power when he wants it and when he becomes sufficiently active. The means to exercise power resemble the means of the 1% and the godfathers. Care for it that the money stream to decision-takers is curtailed by disturbing their private living situation. The 99% can care for it that the cosy world of decision-takers falls apart when they continue to take decisions that hurt the freedom and well-being of the 99%.

Putting pressure on decision-takers improves a little the present world. When we want a Humane World it is necessary to pressure the top of the power pyramid. The pyramid is built on money, so attack the money factor. It all comes down on creatively disturbing the world of decision-takers, the 1% and the godfathers. Sometimes some violence may play a role but as with the 1% and the mafia, the threat that violence could be used is more important than the use of violence itself.

Leftist nor rightist activist use these ideas, therefore I call myself autonomous. They do not force (use power) but only beg leaders to change decisions. They even propose different decisions. When their demands comply with the money paradigm they have some success as was the case with the abolition of slavery. Demands to close all nuclear plants fall however on deaf ears. Squatters had a somewhat better policy. They were not involved in building more houses for homeless people (co-governing) but used their power to occupy empty houses. In the end however the power of the 1% prevailed and squatting was outlawed. Squatting nearly disappeared because of the use of power and a lot of violence.

When there are no attacks on the weak points of the 1% (the money and their fear for violence) the 1% continue to rule the world.

Chapter 8

The Fourth People's Power

The autonomous power instrument of the 99%

More than two hundred years ago the count of Montesquieu, member of the French elite, introduced the Trias Politica to solve conflicts within the elite. He separated the judicature, the executive and the legislature. All three powers are controlled by the 1%. Most people in the Trias Politica are nominated by peers, only some in the legislative power are elected. The influence of common citizens is minimal, they lack power and money to use or change laws. The Trias Politica violates the same status paradigm.

The Trias Politica can only be used by people with money. Good lawyers are too expensive. The 99% cannot use the Trias in the same way as their opponents. The money paradigm cares for it that juridical possibilities hardly can be used by the 99%. The Fourth People's Power is based on the same status paradigm, an independent power instrument, not open for people belonging to the highest layers of society.

While citizens have to pay lawyers and legal fees from their own pockets, the 1% use public and private money. They influence the decision-making process by misusing their money and power to change decisions in their favour. Sometimes by corruption and bribery but also by using lobbyists who use a lot of public and private money to please decision-takers. Common citizens do not have this possibility, one more reason for a Fourth People's Power.

Montesquieu separated the three powers that control each other. The count belonged to the elite and disregarded the existence of the 99%. He did not propose any possibility for the 99% to control the Trias Politica. In a Humane Society the 99% control with the independent Fourth People's Power any leader who takes decisions that benefit the own group by controlling, vetoing and punishing faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of common citizens.

The Fourth People's Power is independent from the elitist powers. It grows by activities of the 99%. After the revolution it consists of groups of individual 99% who have learned during the revolution how to use independent Autonomous Clubs against people who form a new 1%.

In past revolutions beautiful words inspired the 99%: Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood! All Power to The People! All Power to the Soviets! But after the successful revolutions nobody knew what to do with these slogans. Soon they were forgotten and a new 1% took power.

Towards a world without a 1%

All Power to the People was only a slogan. After all revolutions directors still could sack workers while workers could not sack directors. How can one worker in a factory with ten thousand workers exert as much power as one director? Not with strikes and demonstrations. These actions often lead to conflicts with security forces. A director has another status and does not need to strike or demonstrate to force workers to behave as he demands.

The Fourth People's Power is not an organisation with leaders and possessions. Then it gets the same pyramidal power structure as the rest of society. From the beginning the People's Power must comply with the idea that all people have the same status. Members must control their own life and the activities of their Autonomous Club. They must decide how, when, where, against whom and with whom actions take place. Many small actions of many small temporary Autonomous Clubs form together the Fourth People's Power.

The peasants in guerrilla wars in China or Vietnam were mostly busy growing food to survive. Sometimes they fought their oppressors. Common citizens also live their own life and only sometimes when they are sufficiently inspired by the bad situation they live in they become active with a few friends. Then they must know who violates their freedom and well-being and what they can do against it. They learn that during revolutionary times.

All independent organisations of citizens that fought in revolutions have been dissolved after the revolution. Independent groups were incorporated in the army or the secret services, centralised organisations in which independent actions of citizens were impossible. All independence the 99% had gotten during the revolution disappeared after the revolution and the 99% were again left without an own power. Even during revolutions individual resistance was mostly dependent on demands of centralised organisations. Citizens were used as pawns in a game played by people who could hardly be found in the front lines of the struggle. From the beginning the Fourth People's Power has to remain a loose coalition of small temporary Autonomous Clubs that are active against high-placed people. It starts with a few Clubs that show that something else is possible.

The Fourth People's Power is an idea how individual people can have the same power as organisers. Nobody can control this Power because it are many small independent groups of citizens tied together by the same idea, controlling and punishing faulty leaders. The Power does not have possessions as buildings, saving accounts, presidents or employees, does not obey the Iron Law of Oligarchy that paralyses the activity of big workers organisations. People who use the idea do not negotiate or govern, they only control, veto and punish faulty leaders who violate their freedom and well-being.

How can the Fourth People's Power come into existence? It begins with some actions of some activists who oppose the present society. That can be leftist as well as rightist people. They are tied together by a common goal, dissatisfaction with the

Towards a world without a 1%

behaviour of the 1% and lower leaders who violate the well-being of the 99%. This common goal avoids that leftist and rightist groups clash with each other. Existing differences between left and right are put on ice and solved when the 1% is dethroned. Now the undisturbed 1% emphasize the right-left differences to hide their own often criminal behaviour. Actions should emphasize the important role of the 1% and other not-elected leaders in connection to the wide-spread misery and the growing control over citizens. Elected political lackeys are less important than non-elected directors and owners in the private and public sector who hardly feel any pressure from activists.

Two hundred years after the French Revolution the influence of the 99% over their own life is still negligible and even decreases because of the new electronic surveillance possibilities. Jean-Paul Marat advanced ideas to prevent that the old leading class together with new greedy people regain power, he advanced ideas how to control and punish the egoistic behaviour at the top of society. By using Autonomous Clubs the 99% secure their freedom and well-being. Based on the idea that all people have the same status we can develop the Fourth People's Power in the fight against the 1%.

Chapter 9

A revolution needs a paradigm shift, new basic ideas for a new society

The idea that everyone has the same status should replace the dominant role of money

A paradigm is a basic idea on which society is built, a reference point, a guide for our thinking and our activities. Each decision, each action should be tested with the new paradigm. The sentence “everyone has the same status” is simple but has a great influence. Does an action contribute to the idea that all people have the same status? Most actions do not undermine the power position and the higher status of the 1% and their political stooges. That did even not happen during revolutions. The old power was replaced by a new power and inequality continued to exist. The great ideas of the French Revolution – Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood – were hardly used during the revolutionary struggle and after the revolution soon discarded. A change in paradigm opens the way for completely new ways about how society is organised, how problems are solved, how and which decisions are taken and how people behave.

A well-known example is the development in astronomy after Copernicus changed the basic idea that the earth was the centre of the universe in the idea that the sun was the centre. Because of the new paradigm many seemingly unsolvable astronomical problems were solved.

The problem of the nearly ten million children that each year die before they are five years old can now not be solved because the kids are not involved in the money economy. They are not important, they hardly exist. Children in rich countries do not die before they are five years old. With the new paradigm emphasis lies on the cause of this misery, the higher status and the greed of the 1%, and not on the effect of this misery, the lack of food. With the new paradigm this problem stands on top of the list of world problems because kids that die before they are five years old are obviously not humans with the same status. Also the inferior position of women and racism disappear fast in the new Humane Society.

It lasted hundred and fifty years before the Copernican paradigm shift was accepted but in the present society with electronic communication a paradigm shift can convince and inspire people faster. In the revolutionary transition time people use the new paradigm in their daily life and in their actions. Their mind changes and after the revolution there is a new kind of people that is not anymore conditioned by the money factor. Revolutionary actions should always combat the cause of the misery in

Towards a world without a 1%

the world, the money paradigm and the unequal status of people and not concentrate on the effects of the fact that money rules the world. The question should be what the new same status paradigm means for actions.

Demonstrations that beg for different decisions affirm that there are beggars and leaders. That does not comply with the same status paradigm. Autonomous Clubs that control, veto and punish faulty leaders who violate the well-being of the 99% strive for the same status for everyone. The Clubs are inspired and guided by the same status paradigm to equalise power differences between leaders and common citizens.

The Golden Rule for Actions complies with the new paradigm. Damage to the 99% should be minimised. Any damage should hit the 1% who are now nearly untouched by actions. They have a higher status. The paradigm says also that when the 1% violates the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99% the 99% may violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 1%. We have the moral right to intrude into the private living sphere of the 1%.

Greed, money, power and the existence of an exclusive elite dominate all decisions, common people are secondary. Money for the Few, misery for the Many who have not the same status, not a decent life, a place to live, good education, available health care, enough food to survive etc. Corruption, bribery and crime at the bottom is now punished while powerful people who give themselves ridiculous incomes are presented as honest workers who deserve a lot of money. The 1% have reserved for themselves a higher status and a different treatment than the inferior 99%.

That something is produced is more important than what and how something is produced and who the producers and the customers are. What you possess is more important than what you need and who you are. Everything should turn around living people and not around dead money, dead buildings, dead corporations or dead systems. Actions should not take place in front of dead entities but in front of the houses of living people who violate our existence.

The first slogans of Occupy pointed to the same status paradigm, "We are the 99%" and thus there is a 1% that is different emphasizes the human factor. But "Occupy the Financial Centres" gave attention to buildings and not to people who use these buildings for their own benefit. It turns around bankers and not around banks, about CEO's and not around corporations, around directors and not around institutions, around greedy 1% and around people with a higher status who find the 99% inferior. When people who take decisions are not personally called to account for the consequences of their deeds, their minds do not change. When activists continue to demonstrate in front of dead buildings their mind does also not change. For a Humane World we need people who know that it is a better world when all people have the same status.

Towards a world without a 1%

The new paradigm will not immediately be understood by The People, they are indoctrinated by the old paradigm. It takes time to penetrate in the minds of the 99%, it takes arguments and above all it takes successful actions. When new action methods have small successes in contradiction to the unsuccessful old-fashioned actions, more people change their attitude. And suddenly society changes, suddenly the revolution is there.

The Humane Society completely differs from the present one based on power, money and inequality, based on a power pyramid with the 1% on top and the 99% down under. Decisions may never violate the basic rule that people stand central, that people have the same status.

Taking the road to a world without a 1% we get a society in which all human contribute to the well-being of all and not only to the well-being of people who are already privileged.

Chapter 10

Revolution is about living people

Not about dead systems, corporations, institutions, buildings or governments

During a revolution people change, the 99% lose the idea that they are inferior to leaders. They become self-conscious when they learn during the revolution that they have the power to conquer any injustice brought upon them by the 1%. Then they can use the dead buildings or corporations for the benefit of all. Living people are more important than dead buildings, corporations, institutions, banks, governments, systems or money. It are only instruments to suppress and control the 99%.

When you are attacked by someone with a stick in his hand it does not help taking the stick away when there are many other sticks lying around, you have to attack the person. Actions should also minimise damage to the 99% and maximise pressure on the 1% (the Golden Rule for Actions). That is mostly not the case with mass actions in front of buildings or actions in town centres. People who took wrong decisions stay out of range. These people base their decisions on the money stream to the top, what happens to the 99% does not interest them. Decisions are taken because of the importance of money and restrict the 99% in their daily life. To strive for more and more dead money is the basic reason that there is a power and money pyramid that divides humanity. Dead money as the dominant factor in all decisions should be replaced by the humane idea that all people have the same status. Occupy also made this fundamental mistake by advancing the slogan "Occupy the Financial Centres" instead of "Occupy the private houses of bankers".

Some political organisations want to change the system to get a communist, fascist, socialist or fundamentalist world. Leaders of such "revolutionary" organisations force the 99% to direct their actions on systems and other dead entities. The role of individuals is neglected. These political organisations have a small group of leaders at the top and the masses down under. Action leaders know they can benefit from any new system when they remain on top. They do not teach the 99% how they can pressure any leader because that endangers their future high place in society. The masses are only seen as obedient foot soldiers and should not become autonomous citizens.

People at the top of our society know they take decisions for their own benefit. To protect their private life they have personalised organisations. The Shell, Monsanto, Apple but also governments, banks, the F.E.D. should take decisions. But not Microsoft flouts monopoly laws and not Microsoft should be fined. People like Bill Gates who lead or own Microsoft break the laws or at least order or permit lower

Towards a world without a 1%

bosses to break laws. Microsoft cannot type a letter, cannot issue orders, cannot transfer money, only people can do that. In our society Microsoft is prosecuted and not people who violate the laws. The German beer industry was fined 100 million euro because of cartel agreements about prices. But industries cannot make agreements, directors do and owners and directors profit from punishable offences. People who are guilty of asking too high prices are not prosecuted and common citizens pay the damage because prices are again raised. Living people should be punished not dead entities. The 99% cannot hide behind dead entities and they are judged as persons. That should change during the revolution. People should become targets, not systems, corporations or buildings.

The 99% can make a first step by not saying that Shell or the government does this or that but calling culprits by name, directing attention to living humans who attack the freedom and well-being of the 99%. Activists should talk about bankers instead of banks, about directors and owners instead of Monsanto, Shell or the FED, about high-civil servants and ministers instead of about ministries or governments. Activists should not talk about dead entities that are only means to control the 99%. Demonstrations should not take place in front of dead buildings but in front of private houses of living leaders who take wrong decisions. Buildings are not responsible, people are. Leaders are not disturbed by a demonstration in front of their working place nor by fights between protesters and security forces.

In a Humane World living people with the same status stand central. The 99% have to carry this change through during the revolutionary transition time. All activities must contribute to this necessary change in consciousness. That is never achieved when the "party" or the "organisation" decides how activists should be active. Jean-Paul Marat said more than two hundred years ago *"The People should control, veto or when necessary punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom and the well-being of the 99%"*. Later revolutionaries emphasized the change of systems and not the change in humans.

Actions should continuously increase pressure on leading people who take wrong decisions. In a real action because of a ridiculous rise in rent some responsible people were pressured in their private living situation. After some time the rise in rent was indeed reduced. That is in agreement with the ideas of Marat who said that we should only control, veto and punish and not govern, not prescribe which decisions have to be taken. Buildings, institutions or other dead entities are never involved in the decision-taking process and should not be targets. Only powerful persons take decisions that are disadvantageous for the 99%.

We cannot predict how the world looks like when the 99% have become so self-confident that they can destroy any injustice, disparity, greed or corruption. But it will be a world in which living people and not dead systems take first place.

Chapter 11

People stand central, also in actions

Not what is wrong but who is wrong

The human principle that living people stand central and not dead corporations, institutions, the Parliament or money should be applied everywhere. These dead entities include also laws, spy agencies or the obedient security apparatus that are only instruments used by the 1% to control the 99%. Not instruments are important but people who use these instruments in a way that is harmful for the 99%.

Actions should be directed on leading people and not anymore on corporations or buildings. Only then we can penetrate in the minds of leaders. That does not happen in most actions. Rulers do not listen to what is demanded in demonstrations, petitions, boycotts, strikes, etc. Leaders are not disturbed when they are a little bit harassed in their working place. That belongs to their work and after having worked they go to their cosy, privileged, safe and exclusive eliteworld. There they have never been disturbed. But this separate world is the most important reason why they take decisions that favour in the first place themselves.

People at the top of society see themselves as superior. This idea does not disappear when buildings or other dead entities are attacked in actions. *“Let me tell you about the very rich. They are different from you and me. They possess and enjoy early, and it does something to them, makes them soft when we are hard, and cynical where we are trustful, in a way that, unless you were born rich, it is difficult to understand. They think, deep in their hearts, that they are better than we are because we had to discover the compensations and refuges of life ourselves. Even when they enter deep into our world or sink below us, they still think that they are better than we are. They are different”.* F. Scott Fitzgerald

The elite thinks in the first place about money and the expansion of their privileged world. They will never be workless, their houses are not foreclosed, they move in exclusive places, clubs and neighbourhoods. They live in an extravagant prosperous world where the 99% are only allowed to enter as servants. They have a quiet, secured and privileged life. They think they are superior, unassailable.

In The Netherlands the 1% call themselves Our Kind of People, clearly distinct from That Kind of People, the 99%, whom they consider to be inferior. For the 1% only their own kind of people counts. What happens to the 99% is not important. Many action leaders still think that the 1% and their lackeys are reasonable people. They are not. They are people who violate our freedom, privacy and well-being and we should stop accepting that. Activists and action leaders should read Sun Tzu who emphasized the importance of human beings: *“Foreknowledge cannot be gotten from*

Towards a world without a 1%

ghosts and spirits, cannot be had by analogy, cannot be found out by calculation. It must be obtained from people, people who know the conditions of the enemy”.

A tiny portion of their wealth could solve the problem of the nearly ten million kids that each year die before they are five years old. It does not happen because the 1% consider the 99% only as instruments that care for the needs of the 1%. How the 99% live or die is secondary.

In wars soldiers die but never generals, politicians or CEO's and owners of the weapon industry. We should realise that we are always damaged. That occurs also in actions. Activists and police officers are hurt and even killed but bosses, including action leaders, are living on, undisturbed about what happens in the streets, not interested in how much blood colours the pavement. All people should have the same status and therefore we must adhere to the Golden Rule for Actions, damage to the 99% should be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing. Most actions do not comply with this idea.

Nobody disturbs the top but the top disturbs the 99% forcing them to maintain the eliteworld. The first action target should be to disturb the life of these people. It is a new action policy that has always been rejected by (leftist) action leaders. But when two separated worlds continue to exist real change is not possible.

There are many contacts between the 1% and the 99%. The 99% produce, deliver and repair goods and services the 1% need for their existence. The 1% organise and control the 99% in such a way that the present system continues to exist. There are many connections between the world of the 1% and the places where goods and services come from. These connections are the veins through which the blood streams that is necessary for the life of the 1%. We can disturb these veins. When supplies from the world of the 99% to the world of the 1% are disrupted, the eliteworld becomes uninhabitable.

The veins that feed the 1% are the weak points because they are so numerous that they cannot be protected. The web of veins covers the whole world and can fairly easy be disturbed by small actions of Autonomous Clubs. Such actions hardly disturb the life of the 99% and comply with the Golden Rule for Actions because only the life of the 1% is threatened.

By preventing that the 1% buy and use extravagant goods and services or enter special places where only they are allowed to come, we disturb their cosy, privileged and exclusive private life. Then they must descend to the world of the 99% and we make a step in the direction of a Humane World where all people have the same status.

By disturbing their world the 1% become uncertain because they have never been disturbed in their life. Any individual or small group can become active on the place, the time, the how, with whom and against whom he chooses. The War of the Flea by

Towards a world without a 1%

Autonomous Clubs against the extravagancy of the 1% will time and again shock the 1% and gives activists a lot of pleasure because the 1% do not know what to do against it. The same person that in day-time repairs the expensive car punches in night-time holes in the tires or maybe remove a beautiful plant from the front lawn of a 1% to replace it in a public park where all 99% can admire the flower. The 1% have never been attacked in their golden and ivory towers. When it happens, the world changes.

Chapter 12

Autonomous Clubs pressure leading people

They control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate our freedom, privacy and well-being

When your phone or car is broken you go somewhere to have it repaired. You do not tell the mechanic how to repair it. Of course not, you are not an expert. In politics it is different. When something is wrong protesters tell experts how to repair the wrongs. Are protesters experts? Probably not. When experts do it wrong they have to do better. How? That is for them to decide.

When we find that our environment, our freedom and well-being is attacked because too much carbon dioxide is emitted, experts have to come up with better solutions. Activists should not tell experts how energy should be produced. The problem is that energy is produced in the wrong way. We should control if they correct their mistakes, veto if they take wrong decisions and when they do not listen, punish them.

When the wages are going down, the number of poor people are rising and many people become workless because of the financial crisis. We do not have to advance solutions. We may point to the surplus of money that streams to the top because of whitewashing or corruption. When the 1600 billion euro corruption money that each year is stolen by the top is used for all people most financial problems can be solved. The use of too much money by the Happy Few and the support for the growing money stream by politicians is an important action point. It are people who take this money and who do nothing against the growing inequality. Those people should become targets, they do it wrong.

I do not see any action against corrupt or condoning leaders while corruption is one of the important money streams to the top besides that hardly taxes are paid, salaries are rising tremendously and the world of the 1% is not at all disturbed by the crisis. The only people who are damaged by these illegal practices are the 99% who see their income go down, their work disappearing and their life restricted.

This is a completely different activist idea. Now activists advance arguments how it should be done and do not pressure leaders. Activists mostly lack knowledge and education but they can judge the effect of decisions on the life of the 99%. Experts should decide and when they don't do it right we should force them to change decisions.

Action methods must change. We should only control, veto and punish leading persons when they violate the freedom, safety and well-being of the 99%. We should avoid discussions with experts, not become involved in the process of taking

Towards a world without a 1%

decisions. We must not meddle in public or private affairs, govern or administrate. Negotiations lead always to compromises. *“Those who are inclined to compromise can never make a revolution”* (Ataturk). Autonomous Clubs only make clear that the 99% are not satisfied with what a leader does. They do not tell how it has to be done, they only interfere when leaders take wrong decisions. Leaders govern, we control (veto and punish).

This idea was already advanced by Jean-Paul Marat but never used by leftist nor rightist activists. These political groups want an own power to govern. After each revolution however a new 1% took power and the situation before and after the revolution became comparable. On top a small group of privileged and powerful leaders and at the bottom the powerless 99%.

The 99% should develop an own effective power to control the 1%. Everyone agrees that the top is not doing a great job. They make too many mistakes. Wars continue to take place, millions of children under five continue to die each year, the environment becomes worse and worse, the amount of laws skyrockets, the wealth at the top increases, corruption and crime are feeding the wallets of the 1% etc. The 1% attack our freedom, privacy and safety. Let's return the gesture and invade their private living sphere, not asking but forcing them to change their attitude and decisions. We should only control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders.

Chapter 13

Resistance instead of protest

Forcing and not asking or begging leaders to take better decisions

Resistance is forcing leaders to take different decisions. Protest is asking and begging them to change decisions. Resistance is part of a revolution that wants change, protest is part of a revolt that shows the dissatisfaction of the 99%. Resistance challenges the power, protest appeals to the conscience of leaders.

When a country is occupied by a foreign power protest is senseless. Authorities do not listen to protests and the only way to achieve something is by resistance. In Western democracies protest can have some success but not when it concerns important subjects. When a lot of money (for the 1% and their lackeys) is involved protests fall on deaf ears. The Anti-Nuclear Movement, actions against fracking or against genetically modified food were not very successful. Efforts to restrict the use of cars because it uses too much precious materials and fossil energy are failing. Withdrawing support for regimes that suppress the own population (and the lack of support for freedom movements in those countries) is also nearly without positive result. Human Rights are unimportant when trade agreements are discussed. Money stands first and not the interests of the 99%. Protest actions give maybe some power to action leaders who want to be embedded in the political game but do not change the life of rank and file activists. This is in contradiction to the idea that all people have the same status.

When money is involved different actions are necessary. Money has an increasing influence on decisions and protests have become superfluous. From about 1960 to 1985 protest movements had still some successes. Actions in 1968 in France (in The Netherlands the Provo Movement) changed a little bit the attitude of leaders but after a few years the elite regained control and the power to amass money became even greater than before.

The Squatter's Movement gave thousands of young people a payable living place but squatting became outlawed and the problem how young people could live independently was not solved. The anti-WTO demonstrations of ten years ago were massive but the undisturbed leaders of the WTO just went on.

After 1985 movements ceased to exist and the successes of protest actions became smaller and smaller. The 99% understood that protests did not achieve anything anymore and withdrew from the action world. Action leaders however continued to ask and beg political leaders to change decisions. They had not learned from the past that protest actions are almost useless. The powerful 1% were never challenged

Towards a world without a 1%

in their extravagant life and bankers who caused the crisis (for their own benefit) kept their lucrative jobs. Action leaders could not make the step from protest to resistance and blocked all progress in action methods.

The successes of protests have been meagre. Demonstrations ended in fights with the police, strikes could not prevent that the wealth, income and power gap grew tremendously. The 1% were never disturbed in their privileged living sphere. Some activists still think that elected representatives (but most top-people are not elected) care for the interests of the 99%. When the dominant position of power, money and greedy rich persons is not undermined actions will be in vain. Some people call the demonstrations about ten years ago against the WTO a success but I saw only hurt and imprisoned activists while the train with powerful people continued its planned course. After the big demonstrations in Seattle and Milan the movement lost its momentum. The 99% realised that these actions were not the right way.

Protests failed to bring fundamental change, militant resistance is needed. Even when leaders give in to some demands their position is never challenged. Nearly all actions are in town centres where leaders never come. The goal of protests is to inform fellow-people and not to change society or to remove failing leaders. In resistance we point our arrows at powerful people to weaken their control.

In some demonstrations protesters were forced to fight though fighting belongs to resistance. Therefore many action leaders reject any street fighting, it is contradictory to their idea that you only may beg politicians to change decisions. Fighting should however not take place with the police but with those faulty leaders that enrich themselves by disregarding the interests of the 99%. *"We have to attack the enemy where the army cannot be used"*. (Marat)

To get a Humane World protest is not sufficient. Wrong actions are carried out around wrong subjects. Most actions are guided by the idea that elections may give change. *"Politics is a game played by people with power. By elections you are asked to choose sides in false conflicts. We are given the illusion of choice but as long as those in power do not lose their control, the choice we made only influences our life and not the life of the people in power."*

Even a superficial analysis reveals that through the ages greedy rich people ruled the world. Despite natural catastrophes, revolutions, uprisings, revolts, wars, technical inventions, etc. elites continued to rule, revitalised by new members who accepted the rules of the top layers of society. The motivation of the 1% remained the possession of more money than people down under. Money rules the world!

Money has never been an item in protest actions. The system should change but nothing was said about the super-rich who can use any system for their own benefit. New systems produce new greedy leaders. Colonies disappeared but new indigenous leaders resemble the old colonial rulers. Communism disappeared but old leaders remain on top and form a common front with the former enemy. The French

Towards a world without a 1%

or the American Revolution gave new impulses to society but a small group of rich and greedy leaders still cared in the first place for their own well-being.

We need resistance against the dictatorial role of money and against people who amass money for their own benefit. All problems are caused by the 1% and money.

Participation in actions, the number of strikes and the interest in elections is dwindling. Even the crisis did not stimulate the 99%. They grumbled, became more dissatisfied but remained at home. Rich leaders who caused the crisis are still on top. Without pressure from below they continue to reap the fruits from their financial manipulations. Temporary successes of protests without a greater goal of changing society are not sufficient to secure the freedom and well-being of the 99%. Resistance inspires to great deeds.

When we dream about a Humane World actions that do not contribute to getting that world have to be abandoned. Resistance should replace protest.

Chapter 14

Chaos and catastrophes

Necessary conditions to get a Humane World in which the 99% have power and the same status

Chaos is unpredictability, not knowing what is going to happen. Humans are often chaotic, doing things that cannot be derived from what they did in the past, a past that gave no indication of what could happen in the future. Chaos promotes creativity. People are often afraid of chaos and catastrophes but they make life interesting. Chaos means more freedom and less control from above. In these periods humans become more human because they have to decide themselves, chaos forces them to think and act independently. The control from above by unassailable leaders or untransparent organisations weakens.

The unpredictable movement of football players is the reason why people go to football matches. The sacrifice in chess, accepting a new job, a marriage or a divorce, the possibility to meet new people, it are all jumpy moments that make life interesting. Without unpredictability, without some chaos, life tends to become boring, people become depressed and lose interest. In chaotic times new things happen that make life worth living. The mass revolts in the last ten years in many parts of the world created chaotic situations but not yet a catastrophe, a revolution.

Catastrophes and revolutions are sudden changes. They resemble in a certain way chaos. Chaos is a prime condition for a possible revolution. In a chaotic situation it is easier to strengthen the factors that can lead to a catastrophe, a fundamental change in society. The past, the present and the future become disconnected. A catastrophe is an opening towards a new completely different situation. After a revolution, a jump in social developments, a new society is born in which new things happen that could not occur and even could not have been foreseen before the revolution. Old relations are disturbed and new relations spring up. Entering the unknown is exiting and chaos and catastrophes should be promoted. Not evolution brings progress but revolution, a jump towards a society that cannot come into existence in an evolutionary way. Chaos and catastrophes are more interesting than gradual developments that extrapolate the present situation. Evolution brings order in society and increases control over the 99%. Revolution gives more freedom and is more interesting and more agreeable than evolution.

In my free downloadable book "[The Scarists](#)", contemplations about a society beyond democracy" I write on page 55: *"Never remain on familiar paths and never think you know everything. When you proceed on a familiar path you only learn that path. Life can (and must) take more paths".*

Towards a world without a 1%

The 1% have a cosy, privileged life and do not want chaos or catastrophes. That endangers the constant stream of money to the top on which they base their power and existence. The 99% have less to lose and a lot to win, they need chaos and catastrophes to get the same status for everyone.

