

**about**  
**VIOLENCE**  
**and**  
**DEMOCRACY**

**In search for an alternative to democracy**  
**Joost van Steenis**  
**(2009)**

**[downwithelite@gmail.com](mailto:downwithelite@gmail.com)**  
**<http://members.chello.nl/jsteenis>**

## **How to reach a society beyond democracy**

The sudden disappearance of the traditional communist enemy in Eastern Europe has opened the possibility to wonder if there is anything better than democracy. It cannot be that democracy is the end of the development of our society. When we consider the huge and seemingly unsolvable deficiencies as the lasting poverty and hunger, the growing pollution, the subordinated position of women or the dependency of the majority of the people on the wishes of a small group of powerful and wealthy leaders then there must be something more humane than a democracy. The contradiction between elite and mass seems to be an eternal antagonism. In this book I have brought together a number of new ideas in order to advance to a new future, to take a new step in the development of human society. In such a future humans will be freer, more individual and less determined by public authorities and political mass organisations. Masspeople who are now powerless will get more power by using a certain amount of violence on a creative, autonomous and inventive way against elitepeople who in the first place want to preserve their own high income, their ownership of more earthly goods than the average human and their privilege to give this wealth and power through to their children.

In a new kind of society power relations should be more equal, the autonomous massperson should have more influence on life in general and on his own life in particular.

Masspeople will work together in small temporary groups of active, interested and involved citizens on the road towards a future beyond the present hierarchical elitist democracy. This road will be sometimes bizarre, chaotic or even objectionable but that may not be a motive to hang on to a dying democracy.

Written in 1990 by **Joost van Steenis** and edited by the **Foundation Power & Elite**.

Rewritten by **Joost van Steenis** in 2009.

# Contents

Preface	4
1. Democracy	6
2. Guiding Myths	13
3. The elitist democracy	18
4. The strongman	23
5. Democratic Powers	28
6. Media Power	32
7. The importance of living beings	37
8. Mass Power	41
9. Actions	45
10. Psychological violence	50
11. The phenomenon violence	54
12. Violence in history	59
13. The First and the Third World	64
14. Creative violence	67
15. Revolutionary violence	70
16. Kinds of violence	76
17. Terror of the elite	81
18. Mass Terror	85
19. Creative Disturbance	90
20. What is to be done	94

# PREFACE

## **How to reach a society beyond democracy**

The world turns around power, power dominates relations between people. Power is narrowly connected to the surplus of wealth at the top echelon of our society. Violence is the ultimate means of power to keep masspeople in a subordinate position but it has also been a vital factor in all past social changes. In the hierarchical organised democratic society the elite has a near monopoly on the use of violence to safeguard its privileged position, rulers and ruled live in two separated worlds, the eliteworld and the massworld. Humanity makes a step forward when all people should live in the same world in which power differences are minimised and in which all people have the same status. To reach such a world masspeople must use new kinds of creative down-top violence to counter the top-down violence that maintains the unequal position of power and wealth of the elite.

This book is meant for people who want a fundamentally different kind of society that honours the individuality and creativity of autonomous humans. The present elitist democracy is petrifying because dead money suppresses original ideas of free people. Creativity and autonomy are not appreciated. Democracy is hardly less violent than other social systems. Hundreds of millions of people were killed in wars started by democrats. Rich Western democracies support regimes that maintain a situation in which many people do not even get enough food. Other regimes deny any freedom to women. An astounding high number of capable masspeople is in prison. The standard of education, social security and housing in important parts of our world is very low.

It is the consequence of the monopoly of violence of the top of our society that wants to preserve its privileged life. In Western countries only a small part of the population is involved in decision making. Maybe democracy is the best social system ever but it is not a free society in which masspeople can determine their own life. In less democratic countries the elite determines even more the life of the masses. Only in the West the level of prosperity, education, housing and health is so high that a new kind of society beyond democracy is possible. This new society will be so different from the present one that it is not possible to reach this goal by slowly improving the elitist democracy. All efforts to improve democracies are futile and do not change the unequal balance of power. The artificial contradiction between left and right in politics only divides the masses and continues the dominating power of the elite.

The life of masspeople is determined from birth to death by hardly known leaders and humans have become machines without any independent influence on what happens. The supremacy of the elite seems eternal but unexpected change is possible. A year before the Fall of The Wall nobody could predict this drastic change in Eastern Europe. The French or the Russian Revolution have also shown that a

fundamental change only takes place after a chaotic period. Order and chaos are important aspects of human life.

The idea that violence is needed to reach a better society stands so far from current political ideas that it makes room for a different kind of thinking. By rejecting the existing the door to a discussion about a new social system will open. This discussion will determine which basic characteristics are wanted in a future society. These characteristics must already be implemented during the struggle to reach a new society and involve more freedom, autonomy and independence of masspeople and the development of their creative talents. The road towards this bright future will sometimes be violent, unpredictable and chaotic. But when masspeople do not dare to confront chaotic situations, do not dare to use independent violence they will never escape from the present subordinate position. Human progress will be blocked and humanity will come nearer to its downfall.

**Joost van Steenis**

March 2009

## Chapter 1. DEMOCRACY

Why should voting be the best and most responsible way masspeople can exercise influence? Why should a majority have the best opinion? Democracy and elections are sacrosanct though nobody can seriously believe that you get real power by casting your vote. The highest right in human society should not be the right to vote but the right to influence decisions in the same way as the powers that be. The partition of power and not elections should stand central. Elected representatives think in the first place of the interests of people around them who have about the same social position. And they give excessive attention to the needs of still more powerful people. The interest of the electorate is subordinate to the interests of this privileged elite. We live in an elitist democracy in which the elite always takes first place.

It is a fairy-tale that hardly involved or informed majorities decide. In Belgium nearly 100% of the population votes because voting is obligatory. In the Netherlands 40 to 80 percent comes to the ballot box. In provincial elections in England sometimes less than one in five voters take the trouble to vote. But elected representatives will never refuse their seat because they represent only the minority that went to the ballot boxes.

Even at American presidential elections half of the population stays away. **Kennedy** got the vote of hardly a third of the people though a record 62% voted. Moreover expensive advertisement campaigns lured people to the ballot boxes. It is better, fairer, more humane and even possible to replace democracy by a political system in which alternating minorities of active, interested and involved citizens directly influence decisions. In democracies interested and involved masspeople are almost powerless against the sitting political power.

The abyss between politicians and masses is deep. In the elitist democracy most people do not participate in the decision-taking process. Politicians mostly do not even want to ask people their opinion, do not even want to listen to voters. They are in power and their position does not change when only ten percent of the population should go to the ballot boxes. The intensive attention of media for elections conceals the low participation in election processes and proves that masspeople know they have hardly any influence on what happens in a democracy.

Masspeople cannot interfere in the decision-making process because they have transferred their voting power to democratic leaders who act on behalf of the masses. Elections undermine the possibility that individual masspeople make autonomous decisions. They lose some of their freedom when political activities are restricted to voting. Then they can never exercise any power on the moment and on the subjects they choose. Leaders decide when, how and about what they should act. Democracy restricts the freedom of the greater part of the population because a small group of leaders acts without any interference from outside. It is a manifestation of the old contradiction between rulers and ruled.

Society needs people who take decisions. It is impossible that everyone can always and everywhere decide about everything. Most people lack the interest, the skill, the knowledge and the time to become involved in many subjects. They trust that other people take right decisions. But involved and interested people must have a possibility to exert direct pressure on decision-takers. Elections give citizens some influence about the general ideas of leaders but not on specific decisions. The real players in the democratic game can be found at the top, the masses are allowed to vote, to shout, to applaud, to hiss or even to throw stones, but they are never allowed to participate in the game.

Democracy is considered as the best possible system but the rich baron of **Montesquieu** who in the 18<sup>th</sup> century introduced the Trias Politica never meant that masses should get influence. The elite should remain in power. In the course of time everyone was allowed to vote but the system did not change, a small group at the top took decisions and the rest had to be obedient. The only thing that did change is that elected leaders had to convince masspeople that only the elite could safeguard their interests. In political less developed countries the opposition is silenced or even forbidden to enter Parliament but in the West the opposition is bribed and buttered up. The German Green Party received hundreds of millions and entered the government. The party even defended German participation in the Afghan War. The opposition may bring its views forward in Parliament and may even organise (peaceful) street demonstrations but ideas must fit in the current political tendencies. Ideas that dissent too much from the mainstream are not allowed. Soon after World War II so-called revolutionary parties abandoned the struggle for another kind of society and joined the election circus.

Democratic leaders resemble church leaders. Because they want to maintain their grip on the masses they change the rules when the masses become too unruly. Rome abandoned Latin as church language and even allowed popular music to be played in churches but the clergy retained power. Democratic leaders did not lose their dominant position when referendums were introduced to give masspeople an illusion of power. But hierarchical systems are losing support. The membership of religious or political organisations is declining. In Germany only three percent of the population had in 2003 some trust in political parties. Institutions as labour exchange, health insurance or churches are trusted by less than ten percent. Only church organisations at local level, automobile organisations, charity organisations and environmental clubs like Greenpeace are trusted more. In the Netherlands just over two percent of the population is member of a political party and only a tiny fraction is political active. Political parties can hardly find enough people to fill the places needed in democratic organs. The enthusiasm to participate in elections is everywhere decreasing. Ten years after free elections were introduced after a long-lasting bloody civil war, only a meagre forty percent of the population voted in El Salvador.

There are many irrational reasons why people continue to support democracy while they rationally know the system is flawed. Because of the myth that democracy is the best system ever it continues to exist. The democratic myth is also strengthened because leaders from time to time introduce novelties as referendums or more local governance. In Holland some democratic leaders propagate that citizens should get

more influence when mayors are directly elected though this idea has already been proved worthless in countries as France or the United States. The legitimacy of democracy is however dwindling and the need for another social system is growing. But change only occurs as the democratic power structure is weakened.

Children know that fire is dangerous when they once have burned their fingers but politicians repeat time and again refuted arguments as for example the myth that majorities are always right. The majority of the Germans supported **Hitler** when he started World War II. The majority in Iran supported **Khomeiny** and should have voted in favour of fundamentalist laws. Only ten years later the same people supported in majority the movement against the harsh Islamic laws. But why should a law that is supported by a majority be valid for all people? Why should a Dutchman who is not religious be forced to follow rules that are pushed through by nuns and fathers who follow the words of foreign zealots in Rome or words in old books that were written in fundamentally different times? Is it right that such decisions can be imposed on people that have no connection at all to the Catholic Church? In democracies majorities often suppress minorities and the freedom of individuals is virtually non-existent.

Opinion polls give people also only an illusion of power. Leaders take the opinion of the masses only into account when this opinion agrees with their own political strategy. In the Netherlands the majority of the population wanted to remove all nuclear weapons from Dutch soil. But when Labour leader **Wim Kok** who had openly declared to be opposed to such weapons became Prime Minister nothing happened. What does it mean when the majority of non-peasants wants peasants to lower their prices, when village-people find that too much money is used to solve traffic problems in big cities, when Christian people find that the family is the cornerstone of society? Can a minority be forced to live according the opinions of a majority? Polls are a power instrument for the leading class but do not give power to the masses. But it is fun to read that most Americans think that the government is always lying or that Americans are twice as much afraid of letters about taxes than of letters that could contain anthrax.

Why should we continue to love democracy? Why should not-involved majorities decide and not alternating, involved, concerned and active minorities? In The Netherlands we had the slogan "Boss in Own Stomach". Yes indeed only women have the right to decide what happens to their stomach in case of pregnancies. That is an excellent example of a minority who should decide but in the end a majority of male leaders took decisions.

Ideas for a better democratic future begin to disappear. Pragmatists replace political visionaries. Each problem is seen as a thing on itself and solutions consist only of making more laws that restrict the freedom of citizens. By taking harsh measures the drug problem in the centre of Amsterdam was somewhat reduced but drug problems in other quarters of Amsterdam grew. The bombing of Afghanistan has chased away the Taleban regime but women remained in an inferior position. The terrorist group of **Osama Bin Laden** lost its bases but new Bin Ladens with new organisations and new techniques are elsewhere arising. The defeat of the regime of **Saddam Hussein** has increased the number of terrorists. New weapons will be invented because the USA dominates conventional weapons. When one problem is solved, another arises.

Pragmatic solutions do not take into account why people use drugs, why terrorist groups have broad support. Politicians without vision force masspeople to live in straitjackets. Autonomous activities are reduced to discourses in front of elitist judges. Fewer rules will give masspeople more individual freedom because then they cannot fall back on rules when problems arise. When at last leaders have disappeared masspeople have to act and think for themselves when problems arise.

In Europe the number of laws has risen tremendously with the coming into power of social democracy. But American society is even more regulated. Laws regulate in the first place the life of masspeople that cannot find holes in the laws. The elite knows how to avoid laws. That is shown by the many court cases in which high-placed people are acquitted because they can hire the best lawyers. The case concerning the illegal use of monopolies by Microsoft and his leader **Ben Gates** is an excellent example. The harsh treatment of petty criminals (including the deep intrusion in their private life) is not applied to people who evade taxes. In our elitist democracy laws are made for the masses, the elite has a free hand to safeguard and increase its privileges.

Politicians think that everything can be regulated, that the future can be made and predicted. This deterministic idea originated in the philosophy of the nineteenth century but is refuted by the newest developments in science. But it is still the leading doctrine in politics as well as in economics. Individual responsibility is replaced by collective responsibility and people have become pawns in a game. Personal freedom was one of the stimulating forces at the start of the democratic system but it has nearly disappeared. The lack of personal freedom was one of the convincing objections against the Soviet system but it enters also Western societies. Our society petrifies because problems are not anymore connected to each other but regarded as separate entities. Hooliganism is combated by juridical measures that only lead to a higher prison population. It is not solved because the causes of violence around sport games are not understood. A month or two in prison does not make young people responsible citizens.

To combat social evils only new rules and higher punishments are proposed. Autonomous thinking is suppressed. Individual, reasonable free Protestants developed the world when after the Middle Ages society started to petrify because of the strict rules imposed by the Catholic Church. A comparable petrification occurred in the worlds of the Islam, the Hindus and the Chinese mandarins. When people become robots with predictable ideas a complicated society lacks people who take new initiatives. It is not possible to think of new things in a society in which dissenting behaviour is regarded unjust or even dangerous. But when people are restricted some of them will react vigorously and become extremists who reject all rules. From my vast experience I have concluded that when peaceful demonstrations become violent, the most violent demonstrators are people who have been held short in their youth, their study and their job.

It seems a paradox that a stricter regulation of our society causes more chaotic and individualistic behaviour. People who dodge the law can be drunken drivers, black workers, tax evaders or child abusers, most of it is caused by the social straitjacket. One of the causes of the dozens of deaths during a 1985 soccer match in the

Belgium Heysel Stadium was the fact that accidental circumstances gave some people the chance to break suddenly out of the straitjacket.

It was not the first time that English soccer fans were involved in catastrophes. On the cosy tribunes of the elite it is mostly tranquil. For the masses sport is one of the few places where they can express their individuality. Sometimes this leads to terrific situations. In 1971 66 people were killed in Glasgow and in 1985 56 people were killed in Bradford. Different situations, same causes. Then the authorities made strong gates (they tried to solve the situation with new rules) to contain and control the masses and in 1989 95 people were crushed to death in Sheffield. A seemingly ordered situation suddenly gave rise to a not predicted chaos, to a catastrophe. Authorities cannot understand what is happening because they want to control individual humans who cannot and may not be controlled. After the Heysel-drama some individuals were sent to prison though they had acted as part of a mass happening. The organisers went free although they had indeed individual responsibility. After each disaster the powerful ask for more laws even when more order gives rise to more violent chaos. Another kind of laws is needed that does not consider masspeople to be indistinguishable sheeps in a herd but that take the responsibility of each person for his own deeds into account. In a new society people must have the right to act as an individual. Democratic politicians will not agree because freedom for masspeople undermines the power of the elite, whose position is guarded by the political class.

we benefit the privileged rich. It is better to steal a hundred thousand from the tax office than a thousand from a petrol station. Petty criminals get high prison sentences, people who pollute the environment and endanger the drinking water system only get a fine. The laws are so specific that you can dodge the law when not stipulated that what you throw away is pollution. We need laws in which the damage to other people and the intention to cause damage stands central, laws that specify in general terms what is human. Dead written laws have to be changed into living human laws. Moreover order is not the highest form of human society because just in irregular chaotic situations people have the possibility to show their strength and to prove their worth. It is better to strive for chaos then for a society in which the future can be predicted.

The supporters of democracy advance the idea that though democracy is indeed not ideal, it is still the best system there is. All other systems lead to chaos, corruption, arbitrariness, misery and other awful things. Corruption etc. is also common in democracies but democratic thinkers say that they are working hard to repair all wrongs. It is better to have a boring democracy with some flaws in which the future is secured than to start an adventurous revolutionary experiment that can go wrong. By repeating these silly arguments people except the lasting injustice of democracy and abandon any effort to tackle the basic intrinsic flaws of democracy. The growing gap between poor and rich, the growing corruption in rich Western nations, the failing health system and the big holes in social safety lead to the inevitable conclusion that democracy is fundamentally wrong. It is not possible to change democracy slowly in a society in which wealth and power are unevenly partitioned.

After some time all political parties that say to strive for a different kind of society lose courage. Extreme-left political parties utter sometimes revolutionary words but the

longer they are working with and in democratic institutions the more they want to stay there. The idea to take over society by walking through the democratic institutions as was proposed in the sixties and the seventies only makes you similar to people who are already in the institutions. After some time old democrats and former revolutionaries cannot be distinguished. **Cohn-Bendit**, **Schiller** and **Fisher** have become right wing social democrats and lost their extreme points of view. A president of the European Commission, the former Portuguese prime minister **Barroso**, began his political carrier as Maoist. Shortly after the Russian Revolution the wish to create another kind of society was abandoned and Soviet society started to resemble the abused Western democracies, with an elite at the top and powerless masses at the bottom. All democratic forces try to preserve a system in which most measures are taken top-down. Not only right-wing parties but also leftist parties neglect the possibilities of autonomous people. Mostly because it is easier to work in a hierarchical system in which the top gives the orders that are carried out by lower people. Critical and autonomous people are a nuisance. Democracy resembles a religious sect in which a small group predestines all and in which the freedom of unique masspeople is curtailed. In both systems the leadership is all knowing and all regulating. The democratic God has replaced the heavenly God. Neither church leaders nor political leaders are responsible to masspeople. New leaders hope to climb the social ladder and become part of the elite. Communists dreamed of a world in which only they formed a new elite, social democrats understood that it is much easier to become member of an existing elite.

The contradiction left right belongs to the past. Differences between political tendencies have nearly vanished. Advertisement firms and charismatic leaders have become more important than political programs. All parties look for votes to inactive, not-involved majorities, while the interested minority is left to small parties on the extremes. It is difficult to deduce from decisions if leftist or rightist governments have taken them. The election circus and the parliamentary discussions have become a tasteless porridge in which elected representatives only try to steal a march on their colleagues. A political struggle is like a fight between two detergents which have the same washing power but in which the richest company always wins. Can we expect something new from such a situation? No, elections and democracy kill all progress.

Everyone will agree that it is outrageous to elect a professor in mathematics. Directors of multinationals, ministries or hospitals are also not elected. Only members of Parliament are elected in elections that are often manipulated by publicity and old customs. Blacks tend to vote Democrat in the United States though it is not proved that Republicans are worse. The war in Iraq gave **Bush jr** nearly 90% support. In the first Gulf War **Bush sr** had also an appreciation of 90 % but he lost the next elections. Non-political events as an earthquake, a terrorist attack or a nuclear accident influence the result of elections. It is hardly important if elected are capable or experienced. Representatives lie, distort the truth and make big mistakes but a next time they are again elected. In the media they are mostly praised and hardly punished. **Den Uyl**, former Dutch social-democrat leader, told miners they should get other jobs when he closed the Dutch coal mines. He lied and most mineworkers remained idle for a very long time. But he was anyhow rewarded with an honourable degree in economics. Mayor **Guiliani** of New York, whose popularity had fallen deeply, was nevertheless elected by Time as Man of the Year 2001 because he had nothing better to do than to walk around in the ruins caused by the WTC attack.

Masses hardly have any influence on the list of candidate MP's that are pushed forward by party bosses that are not elected. At the top you find the party elite, at the basis only powerless party members and outside the even more powerless voters. It is understandable that still fewer people are member of a political party.

Maybe democracy is the best political system ever but it has fundamental shortcomings that prevent the further development of humanity. It is not enough to improve the system a little. Democracy, human rights nor equality of women fell from the sky. Those events were accompanied by some violence. But the rights of many humans are still trampled upon by the feet of lawmakers and police. Women are still not allowed to play soccer in the same team as men, in the top of big organisations men are a big majority, prisons are full of people from the lower classes that cannot afford expensive lawyers that keep people from higher classes outside. Though the USA propagate that in their democracy people are free, more than two million people are in prison and an additionally four million under direct state control. These numbers are comparable to the number of people in the Russian gulags. There is something fundamentally wrong when one in eight male Afro-Americans between 20 and 40 is imprisoned. Of white masspeople only one in sixty-three lost his freedom.

In democracies important decisions about the life of masspeople are taken elsewhere. People with high incomes who will never be hungry discuss the problem of hunger in the world. They tell hungry people that the problem will be solved but it still cost many years and many deaths. It is perverse that small children are forced to wave flags in honour of high-placed people they do not know. It is preposterous that rich people can decide that medicines against HIV can only be used by poor people when they pay a lot of money – dead money has become more important than living humans. The greater part of humanity is deprived of products made with the help of patents that should benefit all humans. Can this ever be justified? Is it absurd to strive for another kind of society?

An alien, coming from another planet, will wonder what is happening on earth. Why are some people hungry while elsewhere food is spilled? How is it possible that a few years after a devastating war leaders are again on friendly terms while millions of common citizens have died? Why are weapons becoming still more dangerous while existing weapons can already destroy the world? Why is wealth and power so unequally divided? Why is most law making directed against petty crimes as the stealing of bicycles and cars while big crimes from civil servants who spill millions, factory owners who pollute the environment or corrupt people who steal millions is left alone. I am sure the alien will fly away from earth as fast as he can.

Democracy cannot change these abuses and elections are not sufficient to get a better world. Nobody can believe that democracy will soon eradicate inequality. Nobody can believe that democracy will give masspeople more freedom, more say over their life and more possibilities to use their unique characteristics as autonomy and creativity. When masspeople want change they must abandon the idea that democracy and elections can give them influence, freedom and a better world. They must look for other ways.

**I do not vote anymore.**

## Chapter 2. GUIDING MYTHS

Society is too complicated to understand everything. There is always room for irrational thoughts, for unproven ideas, for the myth that a fundamentally different situation will arise when you act now.