Catastrophes, revolutions, jumps are fairly common, essential and important elements of life. To pass or fail an exam and getting a diploma opens an often uncertain and chaotic road to a new situation. A new job, a sudden sacking, a birth or a death are examples of jumps after which the world changes in an unpredictable way.

In politics the powers that be want to avoid chaotic or catastrophic situations. They need predictability, the certainty to continue control over the 99%. The 99% can alleviate the growing control by creating some chaos, controllers cannot cope with chaos. Many 99% spontaneously escape control in sometimes chaotic situations at mass meetings around music performances, the behaviour of football hooligans or the massive dodging of laws. This chaos is caused unconsciously and does not disturb the power relations at the top. That is only the case when the 99% make the private life of the 1% and their lackeys chaotic. Carrying out actions that cannot be predicted by the targets. Demonstrations are insufficient for this goal because authorities have the time to organise their control apparatus. When controllers have to attend to chaos in their private life they have less energy to control other people. What happens elsewhere becomes less important when the own situation is disturbed in an unexpected way.

Chaos enters when the certainty for tomorrow falls away. The austerity measures that make future pensions uncertain could be a sign of a coming chaos. The growing number of jobless people is another sign. The life of many young workless people has become futureless and they are excluded from society. Football hooliganism is one sign as is the behaviour of people in shanty towns all over the world. People want to jump towards another world. It is often the world of drugs, using it and earning from it. It is the consequence of a hopeless non-existing future. The recent uprisings in many countries as in the Arab Spring, in Turkey, in the Ukraine, in Thailand, in Brazil or in Greece in which many 99% were killed, wounded and arrested is another sign that society is failing. Protesters created a chaotic situation which they obviously prefer over the terrible and known situation that has no future. They are not driven by money but by the wish to find a road to another future. Despite personal risks when they again and again go out on the streets many protesters find this way necessary, promising, exiting and interesting.

A human made catastrophe can be the result of a mounting chaotic situation in which life becomes even more unpredictable. It can occur when the factors that cause a catastrophe are strengthened. An important factor in getting a diploma is the increase in knowledge, in getting a social revolution, the increase in human activity, the growth of movements for another world. A moving society is more chaotic and increases the

Towards a world without a 1%

chance on real change. Chaos also occurs during wars or during wide spread hunger, the forebode of e.g. the French and Dutch revolutions. Another factor is the weakening of the power of the 1% when actions make their private living sphere more chaotic by creative and surprising disturbances. Then the 1% lose their grip on society. They cannot maintain the dull continuous situation that is needed to increase their money and power.

On the way towards a revolution, many small catastrophes take place that influence the life of the 99% as well as that of the 1%. A small catastrophe occurs when a 1% decides to change a decision because of pressure by the 99%. A bigger catastrophe occurs when the 1% abandons his position in the top of the power pyramid because of actions by the 99%. Another factor is when the 1% perceive that the possibility of getting and spending money, a prime condition for belonging to the top of the power pyramid, becomes too difficult. Their position is no longer unassailable and becomes unpredictable, more chaotic.

A still bigger catastrophe occurs when the 1% starts fighting each other. The chaos under the 1% increases because they do not know what to do against their loss of control over the world of the 99%. The 99% must not take sides in such conflict but remain the third dog that walks away with the bone. In Egypt the 1% fought with each other (Mubarak contra the other 1%) but the conflict was not caused by the 99%. There was no direct pressure on the 1% and the revolting masses did not cause chaos under the 1% to strengthen their own position and to put still more pressure on the 1%. The 1% needed some time to solve the internal conflicts and then they used their power to restore control over the 99% they had lost during their internal struggle in which many 99% were used as foot soldiers. The weakening of the power of the 1%, what was hardly the case in Egypt, is an important factor in getting a political catastrophe.

Other factors that promote chaos and maybe revolution are the growing number of Autonomous Clubs, the explosive rise in actions against the private life of the 1%, the growing movement for a Humane Society and the increasing acceptance of the new paradigm that all people have the same status. Though the situation becomes more chaotic most people acknowledge that something special is happening, a jump in the development of society, a catastrophe, a revolution.

PART B

The 1% are the prime target, they have most power and money

We must take the power and the money away from the 1%. "Spending 200.000 euro in one year should be the limit!" The 1% ruled in the past, rule in the present and continue to rule in the future when there is no revolution. All pressure should be put on them and hardly on politicians and other secondary leaders. We can destroy the pyramid of power and money by taking the power and money away from the 1%. We can prevent they can use their ill-gotten money by making their exclusive eliteworld uninhabitable. The Few have not the moral right to have goods and services the Many never can acquire.

Chapter 15..... 52

The separated and exclusive world of the 1%

The reason why the 1% want to keep their privileged position

Chapter 16..... 55

Quotes about the privileged place of the 1% in our society

Why the 1% are the ultimate target

Chapter 17..... 58

Are the 1% the only target?

Also lower bosses can be pressured

Chapter 18..... 60

The pyramid of power and money

Power and money for the 1%, the 99% subordinate and considered inferior

Chapter 19..... 63

Corruption money streams from the 99% to the 1%

Corruption is a focus point for attacking the power of the 1%

Chapter 20..... 66

Taking the power and the money away from the 1%

Preventing that the 1% can use their ill-gotten money

Chapter 21..... 70

Spending 200.000 euro in one year should be the limit!

The Few have not the moral right to use their money on goods and services the
Many never can acquire

Chapter 15

The separated and exclusive world of the 1%

The reason why the 1% want to keep their privileged position

Let me tell you about the very rich. They are different from you and me. They possess and enjoy early, and it does something to them, makes them soft when we are hard, and cynical where we are trustful, in a way that, unless you were born rich, it is difficult to understand. They think, deep in their hearts, that they are better than we are because we had to discover the compensations and refuges of life ourselves. Even when they enter deep into our world or sink below us, they still think that they are better than we are. They are different". (F. Scott Fitzgerald)

How distinguish the 1% themselves from the 99%? How acquire they a higher status? Because of money, being capable to buy anything common citizens cannot buy. Everything turns around money.

Only by disturbing this money world we get a society in which all people have the same status. Actions connected with items that can only be acquired by people with too much money pressure the 1% and not the 99%. That complies with the Golden Rule for Actions, damage to the 99% should be minimal, pressure on the 1% ever increasing.

As prime adepts to the idea that money dominates everything, the 1% give themselves a higher status by expressing everything what happens in money terms. With the use of brainwashing methods the 1% insert in the minds of the 99% that you only can get a higher status by having a lot of money. This leads to ridiculous situations. Very high prices are asked for diamonds or gold and the prices are kept high by shady manipulations of corporations and a propaganda machine telling the people that expensive is beautiful even when the difference between a diamond and a glass copy can only be determined with special techniques. That can be said of the whole luxury industry. *"The arts and crafts are corrupted by the co-presence of great wealth and poverty"* (Plato). The intrinsic value of goods is increased by using the money paradigm. Campaigning to prohibit forgeries (goods with the same intrinsic value not made by the luxury industry) gives free way to higher prices. Expensive is sold as good and beautiful. People with money judge articles on their money value and not the intrinsic value.

You have to show to your peers that you belong to the top. Extravagant mansions, private planes, very big cars, exclusive restaurants, sitting on the first row at meetings, attending special parties, only drinking and eating expensive food etc. Money dominates the life and the brains of the 1%. The money paradigm rules

Towards a world without a 1%

because anything is considered in connection with money, expensive is good, cheap is wrong.

Having money and how to spend money is superior to how you got that money. The acceptance of rich criminals in the eliteworld of the 1% supports this statement. The 1% are often criminal, hiding wealth in tax havens, being corrupt, misusing power to get ridiculous salaries and bonuses, etc. The crisis has proven that bankers use criminal ways to extort money from the 99%. Hardly any banker has been prosecuted.

Not all rich people belong to the 1%. It is not only money that secures a place in the top but also power and contacts often via education, sports and family. Sport millionaires, lottery winners or the yet set do not belong to the 1% but also technical whizz kids as Bill Gates are not directly accepted. They often have a restricted influence (only in the IT) and have no information or financial support via trusted family members, close friends and other acquaintances. But Gates has so much money that he is not a factor that can be neglected.

The 1% think they have the “right” to have more than the 99%. In a society built on money the powerful can use anything to get more money. Corruption is one of these means.

The definitions of corruption (the misuse of power for the own benefit) and of the 1% (the group with most power and money) resemble each other. In both cases everything turns around having more money than other people. How you get that money is not important. Everything the 1% do to amass money is uncontrolled and in the case of corruption clearly criminal.

If the 99% had some money they can hardly use these criminal ways to get still more money. They miss the criminal mentality which is the prime reason why people are criminal: money. With this money the 1% has built an exclusive, extravagant eliteworld only open for a special kind of people. Willam S. Domhoff described this kind of people in “Who rules America”: *“Underlying the American upper class are a set of social institutions which are the backbone – private schools, elite universities, the “right” fraternities and sororities, gentlemen’s clubs, debutante balls, summer resorts, charitable and cultural organisations and such recreational activities as foxhunts, polo matches and yachting”*.

Ferdinand Lundberg describes in “The rich and the super-rich” the mentality of the 1%: *“One doesn’t need to tap their telephones or induce psychoanalysts to break confidence that they (the 1%) are nearly all motivated by retaining their power and money, adding as much money and power as possible, making use of all the resources of modern science, technology and politics in the retention and the expansion of their power, keeping their share of the tax burden as low as possible, supporting whatever politico-economic policies support or improve their position and*

Towards a world without a 1%

struggling against those who seem less likely to diminish that and having themselves presented to the world as especially worthy people”.

It shows a big difference between the 1% and the 99%. The first live in a privileged eliteworld, the others in an often harsh massworld. The eliteworld is separated from the world of the 99%. To cross to the other side you only can use bridges controlled by the 1%. They select who may enter their world on the condition you accept money inspired criminal behaviour. The eliteworld is exclusive and extravagant. The first condition to enter this world is the possession of a lot of money and nobody shall ask where this money came from. All aspects of their world are drenched in money common citizens never possess.

The money of inhabitants of this eliteworld comes partly from the past by inheritance but also via exorbitant profits and salaries of which the height is determined by people who have comparable incomes. Partly it comes from the misuse of private or public money for the own benefit. In both cases the money stream is caused by a misuse of power for the own benefit or in one simple word because of corruption. To undermine this privileged world you must imagine what the 1% find important. It are things connected with money. By creatively disturbing these things you disturb the exclusive eliteworld, you undermine the reason why the 1% is the 1%.

What do the 1% do with their money? Except using it to extend their power position the 1% use the money to buy goods, acquire services and build places that are too expensive for common citizens. That are many action targets. Not only the goods and services but also manufacturers, suppliers or distributors. We can advise them with forceful arguments to look for a more humane job. One aspect of the idea that we can disturb the web of veins that feed the 1% is that all 99% should sever the ties with the greedy rich.

Chapter 16

Quotes about the privileged place of the 1% in our society

The reason why the 1% are the ultimate target

Some quotes about the special place of the 1% and their selfishness. They seem hostile aliens that enslave the 99%. The 1% live in a separated, exclusive, extravagant and privileged world where the 99% are only allowed to come as servants . To get a Humane World we must creatively disturb the world of the 1% and make it uninhabitable.

“To be at once exceedingly wealthy and good is impossible” (**Plato**)

“Despite their defeats, the princes do not lose anything” (**Jean-Paul Marat**)

"When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men living together in society, they create for themselves in the course of time a legal system that authorizes it and a moral code that glorifies it" (**Frederic Bastiat**)

“Let me tell you about the very rich. They are different from you and me. They possess and enjoy early, and it does something to them, makes them soft when we are hard, and cynical where we are trustful, in a way that, unless you were born rich, it is difficult to understand. They think, deep in their hearts, that they are better than we are because we had to discover the compensations and refuges of life ourselves. Even when they enter deep into our world or sink below us, they still think that they are better than we are. They are different” (**F. Scott Fitzgerald**)

“In all societies from societies that are very meagrely developed and have barely attained the dawning's of civilization down to the most advanced and powerful societies two classes of people appear, a class that rules and a class that is ruled. The first class, always the less numerous, performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages that power brings, whereas the second, the more numerous class, is directed and controlled by the first in a manner that is more or less legal, more or less arbitrary and violent and supplies the first, in appearance at least, with material means” (**Gaetano Mosca**)

“The powerelite is composed of men whose positions enable them to transcend the ordinary environments of ordinary men and women; they are in positions to make decisions to have major consequences. Whether or not they do or not make such decisions is less important than the fact that they occupy such pivotal positions: their

Towards a world without a 1%

failure to act, their failure to make decisions, is itself an act that is often of greater consequence than the decisions they do make” (**C. Wright Mills**)

“Everybody who is part of the ruling class is Man by the Grace of God”. Because he was born in a setting of rulers, from childhood on he has been convinced he was born to rule and in a certain way that is indeed true, because his parents who were also rulers, have procreated him as their successor. In the future there is waiting him a certain social function into which he can enter when he is of ageThis sanctified character that the bourgeois possesses for his class and that is expressed by an entire ceremonial of recognition (as the way of greeting, the visiting-card, the notifications of marriages and deceases, the entire ritual of courtesy visits etc.) that is called HUMAN DIGNITY” (**Jean Paul Sartre**)

“So long as a citizen’s whole soul is wrapped up in the passion for wealth, he cannot give a thought to anything except the day’s takings. Here is one reason in particular why society declines to take learning and any other wholly admirable pursuit seriously. Everyone is ready in his furious thirst for gold and silver to stop to any trade and any shift, honourable or dishonourable, which hold out a prospect of wealth, ready to scruple at no act whatsoever – innocent, sinful or utterly shameful – so long as it promises to sate him, like some brute beast with the perfect glut of eating, drinking and sexual sport” (**Ferdinand Lundberg**)

“Who, if anybody in particular, really makes the basic decisions that govern society? Who calls the shots.....virtually every person knows he isn’t calling the shots, nor are any of his neighbours, co-workers or acquaintances. Everybody knows it is some distant and obscure “they” It is true that all persons have their compensation for work determined by a market. The elite, however, do not have their revenues impersonally determined by a market, to the dictates of which they submit. They make market rules pretty much suit their inclinations. Members of the labour force, high and low, come up against a decree that says: So far and not further. They have not acquiesced in this decree, they have not been consulted about it, they are often opposed to it but they are powerless to push it aside. It looks very much as though this decree has been handed down from some esoteric group, for there is no rule against having an expansive income in a booming economy” (**Ferdinand Lundberg**)

“So, when wealth is honoured in a state and the wealthy, virtue and the good are less honoured Thus, finally, from being lovers of victory and lovers of honour they become lovers of gains and of money, and they commend and admire the rich man and put him in office but despise the man who is poor”

(on democracy) “The insatiate lust for wealth and the neglect of everything else for the sake of money-making were the cause of its un-doing”

“The arts and crafts are corrupted by the co-presence of great wealth and poverty”.
“Wealth and property should be kept out of the good society since the one brings

Towards a world without a 1%

luxury, idleness and innovation and the other illiberality and the evil of bad workmanship” (**Plato**)

“When rich people fight wars with one another, poor people are the ones to die” (**Jean-Paul Sartre**)

“One doesn’t need to tap their telephones or induce psychoanalysts to break confidence that they (the 1%) are nearly all motivated by retaining their power and money, adding as much money and power as possible, making use of all the resources of modern science, technology and politics in the retention and the expansion of their power, keeping their share of the tax burden as low as possible, supporting whatever politico-economic policies support or improve their position and struggling against those who seem less likely to diminish that and having themselves presented to the world as especially worthy people” (**Ferdinand Lundberg**)

“Underlying the American upper class are a set of social institutions which are the backbone – private schools, elite universities, the “right” fraternities and sororities, gentlemen’s clubs, debutante balls, summer resorts, charitable and cultural organisations and such recreational activities as foxhunts, polo matches and yachting” (**G. William Domhoff**)

“The people of the higher circles may be conceived as members of a top social stratum, as a set of groups whose members know one another, see one another socially and at business. The elite feel themselves to be and are felt by others to be, the inner circle of the upper social class. They form a more or less compact and psychotically entity. They have become self-conscious members of a social class. People are either accepted in this class or they are not and there is a quantitative split separating them from those who are not elite” (**C. Wright Mills**)

“The basic offense of most of the active rich is that they usually pursue their own visions, skilfully or crudely, not only to the neglect of the rest of the world (as does the poet) but, at times, because they have power, against or indifferent to the needs and wishes of the rest of the world. Not only do they have power but, like most people are thoroughly egocentric” (**Ferdinand Lundberg**)

Chapter 17

Are the 1% the only target?

Also lower bosses can be pressured

People stand central so the question is not what is the target but who is the target. Targets are all people who take decisions that violate or negatively influence the life, the freedom, the privacy or the well-being of the 99% often for their own benefit or the benefit of their bosses, the 1%. The 99% have hardly influence on decisions taken over them. To get a Humane Society without a 1% it is necessary to target the 1% who keep the power and money pyramid standing up. In the revolutionary period the 99% develop an own power that blocks any new 1%.

The 1% do not take all decisions that influence our life. They draw up the general lines, the idea that decisions must never disfavour them and the guideline that money dominates all decisions. They decide how high profits are in comparison to the sales or that salaries, bonuses and perks of CEO's may reach ridiculous heights. The goal of actions is to take away the reason for their greed, the extravagant eliteworld and the possibility to amass huge amounts of money. Their power is based on money. When the possibility to spend and amass money disappears the 1% are as powerless as a general without soldiers. Attacks should creatively disturb the private living sphere of the 1% to make the exclusive eliteworld uninhabitable.

Many decisions are taken on lower levels of the power pyramid by lackeys and other servants of the 1%. It is just the mafia. Decisions of lower leaders directly influence the life and the interests of the 99% and not the life of the 1%. It are decisions in agreement with what decision-takers think favour the wishes and the interests of the top-bosses.

The puppets of the 1% in the private and public sector are hardly put under pressure when they hurt the 99%. Bankers, sheriffs and higher police officers who evict people in foreclosures, directors and chiefs of personnel who sack workers or higher civil servants who take wrong decisions are never pressured when they unnecessary and negatively influence the private life, the well-being and the freedom of common citizens. They must acknowledge there is not only a power above that forces them to take certain decisions but that there is also a power below that demand different decisions.

Also politicians take decisions that are negative for the 99%. They are elected and one of the principal causes for the division of the 99% in left and right. Attacking leftist politicians alienates rightist 99%, attacking rightist politicians alienates leftist 99%. Such attacks strengthen divisions in the 99%. Politicians should only scarcely be attacked. Though they take wrong decisions, these decisions can also be blocked by

Towards a world without a 1%

pressuring not-elected civil servants who execute the political decisions. Attacks on lower bosses do not split the 99% and have an indirect influence on politicians. Besides politicians are often after only a few years replaced by other politicians and the building up of pressure on them has to start again. Lower bosses in the private and public sector remain much longer on their post, just as the 1% are always on top of society. Attacks on them have a lasting influence.

To correct injustices the 99% may pressure lower bosses. For many activists the 1% are too vague, too much behind the screens, too difficult to attack, too far from where the 99% live. Attacking lower bosses is easier and activists can be like a fish in the water because many live in neighbourhoods were the 99% lives. In these attacks the 99% build up experience for more difficult attacks on higher placed targets. By attacking lower oppressors the 99% learn that the present world is not changing. Basic injustices like the disparity in wealth and power continue to exist. By pressuring lower bosses you get small successes that strengthen the movement. It makes other 99% clear that it is possible to readjust injustices. The self-consciousness of the 99% starts to grow.

Most workers in the private and public sector on lower echelons do not take decisions, they only execute decisions that are taken above them. The most obedient servants may be attacked but it are only warnings that they should be careful not too much to follow orders from above. Lower servants who are in direct contact with the public are often abused and attacked. They are used to a certain amount of violence and sometimes even trained to cope with it. For activists it is often more dangerous to harass lower officials who also belong to the 99% than directors of institutions. Because persons stand central, we should contemplate how bosses react on actions of common citizens. Top bosses have seldom been attacked. Attacks on them give surprising results.

People in the highest echelons of our society have no practical experience with angry citizens. In their offices they hear of the violence but in their private mansions they live quiet and undisturbed far from the harsh sides of society. When some activists enter their front lawn their existence starts to shake.

The 1% and their servants are unprepared for action methods based on penetrating in private living spheres. When masses demonstrate, the 1% use security forces and do not mind if people are hurt or killed. That changes when arrows fall in their backyard, when the 99% put direct pressure on bosses by stealthy intruding their private quarters. Confrontation with security forces should be avoided.

The goal of actions against lower bosses is to change decisions and thus getting small successes that fuel the movement. The goal of actions against a 1% is their withdrawal from decision-taking circles, the weakening of the power pyramid. It is a warning to other top-people that the world is changing. But *“we should attack the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used”*.

Chapter 18

The pyramid of power and money

Power and money for the 1%, the 99% subordinate and considered inferior

“To be at once exceedingly wealthy and good is impossible” (Plato). Rich people have power, powerful people have money. Poor people are powerless, powerless people have no money. That is the consequence of a society in which money dominates all decisions. The 99% should develop an own power.

Humanity is not based on the idea that all people have the same status but people are arranged in layers, the most powerful and rich at the top and the poor and powerless masses at the bottom. Orders are issued from top to bottom while money is going up to the top. The organisation of humans in our society can be characterised by a pyramid.

The whole world is organised in a pyramidal way. Even the smallest organisations have a president and a direction who seem to have a higher status than ordinary members. Only in big leaderless movements you can see a glimpse of a future society in which all people have the same status. The 1% at the top find themselves superior and consider people at lower levels as inferior. There is no fundamental difference between the present society and the old slave society. The few at the top live safe, comfortable, privileged and extravagant while the many at the basis have to fight for their existence. Many are not sure to have the next day enough food to survive. Inequality rules and nobody at the top even thinks of giving some of their affluence to the basis. On the contrary, the money stream goes from bottom to top, not the other way around.

In the mafia the pyramidal structure is obvious. Some godfathers at the top, then the lieutenants and the lower capos and at the bottom the many mafiosi who carry out the most risky tasks. The godfathers do not decide about all activities but determine the general line, keep order and interfere when something goes wrong, when the stream of money to the top is slowing down or has to be intensified. Lieutenants have freedom to act but for the intervention of the very top. In their activities they always think about what the godfathers should do and like. Ideas from the bottom about the safety of the rank and file are disregarded.

The big society is organised in the same way. Generals do not die on the battle field, only soldiers and occasionally lower officers die. Lieutenants, the political servants, decide what is the best decision by thinking in the first place about the well-being of the 1%. Just as in the mafia, the godfathers of the big society are not elected. In the

Towards a world without a 1%

top of the pyramid there are no elections and no democracy. There the great lines are determined and there decisions are taken to interfere when necessary to maintain the prominent and lucrative position of the 1%.

Problems at the top are solved quickly and peacefully at the cost of the incomes of the people down under. The Trias Politica, the judicature, the executive and legislature are controlled by the top but too costly to use for the 99%. Problems at the bottom are not important. When the 99% have not enough to eat, have no jobs, no education, nor houses or health care it is said that it is their own fault. But they have to remain within the boundaries of the law, people at the bottom are punished fast, severe and often violently when they violate the law. Crimes at the top are treated leniently. Stealing one bread is worse than stealing millions as bankers do.

Many people admire the Egyptian pyramids but these pyramidal structures were only built to honour the pharaohs, their money and their power. Many common people died in building these structures, pyramids should be coloured red. Also huge cathedrals are admired though they were only built to show the 99% the wealth and power of the religious 1%. The same can be said of the sky scrapers of corporations and banks. On top level are the offices of CEO's and owners, it are modern pyramids. But the highest trees have the greatest fall. As we say in my language, high trees catch a lot of wind. We only have to provide the wind and the high trees fall down.

We should strive for a society without a power pyramid, a society in which nobody is secured of a privileged life at the cost of other people. To get another society we should destroy the power pyramid.

How can a pyramid be destroyed, how is a pyramid built and how is it kept together. A pyramid is vast at the bottom, small at the top. Except for accumulating power and money, the top must hold the ends together of the beams that give the pyramid its structure. When they fail to do that one of the beams can fall down and then another and another and suddenly the whole structure succumbs. The pyramid falls apart and all people are on the same level. The revolution has overturned the unequal situation. For the first time in history all people have the same status. And the 99% know that when they have once destroyed a pyramid they can resist anyone or any group that tries to build a new pyramid.

In a revolt the power pyramid is not destroyed and the future society is like the old one. Only a revolution destroys the power pyramid. The top cannot hold the pyramid together when they have become the prime target. All fighting on lower levels is senseless when the big structure remains intact. Control and money remain in the hands of the 1%. The revolts in Egypt and elsewhere have shown that when necessary the 1% retake power that they seemed to have lost after a revolt. In Egypt Morsi got some power but only after a year the undisturbed 1% appointed another leader to pacify the 99%. The money stream to the top of the pyramid continued to exist. People at the bottom of the pyramid hardly got any benefit from the revolt. And

Towards a world without a 1%

if there was some benefits, it can always been taken away by the undisturbed power of the 1% at the top of the pyramid.

Only by undermining the power structure of the pyramid, by caring that the 1% cannot hold this structure together we get a Humane World.

Chapter 19

Corruption money streams from the 99% to the 1%

Corruption is a focus point for attacking the power of the 1%

Corruption is the misuse of power for private gains or for the benefit of groups of decision-takers as the 1% or the top of the public or private sector. Power and money are interconnected. Corruption is one of the ways to get money and perks by using power. Corruption is in contradiction to the public interest and increases the gap between powerful rulers and powerless ruled.

Small and big corruption accounts for a huge stream of money to the top of the power and money pyramid. In The Netherlands the yearly cost of corruption is at least ten billion euro. For all OECD-countries it is much more than a trillion euro. More money is involved in corruption than in laundering drug money though also in this branch the 1% is present. Hardly anyone at the top is prosecuted. Only small corruption by the 99% is punished. Any crisis could be solved by stopping corruption. And the yearly dying of ten million kids before they are five years old stops when some of this money is used better. But ten million dead kids are less important than the greed of the 1%.

Though corruption is illegal hardly anyone is prosecuted. There is almost no control of this money stream and independent controllers as financial auditors often play a dubious role. The top of society protects each other because all are involved in corruption. The behaviour of the 99% is controlled by strict laws, the 1% and their lackeys can spend private and public money on ways they determine.

In developing countries common citizens are often forced to pay lower officials who have to pay their bosses, who have to pay their bosses etc. These small bribes are a nuisance but hardly prosecuted because part of this corruption money arrives at the top. This stream of money is not monitored by independent people. Small corruption is in developed countries less frequent but some lower officials are still inclined to use their power to get more money. Control of lower officials restricts this behaviour while the top of society is hardly controlled.

Independent control can combat corruption but then controllers must be really independent and have the power to intervene. Now most controllers belong to the same group as the people who are corrupt. Judges do not like to sentence their peers, auditors to correct people they meet on parties. Corruption is caused by an inequality in power. When the power distribution is not changed corruption continues to exist. Therefore we need Autonomous Clubs of common citizens that control and eventually punish faulty corrupt leaders.

Towards a world without a 1%

In rich countries small bribes are less frequent but the life of the 99% is deeply influenced by corruption at the top of society that causes higher taxes and higher prices. There are many forms of corruption, the trade of power and influence in which often money is involved. Bribery is a direct form of corruption but uncontrolled misuse of power is wide-spread. The mentality that decision-makers have the “right” on much more and have the power to influence decisions by using money is the cause of much of the misery in the world. First the demands of the powerful have to be fulfilled and then the needs of the powerless. People do not have the same status and the 99% are inferior to the extravagant demands of the Happy Few for more, more and still more.

Declarations for private necessities by politicians and higher servants in the private and public sector or incomes, golden hand-shakes and lavish pensions for top-managers are all misuse of power. There is no relation between the time and energy needed for the job and the money and other benefits they get for their work. Direct corruption is also wide-spread. To get new orders many forms of corruption are often involved and nobody controls and nobody is prosecuted. It cost the 99% yearly hundreds of billions, money that is transferred from the pockets of the 99% to the top who has so much power that they unpunished can misuse their power for their own benefit. There is hardly control and when someone is sentenced for corruption the 99% are not compensated for damages while the people who did not control remain on their posts.

It is corruption when higher placed people have bigger offices, bigger desks, more expensive furnishing of the office, higher travel allowances, free use of the expensive sex industry or five star hotels etc. when that is not needed for their job but paid for by the organisation. Overhead costs are often very high, even in charity organisations but never connected to the idea that this is corruption. It is corruption when bank directors give themselves high bonuses when they are already paid lavishly for their work. Why should the top travel first class and lower servants second class? Why should food for lower servants cost less than that for the top? Not because they produce more but because they think they are higher and better than common citizens and deserve better and more expensive food. They misuse their power to get more.

Corruption is an integrated part of our economic system, an institutionalised vice, a permitted crime. Crimes as money laundering or Ponzi schemes, often committed via legal institutions as stock exchanges and banks, are narrowly connected with corruption and the misuse of power for the own benefit. To ask too high prices that is common in the pharmaceutical industry and elsewhere is tolerated. One third of the price of each ipad is profit for the owners. Well-paid lobbyists use a lot of private money to influence decision-makers. Misuse of private and public money leads to a decay in the decision-making process in which decision-makers consent to deviate from criterions which should rule their decision-making in exchange for a reward or

Towards a world without a 1%

for a promise or an expectation of a reward. These motives influence the decision-making process and should not be part of the decision.

A more concealed form of corruption (misuse of power) is the Gatesian corruption. It is not humane when someone amasses billions in a few years. It is not humane to get 50% or more profit in a few minutes, days or months. Asking too high prices for products is misuse of power but permitted by other corrupt people at the top. Microsoft is known for breaking monopoly laws but people who order this law-breaking, including Bill Gates, have never been prosecuted. A criminal is prosecuted when he steals by order of the top of Crime.Incorporated. A greedy CEO of Production.Incorporated is not prosecuted when he orders the theft of billions from common citizens by asking too high prices.

Corruption is necessary to secure the big stream of money from low to high. There is no control, only Autonomous Clubs of common citizens, the Fourth People's Power, can stop this corruption. Corruption is now more or less legalised and even accepted by the 99% who have to pay for it. 150 years ago Frederic Bastiat said already: *"When plunder becomes a way of life for a group of men living together in society, they create for themselves in the course of time a legal system that authorizes it and a moral code that glorifies it"*.

When money continues to dominate decisions corruption cannot be wiped out. In combating corruption the idea should stand central that the top does not have the right on more earthly goods because it contradicts the same status paradigm. The ultimate target in actions against corruption is the extravagant private life of top people who misuse their power for the own benefit.

Corruption is an integrated part of the present society in which money and not people is the leading factor in all decisions. In the end everything turns around one reason, to have more money than other people. How you get that money is not important, the friendly ties between the 1% and the top of organised crime support this idea.

The 99% do not like corruption and corruption should become a focus point in actions. The stream of money to the top is one of the causes of much of the misery for the 99%. Corruption is a clear goal instead of jumping from one subject to another and sometimes alienating part of the 99% because they do not agree with the action goal.

Corruption is done by powerful people so when you want to stop corruption you have to attack these corrupt people.

Chapter 20

Taking the power and the money away from the 1%

Preventing that the 1% can use their surplus money

The 1% ruled in the past, rule in the present and rule in the future when we do not dethrone them. They are the prime target of any action. My own research supported by research in other countries determines the size of the 1% at about 0.25%, in the USA less than one million people.

“The rich confront the rest of society as a solid semi-corporate phalanx, buttressed by law and public policy. By law they hold their positions legitimately and hence can feel complete rectitude. When the national anthem is being sung, they can feel it is being sung in celebration of the legal system that supports them, for the aggrandisement of which every man, the poorer especially, may be called upon to offer his life simply by presidential order, without any declaration of war by Congress. Beyond this, existing policies under the law favour them; they have been adopted largely by their agents with their corporate permission”. (Ferdinand Lundberg)

Most actions take place in the political sphere and not against the highest power, the 1%. Politicians and political parties are the servants of the 1%, often in some way paid by them. They take decisions that in the first place please or spare the masters. The centre of power is hardly challenged in actions. Politicians control the 99% but there is hardly control on activities in which a lot of money is involved. The incomes of high-placed people are sky-rocketing while at the same time the well-being of the 99% deteriorates. The inflow of money in the economy from criminal activities as with whitewashing, is hardly prosecuted. Evading taxes by the super-rich is continuing. Corruption on higher levels is not punished. The inequality in wealth and power continues to grow. Money rules and only people without money are controlled. Politicians are lackeys without power to challenge the money and the power of the 1%. These servants have to care that bosses can do what they like to do and are well-paid for it.

The 1% are not conspiring. They believe their group is different and superior. The people down under are the dumb masses, while they are educated and advanced individuals who work hard to maintain and improve their elevated position. Change only occurs when individuals from the 99% put direct pressure on individual 1% and undermine the privileges of the top group. Any attention for the 1% is now directed on organisations as the Bilderberg Group or G-8 meetings that are only means to exercise power. By giving attention to the means the only change possible is that

Towards a world without a 1%

some means are replaced by other means while power relations do not change. Individual 1% have never been under fire.

The first goal of the 1% is to preserve and extend their position at the top of society by increasing their wealth and power, to make money still more the foundation of all decisions instead of complying to the idea that all people have the same status. *“Underlying the American upper class are a set of social institutions which are the backbone – private schools, elite universities, the “right” fraternities and sororities, gentlemen’s clubs, debutante balls, summer resorts, charitable and cultural organisations and such recreational activities as foxhunts, polo matches and yachting”*. (G. William Domhoff)

Some of the money of the 1% is used to reward decision-makers, the servants at the top of the private and public sector and the political lackeys. They take decisions and make laws favouring in the first place the already privileged position of the 1%. This corrupt behaviour, misuse of power for the own benefit, is legalised.

Most of their money is used to build an extravagant eliteworld that is not open for the 99%. Money is the prime factor for the existence of a separated and exclusive world of the 1%. To get a Humane World where all people have the same status this eliteworld should be made uninhabitable. That occurs by undermining the possibility for the 1% to buy goods and services the 99% never can acquire. Actions directed at money-related targets support each other. Disturbing one exclusive golf course increases the fear that also other elitist golf courses will be disturbed. Now actions are isolated from each other. Then Monsanto is attacked, then a bank or a government building but the 1% are not disturbed. Attacks are not personal.

Over the ages the 1% has hardly been put under pressure and when that happened *“despite their defeats, the princes do not lose anything”* (Jean-Paul Marat). We have to change that. Undermining the power pyramid and disturbing the eliteworld by intruding in the private living sphere of the 1% are the prime goals in any action.

There is hardly contact between the 1% and the 99%. The 1% have only contact with the servants and marionettes of whom some are invited to enter the eliteworld. It is one of the means to reward people who know that their prime task is supporting and promoting the place of the 1% at the top of society. Actions should penetrate the upper layers of society by intruding in the privileged private living sphere of people who consider the 99% inferior. Without destroying the eliteworld by creatively disturbing the exclusive life of the 1% we never get one world in which all people have the same status.

To achieve that we need actions that only disturb the 1% and not the 99%, actions that influence the private life of the 1%. Actions in connection to their working life are a nuisance but their private life is sacred. There they spend their surplus money. There the 1% demands to be undisturbed. There attacks exert most pressure and have most success.

Towards a world without a 1%

Be creative and carry out actions by which the own risk is minimal. All actions should take a little bit away from the feeling that the eliteworld is a safe and cosy world which is the crown on the life of the 1%.

The list of targets is endless.

Housing. The size as well as the number of houses that often stand idle. Big mansions in beautiful places where the 99% only may come as servant.

Means of transport. Very expensive cars, private planes, yachts of over ten million euro etc.

Servants. The 1% need people from the 99% as drivers, cooks, waiters or cleaning people. They do not want to dirty their hands on work that is done by those other people.

Safety guards. When you possess a lot you are afraid thieves will take some of it. You must protect yourself and the unique articles that confirm that you are a 1%.

Means of communication. Anonymous is proud when they hack a site from a corporation but that is repaired after some time. Why don't they block all private electronic communication of the 1%.

Food. Exclusive restaurants where a meal cost more than the wage of a worker but also expensive foodstuffs and drinks that have to be imported from far away. The price is not important, much is paid via corporations.

Health care. There are special hospitals for the very rich.

Funerals. The 1% have often family tombs a common citizen cannot afford. Deceased ancestors show that power belongs to the family and cannot be disputed.

Exclusive entrance to mass meetings. In concert halls the first rows are reserved for the Happy Few as in Sky Boxes in sport stadiums or by attending exclusive sports as polo.

Recreation. Special, isolated and beautiful parts of the world are reserved for holidays of the 1%. Common citizens are not allowed to enter exclusive clubs, expensive sex clubs, luxurious conference places, expensive hotels and restaurants, free journeys mostly paid for by corporations etc.

Education. Children mostly attend private schools with high entrance fees and go to special universities.

The art world. The luxury world with watches of a million, laptops of five million, fashion, jewellery, furs etc. The 1% pay ridiculous prices for art that should be human heritage and available for all to see and not only for a select group of privileged people. Auction sites where these objects are sold are targets.

Towards a world without a 1%

Juridical support. When the 1% break the law they are protected by expensive lawyers. The 1% has less chance to be convicted than the 99% who only can afford second-rate help.

This list can be extended infinitely. Be creative and find weak points in the life of the 1%. Then put pressure on these points, prevent that the 1% continue to be sole users of certain goods and services. This exclusivity has to be broken and the separation between the two worlds of the 1% and the 99% has to be destroyed.

Undermining the exclusive life of the 1% is part of the idea to make the world of the 1% uninhabitable. All people have the same status and the Few should not be allowed to have a separated world where the Many are not allowed to come.

Chapter 21

“Spending 200,000 euro in one year should be the limit!”

The Few have not the moral right to use their money on goods and services the Many never can acquire

Why is society so rotten, why is there so much misery, why all these wars, why are nearly ten million kids dying each year before they are five years old? Why do some people amass so much money they cannot even spend it in a thousand years? Why can a few spend millions while many must survive on a euro a day? There is a simple reason that is never challenged. Money and greedy selfish people. We need new actions that lead to revolution and a Humane World in which people stand central and not money for the few and powerful.

Money dominates the world, dominates all decisions. Too much money for the powerful Happy Few and too few coins for the powerless Unhappy Many. The 99% produce the goods and services the 1% want. Just as slave-owners were not interested in the life of slaves, the 1% are not interested in the life of the 99%. The 99% are not allowed to enter the world of the 1% as equals. The wide-spread misery in the massworld does not penetrate the minds of the 1%. In the present world people have a different status. For some all doors are open, most stand for closed doors.

Money spend by the Few cannot be spend for the Many. The Few think they are superior to the Many, that they have the right on more money than those many people they hardly see and never know. When they cannot spend this surplus money anymore on extravagances and their exclusive eliteworld, the reason for their existence and for the idea that they are superior disappears. We can achieve this by preventing that anyone can spend more than 200,000 euro in one year.

Politicians will never impose an earnings limit on the 1% because they are only puppets. In the USA politicians even oppose that millionaires pay the same amount of tax as common citizens. But the 99% can impose a spending limit on the greedy rich who caused the crisis for their own benefit.

The 1% live in a privileged exclusive eliteworld. They use and buy extravagant goods and services the 99% never can buy and come in exclusive places the 99% are not allowed to come. By creatively disturbing the world of the 1% we prevent that they can use their surplus money for their privileged life. That influences their centuries long extravagant life style and the idea that they are “better” than we. By making the

Towards a world without a 1%

eliteworld uninhabitable we get one world for all people on our way to a Humane World in which all people have the same status.

“Spending 200,000 euro in one year should be the limit!” is the guiding slogan for actions. All goods and services that cannot be bought or used by 200,000-minus people are action targets. The mentality of all people changes when nobody can spend so much money. Money becomes less important and there comes room for the well-being of all people. It has also influence on money-driven fields as crime, corruption, gambling, expensive sex or ponzi-schemes.

People get the same status but that does not mean that all people are equal, they are not. Individuality, creativity, originality and hard work is still appreciated and honoured. But ridiculous differences as 200,000 euro for a speech of half an hour, hundred million to buy a soccer player, exorbitant prices for art objects that should be in museums cannot be allowed. Activities of the 99% can take care for that.

Money becomes less important and people are rewarded for their efforts. Not because someone has enough money to buy sport clubs for his own greatness. Prices of many products go down when the overhead costs of too high salaries, bonuses and exorbitant profits go down. The luxury industry is known to spend more than half of the sales on extravagant salaries, extravagant trips and advertisements that are full of lies, propagating that expensive is exclusive and better, influenced by the idea that money is the measure of all things.

Many objects are only judged by their money value and this idea not only dominates the 1% but also the 99%. The Night Watch of Rembrandt or the Mona Lisa of Da Vinci are special art objects. They are in museums for everyone to see, the same status paradigm! Other work of these artists have not the same artistic value but are valued at exorbitant prices and only obtainable for people with money. Not the intrinsic value determines the uniqueness of paintings but the amount of money someone pays for an object signed by Rembrandt or da Vinci. The Dutch painter Van Meegeren made beautiful pictures that were certified by experts as real paintings of Dutch painters as Vermeer. When became known that it were forgeries the price went steeply down though it were still the same paintings as before. Money judged if it were art objects. The very-well paid experts who had certified the forgeries as being real were of course not punished. They continued to judge paintings on their money value and not on their artistic value. Auctions who use the money factor to sell articles at ridiculous prices are excellent action objects.

When you cannot spend your money anymore, why should you be greedy or corrupt. Why should everything be related to money and not to the work and pleasure producers have by producing goods. Why should anyone want to possess a Rembrandt that cannot be distinguished from a forgery but by the use of advanced scientific instruments. Why should anyone start a Ponzi-scheme and amass fifty billion dollar as Madoff did. To buy respect? When you cannot spend more than

Towards a world without a 1%

200,000 euro in one year you get respect on what you are and not on what you possess, not because you are a monster with a lot of money.

The limit of 200,000 euro is a guideline to imagine what can be acquired by spending more than 200,000 euro in one year. There are many targets, golf clubs with an entry fee of more than 100,000 euro, restaurants where a dinner cost the wage of a working man, cars of over 200,000 euro, servants, watches of a million euro, ten private mansions that mostly stand empty, very expensive hotels, exclusive parties, holiday and recreation places, private schools and universities, exclusive health care, private closed clubs, the luxury industry, private planes and expensive yachts, the upper part of the sex and gambling industry, art objects that should be available for all people, VIP-places in stadiums and theatres, the use of security personnel that is needed to protect surplus money and extravagant possessions, etc.

Actions inspired by the slogan are humane and comply with the Golden Rule for Actions. Pressure on the 1% is maximised and damage to the 99% minimised. Of course some factories and institutions close but money will be reinvested in new production capacities and new work that favour all people.

The world of the 1% has never been disturbed. The War of the Flea by Autonomous Clubs preventing the use of extravagances will shock the 1%. Any individual or small group can select objects to make unusable on the time, the place and the how they select.

When the number of Clubs rises, the influence of the dominating money paradigm goes down. It is a first step in the direction of a world in which all people have the same status.

PART C

Actions of the past have not changed the world

Most actions are sulking, whining, complaining and crying out loud and then it stops. The 99% do not become politically interested by awareness actions but only by scores of small victories. The 99% know already the world is wretched. They only do not know how to change the world. We should stop reacting on what the 1% do and attack independently. Past mass actions have not changed the world, are not analysed and time and again repeated. They do not pressure the 1% or lower bosses but in vain suppose that someone listens to activists. We need a different kind of actions pressuring the 1% in their private living quarters.

Chapter 22..... 74

Actions of the past have not changed the world

Out-dated actions gave hardly change and damaged too much the 99%

Chapter 23..... 77

We must not react on them, they must react on us

We must decide and have the initiative, not being dependent on what they do

Chapter 24..... 79

Whining, complaining and crying out loud and then it stops

Old actions are not analysed, individual actions are not proposed

Chapter 25..... 82

Awareness actions are superfluous

The 99% know the world is wretched but they don't know how to get a better world

Chapter 22

Actions of the past have not changed the world

Out-dated actions gave hardly change and damaged the 99% too much

Why participate in actions when fifty years of (mass) actions have proven that successes are small or not existing? From about 1960 to 1985 people were active in movements. The Women's Liberation Movement and the Squatters Movement had some successes. But women have still an inferior position to men and the housing situation is still abominable. Positive results of many other movements as the Anti-Nuclear Movement were hardly visible. After 1985 movements virtually ceased to exist. In the last fifty years successes of mass actions were disappointing.

Actions of the past hardly benefited the 99%. The abolition of slavery was partly achieved because some of the 1% from the North needed black workers in the factories and not on the cotton fields where they produced next to nothing. The Civil Rights Movement was a small step in the emancipation of blacks but many coloured people still live in ghettos and racism has not disappeared. Upper layers of the black population profited most.

Women got a better place in society but higher echelons of the female power pyramid profited most. Students profited more from squatting houses than working youth. Still these movements were fairly successful. But we need other action methods to get a world in which all people have the same status, a world without racism, with real equality of men and women, with a decent living place for everyone etc. Therefore we must take the power and the money away from the 1%.

Most actions are short-term actions, long-term actions are scarce. Something happens and there is a protest. When the protest dies down another item comes up and again there is a protest. Activists jump from one subject to another. First they support Tunisians, then Egyptians, then Turks but in the meantime the first ones are forgotten because all attention is drawn to the latest incident. To participate in actions seems more important than the result of actions. Past actions are not analysed. Nothing is learned from the past. New action ideas are blocked by people who obviously have an interest in unsuccessful actions.

There are many protests against the NSA. But forgotten are the unsuccessful protests against other restrictions of the freedom and privacy of the 99%. Telephone records are hoarded for years, cameras are everywhere, tax payers are controlled, people in social security nets are harassed. But big crime, corruption by the top or

Towards a world without a 1%

criminal evading of paying taxes are hardly prosecuted. Protests did not slow down the coming into existence of an Orwellian “1984” society.

In the present time with growing unemployment, decreasing wages, rising incomes for the rich etc. there is only protest and no resistance and certainly no pressure on people who caused the crisis for their own benefit. After decades of suppression the Arab Spring ousted some old leaders but the local 1% still rule. Southern European countries saw massive activities on the streets but austerity is just going on and demonstrations disappeared. Why take part when there are no results? The position of the 99% is deteriorating while the position of the 1% and their political lackeys is not disturbed. No new action ideas are advanced and out-dated street actions continue to beg and not force politicians to change decisions. The top of society is never challenged and remains untouched in their quiet privileged mansions.

The right to assemble or to demonstrate did not change the power of the 1%. Protest demonstrations, petitions, strikes, boycotts, elections or the use of justice courts are not sufficient. By these old-fashioned means, granted to them by the 1% the 99% never get influence, never can curtail the power of the 1%. Withdrawing in commune-like organisations, trying to make a better society inside the present one may be nice for the involved people but the masses will not join. Civil disobedience does not work. It is based on the idea that wars will stop when nobody becomes a soldier. That does not happen. These activities do not challenge the power of the 1%. It are reactions on what the other side is doing. Activists show no initiative on which the 1% are forced to react.

The out-dated actions have sometimes small successes. Strikes did increase wages but the incomes at the top of the private and public sector increased more than at the bottom, so you should wonder if strikes have been successful. Boycotts have damaged in the first place the 99% while life at the top was hardly touched. Demonstrations did not achieve much. When activists refuse to analyse past actions nothing will change.

In protest actions too many activists are imprisoned, hurt or even killed. The pressure on the 1% is minimal. In actions on streets in town centres many not participating 99% are hindered. That causes divisions inside the 99%. When actions have the 1% as target, other 99% are not disturbed. Mao Tse-tung said once: *“All the guiding action principles or action operations grow out of one basic principle: to strive to the utmost to preserve one’s strength and destroy that of the enemy”*. In most actions that does not happen.

The idea that big mass actions in the streets give change is problematic. A long string of small actions with many small victories increases the feeling under the 99% to have power. The masses need new ideas to improve their position in regard to the increasing power of the 1%. Action leaders mostly do not trust the masses. They force the 99% to use actions in which they can keep control over the actions. If actions comply to the Golden Rule for Actions does not interest them. Many action

Towards a world without a 1%

leaders climbed up to the circles of the political servants by propagating actions that did not disturb society too much and opposing actions outside their control.

To get a Humane World new people must arise who are creative and autonomous and who interfere when they find that necessary. Now most actions are centrally organised and participants follow rules laid down by a small leading group. Texts on placards are often censored, strikers wear the same shirts with the same texts. Occupy was suddenly declared non-violent. "Actions should be dignified". Attacks of the 1% on the 99% are seen as inevitable ("the police must use water cannons against the demonstrators") while attacks on the 1% who caused the crisis are rejected. Most actions are complaining and crying out loud without developing a counter-power. No wonder the 99% refuse to take part. They know this kind of actions will not help.

We need something new!

Chapter 23

We must not react on them, they must react on us

We must decide and have the initiative, not being dependent on what they do

People protest against new laws but old laws they also protested against have been carried through. Workers protest against sackings but their protest does not help workers who are already workless. People protest against foreclosures but still more people become homeless. People protest against certain election candidates though they know that all elected representatives are untrustworthy. Lying, cheating and filling their own pockets continues. There is no protest against the 1% who live far away in their exclusive world paid by money stolen from us.

Activists mostly react on what leaders just have done. They have not the initiative to tackle the causes of the wrongdoings. Attacking leaders who order the police to hit protesters, to throw people out of their foreclosed houses, to harass common citizens. There are no actions against high-placed people who continue to take wrong decisions and to promote their own well-being. Decisions are now determined by the money factor. When we pressure them they will acknowledge that active but elusive members of the 99% form another vague force next to the money they have to reckon with.

The 99% are allowed to ventilate their anger and dissatisfaction in meetings and demonstrations. But leaders hardly listen and control any protest. The results of such actions are mostly negative and protesters become disillusioned. They cease to be active. Nothing seems to help. Crying out loud and participating in demonstrations is not sufficient. There are no lasting successes. Reacting is not enough, we must autonomously choose our own targets.

The Squatters Movement had a lot of success. Many houses were occupied and homeless people got a nice living place. Politicians must react on unexpected actions and many 99% sided with the movement. It was not a protest but a direct attack on people who speculated with houses to earn a lot of money. Squatters acted and authorities had to react.

The start of Occupy with the world-wide occupation of thousands of squares forced political lackeys to react. The 99% sided with the Occupiers. But actions stagnated and sympathy disappeared. There were hardly outstanding successes and the squares were cleared. Occupiers resumed the old unsuccessful action methods, protesting against what authorities were doing. Activists did not even think of a new

Towards a world without a 1%

kind of actions that forces leaders to react. Undisturbed decision-takers still take measures that damage The People and benefit the already privileged. The same bankers who caused the crisis by illegal means still rule our financial world and our wallet. Nobody attacks them.

Whistle-blowers Assange and Snowden publish secret documents (why are the 99% not allowed to see what is kept secret, why are they not informed when and why their name is on a list of suspected terrorists?) exposing how leaders conspire to control citizens. It is not enough because the only reaction of the top is to make secret actions legal or still more secret. They have not stopped spying on common citizens. Decision-takers were not disturbed in their privacy although they violate our privacy. The actions of these courageous people were only a nuisance. Attacks pinpointed the latest crimes of the controllers but spying happened also in the past by the same leaders and that has been accepted. We do not need Assange or Snowden to know we are spied upon. We know it already but nobody does anything to stop it. All attacks of the 99% are directed against the system and the answer is at the most some reform of the system though hardly in favour of the privacy of citizens. The same leaders who ordered the spying are still on top of the spying agencies, have still the same idea that spying is necessary to control us.

Attack is the best defence but most actions are defensive, reactions on leaders who sack, foreclose, raise taxes, install new spying devices etc. Actions do not ask why and who take decisions. Actions are not directed on the question why leaders who take wrong decisions remain in power. Authorities are not forced to answer on protests. They know that most protest dies out in a few weeks and that their position remains unchallenged. Actions should stealthily intrude the exclusive world of decisions-takers just as they stealthily invade our private life. Actions should undermine the mentality that leads to wrong decisions and not only attack new wrong decisions while old wrong decisions remain. We should control, veto, and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate our freedom, privacy and well-being on our way on the places and reasons we decide. Then they have to react and we can force real change.

Chapter 24

Whining, complaining and crying out loud and then it stops

Old actions are not analysed, new actions are not proposed

Most political messages on Facebook, Twitter etc. are sulking, whining and complaining, crying out loud, saying there is a problem but then it stops. A next message sulks, whines and complains about a completely different subject. Something terrible is happening, the government is bad, a new law restricts still more the freedom of common citizens, the rich become richer and richer, the poor are growing in number, All comments are about what others do, but what do the whiners? They have not even an inkling of an idea how to change the bad situation, only saying it is bad and then it stops.

There is not a beginning of change, laws are criticised but when an even stricter law is proposed the old law is forgotten and all attention is drawn to the new law. They jump from one subject to the next without even thinking what is the result of their twaddle. Some groups stick by one subject and analyse to the smallest details what is wrong. But they do not know what to do with this knowledge. The 99% can only use it to show their dissatisfaction in talks with other 99%. Not very inspiring.

Such protests are not successful, they do not force authorities to take different decisions. It is not resistance but at the most contributes something to a certain awareness. But most awareness actions underestimate what people know and feel. Street actions in Turkey showed that The People were very aware that something is terribly wrong. They joined in great numbers a not so important struggle for the preservation of a small park in Istanbul. Dissatisfaction with the general political and economic situation caused massive activities against the powers that be. Awareness actions had not been necessary.

Why should the 99% join actions when they know those actions do not change anything. The restriction of our freedom and the massive collection of data continues to intensify. The masses know but keep silent because nobody listens when they complain. Complaining is depressing, you better keep your complaints to yourself and only bring them forward when there is real action. Why should you read time and again that the world is bad, you know that already. Just look for the bright sides of life because complaining does not bring relieve.

Many people like it when the masses come out on the streets. Alas, the fights are only with the police and not with the real culprits, the 1% or the lackeys in the public and private sector. The results are mostly disappointing and after a short time mass

Towards a world without a 1%

revolts wither away. Unconsciously the 99% agree with the Golden Rule for Actions. Fighting with security forces changes nothing. It may have some positive effects but only the 99% have to lick their wounds. It is an important reason why the 99% withdraw in their private circles to make the best of it.

Most activities on internet or on the street are reactions on what the other side just has done. A new law was introduced in the USA about the NSA to spy on all citizens. Protest! But the state spies already a long time on citizens, this law is only one more step to control The People. It is striking that crime, corruption and greed seem to fall outside this control. George Orwell described in his book 1984 already a long time ago the future of a controlled society.

Protests of the past are forgotten and new laws result in new protests, new complaints and new whinings. What about the myriads of cameras that control our whereabouts? What about our financial activities that can be seen by the state? What about the registration of our whereabouts via GPS on phones. Or the spying on our financial data and habits, on our email and other electronic messages. On where we travel to by car, bus, plane or train. Many personal data are collected by the private and public sector in huge storage tanks that only can be used by authorities who control and restrict our freedom.

Before the NSA our freedom was already restricted and all protests did not have any influence on the coming of even worse laws. Awareness actions are depressing, you listen for a while, agree with what is said, but then you close your ears and listen to more agreeable things. Because leaders do not listen.

There is no continuity in actions. In the Squatters Movement I proposed long-term actions. When we had squatted a house from a greedy house-owner, the house was sometimes retaken by the police. Why should we not make known that the house could not be used by anybody. That people who bought this house should know that even after ten years their house could become a target of actions. The movement did not agree. They were too busy with short-term actions, squatting other houses, sometimes keeping it for new residents, sometimes losing it to people who wanted to earn a lot of money. The movement had many small successes but when the government was more and more repossessing houses, the movement withered away. You do not squat anymore when you know that the squatted house will be lost in a few months.

Carrying out actions must not be whining and complaining, not protesting and begging authorities to change decisions but forcing authorities to do otherwise. That is resistance, acting in our own way against targets we select and not reacting on targets authorities select. We should not be dependent on what the other side does. Attack those points that are difficult to defend. We must act and not react!

Hackers and Anonymous have more initiative. They attack not yet the 1% but they are unpredictable. The other side hardly knows what to do against them. We should

Towards a world without a 1%

be offensive and not defensive. Offensive activities are connected with a beautiful future, with what we can do to reach that future. But there is no initiative, no pressure on who decides. We need new action ideas to get a better world. There are hardly discussions how to develop an offensive policy against decision-takers. Actions against the 1% are non-existent.

Where were actions of Occupy against greedy grabbers? By attacking the 1% you go outside the system. Political groups had too much influence and restrict themselves to acting within the laws. (We have freedom of expression! We are allowed to demonstrate! Camping on squares is allowed according to the law!). The power of the 1% has to be attacked. We must transgress and evade the boundaries of the law. We must not be controlled by laws made by the people we attack.

The slogan "We are the 99%" is beautiful because it unites all people except the 1% who are different. We have to find the best means to attack this target with our common sense and without complaining. The 1% are motivated by money. We must use new tactics to creatively disturb the separated, extravagant and exclusive world of the 1%, build on blood money extracted from the 99%.

When we complain nothing changes, when we have the initiative, we win!

Chapter 25

Awareness actions are superfluous

The 99% know the world is wretched but they don't know how to get a better world

“One of the symptoms of revolution is the sudden increase in the number of ordinary people who take an active interest in politics”. (Lenin) The 99% know a lot and why should they become active when there is no prospect on success or real change? People who fought in revolutionary struggles did not analyse society, did not read first the works of Marx, Bakunin, Lenin or Mao Tse-tung. Most 99% could not even read and fought with their heart. During the struggle they got more knowledge how to fight. Awareness actions without practical successes and without information how to use the new knowledge are superfluous.

Despite all awareness actions, awareness has not increased in the last fifty years. Awareness activists intend to make common people clear that something is wrong. But the propaganda apparatus of the 1% cannot be defeated by propaganda by activists who lack money to beat the 1% on their own grounds. We must use our own means and circumvent the defence apparatus of the 1%. Awareness increases when our actions are successful. We must not use words, placards or the hope that something appears in the media, we must develop power in actions, we must have the initiative and not copy what the enemy is doing.