A myth is not a utopia. A utopia is a blueprint of a future situation in which the road to that future is not specified. A myth is a vague idea about a future that includes the path to that future. Moreover the myth as well as the road to that myth are dynamic processes which are constantly changing. Anarchism and other utopian tendencies will never lead to another social system. There is no connection between the present situation and the utopian future. Many anarchists try therefore to realise anarchist ideas in the democratic structure, for example in education. The unattainable future is only discussed with fellow-believers.

Myths are inspiring guiding principles for human activities. People are even more prepared to die for ideas than for certainties, for what is believed than for what is known. People fight for freedom, democracy or the Jihad, although they know they can die in the struggle. Soldiers that are paid or conscripted are less motivated. Most myths inspire only for a restricted period of time. The democratic myth is more than two centuries old and has lost most of its power. A new myth has to replace the aging democracy, a myth that is also based on irrefutable facts and irrational elements.

That democracy is the best political system ever is a contemporary myth that still inspires many people in the Third World. In the rich part of the world trust in democracy is declining though leaders continue to propagate that democracy will improve society. This distrust is also increased by the curtailing of private freedom through the a growing number of laws and rules, a trend that is accelerated because of the War against Terrorism and the domination of a super power that does not permit deviating opinions.

The waning support of the democratic myth forces the elite to introduce new myths. The War on Drugs and the War on Terrorism have replaced the Cold War in an effort to convince citizens that a safer world is possible. It has been followed by the Afghan War and the Second Gulf War that aim to install democracy in far off countries (while restricting freedom at home). The meagre result of these wars causes a further decline in the support of the elite. An important part of the increasing criminality has nothing to do with drugs or terrorism. The growing number of middle and upper class houses in guarded compounds also contradicts the idea that the world becomes more secure. The growing state control undermines the myth that democracy gives citizens more freedom.

Political systems attract massive following because part of the doctrines cannot be reasoned-out or proven. **Karl Marx** claimed nevertheless that communism was a scientific doctrine. The change from capitalism to communism should be irrefutable and even unavoidable. I do not agree, political systems do not change by itself, changes are produced by human will and effort. The attraction of Marxism is not its determinism, but the belief in a better future after the revolution. Despite all improvements after the October Revolution, the factual basis of the communist myth was undermined because Soviet-communism could not catch up with Western prosperity. The communist myth lost its grip on Western people (and on the

Russians). It cannot anymore serve as a motor for further development in the West, just as religion has lost much of its mythical strength. In the Third World however religious myths are still strong. Communism lost also its attraction even though it cannot be proven that the communist system is economically inferior to Third World democracy as we look at the lasting poverty, the repeating economic recessions and the vast corruption. In the acceptance of political ideas facts and belief, reality and myth are factors that cannot be separated.

Nationalism is based on the myth that life will be better when 'own' people lead the country. In the United States the American Dream strengthens this myth. The **Monroe**-doctrine, that restrained the influence of non-Americans in Latin America, was a practical result of this myth. In Nazi-Germany the nationalist myth was strengthened by racism, by the idea of the superiority of the German race. A few centuries ago the myth of rationality arose in the West, the belief that all problems could be solved by reasoning and by the inevitability of technical progress. This myth inspired many Europeans to great deeds. Politicians use often mythical phrases as "the people want .....", "democracy demands .....", or "all is going well because the GNP is increasing ....." even when real wages are going down. All these concepts have a vague content and everyone can interpret these words in his own manner. But the common point of all myths is the promise of a better future. In religion this future is heaven, in democracy the improved situation when people live and act according to rules deduced by leading groups from the democratic myth.

Only a minority is in the West opposed to the democratic myth (by lack of an alternative?). Right as well as left political tendencies support democracy. The left wants to improve the situation of the lower paid people though masspeople will always remain subordinate to the elite. Most leftist grass roots organisations are as hierarchical as democratic organisations. Members have hardly influence on small leading groups. The masses are never allowed to use their individuality and their creativity. Green Parties and organisations as Greenpeace have some sympathetic features but they only want to improve life within the boundaries of democracy. They do not believe that another society is possible and leftist leaders propagate that masses can only get influence by electing better representatives. After a century of universal suffrage, masspeople begin to understand that elections are just an excuse to preserve existing power relations.

Just as it is impossible to predict the weather in the long term, it is impossible to predict the social future. The result of many proposals is time and again different from what was said when they were introduced. Irrationality is an integrated part of human existence. But that does not contradict with the rational basis of our life. The Bible is based on facts from the time the book was written. Many irrational facts were added that are now attacked by rational reality. Religion started to be undermined when the future deduced by church leaders from ancient texts did not conform daily reality. People are leaving the Catholic Church for example because the Church rules about sex do not agree with the practical experience of the masses. When a myth grows old, insurmountable problems arise that undermine its strength. To cope with this problem leaders try to change the myth. New myths, new religions or new sects cannot prevent that the original myth loses its influence. It is better to fight wrong myths with practical achievements and rational arguments than to prohibit the

doctrine. In this way democracy and the Theory of Evolution undermined the influence of religion.

Myths are partly based on facts. Political systems are indeed built on logical assumptions. This rational basis is difficult to combat because it is founded on historical facts. It is difficult to determine if Jesus was a prophet or a fantasist, it is even difficult to ascertain if such a person ever lived. But that is not important because deduced facts can be attacked. In democracy for example it is possible to attack the myth of the Trias Politica, the separation of the legislative, the executive and the judiciary. The fact that this separation does not exist for the majority of the population diminishes the belief in democracy.

The rational basis of a myth provides guidelines for the present and the near future. The irrational determines the future that is further away. Democracy is working quite well in short-term economics though the results are not always what is wanted or predicted. Recessions occur because nobody understands how the myth of the free market really works. Economic freedom has many unpleasant side effects especially for the masses. That is one of the reasons that their belief in the democratic myth diminishes. But the world is bigger than economics though in the present time politics has become inferior to economics. Economics should serve the people and not rule them. The present economic power is concentrated in the hands of those who have already high and prosperous positions. Economic power can only partly be measured, an important part is based on the mythical believe that only leaders are capable to do the right things.

The freedom of expression is also a myth that is undermined because the elite regulates the media. Though it is allowed to say what one wants to say (that is now attacked by American anti-terrorist laws) it is hardly possible to transfer these ideas to other people. The American administration tried even to close the Arabian news channel Al-Jazeera because it distributed news about the Afghan War that was not appreciated. In the Gulf War they targeted again Al-Jazeera and fired a rocket at the international press hotel in Baghdad. The American government bought even all satellite photographs to prevent that the public could see collateral damage (dead civilians) caused by American bombs. The democratic myth of Freedom, Equality and Fraternity that inspired the French Revolution is undermined. And this is strengthened by many facts such as the lack of houses for the young in contradiction to the surplus of houses for the well to do.

Because the near future can ever more be precisely determined, the irrational side of the myth is pushed further in the future and the contact between rational and irrational is diminishing. Political parties talk more and more about what now can be accomplished. But humans live longer than a few years and they see that many beautiful ideas are never realised. When the future is neglected, when in the present the future factor is absent, guiding principles for progress are abandoned and practical deeds in the present become useless. Humans are the only living beings that can connect past, present and future. Pragmatism eliminates the future and thus removes part of the essence of human existence. By being pragmatic humans become animals that only live by the day.

Democracy has become pragmatic and lost much of its irrationality. In the past it was an inspiring force because it offered an interesting future. "When there is no future how can there be sin, we are the flowers in the dustbin" were lines from a 1977-hit of the punk band The Sex Pistols. They were right. The 'no future generation' lost its mythical beliefs and is living by the day. To get another world we need a new future, another myth. One of the central points of such a new myth is the individualisation of autonomous humans, the belief that by creative actions humans can influence their own life as well as society. Democratic majorities suppress the autonomy of individuals. Only autonomous minorities can repel the growing powerlessness. Small groups of alternating minorities can create their own practice. No leader may tell individual members what they have to do. In special circumstances, for examples in wars, the irrational side of the minorities myth inspired seemingly insignificant people to develop a power, an initiative and a responsibility that they did not have, or were not permitted to have, in times of peace. The irrational belief to be capable to repulse the enemy – a myth of course – inspired some people to rise to unexpected heights.

The strength of religions is also based on the mythical belief in a better future that cannot be proven to be true or untrue. In Iran the failing democratic myth was replaced by the Islamic myth. During the reign of the Shah economic improvement became an illusion. A new myth was needed to get a better future. The new Iranian leaders undermine however the religious myth because politics and not ancient religion should decide over economic problems. Without the separation of state and religion the irrational part of one doctrine will be damaged by rational facts that are connected to the other doctrine. Economic failures are written on the account of religion and the impotence of religion to solve the daily needs are seen as a result of the incompetence of political leaders. An undermined myth gives room for a new myth, for a fresh start. In the West the influence of religion has been vastly reduced. Modern politics and economics need more or less free humans while religion tries to subordinate people to Old Writings, which are elevated to a sacred status that cannot be discussed. In general a myth will lose its strength when practical applications contradict daily life. The myth loses its irrational force and thus its power. That happens after a military coup. In the first years economy is thriving but when the military want to impose their strict rules on the entire society people begin to see they are too much restricted by military-like rules. This undermines enthusiasm and old problems return in a stronger form.

In social Movements the myth for a better future leads to temporary activities. The squatters put the mythical slogan in practice that people without living space should take the houses they needed. Part of the myth was realised on the way towards a better future. The Movement collapsed when the number of houses that could be squatted became too small. Negotiations with the Town Council in an effort to reach the goal within the democratic structure were another reason for the dwindling influence of the squatters' myth. The negotiating squatters had abandoned the mythical view of another housing policy and the Movement lost its mythical power because it became embedded in the democratic system.

Most members of social Movements believe that democracy can be improved and only a minority strives for fundamental changes. Some parts of the Anti-Nuclear Movement wanted to stop production of nuclear power because possible nuclear accidents were too dangerous while others wanted to promote green energy. The

second tendency still looked for solutions within democracy. Some conscious objectors in the Peace Movement (in the time there was still general conscription in Holland) accepted to serve the state outside the military service. Others saw the army as an integral part of the aggressive democratic system and did not want to support democracy by serving the state in non-military functions. They believed in another myth.

Religious fundamentalist tendencies are based on the myth that a religious state must replace the secular state. A compromise can not be reached. **Khomeiny** showed the road towards the Islamic state. The road of **Bin Laden** towards an Islamic state is less clear because the proposed Jihad is in the first place directed against the influence of the West, the presence of Israel and the subversion of Arabic states. There are not enough own ideas about a future society. Terrorist attacks are limited to a vanguard and cannot be supported by masspeople that lack technical knowledge to carry out complicated terrorist acts. Moreover the myth will not inspire the Islamic masses because it is not clear what they can do in their own country to come closer to the myth. The Palestinian Intifada is on the contrary indeed a step on the road towards the fulfilment of the myth of an independent Palestine. I predict that the Bin Laden Movement (it is actually a hierarchical terrorist organisation) will not exist long. But the horrendous situation on the world will time and again give birth to new groups that will carry out even bigger actions. The arrogant policy of Western democracies provides a fertile recruiting ground for dissatisfied Moslems. This arrogance is also an important reason why the democratic myth will never get a big impact on poor masses.

Guerrilla wars in the Third World also used the myth of a bright future, the Peruvian Guerrilla Movement was even named Shining Path. The myth inspired followers to practical activities. Though some Westerns admire these fighters, a Third World guerrilla will never take place in the First World. The German RAF or the Italian Red Brigades remained in the margin of society and their myth could not attract massive following. They did not promote individual autonomous mass activities. The masses should follow the road paved by the actions of the revolutionary vanguard. This concrete way to reach the future contradicts the principle of a successful myth in which the future and the road to that future are both vague and ever changing. The masses must use the myth to generate their own activities.

The democratic myth is losing its appeal because it is said that the future can be deduced from the present when leaders are followed. Democracy can be attacked by the rational argument that results of the doctrine do not agree with promises that follow from the myth. It is however better when vague arguments are being used that are deduced from a new myth. But still discussions will often end with vague phrases like: "I believe that democracy is better". The negation of the old myth does not automatically create a new myth. Critical analysis of the old myth can give some indications but the new myth must contain independent and new elements. It must be based on new rational and irrational elements from an unknown future. These arguments will only penetrate in the minds of the masses when they have lost most of their trust in the old myth.

**I am convinced that the democratic myth is dying. It is time for a new and inspiring myth that will bring humanity further.**

### Chapter 3. THE ELITIST DEMOCRACY

Why is it permitted that democratic governments and high-placed people may break human laws at will, embezzle, lie and kill – also when war is not declared – while that is strictly forbidden to common citizens. The French Secret Service bombed a ship of Greenpeace and killed a Portuguese photographer. An English anti-terror unit shot three suspected unarmed IRA-members in Gibraltar who were waiting with their hands in the air for their arrest. The English Army helped Protestants in Northern Ireland to kill some nasty Catholic opponents. The Americans used Depleted Uranium Bombs in the Balkan War – many Serbians but also American soldiers died from leukaemia. In the Afghan and the Second Gulf War this mass destruction weapon was again used. High-placed people in powerful countries are never blamed for terrorism or war crimes.

Some people earn in a very short time so much money that you can call it stealing. Bill Gates from Microsoft got in a few years tens of billions. Only a few billions could solve problems as the lack of vaccinations against childhood diseases. Corruption in the top of civil services and in political circles where people get huge benefits in addition to already high incomes is growing. The number of laws that restrict the freedom of masspeople is increasing but the elite knows how to avoid these rules. Elitist laws are beneficial and lenient for the own group and rigid for the masses. When the masses find a new hole in a law, lawmakers quickly patch the hole.

They said we had a class society. The top had a greater wealth, income and power, lived in special areas and had its own behaviour, taste and even language. Moreover the old elite showed hereditary characteristics, power and wealth were transferred to the progeny and to people who had acquired the same habits as the old elite. In young Third World democracies we see how the elite uses its power. The members live lavishly on corruption money. The former president of Bangladesh took power after a military coup. He abolished the Constitution. After a few years he organised general elections. After he had won the fraudulent elections he introduced a new Constitution, which stipulated that the president could never be held responsible for what had happened when he had been dictator. Anyhow opponents killed him. In 2001 the presidential candidates were two elitist women, the daughter of the dictator and the wife of a former president. In our elitist democracy a leading class seems to have disappeared but rulers still take a much bigger part of the wealth and the elite has still hereditary traits. They are hardly ever punished for their deeds. Leaders of older democracies seem friendlier but when needed they also use the sword – the Second Gulf War is a war between two parts of the elite – and the victims are only masspeople.

When a high-placed individual embezzles millions it is nearly always tolerated. The elitist swindlers remain on top often without any sign of remorse. In Colombia drug barons were allowed to kill thousands of masspeople. They even killed more than fifty judges, protectors of the elite. An inter-elitist struggle still took not place. But when the barons killed a real member of the elite, someone who wanted to become president, that part of the elite that earned its money outside the drug economy declared war. But though some lower members of the drug elite were extradited to

the United States the drug trade was not stopped. The elite was obligated to make a common front with the drug elite because a leftist guerrilla threatened them. The continuation of the power of the elite was more important than the elimination of the drug trade. The masses that suffer most from this situation did not have any influence on this decision.

Through the ages the situation has not changed much. In the Middle Ages foot soldiers were killed after a battle and losing knights were invited to take part in the feast that concluded a war. A similar situation we see in Afghanistan. Some leaders were killed in the battle but most are included in the new leading group. Leaders who killed many masspeople were treated leniently while many thousands foot soldiers were killed after they had surrendered. German industrial and military leaders, who had wholeheartedly co-operated with **Hitler**, were never removed from the elite. The former president of the Philippines, **Marcos** who stole billions of dollars could leave his country. The same was true for **Idi Amin** of Uganda, the **Shah** of Iran, **Somoza** of Nicaragua and many more leaders who should have been called thieves, murderers or monsters when they had belonged to the masses. They should have got long prison sentences, but they got a comfortable life in a foreign country.

In the past the elite consisted of kings, noblemen, the top of the clergy and some rich traders. Time and again a few masspeople climbed the social ladder. The word climbing is already monstrous because it contains the idea that there are low and high people. In Europe the remnants of this old elite have still a proportionally huge influence. It is not by chance that the noble **A. A. Loudon** was CEO of multinational Nobel-AKZO, while his brother was director of ABN/AMRO bank. A nephew could be found in the top of another bank and his father was CEO of Royal Dutch Shell, one of worlds' biggest multinationals. Elections and democracy have nothing to do with their nominations in the financial top of the world. Only a few leaders are elected, most leaders of enterprises and institutions are not bothered by democratic procedures. Leaders can be good or bad, pleasant or unpleasant, take good or bad decisions but masspeople have hardly any influence on their behaviour. Though democratic leaders propagate equality an important part of the elite consists of children of old members of the elite. This hereditary feature is in our society secluded because more people have leading positions than a century ago. But the children of the rich and mighty have still easier access to high positions.

Communist Russia was lead by the Nomenklatura. This Russian word means something as the list of names of people who belong to the top. In 1917 the Russian Revolution took place and new leaders replaced the old leading class. The hereditary line in the Russian elite was discontinued. Seventy years later the new leading class had already acquired hereditary traits. It based its power not anymore on the possession of capital but on the possession of functions. In Russia it is possible to see how a hereditary elite came into being and how it exerts power. Masspeople who rise to the top without the help of genes are only accepted when they adopt the habits and thoughts of old members of the elite. It is proved that France has also a Nomenklatura with hereditary traits. And many descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers (the WASPs, the West Anglo-Saxon Protestants) have still leading positions in the USA.

The power structure in the former Soviet-Union resembles the Western power structure. In both systems a powerful elite, much less than five percent of the population, reigns over a powerless mass. All people in the Russian Nomenklatura were members of the Communist Party. The Central Committee reigned over the elite and thought that all could be organised. It is wrong to have a central body that regulates everything. All initiative and creativity is suppressed. The Soviet society started to petrify because the Communists did not understand that there must be a certain freedom inside the elite. It is not necessary that all top people are member of the same organisation. In democracies the top has understood that to maintain its privileged position, members have only to honour the basic demand that the interest of the elite stands first.

In the democratisation process in Eastern Europe after the Fall of the Wall the elite learned that unity is crucial to survive. In the West the power of the elite is divided over several centres that are sometimes competing with each other. There is no central force that regulates conflicts. Any disharmony is regulated by the Trias Politica, the separated legislative, judiciary and executive power. In the Soviet Union the top of the almighty Party overshadowed this system. The **Bush** government is beginning to resemble the old soviet structure. After the WTC-catastrophe **Bush** launched the slogan that who was not in his favour was against him. This strong central power is accompanied by uniformity of the media, the political discussions and even the industrial production. The USA has copied many characteristics of the despised communist system. Deviating ideas are suppressed by the central power. A similar monotonous uniformity as in the Soviet Union begins to reign in the American elite. Unique, autonomous and creative humans are becoming rare.

All countries are ruled by the same principle. The social organisation is hierarchical and power is concentrated in a small minority. This elite has a greater wealth than the masses and has many privileges as tax reductions, free transport, cheap housing, servants that are paid for by others, agreeable free holidays etc. In glamorous, glittering and expensive meetings the elite gives prizes, honourable doctorates and other distinguished titles to each other accompanied by bombastic speeches. And the masses are coerced to applaud these half-gods. Elitepeople never forget their right to leave their wealth, power and position to their progeny.

The present society is hierarchical organised. Decision takers look to the top because the top-elite butters their bread. Decisions that concern the top are thoroughly discussed, measures concerning the masses are pushed through without many arguments. Only a few people have a mortgage of more than a few hundred thousands dollars but the Dutch parliament spent a great deal of its time in discussing if big house owners should keep their tax privileges. Even when it is obvious that tax reduction gives someone who lends a million more profit than someone who lends only two hundred thousand. But the discussion about the increase of the compulsory contribution to the health service was embarrassingly short. The rich profit most from decisions by legislative organs. During the French Revolution the masses were hungry. But the rich were put on ease by the decision that their grain should not be divided under the hungry. The rich could continue their better life while the poor had to live with the illusion that their life should become better in the future. It is one of the first examples that elected members disregard the

interest of their voters and look first after the interest of the elite, the ultimate power in all democracies.

Most members of the elite are born in elite spheres. Newcomers are only accepted when they bow to the rules that regulate relations between elite persons. Elections are a propaganda instrument to keep the masses quiet. It is unmanageable and too expensive to use elections for all higher functions. The elite lives separated from the masses in a world of power and money. When a member does not act on the right way he is removed from his function but remains in the elite, while dismissed masspeople often come in a difficult position. A wall separates the elite from the masses, the powerful from the powerless, the rich from the poor. In the United Kingdom it has been shown that under a so-called leftist government neither the position of masspeople nor the number of elite persons on important positions did change. The barrier between elite and massworld was not lowered.

Many centuries ago **Machiavelli** described how elites exerted power without taking into account the plights of the masses. What is good for the Prince is good. It did not matter how the Prince reached his goal. The goal of the elite is to maintain its privileged position. To reach this goal all means are allowed when they to a certain height fit in the existing social relations. The elite can however bend those relations a little to its own profit. The Afghan War is generally accepted even when thousands of masspeople are killed and the position of women remains degrading. The Second Gulf War was opposed by important parts of the international elite but not because only masspeople should be hurt. The coming bombing of countries as Iran or North Korea will also not undermine the power of the highest world elite, it will at the most force lower elites to rally behind the American top elite.

In the course of time the Machiavellian method started to falter. Society became more complicated, contacts between different nations improved and inventions changed the world. Internal contradictions started to undermine the power of the elite. The inter-elitist struggles could not be regulated anymore by the Machiavellian principles of power, deceit and intrigue. Baron de **Montesquieu**, member of the French top-elite, advanced new principles. The French Revolution introduced the separation of the executive, judiciary and legislative power in the greater part of Europe. The Trias Politica replaced the guiding religious myth by the democratic myth. Even the symbols of power changed. The once dominating cathedrals and churches were eclipsed by huge democratic buildings and other symbols of power as banks, multinationals and the communication and information industry.

Members of the elite occupy most posts in the organs of the Trias Politica. Unemployed, lower civil servants, workers, wives of men who earn a minimum wage, people who do not have a house or young people do not get posts in these organs. The system of the Baron was introduced to maintain the privileges (and the power) of the elite. Masspeople do not have any influence on the Trias Politica though they have benefited in some way because the arbitrary treatment of masspeople by individual members of the elite was put under restraint. The abolition of slavery – the absolute ownership of elitepeople over masspeople – is a striking example. The elitist democracy has penetrated in all layers of society. Trade unions, which should be organisations of the masses, have withdrawn from the streets. Social struggle has become restricted to discourses in courts of law where members of the elite have the

upper hand and where masspeople are still treated as insignificant objects without any independent power.