For whom did Friedrich Engels wrote in 1845 “The condition of the working class in England”? Workers knew already that 4408 out of 10.000 kids died before they were five years old. That 1006 adults out of 10.000 died before they reached the age of 39. When you do not say what to do with this knowledge you are an academic or a journalist, not an activist. Telling people how rotten society is (awareness) and not offering possibilities for change does not bring revolution nearer. The revolts of 1848 were not caused by books but by the growing realisation that enough is enough. Awareness had not been necessary, the Parisian masses knew already that something was wrong.

Most actions are awareness actions. Telling people what is wrong in the world. When start activists to change from awareness actions to actions that force the 1% to behave differently? When 10 per cent of the people are aware, or 30 or 50? How do you know how many people are aware? Who are you to teach the 99%? Do you understand exactly how the 1% rule over the 99%? In sudden mass revolts as in the Arab Spring, the Ukraine, Thailand, Brazil etc. awareness under the 99% was already at a high level. Then people stand open for more knowledge. In quiet times it is

Towards a world without a 1%

superfluous to tell the 99% time and again how bad the world is without indicating what to do now with this knowledge.

The 99% have hardly time to listen to awareness actions, they have to secure their existence. They are the no-future generation that only lives in the present. Sid Vicious of The Sex Pistols sang already in 1977 *“When there is no future how can there be sin, we are the flowers in the dustbin”*. They become active when a new future looms. Instead of awareness actions there should be actions how to get power.

Knowledge is only power when you have the means to exert power. Awareness should be combined with ideas how to use the new knowledge for concrete steps in the direction of a better world. Otherwise awareness becomes frustrating, again is told that we are poor and inferior, that we don't get paid enough, that the world is racist, anti-women, full of corrupt people who plunder our world at our cost, that the climate is being destroyed, that ten million kids are yearly dying before they are five years old. We know that already but what can we do?

Why should you continuously tell people what is wrong in the world? Do you think the 99% are stupid, that they do not see that the wealth and power gap is growing, that corruption and privileges are rife in higher circles? Why should the 99% listen to you? Does more knowledge about what is rotten lead to improvements? Knowledge only grows and is used when the 99% see how they can use knowledge successfully.

In past years there have been many protests against the restriction of our privacy, camera's all over the town, emails and telephone calls intercepted etc. Despite all protests still more laws restrict our freedom. This kind of awareness actions has not changed the situation. We need militant actions that pressure people who tighten control over the 99% to make them numbers in their accounting system.

Awareness actions remain within the borders of the present society. Occupy advanced demands outside these borders: “Occupy the Financial Centres!” That attracted many 99% who were already aware of the negative role of greedy bankers. When there were no actions interest in Occupy went down. Nothing was learned from the militant history of the Black Panther Party or the Malcolm X Movement. Successes were rare, there was no lasting improvement, so the 99% withdrew from Occupy. The refused to listen to people who wanted to make them still more aware.

We should not tell what is wrong but who is wrong and what to do against faulty leaders. Who makes these laws, grabs our money, deprives us of our work, does not protect our homes against hurricanes etc. Awareness actions are spilled energy when they are not accompanied by militant actions against the culprits. On Twitter, Facebook and other social media most messages are awareness messages. There are hardly discussions about how to get another Humane World. All energy used in protest and awareness actions could better be used in organising and carrying out actions against the 1%.

Towards a world without a 1%

We should learn from the words of Jean-Paul Marat that we must control what leaders do, veto when they take wrong decisions and when they do not listen punish them who violate our freedom, privacy and well-being.

The 1% is our target but I see hardly any action that targets faulty leaders who live in extravagant mansions and do not have any idea about the problems of the 99%.

PART D

For a revolution we need movements and not organisations

Only when the 99% move they stand open for new ideas. Then revolutions can succeed. Organisations are embedded in the political structure and restrict the creativity and individuality of activists. Organisations are static and vulnerable because they have leaders and possessions, movements are elusive and volatile. Many small successes inspire the 99% and undermine the power of the 1%. Mass uprisings and revolts on the streets in town centres are not revolutions because the central power of the 1% who live elsewhere is not undermined. We need leaderless movements with a clear target: the 1%. The new paradigm that all people have the same status leads to a world without a 1%

Chapter 26.....	87
Only movements give change and revolutions	
When the 99% do not move nothing will change	
Chapter 27.....	90
Revolutions need movements, not organisations	
Leaders of organisations restrict the creativity of individual 99%	
Chapter 28.....	93
Movements need successes but what is success?	
Positive results inspire the 99% otherwise they become disillusioned	
Chapter 29.....	97
How to get successes with Autonomous Clubs	
New and more effective action methods by small groups of activists	
Chapter 30.....	100
Success after real actions of an Autonomous Club	

Towards a world without a 1%

A practical example of an action by a small Autonomous Club

Chapter 31..... 103

Mass actions are revolts and not (yet) revolutions

Even millions of 99% on the streets gives us no lasting power

Chapter 32..... 106

Egypt, revolution or revolt?

Mass actions cause a lot of damage to the 99% but the 1% continue to rule

Chapter 33..... 109

Changing the money paradigm in the same status paradigm

The idea that all people have the same status should dominate all actions

Chapter 34..... 112

Changing the minds of the 99% and of the 1%

The same status paradigm will penetrate and change all minds role of money

Chapter 26

Only movements give change and revolutions

When the 99% do not move, nothing will change

Movements cannot be organised, they arise spontaneously caused by the accumulating dissatisfaction of the 99%. When movements are controlled by organisations they wither away. Movements have vague concepts based on great ideas and clear goals that unite the 99%. They have neither leaders nor members, only enthusiast people who find they belong to a nationwide or even worldwide movement willing to do something to realise the goals of the movement.

Sometimes movements change in mass uprisings but it are not yet revolutions. In uprisings the 99% are still protesting, in a revolution they directly attack the power of the leading class. Therefore new action methods must be used because all actions in past revolutions did not succeed in changing the power and money relations to create a world without a 1% in which all people have the same status.

The bad housing situation in The Netherlands during the seventies forced some people to squat some of the many houses that stood empty. Suddenly the Squatters Movement came into being. It was a real movement. Unknown common citizens said to squatters "Hey, near me a house stands empty, can you squat it?" In demonstrations protesters were warned by unknown lookers-on for undercover policemen. In the anti-establishment movements of the sixties many individuals let their hair grow and protested against the strict rules without any support of organisations. The general ideas of these movements activated many people. That hardly happened anymore after 1985. But it can occur again.

A small movement recently started in the north of The Netherlands. The extraction of gas deep under the villages causes earthquakes. People become more and more annoyed. Suddenly many people took to the streets, people who had never been political active before. Then it is possible to introduce new action methods that directly put pressure on leaders who care more for money than for the well-being of the 99%.

Movements are always spontaneously and ignited by a single spark that started the prairie fire. But the basic cause is accumulated dissatisfaction – not enough houses, discrimination of women, continuing small earthquakes, growing corruption, increasing number of lies of politicians etc. The accumulation of discontent takes many years. After the decolonisation in the sixties the first twenty years were filled by a (dwindling) hope on a better society. The next thirty years the situation did not improve for the masses while the top of society became richer and richer and more and more greedy and dictatorial. Then people started to move. Movements sprang up

Towards a world without a 1%

everywhere. Indonesia, Thailand, Brazil, Turkey, The Arab Spring, The Ukraine, Venezuela, Colombia, India, Pakistan, Bangla Desh, China, Greece, Spain, The Congo etc.

In the last fifty years I have been involved or have been present in many movements in Europe but also in countries as Indonesia, Thailand or Colombia. I have seen the fury of the masses and also the inspiration movements gave for a better future, a future that was destroyed by the greedy selfish top. Maybe it takes twenty or thirty years but then the masses break out. Then they are willing to fight, then they can learn how to attack the prime cause of all misery, the existence of a 1%, a bunch of greedy people who only care about their own future. These mass happenings are not caused by political organisations that strive to improve the situation of the people only a little bit. They are spontaneously caused by people who say "Enough is enough!" It is a wonderful time and leads to a better future when the energy of the masses is directly turned against the real culprits, the 1% and their political lackeys.

In movements, people move, they are freer, they reject the rules imposed on them by people high above them. Their behaviour becomes unpredictable, chaotic. It is part of the chaos that can lead to a revolution. Organisations are sitting ducks. Authorities can attack leaders and possessions. Movements don't have leaders or possessions, they are elusive. There are no fixed points where security forces can attack. Actions are unpredictable. Disturbing the private living sphere of the 1% can happen anywhere. The 1% has become the sitting duck, the 99% have the initiative. The driving factor is the common goal, taking the money and power away from the 1% by controlling, vetoing and eventually punishing faulty leaders that violate the freedom, privacy and the well-being of the 99%.

Movements have no organisational structure, there are no rules, only ideas. Activists decide which actions should take place and which tactics may be used. Occupy withered away when self-appointed leaders demanded that the movement should be non-violent. Jean-Paul Marat said in the far past: *"It was easy to distinguish sham magazines from the true "People's Friend" because their authors always preached peace, tolerance, patience, submission to laws etc."*

A Movement for a Humane World has room for all 99%, be it street fighters of the Black Bloc, supporters of the Tea Party, football hooligans or people who live in old people's homes, it is not right or left, it is an autonomous experience of the masses. Everyone can do something on his own way and in his own time to promote the idea that all people have the same status. Actions should concentrate on making the world of the 1% uninhabitable, making their life so chaotic that they can no longer use their power over the 99%. They need order, the people some chaos.

Movements are volatile, people move and should not occupy squares, amass possessions or have paid leaders. Movements are offensive, organisations must defend the organisation and its possessions. Organisations differ essentially from movements, they are dependent on the money paradigm having paid leaders,

Towards a world without a 1%

employees and possessions and a power structure that resembles the elitist power pyramid, powerful people at the top and foot soldiers down under. They are easy targets for the opponent. They do not comply with the same status paradigm. They have partial demands within the existing society about which they discuss with the top of society. Maybe they alleviate the inferior position of the 99% a little but they do not challenge why the 99% are in a bad situation. Some people advanced soon after the start of Occupy partial political demands. They wanted only small changes and changed the Movement Occupy in the Organisation Occupy. It had no success, the 99% withdrew from Occupy.

We do not need leaders who negotiate with leaders of society. In the words of Marat *“we must not be involved in the process of making decisions we only punish the perpetrators of crimes against public and individual freedom or safety”*. Movements only control, veto and punish faulty and corrupt leaders. That are already elements that we need in a future society. Small Autonomous Groups of interested and involved citizens put pressure on leaders at the top of the power pyramid. The new society does not have a power pyramid.

Another kind of society cannot be negotiated. Then faulty leaders remain on top, old powers have still the possibility to regain their power. That is not possible when the 99% have learned how to take the power and money away from any 1%. It is a protracted struggle that ends when the 1% has lost their privileged position, lost their surplus of money and power.

When there are no negotiations we do not need one-sided media. We must force leaders to behave differently and then the media may decide if they want to write about that change. Media are owned by the 1% and because the arrows of the 99% are directed at people at the top, you cannot expect that media write favourably about such a struggle.

Movements should never cooperate with organisations that curtail the initiative and creativity of active citizens to boost the organisation. The Dutch Provo Movement in the sixties withered away when some people participated in elections by using the name provo. The same will happen with the Pirates Movement and other movements that still trust the parliamentary structure. Taking part in elections kills the initiative of individual followers, redirect most energy to a goal that has very restricted results. Individual independence necessary for a Humane World is destroyed by changing movements in organisations.

Only a movement in which people independently decide how to be active can lead to a revolution and to a completely different kind of society.

Chapter 27

Revolutions need movements not organisations

Leaders of organisations restrict the creativity of individual 99%

Organisations have a pyramidal structure with leaders at the top and soldiers at the basis. They are not the right instrument to open the road to a society without a 1%, a society without a pyramid of power and money. Such organisations carry already the seeds from which a new 1% can grow. That is proven after communist revolutions. “Revolutionary” organisations are deeply influenced by the dominating money paradigm. They have paid leaders, offices, employees and costly possessions. Orders come from above as in the society they want to change. For a revolution we need something different. Mao Tse-tung saw that his best strategy in the guerrilla war was to defend nothing, that conceals the weakness of the communist forces and exploits their strength, the capacity to move at speed and appear at the time and the place of their choosing, surprising the enemy. That is not possible when the organisation has possessions.

In the new society the 99% have more freedom and an independent power. In the revolution they should not be controlled by leaders because the 99% must learn how to get individual power, they must not be dependent on what other people think but use their own ideas. Occupy failed from the beginning to become a leaderless movement. Decisions were taken in general meetings by people who had the time and the money to be present. Decisions were taken on the basis of consensus by a small group of would-be leaders. It denied that many different tactics could be used. But only peaceful demonstrations were allowed and activists who defended themselves against the violence of the police were attacked as not belonging to Occupy. General meetings should be scarce and used to exchange ideas, not to prescribe how people must behave in actions. It was the beginning of the transformation of the Movement Occupy in the Organisation Occupy.

Jean Paul Marat advanced two centuries ago ideas about Autonomous Clubs: “We will never be a club that is involved in the process of making decisions. That should be a serious mistake: a free union of citizens is not allowed to meddle in public affairs, to govern or to administrate”. In another society the 99% control, veto and punish leaders who “perpetrate crimes against the public and individual freedom and safety”. People decide when they control and then take action. That cannot be ordered by leading activists in general meetings.

Towards a world without a 1%

The 99% should not listen to leaders that call upon them to become active on the way leaders are propagating. General guidelines should be discussed but actions are the responsibility of small Clubs of trusted people. These Clubs decide who is violating their safety and well-being. They decide when, where, how with whom and against whom they become active. In the revolution the 99% develop special skills that are needed in the new society to prevent that a new 1% arises. The Fourth People's Power is not an organisation, it is a loose coalition of many small Autonomous Clubs that become active when they want that.

Partial political demands as a small raise in wages can also be reached by pressuring people involved in the wage structure but it does not change the structure of society. Autonomous Clubs are not involved in governing, giving guidelines how society should be organised but care that leaders do their work in the right way. That they not favour the already privileged with high bonuses while incomes on the floor hardly rise. Mass movements of the past had specific demands to improve society a little, Autonomous Clubs work to change the minds of decision-takers so they take into account all people in the same way.

Revolutionary movements are leaderless and demandless. They are unpredictable in their actions because there is no guideline how and where actions should be held. Except for the Golden Rule for Actions that the 99% should be hardly damaged. They are not guided by rules or orders from above but by basic ideas, by applying the idea that all people have the same status. The possibilities of revolutionaries are limited when their actions are restricted because of the danger for the existence of the organisation.

Robert Michels formulated more than a century ago his "Iron Law of Oligarchy" after the study and analysis of trade-unions and other big political organisations. After some time organisations of free people change in organisations with leaders who decide what members should do. They copy the hierarchical structure of the rest of society and do not belong to the new society. Common members have hardly influence on decisions that are taken in far off and unreachable places. Elections give citizens only in theory some power, in practice the influence is next to nothing.

Small Autonomous Clubs do not obey the Iron Law. Actions stand central and how these actions are carried out is the responsibility of individual activists. The binding factor is that all activities are concentrated on the 1% and on the defence of the interests of the 99%. Only the 1% are disturbed by such actions, the 99% remain out of range.

Movements should not get involved with organisations that are embedded in society even when they seem sympathetic. Trade-unions may have contributed to an increase in wages but they have done nothing to stop the increasing difference in incomes between the top of society and the bottom. They have the narrow goal of improving the situation of workers. When movements start to work with such organisations they wither away because the freedom to carry out actions is restricted.

Towards a world without a 1%

The history of the Black Panther Party illustrates this process. Founded on the great idea of militant and armed defence of the rights of blacks the movement grew from the founding in 1965 to the top in 1969. Then it started to wither away, partly because it became strictly organised, partly because demands for partial improvements replaced revolutionary ideas that could lead to real equality. Community activities that started in 1971 could not prevent the demise of the Party. People lost the possibility to act individually as had been possible at the start of the Party. After 1970 all new initiatives were smothered by the demands of the organisation.

The same withering away occurred in the Occupy Movement when the idea to “Occupy the Financial Centres” was replaced by partial demands. Community activities replaced activities that could lead to a fundamental change. Demonstrations, petitions, strikes, attention for politicians and their political games do not change anything. Attacks on the 1% were suppressed by people who wanted the Movement Occupy to change in the Organisation Occupy. There were never actions in front of the private houses of bankers and only a few in front of banks, never in front of the houses of CEO’s but only a few in front of offices of corporations. Action goals were guided by the structure of society that had personalised corporations and not by the role of greedy people who used that structure for their own benefit.

The idea that each action should contribute to the great goal of taking the money and power away from the 1% was abandoned. New ideas as the demand that all people have the same status, new action tactics by intruding in the living sphere of the 1% and clear targets, the wealth of the 1%, are the only possibility to enter a Humane World.

Chapter 28

Movements need success but what is success?

Positive results inspire the 99% otherwise they become disillusioned

Movements thrive on long series of small successes. Examples are the Women's Liberation Movement and the Squatters Movement. Women got a better place in society and young people a place to live. All successes remained inside the possibilities of the present society, there were no revolutionary goals. Occupy started with revolutionary ideas (Occupy the Financial Centres!) but soon these goals were replaced by small political demands. By lack of successes Occupy withered away.

Is it a success when there are 10,000 strikers, 20,000 protesters or 100,000 signatures under a petition? Tremendous efforts and a lot of money are used to activate people. The higher the number the greater the success, according to the organisers. The number of houses squatted or the number of discriminatory laws changed is a success, not the number of people that participated. Without visible successes many activists will retreat from any activism.

Occupy seemed a new movement but suffered from the number argument. "We are strong, we are revolutionary because we occupy many squares!" The number argument disappeared when the squares were cleared and Occupy had no further successes. The top of society was not impressed by many people on squares in town centres, they lived elsewhere and were not disturbed. There had hardly been discussions about what to do. Past movements were not analysed and most actions were copies of unsuccessful events from the past. The lack of successes is the reason why the number of strikes goes down and why movements virtually ceased to exist after 1985.

Instead of moving Occupy became a sitting duck. New slogans that gave enthusiasm, inspiration and hope were discarded. "Occupy the Financial Centres" pointed to the culprits of the economic and financial crisis but actions against bankers were rare. The second slogan, "We are the 99%", included the idea that there was thus a 1% that was different and should be the target. Soon the term 1% disappeared from discussions and attention was directed on political lackeys.

New ideas to attack the centre of power were replaced by old ideas that had not prevented that the 1% got richer and more powerful. A central guiding slogan could be: "We must take the power and the money away from the 1%". But Occupy restricted itself to partial political demands or helping people in hurricane areas who should be supported by the government. The top of society was not impressed by out-dated actions or by people on squares in town centres.

Towards a world without a 1%

It is success when leading people change decisions. The Anti-Nuclear Movement did not achieve this target. After a fairly short existence the movement nearly disappeared. Even after Fukushima it did not resurge. A long series of victories occurs when the 1% start to complain in the media they are prevented to make money with their activities that should bring humanity further. But with humanity they mean their own group, with progress the thickness of their wallets. What happens to the 99% is secondary. The media promote this idea by saying that economy is booming though incomes of the 99% go down.

Anti-Monsanto actions or the struggle against the exploitation of shale-gas are also not very successful. Action leaders still hope the 1% listen to their complaints. There is hardly pressure on politicians and none at all on the 1%. In secret backrooms the 1% instruct political servants to give free way to GM-food and environmental damaging exploration of shale-gas. There is no influence of common citizens.

In the last years there were massive demonstrations in developing and South-European countries. Austerity measures were not stopped and actions as the Orange Revolution in the Ukraine or the Arab Spring did not improve the situation of the 99%. The old 1% remained in power and it became difficult to make the 99% enthusiast for new massive actions. Because of lack of successes and small victories through old-fashioned actions people withdrew in their private living situation. Even when there are some successes, protestors may hesitate to return to the streets. The damage to the 99% is too big and they feel they remain outsiders in all decisions.

To get another society, we need successes that accumulate over time and then suddenly we jump to a different world. A Revolutionary Movement has no demands, it has the goal to bring a Humane Society nearer by changing power relations. A first success is when decision-takers start to react defensively on pressure from unknown assailants, a second when they start to change decisions. Activists remain mostly anonymous and do not tell which decision should be taken. They only control, veto and punish faulty leaders. There are no negotiations because the most powerful party can manipulate any negotiation.

In the new society decisions are not dominated by money but by the idea that all people have the same status. Actions and successes should be connected with this idea. Leading people take decisions. When pressure from the 99% increases the 1% are forced to change decisions in favour of the 99%. That is a success. Other leaders oppose this change and the homogeneous elite starts to fall apart. Now leaders find themselves high above the 99%. They decide. Their status goes down when activists intrude in their world and force them to listen. The status of the 99% rises by seeing that the 1% and their lackeys react.

Past movements moved within the borders of the present society. Activists had specific demands and lost sight on the great line, getting a better society in which problems are easily solved. Trade-unions demand a wage rise of 5%, get 3% but in the meantime wages of the management rise 20% but that is not the problem of the

Towards a world without a 1%

union. When activists start to negotiate with leaders they become part of the decision-making process and lose sight on a society beyond the borders of the present one.

A movement to change society only demands that decisions do not hurt the freedom and well-being of common citizens. Jean-Paul Marat said that an Autonomous Club is *"never be a club that is involved in the process of making decisions. That should be a serious mistake: a free union of citizens is not allowed to meddle in public affairs, to govern or to administrate"*. Another society cannot come into being via negotiations. A Revolutionary Movement forces leaders to take different decisions. Successes must not be found in the number of activists but in reactions and a different behaviour of leaders enforced by activities of common citizens.

Success is never instantaneous, leaders have many methods to cope with pressure from below. The first line of defence is to remain silent. Do not tell that you are pressured. Most protests are short-term and soon life retakes its normal course. This happens with demonstrations. Leaders know that big mass actions occur only a few times and then activists concentrate on other demands in which other leaders are involved. Any pressure on rulers by such old-fashioned actions is short-lived.

When the pressure continues leaders react in the media. Something happens and they use the media to call for support. Reaction can also be seen in their own privileged neighbourhood. In one case a pressured leader installed floodlights around his house and his neighbours did not like it. His behaviour started to change, he became jumpy and started to complain about his situation.

When actions last a few months, leaders start to deny that better decisions are possible. Their decision was the only right one to solve the problem. This denial is a success because leaders defend decisions by reacting on actions of the 99%. Activists who only write letters full of arguments are disregarded. Leaders are not forced to read such letters.

There is now hardly pressure on the top. Most actions are crying out loud in the hope that someone listens. Politicians and other decision-takers listen primarily to the 1% and not to the 99%. In my country hundreds of petitions send each year to Parliament remain unanswered. Petitions, demonstrations, boycotts or strikes do not pressure people who live far up. Actions are too short-lived and not directed at leaders. The desperate crying-outs get lost in the parliamentary desert.

Leaders take decisions about the personal situation of citizens. The 99% do not penetrate in the minds of the top by carrying placards or by crying-out loud in demonstrations, even when tens of thousands of people participate. There are hardly positive results and a next time the 99% remain at home, convinced that nothing helps.

Towards a world without a 1%

Isolated one-time actions against leaders can be shrugged off. It is a nuisance but it belongs to their profession. When their private life is intruded over a longer time, they are forced to react. Everyone sees the small victory when leaders react and change decisions to alleviate the pressure from unknown assailants. Then it becomes clear that decision-takers give attention to lower-downs. It is the beginning of real change.

Chapter 29

How to get success with an Autonomous Club

New and more effective action methods by small groups of activists

I was involved in several real actions of Autonomous Clubs. Here some concrete steps to achieve successes.

First step. Be concerned about a problem, a decision, an injustice that negatively influences the private life of common citizens. You want to change decisions who make the position of the 99% worse. Most actions have hardly success and hurt the 99%. Lost wages after a strike, damages after a fight with the police, lost money and time after an unsuccessful action etc. It does not comply with the Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% must be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing.

Second step. Find some trusted people who are also concerned about the problem. Leaderless Autonomous Clubs have only one goal: forcing leaders to solve the problem. Members of the Club should not have intensive contacts with each other and not increase suddenly the number of contacts. That can be suspect. The safety of activists is of prime importance.

Third step. Be prepared for long-term actions. In the first months there will be hardly reaction, fun is first success comes later. Imagine how targets experience the rising pressure on their private life. "L'imagination au pouvoir", "Imagination should rule" was a slogan in the French Revolt of 1968. Think how leading people react on unknown and surprising activities when their private life is invaded. Never expect much. Many people stopped being active after two massive blockades of a Dutch nuclear plant. People who could close the plant lived elsewhere and were not personally disturbed. Activists became disappointed, the goal of the action was too high. Closing a nuclear plant cannot be achieved in a few days by a few thousand people in front of the plant.

Fourth step. Remain anonymous as long as possible to avoid repercussions. Do not brag about the action to other people, it endangers activists and does not give more pressure. It is not necessary that all members of the Club know each other. General meetings should be avoided. For the own safety have an alibi when you carry out an action. Be surprising and creative. Do not use too often the same telephone when calling a target.

Fifth step. Do not offer solutions for the problem, only control, veto and punish faulty leaders. People who took wrong decisions have to decide differently after

Towards a world without a 1%

which we again control, veto and punish. Our demand is that the original decision is changed. We must not become involved in governing by proposing solutions.

Sixth step. Determine which persons have power to change decisions. Too many targets weaken the pressure. Select a bigger group of people as family members, employees, scientists, journalists, owners of clubs, restaurants or hotels the target often frequent etc, who are in some way acquainted with the target or the problem. Inform them about the objectionable deeds of the target. Time and again he may then be asked what is happening. Friends do not want to become disturbed by actions so the target becomes isolated.

Seventh step. Collect private data as telephone numbers, email addresses, signatures, IP-addresses, second houses, most frequented places, their friends, their contacts, their fixed routes along which they travel to their work, secondary jobs, hobbies etc.

Up till now there has not been any action, only the formation of an Autonomous Club, the selection of the targets, the collection of data and the planning of possible actions. No risk for the activists, no pressure on the targets.

Eighth step. After the preparations actions start. Do not plan everything beforehand, remain creative and adapt to changing situations. Time is on our side so actions may even stop for months and then start again. Activists are inspired by the wish to be active and not by a self-imposed compulsion to carry out actions. Start pressure on the private life of decision-takers who violate the freedom and privacy of common citizens. The threat of an action is as important as a real action when the target is convinced that real actions can take place. L'imagination au pouvoir!

Actions should be small and easy to carry out and remain mostly inside the existing laws because of the safety of activists. There are many surprising possibilities. Imagine what a target thinks of a not-burning Molotov-cocktail without any fingerprints at the entrance of his garden. It is hardly punishable. Making contact with one of his friends who is shopping in a mall and explain the faults of the target. It disturbs the target who want to keep quiet about what he does in his work. It is also permitted. In the end threats and real actions dominate his life. Creative and surprising actions increase the uncertainty of the target, what will happen tomorrow, what can I expect next week? Give him the idea that he is everywhere followed by sending him messages telling him where he was in the last few days. Spreading rumours, pamphlets and letters make the wrong decision of the target known to his acquaintances. One of the goals is to isolate him from neighbours and family.

Ninth step. After some months the impact of the actions becomes visible. Targets react. He may send messages around explaining his decisions to his acquaintances or activate media complaining that some thugs are disturbing him. Media do not publish messages from Autonomous Clubs but only from power-bearers.

Towards a world without a 1%

Once a target offered to discuss the problem with the Autonomous Club. That should never have happened when there had not been actions. The Club refused of course, decision-makers decide, Clubs only control, veto and punish. Autonomous Clubs do not negotiate, they refuse to govern.

The greatest success is when decisions are changed. That should never happen when activists only begged or asked for change, when only arguments were forwarded. Begging or asking is only rewarded when decision-takers know that askers have the power to pressure him.

Chapter 30

Success after real actions of an Autonomous Club

A practical example of an action by a small Autonomous Club

The rent in a public housing complex in a small Dutch town suddenly increased by 50%. The efforts of the Tenants Committee to lower the increase were refuted. Some people, not living in the complex, formed an Autonomous Club to correct this gross injustice. I was involved in the activities.

The management of the complex violated many laws and benefited financially from repairs and insurances of the building. This corruption, misuse of power for private gain, was never prosecuted. Two high civil servants of the Ministry of Housing approved the excessive rise in rent though they knew that the activities of the management were dubious. They had not consulted the tenants nor taken into account media reports about embezzlement, corruption and other punishable activities.

The Autonomous Club decided that the civil servants were the prime targets because they failed to protect common citizens and had the power to reverse the decision of the management of the complex. The media had written about the wrong decisions, the rise in rent was vetoed by the tenants and now the Autonomous Club started to punish faulty leaders.

Flyers were distributed in the complex and sent to the media (no reaction), the management, the high civil servants and some other involved people: *“The rent of your flat suddenly increased by a vast amount. Take another example. You buy a TV-set for 600 euro. A year later the salesman asks you another 300 euro because he had miscalculated the price. Then you ridicule him because you paid a reasonable price and you handled in good faith. For a reasonable price and in good faith you rented some years ago a flat and now they want more money because they did something wrong”.*

The flyer contained the names, the private addresses and the telephone numbers of the two civil servants who were in first place responsible for the ridiculous increase of the rent. The flyer continued:

“You and your family can spend every month 200 euro less. It is right that people who are responsible for your loss will suffer also You only have to make sure that in the coming years the two mentioned persons will time and again be remembered of the irresponsible and unfair decision they have taken. Of course you can attack the

Towards a world without a 1%

managers of Saint Hippolytus but they have not the power to bring your rent back to the level you paid before. You have to pressure people who really are to blame and who have the power to turn the decision around..... Your private life is disturbed by these responsible persons while they continue to live their own pleasant life. You have to undertake something”.

The flyer contained some practical tips about what tenants could do against leading persons.

- “1. Call them time and again by preference at a time they do not want to be disturbed.*
- 2. Ask the Telephone Company to connect his telephone to some unknown number in a foreign country.*
- 3. Send telegrams by using their telephone number to arbitrary persons. The costs will be subtracted from their accounts.*
- 4. Send them all kinds of goods by ordering them on their name from mail-order companies.*
- 5. Organise a demonstration in front of their private houses and not in front of the Ministry.*
- 6. Try to use their signature to remit some money from their account to a charitable institution.*
- 7. You may also use some actions that are punishable - they have committed many crimes and will never be punished. Break a window, throw a can with paint over their car, empty a can with used oil in their garden, do something against their second house, against their boat, etceteras.”*

The flyer ended with the words: *“These are only some hints, you can think of much more that disturbs their private life.”* A second flyer said: *..... the burden of faulty decisions cannot always be laid on the shoulders of common citizens. It is necessary that responsible persons are also disturbed in their life”.*

In the meantime members of the Club countless times called the civil servants by phone and carried out several actions in their private living sphere. The reactions on the phone-calls showed that pressure was mounting.

Suddenly without any explanation the increase in rent was lowered by 40%. The Club was not satisfied and continued its actions. Then the rise of the rent was again lowered by 40% and this was accepted by the Tenants Committee.

A clear success of the Autonomous Club. Some unknown tenants joined anonymously the actions of the Club by also intruding in the private life of high-placed civil servants. The full story can be found in Chapter 7 of my book [**The Power of the Autonomous Human**](#), theory and practice of attacks on persons”.

“The attack on the private life of a leader has to be done in secret. Nobody wants to be attacked in his private life. The English say indeed: my home is my castle. Political parties are opposed to attacks on private persons, because political leaders fear that

Towards a world without a 1%

they also can be attacked. Actions only seem to be illegal. It is allowed to ask a civil servant why he has agreed with a ridiculous increase in rent. When he refuses to give a reasonable answer you may ask him again to explain the case and again and again and again. It is also permitted to ask this question at a time the civil servant is off guard, for example at three o'clock in the morning. Maybe then he will tell the real reason for the increase”.

“Most tenants said that such actions were a bridge too far. Later some of them admitted that the attacks on the private life of the civil servants had been an important factor to get a better decision. Next to their own activities the Club had perceived many other actions. Some people who openly said they did not like the actions obviously had secretly also carried out actions to reduce their powerlessness in regard to high-placed gentlemen who take decisions that disturbed their life”.

The action was completed in a reasonable short time. *“It lasted only a few months. Most actions against private persons take longer before you see any effect. But something had to happen to change the decision. Now citizens are damaged by activities of higher-placed who themselves are never disturbed. This inequality must disappear”.*

The Golden Rule for Actions did not work quite well for me. While distributing flyers I was arrested and three days imprisoned on a police station. Later I was acquitted in court. Remain careful but there is always some risk. But less risk than in street actions that are mostly without any positive result.

Chapter 31

Mass actions are revolts and not (yet) revolutions

Even millions of 99% on the streets gives us no lasting power

A Humane World is not ruled by the idea that money dominates all decisions but by the idea that all people have the same status. Such a new world can only come into being after a revolution, a fundamental change of the basic rules that determine society. Not only society but also the 99% change during revolutionary times. They become self-conscious because they have developed an own independent power.

In the last fifty years there have been many spontaneous mass uprisings, The Philippines, Portugal, the Ukraine, Thailand, the Arab Spring or the Turkish revolt. The result was at the most the replacement of some old leaders by new leaders who mostly came from the same circles as the old ones. The 1% remained in power. Sometimes they ousted a few of their kind who had been too greedy and damaged the power and money of the rest of the 1%. The improvement of the life of the 99% was generally disappointing.

Revolts and revolutions are often inspired by economic factors, the deteriorating life of the 99%, the increasing greed of the top or the growing contradiction between life at the bottom and at the top. Most mass revolts occur in developing countries where influence of The People is even less than in rich Western countries. The severe austerity measures initiated by the 1% were the prime reason for Greek and Spanish masses to take to the streets, mostly without success. Mass actions on streets in town centres are not revolutions. Activity of common citizens is a prime condition but without inspiring basic ideas it remains a revolt. Mass actions that do not penetrate in the separated privileged world of the 1% are short-lived and do not result in lasting changes. Actions become a revolution when the power basis of the rulers is attacked and destroyed, when the basic rules on which society is built are changed in rules that benefit all people.

Mass actions are an expression of the wide-spread idea that something is terribly wrong. In rich Western countries there are hardly mass actions. Big demonstrations are generally initiated and organised by leaders of organisations that belong to the existing power structure. Spontaneity of the masses is far away and the results of actions that count hundreds of thousands of participants are disappointing. Such actions keep the masses quiet and under control of lower leaders in the country's power structure.

Towards a world without a 1%

It is less easy to control masses in developing countries. Contradictions and differences between lower and higher layers of society are much greater and the dissatisfaction of the 99% can grow fast. Some reasons are the lack of belief in future improvement or the fear to lose even the most basic means of existence. Mass actions are more probable when top leaders are a long time in power and contradictions inside the 1% are increasing. Mass revolts are an expression of the wish of The People for another society but mostly they are contained by the sitting powers.

Some justified demands of the 99% can be realised without changing the power structure and the wealth distribution. Better housing, higher wages, better education or health care are realised in richer countries. But the basic structure of these societies is the same as in poorer countries, the powerful and wealthy are on top and on the bottom are the 99%. In richer countries the 1% also caused a lot of misery by their financial-economic crisis.

When mass actions have not the expected result many 99% withdraw in their own circles to make the best of it. Mass actions are mostly short-lived and the 1% can afford to wait some time, then activate their power and return at the top of society. That happened in Egypt after the Arab Spring. Actions did not disturb the private life of the 1%. When the situation of the masses does not improve after a revolt it will last some time before The People again take to the streets to fight for a better life. The heavy toll in wounded, arrested, tortured and killed members of the 99% and the scanty results undermine the wish to fight again. "Nothing seems to help", you do not continue participating enthusiastically in mass actions when there are hardly positive results.

A prime example is the Ukraine where a corrupt president was chased away in the Orange Revolution of 2005 at the cost of great damage to protesters. A new president was elected who was as corrupt and cruel as the chased one. In 2010 new elections were held and the ousted corrupt president won without any revolt in the streets. The Ukraine people had learned their lesson, street demonstrations were harmful for the own people, people at the top were not disturbed and hardly anything changed. Why should you again risk your life.

In 2013 new mass revolt happened. This time about the association of the country to Russia or the EU. The power structure was again not attacked and this revolt will again increase disappointment. To be under the Russian top or under the European top does not make much difference. Because the economic reasons for the revolt were obscured by differences in language and origin the 99% became divided and leaders could continue to rule.

One of the leaders of the revolt (as was the case in the Orange Revolution) want to become the new president. He will be as corrupt as past presidents. A revolt in which leaders negotiate with sitting powers does not change the basic inequality in power

Towards a world without a 1%

and money. It brings no progress. Ataturk said once: *“Those who are inclined to compromise can never make revolution”*.

Revolts without lasting change only increase the dissatisfaction of the 99% who realise they are powerless against the greedy top. For a revolution more is needed than a few hundred thousand people in the streets in town centres. A revolution needs great ideas about a promising future.

The transition from revolt to revolution, from possible minor improvements to a completely different Humane World is difficult. A revolt activates people by using partial political demands. During the revolt it is nearly impossible to change these targets into revolutionary ones, the destruction of the existing power structure. A revolution needs a prime target and new action methods. It challenges the sitting powers. The new leading and inspiring ideas for a revolution can be summarised in one simple sentence: We must take the money and the power away from the 1%.

Chapter 32

Egypt, revolution or revolt?

Mass actions caused a lot of damage to the 99% but the 1% continued to rule

I like people's uprisings because it shows the 99% are still alive. Revolts express the hope on a better world. An uprising is however not a revolution and most uprisings do not result in real change. Actions restricted to mass gatherings on streets in town centres do not disturb the power structure. Some attacks maybe directed against the most visible oppressing opponents, the police, but the 1% remain untouched. The Egyptian army was only used after two years of street activities to help the Egyptian 1% to retake their place at the top of society.

Many Egyptians became politically active against the misery of their existence that stood in sharp contradiction to the lack of misery for the leading classes. But it remained a revolt and was not a revolution, the misery continued. A revolt is a people's insurrection against injustices, a protest against the miserable situation. After the protest the country is again ruled by the same people as before and relations between rulers and ruled hardly changed. The revolting masses have still no influence on decisions after the revolt dies down.

Revolutions are guided by great ideas about another kind of society. The French Revolution was guided by the idea of Liberty, Equality and Brotherhood, the Russian Revolution by the slogan All Power to the Soviets, the Chinese Revolution by the idea of a new Communist Society. Revolutions strive for a different kind of society, revolts for improvements within the existing power relations. Great ideas were missing in Egypt. The driving force was "we want a better life". The masses fought united but after the very top of the 1% (Mubarak) was removed old differences resurged and the 99% were again divided in secular and religious masses. The 1% could easily regain power because they had never been the prime target.

The basic ideas on which societies are built are not changed by revolts. The presence of a 1% with more power and money than anyone else was not challenged. The revolting Egyptian masses were compelled to act because of growing differences between rulers and ruled, growing misery, lack of a bright future and rising tensions under the 99%. It was supported by internal difficulties in the 1% because the Mubarak clan claimed too much power and money for the own group. Suddenly enough was enough and a small spark caused a prairie fire (Mao Tse-tung). The Arab Spring was started by a self-immolation in Tunisia and spread to other countries. But actions did not undermine the power of the 1% who have a good grip on the army that is involved in much of the economy. After two years of mass actions,

Towards a world without a 1%

the 1% used the secular army to retake power by exploiting and intensifying old contradictions inside the 99%.

In other Arab countries the army was not strong enough and the split in the 1% too deep. In Libya some members of the 1% used tribal backgrounds to get a bigger piece of the pie than under Gaddafi. Also in Tunisia different sections of the 1% fight each other often using contradictions between secular and religious masses. In Syria masses are activated along religious lines. For a revolution a unified 99% is needed to conquer the principal reason for their misery, the 1%. None of these countries saw direct attacks on the 1% so it cannot be expected that a new power structure comes into being. There is still a power pyramid with the 1% on top and the 99% down under. The Arab Spring is a justified revolt of the dissatisfied masses but it is not a revolution.

The recent history of Egypt saw changes in the top of society but not in the life, the power and the well-being of the masses. In 1952 King Farouk was ousted by a military coup and allowed to leave the country, the not-royal greedy rich were too much hindered by the greed of the royal family. The first president was Mohammed Naguib (1952-1956) who was ousted by the second president Gamal Abdel Nasser (1956-1970). One of the main reasons was the growing influence of the Muslim Brotherhood that was in contradiction to the ideas of Nasser who wanted a secular society (with the military on top). The Moslem Brotherhood tried to kill Nasser in 1954 and the military cracked down on the organisation. In 1970 Anwar Sadat became president and he was murdered in 1981 by fundamentalist officers.

Under the Fourth president, Hosni Mubarak (1981-2011), the power of the military-economic complex increased but the situation of common citizens hardly improved and dissatisfaction grew. The Brotherhood got more freedom and became the only organised political force. The contradiction between the affluent 1% and the Egyptian people continued to grow. Inside the 1% the Mubarak clan demanded more money and power for the own fraction. Dissatisfaction grew also under the 1%. After thirty years The People revolted. Secular and Muslim people worked together to oust the Mubarak clan. The revolt was supported by parts of the 1% who were threatened by the growing greed of the Mubaraks.

Mubarak was arrested but power relations were not changed. Of the three groups, two had a clear plan. The 1% (minus the Mubaraks) wanted to preserve the military-economic complex as the most powerful factor in the country. The Muslim Brotherhood wanted a religious future. The rest of the masses just wanted a better life. Soon the masses realised that the Brotherhood preferred religion over the improvement of daily life. The secular masses did not have a clear idea where their revolt should lead to and in the end preferred the army over the Brotherhood, both paternalistic powers that wanted to control the masses. They did not realise that a new paradigm was needed, that money should be replaced by the idea that all

Towards a world without a 1%

people have the same status. This is of course in contradiction to a religious state in which a religious 1% rules over the people.

Only great ideas and the undermining of the power centre can guide people towards a new society. The military had not been under any pressure. The removal of the Fifth president Mohammed Morsi was applauded by protesters on the squares but the military move was only inspired by the wish to protect the position of the 1%. The Brotherhood threatened this position just as it had tried before to oust Nasser and Sadat.

Though it is great that the Egyptian masses have shown such an intensive activity, the revolt hardly improved the position of the 99%. It did not lead to a world without a 1%. The 1% remained on top with more power and money than anyone else. The Arab Spring is a revolt and not a revolution. It did not become a revolution because only a slightly better society was demanded. The masses did not try to force a fundamental change with the possibility on a much better life. Mostly by lack of great inspiring ideas that serve as a guide for actions the step to a Humane World without a 1% has not been taken.

Chapter 33

Changing the money paradigm in the same status paradigm

The idea that all people have the same status should dominate all decisions

All societies are founded on basic ideas, on paradigms. The 1% use their power to strengthen the present paradigm that money rules. Any activity is judged by the effect it has on the flow of money that goes from down below to the upper layers. Money dominates everything, people are secondary. A paradigm shift, replacing the dominant role of money by the idea that all people have the same status, is a revolution. It supports the idea that movements must be leaderless because leaders have another status than followers.

Thomas S. Kuhn wrote in 1962 about paradigm shifts in science in his famous book *"The Structure of Scientific Revolutions"*. In the period between two revolutions scientists apply the old paradigm on existing problems. He calls this kind of science the solving of puzzles. Not all problems can be solved in this way. *"The failure of the existing rules is the prelude to a search for new ones"*. In the present world many big problems cannot be solved on the puzzle-solving manner. A new paradigm is needed to solve unsolvable problems as the continuing misery for a great part of humanity, poverty, hunger, wars, illnesses, racism, discrimination, etc. These problems are not solved because money and not people is the basic reason for decisions.

The continuing problems for the 99% are the reason why movements should be demandless. Demands give the idea that problems can be solved inside the present society. By concentrating on the paradigm shift, by taking the power and the money away from the 1%, seemingly difficult problems are easily solved after the power is taken away from the greedy few.

In a revolutionary period scientists use the new paradigm to solve unsolvable problems. During and after the paradigm shift *"scientists see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they looked before..... What were ducks in the scientist's world before the revolution are rabbits afterwards. The man who first saw the exterior of the box from above later sees the interior from below"*.

Kuhn emphasized the role of humans who get new insights by applying new ideas, new paradigms. Nobody sees now a solution how to save the nearly ten million kids that die each year before they are five years old, how to let the inferior position of women and coloured people disappear, how to correct the backward situation in

Towards a world without a 1%

many parts of the world, how to combat the rising inequality or how to prevent the coming environmental catastrophe. By continuing to regard everything with the idea that money is the dominating factor, these problems cannot be solved. We need a paradigm shift, a revolution.

Existing problems cannot be solved in small steps, by a series of small improvements. That is again proven by the present financial and economic crisis that has been a huge setback in the life of the 99%. Any past progress we have made in small steps is in a short time destroyed by the crisis, fabricated by the elite to protect and improve its own position. A paradigm shift is a jump to unknown territories. We live now in a dark society in which the bright future is not anymore visible. A revolution chases the clouds away and opens the way to a Humane World. Only with jumps humanity can develop to a higher stage. That has been shown by past social or technological revolutions.

The new paradigm gives rise to new ideas for actions against the 1%. In the transition period towards a new kind of society the same status idea should already be used. One of the consequences of the new paradigm is a solution to the problem that in past revolutions the biggest burden was carried on the shoulders of the 99%. Too many 99% died in revolutionary struggles while the damage to the 1% was small and direct pressure on the 1% hard to find. This gives rise to the Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% must be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing. Living people should stand central and not dead money. The Golden Rule for Actions puts people in first place.

When all people have the same status it becomes intolerable that some people possess and spend tremendously more money and live a completely different life than other people. When we translate that in actions the slogan "Spending more than 200.000 euro in one year should be the limit!" makes sense. All goods and services that cannot be acquired by 200.000-minus people are action targets as well as the people who use this kind of goods.

The new paradigm does not say that all people are equal but that all have enough food to eat, a decent living place, good education and health care, basic ingredients for living decently, not being forced to use most energy for the daily struggle to survive. There remain many differences between individual people. In my book "[From Chaos to Change](#), entering a new era", I give more examples but nobody can foresee how the future will be when it is based on a new paradigm.

By being creative many small actions that are carried out by many Autonomous Clubs will change the world. The saying that small is beautiful is also supported by the new paradigm. In big organisations people are subordinated to leaders and human individuality and creativity are suppressed. Action methods based on small Autonomous Clubs moves responsibility from leaders to individuals.

Towards a world without a 1%

The new humane paradigm inspires and guides the 99% towards a new and better world. Actions guided by inspiring slogans say which action targets and methods contribute to progress and freedom. It is the first step towards a world without a 1% and with individual people who have developed new means and skills to protect their freedom and well-being.

Chapter 34

Changing the minds of the 99% and of the 1%

The same status paradigm will penetrate and change all minds

When we want a different kind of decisions that are beneficial for all people and not in the first place for a small privileged group we must determine why decisions are taken and who takes them. The privileged living situation of decision-takers is one of the prime reasons for their one-sided decisions. They look at what happens in their own environment and not what happens to the 99%. We must change the mind and the environment of the most powerful people, the 1%, who only see their own kind. Therefore we have to penetrate in their private living sphere.

People stand central so why should we talk about political systems. Any system can be used by powerful people for their own benefit. The present system is dominated by the power pyramid and the assumption that money is more important than people. Decisions are not guided by the idea that all people have the same status. The top lives very high up in the skies and hardly listens to or has knowledge of life at the bottom.

The system and the basic money paradigm are maintained and defended by the power of the 1%. When people start to use the new same status paradigm they see different solutions using the same facts as before (Thomas S. Kuhn). The first guiding idea from the new paradigm is that we should pressure living people. It is contrary to the present idea in leftist and rightist organisations that the system should be changed. First we should have different basic ideas then the system will change also. The system will however only change in the right direction when the 99% have changed.

It is nearly impossible to convince people that a new system is better than the old one when nobody knows how that system looks like. It is one of the failures of leftist revolutionary parties who want another system, talking about the new system but forgetting to explain how that system should be reached. These parties ended their revolutionary struggle by being embedded in and even endorsing and promoting the money dominated system. Party leaders want power and a good life for themselves more than another society in which all people have a better and different life. Only by actions we can make the 99% clear how we get more power and how the 1% change because of our pressure. Because of small successes many people who know that the present system is rotten get hope that something else is possible. Actions change the minds of the top as well as the minds of the 99%. Now the human mind is too much influenced by money. A new world arises when the 99% experiences that they have the knowledge, the possibilities and the power to control their own life by

Towards a world without a 1%

blocking any control from up there. They have only to apply the new human paradigm that gives all people the same status.

Most action targets are too vague and bring no inspiring successes that persuade the 99% to join the Movement for a Humane World. We should reject old unsuccessful action methods. Efforts to change the system have failed in the past. Power is a too vague concept but actions around money are concrete, undermining the use of surplus money by putting pressure on greedy people. The human factor stands central. The exclusive private life of the 1% is the reason why they are so selfish. The prime target are people with a lot of money who take wrong decisions about the 99%.

Top-people take decisions because their mind is formed in a special way in the family, on elite universities and in organisations that are guided and inspired by the idea that money dominates everything. Changing the institutions where the 1% are educated is difficult. We can disturb teachers but the result will be indirect with hardly visible results. Just as proposing another system, changing the environment of the 1% is too slow. In the meantime much more misery has to be accepted by the 99% and there is no prospect on a world without misery.

Money and the environment are important factors that influence the minds of the 1%. The idea that money dominates is obvious in the gated communities and the big mansions where the 1% live. Money is always prominent present in their life and minds and they strive to further improve their already lavish environment. People without money are not welcome. The 1% meet people of their own kind in their neighbourhoods, their private schools and universities, their clubs, restaurants, holiday resorts, hotels etc. Ideas that are widespread in these environments dominate decisions. What common citizens think is unimportant, they barely exist for the 1% and they hardly meet these inferior people on the same level. They use the upper layers of the 99% as source of knowledge and as instruments to spread their ideas about money as the dominating factor under the lower layers of the 99%.

Action targets are simple. Care for it that they cannot use their money. Care for it that they cannot remain an isolated superior group. When the world of the 1% becomes uninhabitable they must descend to our world and their minds change because their environment changes. Also the minds of the 99% change because they see that the seemingly unassailable leaders are now living nearby. The 99% have accomplished something they could never imagine they could accomplish. The 1% and their lackeys realise that they are forced to do things they never imagined they should do in the past. One of the simple ideas that guide actions is creatively disturbing the world of the 1%.

Actions have success because the 1% have never been attacked in their safe-looking castles. They react on the pressure on their eliteworld. Then the 99% realise that at last they are calling the 1% to account for all misery they have caused to the 99%. Because of the constant pressure by the 99% on the private life of the 1% all minds change and different values start to rule the world.

PART E

Thousands bites of a Flea are worse than one bite of a tiger

Activists must avoid what is strong and strike at what is weak. They decide when, where, how, with whom and against whom actions are carried out. They do not react on what the other side does but retain initiative by acting autonomously by using guerrilla tactics in a War of the Flea. Some violence is unavoidable but should only hit the 1%. Most actions hardly cross the legal lines drawn by the sitting powers. Violence is only one of the tactics in a very violent world in which nearly ten million kids die each year before they are five years old.

Chapter 35..... 115

The War of the Flea

Thousands bites of a flea are worse than one bite of a tiger

Chapter 36..... 118

Guerrilla tactics (1)

Guerrilleros should not confront armies but directly attack the 1%

Chapter 37..... 121

Guerrilla tactics (2)

The Fourth People's Power uses its own weapons and tactics to prevent damage to the 99%

Chapter 38..... 124

Violent actions cannot be avoided

Without some violence activists fight with one arm tied to their back

Chapter 39..... 128

What kind of violence?

“Non-violence is fine as long as it works” (Malcolm X)

Chapter 35

The War of the Flea

A thousand bites of a flea are worse than one bite of a tiger

“The Flea bites, hops and bites again, nimbly avoiding the foot that would crush him. He does not seek to kill his enemy at a blow but to bleed him and feed on him, to plague and bedevil him, to keep him from resting and destroy his nerve and morale..... All this requires time. Still more is needed to breed more flees. What starts as a local infection must become an epidemic, as one by one the areas of resistance link up, like spreading ink spots on a blotter”. (Robert Taber, The War of the Flea)

Sun Tzu lived 2500 years ago. In his “The Art of War” he described how to fight a seemingly invincible enemy. Carl von Clausewitz, Mao Tse-tung, Vo Nguyen Giap, Ernesto Che Guevara and many others promoted and developed guerrilla warfare by studying The Art of War. “So in war, the way is to avoid what is strong and strike at what is weak” leads to the idea “be where your enemy is not” and to the conclusion that “great results, can be achieved with small forces”. In the last decades these ideas were hardly applied in actions. The emphasis was on mass actions not on guerrilla-type actions. No wonder the 1% still rules.

Imagine a huge demonstration with a hundred thousand participants. It is hardly possible to organise such events more than once a year. It cost a lot of energy and money to get so many people in one place. Making advertisements and placards, caring for transport, organising food, drink and health care at the demonstration etc. Not to mention the time and the money spend by participants to go to the meeting place and back home. Did the demonstration achieve its goal? Was there a small change in decisions that were taken by decision-makers who live somewhere high-up where the 99% are not allowed to come and not allowed to take part in discussions? In most cases the answer is no, the results are mostly very disappointing.

Such mass actions do not belong to a War of the Flea, they are in contradiction to the simple guidelines of Sun Tzu, “let your plans be dark and impenetrable as night, and when you move, fall like a thunderbolt”. A mass gathering is openly planned at a known time and place, the enemy can make preparations to control the action. By following the advice of Sun Tzu “attack him where he is unprepared, appear where you are not expected” a more successful action is possible that penetrates in the centre of power.

Imagine that only one per cent of the participants of the big mass gathering, one thousand people, throw within a period of one month each one rock through the window of one 1% who lives nearby. One thousand broken windows Not much

Towards a world without a 1%

of an effort, no costs, no time spilled, no arrests when you are careful. A surprising and unexpected series of small actions. Small is beautiful. Thousands of small actions have more success than one big action. Small volatile and elusive Autonomous Clubs using the creativity and individuality of its members can apply the idea that "*the whole secret lies in confusing the enemy so that he cannot fathom our real intent*". The result is tremendous, use your imagination and you perceive a shock going through the higher echelons of society. It is a first small step on the road to change the world!

Many small actions in a War of the Flea are fundamentally different than mass actions. It are offensive actions in contradiction to defensive mass actions. A War of the Flea consists of a multitude of decentralised small actions on the initiative of individual members of the 99%. Sometimes they act alone, sometimes with a few friends. This War forces leaders to change decisions, mass actions only ask or even beg leaders for change.

Participants in mass actions want to air their dissatisfaction. In such defensive protests the initiative lies by leaders of organisations, activists are followers. Offensive actions during the War of the Flea are resistance actions carried out by small, temporary and more or less homogeneous groups of creative individuals that disturb the private living sphere of people with power. The initiative lies by individuals.

Massive protest actions need consensus about action tactics. Small actions can be carried out anytime and only a few people have to agree with the tactics. No consensus meetings are needed. It starts as a brooklet that will turn into a river that wipes away the 1%.

It is fun to carry out surprising small actions. By participating once in a while in a big protest you only can hope for a favourable echo of the action in the media. Creative and individual actions by small Autonomous Clubs increase the self-esteem of the members. Because the 1% live in an exclusive world where the 99% only may enter as servant, traditional actions do not penetrate in that world. The War of The Flea is an excellent action method to disturb the life of the greedy, criminal and corrupt leaders in the background.

Mass actions want to get attention of decision-takers and above all of media. Organisers distribute pamphlets and give press conferences. When the media do not write about the action, participants are disappointed and think twice before participating in a next mass action. You may also wonder if media articles penetrate the minds of decision-takers. The results of such mass events are hardly tangible and the energy of protesters is mostly spilled in vain. Media play an important role. In small actions of the War of the Flea media are hardly involved but sometimes the 1% complain about their difficulties. Their reflections in the media on offensive guerrilla actions increase sympathy of the masses for the struggle by showing that the 1% are under pressure. That is not the case with the one-time media reports after big demonstrations.

Towards a world without a 1%

Mass actions do not penetrate in the power centre of the 1%. To take the power and the money away from the 1% you have to destroy their basis, their safe and comfortable eliteworld. Because they have hardly been attacked, the centre of power is not well defended. When defences are strengthened, concentrate on supply lines and disturb the supply of resources to the centre of power.

When the private living sphere of the 1% is disturbed they will be flabbergasted because it never happened before. The 1% does not understand why this happens. They start to whine and complain about their predicament and the 99% become amused because they see the 1% have the same difficulties as they have had for ages. The same status paradigm is coming nearer. The 99% are often disturbed by police officers, tax officers, house owners, bankers, civil servants, etc. It has become part of their life and it gives them a feeling of powerlessness. That feeling disappears when they become active and transfer the feeling of powerlessness and uncertainty to the 1%.

The 1% is protected by servants. Not only security personnel but also lawyers, cleaners, advisors, etc. These servants regulate any difficult and annoying item. Small War of the Flea actions go around this wall, they *“make them toil when relaxed, starve when they are full, move when they are settled”*.

In the War of the Flea people are autonomous, independent of leaders, choosing themselves when, why, how, where, with whom and against whom they become active. A new kind of humans comes into being who are creative, individualistic, caring for their neighbours and knowing how to combat and defeat any injustice or restriction of their freedom, privacy and well-being by greedy leaders who put the interests of the own group over the interests of all people. That leads us to a world without a 1%.

Because of their individual involvement and their responsibility for the own safety activists take care that they do not get damaged too much, that they are only active against targets that are undefended. The War of the Flea complies with the Golden Rule for Actions to avoid clashes with the police who are also part of the 99%. As the French Revolutionary Jean-Paul Marat already remarked a few centuries ago, *“Revolution will be a kind of guerrilla in which we can attack the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used. This means that we can deprive the enemy of all his advantages”*.

Chapter 36

Guerrilla tactics (1)

Guerrilleros should not confront armies but directly attack the 1%

Guerrilla tactics have proven their worth in fights against a seemingly very powerful and superior armed opponent. The principles written down by Sun Tzu in “The Art of War” about 500 BC can still be used and only need some minor changes. Wikipedia defines guerrilla as “a form of irregular warfare in which a small group of combatants such as armed civilians use military tactics including ambushes, sabotages, raids, petty warfare, hit-and-run tactics and extraordinary mobility to fight a larger and less-mobile traditional army”.