Machiavelli described how small powerful groups should fight against each other. De Montesquieu regulated the inter-elitist struggle. In regard to the masses Machiavellian methods are still used. The rule "over us, about us and without us" is still valid for masspeople. Much what is discussed in informal circuits remains behind closed doors. Masspeople are not allowed to exert any influence. When wealth is divided, masspeople always come second. That is the essence of the idea of the Baron: power has to be preserved in the hands of the elite. The masses have no independent power instruments in the democratic system. The Baron cannot be blamed to neglect the masses. He wrote that only representatives of the people know how to decide, masspeople are not capable enough. The Baron died two hundred years ago but his ideas still rule the world. The elite uses the same methods (which are always based on the use of violence) to solve problems as were used two centuries ago. It is time for a change. Masspeople must create their own independent power so they can control leaders and rule the rulers. Elections only permit masspeople to choose which eliteperson will become controller.

In elections masspeople transfer their controlling power to Members of Parliament who again delegate their power to higher leaders. Elections only concern the legislative power. Masspeople have no influence at all on the judiciary and the executive power which are dominated by specialised lawyers that know the way in the vast forest of rules and regulations in which masspeople get lost. This apparatus restricts the freedom of common citizens. Even outside the juridical apparatus masspeople are often punished without the involvement of any judge. They are sacked, financial help is refused and security forces harass them. They are powerless against the data that are collected about them and through which the apparatus determines their life. They are powerless to change their inferior position and only sometimes they use direct action to get justice. Only by acting autonomous, creative and uncontrolled they can get positive results. In this process they become freer because they have achieved something without the help of higher-placed persons. But the elite will prevent that masspeople will take an independent road that opens the way to a permanent mass power. Only by also using some violence the masses can open this independent road to a new future and destroy the controlling and suppressing bonds.

Democracy cannot answer the question how masspeople can exert influence over the three elitist powers of Baron De **Montesquieu**. To get more freedom masspeople have to bypass the democratic system that favours in the first place the elite and maintains the present relations of power. They should not occupy themselves with power relations inside the eliteworld nor with the question how masspeople are regulated and controlled by the elite, nor with internal struggles (e.g. the left-right contradiction) in the massworld. They should acknowledge that power is exerted from top to bottom. They should concern themselves with a down-top exertion of power that neutralises elitist top-down power.

**They should direct their arrows at the centre of power where the elite lives in order to achieve one world for all citizens.**

## Chapter 4. THE STRONGMAN

The most powerful man in a hierarchical organisation is the man at the top. This strongman (sometimes a woman) is accredited with miraculous power. In an elitist democracy the step from the strong group at the top to a strong leader, a strongman, is very small. You have to look up in awe at the President of France, in the USA everyone speaks with respect of the President who should be very special. A strongman is the logical consequence of a hierarchical organisation. You can wonder how it is possible that free elections can lead to the election of the son, the daughter or other family-members of a former leaders. Democratic strongmen and dictatorial rulers are comparable and contacts between democratic and dictatorial leaders are often cordial. But the concept strongman is in contradiction to the idea of the existence of free and independent citizens.

Strongmen who protect the masses from evil are everywhere applauded. Writers as **Jean Paul Sartre** or **Norman Mailer** who do not write about strongmen are exceptions that prove the rule. In films the Rambo mentality is widespread. By spectacular individual actions one person guarantees the happiness of the masses. Brilliant police officers solve all crimes, heroic cowboys kill bad opponents, supermen always win. Real life is different. Rambo's are artificial and give only an illusion of safety. **Clint Eastwood**, **Charles Bronson**, **James Bond** and all other heroes are a caricature of individuality. But they that the leaders care for safety and human happiness. They solve problems masspeople cannot solve. Special people guard the masses against any evil.

The Rambo's of the political world claim that only they can lead society. Masspeople should accept that. Everywhere the Rambo syndrome is propagated. In sport top players are attributed a knowledge and a skill that rise far above their ability in sport. **Ruud Gullit** was one of the best football players ever but why should a car be better because he is telling you that in an advertisement? And by the way, why should sport games have a winner, why can we not just enjoy the show and also applaud the loser? Is it not possible that two people are of the same strength? In Europe many sports still know draws but in American sports as baseball and basketball draws are impossible and all attention is concentrated on the winner. Americans adore strongmen even more than Europeans. Everybody must be better than someone else, there must be a winner, the champion is the greatest. The loser is a nobody. The elite is all, the masses are nothing.

The Rambo concept is very old. God is almighty and you have to follow Him. This idea is imposed on Catholics by a hierarchical church organisation with on top the representative of God on earth, the pope. **Bagwan** and other leaders of smaller religious sects are also seen as almighty. The social and economic developments in Northwest Europe gave rise to a more individualistic Protestantism but also in this religion leaders are worshiped. The absolute ruler of Iranian Islam, **Khomeiny**, was also the secular ruler. He was by definition the best and strongest man, the saviour of

Iran. The life of Rambo's is often short because they are obviously not so strong that they can maintain their position for a long time. After a coup d'état a new strongman rises to the top. Even in dictatorial countries the position of the leader is not always as strong as it looks. Only a few leaders as **Castro**, **Stalin** or **Saddam Hussein** maintained their position for a longer time. Other elite persons can obviously remove a seemingly absolute leader.

Masspeople have hardly any influence on strongmen who keep the masses under control by appealing on nationalistic feelings. Not only in dictatorships but also in democracies you find strong nationalist tendencies. It is the expression of the idea that we are better than other people in other countries. Nationalism was virtually unknown before nationalist states were formed. Chauvinism, the excessive love for the own country, is derived from the name of the soldier **Chauvin** who served under **Napoleon**. The elite uses nationalism to set the own masses up against masses of other countries. In this way differences between mass and elite are hidden under differences between nations. Moreover nationalism promotes racist ideas, which are sanctioned by democratic leaders as was evident from the support of Western democracies of racist South Africa. Strong woman **Thatcher** used the aversion of foreigners to start a war against Argentina over some far-away rocks to disguise the terrible internal political situation. It was unimportant that thousands of masspeople died in this war. Strongmen have always driven masspeople to their death for the sake of a vague idea, sometimes religious, sometimes nationalistic but in the end always because of the greed for more power, honour and money for the elite.

The idea of a strongman supports the continuing domination of men over women. In non-western countries sex-discrimination is even stronger. The predominantly male leaders of Western countries have friendly connections with for example Saudi-Arabian leaders who do not allow women to drive cars. The fabricated superiority of men finds its expression in many places. When a ship is capsizing women and children have to be saved first. Why? You can wonder if a child that stands at the beginning of his life values more than a man whose death influences many people around him. But why women? Are they a different species? Why were women evacuated after an earthquake in the former Soviet Union while men had to stay to solve the problems. The hierarchical problem that can be seen in the strongman – weakwoman dichotomy has everywhere in society its consequences. An exception as iron woman Margaret Thatcher affirms that power is in the hands of men who time and again confirm their high position by using violence.

The self-assured attitude of macho men is deeply rooted in our society. You could try to change this situation by decreasing the use of force and violence. Then the male-female relationship, in which the female side has always been less violent, will become more equal. But the elite does not want to diminish its use of power and violence and people are forced to opt for the hard line when they want to equalise the power balance. The inequality of elite and mass is based on violence and the weakest party is forced to increase its use of force. Women who want change must also use more power and violence and not restrict their activities to friendly demands to improve the behaviour of men. But this violence must never be based on the idea that the weakest must become the strongest. In the struggle for a future society violence must not be aimed at acquiring more power than the adversaries but at the change of the minds of leaders (the elite) so they will accept that masspeople are

equal. The power instruments of the masses can be found in those domains in which women and men are indeed equal – in the use of their brains, in their creativity and their autonomy.

Hierarchical power relations can not only be found in the relationship between man and woman but also in industry, in sports, in the governmental world and in extreme organisations as the police or the army. Individuality and personal freedom are made subordinate to the organisation. The opinion of a group of people that form an organisation, thus the opinion of an organisation is not the opinion of the individual members but the opinion of the leaders. Society is going well when production increases. The human factor, the wretched life of some individuals because they are unemployed, disabled or ill, is an inferior problem. Society is an abstract concept that in our democracy is personalised in the strength and welfare of the leaders.

The social organisation of our elitist democracy resembles corporate of fascist societies in which strongmen are even more important. Fascism strives to maximise the welfare of the own group at the cost of people who do not belong or do not want to belong to the group. Democratic trade unions demand often advantages for its members. Soccer organisations introduce passports for members so other people are excluded from attending matches. Strict measures are taken to confine the freedom of citizens under the pretext to combat terrorism. But arbitrarily body searches will hardly hinder individual terrorists. It is one of the instruments by which the elite controls the masses.

The transition of democracy to fascism/corporatism and vice versa is often only gradual. **Hitler**-Germany and **Salazar**-Portugal rose to power by democratic elections. After their fall many individuals who had a high position under the fascist regime entered democratic organisations. Former IOC-leader **Samaranch** was high-placed in the Spanish fascist regime. The developments after the death of **Franco** in Spain or the succession of democratic and fascist regimes in South- and Central-America prove that dictatorship, fascism and democracy are three branches of the same tree. Most citizens accept – because they are powerless or indoctrinated – without much reluctance a different system. There is only a gradual difference in individual freedom and in both systems masspeople are virtually powerless against the power of the elite. In democracies freedom can also suddenly be restricted. The crash of some hijacked planes in the WTC, symbols of financial power, has restricted the freedom of masspeople. A few people gave the elite the opportunity to increase its power over the masses. In democracies the emphasis lies not on individuality but on togetherness. All political parties adhere to the leader principle. And leaders strive for absolute power, they want to absorb the individual in a symbolic unity, personalised in the party, the nation, the royal family or the leader.

The existence of a partly hereditary elite is one of the causes that democracy is not working well. Some elitist theoreticians as **Gaetano Mosca** advance the thesis that a new leading group must always succeed an old one. The idea of the circulation of elites was maybe valid in the past but it does prove nothing for the future. Masspeople must reject any subordination to elites. This mythical idea can activate masspeople and will replace the ideas of **Macchiavelli** and De **Montesquieu** that activated the upper layers of society. Their ideas resulted in a growing number of laws and rules. The two M's were of course in favour of strongmen. Chilean dictator

**Pinochet** even said that democracy was a quiet and regulated society. I agree, democracy does not favour free, creative and independent people but curtails individuals with the invisible bonds of the Law. The concept of Law and Order demands that everybody must follow rules that are imposed by higher circles. Deviations are suppressed even when this leads to the suffocation of society.

Machiavelli described a society that was ruled from one centre of power. De Montesquieu proposed three centres that controlled each other. Any influence of masspeople was canalised in elections of the executive power, the two other powers remained in the hands of the elite. Nowadays there are some other centres of power in industry, civil service, scientific world, medical world or the world of lawyers. All centres are however lead by members of the elite. Most conflicts are still caused by the interests of two different elites. The Gulf Wars were caused by a conflict between the highest elite (the USA) and a lower elite (Iraq). In the first war the power of the weakest elite was restricted, in the second war it was destroyed. Both times excessive violence was used that damaged in the first place masspeople. The masses should not take side in these inter-elitist wars.

Through elections the masses can get only influence on a small part of society. Because elections do not often take place, masspeople have only sometimes the idea that they can utter their grievances. Therefore a growing number of masspeople refuses to vote. Sometimes they use their creativity and autonomy to find other ways to bring their demands forward but the elite curtails them with laws and rules. The dilemma between obedience and autonomy is sometimes solved by spontaneous and violent uprisings that abhor media and leaders. Street power of the masses should also belong to the democratic powers of De Montesquieu. But it is a weak and vague power that cannot often be used. Only sometimes it hinders the activities of the elite. Because the elite does not like to be hindered by the masses it uses the biggest power instruments to suppress this spontaneous mass power. But state violence was already used in the time of Machiavelli.

De Montesquieu was not interested in masspeople. He wanted to control the power of the Prince by other elitist powers because the partition of wealth inside the elite was too unequal – the Prince got too much for too less work. Moreover he created the possibility that some elitepeople became strongmen in their part of the eliteworld. Conflicts between parts of the elite could weaken the overall elitist power. Unity was needed when the power of masspeople was increasing. The French and Russian Revolutions in which the weakened national elite was defeated proved him right. After the French Revolution the rows of the elite were again closed and up till now the old elite is still reigning France. In Russia, the elite was replaced but the communist system allowed the rise of a new elite, which established good connections with old Western elites. Democratic elites most of the time respect each other to preserve a unity against possible attacks of the masses. Only in some cases they will attack each other.

De Montesquieu solved the question how to control rulers by founding a more or less independent judiciary. The masses cannot use this solution because the question is not who controls leaders but how power relations can be changed. Now only elitepersons control a too greedy elite and even strongmen. When dictators become too greedy, they are often called to account for their deeds, corrected or removed.

And when these former strongmen have to leave their country they are welcomed by elites of other countries (with their stolen millions). The **Shah** of Iran and **Somoza** of Nicaragua were welcome in the United States. The English elite released **Pinochet** of Chile who was threatened with a process because of crimes against the masses. **Bokassa**, the self-appointed emperor of the Central African Republic, went to France, just as **Duvalier** from Haiti. Masspeople do not exist in these inter-elitist games.

**Masspeople should reject any strong leader even when this leader originates from the masses. They should only trust their own autonomy and creativity.**

## Chapter 5. DEMOCRATIC POWERS

Because of the complexity of society and the accumulating quantity of information the old elite could not anymore control the civil service. A new Fourth Power, the Power of the Civil Servants, was created with the same features as the old powers of the Trias Politica. All Democratic Powers are controlled by people with an income and wealth far above average. Via elected representatives masspeople have only a negligible influence on this new power centre. Top civil servants make rules and laws that regulate the life of citizens. Masspeople cannot interfere when civil servants prepare these decisions in secret. They can also not control which data are collected about them nor can they change wrong data or delete superfluous data. Making of new roads, town planning, permission for building polluting factories in the vicinity of citizens' houses or purchasing mass destruction weapons as rockets with nuclear warheads is prepared by the civil service long before political discussions take place. Masspeople can hardly control what civil servants are doing because top civil servants are not responsible to the masses.

Masspeople can only reach the top of any Democratic Power when they accept most of the rules that regulate the behaviour in these high circles. But than they leave the world of the masses and become low-ranked members of the elite. Most masspeople do not want to be part of ruling organs that regulate the life of other people and do not want to be too much involved in decision making and taking. Only sometimes on some subjects they want to have influence. But in a democracy it is impossible to become involved on the place, the time and about the subject masspeople determine. The only method to get influence is to elect other representatives but elections take always place on the time and about the subject that is determined by others.

One of the many disadvantages of elections is the fact that people do not know the exact behaviour of elected persons when decisions are taken. Candidates have a vague political program but on many subjects their ideas are not known and change dependent of coalitions with other political parties. Party programs are propaganda pamphlets and not guiding principles by which the elected abide when decisions have to be made. The personal behaviour and appearance of candidates has become more important than political ideas. Political parties hardly differ from each other. This trend started in the United States but penetrated also European politics. Pragmatism reigns over deeper political ideas. What can be achieved in the short term has become more important than the future that is further away. If and how a fundamentally different society can be reached is not considered at all.

The behaviour of elected candidates is often unpredictable because higher powers exert more pressure on them than unknown voters do. The interest of privileged people is more important than the vague interests of anonymous voters. Decision taking is much more determined by party leaders than by the opinion of voters. Other influences are secret agreements between political parties, semi-secret contacts with civil servants and representatives of the industry and not in the least by direct

contacts with fellow-members of the elite. **Nancy Reagan** forced her husband to take decisions on the basis of astrology, **Lynne Cheney**, the wife of Vice-president Dick Cheney, wrote a report stipulating which university professors should be considered insufficiently patriotic. Society is ill when family members heavily influence elected representatives.

Why should masspeople give their vote to only one political party? You may be liberal but still have the opinion that unemployed get too much money. You may be a conservative like president **Chirac** but oppose Gulf War II, you may be member of the pro-war Dutch Christian-Democratic party but still prefer Labour Party Leader **Bos** who opposed the Gulf War. But what can you do when a year later **Bos** turned around and supported sending more Dutch troops to occupied Iraq. **Bos** changed his opinion without consulting his voters. In his party program nothing could be found about pre-emptive wars. Voters are powerless when political parties take decisions that are contrary to their political programs. Though you may wonder if voters have influence on representatives, it is certain that masspeople do not have any influence on members of not-elected Democratic Powers. Even representatives in the Legislative Power have hardly any influence on other Democratic Powers. Civil servants in health service, public housing, sport or contacts with big industrial conglomerates are barely controlled. Waste of tax money, astounding rises in salaries and other monetary scandals are no exception. Masspeople have no possibility to become involved in the decision-forming process in this sector. Demonstrations and petitions are even completely useless.

Each problem divides the masses in an interested minority and not a not-involved majority that does not want to be bothered. Only a minority is interested in housing shortages, racism, unemployment or the sending of troops to foreign countries. Leaders count the number of opponents and conclude that a silent majority agrees with their policy. Abstentions do not count in a democracy. Less than fifty percent of the voters participated in the Amsterdam town elections and in the last town elections in England turnout was only thirty percent. Leaders are elected by a minority but determine how majorities must behave. Elitist minorities take decisions, mass minorities have no influence and cannot penetrate in the Democratic Powers. The masses must not be bothered by the democratic postulate that majorities are decisive. Mass Power must be based on the assumption that everything turns around active interested and involved minorities that fight decisions taken by another minority, the small group of elitist leaders.

All Democratic Powers as the Trias Politica, the Fourth Power of civil servants or the many power centres in industry or the medical profession are lead by people who belong to the elite. Inside these Powers concrete decisions are taken. Next to these concrete Powers mythical Powers exist as for example the invisible hand of market mechanism. The elite uses the belief in this mechanism to promote its interests. Scarce goods are for example not available for those who need it but only for people with sufficient money. Aids continues to be dangerous to poor people because medicines are very expensive. The market mechanism fails completely in social fields as unemployment, hidden poverty or lasting inequality. The lasting differences between poor and rich countries make the inadequacy of the mechanism fully transparent but masspeople cannot influence the market mechanism nor can they use it to safeguard their interests.

It cannot be denied that market mechanism is a driving force, though in the first place for the minority of well-equipped people. It does not always improve society. Each society needs mythical forces because otherwise petrification will block development. Because leaders of communist societies could not introduce new stimulating myths they started to use capitalist myths to inspire masspeople. They tried to develop their countries by offering people more money. But just as in our society, inequality in the communist world increased and the masses remained subordinate to a privileged elite. By imitating capitalist society – by introducing the market mechanism – communism dugged its own grave and passed away.

Masses need also mythical forces. I propose the myth of the invisible fist of minorities of active masspeople who strive for a society in which all people have the same status. Leaders can never control this individual mass force. The mythical power of the elite is among other things based on the possibility to use violence against opposing masspeople. The mythical force of the masses needs also some violence but the threat must remain more important than real action. Just as the elite only sometimes uses violence to impose its power. A big difference between elitist and mass myths is that elitepersons use hierarchical organisations as police or army to use violence. Masspeople live in an egalitarian world and do not have subordinates. They have to think and act for themselves. While elitist violence is relatively uniform, mass violence is multiform because it is connected to individual humans who are not restricted by rules set by people above them.

New forces do not fall from the sky. The invisible fist of the masses is already sometimes used. The threat to use violence in the time of the Squatters Movement helped many young people to get houses. Many people still think that it is not useful to oppose capitalism in an individual manner. They bow to the wishes of leaders and take part in elections in the hope life will become more liveable. They do not understand that the level of consciousness of the masses has increased so much that it is possible to increase freedom, individuality and creativity by using individual power in such a way that another kind of society comes closer.

A complicated society has a high degree of organisation. To make aeroplanes you need competent organisations. But who controls the organizer who has often a greater wealth than workers with whom he forms a team? Why are interested and involved outsiders not allowed to have some influence? Seen the corruption and the privileges of organisers and seen all wrong decisions something is indeed lacking. Peers control the organisers and common citizens do not have controlling power. But ordinary workers, users, buyers and even all those who are interested in planes must have some possibility to get influence. Each individual must have the possibility to control something when he wants it. It is preposterous that leaders say they are solving problems while after some years nothing has changed. Hunger and curable illnesses still exist in Third World countries while it is fairly easy to solve these problems. The IMF and the World Bank repeat they will solve the hunger problem but more people than ever are hungry. There is something fundamentally wrong when leaders who do not solve these problems remain in decision-making positions. The existence of mass destruction weapons seems impossible to solve. It is forbidden to use chemical weapons but it is allowed to produce them. The same goes for biological and nuclear weapons or landmines. The elite wants to keep these

weapons to destroy masspeople when needed. In democracies masses cannot destroy weapons that are in the first place dangerous for themselves.

Masspeople must develop an own power that has to be so strong that the elite acknowledges that its power is not anymore uncontested. In the end power differences will disappear. This Mass Power can be based on alternating minorities of interested, involved and active citizens. This power of mass minorities is in flagrant contradiction with the present power based on silent majorities of not-interested, not-involved and passive citizens lead by powerful minorities from often invisible elitepersons

By using this Mass Power active minorities can veto wrong decisions and change the minds of leaders when they intrude in the private living space of decision-taking elitepersons. Without an independent power masspeople have no rights. Now the elite decides about the rights of masspeople. Demonstrations are regulated, wage increases are small, health service is limited, the right to live is restricted by high wages for top people with excessive incomes. The self-imposed right of the elite to have more money than people from the masses dominates all decisions.

Sometimes masses already veto decisions. The Squatters Movement cared for houses for the masses because minorities in this Movement used force or threatened to use force when tenants were evicted. In Tunisia a rise of the bread price was annulled after violent mass demonstrations (at the cost of the blood of many masspeople). But masspeople must not become part of big hierarchical organisations, they must act autonomously. Leaders of mass organisations form the nucleus of a new elite.

The new independent Mass Power will slowly be added to the existing powers. The old powers have a common purpose: the preservation of the power and the privileged position of the elite, the continuing existence of a separate eliteworld. This world is more and more recognisable. In the last twenty years about 3000 guarded compounds were build in the United States. The Power of mass minorities is fundamentally different. It controls leaders, diminishes the distance between the elite- and the massworld and increase the self-consciousness of masspeople. It forces the masses to develop their creativity. To get real power masspeople must refuse to be absorbed by elitist powers. That makes them dependent of leaders and restrict their freedom.

**When Mass Power increases elections will become obsolete. Elections give the masses only an illusion of power, only the own activity will give them real power.**

## Chapter 6. MEDIA POWER

Democratic Powers regulate relations inside the elite. By voting the masses have some influence on the legislative Power. All other Powers are lead by elitepeople that are not elected. This is also true for the media that is sometimes considered as an independent Power. The media should guarantee and safeguard the rights of masspeople and correct wrongdoings. Public opinion is however not the opinion of masspeople but the opinion of a few press people at the top of the media. These people represent in the first place leading groups – sometimes because they are ordered, most of the time because of self-censorship. Public opinion is one of the weapons of powerful people. Media Power is used during internal elitist struggles and also to control masspeople. Masspeople can hardly use the media against the powers that be.

A free press gives the masses only an illusion of power because it spins a non-transparent web that hides what really happens. Beautiful designed newspapers or attractive television programs show that appearance is more important than contents. It is comparable with what happens during elections, political programs are subordinate to the attractive appearance of the party leader – who is never pockmarked, does not stutter and does not sit in a wheel chair. Not the result of a decision determines the quality of a leader but the way he proposes the decision. Not the fact that many coloured people from Third World countries want to enter our country stands central but how these people have to be accommodated before they are thrown out of the country. The perceptible dominates the invisible, easy slogans based on half-truths replace ideas based on hard facts. The way of acting is more important than what really happens, laws and rules reign over reason. Society is a mirror of what happens in the elite in which forms (mores, clothing, language) dominate facts because in their behaviour the elite distinguishes itself from the masses.

The media preserve also the existing power relations by keeping the masses quiet with fairy-tales about sport, cowboy books, soaps, police series, quizzes, the glitter world of the jet set, etc. They give some information but their prime function is control and amusement. "Give the people bread and games" was said in remote ages and the media take a central position in this slogan. Organising profitable Olympic Games transforms information about bread and games in money. Only the elite has the power to transform information in profit. Some publications are specially written for the elite. Fortune, Robb's Journal, International Affairs and other specialised magazines tell the elite about the own situation. But information is only power for those who can connect information with forcing deeds. The masses cannot make large-scale publicity nor can they benefit from publicity. In the fight to establish an independent mass power media are insignificant.

Media hardly play a role in mass activities. Mass movements do not come into existence after press campaigns. They gain momentum before media are involved. When a movement becomes massive the media jump on the bandwagon but have

hardly any influence on what happens. Though the media are very negative about European hooliganism it continues to flourish. The elite cannot influence independent activities of young masspeople even when the press unanimously makes a stand against it. In the Third World it is even more evident that Media Power is limited. When the prices were exorbitantly raised in Venezuela the media did not cause the people's revolution nor was the slaughtering of hundreds of poor people prevented by the press. And repressive measures did not stop because the media were against it.

Even in politics media are less important than leaders want the masses to believe. They cannot prevent that still fewer people go to the ballot boxes. Some leading politicians profit from exposure in the media but they resemble each other so much that it does not matter who will lead the next government. Decisions are taken by politicians but prepared by think tanks on which voters have no influence. An important part of the masses is alienated from politics, does not trust politicians and votes for opposition candidates who will never enter the centre of political power. Right-wing politician **Le Pen** won nearly 20 % in the French presidential elections, charismatic populist **Fortuyn** 17% in the Dutch general elections. It caused some annoyance by leading politicians that can neither solve problems at the lower side of society nor stop the enrichment at the upper side. Unemployment, poverty, crime, housing shortage, drugs and many other problems become worse but media do not have any power to change the deteriorating situation in the rich Western world.

Nobody can believe that an elite will tolerate a free press when this could endanger its privileged position. It looks if media have freedom of expression but most are owned by rich tycoons and represent mostly the views of the elite. Media owners as **Turner**, **Maxwell**, **Murdoch** or **Berlusconi** dominate the media. Masspeople cannot spread their ideas and opinions on a countrywide scale. Freedom of expression is to a great height guaranteed but the freedom to spread dissenting views is restricted. In the Third World the freedom of expression is restricted because leaders do not yet understand that the stability of the regime is strengthened when a free press gives the masses the illusion of power.

Masspeople can hardly bring their opinion forward in the media. They have to wait till press people are so kind to write about their problems. Mass violence is never propagated or even positively discussed. Even when it is known that violence is the ultimate instrument of power in the struggle between two parts of the population. Violence is a monopoly of the sitting powers – nobody else may use violence. Despite a so-called free press it was in England prohibited to publish declarations of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the IRA, that had even some seats in British Parliament. Media give only information that is approved by the elite. American prisoners of war were not shown on American television during the second Gulf War. The elite feared that masspeople could become disappointed with its leadership because they promised a fast victory with few casualties. Masspeople always have to wonder why something is published. Most information in some way favours the sitting powers. Objective information does not exist.

Information from leading circles is hardly controlled. Leaders are allowed to lie about prestigious projects as expensive metros, town halls or unnecessary submarines. Politicians are allowed to lie about negotiations to maintain the illusion of progress.

Leaders in industry are allowed to lie about sales and profits. Lies spread by advocates of nuclear energy get more attention than facts brought forward by opponents. Spokesmen of the police may disguise facts so that not becomes known that the police treat demonstrators harsher than is allowed by law. And in war truth is the first victim. That so many people still doubt much what is published proves that masspeople still have some healthy ideas and that Media Power is not absolute.

The media are for the elite a source of information. Sometimes the veils that seclude inter-elitist power relations are lifted. When a wealthy Italian wanted to buy the biggest Belgian bank the Belgian elite used the media to rally its members against this foreign power. In this internal elitist struggle the media played some role and the information was rather objective. In most cases the elite uses Machiavellian lies also against the own group. The American elite wanted the support of other Western elites in the Vietnamese War. So they fabricated the story that North Vietnamese ships had attacked American ships in the Gulf of Tonkin. The American elite silenced any opposition from fellow-elites by such lies and started a devastating air war on North Vietnam. Despite the killing of many hundred of thousands masspeople the American president never was accused of War crimes and next presidents could use comparable lies to start wars in Afghanistan or Iraq. In the second Gulf War was again based on a lie. Mass Destruction Weapons were never found in Iraq but the Americans nevertheless invaded the country and remained when became clear that the invasion was based on lies.

The Panamanian president and former CIA-agent **Noriega** was arrested in his country. His involvement in drug trade was already known when he was a secret agent. It was not important that an independent country was invaded and that thousands of masspeople died in the operation and also not that the drug trade went on as before. Media did not accuse American leaders after this incident. Neither had they any influence on the removing of **Nixon** from the presidential chair. Some powerful members of the elite found that Nixon harmed their interest and used the media to spread information that weakened the position of the president. Although Watergate was probably less important than Irangate, **Ronald Reagan** was allowed to remain president because his actions did not influence the power position of the elite.

Leaders of action groups (and other leftist political organisations) support the illusion of Media Power. They are sometimes allowed to ventilate their opinions but the effect is negligible. Later they can show their scrapbooks to their children and grandchildren. But more important they want to show the elite that they abide by the democratic system even when they know that a few messages of an action group never can compete with the many messages that contradict these ideas. It is a faulty myth that the pen is stronger than the sword, publicity does not bring a desired change nearer. The myth of Media Power is strengthened when sometimes a member of the elite is attacked and punished. But that is part of the game as was the case with the effort to prohibit the book "Spycatcher" about the crimes of the English Secret Service or to prohibit a pornographic book of **Henry Miller** in Germany. The position of the elite was never in danger.

The information around the 9-11 attack on the World Trade Centre proves that media have another function. An important part of the information was used to create a new

foreign enemy to hide the abominable situation of many Americans. The Red Danger had become obsolete after the Fall of the Wall and two new Dangers were created, Terrorism and Islam. It was used to attack independent countries as Afghanistan or Iraq. But the real reasons were disguised. American domination of the world, continuing power over oil production and the guarantee that drug profits continue to flow in Western Banks were hardly discussed. All attention was given to the backward regime in Kabul and the atrocious regime in Baghdad. That after those wars the new regimes could hardly be distinguished from the old ones was not important.

Mass media cannot prevent that important parts of the masses distrust all politicians. Sometimes a politician is indeed attacked but the top of the political elite remains out of bounds. Most politicians are presented as able, trustworthy people. What the highest politicians do is not important they remain on top. The Bosnian town of Srebrenica was under attack from the Serbian army. The United Nations and the Dutch government promised that the population should be protected by Dutch troops. Still the Serbians killed 7000 Moslems. Dutch Prime Minister **Kok** resigned eight years later. A few months later he got a high function in the European Community, the dead Moslems were forgotten. Politicians say they take responsibility for their deeds but in practice they just move from one post to another. The media never say that failing politicians must be removed from any leading position. Once accepted in the elite you must behave very weird to be thrown out. The media are lenient about top people but very negative about masspeople who are active during wild strikes, violent mass actions or acts of terror.

Media are an integral part of the democratic system and often distort truth. But Media Power is a secondary power compared to other Democratic Powers. By attacking media or media people society will not change. When the time of change arrives, media will change also. Media cannot influence this moment because masspeople will stop giving attention to the biased news that is published. Masspeople will act autonomously too reach another situation. Media do not think about the future because they defend the present social structure. In South-America time and again masses revolt against greedy dictators that are supported by Media Power. They mostly publish stories that do not agree with the daily reality of the masses. The influence of media appears surprisingly small despite the presumptuous words of journalists.

Media pay a lot of attention to the phenomenon violence because it is controversial, unexpected and unpredictable. Violence is a question of life and death, one of the great problems of human existence. But only violence that involves weapons or clashes between demonstrators and security forces is of interest. That masspeople die because they are violently deprived of food is not seen as a problem in which violence is involved. The government of India is therefore seen as democratic and not excessively violent though millions of Indians die every year of hunger. Mass violence is always rejected in contrast to the approval of elitist violence that causes much more damage. The accomplishments of the own army are often applauded even when many masspeople have died. The bloody coup d'état in Chile, the American invasion of Panama or state violence against peaceful demonstrations is generally endorsed. When the elite is unanimous, the power instruments of the elite mostly side with the elite. When elitepersons are violently attacked media publish

extensive stories. The killing of former Nicaraguan dictator **Somoza** got much more publicity than the many peasants that were killed by his hangmen. The murder of a director of Siemens was unanimously condemned by the media but the decisions of this man about the treatment of South-African workers, his involvement in nuclear energy, his crimes against the environment or his involvement in the production of mass destruction weapons was left unattended.

Masspeople can use the fact that violence is of prime importance for media to spread political messages. The shooting of a leader or a violent demonstration by a handful of people are hotter news items than a massive peaceful demonstration. Media can not determine what kind of violence is used nor can they initiate violence. The violence of the IRA did not start because the press asked for it, nor did it stop because the media were opposed. The Israeli-Palestinian question became known in the whole world when the PFLP captured and destroyed some planes. Justified demands of poor people for a decent life come only to the fore when organisations use violence against their rulers. Peaceful demands are disregarded because the powerful are not forced to listen to the powerless.

The elite can reach its fellow-members through the media. Masspeople can never use the media to reach fellow-masspeople. The leaders of the media decide what can be published and only sometimes give attention to the problems of the masses. The elite comes first. This top-down method agrees with the hierarchical organisation of our society. The effort of some independent masspeople to create media especially for the masses is only a drop in the vast sea of media that are controlled by the elite. Only a few masspeople will read the information of these sympathetic media. When such opposing media become too strong or are directly calling on the masses to use violence, the elite knows how to silence these independent media (by elitist violence).

When elitepeople are attacked they will ask other elitepeople for help via the media. Therefore the echo of mass actions against elitepersons will resonance in the elitist media but only when the elite is deeply shocked, when their power position is undermined. But still masspeople will never be capable to use media as they want it.

**Only when the elite is wavering, the media will write about the ongoing struggle between mass and elite.**

## Chapter 7. THE IMPORTANCE OF LIVING BEINGS

Living individuals are more important than dead structures. It is not right that institutions rule over the only beings that can take individual decisions as well as look into the far future. It is amazing that some people are afraid of dead computers that collect private data and endanger privacy. Living elitepeople use dead computers and dead data for their purpose. When someone wants to prevent abuse of data then it is not right to attack computers or destroy data. You must put pressure on those people that use these data. Power rules in our democracy but only living people can exert power. Power that seems to be exerted by institutions, governments, armies etceteras is always exerted by living beings. Powerless citizens can only get power when they exert pressure on powerful leaders. The most effective pressure finds place in the private living sphere of leaders.

Powerful high-placed people want in the first place to safeguard the interest of the own group. Leftist leaders seem to contradict this statement but they too want to preserve the unequal partition of power and wealth. They too use social structures and institutions to impose decisions on masspeople. Ministers and not ministries decide to cut benefit allowances. High civil servants and not ministries decide that the driving speed on motorways has to be changed. Shell directors and not the Shell decided to sell oil to racist South Africa. But leftist activists still demonstrate in front of offices, still demand that factories stop polluting the environment, try to stop trains that transport nuclear waste or even bomb offices where wrong decisions have been taken. Decision taking people do not experience any pressure when their workplace is attacked.

Everything turns around individuals. Elitepeople are always working to maintain and expand the situation in which their group has more than masspeople. Even when they steal millions they are treated as equals, not as criminals. Some directors of Enron who stole hundreds of millions are being prosecuted (but not in prison). Enron workers not only lost their job, which made their present life difficult, but also their pension, which distorted their future life. The fraudulent directors have enough money stacked away to secure a happy future. Incapable directors who cause the sacking of many workers often get a golden handshake. Elitepeople have a secure present and future life, the life of masspeople is insecure in the present as well as in the future. And the greedy bankers who caused the financial crisis are still in high positions, they are even asked to solve the crisis while they have not changed their attitudes, have not analysed their mistakes.

Hardly controlled powerful people are often corrupt. Corruption is getting benefits for oneself or the own group at the cost of other people. Who has most power can get most benefits, the greater the power differences, the greater the corruption. The elite is per definition corrupt because its first objective is the benefit of the own group. The interest of the own group comes first what happens to other people is less important. The Americans withdrew from Vietnam because too many Americans died. The killed Vietnamese were of minor importance. The Second Gulf War was started because

the Americans thought that most casualties would be seen on the Iraqi side in their pursuit to secure the petrol supply to the USA (but the number of dead Americans is just as in Vietnam growing and growing). Rich countries export harmful waste to poor countries because in this way the own population is not hurt. It was therefore quite logic that a Dutch industrialist was sentenced to several years in prison because he polluted a Dutch field that was destined to become a golf course. Leaders know how to stop damage to their own environment.

During the French Revolution some masspeople got prominent positions as elected representatives. After some time these former masspeople started to think in the first place about rules that benefited the rich because these people surrounded them in the decision-taking organs. Soon laws were made that safeguarded personal property. They said they wanted to do something about the lack of food for poor people but decisions were delayed. Hunger was a minor subject because in the direct environment of decision-takers hunger was non-existent. Only after violent actions of Parisian sans-culottes, the masses could enforce some beneficial decisions. In the Middle Ages the plight of poor people got only attention when they threatened to disrupt the harvest and the supply of food to the cities. Only because their private interests were endangered the elite was willing to give some of its wealth to the masses. It shows that masspeople only get some power when they intrude into the eliteworld. Then it becomes clear that the elite can also take decisions that benefit masspeople, in quiet times they only see their own sorrows.

Elitepersons hide behind impersonal obscure structures. Through these institutions they exert power. Only some decisions are taken in Parliament. And even the greedy voracity of the top is sold to the masses as detergents that whitewash all crimes. The same advertisement agencies sell **Bush** or **Blair**, **Chirac** as well as **Mitterand**. Most politicians are salesmen and have hardly any power. Nobody can sincerely believe that **Ronald Reagan** was the most powerful man in the world. He was accustomed to obey producers when he was an actor and when he became president he obeyed other masters.

Some democratic organisations acknowledge that power is personal. Amnesty International regularly calls upon its members to write letters to the powerful. But powerful people do not change when they receive even a million letters. In the United States it is quite common for voters to write their representatives asking them to promote or block certain decisions. It shows that leading individuals in democracies indeed have power. But voters have transferred their power to representatives and may only ask for better decisions, they never can force the elected to act in their favour. The elite only complies when requests do not hurt its interest. Or because a few concessions strengthen the illusion that masspeople have some power. The minds of leading persons are not changed by such actions because they know that their power position is not challenged.

The elite often directly attacks individual masspeople. Strike leaders in the transport industry are treated as pariahs and their life is made difficult by assigning them the most difficult roads. Trade unions cannot protect its members from this personal pressure. Sometimes massive violence is used against demonstrations when people are chased away by heavy-armed police troops but direct violence against individuals is also not shunned. In a war weapons are deployed that only kill people and do not

destroy buildings. In daily life direct violence is often used against individual masspeople. The elite isolates these people when they might endanger its power position, because mass leaders can form a new elite on which the old elite has no influence. The emergence of the Soviet Union has been an example of a change in elites. So the elite tries to prevent the rise of new leaders by disturbing their life, by fining and imprisoning them and in the end by killing them by secret dead squads. In Israel houses of suspected Palestinians are blown up and suspected leaders murdered. In Chile children of suspected members of the resistance were taken hostage and Americans do not hesitate to extradite members of Al Queda to countries that torture prisoners. The Dutch Secret Service gives names of members of extremist organisations to employers and pressurises the family of people who dislike the elitist democracy.

Masspeople cannot use the juridical instruments that De **Montesquieu** designed to solve inter-elitist conflicts. They become lost in the juridical labyrinth and professional support is too expensive. In the democratic law system criminals are personally responsible for their deeds but there is a big difference between a petty thief and a director that ruined a firm with all disadvantaged effects for workers. The director can hide himself behind a corporate body so that he is not personally accountable for his misdeeds. The small criminal cannot hide behind a corporate body called Thief Ltd or Vandalism Ltd.

The elite does not personally attack masspeople. In demonstrations and other mass actions the police, protectors of the elite, directly confront activists. A conflict between mass and elite is changed into a conflict between two groups of masspeople. In the new kind of actions only elitepeople are the target. Protectors of the elite must not be attacked or damaged so they are less motivated to do their work because they also know that elitepeople live on another world. The media will also not write enthusiastically about attacks against elitepersons. It is hardly possible to rally masspeople against psychological attackers who only tickle leaders – though a prolonged tickling will influence deeply the private life of leaders. Even the killing actions of the German RAF (Rote Armee Fraktion) had ample support under the masses. But it is not the intention to kill leading people but to change their mind.

It is not necessarily that attacking masspeople propagate their actions widely because elitepersons will use the media to get support of fellow-members. The propaganda of activists can be restricted to an analysis of the situation and to show that all masspeople can get some power by directly attacking powerful leaders. The present mass organisations only try to make the own organisation bigger and they hardly tell their members what they can do once they have joined the organisation (besides following the orders of the leaders). What a single individual can do to change the present inequality in wealth and power is left to the future. Or even worse, the fairy-tale is spread that society will change when the organisation has grown so big that a majority of masspeople votes new leaders in power. But that elections do not change power relations is already many times refuted in the past.

It is more important to show people what they can do than to make them a more or less passive member of an organisation. Individualism, autonomy and creativity must be emphasised. A few small actions might be the start of an avalanche that will destroy the world of the elite. The growth of the snowball can be followed in the

media where attacked elitepersons tell what is happening and where they warn other elitepersons of the growing pressure. Though these actions give a single massperson only a limited amount of power, many independent activists can exert a lot of power also because all energy is directed against one target, the elite. Now leftist activists jump from one subject to another. Actions were concentrated around Vietnam, then they supported the Nicaraguan people, then Iraq, nuclear energy, housing shortages for poor people or environmental damage. Results remained meagre because most (short-term) pressure was directed against dead objects than against living leaders. Because of the lack of results disappointed activists withdraw after a reasonable short time. And also because actions hinder masspeople more than elitepeople. Strikes prevent masspeople to go to their work, to go on holiday or to get rid of their garbage. Violent actions against Shell in which activists cut the hoses of petrol stations hindered people who needed petrol. Dead petrol pumps do not take decisions, only living persons have that power. A snowball is only started when living leaders come under a lasting pressure – a year, two years, maybe even ten years.

Only a few demonstrations have been held in front of expensive villa's, only some stones broke the windows of houses of leaders, only once the refrigerator of a minister was plundered. Most actions take place around the workplace. Actions in the private sphere have been incidental and nearly always aimed at getting publicity. Without continuity such actions are a temporary nuisance. What I propose can be compared with the so-called Chinese torture method. Every five second a drop of water descends on the head of a suspect. In the beginning it is inconvenient but in the course of days the drops become heavier and seem to fall faster. Though physical damage is small, the pressure on the mind becomes unbearable. The attacked person is brought in such a situation that he will disclose his secrets. An eliteperson who is under lasting pressure from masspeople will also change. He knows the pressure will stop when he takes different decisions but he fears the counter-action of other elitepersons. He is in a dilemma and starts to behave strangely. He becomes the kernel of the snowball that can cause an avalanche. Because this eliteperson will try to explain his odd behaviour to other elitepeople masspeople can follow what is happening in the media. Then masspeople know their power is growing because a powerful eliteperson is forced to do things he never has done before. It is the first step on the road to a different future. Other masspeople will join the elite-attack-club that has no paying members, no leaders and no structure. It is an autonomous organisation with independent active people. This club may sweep away the present elitist democracy and the secluded eliteworld.

**Then a New World will come into existence in which rulers and ruled live together for the benefit of all.**

## Chapter 8. MASS POWER

A massperson belongs to the masses because he is with many though he remains a unique living being. Advertisements for mass sport, mass holiday destinations and mass meetings connected with religion, nationalism, charity, politics or art try to show that masspeople only act en masse. But when contrary characteristics as uniformity and autonomy are brought together in one human being ambiguous behaviour is the result. Masspeople mostly act in the same way as others but suddenly they do something different. Then they distinguish themselves from animals that from birth to death vegetate without thinking of any future. Humans are capable to influence their own life.

An eliteperson belongs to a small group that tries to maintain the existing situation of a privileged and an inferior world. He uses his individuality to safeguard the privileged position of the own group. A deep abyss separates the worlds of mass and elite. In mass sport masspeople are sitting on common seats while elitepeople can be found in skyboxes. Masspeople are powerless against social developments. In an extreme situation as a war the opposing elites dine with each other while masspeople fight each other to defend the interests of leaders. In democracies masspeople may only ask leaders to do something in their favour, they always depend on the good will of the elite if their request will be honoured.

Elitepeople differ from masspeople even though they are also dependent on decisions taken elsewhere. Directors and ministers must also pay taxes and have hardly influence on the spending of tax money. They appear to be powerless but they know that fellow-members elsewhere in society take decisions that are mostly in their favour. They know they belong to the elite and that they can talk on an equal basis with other leaders when they are bothered by something. The power of the elite is also founded on the myth of its superiority that contains some truth because the elite has more power and wealth than the masses.

Masspeople lack self-consciousness. Members of trade unions still look up to directors. The opinion of directors can become law even when workers are against these decisions. The opinions of workers are only honoured when directors agree. Only higher-placed members of the elite can block measures taken by lower-placed directors.

Masspeople mostly only react on activities of the elite. When the elite organises conferences to regulate the world economy, masspeople are demonstrating outside (without much success). This method must be turned around. Masspeople must autonomously determine the place, method and target of their activities. Then the elite has to react. Then the masses become freer and more independent.

Most laws only regulate the life of masspeople. People who rent a house have to comply to more regulations than people who buy a house. When you fall under the state-controlled health system you cannot decide where to be hospitalised, when you have plenty of money you can get a new heart in a private clinic. When you have not enough money you have to go to crowded holiday resorts while with enough money

you can choose a quite place to get your tanning. Elitepeople are often not hindered by laws because they have money and connections. When your company pays your fines, you can park your car everywhere. When you can pay a good lawyer, all kinds of embezzlements are not punished. You may be a big criminal but you can hide behind the corporation you work for.