The Wikipedia description of a guerrilla is based on Sun Tzu and many other military strategists who see guerrilla as part of a struggle between two armies. Guerrilla introduces new action methods in an orthodox war by undermining the strength of an army. The central command gives the orders. It is not a fight of small independent groups from the 99% against small groups or individuals from the 1%. A guerrilla based on the same status paradigm pinpoints leaders who think they have a higher status than common citizens and avoids contact with security forces that protect these leaders. In both forms of guerrilla the general ideas of Sun Tzu may be used.

For a new kind of society we need an individual guerrilla that is not controlled by a central command but gives power to individual 99%. Small groups of individuals with the same status hit what is best and easiest to hit. It is the forebode of how power is used in a future society in which basic ideas are not forced upon the 99% by a 1% but in which the 99% decide how to apply the rules. It is a society in which the 99% have the power to affirm and defend the same status. To achieve that we must use individual guerrilla tactics during the revolution and also when the revolution has succeeded.

Mao Tse-tung also avoided the enemy army's offensive power. He proposed to attack supply lines of the hostile army. In a people's guerrilla direct confrontations with security forces should be avoided and actions should concentrate on supply lines to the 1%, on the veins that bring the necessary blood to the eliteworld, on the veins that are needed to sustain and extend their exclusive world. Guerrilla tactics can be used to disturb and confuse the eliteworld so that the elite cannot anymore harass common citizens.

Many small disturbances of supply lines force the 1% to strengthen their defence and spread security troops over a big area. Attacking veins undermines the power of the 1% to control the world because they have to defend their own existence. It is demoralising when there are continuous attacks on places that are hardly defended.

Towards a world without a 1%

Sun Tzu said already: *"You can be sure in your attacks when you only attack places that are undefended"*. We have to look for holes in the defence. *"So in war, the way is to avoid what is strong, and strike at what is weak"*.

Present actions hardly comply with these ideas. Revolts in the Ukraine and in Egypt have become fights between demonstrators and security forces that have been withdrawn from other duties. Thefts of artefacts from Egyptian museums show that withdrawal of security forces from traditional tasks boosts crime. Street fights are attacks on strong points of the defence of the 1%, the world of the 1% remains mostly untouched. Such mass demonstrations are in contradiction to guerrilla tactics. They are harmful for the 99% and violate the Golden Rule for Actions. The ruling 1% remains out of range.

Sun Tzu said also: *"Rouse him and learn the principle of his activity or inactivity. Force him to reveal himself, so as to find out his vulnerable spots"*. *"A victorious army opposed to a routed one is a pound's weight placed in the scale against a single grain"*. The goal of the struggle is not do defeat the army but to make it impossible that leaders can use the army because it is spread too thinly to defend the 1% and the centre of power. Small Autonomous Clubs hitting then here and then there are superior to mass actions in which all strength is concentrated. There should not be fights between concentrated security forces and concentrated activists. The army of the 1% is avoided when volatile units of the 99% (Autonomous Clubs) attack elsewhere.

Standing armies need bases, supplies, contacts with the centre of power etc. Guerrilla forces are like a fish in the water, they feed on their surroundings, they move from one place to another, they are elusive. Just as Lawrence had concluded in Arabia, Mao saw that his best strategy was to defend nothing. This allowed his forces to conceal their weakness in lack of hitting power and exploit their strength: the capacity to move fast at the time and place of their choosing, surprising the enemy.

Guerrilla has the intention to undermine the enemy's strength. The enemy is forced to fight the war on our way. Do not become a sitting duck as in mass actions. Gaining space, occupying buildings and the use of specialised weapons that are better than the weapons of the enemy change a guerrilla war in a regular war, a fight between two armies in which the strongest army wins, a war between two centralised power instruments. Guerrilla tactics adapt to changing situations, wars demand organisation, leaders and a power pyramid. That is in contradiction to a Humane World in which all people have the same status and the possibility to exert power.

According to Mao Tse-tung orthodox warfare takes only place during the final stage just prior to victory after the enemy had been weakened and demoralised. Regarding guerrilla he says: *The people's guerrilla and the main forces of the Red Army complement each other like a man's right and left arm, when we had only a Red Army we would be like a warrior with only one arm"*.

Towards a world without a 1%

The ultimate goal is not to topple the old regime by clashes between standing armies. The ultimate goal is another kind society with different power relations and in clashes between two armies old power relations are reintroduced. Armies are the prime example of being ruled by a power pyramid with generals who order and die in bed and soldiers who fight and die on the battlefield. By relying in the last phase on armies the possibility of any citizen to interfere when he finds it necessary becomes after the revolution a vague goal. The guerrilla is in this traditional model only a small phase in the struggle and not one of the principles on which the new society is built.

Guerrilleros use different weapons than armies. When guerrilla forces concentrate to face a standing army the guerrilla is forced to exchange its former effective weapons in mass destruction weapons that are used in wars. Guerrilleros become part of a power pyramid and are again powerless. The guerrilla is disarmed and after the revolution it is not anymore a force that can defend the interests of the 99%. Autonomous Clubs safeguard the freedom, privacy and the well-being of common citizens by punishing in small guerrilla-like actions faulty leaders and preventing that ever a new 1% arrives.

Chapter 37

Guerrilla tactics (2)

The Fourth People's Power uses its own weapons and tactics to prevent damage to the 99%

The 99% need a revolution to get a society in which all people have power and the same status, a society without a 1% and without a power and money pyramid. Leaders of revolutionary organisations want power to get a new society under their leadership. Then the new society contains still elements of the old society with a leading group and dependent masses. In a revolutionary guerrilla war the 99% learn how to use simple weapons and their creativity in a War of the Flea to defeat old leading groups. Their evasive and volatile weapons can also be used in the new society against any faulty leader to prevent that a greedy 1% ever get again on top of society.

Before the Chinese Revolution most revolutions started as revolts that became a revolution in which sitting powers were replaced by a new powerful group. Decentralised guerrilla actions hardly played a role. After the emphasis of the Chinese on guerrilla methods the struggle changed but guerrilleros were still subordinate to what was decided in the centre of power. The goal of the revolution was the replacement of the old leading group by a new one. All past revolutionary struggles gave only in words attention to the 99% (Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood or All power to the Soviets). Soon the power of new leaders became nearly absolute. The guerrilla did not create an independent people's power based on what they had learned during the revolutionary struggle.

In the French Revolution there were some direct attacks on the ruling elite. The 99% knew who was responsible for their misery. These direct attacks hardly occurred in later revolutions. Guerrilla actions were used to weaken the army of the enemy and the revolution succeeded after a decisive fight between two armies. Jean-Paul Marat pointed to the importance of pressuring mighty people but his ideas are forgotten. Most fighting took place between parts of the 99%. Members of the leading class were hardly damaged and after successful revolutions they left the country with their money. The Golden Rule for Actions was violated, the private living sphere of the 1% was not undermined and the minds of the 1% not changed. A new leading group took possession of the old extravagant eliteworld or built new extravagant and exclusive living places. After some decades you could hardly distinguish them anymore from the old elite.

The principle of guerrilla warfare is attacking weak points. *“Attack him where he is unprepared, appear where you are not expected”*. The weakest points can be found

Towards a world without a 1%

in the eliteworld where the 1% lives. There are some guards but there is no army in that world. So we avoid and circumvent the army. In our time continuous guerrilla tactics till the revolution has succeeded is the only way to remove a 1%. It is not possible to have safe base areas as in China, Vietnam or Cuba where a revolutionary army was built. But guerrilleros can still be like a fish in the water (Mao Tse-tung). We must use our own weapons and avoid a hierarchical organisation. Organisations give the opponent clear targets. When in Peru the leading group of the Maoist Shining Path was arrested, the struggle for a free Peru came to a standstill. Leaders and a centralised command are vulnerable. We need small groups in which activists themselves decide how, when, where, with whom and which leader they attack.

Organisers of mass actions know their activities have only a small impact. Still they do not change from defensive protest actions to offensive resistance ones. They refuse to propagate a War of the Flea. They want to remain part of the existing society thinking that political lackeys are reasonable people. Even when an old regime should be toppled by mass actions there is no idea how the 99% can control new leaders. The future society becomes a copy of the present one while a revolution is a jump to another kind of society with different power relations.

In 2005 the people in the Ukraine massively demonstrated against the corrupt president. They succeeded to remove the president but the new one was as corrupt and bad as the ousted one. In 2010 the old president was re-elected without any mass protests. A few years later new mass uprisings demanded less dependence of Russia and closer ties with Europe. They did not ask the Greek 99% what they thought of closer ties with the richer parts of Europe. Then they should have realised that they fought to solve the wrong problem. Remaining dependent of Russia or becoming dependent of North-Western European countries. In one way or the other they remain a neo-colony just as Greece is a neo-colony. The leaders of the mass uprising saw a bright future for themselves. The uprising was not a learning school for the 99% to oust any leader who became greedy and corrupt. The enthusiasm in Western activist circles for this mass struggle in which only the 99% are damaged can hardly be understood. Maybe there will be a new uprising when the Ukrainian 99% experience what it is to be dependent of rich European countries.

An independent Fourth People's Power came never into being. The beginning of such a power was frustrated when the guerrilla war changed into a war between two armies. The power of the central leadership increased and the individuality and creativity of small guerrilla groups suppressed. In the last World War the Dutch resistance used guerrilla tactics which were for the greater part organised and controlled by the Dutch government in exile in England. The Dutch historian Lou de Jong gave in his book on the History of the Netherlands during World War II (14 volumes) hardly attention to individual resistance acts but emphasised official resistance ordered from the safe seats of the government in England. That resistance was part of a war between two armies. The sitting powers continued to control the

Towards a world without a 1%

situation to be sure that after the war they could regain their place at the top of the power pyramid.

Guerrilleros should pressure the 1% and avoid contact with security forces who also belong to the 99%. Then only the 99% are hurt and split in warring factions while the 1% continue to live quietly in their privileged quarters. In a guerrilla activists should directly attack the 1%. Tactics of Moslem fundamentalists are also wrong. Targets are hardly the top of the power pyramid but mostly security forces or places where many 99% come together as markets or mosques. Many 99% are killed but the 1% are hardly under fire.

In a guerrilla not weapons stand central but the strategy. Guerrilla is a political struggle, an action method of common citizens without any specialisation. Weapons are hardly necessary because a guerrilla in our countries is not a war of a weak army against a strong army. It is a war of harassment, attrition and deception against the 1%. *"All warfare is based on deception and confusion, mystify, mislead and surprise the enemy"*.

"The guerrilla fighter is primarily a propagandist, an agitator, a disseminator of the revolutionary idea who uses the struggle itself – the actual physical conflict – as an instrument of agitation. His primary goal is to raise the level of revolutionary anticipation and then of popular anticipation to the crisis point at which the revolution becomes general throughout the country and the people in their masses carry out the final task – the destruction of the existing order". (The War of the Flea, Ronald Taber).

The basic ideas for a guerrilla formulated by Sun Tzu, Von Clausewitz, Mao Tse-tung, Guevara or Taber can still be used. A continuous undermining of the enemy by harassing techniques leads in the end to the collapse of the regime. The central point is the exploitation of the weak points of the opponent. As Robert Taber says: *"The guerrilla fights the war of the flea and his military enemy suffers the dog's disadvantages: too much to defend; too small, ubiquitous, and agile an enemy to come to grips with."*

Guerrilla tactics, the War of the Flea, are the best method to get power. During the revolution the 99% realise they have an independent power they can use when necessary. Sun Tzu and Von Clausewitz were interested in wars between armies, Mao Tse-tung in a revolution but still in a society with a power pyramid. That is not complying with the same status paradigm. That idea forces the 99% to develop an own power. Irregular warfare of common citizens using their own creative means of action, harassing the enemy by many small actions and exhausting its resistance should become the standard of any action of the 99%. Mass actions hardly pressure people who live far away in cosy and extravagant mansions from street fights in town centres.

It is time for change, too many 99% have been damaged by the old action means.

Chapter 38

Violence in actions cannot be avoided

Without some violence activists fight with one arm tied to their back

Nearly ten million kids die each year unnecessary before they are five years old. This atrocious violence dwarfs any violence the 99% ever can perpetrate. All violence of the 1% hurts the 99%, while there is no violence against the 1%. When there is no revolution the 99% continue to suffer, when no violence is used revolutions will never succeed.

“A revolution is not a dinner party or writing an essay or doing embroidery. It cannot be so refined, so leisurely and gentle, so temperate, kind, courteous, restrained and magnanimous. A revolution is an insurrection, an act of violence by which one class overthrows another”. (Mao Tse-tung)

What happens in the Ukraine and in Egypt is inspiring because the 99% are politically active. But what will be the result? Again a society like the present one with a privileged group on top. And only the 99%, activists and policemen, are hurt. The 1% and the political leaders again escape unscratched from the turmoil. We need direct actions against the 1% otherwise we never get a world without a 1% where all people have the same status. To reach that Humane World we need some violence directed at the present and the future 1%. That must be the leading idea in all actions, dethroning any 1%.

Actions can be risky but are necessary to pressure the leading class. Actions that hurt activists and hardly influence the private living sphere and the minds of the 1% should not take place (Golden Rule for Actions). Any violence must comply to this rule. Fights with the police cause too much damage to the 99% and pressure on people somewhere high up is negligible. These violent fights show that some people are so angry that they are prepared to take risks. It is a first step towards an effective kind of actions that hit the weak points in the armour of leaders and not the strong points, the rank and file police officers. Higher police officers who train the police by installing in them the idea that they must defend faulty leaders against attacks of the 99% and that they must quell any revolt are better targets.

Street violence inspires people to become active. Street fighters are an important element in the struggle but should change tactics because there is no pressure on the 1%. Also bombings or killing an individual leader do not pressure the 1%. Many people like such actions but they are too difficult for common citizens to carry out. Guerrilleros should use simple weapons and not specialised ones. A deceased 1% is replaced by another 1%, pressure on the new 1% has to be built up again, security

Towards a world without a 1%

measures are intensified and the 1% continue to rule. The danger for activists is too big.

Town guerrilla groups as the German RAF, the Uruguayan Tupamaros, the Peruvian Shining Path or the Italian Red Brigades were active in the seventies. They used a lot of violence that forced them to operate in secret and violated the rule that you must be like a fish in the water. They were decimated by security forces and disappeared. They could not solve the problem how to defeat the enemy because most actions had the wrong targets and did not build up pressure on the 1%. Small violence should be preferred over big violence, many small actions over some big actions. They should have studied Sun Tzu and Mao Tse-tung. *“So in war, the way is to avoid what is strong, and strike at what is weak”*.

Though they got a lot of sympathy they could not mobilize and activate the masses. Their actions were too specialised and could hardly be copied by common citizens who wanted also to live a normal life. The use of big violence is not right at the start of the struggle for a Humane Society. First should the power pyramid be undermined by Creative Disturbance of the privileged eliteworld. Violence should not be rejected but used in a way that fits in society. In the Egyptian or Syrian situation more violence is accepted than in Western Europe. Throwing a rock through a window of a 1% is as effective as throwing a Molotov-cocktail or using fire-arms. The first act is hardly punishable while the last kind demands secrecy and experience, buying weapons, having enough money to buy, learning to shoot, hiding weapons, etc. Activists should consider when, if and how violence is necessary and most effective. They should minimise risks for the 99% and maximise pressure on the 1%.

Even before Occupiers used any violence self-appointed leaders proclaimed that Occupy was a peaceful movement. Such people do not want to make an omelette because they refuse to break a few eggs. They do not want another society because they oppose any use of violence against the 1% who use a lot of violence to maintain their privileged situation. They do not agree with Mao Tse-tung who said *“Revolution is an act of violence”* or with C. Wright Mills who said *“All politics is a struggle for power; the ultimate kind of power is violence”*.

Though the opponent excessively uses violence to suppress movements, these leaders (of a leaderless movement) reject one of the tactics of the struggle and thus weaken the movement. Leaders of the country never listen to arguments of peaceful activists when demands contradict the interests of the top. Some violence increases the attention for what the 99% want. Peaceful actions hardly knew successes.

Non-violent activists only use tactics that are allowed by the sitting powers. Activists who use some violence should also mostly remain within the boundaries of the law. There are many hardly punishable actions that deeply penetrate the minds of the 1%. Non-violence activists often talk about civil disobedience, refusing to obey commands from the top of society, but disobedience actions do not lead to a Humane World. They demand a high degree of organisation and a leading group that kills the

Towards a world without a 1%

creativity of the 99%. Such actions remain within the present society. The boycott of oranges did not change the minds of leaders of Western countries who continued supporting white supremacists in South-Africa. Mandela was still on the list of terrorists when he was president of South-Africa while the white racist president De Klerk never was on that list. Civil disobedience actions and boycotts do not disturb the 1% and damage the 99%. It contributes nothing to getting rid of the 1% with their surplus of money and power. The 1% only listens when it fits in their policy.

Leaders redirected the goal of Occupy from a fight against the 1% to a discussion about which tactics could be used. After a few months the unifying target, the 1%, disappeared from publications and the movement started to wither away by lack of successes. Violence of participants was rejected and violence of the state was accepted as objectionable but inevitable. Positive results of past movements were only seen through “peaceful” eyes, achieved by non-violent activists. My experience in the Squatters Movement showed that violence often prevented owners to repossess squatted houses. Without violence we are too vulnerable to resist violence of the state. An additional benefit of the use of some violence is that organisations will not take over movements. Organisations are part of the existing social system and cannot afford to use violence. That threatens their existence.

Gandhi and Martin Luther King were peaceful activists but their tactics damaged the 99% too much. Successes were hardly the result of peaceful actions. Armed resistance in India, the militant Black Panther Party, the supporters of Malcolm X and the race riots had more influence than peaceful leaders. But the sitting powers invited only non-violent leaders to negotiate, violent activists were excluded. The results were disappointing, racism is still wide-spread in the USA and India is still a neo-colony of the West where each year two million kids die unnecessary before they are five years old. That problem is nearly solved in China that knew a violent revolution. The world is full of violence against the 99%. The 1% are the only people with a peaceful life.

Jean-Paul Marat said already that *“violence of the people is legitimate, it remains always far inferior to the sum of all injustices by the despots over the centuries”*. The American scholar Barrington Moore jr wrote in his book “Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy”: *“to dwell on the horrors of revolutionary violence while forgetting that of “normal” times is merely partisan hypocrisy the costs of moderation have been at least as atrocious as those of revolution perhaps a great deal moreone argument against the comforting myth of gradualism is the cost of going without a revolution”*.

What happens in so-called non-violent marches was shown in the Indian Salt March in 1930 that aimed to break the English monopoly on salt. (source Wikipedia). *“Gandhi was contemplating a course of action which is clearly bound to involve violation of the law and danger to the public peace. On March 12, 1930, Gandhi and 78 male satyagrahis (activists of truth and resolution) started their 23-day-long*

Towards a world without a 1%

journey. Women weren't allowed to march because Gandhi felt women wouldn't provoke law enforcers like their male counterparts, making the officers react violently to non-violence. A month later, Gandhi was arrested and thrown into prison, already full with fellow protestors. The Salt March started a series of protests, closing many British shops and British mills. A march to Dharshana resulted in horrible violence. The non-violent satyagrahis did not defend themselves against the clubs of policemen, and many were killed instantly."

Though activists did not use violence the march was not peaceful. Gandhi provoked police violence that damaged his own people. He knew that when there is no violence, nobody listens. He choose the wrong way. I propose small violence that only damages the 1%. I should never organise actions that cause still more violence to the 99%. Actions are risky but provoking more violence and damage to the 99% as Gandhi did violates the Golden Rule for Actions. These leaders forbid followers to use violence but know that violence can hurt their people. I cannot call these actions peaceful.

Without some violence no change is possible.

Chapter 39

What kind of violence?

“Non-violence is fine as long as it works” (Malcolm X)

Violence achieves something that can never be achieved on a non-violent way. A struggle for power always includes some violence. Revolutionary violence is insignificant compared to the violence caused by the 1% and their system. They are responsible for the ten million kids that each year die unnecessary before they are five years old. The American army was chased away from Vietnam, Lebanon, Somalia and now from Afghanistan. Saddam Hussein and Noriega were disposed after American violence. The Spanish and Philippine army left Iraq after violent actions against their citizens. Jordanian, Saudi and Turkish firms stopped their business in Iraq after employees were abducted. Mediciens sans Frontières left Afghanistan after the death of five collaborators. Many prisoners were freed after the payment of ransom. Many violent acts by unknown people never reached the media but show that violence sometimes has successes non-violence never can achieve.

Violence must hit the power bearers and not the 99%. The Danville Civil Rights Movement of 1963 was worn down by mass arrests, and many wounded and killed marchers. Only after ten years sentences against six demonstration leaders were suspended. (The killer of Jimmie Lee Jackson in 1965 who was the direct cause of the Montgomery marches was sentenced to six months in prison in 2007). The first Selma-Montgomery march was qualified as “Bloody Sunday”. Such actions are unacceptable.

The 1% rule from their comfortable management chairs. They fall when we (violently) break only one leg of the chair. Other 1% wonder if their chair is also undermined. Their future becomes uncertain and the 1% start to act differently to safeguard the legs of their chair. The threat is as important as the real action. Psychological actions combined with some real actions influence the mind of leaders. A changed mind causes that the 1% take into account the plights and wishes of all people and not in the first place the interests of the elite. Without some violence threats and rumours are empty, you cannot break a leg of a chair in a peaceful way.

Place a not-burning Molotov-cocktail on the doorstep of a 1%, put a rock with the words “care for your windows” in the pocket of his coat when it hangs somewhere in an expensive restaurant, send him a letter asking him if he is sufficiently insured, call him in the middle of the night for help against the foreclosure of your house, put a flyer under his windscreen with the text “this could have been paint”, paint texts or spread flyers in his neighbourhood with rumours about his behaviour, drive around

Towards a world without a 1%

his house at four o'clock in the morning on some Harley-Davidsons, do some innocent aniline in the pond so the water becomes blue, send back the stress, the burn-out, the poverty of our life and much more misery they impose on us to their private living quarters. After a month or so they look for ways to reduce the stress. The first step is taking different decisions, the last one leaving the 1%. A thousand small actions during a few months are more intruding than one big action after which life just goes on as before.

Is this psychological pressure violent or non-violent? When you get a letter that your house will be foreclosed you know the state uses violence when you do not comply with the demands. A notice of foreclosure and the following misery is not peaceful, it is a violent deed of politicians or bankers because when you do not comply violence is used.

Actions should combine physical and mental pressure, it are two sides of the same tactic. Street actions can be violent and had some success in getting more rights for American coloured people. Such actions are always restricted in time. Small violence against rulers is a continuous pressure on their position. In the end rulers crack. During street violence they withdraw for some time in their safe and cosy living quarters. There should only be discussions about which kind of violence is best to dethrone the 1%, to take their money and power away. Activists who carry out actions decide about the tactics and not leaders. Non-violent people hinder the development of the movement by restricting activists to unsuccessful action methods.

Small violence is a necessary factor for actions to undermine a mighty enemy. It should be sparsely used on the right way and minimise damage to the 99%. Violence can often be restricted to Creative Disturbance, causing some damage but with the threat that damage could be much worse. When activists intrude in the private living sphere of targets, they also penetrate their minds. The 1% start to realise that people outside their privileged group are obviously so disturbed in their private living sphere that they return the gesture. To avoid these disturbing actions the 1% will take decisions that are also beneficial for these other people.

More about violence in my book "[About Violence and Democracy](#)", in search for an alternative for democracy".

Chapter 10. Psychological violence

Chapter 11. The phenomenon violence

Chapter 12. Violence in history

Chapter 14. Creative violence

Chapter 15. Revolutionary violence

Chapter 16. Kinds of violence

Chapter 19. Creative disturbance.

The book is an analysis of our society and what should be done to change it in a Humane Society. Democracy is built on violence by powerful greedy rulers. To reject violence as one of the means to get change is discarding a mighty weapon.

Towards a world without a 1%

I first called the action method Small Violence but changed it later in Creative Disturbance, creatively disturbing the cosy private life of the powerful who use a lot of violence to control the 99%. The 1% experience any action in their private living sphere as a violent intrusion. The 99% are used to violence from the 1%. The prisons are crowded with members of the 99% who are violently excluded from participation in our society. Criminal corrupt bankers who amass money at the cost of the 99% are hardly put in prison though they wreck the life of many decent citizens.

Creative Disturbance emphasizes that change occurs when people become active and creative in disturbing targets while avoiding being damaged. Activities against the 1% are a war of attrition, a War of the Flea in which the 99% only use small weapons. Because there are so many 99% the many small pricks in the end force the 1% to leave their privileged and extravagant world so that at last all people have the same status.

PART F

Individual actions give more power than mass actions

In actions of Autonomous Clubs people stand central. The Clubs control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99%. Many real actions have successfully intruded the private living sphere of leaders, giving small successes. In general traditional action leaders block such change in tactics and promote the use of old-fashioned actions that had hardly any success. Individual actions that force are more important than mass actions that only beg and ask. Psychological actions and actions from a distance are methods mosquitos use in their wars. The humming of mosquitoes is often worse than the prick.

Chapter 40..... 132

Individual actions versus mass actions

In mass actions others decide, in individual actions we decide

Chapter 41..... 135

Practical ideas to guide actions

Actions should be based on and judged by the new paradigm that all people have the same status

Chapter 42..... 138

Actions and action targets

Preventing amassing and using too much money guides the actions the 99%

Chapter 43..... 141

Psychological actions, threats, hoaxes and rumours

To change the mind of people psychology is important in actions

Chapter 44..... 145

Actions from a distance, the use of electronics

Damage to the 99% is minimal by using electronic means in actions

Chapter 45..... 147

Actions from a distance, non-electronic means

Damage to the 99% is also minimal by using non-electronic action means

Chapter 40

Individual actions versus mass actions

In mass actions others decide in individual actions we decide

There is a big difference between mass actions and a string of individual actions. Mass actions are staged events in which organisers decide when, where, how and about what subject actions take place. In individual actions activists decide why, when, where, how with whom and against whom actions are carried out.

Mass actions ask or beg leaders to change decisions but leaders who took wrong decisions remain in function. They are not pressured and will take more wrong decisions because they put the interests of the 1% before the interests of the 99%. Their mentality is not changed. Individual groups pressure leaders by controlling, vetoing and punishing them when they violate the freedom and well-being of the 99%. These actions influence the mentality of leaders because they are forced to acknowledge that a new power of the 99% is coming into being next to the power of the 1%.

The responsibility and the involvement of individuals is greater in individual actions than in mass actions. Individual actions are actions by small, leaderless Autonomous Clubs. The result is directly connected to the creativity and activity of activists who get the feeling that they accomplish something. It gives participants more self-esteem and more pleasure than is ever possible in mass actions.

Mass actions have some positive affect on the solidarity under the 99% but can only take place once in a while. Individual actions lead to tangible results in the struggle to take the power and the money away from the 1%. Mass gatherings can be pleasant but individual actions have more positive results. They improve the own situation and the situation of fellow-99%. They result in a long series of small victories and successes. When one group has a pause, another group continues the pressure on the 1%.

Mass actions lead to disappointment when the result does not comply with the hope on success before the action started. When Occupy did not “Occupy the Financial Centres”, many followers withdrew from the movement. Other big movements based on mass actions had the same effect.

In Dutch actions against the nuclear plant in Doodewaard a failed effort was made to combine mass actions and individual actions. The mass action consisted of two blockades (a year apart from each other) of the nuclear plant by a few thousand demonstrators. It resulted in clashes with the police and the plant did not close. The new idea was inspired by the slogan “Doodewaard is everywhere”. Small groups

Towards a world without a 1%

of activists carried out small actions in their own environment, being like a fish in the water. Targets were the veins that connected the plant with the rest of society. The roads to the plant, the power lines, the offices of the owners of the plant, the clients that used nuclear energy etc. Also some propagandists of nuclear energy and some directors of the plant were targeted in their private living sphere. The action period lasted several months but there were not enough small actions. When the blockade stopped individual actions also stopped. The new idea was not carried out in the right way. Most energy was spend on the “decisive blockade”. Many activists were disappointed that the plant did not close after the blockades and the Anti-Nuclear Movement withered away.

The panic and disapproval of organisers of mass actions when autonomous groups as the Black Bloc deviate from centrally imposed guide lines is characteristic. A few self-appointed organisers claim a monopoly on what should happen. They act like the 1% who decide how money is divided, criticism is not allowed.

Humans like being together with many other people. The results of mass actions are mostly very disappointing, it are actions that do not belong to a War of the Flea. Activists want to accomplish something. When there are not enough positive results people stop participating. Walking in a demonstration is not sufficient to remain active.

Looking at sport matches, listening to well-known musicians or interesting speakers together with thousands of people gives a special feeling. It is nice to be in a pleasant place, to have fun and to get new experiences. You meet other people with the same taste, the same idea, the same interest. In mass meetings participants have the same status though there are also organisers with a higher status. Participants have hardly influence on what organisers decide. Mass actions are to a certain extent in contradiction to the same status paradigm that rules in a Humane World.

In mass gatherings people are like pawns in a game. They can hardly use their own ideas, their own individuality, their own creativity. In demonstrations and strikes the goals, transport, clothing and even the texts on placards are centrally organised. Own initiative and own activity is hardly appreciated. People are like a grain of sand in a big mountain of sand.