Masspeople are often not allowed to use their individuality, elitepeople emphasise that they are unique. Elitepeople have a purpose in life: to get as much as possible and to care that that their progeny inherit a comparable position. Masspeople have hardly a purpose that goes beyond the struggle to exist. Their life passes on, they do not build anything nor do they leave some (mental) inheritance to their progeny. Purposes that lie in a far-away future seem ridiculous to strive for. Masspeople know they are powerless and thus they continue to live a life that to a great height is controlled and determined by the elite.

Society is not very decent. That is also caused by masspeople that do not want to change their lower status even when life is unjust, inferior or empty. Citizens are inactive because they believe activity leads to nothing. To break the inferior situation masspeople have to become active. But actions must know success on the short and on the long term. Actions must be connected to the myth that society will change when citizens become active. Because the elite seems to control the real future, masspeople dream away in a world that is filled with stories about rich people, rambo's, the jetset and other heroes. In their dreams masspeople free themselves from all rules and laws that order and regulate real life. But it is only a dream, reality can be very cruel.

Sometimes masses break spontaneously their powerlessness by setting fire to their own world in the hope the eliteworld will be roasted. These eruptions of powerlessness do not lead to any lasting change in the power relations. That we can learn from racial uprisings in the United States, but also from Revolutions in France or Russia. In South Africa most black people still belong to the lower classes. In the struggle for a black regime the white elite was hardly attacked and the black masses suffered most. The new (black) leaders hardly changed society. That is a gloomy picture of the future. The distance between rulers and ruled may have become a little bit smaller in democracies but is still too great. Masses still cannot prevent that in a next war many of their kind are slaughtered while the elite continues to live its privileged life. The Balkan War and the Gulf Wars show that masspeople suffer most from wars, the life of the elite is hardly disturbed. And the present financial crisis caused by mistakes of the elite will also hurt masspeople more than elitepeople.

Action purposes must be partly realised in the present and partly in the future. The elite strives to maintain its privileged position, the masses have to strive for a different kind of society. It is interesting to take the road to this New World. How this New World will look like will become clearer when the masses advance on the road. In this creative process humans will confirm their individuality and get rid of their powerlessness. They will get more grip on their own life when they proceed along the road towards a mythical new society with more freedom and autonomy. The road is fairly concrete, the future can never be exact, precise or detailed.

On the road towards this future concrete and precise demands can be put forward. Leaders who want to safeguard the present society are only prepared to concede what remains inside the self-imposed boundaries of elitist society. Masses will more and more go beyond these boundaries. Not only the honesty, integrity and ability of present leaders is at stake but also their basic ideas of the future because in a new society there is no room for groups that live in another world. Now masspeople spent most of their time on hobby's, family and friends and of course on getting money to live. They do not contribute much to the future. Their time spent on future myths must have some result otherwise masspeople will become disappointed and withdraw from society. In actions masspeople must already experience more freedom and individuality, must see that their autonomous creativity is honoured by results.

The elite is incapable to solve social problems. Addiction to alcohol and drugs, wars, hunger, poverty etc. continue to exist. The exertion of Mass Power will lead to a kind of leaders that subordinate their own interests to the interest of all people. Because of the direct pressure from individual masspeople rulers will admit they are no longer servants of a small rich group. When masspeople become more satisfied and conscious of their power when they see that the behaviour of leaders is changing they will admit that they have created something, that they are not anymore useless and powerless but are proceeding on the road towards a new kind of society.

A second characteristic of Mass Power is anonymity. It is safer that the elite does not know the attacker. You cannot be active when you are in prison. The elite must work openly because it must tell the masses which decisions are taken. While the power of the elite is partly based on the vague Power of the Market, the power of the masses is based on a vague myth that is based on creativity and autonomy and the wish to get one world where all people have the same status. Mass Power is based on anonymous actions of individual masspeople that attack individual leaders who refuse to listen to masspeople. After some time the elite perceives that some masspeople have lost their status as cattle that only has to be fed to give the best production results. Some masspeople get independent ideas and will not anymore live for bread and games alone. They move autonomously in a direction the elite does not want. But power relations do not change without struggle. Masspeople only develop a new consciousness as they have some success without any help from the side of the elite. After each successful action the myth of individual Mass Power will be strengthened.

Masspeople must independently precede on the road to a freer society. The Peruvian guerrillas called themselves Sendero Luminoso, Shining Path. They started their actions around 1970. Many powerless masspeople joined the Movement. But the organisation was too centralised and individuality was curtailed. Therefore the Peruvian elite could break Sendero Luminoso by killing or imprisoning most leaders. The masses returned to their subordinate position. Colombian guerrillas in the FARC make the same mistake. Even when they succeed to oust the old elite from its powerful position the new society will hardly differ from the present one. A new elite will come forward that will alleviate a little the wretched situation of the masses but will never accept that individual masspeople become really free.

Actions of squatters showed the enthusiasm of masspeople. Anonymous people in anonymous actions put pressure on concrete leaders who then changed their policy

and started to build cheaper houses for young people. In Amsterdam alone the Movement secured more than twenty-five thousand squatted houses. Masspeople got more free living space but when the Movement withered away many squatted houses were retaken by the leaders. The success of the Movement could have been even greater if squatters had penetrated in the private living sphere of comfortable living leaders.

Mass Power differs from Elite Power that uses the hypocrite and slimy Machiavellian principle of sometimes being lenient and suddenly using violence. And the elite always lets other people do the job. **Hitler** or **Eichmann** did not kill any people but ordered the rank and file to massacre the opposition. The power relations in the Mafia are also indirect. In this hierarchical organisation the lower ranks act on the way they think the top should order to act when it was asked. As long as the direct aim of the top (money) is fulfilled, the top will approve any action by lower ranked people. When the flow of money stagnates the top can be very cruel against own people and violence is never shunned.

The comparison between democracy and Mafia is not accidental because both organisations have a hierarchical structure. On the top you find a more or less closed group whose first aim is the own enrichment at the cost of third persons. Mass Power must prevent that other people use their power to their own interest. But Mass Power is individual and masspeople cannot order others to act on their behalf. Mass Power is also contrary to the collective power that leftists prefer to use when they confront the elite. Mass demonstrations and other mass actions do not allow ideas that contradict the ideas of leftist leaders. In most leftist actions masspeople are still like cows in a herd.

Masspeople are sometimes indeed be autonomous. Political experts were amazed that millions of French people demonstrated spontaneously in 1987 about problems in the education system. Leftist organisations as trade unions and political parties were not allowed to participate. The actions were caused by the growing dissatisfaction that was accumulating in the heads of the masses. Suddenly masspeople took a new road and rejected the leadership of leftist know-alls and rightist totalitarians. It was shown in the turbulent sixties that in a relatively free climate new ideas come forward. New kinds of actions can lead to a new society that arises from social chaos as the bird Phoenix from the fire. It is very difficult to imagine what will happen in and after these lively periods.

**The Movement towards a New World will inspire masspeople to become active against leaders of the present hierarchical organised society that cannot eradicate all misery caused by drugs, alcohol, hunger, wars, suppression, torture, unemployment, poverty etc.**

## Chapter 9. ACTIONS

The elite uses mass weapons to control and suppress masses. Weapons of the masses should attack individuals and emphasise that humans are autonomous individuals who are responsible for their own deeds. In conflicts between countries elitist means of power are used. Some of these means are only available to rich (Western) elite countries. With the best aeroplanes you can bomb the adversary. Carpet bombing was already used in World War II when than hundred thousand masspeople were massacred in Dresden in Germany. Cruise missiles are launched from submarines that are hundreds of kilometres away from the target or from high-flying stealth bombers. They seldom hurt leaders that are hiding in safe places. Expensive atom bombs, ballistic missiles, guided bombs etc. are weapons of the rich who also have chemical and biological weapons. Poor people should use cheap weapons and avoid battles when the opponent is superior. In the second Gulf War the Iraqi elite proved that they understood a little this simple truth. It dissolved the army before it was completely destroyed by the American superior weapons. And everywhere small weapons were hided in safe places to be used later to attack the American occupier.

The top-elite that polluted the world with nuclear tests and used Agent Orange in Vietnam complains that countries as Iraq and Iran have chemical weapons. Already in 1925 the Protocol of Geneva prohibited the use (but not the possession or production) of chemical weapons. But why prohibit one weapon while other mass destruction weapons are permitted? Why are normal bullets permitted and dum dum bullets prohibited? Why have some countries nuclear bombs and make the rich great fuss about biological and chemical weapons? The top elitist countries want to maintain their monopoly on mass destruction weapons and forbid cheap weapons that could be made by poor countries. The monopoly on the greatest violence is in the hands of the highest elite.

The masses must not participate in discussions about elitist weapons but develop their own weapons. Elitist mass destruction weapons hurt nearly only masspeople. They are used to install in the masses a lasting fear for the power of the elite. Unruly masses are controlled by elitist violence by impersonal weapons as teargas, rubber bullets and also guns. Direct confrontations between elitepeople and masspeople are rare. The elite always orders other people - police, army and other security forces that consist of masspeople - to use anti-mass power instruments. The masses must never use such arbitrary methods that hurt arbitrary people but must develop methods to influence specified people.

Elitist violence is nearly always connected with the use of mass weapons. Leftist leaders still call upon the masses to participate in mass actions and reject actions of small groups. Fifty thousand demonstrators who passively listen to some leaders are higher rated than direct action against individuals who hurt the interest of the masses. Leftist leaders organise only actions against which the elite can use mass weapons. The masses should look for actions against which the elite cannot use the only

weapon they have to control masses: means that control groups rather than individuals.

Leftist leaders do not understand that in the democratic system elitist leaders determine the means of action. The Trias Politica settles elitist conflicts in court. In the West violence is seldom used. In less developed countries as Afghanistan fighting between war lords is still fairly normal and most present wars are mostly fought between small elites that do not believe in the ideas of De **Montesquieu**. The Gulf Wars were fought over the control over the supply of petrol because the Iraqi elite was too independent. But most elitist conflicts are solved peacefully by elitist democratic organisations as the United Nations though even then there is power play. The strongest party has more (violent) power instruments than the weakest party. The Protocol of Geneva is not the only treaty in which weaker parties are deprived of power instruments that are available to stronger parties.

Masspeople suffer most in elitist conflicts. The elite has a monopoly on the use of violence. While the elite can do what it likes to do, leftist leaders restrict the power of the masses to peaceful means of actions as strikes or demonstrations. In the past strikes were a direct attack on the wallet of owners. Now they do not endanger anymore the existence of leaders of industrial concerns. Strikes in the governmental sector have never been dangerous for directors appointed by the government. Striking civil servants only hurt fellow-members of the masses. Strikes of garbage collectors are for example directed at dead objects (the not-collected garbage) and not at living directors who do not pay enough. In demonstrations – and also in most strikes – leaders are only asked and never forced to change their policy. Demonstrations affirm the subordinate position of masspeople when organisers of demonstrations prevent individual initiatives as an own slogan or the throwing of a (indeed useless) stone. When demonstrations turn violent leaders are accused having lost control. Most participants however still trust leftist leaders. But violent demonstrations must also be rejected because most violence is directed against dead objects or security forces. In the first case ministries, windows of banks or arbitrary cars are damaged. In the second case the demonstration ends in a clash between demonstrators and security forces that both belong to the masses. Security forces are only a stick with which the elite hits opposing masspeople. The elite has many sticks to hit and the beating will only stop when you attack the leader who carries the stick.

Mass actions as strikes and demonstrations are democratic means of action. While leaders negotiate about possible changes masspeople suffer under elitist violence. Masspeople must distrust means of action that are applauded by democrats that say that demonstrations and strikes are the ultimate means of power for masspeople. In demonstrations participants can utter their grievances in the hope something will be done to correct the situation. But demonstrations give masses never the right to change the situation, they are not powerful enough to force leaders to change. Only when demonstrations turn violent the message becomes so strong that something can happen. In Tunisia an exorbitant rise of the bread price was cancelled after violent protests in which hundreds of masspeople were killed. Peaceful demonstrations against atom bombs have never known success. But demonstrations and strikes should anyhow be rejected as means of actions because the results are negligible. And moreover individuality and creativity of masspeople are suppressed.

Only actions that emphasise special human characteristics as autonomy, creativity and individuality can change the social structure. Actions must increase the power of common citizens. This occurs only in a direct confrontation between mass and elite minorities. **Jean-Paul Marat** advanced this idea during the French Revolution. He stated explicitly that members of the elite should not be included in active mass minorities. His ideas were mostly neglected. Mass leaders only organise masses in hierarchical organisations to build an own mass basis from which they negotiate with the elite. But they know they do not have enough power to solve the unequal power distribution. The elite does not want to lose its privileged position. It is only prepared to give the masses some crumbs that fall from its well-supplied table.

Talks between two fundamentally contrary opponents can hardly change the existing situation. Even within the elite two opposing fractions can often not co-operate without resorting to violence. **Reagan** and **Gorbatsjov** only agreed that old nuclear weapons had to be destroyed, the newest weapons stayed outside the talks because weapons are the ultimate means of power of the elite. Without weapons the elite could lose its power and its privileges. Without weapons the elite cannot anymore neutralise indigenous or foreign masses. The elite will always use mass destruction weapons because individual weapons could also be used by masspeople. In World War II the Germans were defeated by mass destruction weapons and individual acts of resistance were as much as possible controlled by the elite.

The strong have better weapons than the weak. The United States threatened Libya with planes and aircraft carriers and Iraq with precision bombardments. France still uses its Foreign Legion. Poor elites can only use terror or cheap mass destruction weapons. Though rich countries possess many military bases and many advanced weapons they are not almighty. France was ousted from Vietnam and the United States could also not manage to control this country. The mass weapons of the Americans killed many Vietnamese masspeople but still the USA had to withdraw. In the Middle East War the underlying party used car bombs and other terrorist weapons in France and these bombs killed lots of masspeople. But both sides were elitist because they killed in the first place masspeople. This kind of violence must not be used by masspeople. The targets must be elitist leaders. The deep abyss between elite- and massworld must also become noticeable in the kind of weapons that is used by the warring parties.

The elite wants to solve conflicts in a short time. The masses are not strong enough to decide conflicts with short-term actions. This is also caused by the simple fact that the inferiority complex of masspeople cannot be destroyed overnight. Actions must therefore be successful, long lasting and varied and must increase self-esteem. The mind of leaders can only change by many small actions over a long time. Small autonomous actions contribute to this process. Even when a massperson does not know that other people are also active he will discover that the effect of his activities grows when fellow-masspeople target the same eliteperson. In the end the mind of the leader will change because the ever-increasing pressure from the masses threatens to destroy him.

Not all individual actions of masspeople can be admired. When **Jan Palach** burned himself to death after the Russian invasion of Hungary he only cried out but did not increase the pressure on any leader. He died and was not capable to carry out more

actions. Dead, arrested or inactive masspeople do not contribute anything to a better world. The media described suicidal actions of Vietnamese monks as courageous but I do not agree. At whom is their action directed? The own kind of people knows already what is happening and foreign masses are powerless to help their fellow-citizens in other countries. The own as well as the foreign elite is not pressured by the actions. To become active can of course be risky but activists must minimise the chance they cannot carry out any further actions. I also do not agree with suicidal actions of desperate Islamic people. These masspeople copy the behaviour of elitepeople, they hope that one big action will change the world. But one individual action will never change a world with seven billion people.

Actions that do not directly attack elitepeople are only effective when they inform the masses that the elite is incapable to lead our society. Discussions around the nuclear catastrophe in Tsjernobil increased the general knowledge of masspeople. But information does not increase the self-consciousness of masspeople and does not change the balance of power. Information is only a force for powerful people. Most leftist action groups as Greenpeace or Médecins Sans Frontières are powerless clubs inside the existing social structure. They alleviate the plight of the masses but contribute nothing to a change of the social structure. Massive demonstrations take only once in a long time place. The biggest Dutch demonstration ever asked the removal of cruise missiles from Dutch soil. They are still there. But imagine that each of the five hundred thousand protesters had thrown only one stone through the window of one eliteperson ..... This multitude of small actions should have had an immense effect.

It is sometimes beneficial when masspeople concentrate their actions around some virtual focus. The masses are like a piece of paper that only catch fire when rays are concentrated by a magnifying glass. This mythical metaphor is part of the myth that changes only occur when attacks are time and again directed at the same targets. In the fifties and the sixties such focuses were the Algerian and the Vietnamese War. The Provo-ideas were directed against the power of the establishment. Nuclear power and atom bombs were also focuses. Masspeople should have acted against members of the elite that were connected to these subjects. But in most cases the focuses blurred and the elite regained control. Moreover actions lasted too short and much of the action energy was directed at other targets. And also because masspeople still trusted the elite. Leftist politicians who first backed the wars were later praised when they changed their position. But they only wanted to improve their own position in the eliteworld, they still supported the continuation of the elitist power.

In the eighties squatting became a new focus in The Netherlands. Young people could hardly get decent living quarters although many houses were standing empty. Some people started to occupy empty houses. The unavoidable clashes with the police followed. But there were also direct actions against landlords, speculators and other higher-placed people that were involved in the housing question. Always with the silent message that when they left the squatters undisturbed these leaders could also continue their life. Many houses were saved. But actions were again short-lived and incidental. Squatters often stopped being active when their house was secured. Important squatter houses as the Lucky Luyk or the Old Wetering were lost and the owners gained a lot of money. Squatters did not understand that many more houses could have been saved when they had continued to keep owners under direct

pressure. Now some owners suffered – assurances mostly paid for it – but most owners knew they could continue their speculative business because actions only sometimes were directed against them.

When actions turn violent some politicians change their ideas but mostly to strengthen their own position. The housing problem was partly solved and squatters were allowed to occupy empty houses. But after some time the political elite retook the control they had loosened. Laws were made to prohibit squatting but nothing was done against house speculation. Squatters rightly advanced the slogan that "their law is not our law" but could not prevent that squatting became fairly difficult. The slogan expressed the unconscious wish of the masses to draw a sharp line between them and the elite. But the slogan was not accompanied by activities. Many squatters still wanted to talk with the town council even when they knew that the mayor time and again ordered the police to attack squatters in ways that transgressed the own democratic rules. Nothing was done for example against a police slogan "Sla Vaker Een Kraker" ("hit squatters more often").

An Anti-Nuclear slogan was more to the point: "Nuclear Energy is Everywhere". Many enterprises, institutions and individuals are involved in nuclear energy. Actions were carried out against many objects (and some individuals) but the slogan was too wide. The chance that someone or some object was hit was too small. After a last massive demonstration the Dutch Anti-Nuclear Movement withered away – also because of lack of success. It was the last big Movement in Holland. In the second part of the eighties and in the nineties the masses stopped nearly all activity. The massive but powerless demonstrations against the second Gulf War only showed that the political elite had regained control.

Leftists people often favour boycotts but then masspeople suffer more than elitepeople. The boycott against racist South Africa damaged black masspeople but not elitist black leaders as Bishop **Tutu**, white church leaders as **Beyers Naudé** or white racist leaders as **De Klerk**. Rich white Africans could continue their lavish life in a slave society. Active masspeople outside South Africa should have wondered if there could be other goals. Many contacts existed between Western and South African elites. A South African astronomical observatory was closely connected to the Dutch observatory in Leiden. Dutch money was paid to acquire data from South Africa. This contact favoured in the first place the South African white elite. Why should such contacts not be broken by actions against Dutch astronomers? Because astronomers form a closed group, all members will hear of actions against one member. Their idyllic world will be destroyed and it will become clear that they support an inhuman regime. Actions that sever all outside contacts of the racist elite are more effective than a boycott that killed only black masspeople.

**Activists should always remember that the elite must be hit, not fellow-masspeople.**

## Chapter 10. PSYCHOLOGICAL VIOLENCE

Power is partly based on trust. Therefore positions of power can be undermined by rumours. Former French president **Valerie d'Estaing** was a prominent member of the French elite. He should have received some diamonds from the dethroned emperor **Bokassa**. Nobody knew exactly what had happened but because of these rumours **d'Estaing** probably lost the elections for a second term as French president. Rumours are like myths. They contain some truth and are difficult to deny, to contradict or to attack. Elitepersons are vulnerable for rumours because they have something to lose. The democratic myth supports the prominent position of the elite, rumours can break it down.

Psychological violence is dangerous for powerful people. The threat of an action is often more damaging than the action itself. The elite rules over the world from its comfortable management chairs. When only one leg breaks the eliteperson falls. Other elitepersons will wonder if their chair is also undermined. Because their future becomes uncertain elitepersons will try avoid that their chair becomes undermined. Psychological actions influence the mind of leaders. And a changed mind can cause that elitepersons will take into account the plights and wishes of all people and not in the first place the interests of fellow-members of the elite.

In our society it is hardly forbidden to spread rumours – even when they are flagrantly untrue. Direct actions that cause material damage are often less intruding than soft psychological actions. Dead material damage can be assured but pressure that influences the mind of leaders is more difficult to resist. A lasting psychological pressure makes leaders uncertain. And it is easier to carry out a long series of psychological actions than many actions that cause material damage. The last actions however support psychological violence and should not be excluded.

A small example of psychological damage was the blockade of Dutch canals by skippers who were opposed to a change in the way cargo was transported on waterways. The blockade was stopped after a violent confrontation with police troops. But the image that Holland was a quiet country with safe water transport was damaged. Therefore leaders reconsidered their policy and the mostly psychological action proved to have had some influence on the minds of some leaders even though the amount of violence had been negligent.

The minds of Israeli leaders changed after long lasting actions (under which the intifada) in which material violence dominated though psychological violence was not unimportant. The Palestinian actions undermined the belief of Israeli leaders that they could continue to live on the old way in a fairly secure country, while nearby living hostile Palestinians were controlled by the Israeli army. Once some fields of Israeli farmers were put on fire and the fear that in the future more fields could be made unusable influenced the minds of farmers. Activists must never determine how the mind of attacked leaders must change. Leaders will suddenly admit they can only

continue to reign when they take into account the interests of all people. In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict the interest of Israelis dominates the mind of Israeli leaders still more than the plight of Palestinians. When actions continue they will acknowledge that this cannot go on forever, the present policy will be abandoned and Israeli leaders will begin to look for another future. The deadly attack on Gaza in 2009 showed that the Israelis are very nervous despite their superior weapons.

Threats to poison foodstuffs or drinking water have also the aim to make people uncertain. But most actions are only damaging masspeople and the elite is not directly put under pressure. Then the minds of leaders will not change. When the University of Amsterdam appointed two new male professors in favour of female candidates actions were again not directed at the centre of power. Some rooms in the University were occupied but this did not change anything. University leaders stipulated that students had the right to demonstrate but that such actions did not influence their decision. Activists only advanced their opinion but did not intrude the minds of the leaders. In democracies leaders are seldom directly put under pressure and are thus not directly responsible to the masses. When masspeople want to have some influence they must direct themselves at responsible leaders and make them clear that when they continue to decide on the old way they will not be allowed to continue to live on the old way.

Even when actions have hardly success despite the energy put into the activities masspeople often do not change their political activities. They continue to listen to leaders who organise actions on a professional basis. For trade union leaders earning money is more important than getting results. Even many leaders from the so-called independent action world want to climb up in political parties. They never attack democratic leaders in such a way that their future career will be endangered. Their actions remain inside the boundaries of the existing social relations. They oppose all violence and restrict the originality and the autonomy of activists. Strikes, demonstrations and other short-time actions are propagated as the best means of action. This kind of leaders continues to bow to the wishes of the Parliament or the Court when these elitist organs decide that certain actions are not permitted.

Most actions are organised from above though top-down actions do not contribute much to a change in power relations. The hierarchy remains intact and the discontent of the masses is at the most temporarily suppressed. In the sixties and seventies the economy was surging and masspeople came in a better position though power relations did not change. The elite was not forced to give the masses a greater share of the wealth and in the next decades the elite recouped their loss. The masses did not have any influence on this process. The strengthening of the security apparatus and the introduction of even more laws also restricted the freedom of citizens. Masspeople did not have any answer on this policy though they understood that strikes and demonstrations could not stop this deterioration. They withdrew in their private living space and alienation increased. The sudden rise of populist politician **Fortuyn** who got 17% in the Dutch general elections of 2002 showed that many people were very dissatisfied with the old political leaders.

The elite also uses psychological violence. By lying and deceiving on a Machiavellian way it controls the masses. Masspeople lie and deceive also but in comparison to the elite they are most of the time honest because they believe they still live in a

predominantly nice world. **Nelson Mandela** could have been freed much earlier if he only should have renounced the use of violence in the fight against racism. He refused though such a forced declaration is never legitimate. He should have withdrawn his promise after he became free and contributed more to the struggle. When masspeople should realise they live in another world than the elite they should admit they do not have to be honest in regard to the elite. Then they could also include lies and deceit in actions. When actions take place on the border between fantasy and reality attacked targets will never know what is real and what imaginary. Rumours drag an eliteperson in a net of fantasy and reality. Such actions cost less time and are less dangerous than throwing a Molotov cocktail but the effect is often more impressive.

Actions must be long lasting and the effort must be worth the result. The time spent on activities must however never prevent masspeople to live their own private life. Only the attacked person must feel the pressure. An eliteperson only can perform well when he has contact with other leaders. Actions should also try to sever bonds between leaders. The target must be isolated from fellow-members of the elite. Because leaders do not want to be disturbed by other people, rumours are an excellent means to increase the distance between attacked and not-attacked leaders. When becomes known that some leaders are changing their behaviour because of pressure exerted by masspeople, other leaders will minimise their contacts to remain outside the conflict. This intensifies the pressure on the attacked leader.

In our fairly peaceful countries psychological actions are more intruding than violent actions. By threats and other small actions masspeople create a balloon that cannot be pinched by an eliteperson because he never knows if the balloon is filled with air or with water, maybe the contents is even poisonous. He has the same dilemma as the police that gets a warning about a bomb. The police does not know if the bomb is real or not but has to do something. Elitepeople must also give attention to all actions and will have less time to fulfil their most important task in life – to care for the well being of the whole elite. When this is not anymore possible something will change.

The elite will find it difficult to defend itself against sneaky attacks. Their protectors - the police - come from the same world as the perpetrators and are not under pressure. They hardly understand why the eliteperson seems disturbed. Psychological and material actions must only involve things that are important for members of the elite. When masspeople are in the middle of the night attacked by SMS or phone it is a nuisance but they can disconnect – leaders must always be available. Is it really so bad when someone reads in a newspaper that he is deceased? You can hardly 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 the car, who ordered a taxi while the eliteperson did not want to go out, who annulled the hotel in a far-off holiday place. Even when a window is smashed the police hardly can find the perpetrators and elitepeople must fear for more stones, wait for new actions while they can do nothing. The direct damage is small, but the immaterial pressure influences the mind of elitepersons because they know they can only alleviate the pressure by changing their behaviour. And activists are strengthened in their activities when they perceive that unknown masspeople are also attacking the same eliteperson. Then creativity grows, fantasy becomes more vivid and uniqueness and autonomy becomes part of the daily life of masspeople.

A multitude of seemingly innocent actions will make the world of the elite uninhabitable. Elitepeople will be forced to leave their secluded world and descend to the massworld.

**They will be confronted with the life of people they ruled before from a high and unassailable position. Then they will understand that other decisions are possible and necessary.**

## Chapter 11. THE PHENOMENON VIOLENCE

People are fascinated by violence. It is the naked expression of power in relations between people and between elite and mass. Violence is seen as the ultimate means that solves all troubles. **Bush** did not even try to talk to **Saddam** but engaged in a violent Second Gulf War. In movies violence attracts probably more viewers than sex. Violent and dangerous games as boxing, wrestling or bungy-jumping are as popular as auto races in which people hope to see crashing cars. Famous poets applaud generals though neglect that many masspeople die in wars. Sometimes even masspeople reach eternity in books that describe their heroic but risky deeds. War, terrorism, homicide, rape, vandalism, street fighting and natural catastrophes as fires, earthquakes, flooding or tornadoes are very prominent in the media. Though some acts of violence as suicides are still dubious subjects, it looks as if violence is the prime focus for all what happens in the world.

Violence is connected to power, wealth and prestige. As long as the eliteworld is built on personal power and wealth violence will be part of society. Utopians and pacifists want a peaceful future but the way to this society is paved with violence. Most violence is connected to the most powerful group in society and it can only be destroyed by contra-violence by weaker groups. Mass violence will equalise power relations and destroy the need for violence. The equilibrium in power (and violence) between the United States and the Soviet Union has avoided a Third World War. This equilibrium is now broken and many violent conflicts take place between strong and weak countries. Vietnam, Afghanistan, Grenada, Lebanon, Libya, Panama, Iran and Iraq are only a few examples in which stronger forces use violence to impose their will on weaker opponents. Weapons of mass destruction minimised the chance on a war between strong nations but are used by strong nations to impose their power on weaker nations. Masspeople always suffer most.

People who are afraid of violence – even of loud voices and harsh expressions that belong to violent behaviour – see the world as a sweet entity in which conflicts can be solved in a reasonable and peaceful way. Huge contrary interests affirm that this is an illusion. In the present society talking and reasoning cannot solve all problems. Seemingly decisive arguments are often meaningless for opponents. A middle course yields new problems and opposing parties slowly sink away in a social swamp in which everybody will drown. But a chaotic situation caused by catastrophic behaviour including violent behaviour, will sometimes result in a new situation in which seemingly insoluble problems can be solved.

Libraries are filled with books about the strategy of conventional wars, guerrilla wars and terrorism. In details is explained how weapons, made in the gigantic weapon industry, can be used. Nearly all analysis is related to violent confrontations between mass organisations that are led by elitist leaders. A guerrilla war is seen as an armed struggle between two hierarchical organisations. Terrorism is treated as a conventional war carried out by other means. Participating humans are only present as leaders, never as creative masspeople who have their own agenda. Nearly all books talk about the practice of violence. You hardly find books describing

the social benefit of violence or the importance of violence in past social developments. Never is determined which violence can be used beneficial and which violence has to be rejected because it works as a boomerang against the users. Nearly nothing can be found about how masspeople can use violence to improve their situation. The use of a special kind of violence to replace the violent elitist society by a more peaceful mass society is totally disregarded.

The application of scientific principles on political and social questions is still in its infancy and science hardly contributes to the role of violence in fundamental changes. Research is also limited by the axiom that fundamental changes can only be achieved on a democratic way. The use of mass violence against the elite is played down, rejected, twisted or suppressed. Hardly any scientist has personal experience in this field. But still, autonomous violence that is not determined by political parties or other hierarchical organisations can contribute to a fundamental change. But independent mass violence is disregarded because it could endanger the position of powerful leaders who want to block any change.

New nuclear, biological, chemical, electronic or other weapons are invented but the development of social and political relations is frozen. Leaders are afraid of an unknown future. The few revolutionaries that are left do not have many followers because they still abide by the method that on the road to a new society masses should be lead by a vanguard that will form the kernel of a future elite. Why should people adhere to these ideas when they will remain inferior in a new society? New ideas can only blossom when it becomes clear that actions are successful and when mass activity on the road towards this new society anticipates a future in which masspeople can be free, individual, autonomous and creative. The road will be full of obstacles, which have to be removed by mass violence against the centres of power. In this process the boundaries of democracy that are determined by the present elite must be crossed.

Some leaders of opposing groups call on the masses to use violence in the hope to reach another society in which they are the leaders. Iran got a new elite under **Khomeiny** and in South Africa the apartheid was replaced by another kind of dependency. When the Palestinian-Israeli conflict will be solved according to Western democratic rules the masses will also not become free. That is also proven in Afghanistan and Iraq where dictatorial regimes were replaced by hardly less greedy elites. During the transformation period independent mass violence is not tolerated. The Western elite was therefore alarmed when the president of the Iranian Parliament called on masspeople to use autonomous violence to avenge dead Palestinians. Elitepersons may never stir up forces that can be used against any eliteperson, never call on the masses to act autonomous against the elite – even a cruel elite. Activity of the masses must remain under elitist control. The Americans therefore did not support a popular uprising in the first Gulf War. When independent masspeople have once overthrown an elite, they know that violence against leading groups can bring about any change.

During an occupation of a country by a foreign power masspeople are still not allowed to use uncontrolled violence. Leaders that fled the country continue to control the situation. The most important acts of resistance are the illegal press and espionage for the war between two opposing armies. In World War II a direct attack

on occupying leaders hardly took place. After World War II many German leaders and Dutch collaborators were again accepted in the top. Former Nazi-generals became NATO-generals, the German Secret Service was integrated in the Secret Services of the winning countries. In The Netherlands **De Quay** even became Prime Minister even though he had founded the Dutch Union (Nederlandse Unie) that wanted to collaborate with the German occupiers.

Most violence is used to preserve or increase advantages of the privileged group. Masspeople may only use violence against other masspeople. American pilots who bombed Vietnamese towns or Chilean demonstrators who fought against tanks of dictator **Pinochet** were still controlled by leaders that safely lived elsewhere. In socially backward societies this top-down violence cannot completely be rejected because it can bring the country a step further. In a violent revolution many masspeople die but a gradual development is often costlier. Hunger has become scarce in Communist China but is still rampant in India. The last society was not shocked by a revolution and millions of people are still dying because they cannot get the food they need to survive. The first condition to reach a more decent society is that masspeople have enough to eat, some education and a living place. When food and housing are secured people can rise above the level of animals that are always looking for food and shelter. Then masspeople can use their creativity and autonomy to develop further. A slave society, even if slaves are better off than free people, must be rejected because slaves have no future. The slightly violent South African struggle against apartheid created the possibility for a freer society, it was a step forward in the social development of masspeople.

A discussion about violence must include the threat of violence and the consequences of violence. World War II occurred a long time ago but still many people are mentally or physically suffering from violence they then had to endure. Atom bombs were only used against Japanese masspeople. But many people suffer still because this violence may again be used even when the last bomb fell sixty years ago. In daily life possible violence is so important that some people do not want to leave their home because they fear to be attacked or robbed. Others do not want to contradict their employers because they are afraid to be sacked. These people are victims of the myth of violence. Their freedom is restricted because they think something terrible can happen even when this idea is hardly supported by real facts when they should go into in the evil outer world.

When masspeople think they are threatened by violence against which they cannot defend, the feeling of powerlessness is strengthened. They are afraid to be robbed because robbers exist. The myth of the threat has an element of truth. Because they are not allowed to use counter-violence they cannot replace the threatening myth by a protecting myth. When someone wants to walk around after dark a course in self-defence can help, when someone in an inferior position wants to express a deviating view he must have a possibility to counter any pressure and violence from above with independent down-top violence. Because everyone is capable to use Small Violence against elitepersons the own potential of violence can be increased. Self-consciousness and the feeling of freedom increase because of the mythical belief that violence helps.

But must I use violence? Am I determined by violence from elsewhere? It is amazing that masspeople deny their inferior position, do accept insults or repressive decisions even when they get ulcers or psychosomatic illnesses. They do not understand that human life is highly influenced by leaders who use violence. The threat of violence is a hidden tumour that can overgrow the whole life. The threat of a possible unemployment and the following useless life can be countered by using some violence. But most people trust that other (higher-placed) people will help them. But life-long frustrations can even force peaceful people to act unexpectedly. In demonstrations such people suddenly can throw stones at the police even when these stones will not bring any solution. They only demonstrate that their situation is unbearable.

People that are hardly violent in peaceful times will become more violent in times of war. Though nearly all violence is top-down masspeople begin to get accustomed to it. In peaceful time direct violence is rare but some people are still inclined to use violence because they experience a relatively high level of social pressure that is in the first place connected with their inferior position and their restricted freedom. In Rome they said already "Quod licet Jovi, non licet bovi", what the God Zeus may do is not permitted to the bulls. It is an expression of the existence of an upper and a lower world. While some are born with a silver spoon in their mouth, most people will never get a silver spoon even when they work much harder than the privileged baby. The different position of different people is preserved by violence.

In times of great tension as wars the elite has less time to control the masses. Citizens get more space to act and think for themselves. Activities will become more violent. The ethical rule that only the elite may use violence is weakened. Democracy is built on one-sided violence, the elite may use it and the masses are even forbidden to think about using violence to improve their future. The elite knows it must use violence when its position is threatened. It will start wars and even uses weapons of mass destruction. At the same time it propagates that mass violence is wrong even when the situation of citizens becomes unbearable. The leaders of India are guilty of the continuing existence of hunger but lower classes are still forbidden to use violence to break this hopeless position.

When the total amount of violence decreases the personal freedom of individuals grows. But because most violence originates in the eliteworld masspeople do not have any influence on the amount of violence. It seems that The Netherlands have become more peaceful in the course of time. Cudgels, bows and arrows have indeed become obsolete but missiles, atom bombs and psychological violence causes more damage than the violence in the far past. The last World War proves that violence has not disappeared. The Dutch elite still uses violence to preserve its privileged position. Dutch weapons industry is still important and in many countries Dutch soldiers are supporting regimes that suppress the own masses. But though the amount of violence in The Netherlands seems to be less than in countries as Congo, Iraq, Colombia or the Soviet Union citizens of these countries may not experience this. There is not an objective tool to determine the amount of violence. The balance between the experienced violence and the own violence is also important. The more masspeople use violence the less violence from elsewhere will influence them. People are anyhow freer because they know they can always counter violence from above by their own violence.

A sudden increase in the amount of violence influences the life of all citizens. The only way to counter this increase in violence is to increase the own amount of violence so that the proportion between own and outside violence roughly remains the same. Then the fear for outside violence will not increase and the influence of unexpected events caused by others will remain small. The dominating idea that violence is wrong must therefore be rejected. The only way to reach the situation in which nobody has the right to be more violent than others (exert more power than others) is by increasing the own violence. When an equilibrium is reached in the amount of experienced and practised violence the differences in privileges will also be levelled. Because violence is the ultimate instrument in exerting power to safeguard privileged positions.

In turbulent times the amount of violence will rise but also the number of new, interesting and unimaginable ideas. Many of these ideas will later be reformulated and adapted to improve the new social situation. History did not develop gradually, it has never been possible to predict the present from the past. Development goes with jumps. Catastrophic events sometimes bring humans on a higher level though it is also possible that the situation deteriorates.

**New societies did never arise from old ones in an orderly and peaceful way. In the turbulent times of social transformations violence has always been an important, prominent and decisive factor.**

## Chapter 12. VIOLENCE IN HISTORY

Violence seems the only means to shock a petrified world. In the long term violence has its benefits. The rise and fall of the Roman Empire, the spread of Christianity and Islam, the wandering of people over the world, the Crusades, the discovery of America, the colonisation of the Third World and the following freedom wars, the Industrial Revolution and many rapid technological developments have been accompanied by violence and a lot of suffering for masspeople. The United States should not exist in the present form without violence. Former colonies should still be subjected to the rule of foreign masters. Without the armies of **Napoleon** that devastated Europe European unity should still be in its infancy and the metric and the unified judicial system should not exist. Violent wars broke the power of local conservative rulers that blocked progress. Eruptions of creative violence have withered away in Europe and society petrifies because old and outlived situations continue to dominate and violence is monopolised by a small elitist group that does not want to lose their privileged position.

In the course of time violence has become the exclusive right of the elite. The elite is responsible for many violent situations that threaten the lives of millions of people by the continuing existence of hunger, lack of education and decent housing. People down under are not allowed to use forceful means to escape from this situation. Violence comes in waves. During long periods the masses accept a fairly peaceful situation but suddenly they burst out. Then they remember that the elite only listens when violence is used, then they break elitist laws and use violence on unexpected times and places in sudden and spontaneous actions. It shows a fundamental difference between elitist and mass violence. Elitepeople order third persons to use violence, masspeople become active in person.

The revolt of the slaves under **Spartacus** in the Roman time or the outburst that destroyed many images in Catholics churches in the Lower Countries in 1566 were spontaneous mass uprisings. All countries have known such revolts of the masses. But most mass violence damages the own massworld and hardly intrudes in the eliteworld. In the beginning of the eighties some demonstrations in Berlin entered rich quarters and in 1989 some expensive villas were intentionally burned down in a rich Athenian suburb. Such actions against the heart of elitist power are rare. The two captured planes that killed on September 11 2001 thousands of people in the financial centre of the United States also touched the centre of power. Though this was a planned top-down action and not a spontaneous mass action the consequences were enormous. This violent act changed the policy of elitist leaders.

Violence can even be successful in the short term. Because squatters used some violence the number of cheap houses grew. Because Palestinians captured some planes the Palestinian question entered the realm of the United Nations. Because some Americans were made hostage in the American Embassy in Teheran the Iranian government got the weapons they wanted. The influence in the long term is however more profound. In the past many masspeople were slaves or serfs who that

could arbitrarily be used by elite persons. Through the ages the masses showed their discontent in an often violent behaviour. Not because of a guilty conscience but because violence became too costly the elite decided to abolish slavery in 1863. But the elite still refuses to listen to lower-placed people that politely advance arguments. Mass people as waiters, taxi drivers, security officers or house servants hardly exist for the elite that employs them.

In the beginning of the last century the industrial Philips concern acquired a near monopoly in the production of electric bulbs by using violence against its competitors. The oil industry has always been violent and the Gulf and Afghanistan Wars are a continuation of the violent behaviour of oil tycoons who want to extend their influence. It is nearly certain that Shell caused an internal war in Nigeria. The Mafia that had close contacts with the American establishment was very violent during the prohibition period and the drug world is still not peaceful. Many billions of euros enter each year the legal banking system and these illegal (and often violent) activities contribute to the growth of capitalism. In our time most violence is canalised by the government because the ultimate target is the well-being of the elite. But continuing elitist violence accumulates in the minds of mass people. In rich Western countries it becomes more and more difficult for the elite to give the masses an outlet. The Gulf Wars must certainly also be seen in this light. By using violence in other countries the own masses 'forget' that they are violently suppressed. But it is clearly not sufficient and the number of prisoners in the West is still rising. The law and order society in which all is regulated by the top increases the distance between elite- and mass world. The growing restriction of the freedom of mass people is implemented by a growing use of direct and indirect violence. The chance on spontaneous mass uprisings is also growing.

In the course of time the total quantity of violence has grown. In Europe violence by private weapons has greatly been contained but it is still fairly easy to get firearms. The American society knows more killings by firearms than a quiet country as The Netherlands. By prohibiting some weapons the cause of violent behaviour is not taken away. The USA that has ten times as many prisoners (corrected for the total population) as The Netherlands must be more violent. The number of prisoners in the former Soviet Union is comparable with the present number in the United States. The events that led to the Fall of the Wall showed that masses needed an outlet to counter this accumulated violence. It can be expected that the racial uprisings in the USA of the last century will meet their counterpart in the present century though the American elite tries to canalise these feelings by conducting wars in third countries. And the rise of black people as Obama to high positions will also postpone new violent racial conflicts.

Spontaneous mass violence is not only political. It can occur in sports, on the workplace or in the recreation and amusement sphere. The lowest parts of the masses that are most bullied react strongest. Hooliganism, racial strife or student demonstrations are all caused by the growing quantity of violence from above. Violent situations in foreign countries contribute also to this feeling especially because the TV brings hunger, war and poverty in the homes of the masses. But fundamental changes occur only when the situation becomes untenable and incorrigible. So the situation in France in 1968 was not the herald of a new society. It was an incident in a reasonable peaceful society. The elite that just ended its colonial

wars in Algeria and Vietnam and the masses were less violent. In this fairly calm sphere the progressive part of the elite promised the masses a better future. The power of leftist political parties and trade unions grew. But in the following decades politicians left lost their grip on the masses because promises could not be realised.

The Netherlands was very violent during the Second World War when the Germans occupied the country. The colonial war in Indonesia in the years after this war could take place without much opposition because the masses were used to a high quantity of violence. In the fifties internal violence diminished. Violent youth gangs that existed everywhere in Holland disappeared in the beginning of the sixties and the number of prisoners declined. Strikes became rare and a violent incident during disturbances in 1965 was the last outburst at the beginning of a relatively peaceful time. The Provo Movement was peaceful and this situation continued in the seventies. Though fighting and violence was still epidemic in the world – the Vietnam War only ended in 1975 – Northwest Europe quieted down. The rise in violence because of the Balkan, Afghan and Gulf Wars and the accompanying rise of terrorist actions that penetrate into the heartland of the rich countries seem to change the situation. This change is also promoted by possible outbursts of non-integrated people from Third World countries who experience much more violence than the original population. The fights in poor French neighbourhoods with many immigrants can be an indication that society is changing.

In countries as Colombia, Sudan or Afghanistan killing of individuals is to a certain height accepted but that is hardly the case in the relatively peaceful Western countries. The German leftist terrorist organisation RAF had in the seventies less following than the Red Brigades in the more violent Italy. The Dutch Red Youth, which propagated violent actions, was dissolved in 1973 because prominent members concluded that violent bombings did not fit in the political climate. But violent political actions still occurred in quiet Holland. At the end of the seventies violent acts included the burning down of Shell petrol stations. The burning down of the Makro caused a damage never seen before in The Netherlands. Most of these activities were connected with the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa. In the next decade violent mass actions took place in connection with the Squatters and Women Movements. But while political violence was still on a low level non-political violence increased. Violent spontaneous mass actions took place in football stadiums, disco's and holiday resorts. The number of prisoners increased. Europe started to resemble the United States where rising violence forces the richer echelons of the population to withdraw in isolated and guarded communities. It shows that elite and mass live indeed in different worlds.

The elite does not want to solve the underlying causes of the rise in violence but increases the number of security guards and the height of prison sentences. Harsher laws combat social, drug and alcohol problems. The so-called War on Drugs only attacks the lower part of the drug world and leaves the leaders and the flow of billions of dollars to the official economy untouched. The even more damaging alcohol is freely propagated. The inconsistency in laws and regulations is another reason for the rise of violence. Big thieves that embezzle millions by paper work are hardly sentenced while petty criminals face still high sentences. While in boxing and rugby violence is strictly regulated, soccer players are allowed to kick and harass other players without much punishment. Trainers and club owners promote this behaviour.