Participants in mass gatherings in music and sports want to have a nice time. In the political world the goal concerns something outside the place where the gathering is held. If you want to have fun or to ventilate your frustration mass meetings are excellent but it is only complaining and crying out loud and then it stops. Positive results of mass actions are disappointing. It is an important reason why attendance in political mass meetings is fairly low, why it is nearly impossible to organise a longer series of mass actions in a short time. In North Western Europe the number of strikes has fallen drastically for the same reasons, positive results of strikes have been scarce.

Towards a world without a 1%

What is the function of individuals in mass actions? What can an individual contribute to the success? Most people just copy what others do. They are dependent on others getting enough participants, sufficient publicity and determining when, where, how and about what actions take place. The role of the masses is to participate. Damage to activists in mass actions is much greater than damage to activists in individual actions.

The 1% do not listen to what is said in mass actions. Elected representatives hardly react on petitions with hundreds of thousands of signatures. Disappointment lies around the corner. Massive demonstrations and strikes against austerity measures in Spain and Greece had no positive results. The individual contribution of participants was close to zero. There is no fun when nothing is accomplished.

Activists of groups like the Black Bloc use mass gatherings as a shield for individual actions as fighting with the police or breaking windows of banks and expensive shops. It gives some feeling of power and some positive results as shown by the race rioters in the USA in their fight for more civil rights. They combine mass and individual actions. They show that individual actions are more powerful than mass meetings, demonstrations or strikes. But they attack the strong points in the defence of the 1% (the police). They should accomplish more by attacking in small groups undefended weak points in the private living sphere of the 1%. Ten thousand protesters in a mass demonstration accomplish less than a thousand activists who each throw only one rock through a window of a responsible person who violates the freedom and the well-being of the 99%.

Individual actions comply with the new paradigm that all people have the same status. People have to decide themselves what they do and should not be compelled by others to do fruitless things.

Chapter 41

Practical ideas to guide actions

Actions should be based on and judged by the new paradigm that all people have the same status

“In battle, there are not more than two methods of attack – the direct and the indirect; yet these two in combination give rise to an endless series of manoeuvres” (Sun Tzu). The goal is taking the power and the money away from the 1% and that the separation between the worlds of the 1% and the 99% disappears. Actions should be quite different from past actions that did not succeed in getting a Humane World. People stand central so action targets are people who restrict the freedom, privacy and the well-being of the 99%. The same status means that activists act autonomously without leaders.

Money is the prime motive for the 1% to get and keep power. Therefore actions should undermine the money paradigm by preventing that the greedy rich can spend their surplus money. With this money they secure for themselves a safe, extravagant, exclusive and cosy life. The money factor can be undermined by actions inspired by the guiding slogan “Spending 200.000 euro in one year should be the limit!”. Their cosy life is disturbed by intruding in their private living sphere, making clear that their privacy will become as insecure as the privacy of the 99%. At the same time actions undermine the power pyramid that makes common citizens inferior beings. Targets are higher and include lower bosses who take decisions in favour of the upper layers of society by violating the freedom and well-being of the 99%.

Long-lasting direct actions against the 1% have a great impact. The top has been hardly pressured in the past. They do not know how to defend themselves, they are defended by servants. Their minds should change so they accept that all people have the same status. Therefore we must not replace one boss by another boss who is soon as greedy and bad as the removed one but change their attitude. Killing does not comply with the same status paradigm. When a leader is replaced by another leader activists must again build up the pressure on the new leader.

Most actions should not cross the borders of existing laws. Unexpected disturbances that are hardly punishable have more effect than one or two big actions like bombings or arson that can only be carried out by experienced activists. The same status demands that activists are not trained to carry out special actions but that everyone use their own skill and knowledge. The combined skill and knowledge of all members of Autonomous Clubs guarantees that the right actions are carried out.

Towards a world without a 1%

After some time activists see the effect of their activities in the media, the attacked persons care for that. Media hardly publish statements from activists so it is useless to send messages to journalists. One of the defences of the 1% is using the media. Most actions are carried out in secrecy and activists should not brag about actions they carry out. Safety is important says the Golden Rule for Actions. The separation of the two worlds of the 1% and the 99% is another argument for a different kind of actions. The same status paradigm is a guiding idea for the 99%. In regard to the 1% other rules are applied based on the simple words of Sun Tzu *"All is fair in love and war"*.

When simple and clever actions are carried out in the 1% world, for example throwing a can of paint against their front door, many 99% think what the fuss? It is far from my bed and I have experienced worse things. Such small disturbances have a big impact on people who live in a secluded and protected environment. The 99% should be careful not to be caught in actions and follow the advice of Jean Paul Mart: *"We should attack the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used"*.

Because the 1% are money-people actions that cannot be insured are preferable. Removing the most beautiful plant from their garden and replanting it in a public park, spreading rumours in the neighbourhood, disturbing their recreation places, entering with a flash mob an expensive restaurant or throwing dandelion seeds on the greens of their exclusive golf club cannot be insured. Be creative and combine direct and indirect actions.

The 99% are often confronted with violence and the threat of violence. When bankers foreclose our house we get a peaceful letter but with the threat that when we do not leave we are thrown out. But the 99% are used to violence from above. The threat of possible violence disturbs the quiet, guarded life of the 1% more than the life of the 99%. When the number of actions increases it causes rifts between individual 1%. Those 1% who continue to live quiet and comfortable do not want to be drawn into a damaging conflict with the 99%.

The 1% are like spiders connected to the rest of the world by a vast web of thin threads. To disturb these fairly weak threads violence is hardly needed. The 1% need food and many other things as transport, electronic means of communication, contact with family, other 1%, servants and many other people, recreation places, materials to build and repair their property etc. Through the veins they control the world. Orders travel from the heart to the limbs and money flows back to the heart. The veins are maintained by the 99%. The 1% only make their hands dirty for counting money. The world is so complicated that people cannot live separated from other people. When the veins are plugged up, their exclusive world becomes uninhabitable.

Some crows' feet on the roads to the city disconnect the 1% from the rest of the world but there are many other ways to cut roads. Damage to the 99% is minimal because they do not use these roads. Demanding from the milkman or another delivery service to stop delivering goods to the house of a 1% causes some damage

Towards a world without a 1%

to the milkman but he delivers so much more milk to the 99% that this damage is negligible. He will comply with the request to avoid pressure from the 99%. When exclusive recreation places are time and again disturbed, a 1% will be excluded from these places because other 1% do not want to be disturbed.

How actions are carried out is already a long time ago described by Sun Tzu: *“When strong, avoid them. If of high morale, depress them. Seem humble to fill them with conceit. If at ease, exhaust them. If united, separate them. Attack their weaknesses. Emerge to their surprise”.*

It is possible to put pressure on lower bosses, the servants of the 1%, but they are more used to intrusions in their private life. They execute decisions of higher placed leaders and hardly take own decisions. Police-officers, lower civil servants in the public or lower managers in the private sector who have direct contact with the 99% are often abused and attacked. They are used to a certain amount of pressure and sometimes even trained to cope with it. They are more difficult to pressure. Disturbing their private life is a punishment for being a trusted servant of the 1% and thus violating the same status paradigm. Actions against them should not take place too often. Leaders with a higher status are responsible for our subordination but pressure on lower bosses can force these servants to oppose orders from above. It is also easier to carry out actions against them because lower echelons of the power pyramid live mostly in the same kind of neighbourhoods as the 99%. By carrying out actions against lower bosses activists can be like a fish in the water. Such actions can be a training-ground for actions against the 1%.

Only actions that undermine the power and the money of people with the highest status open the road to a Humane World.

Chapter 42

Actions and action targets

Preventing amassing and using too much money guides the actions of the 99%

"The guerrilla fights the war of the flea, and his military enemy suffers the dog's disadvantages: too much to defend; too small, ubiquitous, and agile an enemy to come to grips with" (Roland Taber). We are small and numerous and actions should also be small and numerous, complying with our strength. A flea can pick up a grain of sand, hundred thousand fleas replace a mountain.

In Argentine they invented the rolezinho, in a flashmob poor black youth hold parties in exclusive malls, usually occupied by the white rich. An example how the world of the 1% can be creatively disturbed. Many small actions of many small groups of 99% slowly disturb the cosy world of the 1%. Some activists use sound that penetrates their houses, others use a rock, enter an expensive restaurant and taste the food, disturb quiet recreation places, spread rumours, flyers and stickers with the name, the address, the telephone number and the email-address of the target. Disappear before the police arrives. The 99% should be creative and have fun. Some actions are peaceful, others use a little bit of violence. To disturb the extensive web of veins that connect the 1% with the outside world violence is hardly necessary. The safety of activists is more important. Everything is directed at one goal, disturbing the privileged world of the 1%.

The 1% live in expensive houses, go to exclusive clubs and restaurants, buy items and services the 99% never can buy, go to recreation places the 99% only may enter as servants. They live in a separated, privileged and extravagant world. Actions against these places hardly influence the life of common citizens who live elsewhere. That complies with the Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% must be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing. All these special places are hard to defend. Find the weak points and the stinging flea escapes unscathed leaving a disturbed world behind. Innumerable actions are possible when you are creative. Most targets have never been disturbed.

Exclusive clubs, expensive sex clubs, special sports, holiday places, schools.

Exclusive conference places, expensive hotels and restaurants.

The art and luxury world with paintings of a hundred million, watches of a million, laptops of five million apiece, fashion, jewellery and furs.

Houses (the size as well as the number of houses, most of them standing idle).

Cars, boats, private planes or extravagant plane tickets.

Towards a world without a 1%

Security and service personnel.

Electronic communication networks or special elitist magazines.

Many small actions in this money sphere during a few months are more intruding in the life of the 1% than one big action after which life just goes on as before. People who participated in creative disturbance of the eliteworld had a lot of fun and got more self-esteem because they became less dependent on the caprices of the people up there.

Go with a few friends to a golf club where the entry fee is over 100.000 euro and use your shovels on the spotless greens. Go to an exclusive restaurant and taste the food the 1% has on its plates, make excessive noise outside the house of a 1% or stick some stickers on lampposts in his neighbourhood with his telephone number and the offer to sell a beautiful car. Throw some strong smelling liquid on places he often comes or use super glue to secure doors he uses. A potato in the exhaust of his car gives a nice effect. A phone call to an airport that someone carries some drugs or stolen articles or that his second house is a drugs factory has surprising results. There are many possibilities when you are creative. The target becomes stressed and burned-out, loses control over his life and revises his values.

Even one person with a simple grudge can exert pressure on top leaders. Someone had an accident but he did not get his insurance money. He went to the Dutch headquarters of the insurance company Zürich and during seven weeks he picketed the head-entrance with texts like 'Zürich stinks' and 'Zürich cheats people'. He got some attention in the media. Zürich admitted its fault and gave him ten thousand dollar. He was not satisfied, cashed the cheque and continued the action. Several years he stood in his free time with his placards in front of the Zürich building. Nothing happened. Then he got the advice to go to the private house of one of the directors of Zürich. He distributed some pamphlets in the neighbourhood and occupied with his boards the sidewalk in front of the house of the director. After a few hours the police came and a judge prohibited him to come in the vicinity of the director. The first payment after the accident had taken some years, the chasing away of a demonstrator only a few days. The mounting pressure forced the director to use power instruments as the police and the court. Nevertheless the activist continued his actions in the nice neighbourhood of the director and in the end he got more insurance money.

Part of the revolution can be accomplished by sitting in your armchair but it is sometimes necessary to take some risks. Actions remain however mostly within the borders of the law. Risks are much less than taking part in a demonstration that ends in fights with the police. The Arab Spring has shown that damage to the 99% has been too big.

The action of Greenpeace invading a Russian oil platform was wrong. The results of the often spectacular Greenpeace actions are very meagre and carried out by trained and paid activists. In this action thirty activists were imprisoned for months.

Towards a world without a 1%

Greenpeace leaders used activists not realising that damage was severe and knowing that pressure on the 1% was minimal.

They should first have read Sun Tzu, Von Clausewitz or Mao Tse-tung. Or just one line written by Jean-Paul Marat: "*We should attack the enemy in all places the army cannot come*".

Chapter 43

Psychological actions, threats, hoaxes and rumours

To change the mind of people psychology is important in actions

“When actions take place on the border between fantasy and reality attacked targets will never know what is real and what imaginary”. Power is a vague concept. While money is the basis of the power of the 1%, actions intruding the private living sphere of the 1% are the basis of the power of the 99%. Just as money is only sometimes used in power struggles, direct actions should also be used sometimes. The knowledge that the 1% has money, the knowledge that the 99% can penetrate in the private living sphere of the top determines the amount of power. In a world in which all people have the same status, everyone should have the same power.

“In battle, there are not more than two methods of attack—the direct and the indirect; yet these two in combination give rise to an endless series of manoeuvres”. (Sun Tzu). In the War of the Flea a direct attack is when a mosquito pricks, an indirect attack the humming of the mosquito threatening to prick. Being pricked once people find the humming often worse than the pricking. Psychological actions including the threat that actions could take place are an integrated part of the struggle. The combination of real and possible actions penetrates the minds of targets who become constantly occupied by attacks. Sometimes they alleviate the pressure by taking decisions that favour the 99% even when they come in conflict with their own kind of people. Then the conflict spreads in his environment.

Psychological actions are fairly safe. It gives fun realising how such actions influence the mind of the target who must contemplate about what happens when threats become real actions. This kind of actions complies with the Golden Rule for Actions because it does not hurt the 99% and increases pressure on the 1% whose minds are filled with fear about possible actions.

Psychological and material actions only involve objects that are important for the 1%. When masspeople get a phone call in the middle of the night it is a nuisance but they can disconnect, leaders must always be available. Is it really so bad when you read in a newspaper that you are deceased? You do not ask the police to look for people who throw stinking lysol on the doormat, who trimmed the most beautiful plant in the garden, who flattened the tyres of your car, who ordered a taxi while you did not want to go out, who annulled your hotel in a far-off holiday place. Even when a window is smashed the police hardly can find perpetrators and the 1% must fear for more

Towards a world without a 1%

stones, wait for new actions while they can do nothing. The direct damage is small but the immaterial pressure influences the mind of the 1%.

One of the action goals is making leaders realise that the 99% have power. A long-lasting stream of small actions in the private living sphere influences any human. Actions show that activists can penetrate the living sphere of the target. A can of used oil emptied on the beautiful maintained lawn has the same effect as putting a can with used oil on the lawn without damaging the grass. A flask with petrol, oil and a piece of cloth the same effect as a burning Molotov-cocktail. Surrounding him in a mall with some friends or putting some rocks on his car has a threatening effect but it are also real actions. Knowing that always anywhere unexpected actions can occur starts to dominate his mind. What will happen tomorrow, in a week, in a year Real actions strengthen the feeling that he is never alone unless he changes his attitude, his mentality and decisions that are disadvantageous for the 99%.

The power of the threat of real actions increases when they are accompanied by proof that somewhere, sometimes, something serious happens. It increases the uncertainty of the decision-taker. What will happen is intensified by the idea what may happen. Demonstrations are only temporarily threatening and authorities know that threats shouted out loud in a demonstration are empty words that neither undermine the power nor the private life of the powerful. Activities without a further maybe do not pressure decision-takers.

Actions by Amsterdam squatters of the "hard" line cared for it that more squatted houses were saved in comparison with houses squatted by the "soft" line. Authorities did not want too much disturbing street actions. The actions and the militancy (threatening to become active) of followers of Malcolm X, the Black Panther Party or the race rioters in big towns had more influence on the improvement of civil rights than peaceful actions of the Martin Luther King line, though the police violence provoked by peaceful protesters also played a role. But the threat of militant actions was too small and racism is still wide-spread in the USA and elsewhere. In all activities something should happen that really disturbs the controlled and cosy life of decision-takers. The idea that they are losing control over their private life undermines their power. When the powers that be realise they cannot control the autonomous activity of the 99% they acknowledge there is a counter power. Leftists nor rightist organisations were never a power that threatened the 1%.

Many leading activists still suppose they can change the world through dialogues with decision-takers though their arguments are almost never taken into account. Trade-union leaders did not replace old-fashioned strikes that had some influence in the past by more powerful activities. Strikes nearly disappeared in Western Europe and thus the threat of a strike as a power instrument. The influence of trade-unions is withering away. The same can be said of organisations as Greenpeace and other environmental action groups. Authorities agree with propositions that fit in their own agenda. There is no threat of real actions that undermine the power of the top.

Towards a world without a 1%

The powers that be also combine real actions with threats when they use their money. Threatening to withdraw subventions to organisations that complain too much, threatening to go to another country when their salary is not high enough, refusing to invest in unruly or disobedient countries. Child labour and very bad working conditions in factories in developing countries are continuing because of the threat to replace factories to other countries. Activists do not counter this power by threatening with direct actions in the private living sphere of investors who damage the life of ill-treated workers.

What was the threat of Occupy? Sitting in a square is a nuisance and the slogan "Occupy the Financial Centres" was not accompanied by real actions. Authorities could easily clear the squares and saw the Movement Occupy wither away. Only the more militant Occupy Oakland offered some resistance and lasted a little bit longer.

While the 1% has power based on money to enforce decisions, the activist world hardly has power, the threat of possible actions is not accompanied by real actions that disturb the world of the powerful. The power of the 99% should be based on people who carry out a multitude of small actions in the privileged eliteworld.

In a fairly recent action about a not paid bill for real work it was sufficient to carry out a few direct actions as closing the lock of a front door by super glue next to a few threats of actions as mentioning that the house of the debtor was beautiful but that it was easy to enter the garden of the house. The bill was indeed paid though it took several years to get the payment of a few thousand euro also because the creditor was not very active in pointing his arrows at the debtor. In the end the threat of more real actions forced the creditor to pay.

Psychological warfare is an integrated part of the power of the 99%. This includes not only direct threats of coming actions but also hoaxes or rumours about something that could be true. As Sun Tzu already said a very long time ago: *"mystify, mislead and surprise the enemy"*. Corruption, sex, domestic violence, employment of illegal cleaners and many other subjects the 1% do not talk openly about undermine their position as respectable persons. This penetrates and dominates the mind of decision-takers if accompanied by real actions.

Nuclear bombs were only twice used in the far past but are still used as a threat, just as super weapons as aircraft carriers, nuclear submarines, intercontinental rockets, drones or chemical weapons. Why has the USA a stock of chemical weapons in Panama? Why has the USA military bases all over the world? Not to threaten with military actions because when the threat becomes a real action most weapons do not come from the bases but directly from the USA.

The 99% are time and again disturbed in their private living sphere by real actions of the top so they even listen to threats. Threats and real actions are two sides of the same coin. The top knows that a coin has two sides, activists only use one side of a coin, without threats the other side is blank and the coin invalid and useless.

Towards a world without a 1%

When there is no threat activists are not dangerous. They do not undermine the power of the top. When activists only use arguments they remain dependent on the benevolence of decision-takers. The lack of successes of past activism are not encouraging. The 99% only get some power when they use threats as well as direct actions over a longer period of time.

Chapter 44

Actions from a distance, the use of electronics

Damage to the 99% is minimal by using electronic means in actions

Our life, our devices, communication, travel etc. is influenced, connected or even determined by electronics. Many appliances communicate with each other through free air, via towers and satellites. Just as crow-feet's disturb communication by cars on the ground, electronics also can disturb the private living sphere of the 1% who are even more dependent on electronics than common citizens. Disturbances in communication make their world uninhabitable.

From a distance it is possible to influence and even cut off all use of electronics. Disturbing devices that use electronics is intruding and dangerous for the power of the 1%. Without the possibility to communicate with each other and with their servants they lose much of their power.

Recently hackers hacked the electronics that controls brakes, claxon, steering, throttle and even door locks of expensive cars. These systems are interconnected and the weakest point can be entered from outside to prevent that anyone can use the car. It is also possible to hack a car remotely after installing a device that can be triggered when you want it. To attack the weakest point is one of the basic principles of a guerrilla war. An additional hack of the doors of the garage will further disturb the quiet life of the 1%. Cars can be controlled from a distance and despite safety measures, hacking is still fairly easy.

In such actions the danger for the 99% is small and the influence on the life of the 1% tremendously. Not only cars can be hacked but all electronic equipment as TV, radio, fridge, oven, heating, opening and closing of windows or curtains, etc. It is too difficult to protect these systems. Security corporations have been hacked so why not their products? Everything can be done from a distance. By disturbing the electronic communication the life of the 1% is creatively deregulated and they cannot anymore issue orders that hurt the 99%. The private use of computer, telephone, whatsapp, twitter, site or Facebook can be disturbed, viruses can be introduced and data from GPS-locations made known.

The richer someone is the more dependent he is on electronics. Everything can be disturbed. Electricity, heating or water supply, contact with authorities (tax office and other government services), all data can be changed. And of course the whole money system someone needs to survive. When the money of the 1% is disturbed the fundamental base of their existence is disturbed.

Towards a world without a 1%

Before the action starts collect as much data as possible about the intended target. Telephone numbers, IP-addresses, bank and credit card numbers, which, where and what kind of electronic devices are used, even a signature can be important. The use of devices to listen from a distance to what is said by the target must not be forgotten. A good preparation of any action increases the safety of activists.

Anonymous uses modern electronic means in actions. That complies with the Golden Rule for Actions because hardly anyone of the group has been arrested and certainly not wounded or killed. Actions are carried out from places where there are no security forces. It are however still protest actions. Hackers and Anonymous still target dead corporations and not living CEO's and owners of corporations. Decision-makers are not pressured and do not change their decisions. Anonymous does not disturb the private life of living top-people who use dead institutions to implement decisions that enrich themselves and control and oppress The People.

To get a modern Humane World, we need modern action means but with the present kind of actions even targets are out-dated. The powerful are not disturbed by disturbances of the electronic communication between corporations and customers or when a site of a corporation has a new front page. It is a nuisance but not more than strikes that never changed the power and wealth inequalities. Damage caused by accidental disturbances is much higher than damage caused by hackers. Insurance covers all costs. These actions do not develop an independent power. The use of the electronic weapon looks promising but up till now did not pressure the 1%.

Activists continue to use out-dated action methods as demonstrations (the million masks march, organised by Anonymous) that are only asking and not forcing. Demonstrations are hardly directed against the servants of the 1%, the politicians, and not at all against the real bosses, the 1%. These old-fashioned actions disturb only our own life and not the life of the 1% and their lackeys.

Activists should look for the weakest points that are difficult to defend. Jean-Paul Marat said more than two hundred years ago "*Revolution will be a kind of guerrilla in which we can attack the enemy in all places where the army cannot be used. This means that we can deprive the enemy of all his advantages*". Activists need not to be at places where targets live. We can use actions from a distance, disturbing activities carried out from places where the police is not present. Actions directed against the private living sphere of greedy people and not anymore against the instruments they use to squeeze money out of the 99%. With the new mentality activists enter a modern world by using one of the characteristics of a Humane World, living humans are more important than dead entities as governments, corporations or institutions.

Chapter 45

Actions from a distance, non-electronic means

Damage to the 99% is also minimal by using non-electronic action means

Thousands bites of a flea are worse than one bite of a tiger. We are small but we are the 99% and that is our strength. Our targets are the 1%. Telecom, the post, mail order companies, taxi companies, travel agencies, newspapers, web shops, etc. Actions must use the changing society in which contacts are anonymously laid by modern electronic means of communication. Be creative.

Actions from a distance are fairly safe because activists do not come in direct contact with the target or their safety personnel. Other people are activated to contact the culprit. Before any action can be carried out, data have to be collected about the target. Telephone numbers, bank and credit card numbers, signatures, house addresses, e-mail addresses, the kind of car, hobbies, favourite restaurants, holiday places, etc. Knowledge can be power. When enough data are collected actions start. Do not fear that actions have no direct result. When an action does not succeed, try a different one and in the end you have success.

A simple change of address sent to his family, business and private contacts is disturbing. Unknown people enter his private world, targets as well as contacts wonder what is happening and contacts become careful because something seems to be out of order. There is even a danger the action-virus also hit the contacts.

You can stop his subscriptions to papers and magazines by phone or make new subscriptions he does not want to have. Subscription bills will pour in. Many scientific magazines send reminders to pay. Making false subscription bills with the bank account number of a charity organisation increases the pressure. Each time he gets a bill from an unwanted source he realises he is not anymore alone in the world and that people from down under threaten his privacy.

You can order subscriptions as a present for his friends and family. They like the gesture and call to thank him. Then he has to tell them he did not order the subscriptions and has to do something to cancel the order. It is not nice to tell friends and acquaintances that something is wrong and that they do not get a present.

Nobody likes to be released of some money. You only need a kind of signature and his address to promise money to a charity organisation. He is a known and decent person so it is awkward to tell these organisations that he does not want to support their work. A few dollars send to some friends can be the start of a discussion in his private circle about the strange things that are happening to the culprit. Put some

Towards a world without a 1%

dollar bills in a letter with the message that more money will arrive because he had a windfall. It is an action based on the idea that the target has no influence on what happens, he becomes dependent on what we do and comes in the same position as we who are dependent on what he does.

There are many organisations that send articles or carry out services before asking any money. Order ten cubic meters black earth for the garden to be delivered on the sidewalk in front of his house. Invite people to his house who want to talk about a new kitchen, a financial investment, a new roof on the house, new sun screens, solar panels or an improvement of the garden. Many people have done this already, mostly to take revenge against other members of the 99%. The list of goods and services that have been ordered in the past is very long.

Tens of cold buffets, a disco-show, hotel rooms with and without call-girls, a memorial service with ten funeral coaches, the Municipal Service to exterminate cockroaches, several plumbers and carpenters, a house-painter with a mammoth-crane, a machine to make coffee for fifty people, funeral wreaths, 50 dollar of meat, water softeners, a truckload of flower bulbs, several encyclopaedias and Collected Works of famous writers, a load of hat-and-coat stands, a shipment of logs of wood, all kinds of flowers through Interflora, a nurse to lay-out a dead person, a correspondence course in psychology, 27.000 towels, 4.000 pieces of soap, the controller of the Commodities Act, a shipment of expensive brandy, an undertaker, etc.

You can call the police, the fire brigade and many other people who want to offer their services sometimes for free, other times for money. Order a taxicab and another and another so often that the taxi company will never again send a taxi to the house. The culprit has to explain time and again why he cannot order a taxi. Even the fire brigade will not come when the house is really burning. And the police will stay away so the activist can approach the house of the target without fear to be apprehended.

The method was eighteen years long used by someone who ordered bedroom suites, standing clocks, refrigerators, TV-sets, tens of encyclopaedias, linen bedclothes, golden watches, jewellery etc. It cost the receiving family thousands of dollars to return the unwanted goods. It was a revenge action, not an action against a top leader. After eighteen years the perpetrator was arrested. He was fined one hundred dollar. It was too difficult to prove what the man had done so punishment was low. However you never know what judges say when you attack important people.

Advertisements are also a weapon in the struggle. You can warn shopkeepers not to sell goods to the wife of the culprit because her husband will not pay any bill. You can set his house or his car for sale or tell people that some antiques will be sold on a certain date at a certain time at his home address. Make some stickers with his phone number or his address to offer something. Many people ring the doorbell and every time the culprit has to explain.

Towards a world without a 1%

Buy some cheap old books. Stamp in the book that the finder is requested to bring the book back for ten dollars. Leave the book somewhere in town near people who like to earn an easy ten dollar.

Actions aim to influence the mind of the culprit, not to harm or kill him. They have the sole purpose to increase pressure on people who belong to the elite. Demands of the 99% are now hardly taken into account by members of the elite whose motivation is only the continuation of the power and the wealth of the own group.

The influence of such actions was summarised by a Dutch mayor who was chased away by angry citizens. In the first months the mayor was more than five hundred times called on his phone. Then several windows of his bungalow were broken. He built a special wall to protect his windows but actions went on. A villager even drove his car against the garage of the mayor. The man was apprehended and sentenced to three weeks in prison. Afterwards the mayor said: "I never thought they could succeed..... When you are harassed for months, you start to feel it. We got stressed and the noise of every new stone thrown towards our house became louder and louder.I am glad I am again a common citizen. You are powerless as mayor. Even when they break your windows you cannot do anything.....".The only thing the mayor did not understand is that common citizens are always powerless against decisions and machinations by people at the top.

PART G

Democracy is approaching its end, the future is beautiful but still unknown

A Humane World without a 1% is a world beyond democracy. All people have the same status and the power to safeguard their equality, freedom, privacy and well-being. A world without a 1% is based on the power of minorities of active, interested and involved citizens over minorities of selfish and greedy leaders. New action methods give the 99% power in the new Humane World. The world without a 1% and without all misery caused by the existence of a 1% is magnificent.

Chapter 46..... 151

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (1)

I am not a democrat, I do not give my power to untrustworthy elected people

Chapter 47..... 154

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (2)

Democracy is not the best system ever, we need a Humane Society without a 1%

Chapter 48..... 156

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (3)

Advancing on the road to a different and beautiful future inspires the 99%

Chapter 49..... 159

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (4)

Decision-taking should be based on the freedom, well-being and activity of the 99%

Chapter 50..... 161

Towards a beautiful and humane world without a 1%

Discrimination, racism, crime, corruption, greed and much more misery will wither away when there is no 1%

Chapter 46

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (1)

I am not a democrat, I do not give my power to untrustworthy elected people

In democracies decisions are not taken by majorities. Only minorities of well-to-do people have decisive influence. The 99% may vote once in a while but they have hardly influence on specific decisions. Only a minority of the 99% ever protests because most common citizens know that leading people do not give much attention to protest actions. Decision-takers regard the masses as a fairly stupid but silent majority. People who don't protest are regarded to agree with decisions. The influence of common citizens is close to zero.