It is quite logic that supporters become more violent. The repressive apparatus of the elite becomes also more visible. In the seventies England had only one cop on a thousand spectators, now this has risen to one on seventy-five. Police officers who look like robots, biting dogs, video camera's, water cannons and general body searches increase the feeling that society is becoming more violent. By using harsh policing methods the English elite stopped most violence in stadiums but outside violence is still rising. And the USA is even more violent than European countries.

The higher the total quantity of violence the more the masses accept violence in the own surroundings, including political violence. The Balkan War was very violent and in the aftermath professional killers in the underworld were often coming from this area. The growing suppression apparatus is endorsed by right and left political parties that condemn violent actions that are not controlled by the elite. But violent outbursts that are caused by the general political situation cannot be prevented. While the quantity of violence in the massworld is rising, the eliteworld is still fairly peaceful. A threatening telephone call to an eliteperson in the middle of the night is shocking for Western leaders but such soft actions hardly influence the minds of Third World leaders. In rich countries Small Violence has to be emphasised in which elitepeople are not physically but psychological attacked. It is even better to speak about Creative Disturbance. In countries as Lebanon or Cambodia leaders do not even get a nightmare from Creative Disturbance. There other actions methods have to be deployed.

Attackers can only attack when they are free and can hide between masspeople where they can swim like fishes in a vast sea as **Mao Tse Tung** once said of his guerrilla's. The German RAF and the Italian Red Brigades lost sympathy because they used Big Violence. Their members could only hide by going underground. The distance between violence of hierarchical guerrilla groups and the existent social violence was too big. In some countries masspeople do not care anymore what happens to them. Suicide actions are only partly inspired by religious beliefs. The daily violence is very intense and the situation resembles a war. American soldiers who stormed French beaches on D-Day had a small chance to survive. But many volunteered because their violence fitted in the violent situation that existed in the Second World War. Those people are heroes in Western literature just as Moslem suicide bombers are heroes in Arab literature. In both cases the conscience of the perpetrators is so influenced by the social situation that their personal safety becomes secondary to perpetrating an action. Many people are shocked by the long prison sentences that drug smugglers get in Third World countries. The social situation is however so desperate that despite the threat to their personal safety many take the risk. They even transport drugs by swallowing them in small plastic bags. Many are arrested and some even die because the bags burst. But new recruits are ready to take the place of the arrested and deceased ones.

It is difficult to determine when a situation is ripe for violent actions or when mass outbursts will take place. The present growth of violence in Europe can be a precursor of a period in which change will occur. It is not coincidental that revolutions often take place after periods with wars when the masses are used to huge quantities of violence. The French and Russian Revolution but also **Hitler**-Germany and **Mussolini**-Italy are examples. The Chinese Revolution started shortly after World War I and grew during the Japanese invasion. It succeeded shortly after the end of

World War II. The Chinese spoke about the long People's War what points to the necessity that people will get used to violence and that the myth of creative mass violence becomes a real threat for leaders. The masses become unmanageable and the elite cannot anymore maintain its high standard of living. The Vietnamese elite was not defeated by the military power of the masses but because it was not anymore capable to get the biggest share from the pot of prosperity. The masses became convinced that the old society was dying though it lasted tens of years before this process was completed. Power comes out of the barrel of a gun but that does not mean that everyone has to shoot at any time on all places.

**The masses can only change the balance of power when they can level the experienced quantity of violence by a comparable quantity of mass violence.**

## Chapter 13. THE FIRST AND THE THIRD WORLD

A prolonged guerrilla war is not possible in rich countries. Methods developed in the Third World are hardly effective in First World countries. The reverse is also true. The methods I advance are hardly appropriate for Third World countries. **Lenin, Mao Tse Tung** and many others introduced new ideas but one may wonder if they can be of any use in the West. The Western elite has a profound influence on the political situation in the rest of the world but the other way around influence is minimal. Actions against Third World elites cannot be successful when powerful Western elites are not put under pressure. The Western power is obvious in the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund that preserve the vast differences in prosperity. The falling prices of raw materials, the rising prices of processed products, the obligatory payment for Western patents and property rights are only some instruments that maintain the difference that in the end is confirmed by violent military intrusions in the Third World.

Actions against Third World elites hardly influence the situation in our countries. Till September 11 2001 attacks from the Third World on the most powerful elite were virtually non-existent. There has been a lot of fighting in the Third World but the top elite stays out of range. Poverty and illnesses kill more masspeople than internal wars. In Venezuela hundreds of people were killed in 1989 in demonstrations against IMF decisions. This was repeated in 2002 and 2003. Western directors who are responsible for the lack of progress were not attacked. The basic conditions for a decent life are lacking in the Third World. Hunger, poverty, illiteracy and lack of housing are widespread. This determines action targets. In the Third World people are trying to reach a comparable level of prosperity as in the West. Western masspeople have other targets because prime living conditions are fulfilled. Different targets demand different kinds of action.

In the last decade the living conditions in the Western World begin to deteriorate. The influx of Third World people who work for low salaries starts to change the situation. The income of the lowest paid twenty percent of the American population decreased in the last twenty years but they still earn much more than the poorest half of Third World people that constantly live on the edge of survival and lack any sight on a prosperous future. Many of them try to reach the West where they are treated as pariahs. But still they can go somewhere. The masses of the First World have no place to go. They often take refuge in the illusionary world of drugs or in illusions created by the amusement industry.

Most masspeople stay however in the Third World and some try to change society. Guerrilla wars are still fought in countries as India, Philippines or Columbia. The economic situation in the Third World is so bad that slightly changed communist ideas still have a mass following but for First World people it is not an attractive alternative. Western masspeople prefer democracy even if they have hardly any influence. In Communist China **Mao Tse Tung** initiated the Big Leap Forward that helped masspeople to advance in an economic as well a psychological manner. The

masses were inspired to produce more and they got more autonomy. Hunger and illiteracy were diminished and health care improved. Much is still to be done and the inspiring Big Leap Forward was stopped because most Chinese leaders felt threatened by the enthusiasm of masspeople. China develops faster than other big countries but the contours of an elitist democracy become clear. The Chinese Revolution has only been an event to catch up with Western prosperity.

The Chinese Cultural Revolution activated the masses and was an effort to control party leaders who were forming a new privileged elite. In the Soviet Union the enthusiasm of the masses died even faster after the Revolution and the new elite, the Nomenklatura, continued to rule the country after the collapse of the Soviet Union. The Cultural Revolution was condemned in the West because of short-term economic damage. In the long term however the economy grew also because masspeople had become inspired during these unruly and chaotic times. Young Chinese could afford to lose some years of education because they got the possibility to combat their dependency by being active in a social process without being forced to do so by money or punishments. Chinese leaders had understood that Soviet leaders could not anymore activate their masses. Petrification dragged Soviet society down. This second Chinese experiment was stopped because the new elite was not enough attacked and the powerful Red Army remained even outside the learning process. China retook a course that does not differ very much from the Soviet Union. The present growing mass opposition against the new Chinese elite shows that something has gone wrong. But economic development is in China still much better than in countries as India where more than half of the masses lack enough food, housing, health care and education.

The Red Khmer in Cambodia acknowledged the danger of a new elite after the Revolution. They were also afraid that people who lived in the relatively quiet cities were not influenced by revolutionary ideas. They found a drastic solution by forcing these people to participate in the reconstruction of the country in such harsh circumstances that many died. On the one hand they were aware that many people did not participate in the emancipating struggle, on the other hand they used a top-down method (they ordered people to do this and that) that was contrary to a movement that should activate the masses. The leaders of the Red Khmer denied also the influence of social structures on human activity and wanted to destroy the old elite physically. Cambodian leader **Pol Pot** saw rightly that the organisation of a new social structure after a Revolution was a problem and looked for radical solutions. He did not understand that people couldn't be forced to take part in mass struggles. The top-down orders from **Pol Pot** and his party leaders did not rally the people behind the revolution. Another elite came in power and the position of the masses hardly improved. By the way, the ethical objections against **Pol Pot** stand in violent contradiction to the friendly words about leaders as **Kennedy**, **Johnson** or **Nixon** who ordered to bombard the population of Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. **Pol Pot** and his party killed indeed many people but American leaders caused much more misery to the Indo-Chinese masses.

The guerrillas of Sendero Luminoso in Peru had also some original ideas. They drew a distinct line between the masses and the sitting power. In countries as Colombia or El Salvador guerrilla leaders time and again negotiated with old leaders who had killed thousands of masspeople. They often agreed to lay down their weapons and

some guerrilla leaders entered the elitist world. Such dialogues gave only an illusion of progress. In China negotiations were used as a tactical weapon because the communists did not give up their power position. An agreement with **Tsjang Kai Tsjek** to fight together against the Japanese invaders was only temporary. The Peruvians started a town guerrilla while Chinese communists just propagated to fight in the countryside in order to surround and suffocate the cities where the power of the opponents was greatest. The new ideas of the Peruvian guerrillas failed in the first place because the revolutionary organisation was strictly hierarchical. Sendero Luminoso ceased to exist when most top leaders were arrested. The autonomy of the masses remained in Peru an illusion.

In all revolutionary movements in the Third World masspeople are used as cannon fodder without independent power. After the revolution a new elite replaces the old elite. This is not so strange because the masses lack a general level of education. In the First World this factor has less influence but the struggle for a fundamental change has hardly started. Most actions are still led by people who do not want that masspeople get autonomous power but strive for a place in the leading elite, they want to move from the massworld to the eliteworld.

Revolutions in the Third World can improve the situation of the masses but they can never achieve fundamental changes in the Western world. The most powerful elite that resides in the West is never challenged. The undermining of the top-elite must be done by the masses in the First World. Revolutionary activities as the Russian and Chinese Revolution that improve the situation of the masses are a step forward. But in the rich West the development of masspeople is already on a higher level. For an attack on the most powerful elite the autonomy, creativity and individuality of Western masspeople must be developed by increasing the personal power of the masses in such a way that it can neutralise the power position of the elite.

**Third World struggles hardly contribute anything to this process.**

## Chapter 14. CREATIVE VIOLENCE

Only pacifists condemn all violence. From time to time most people agree with the use of violence. Christians had their Crusades and Moslems their Holy War. Resistance Movements talk about a justified war and many approve state violence to protect the social system. To capture former CIA-agent and drug tycoon **Noriega** the leaders of the USA ordered to bombard some living quarters in Panama City at the cost of thousands of deaths. Nevertheless most Americans approved of this excessive violence. The war between Argentina and England around some clumps of stones called the Malvinas or the Falkland Islands killed many people. But in Argentine as well as in England many applauded this useless violence. Homicides, vandalism, hooliganism and wars continue to exist even when society on all levels resists these phenomena. Violence belonged and still belongs to our society and plays an important role in social relations and developments.

Many negative books are written about violence but hardly anything about creative violence that can have unexpected and unpredicted consequences. The publication of "The Satanic Verses" of **Salman Rushdie** was threatened by violence from the side of fundamentalist Moslems. In several countries the publication was delayed and printed copies were removed from some bookshops. But this violence suddenly unleashed a discussion about the freedom of expression. Even in the so-called free and democratic world publications can be prohibited even when they are as innocent as the Squatters paper "Bluf" (Big Talk). The scientific press is forced not to publish anything that could be used by terrorists. This restriction on the freedom of expression puts a brake on the scientific exchange of data. So many data are kept secret that it is clear that there is no absolute freedom of expression. The elite wants to maintain control and fears that real freedom of expression endangers its position. That the big American press is owned by a small group of very rich people is also not positive for a free press. Several journalists were sacked after the attacks of September 11 2001. They doubted the American leadership and foresaw that this attack could be used as an excuse to strengthen the grip on the own masses and the rest of the world. The plans for the second Gulf War that did already exist before 9-11 could now be realised.

Even leftist democratic political forces admit that violence is a motor for social development but they applaud it only when it is used in Third World countries. In the violent anti-colonial struggle the colonised man fought for liberation from colonial oppression. The violent struggle showed explicitly the inferior role of Third World men in colonised societies. It was even said that when a colonised man killed a colonist the result was not only a dead man but also a freed man. The self-consciousness of people in Kenya, Algeria or China where independence was accompanied by violence is much bigger than that of people in former French colonies where independence was not reached by an armed struggle.

The American "Black is Beautiful" Movement emphasised also the liberating role of violence. One of the forerunners of this movement was **Frantz Fanon** from

Martinique who fought in the Algerian War. He wrote in the fifties about the emancipatory power of violence in the anti-colonial struggle: *"Violence alone, violence committed by the people, violence organised and educated by the leaders, makes it possible for the masses to understand social truths and gives the key to them. Without that struggle, without that knowledge of the practice of action, there's nothing but a fancy-dress parade and the blare of trumpets. There's nothing save a minimum of readaptation, a few reforms at the top, a flag waiving: and down there at the bottom an undivided mass, still living in the middle ages, endlessly marking time."* (The Wretched of the Earth, 1965 page 117). Fanon emphasised that leaders were necessary and neglected violence masspeople could use autonomously. In his view masses must be governed, led and educated by leaders. The used violence gives the masses indeed some self-esteem but also another leadership, another form of control over masspeople. In Africa leaders have become black but the power relations between rulers and ruled, between elite and mass have not changed.

Autonomous violence gives masspeople trust in the own power by which they can break subservience, subordination and inferiority. Only by using violence masspeople can enter a world in which they are equal partners. The elite will never relinquish its power position when it is not forced to do so. By practising violence Chinese masses became convinced of the positive sides of violence. During the guerrilla war that lasted more than twenty years Chinese society changed fundamentally and entered a new phase in human development. Bound feet of women and obligatory tails of men were abolished but this was only a token of a deeper change. Violence continued to be present after the Revolution and played an important role in the often violent Big Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution that activated young Chinese masspeople. This violence gave the masses power to act against the petrified leadership. But even more important than the direct result of violence is the myth that masspeople can neutralise their powerless position by using effective violence against leaders that too much pursue their own interest.

The creative side of violence finds its expression in benefits for active masspeople. Though these successes are often small they change the self-confidence of attacking masspeople as well as attacked elitepeople. Masspeople acknowledge that something has changed by their own doing, elitepeople will change their way of decision taking because they want to avoid any violence that is directed against them. Violence forces elitepeople to think more about the interest of all people. It becomes clear that only violent activities can influence the life and the ideas of the somewhat isolated elite minority. The intruding violence from outside adds a new element to the existing order.

Elitist violence does not initiate any enthusiasm because someone at the top has ordered it. Mass violence is individualistic. When demonstrators violently break through a police cordon the enthusiasm of the demonstrators shows that violence is an activating and inspiring force. And nobody gave the order to throw stones. The conscience of the throwing individual is growing though he can throw a stone because he is to a certain height protected by the surrounding masses. But still he must decide when to throw the stone. Afterwards he will admit that his consciousness is changed. His individual deed has changed the way he looks at the world. After this first individual act the massperson can discard the protective shield of the masses

around him and can throw another stone when protection is not present. In this way the action method develops from mass action to individual action. By the way it must be clear that the stone is meant as a metaphor for any individual violent act from a massperson against an individual eliteperson.

Violence creates humans that are no longer powerless against social forces that are controlled by high-placed persons. Violence creates concrete as well as possible power. In a society where power relations are more equal self-consciousness of masspeople is increased because they know they can always refuse to follow an order because they cannot be punished. Even when only a few masspeople practice violence the myth of mass violence will become an impressive force because the elite will never know who will use violence. It will become more and more the victorious driving force for improvements in the existing society as well as in the struggle for a fundamentally new kind of social ordering. Without some violence from the Dutch Squatters Movement the Amsterdam town council never should have changed its policy and cheaper houses for young people should have remained rare. Because of this fairly insignificant violence young people got many new living quarters in which they could experience some freedom.

**Mass violence will loosen the bonds by which masspeople are tied down. It will be the start of the coming into being of freer people.**

## Chapter 15. REVOLUTIONARY VIOLENCE

Revolution and evolution are both necessary to bring society on a higher level. A longer period of gradual change is suddenly broken by profound shocks. Democracy is an evolutionary doctrine. Because it excludes fast changes it will achieve in the long term the opposite of a better society because society will petrify when it is not sometimes shocked by a revolution.

**Darwin** introduced evolution as the dominating mechanism for development of human life. Unicellular living beings slowly increased in size, became more complicated and in the end became mammals and even humans. Violent natural catastrophes of the past were disregarded. The newest mathematical theories point however to the importance of catastrophes and chaos in complicated systems. By taking small steps the next stadium can never be reached. Of course gradual development exists but small steps do not explain the coming into being of new kinds of animals.

In Nature species evolve gradually but families and classes develop by revolutionary steps. Even within species development appears not as smoothly as suggested by the theory of evolution. The development of horses seems evolutionary. The eohippus, the original horse, was only 27 centimetres high and had four toes, the present horse is 150 centimetres high and has only one toe. Other ancient horses had three toes. But horses with two toes never existed. Was there a sudden development from four to three and then to one toe? Did eohippus suddenly change to mesohippus, a horse that was twice as big and better adapted to the circumstances of that time? Evolution has indeed taken place in less importance changes but the important event that caused that sea animals became land animals was triggered by a revolutionary shock as was the coming into being of talking human beings.

Evolution is the gradual development between two catastrophes. **Darwin** advanced the theory of the "survival of the fittest" in which only those animals survived that could reproduce best under the new circumstances. But big natural catastrophes leave hardly room for survival by adaptation. In the past the world changed suddenly by an increased radiation from the sun, a celestial object that passed the earth on a short distance, an intensive rain of meteorites or a series of volcanic eruption that clouded sunlight. During these disasters new genes could be introduced and dormant genes activated. Then groups of existing animals developed new characteristics. Only these changed animals had the possibility to survive. Not sexual mechanisms but genetic renovation were the cause of change. The survival of the fittest only explains small changes in not-revolutionary periods. The human mind is however so poisoned by evolutionary ideas that the importance of catastrophic jumps for the development of society is suppressed. Revolutions caused by humans are seen as a nuisance, not as a source for fundamental change.

Humans exist by accident and are not the predestined final object of an evolution of billions of years. More complicated living beings will in due time replace humans. Societies are also not eternal, other kinds of society will replace the imperfect democracy. Humans can actively intervene in social processes. People should not only be active in improving democracy – an evolutionary process – but also in creating chaotic jumps that lead to a new kind of social ordering. Evolutionary processes cannot eradicate human problems as hunger, lack of education and lack of housing. In the foreseeable future it cannot give every world citizen a decent life. Revolutions that are characteristic for the development of complicated situations may not be neglected.

Humans are the first living beings that can consciously influence the future. Most big changes in human history have been caused by Nature. Earthquakes or erupting volcanoes changed the climate and caused hunger and misery. Only in the last few hundred years humans started to change the future though revolutionary ideas have now become fairly obsolete. Leftist democrats have buried their revolutionary past and only want to change society by making still more rules and laws that confine humans to an ever smaller living space. Travels to unknown territories are forbidden. The state cares for the masses, guarantees safety and absorbs all spontaneous, individual or creative human activity. Society will petrify even when new discoveries in mathematics show that fixed laws never can determine complex situations and change only can occur by leaps and bounds.

Evolutionary scientists cannot solve many problems because they only look for solutions within the boundaries of the existing system. Democrats are not capable to solve problems as the lack of food, water, education or housing. Therefore other thinkers are needed. Without the revolutionary ideas of scientists as **Galilee**, **Newton** or **Einstein** the world should now be different. But it lasted a long time before their thoughts were accepted. Newton's ideas were only after about fifty years embraced, **Darwin** once said that his ideas only should be accepted when all opposing contemporaries had died.

Evolutionary and revolutionary science live in different worlds and discussion between the two is hardly possible. The new theory will only defeat the old one when it solves problems better than the old one. But the wish for change will inspire many people to behave differently. Revolutionaries advance new ideas and new systems that cannot be discussed, elaborated and even understood within the old situation. They try to cause a catastrophe to reach new pastures. But just as the chaos and catastrophe theories diametrically oppose the old theory of Newton that predicted the future from the present situation, revolutionary social theories are needed to oppose the petrifying evolutionary democracy.

It is not easy to determine when and why revolutionary jumps occur. New theories are not opportune when many problems can still be solved on the old way. But interest in new theories will grow when problems seem to become permanent. Discontent grows when existing theories are not capable to give satisfactory solutions. Just as in science political evolutionary people treat revolutionary people as pariahs. New nice-looking theories are not enough to break the powerful position of evolutionary leaders. Force is needed to break the stalemate and force includes the use of violence. Revolutionaries must not occupy themselves with discussions

about the improvement of democracy that is principally unsatisfactory. It hinders discussions about new ideas. They must bundle their energy to bring a fundamental change nearer. But a lasting unsatisfactory situation will anyhow arouse the masses and revolutionary jumps may suddenly occur.

The contradiction between evolution and revolution exist in science as well as in more complicated social relations. Evolutionary politicians still see possibilities to improve society by making new rules within the boundaries of the democratic system and will not look for other roads. Elections show the hidden discontent of the masses when half of the Americans does not even vote at presidential elections or when populist **Fortuyn** shocked the Dutch political world by getting nearly twenty percent in the general elections. The differences between left and right will become subordinate to the growing discontent. But masspeople do not yet understand that they must direct their energy at the destruction of the dominating power position of the elite that wants to preserve the present social ordering. All involvement in discussions and activities based on democratic ideas hinders the masses to find new roads to new societies.

Violence is an important catalyst in revolutions. Even in scientific revolutions some violence takes place in struggles between contesting theories. The introduction of the genetic theories of **Lysenko** in the Soviet Union killed quite a few scientists. Also in Western countries revolutionary opponents are sometimes forcibly removed from scientific institutions. This is not amazing because a scientific jump undermines the position of powerful persons. Activities that contribute to a disturbance of the existing situation are revolutionary when the possible catastrophic event is more or less consciously caused by human beings.

It is not always possible to cause a revolution. After World War II countries had to be rebuilt and people did not think of fundamental changes. Ten years later it became clear that nothing really had changed and new problems replaced old ones. Discomfort was slowly growing. The avalanche of rules that democrats needed to maintain their grip on society only created more problems. Television revealed that the elite could find the holes in the laws. The masses also started to look for holes and lawmakers were forced to make new laws. Society degenerated in a juridical chaos with rules, holes in rules, subrules, subholes, subsubrules, subsubholes etc. A growing number of people tried to swim through the holes. Democrats obviously could not organise society on a decent manner. Masspeople prefer to judge, decide, choose and act on their own way. It became obvious that humans can adapt very easily to any change in society. Rules and laws have to be replaced by the idea that we live all together on equal footing. Democracy refutes this simple human idea.