Decisions-makers live far from the masses and are not interested in what happens to them. Judgements of people around and above them are more important. The increasing wealth gap caused by the crisis shows that decision-takers favour the interests of the top. It is an indication that the powerful minority at the top, the 1%, has most influence often by using money. The majority, the 99%, is powerless because they have no independent power instruments to influence leaders. Democracy is not the rule of the majority over the minority, it is just the other way around. Most people are not interested in most problems and do not become active to change decisions. It are always minorities that protest. That should become the guideline in a Humane World. Small, temporary and alternating Autonomous Clubs control, veto and eventually punish faulty leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of common citizens. The democratic method that should be in the interests of all and based on majority decisions has failed.

Majorities never decide. The idea that democracy is a system by and for all people obscures that only powerful minorities take decisions, often for their own benefit and disregarding the interests of the 99%. The majority of the 99% is not involved, interested or concerned about most subjects and can be manipulated to support the minority at the top. This top has great financial backing and use the media and advertisement business to create the illusion that the majority agrees.

Most people on high positions are not elected and the elected ones are not supported by majorities. In most elections in the USA the majority does not vote. In July 2002 primaries for presidential elections were held in 18 states in the United States. Turnout was about eight per cent of the electorate, the people who were

Towards a world without a 1%

allowed to vote. In the presidential elections of 1996 less than 50 per cent of the voters came to the ballot boxes. The president got less than a quarter of the people that had the age to vote. Many people were not allowed to vote as millions of immigrants and millions of (ex)-prisoners. In elections for senators about 40% of the voters vote. And candidates can only contest elections when they have lots of money, provided by the 1%. The majority is against or silent. Democracy is not based on majorities.

An opposing minority from the 99% lacks the possibility and the power to forward its opinion or to block decisions. Decisions are taken in a world where manipulation and a surplus of money reign. There are hardly discussions between a minority of interested, active and involved citizens and a minority of decision-takers. Minorities of active citizens are silenced by the democratic argument that the silent majority agrees. Nonsense, the majority is only silent because they neither agree nor oppose and because they know that their judgements are meaningless and disregarded.

Democracy was about two hundred years ago introduced by the count of Montesquieu to solve conflicts within the elite. Before that conflicts were solved by Machiavellian methods based on tricks, deceit and violence. The ideas of Montesquieu stopped for a greater part violence in higher circles but deceit and violence are still widely used against the 99%. The number of 99% that are hurt, imprisoned and killed because they oppose faulty decisions or have to fight in wars for the 1% is staggering. Any violence of the 99% against the 1% dwarfs by these figures. Only when they go to the ballot boxes people seem to be equal but after the election the barriers between the top and the bottom are again sky-high. The People are again deceived and lied to on a Machiavellian way and when they do not listen violence is used to control them. The methods the police use against the 99% are never used when the minority of the 1% breaks the law.

Montesquieu did not include solutions for problems of masspeople who hardly existed for this member of the French elite. The masses were powerless and are still virtually without power. To get a Humane Society the 99% need power which is only possible when democracy is replaced by ideas that give everyone rights because all people have the same status.

The 99% were in the past only seen as dumb foot soldiers in wars between parts of the privileged classes. Defeated knights were invited to the banquet to celebrate the end of a war while at the same time foot soldiers were slaughtered. Without soldiers defeated knights were harmless for the triumphing knights. Towards people of their own kind the nobility was chivalrous, people from lower classes were hardly seen as human. The minds of the 1% did not change much in the last centuries. Western colonists considered people in the colonies as inferior and the products the rich want are still made by people in developing countries for a few pennies a day. Soldiers are

Towards a world without a 1%

still seen as inferior people when a war has ended. The differences between the 1% and the 99% continue to exist.

Montesquieu created the Trias Politica, the separation of the judicature, the executive and the legislature that are controlled by the 1% and their lackeys. There is no Fourth People's Power. Conflicts within the elite are solved on a peaceful way. After two hundred years democracy Machiavellian methods are still used in conflicts between countries and against the 99%.

Because of the growing number of laws and rules and the cost of juridical procedures the conflict solving method of Montesquieu can only be used by the minority that has enough money. The law says that all people are equal but the money paradigm causes that people who can hire expensive lawyers have more rights. George Orwell said already in *Animal Farm* "*All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others*". Democracy works a little within the elite, the masses did not benefit. The influence of common citizens is small, their life is determined by decisions of a minority at the top against which the 99% miss the means to oppose.

The idea that all people have the same status and equal possibilities to exert power should replace democracy. It gives way to a system in which active minorities of the 99% have the same power as minorities at the top. It is a better world when all people have the possibility to have more say about their own life and their personal freedom.

Chapter 47

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (2)

Democracy is not the best system ever, we need a Humane Society without a 1%

Democracy is not the final solution for the organisation of humanity. After two hundred years democracy has failed. Hunger, wars and poverty still exist and no end can be seen to this misery. Democracy does not need some minor improvements, the basic ideas behind democracy are wrong. Democracy gives not everyone the chance on a nice life, the same status and the same influence on decisions. Decisions are not taken by The People but by a small group of privileged people who think in the first place of their own well-being. The majority of humanity has hardly any say. That was already foreseen by the prominent member of the French elite, the count of Montesquieu, who proposed democracy as a new system that continued the rule of the 1%.

Advancing on the road to a better society democracy should be replaced by a system in which anybody can exert power, not dependent on the amount of money someone has or the backing of wealthy people. Elections that only concern a few minor political leaders and not leaders in the public and private sector are not sufficient. The many deficiencies and inconsistencies in the system demand for something new.

The growing number of rules and laws more and more restricts the freedom of common citizens. In Europe the number of laws rose sharply after 1945 when social democrats got more influence with their idea of a society controlled by strict laws for the 99%. They wanted to improve life by regulating the behaviour of The People without allowing them any say. In fact they followed ideas brought forward by the 1%. In the United States the number of laws also steeply increased. This restriction of the freedom of citizens was not caused by the influence of social democrats but by the wish of the 1% to control the 99%. Politicians, it did not matter if they were called left or right, were only one of the means to achieve that.

While common citizens have little influence on laws made by politicians, many other rules are taken without any influence of the 99% and have to be accepted. When you rent or buy a house, want guarantee on products you buy, go on holidays, have insurances, etc, rules are made by the selling organisation and influence of citizens is not possible. When you don't agree you cannot buy or rent a house, you do not get an insurance etc. You have to accept the rules, you are powerless.

Towards a world without a 1%

Laws restrict the freedom of common citizens more than the freedom of elite people. The top of society can use expensive lawyers and advisors to circumvent laws. More laws were only necessary to keep mass people under control and to preserve the power and the privileged position of the 1%. Because the rising level of education the 99% became more conscious of their inferior position. A better education is a prime condition to reach another kind of society with free, educated, wise and autonomous people where the elite will lose its place.

Democracy has to be abolished but when you say you are not a democrat you are accused to support dictators. This indoctrination has gone so far that there seem to be only two possibilities, democracy or dictatorship though in democracies the 1% rule as dictators, opposition is hardly allowed. Many people find democracy the best system even when they see the great mistakes, the great misery for an important part of the world's population, the greed and corruption, the uncontrolled crime and not at least the lasting superiority of leaders who have only one goal, to amass as much money as they can. But they do not know how they get change and where that change will lead to.

Any change could plunge life into chaos and lots of uncertainties. That chaos often occurs in our democracy because the 1% fabricate crises for their own benefit is disregarded. That the many wars, crises and the extraction of commodities in developing countries or the disturbance of the climate because of moneyed reasons make life for the 99% miserable is also disregarded. In a great part of the world chaos is already the rule.

I only advance a simple question: is it possible to get a Humane World in which all people have the same status by breaking the blockade that is built by the 1% to preserve the democratic system that favours the already privileged?

Chapter 48

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (3)

Advancing on the road to a different and beautiful future inspires the 99%

On the road to a different future several elements of a new society become visible. Citizens feel freer by having more influence on their own life and on the general process of decision-making. How the new society precisely looks like is the task of our offspring, of the people who live then. We only can make a start in the right direction. The Nuremberg judges after World War II were succinct in this regard: "Individual citizens have the right to violate domestic laws to prevent crimes against peace and humanity." About the same idea as Jean-Paul Marat who talks about the right to punish faulty leaders when the freedom, privacy and well-being of citizens is violated.

To get ideas about a new society, distance yourself from the democratic system. The idea that majorities decide must be left behind. Active, interested and involved minorities of common citizens should control decisions. Autonomous Clubs are temporary, alternating groups of independent and active people (thus minorities) who are interested or involved in a problem or an injustice. Citizens pressure decision-takers (also a minority) in their private living situation and force them to take their argumentation into account. Actions are often anonymous to protect the safety of the activists. The Golden Rule for Actions demands that damage to the 99% should be minimised. Masspeople become active when, where, how, with whom, against whom and about which problem they select and are interested in. Now political organizations led by a party elite decide what has to be done. Now citizens give their power to elected people who are nearly immune for any influence or ideas that live under the masses. On the many decisions of non-elected top-people in the public and private sectors citizens have no influence at all.

In my book "[The Power of the Autonomous Human](#)", theory and practice of attacks on humans", I describe several actions and also some small successes. I participated in some of them. People who participated in those actions have seen that something else is possible. It is not right to restrict your activity to giving your vote to people who take decisions that are in the first place beneficial for the kind of people that live in the close vicinity of decision-takers. The power of the mightiest group must be undermined.

Towards a world without a 1%

The more or less closed elite uses its power in the first place to preserve and strengthen its privileged position. These not-elected leaders use several methods to compel leaders to take one-sided decisions. This includes direct payment (corruption), promises of future well-paid jobs (also corruption) or embedding decision takers in the sphere of the elite by invitations to lavish parties and other emoluments. Lobbying (the use of power and money to enforce different decisions) is a special form of corruption. All methods are fuelled by money and in actions the money factor and what you can do with this money that is often acquired on a dubious way stands central.

The separated and exclusive world of the most powerful group has to be made uninhabitable to give masspeople more freedom and to destroy the possibility that the 1% use their special position to lure decision-takers into their circles.

Autonomous Clubs confront minorities of decision-takers by controlling them, vetoing wrong decisions and punishing faulty leaders who violate our freedom and well-being. Anyone from the 99% can start or join a Club and all members have the same status what does not often occur in a democracy. Leaders of political organisations mostly use the silent uninterested majority of members to promote their own ideas. All members of a Club are active so there is no need for a leader who can manipulate the Club. All actions contribute to the idea that the 99% get more influence on their own life and the general social development. Only then humans really become freer.

The formation of temporary and alternating minorities of active, interested and involved citizens is contrary to what happens in democratic organs in which decisions are based on majorities that vote in the believe that leaders know what is best. The changing attitude of the 99% about elected leaders favours a fundamental change.

The Dutch phenomenon Fortuyn illustrated this change in the democratic voting process. People turned away from the old left-right politics and followed the charismatic Fortuyn. In the general elections of 2001 he won 17% of the votes in the Dutch elections. His political program emphasized the discontent of the Dutch voter with the political elite. Fortuyn hardly gave solutions but capitalised on the dissatisfaction. In later years support for rightist and leftist populist parties rose to over 30%. In other Western countries the same phenomenon occurs.

Fortuyn was murdered in 2002 but the discontent and antipathy for old political parties increased. After the murder many people said "They have murdered our Fortuyn who should make life better for us". That is in contradiction to the idea that citizens must get an own power and not remain dependent on leaders. The idea that others could make life better is incompatible with the idea that free people decide with their own Fourth People's Power. That has not yet penetrated deep in the minds of the 99%. Citizens are dissatisfied but leaders who decide over and for masspeople can never solve this discontent because they want in the first place more for the own

Towards a world without a 1%

group. Wide-spread corruption in higher circles shows that leaders want to have still more even when they have already lavish incomes and perks.

The prime characteristic of democracy is that people are allowed to vote but that elected decide. That leaders in the private and public sector are not elected is disregarded. But even elected leaders continue to preserve their high posts when it is obvious that they do a very bad job, that they are corrupt, that difficulties are mounting and that the freedom of citizens is more and more restricted. Politicians fail utterly in safeguarding the well-being of the 99% that deteriorated because of the crisis caused by the 1%. Only successful actions by Autonomous Clubs that penetrate in the private life of leaders can destroy this deep rooted problem. It makes decisions-makers clear that they should serve The People and not to rule over them. Power is in a democracy in the hands of a select group of elected and mostly non-elected minority of leaders, in a Humane World in the hands of free, active and involved citizens.

Chapter 49

Alternating minorities versus a democracy based on majorities (4)

Decision-taking should be based on the freedom, well-being and activity of 99%

Politicians take decisions in the first place on ideas that live in their close environment, on ideas of their peers and not on ideas that live in the masses because they hardly know the 99%. The same is true for the well-paid not-elected leaders in the industrial, financial and public sectors.

It is remarkable that corruption in the top is hardly punished. By misusing their power important amounts of money flow to the top. It causes a lot of damage to common citizens who have to pay for the corruption with higher prices and taxes. The theft of many millions by dubious actions of owners or directors of corporations, banks or big public institutions is not treated by their fellow-leaders with zero tolerance or indignation. The words corruption, theft, criminal behaviour etc, are seldom used. In their own circles these criminals remain accepted as full members of the Happy Few. They remain "Our Kind of People". The small mistake of the disappearance or the embezzlement of a few millions does not have any repercussion. When "That Kind of People" embezzle small amounts of money they are dealt with in a fast and severe way.

In the far past some humans changed the world where only one kind of people lived in two worlds with two different kinds of people, the 1% and the 99%. The 99% have to abide by decisions taken by the 1%. It is a black-white painting but it contains a lot of truth. Nobody can deny that decisions often favour the already privileged group. That is obvious by analysing conflicts between powerful and less powerful countries. Also inside the borders of a country differences are striking. The retirement regulations for elected politicians are much better than for the rest of the population. The golden hand-shakes for CEO's are very generous. The top finds they deserve to be treated differently than the rest of the world. They have the power to confirm that with advantageous excessive rewards. That is misuse of power for their own benefit, in one word corruption. Their selfish and greedy attitude is supported in their own circles that for the greater part consist of people who take comparable corrupt decisions. The 99% are not involved in any way in this money stream to the top. Incomes at the top of the private and the public sector are determined by the CEO's themselves, not by politicians and certainly not by workers in corporations. All extra's as bonuses and perquisites are much higher than for lower employees. Trade unions

Towards a world without a 1%

only talk about the income of workers, not about that of directors or about the height of profits of corporations. All extravagances have to be paid by the 99%.

Demonstrations, strikes, elections, boycotts, petitions and other out-dated actions do not impress leaders and do not give citizens decisive power. Former Dutch trade-union leader Wim Kok was in 1981 front man in the biggest Dutch demonstration ever. He told demonstrators he was against any nuclear weapon on Dutch soil. Years later he became prime minister but nuclear weapons are still present in my country. A few years ago they have even secretly upgraded the bombs though the vast majority of the Dutch population is against nuclear weapons in their country. Majorities do not decide, only minorities of leaders do.

New political ideas and new action methods are needed. The 99% should penetrate in the world of the 1% so decision-takers are directly confronted with common citizens. Autonomous Clubs create so much pressure on decision-takers that they are forced to change decisions. Clubs control, veto and punish but never replace them with other rulers. They change the minds of leaders. The Clubs are the Fourth People's Power next to the three elitist powers of the Trias Politica that settles conflicts in the higher echelons of society. It is a power that controls if leaders take decisions in the interest of all.

The pressure by activities of common citizens can be described as Political Stalking, Small Violence or Creative Disturbance (see Chapter 19 of my book "[About Violence and Democracy](#), in search for an alternative for democracy"). Everywhere decision-takers will be confronted with the 99%.

Because of the continuous pressure leaders change their way of thinking. When they continue to favour primarily the wishes of their peers they know pressure of masspeople will increase. At the same time the 99% get more self-esteem when their pressure has more result than actions that are allowed in the democratic system, actions that beg and ask and never force leaders to decide differently. After some small successes the 99% realise they also have power. Then they lose their powerlessness and become people with the same status.

A Humane World cannot come into existence when our world continues to be dominated and regulated by politicians who look upwards to the 1% in making decisions, who find the interests of the 1% more important than the improvement of the life of the 99%. This idea is still in its infancy but the growing discontent under the 99%, the growing awareness of powerlessness in regard to rulers and the mounting restriction of the freedom of common citizens demand another political system and above all another kind of decision-takers than in the present democracy. Democracy is over its top and approaches its end. We can accelerate this process that boosts the well-being of all 99% by attacking the present greedy and corrupt leaders.

Chapter 50

Towards a world without a 1%

Discrimination, racism, crime, corruption, greed and much more misery will nearly disappear when there is no 1%

The 1% are the basic cause of much of the misery in the world because they have the power and the money to implement the paradigm that money dominates decisions and not the idea that all people have the same status. When the money paradigm gets less influence greed and other money related behaviour as corruption and big crime starts to disappear. The motivation to amass money withers away. Different decisions are taken by putting people in first place. When everyone is considered having the same status, the problem of the ten million kids who die each year before they are five years old is tackled at once. In the present money dominated society these kids are unimportant, they do not contribute anything to the wallets of the super-rich.

The world is dominated by the Happy Few with a surplus of power and money. Despite wars, revolutions, economic and financial crises, natural catastrophes, etc. they rule the world already for ages. They continue to rule when we do not develop action means to end their domination. In a new world decisions are not taken because of the pivotal role of money but because all people have the same status.

When the prominent position of a greedy, selfish and often law-breaking 1% weakens less people copy their behaviour and look up to members of the 1%. That happens when the prime motive in life is not anymore money but people. Small thieves exist mostly because in a hierarchical society they follow what the top does. They see that top people are big thieves amassing money on dubious ways by giving themselves ridiculous incomes, all kinds of perks and dodging taxes not only by having accounts on small islands with tax havens. Corrupt behaviour is not prosecuted when you belong to the top. That there are thieves is one of the consequences of the existence of a pyramid of power and money. When there are no big thieves, the number of small thieves also goes down.

Changing the fundamental paradigm that rules society opens the door to a completely different future. When not money but the idea that all people have the same status dominates decisions the 1% disappears. The new paradigm becomes reality when the power and the money is taken away from the 1% by the 99%. To protect this Humane World without a 1% the 99% must have power to prevent that nobody can become a 1%, to prevent that nobody can use ridiculous amounts of money for himself while others have hardly enough to live, to prevent that conditions arise that promote the coming into being of a new 1%, a more or less closed

Towards a world without a 1%

privileged group of people who have more power and money than common citizens. During the transition to the new world and also when this new world exists the 99% control if decisions comply with the new paradigm that all people have the same status and punish leaders who take wrong decisions.

The new paradigm becomes only reality when the power and the money is taken away from the 1% by the autonomous power of common citizens, the Fourth People's Power. In our money infested world controllers and decision-takers are the same kind of people who live far from the world of the masses. Even when it seems that The People sometimes get some benefits, the old saying of Jean-Paul Marat remains valid: *"Despite their defeats, the princes do not lose anything"*. The position of the 1% is never challenged and despite possible set-backs they always come back at the top of society. A changing paradigm that dominates the minds of the 99% is a prime condition for change, the presence of independent power instruments a second one.

Thomas S. Kuhn emphasized in his book "The Structure of Scientific Revolutions" the role of a paradigm shift: *"...when paradigms change, the world itself changes with them. Led by a new paradigm scientists adopt new instruments and look in new places. Even more important, during revolutions scientists see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they have looked before."*

His studies concerned the smaller world of science. In the much more complicated big world unsolvable problems can also only be solved by new paradigms. Then we see things we could not see before. Copernicus could not foresee the influence of his new paradigm expressed in the small sentence: *"Not the Earth but the Sun is the centre of the Universe"*. The future is unknown but we can take the road to that new future by applying a new paradigm, a small sentence that states: *"All people have the same status"* and use this idea in anything we do and think.

The future is not a gradual evolutionary extrapolation of the present. A revolutionary jump brings new, interesting and unexpected possibilities. A new paradigm gives new ideas. The predecessors of Copernicus explained movements of celestial bodies with new calculations but could not solve many problems by assuming that the Earth was the centre of the Universe. *"The failure of the existing rules is the prelude to a search for new ones"* (Kuhn). Copernicus wrote in the Preface to the "De Revolutionibus" that *"the astronomical tradition had finally created a monster"*. Our society based on the money paradigm has also become a monster in which nearly ten million kids die each year before they are five years old. That monster cannot be killed by using old-fashioned action methods.

There is some indignation about a few thousand death citizens by chemical weapons in the civil war in Syria. About the more than hundred thousand people that died by other weapons the indignation is already much less, while the millions of kids that die each year before they are five years old get no attention at all. The indignation is propelled by money not by any thought about the suffering of the 99%. These

Towards a world without a 1%

problems cannot be solved when decisions are ruled by money. By adopting the new paradigm that all people have the right on a decent life this misery becomes a prime problem. Now it is a unimportant one, dying kids are not involved in the money economy. The People have become secondary because money dominates.

It is not possible to change the present world with small improvements. Fifty years ago we could not foresee the present society with the excessive control of common citizens. Ray Bradbury in "Fahrenheit 451", the temperature to burn books, and George Orwell in his book "1984" extrapolated their society and sketched a horrendous world about controlling the 99%. But the money paradigm still ruled in their world. They had no idea what really could happen and of which we see now the first signs. In the present society nobody can give any solution how the freedom of common citizens can improve. Money demands that the 99% are controlled. They must work for the benefit of the Happy Few and some of the 99% are allowed to have it better than the great masses. To change this monstrous society we need a paradigm shift, a revolution. There are however hardly books about a society without a 1% - of course not, the future cannot be predicted.

The new paradigm is the key that opens the door to a completely different world. Advancing on that road is more important than the new world itself. The far future will be organised by people who live then. The transition period is determined by a paradigm shift, a catastrophe, a revolution. The Catastrophe Theory of the French mathematician René Thom tells us that predictions are impossible. We can only strengthen the factors that lead to a revolution. When the fundamentals start to change, society changes also. A small example of a change because of a new idea occurred during the Chinese Revolution. Before the revolution succeeded in 1948 the idea prevailed that all people should have a decent life. The Communist Party concluded that everyone should have the right on some health care and bare-foot doctors were send to small villages in the country-side where doctors were unknown.

Most political activities take place inside the borders determined by the money paradigm. Tobin tax, Robin Hood tax or higher taxes for millionaires do not undermine the power relations. It are examples of extrapolating the already known to the future. Such ideas deceive the 99% by proposing a change that is not fundamental. Some slight changes in the growing control of the behaviour of the 99% because of activities of among others Assange and Snowden do not alleviate the control over the 99% because controlling the 99% is beneficial for the wallets of the 1%.

The new paradigm should be applied in any action. Then the 99% learns how to prevent that a new 1% can ever rise again to the top of society. The Golden Rule for Actions that damage to the 99% should be minimal and pressure on the 1% ever increasing is also an example of applying the new paradigm. Strikes do not comply with the new paradigm, they are determined by the money idea, we want more money! The idea that directors and workers have the same status gives rise to new

Towards a world without a 1%

demands and new action forms. Trade unions never challenge that directors can sack workers while workers cannot sack directors. Unions do not challenge the ridiculous high and faster rising incomes at the top of corporations while these incomes are the prime reason that CEO's have a different status than workers. There are also no actions against unnecessary bigger desks, bigger offices, higher allowances for food and transport, better pension regulations or golden handshakes for higher placed employees.

The money paradigm has deeply penetrated in the minds of the 99% and most actions are dominated by the money factor. The building of a palace for a 1% has for the economy the same value as building a hundred houses for the 99%. Some 99% remain homeless because one 1% wants to live extravagantly. I do not see any action against the palaces the 1% build for themselves.

The deeper cause of most misery, the existence of a superior 1% is not challenged. The present problems cannot be solved as long as the 1% keeps its position and power and as long as money rules decisions. The central slogan in all actions should become "take the money and the power away from the 1%", a simple practical translation of the new paradigm.

The 1% use the money paradigm to rule. Who are these 1% and why do they have so much power? The Theory of the Three F's (Finance, Function and Family) gives some insight. Members of the 1% have a lot of capital at their disposition, the Finance-factor. They have Functions that give them entrance to the decision-making process. And they have Family-members in comparable positions who can provide valuable information that is not available to common citizens. This is obviously not compatible with the same status paradigm.

Copernicus applied his paradigm in his whole work and advanced on the road towards a new future without knowing where he would arrive. It took about 150 year before the new paradigm was widely accepted and only then most scientists had entered the new astronomical world. A new political paradigm in our time with fast electronic means of communication changes the world faster though even now it will take some time before the minds of most people are changed.

When money is not anymore the guiding element in decisions, power relations change. One of the action targets is the undermining and destruction of the power-pyramid, causing that the 1% gets the same status as the 99%. The new paradigm: *"All people have the same status"* leads also to the action slogan *"Spending 200.000 euro in one year should be the limit!"*

The French Revolution at the end of the 18th century was guided by the new paradigm **"Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood"**. It activated the masses but during the revolution the paradigm was hardly applied in actions. Soon after the Revolution the paradigm was discarded. Power returned to new leading groups that included parts of the old 1% and the 99% lost their freedom, equality and

Towards a world without a 1%

brotherhood, they lost their same status. Napoleon and others made the paradigm about freedom for individual citizens inferior to the interests of the French state and the 1%. People became subordinated to the idea that France and the 1% rule the world. The introduction of the new paradigm changed France a little but soon it began to resemble the old society with a small group at the top and the masses down under. The new paradigm was not carried through and old paradigms got again the upper hand.

Before the French Revolution the Count de Montesquieu introduced the Trias Politica to solve conflicts within the elite. The top of society had one mutual interest, money. People with money should act united and not be weakened by internal conflicts. He applied the revolutionary paradigm Freedom, Equality and Brotherhood only to the 1%. The Machiavellian way to decide with a lot of deceit and violence was for the 1% replaced by the Trias Politica that separated the Judicature, the Executive and the Legislature. Deceit and violence remained the principal way of treating the 99%. Only the Legislature is partly elected, members of the other two parts are nominated. The 1% control all three power instruments and the money paradigm dominates all decisions of the Trias Politica. The Trias Politica is in violation with the same status paradigm.

When all people have the same status all should have independent power instruments. In the system of Montesquieu the 99% have no power instruments to confront and control top-people. The Trias Politica can only be used by people with money, lawyers are too expensive. The influence of common citizens is minimal, there is no independent Fourth People's Power and thus not the same status.

Actions should be judged if they contribute to diminishing the power of the Few and increasing the power of the Many. Actions that do not comply with this idea should not be carried out. Petitions, strikes, boycotts, demonstrations, civil disobedience but also the blowing up of a factory do not bring the same status nearer. The insurance pays the damage and the power structure is not challenged.

The revolutionary Jean-Paul Marat pointed two hundred years ago at new instruments to give the 99% power. Autonomous Clubs should independently control, veto and punish leaders who violate the freedom, privacy and well-being of the 99%. The new paradigm emphasizes living people as the most important entities in the world (and not dead money, institutions, corporations, banks or systems). Therefore the Fourth People's Power should pinpoint persons who do wrong. This new idea can be applied in the present society to undermine the power of the top and in the future society to prevent that leaders build a new powerful group.

Alternating temporarily minorities of common citizens form the basic power instrument of the 99%, the Fourth People's Power. There is a simple goal that was already expressed by Jean-Paul Marat: *"The only goal is the punishment of the perpetrators of crimes against public and individual freedom....."* Marat was soon

Towards a world without a 1%

murdered and his ideas were later hardly used in revolutionary circles. In all revolutionary struggles there has never been even the beginning of the formation of the independent Fourth People's Power that also after the revolution had great influence.

A world without a 1% demands that the present 1% start to lose their power and that the 99% develop an own power. That happens neither in leftists actions nor in rightist ones. The new paradigm speaks about living people with the same status. Actions should be directed on the private living sphere of leading people and not on dead buildings or corporations used to exert power. Though sometimes power instruments of the 1% may be attacked, most actions against banks or other symbols of power are not in accordance with the new paradigm. In the small Autonomous Clubs people use their own capabilities, characteristics and creativity in actions. Their kind of actions can be applied in the present society but also in the far future.

The concept of Creative Disturbance of the exclusive life of the 1% complies with the idea that all people have the same status which means that nobody has the moral right on an extravagant life at the cost of other humans. Because of the continuous pressure on the 1% their minds will be influenced by the idea that nobody has the right to have a different status and that getting or using too much money will be prevented. Leaders should be guided by the idea that people stand central and not money.

On the way to a new society an increasing number of actions of Autonomous Clubs care for many small successes that strengthen the self-esteem of the 99%. The chaos in leading circles and the tensions in the top build up. Then suddenly a jump occurs, a catastrophe, a revolution, a fundamental change. We enter a new phase in the development of humanity. Therefore emphasis should not be on how we can improve this society because it is built on the wrong ideas. Emphasis should be on how we can get a new society in which all people can exert the same power.

The future is exiting and the new world with autonomous people will be beautiful.

Towards a world without a 1%