The political crisis becomes visible. Many problems can hardly be solved and the amount of violence is rising. Hunger, poverty, suicides and local wars cost millions of lives. The Balkan, Afghanistan and Gulf Wars prove that the elite openly uses violence to maintain their supremacy. The increasing quantity of senseless violence in prosperous Western states is another sign that something is fundamentally wrong. Till the end of the sixties the masses were still inspired to improve their world but then inspiration began to decline. Masspeople dreamed away in soaps, games, drugs and sex. Society degenerated and more and more people even do not want to be involved in elections. The elite tries to turn the tide but despite a huge propaganda

machine they cannot anymore inspire masspeople to support the development and even the maintenance of society.

Even the lowest parts of the masses become active. They ask for more say in social matters but the leading class excludes them. The masses are not anymore obeying their former leaders. Trade unions change from fighting in juridical organisations. Leftist parties can hardly be distinguished from their rightist counterparts. This cannot go on. The peaceful way that improved life of the Western masses in the first decades after World War II yields fewer results. The hope on a better world evaporates. The incomprehensible decision-process about cruise missiles and nuclear energy, the cuts in social expenditure, the lies and half lies of chosen representatives, the corruption and incompetence of leaders, all is shown on television. Obscure activities on the stock exchange or financial scandals in which leaders of seemingly decent multinationals enrich themselves are drops that fill the bucket to the brim. Maybe the present financial crisis is the drop that does overflow the bucket and is Obama the last leader who can delay the outburst of mass creativity. The violence in the Afghan and Iraq War, the coming water wars and the Israeli-Palestine conflict have also their influence. Because violence is the ultimate means by which masspeople can break the development that is threatening to destroy all what has been built up in the past.

Humans can easily adapt to new situations. Rulers cannot regulate the unknown and make only rules by using what is already known to preserve their power position. Rulers live in the past and the present, masspeople live (also) in the future. Laws and rules are always incomplete because the future is not known. New ways have to be found to solve this fundamental flaw. Just as evolutionary scientists do not understand coming changes, democratic politicians cannot determine social jumps from past events. Jumps are dangerous for evolutionary politicians because they undermine the belief in their evolutionary theory that is the base of their existence. And the future will be very different. Why should a physician always earn more than other skilled workmen? Why must ridiculous products be advertised – are humans not capable to judge themselves? Why is inequality of sexes still rampant? Why is food, education, housing and transport not guaranteed for everybody? Present leaders cannot solve these questions. They put their own privileged position first and do not even think about fundamental changes. They cannot solve many problems because then they collide with the restricted boundaries of the democratic system.

Evolutionary-democratic activities lead to a paradox. Rulers seemingly create more order by introducing more laws but on the other hand they increase the possibility for chaos. The rising number of rules alienates masspeople from society. Juridical schooled people still see some order in the juridical chaos but masspeople see only chaos. Their judgement does not agree with their sense of justice. The acquittal of top leaders that have embezzled millions is incomprehensible for masspeople who have even to pay when they park their car in the wrong place. The enrichment of the top while at the same time the wages of workers are frozen or lowered contributes also to feelings of discomfort. This situation cannot continue for ages. The changing consciousness of masspeople can explode on unexpected times and places. Masspeople still seem to support democracy but suddenly they can participate in the destruction of the democratic system. The collapse of the Soviet system can also happen in the democratic West.

Social jumps do not fall from the skies. Some people are always dissatisfied with the existing structure and look for other possibilities. After a turbulent time as a world war only a few people will be involved in such activities but in quieter times more people will join. Slowly the economic and political discontent grows. In the beginning demands remain within the limits of the existing system and fundamental questions are not brought forward. Physicians continue to earn more than other skilled workmen. But when people perceive that power relations remain unchanged and that reasonable demands do not get adequate response they begin to understand that improvement within the system is not possible. A growing number of people will look to other ideas and other action methods. Provo's in the sixties attacked the closed circle mentality of rulers. That was a beginning. Squatters made a next step when they attacked the idea that third people could possess empty houses while citizens wanted an own living place. Their violence broke the monopoly of the democratic state on violence and actions went beyond the limits set by democracy.

Mass activities are often chaotic because the perpetrators are free and creative people. In Amsterdam some shops were looted during riots. Nearly only elitist shops as jewellers, banks, travel agencies or the exclusive Society Shop were plundered. Activists obeyed the silent rule that only the elite must be attacked. Sometimes temporarily organisations were founded to attack targets that were too big for individual activists. These organisations were built on mutual trust and in clear contradiction to democratic organisations where leaders decide what members have to do. These chaotic clubs dissolved after some time and former members joined other clubs or temporarily suspended their political activities. It was an example of how alternating mass minorities can confront deciding elitist minorities.

In this way chaotic minorities of masspeople can get influence in the ordered world of leaders. Temporary groups are characteristic for a new society because they are not dominated by professional leaders with a higher standard of living. Masspeople do not consciously create a social jump. Jumps will only occur when many people are active in many social sectors. It can not be predicted why, when, where and how such jumps occur but growing autonomous activity of masspeople can be a sign that something will happen. That could have been perceived in the years before the Russian or the French Revolution and also just before the Fall of the Wall. The uncoordinated activity of many masspeople caused a sudden outburst that even a day before the outbreak never could have been predicted.

Nobody can predict the consequence of new theories just as nobody could understand the effect of the theory of **Einstein**. After a change evolutionary thinkers will elaborate the revolutionary theory. But just as in science the benefits of a new theory can never irrefutably been proven before. There will be a long struggle between old and new tendencies till it is clear that the new theory is better. Masspeople will become faster convinced of the righteousness of a new theory when they have been involved in the introduction as well as the elaboration of the theory and when they have seen some encouraging results. When they know that revolution also occurred because of their own independent activity. In the fairly short Russian Revolution only a relatively small vanguard was active and the revolutionary enthusiasm of masspeople withered in a few years away. Mass violence was contained by a vanguard. Most violence occurred in clashes between leftist and rightist armies. In a pre-revolutionary situation all sectors of society must feel the

social pressure. That is only possible when most masspeople use some violence. Because masspeople will only organise themselves in temporary small citizen groups this violence will remain small. But many small acts can be more intruding than one big hit.

**The needed violence that will bring a jump nearer is called Small Violence or Creative Disturbance that will cause that the elite cannot anymore continue their quiet life on the from the masses separated eliteworld.**

## Chapter 16. KINDS OF VIOLENCE

There are many kinds of violence. In the past natural catastrophic events, epidemics or a change in climate was the cause of most grief. Neither animals nor primitive humans could interfere in these violent processes. The struggle between predators and their victims is also violent but only humans use violence consciously as in the domination of women by men, the struggle between small tribes, the devastating wars and the destruction of the environment. In the Third World avoidable misery as hunger, curable illnesses or tribal wars are still wide-spread even if it cost only a few hundred millions to reduce blindness, leper or malaria. In the rich part of the world misery caused by avoidable ulcers, stress, RSI and other physical disorders continues to exist because leaders prefer monetary gains over the well-being of humans. More kinds of violence are specified by prefixes as juridical, physical, vandalic, proletarian, psychological, autonomous, top-down, institutional, sexual, racist or terrorist. In the second Gulf War collateral damage to not-involved citizens, looked unavoidable. Violence by wrong behaviour on the road is quite normal and police and other security forces are fairly violent. The many people in prison are all victims of state violence. In the analysis of the phenomenon violence it is important to consider who the victim is and who the perpetrator and also why individuals or groups resort to violence. One of the prime reasons is that people want more power than others.

(Political) violence in the Third World is predominantly directed at the acquisition of food, money or the freedom from poverty. Violence connected with drugs is a striking example. Farmers in the jungle and people who transport drugs to rich Western clients use violence to obtain monetary gains and to protect their production facilities. The financiers in the West that whitewash the illegal profits that enter the legal system are less violent. They are on top of the production chain and can order other people to use violence. Third World violence is used to get profits on the short term, First World violence is used to secure that profits accumulate in a longer term. In the Congo Wars groups want to secure direct power over a piece of land, in the Gulf Wars the Americans want to secure power over the supply of oil in the next decades.

Societies have become increasingly complicated and it is therefore hardly possible to get change on a short term even when big violence is used. The short first Gulf War must be followed up by the second Gulf War because power over oil was not yet secured. But this control is seen as hostile and suppressed Iraqis will resort to some kind of guerrilla warfare in which adversaries are harassed by fairly small acts of violence. This violence does not have a direct goal, it is aimed at future changes. Therefore it is not important when the guerrilla loses some battles, some leaders or a piece of land. In Peru the destruction of hundreds of high-tension pylons caused some direct damage but the most important reason for these actions was the (long-term) undermining of the power of the elite. It showed that the elite was not almighty and that new forces were growing. The effect of the actions was however restricted because only dead objects and not living decision-makers were attacked. The

destruction of oil pipelines in Colombia is even less effective. Neither the masses nor the elite is much disturbed by such actions.

Violence is the ultimate factor in the quest for power. It is mostly used to defend, preserve, attack or increase a position of power. Because higher echelons of society possess more power most violence is directed at lower parts of society. This top-down violence is in agreement with a hierarchical society and the wish of leaders to maintain this situation. Elite and masses live on different worlds and direct contacts are rare. Because of the distance between the worlds the elite delegates the use of violence to intermediate institutions that are lead by the elite but in which practical work is done by hired masspeople. The institutions are housed in the imposing buildings of banks, multinationals or the government. Actions of masspeople are mostly directed against these immaterial objects, from demonstrations in front of buildings to the blowing up of these symbols of power. Everyone knows that leading people use these dead institutions to impose their power but they are nevertheless seen as living entities. People say: "the government does....", "Shell decides ....." while in reality leaders decide. Human pilots were ordered by higher people to bomb Dresden and Hiroshima in 1945. The same kind of people ordered later the carpet-bombing of Vietnam. Their successors have send hundreds of thousands of soldiers to Afghanistan and the Gulf for more wars in which masspeople are suffering most. And they lie about the underlying reasons for these cruel actions. Of course **Saddam Hussein** is a cruel dictator, of course the Afghani Taleban were inhuman but the reason for war was not the protection of masspeople against cruel leaders.

The reason for war is always the profit that the attacking party wants to its own group. When the power of the Taleban was destroyed the inferior position of women hardly changed and the production of drugs skyrocketed. Drug profits are invested in the West and oil will be transported through a new Afghani pipeline. The situation in Iraq was not worse than in many other countries. The Western elite did not interfere in the genocide in Rwanda/Burundi because these two tiny countries are economically unimportant. The elite has its own agenda and does not take the plights of the masses into account. The resistance of Russia against the invasion of Americans in Iraq was not based on the Russian support for the Iraqi masses but on the Russian fear to lose influence in the Iraqi oil production. Iraqi masspeople that are killed by American troops are for the Russian elite as unimportant as masspeople in Tsjetsjenia that are killed by Russian bombs.

Without direct pressure on living beings at the top nothing will change and the lines along which power is exerted continue to be drawn from top to bottom. For an equal exertion of power it is needed that down-top lines supplement top-down lines. The number of victims under the masses exceeds far the number of elite victims. Fifty thousand Americans died in the Vietnam War but I doubt if even one general perished in combat. And all politicians that ordered the war survived. Only some violence is not controlled or initiated by the top. Soccer hooliganism, mostly directed against dead objects or (living) security forces who also belong to the masses, is mass violence that does not leave the massworld. It is a reaction on the unassailable position of soccer leaders that use violence to contain the unruly masses. It is not revolutionary violence that tries to change society but a reaction on the excessive amount of violence some parts of the masses have to endure. It is quite logic that elite sports as golf are hardly violent.

Racist violence is caused by the dominating position of top-down relations. The elite is not openly racist but because the top-elite is white and puts the interest of the own group in the first place racist ideas are not far away. Coloured people who look for a better life in rich countries are put in a kind of concentration camps. You will hardly find white people in these camps. The contemptuous attitude of the elite for coloured masses from poor countries is one of the reasons for racism in the Western world. The elite keeps its environment white and accepts only coloured people that are adapted to the white society. The masses have to accept everyone. Racism is the consequence of the fact that poor white masses want to safeguard their position against the invading poor from elsewhere. The stealthily racist politics of the elite keeps the masses divided.

Top-down violence consolidates existing social relations. Down-top violence disturbs the social organisation in which an elitist minority has the right to exert the greatest power over the majority of masspeople. Leftist social democrats approve this one-sided exertion of power by copying it in their organisations. Moreover they agree with the state monopoly on violence. Because the elite dominates the state, leftists reject any autonomous exertion of mass power. Still they sometimes call on the masses to use violence. Chilean opposition leaders, who had fled the country, called upon the masses to demonstrate violently against dictator **Pinochet**. Many masspeople died and the success was negligent. But the opposing leaders never propagated a direct attack on the dictator and his hangmen. In the quiet Netherlands leftists never call upon the masses to use violence. Trade unions still use violent language when they ask their members to fight the captains of industry. These leftist leaders remember vaguely that a new elite can only rise to power by using violence. But they have a comfortable life and do not want to undermine the position of the sitting elite by using action methods that fall outside the boundaries of the democratic system.

In a more equal society power and violence should be exerted in all directions. That does not mean that all inequalities vanish but that everybody gets an equal chance to exert power. On the road to this new situation, the question must stand central against whom violence must be directed, who will be damaged and who will benefit most. Individual mass violence differs fundamentally from the present mass violence that is only a reaction on elitist violence. Though this mass violence is sometimes sympathetic it does not contribute anything to equalising the balance of power.

The Intifada has a big following because Palestinians are in an inferior position and lack any promising future. In the last fifty years the Palestinian state did not come into existence and the prospects for the near future are bleak. Actions hurt however in the first place the own and the Israeli masses. The Palestinian elite uses the mass struggle for its own purposes. It is already accepted in the United Nations and the Arab League and now it want a small piece of land to rule the own masses. Only recently, after Israel killed some members of the Palestinian elite, some organisations decided to strike back at the Israeli elite. In general the conflict is a typical example of an inter-elitist struggle in which masspeople give their life for another hierarchically organised society. When a Palestinian state should come into being, the Palestinian masses will remain an inferior majority.

Al Queda is also a hierarchical organisation and actions are in the first place directed against masspeople. Auto bombs, suicide actions, the September 11 action, the

attack on an American warship near Aden, the bombing of a disco on Bali, the attack on tourists in Morocco hurt in the first place masspeople. The attack in the Parisian metro by fundamentalist Algerians and the Sarin attack in the metro of Tokyo by a religious sect again do not hurt the elite. The centre of elitist power remains untouched. Such actions cause at the most a shift in the balance of power in the direction of a new elite.

In the Vietnamese War the communist elite lost indeed some people but most victims belonged to the masses. After the Americans withdrew the new Vietnamese elite intensified the bonds with the former hostile elite that ordered the killing of more than a million Vietnamese. The Vietnamese masses got a better life but the Vietnamese elite improved its position much more. It was accepted by other elites and introduced a hierarchical system in Vietnam. They removed a dangerous elite in Cambodia where the Red Khmers seemed to build an entirely different kind of society. American masspeople who refused to become cannon fodder in Vietnam were again brought under the control of the American elite. Though the majority of the American masses in the end seemed to reject the Vietnamese War later they again supported the American elite in other wars in foreign countries.

Some actions of the Dutch Squatters Movement were directed against elitepeople but most activities were attacks on institutions and other masspeople. This mass violence was however not initiated by or in favour of the elite. The Movement was not hierarchical organised and a new elite could hardly arise from such a Movement. Though in materialistic sense some progress was made most damage was caused to masspeople. The elite was not attacked and could remain united in the struggle against the masses. It emphasised the damage to masspeople and could therefore rally part of the masses behind its policy and initiate an internal mass struggle. The necessary elitist unity can only be broken by direct attacks on one part of the elite so that other parts will turn away from the struggle because they do not want to be hurt by elitist policies that are not profitable for them.

The Anti-Nuclear Movement resembled the Squatters Movement but was less violent because it was partly led by members of leftist political parties that still believe that improvement could be reached by elections. Leftist leaders indeed resemble other elitist leaders. **Blair**, leader of the English Labour Party, joined the American elite in the second Gulf War and proved once more that leftists also use violence to increase the power of the own elite. It does not bother them that most victims in this struggle belong to the lower classes. By taking part in discussions about the use of energy that were organised by the government, some fractions of the Anti-Nuclear Movement tried to penetrate the decision-taking levels of society though without independent power. They did not want to control leaders and influence their mind only to participate in the decision-making process. This was one of the reasons that the Movement disappeared. Members did not understand you cannot change elitist policies by using arguments while renouncing any power play.

Organisers of peace demonstrations do not even think about violent actions. Their powerless actions are directed against symbols of power as the Parliament or military bases. They are never directed at the private living sphere of generals who prepare the use of mass destruction weapons, industrial bosses who profit by the development of still deadlier weapons or politicians that favour wars in which

masspeople will die. Despite two demonstrations with half a million participants – the biggest demonstrations ever in Holland – cruise missiles were not removed from Dutch soil. Some parts of the elite wanted to keep the rockets, other parts were inclined to remove them. But in the end the second part bowed to the first because it did not want to split the elite. Peace demonstrations give the masses only an illusion of power and do not attack the balance of power.

Greenpeace and other organisations that want a better environment sometimes use violence but direct attacks on elitepersons are rejected. The hierarchical organisation, the belief in parliamentary procedures and the belief that information is more important than power prevent that these organisations really become a factor to get a new society. disqualify these organisations as supportive for the well-being of the masses. The big attention of the media for their activities give the masses only an illusion of power.

Most actions cause more damage to masspeople than to leaders. Masspeople do not start wars, do not maintain a situation of widespread hunger, are not guilty of the shortage of good houses and do not contribute anything to the continuing situation of inequality. Leading people who cause these situations are left undisturbed. When the masses want to get results they must change the direction of their activities. Actions must not be carried out in the world of the masses but in the eliteworld where the unbalance of power is maintained. Only then leading people will change.

These political ideas differ fundamentally from those of traditional leftists. The Left wants to change dead social structures and expects that then living human relations will change. I propose to activate masspeople in such a way that living inter-human relations will change.

**After the change old social structures will become obsolete and a fundamentally new situation will come into existence.**

## Chapter 17. TERROR OF THE ELITE

The French word assassin (murderer) is derived from the Persian Assassins who were proud to murder and who killed many high-placed individuals. In the present time they should be called terrorists. Their name has probably its origin in the word hashasheen, a kind of hooligan. It is not likely the word has anything to do with hashish because drugs do not go well with cold-blooded attacks on well-guarded individuals. Power was embedded in the person of the leader and in the chaotic time after the death of a leader others got the chance to become supreme ruler. In our times inter-elitist struggles take still place after the death of a strong leader. American plans to kill **Castro**, **Khadafi** or **Saddam Hussein** have the same background because after the killing other leaders more sympathetic to the American interests could come forward. The Italian Mafia also understands the importance of powerful individuals that are bribed or killed when bribing is not possible.

In 1793 **Gracchus Babeuf** was the first to use the word terrorist in his paper "The Tribune of the People". Together with the Italian **Buonarotti** he organised the "Conspiracy of Equals". The organisation was not successful and **Babeuf** lost his head in 1797 when order was re-established in post-revolutionary France. **Buonarotti** founded later the terrorist Carbonari. The action method of this group should have served as model for the communist coup in Russia in 1917.

A terrorist can be defined as someone who wants to realize his ideas by powerful intimidation. That makes nearly everyone terrorist. To classify all violent actions by individuals or groups as terrorist actions is also not useful. There are so many kinds of terrorism that it is impossible to make an all-embracing definition. Political terrorism aims to reach a political target with the help of violence but one must distinguish between top-down and down-top violence. Terrorism of the elite aims to defend the position of the highest group while terrorism of the masses aims to improve the position of the masses. The media often call the first kind necessary or justified violence while direct or collateral damage of masspeople is seen as deplorable. Mass terror is nearly always rejected by the media even when it is directed at cruel dictators. The masses must use peaceful means to reach their goals, violence is monopolised by the elite.

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict shows that an elite sometimes uses direct attacks on other leaders but most elitist violence is used against masspeople to show them that they are inferior and vulnerable. Still newer weapons hurt only large groups of people. ABC-weapons (atomic, biological and chemical weapons) are being refined. The neutron bomb kills people and leaves dead buildings and machinery undamaged. Biological weapons hurt in the first place masspeople that are weakened by lack of food and have fewer possibilities to get medicine than the elite. Fuel Air Explosives flatten big areas. Guided missiles burned a few caves in Afghanistan but Bin Laden escaped. Cluster bombs lay a carpet of small mines that hurt walking people. Splinter bombs are even worse. The "Mother Of All Bombs", the MOAB, the Massive Ordnance Air Bust, weighs about ten thousand kilo. The

explosive punch should be similar to that of a small nuclear weapon.

Crowds are controlled by weapons that aim at arbitrary masspeople. Rubber bullets, teargas and water cannons can not be used against specific individuals. Pepper gas is also very harmful. There is a whole range of "less-lethal" weapons. Micro-wave rays cause a lot of pain, stench bombs give an obnoxious odour, air-denying weapons put people in a deep sleep, ultra-sound and pulsed sound weapons cause disorientation and vomiting, stroboscopic light that is also used in discotheques causes blinding and epileptic effects, foam guns glue feet and hands to the pavement, magnetoscopic weapons deliver something that feels like a hard blow to the head, thermal guns raise the body temperature above forty degrees Celsius and incapacitate people. Elitist weapons can hardly be used by masspeople against individuals from the top. The masses have to use their own weapons.

In the Third World the elite protects itself by private armies and death squads. In rich countries private security services are less violent but also control masspeople by elitist violence. State violence is a special kind of terrorism by which the elite uses the state apparatus to control the masses. The over-filled prisons in the USA show that the highest elite treats its masses not better than **Stalin** or **Saddam Hussein**. The American elite has friendly contacts with many other elites that treat their masses badly. Human rights never hindered contact between elites. Private contacts between members of Western and racist South African elites were quite normal. Even in World War II top-members of the American elite (for example **Ford** and **Bush**) were in close contact with the German elite. Only when an elite hurts masses under the control of another elite action is undertaken. Former dictator **Somoza** ordered the death of thousands Nicaraguans but American leaders only became active when an American journalist was killed. The maltreatment of Kurds or Tsjetsjenians is treated as an internal problem, the suppressed position of women in Arab countries and in India is brushed aside. But when masses threaten to hurt an elite, the top-elite is fast to react. **Allende**, **Mossadecq** and **Lumumba** are only some Third World leaders that were killed with the help of Western elites, many others who tried to curb the power of the indigenous elite were ousted.

Some terrorist actions seem mass terrorism but are in reality terror of the elite because only the elite profits. In Indonesia **Suharto** replaced **Sukarno** by killing half a million so-called communists. The killing was done by masspeople but ordered by the elite. The defeated elite was deprived of its power but was allowed to live on, the masses that were controlled by the losing side were killed or put in prison. Many leaders of Nazi-Germany survived World War II. Owners of weapon factories got their property back, generals were taken over by NATO and Warsaw Pact and the German Secret Service was integrated in the winning Secret Services. The top was hardly punished for atrocities against the masses in the occupied territories.

Most violence takes place between states or between a state and an organisation that wants to replace a sitting government. The PLO and Hamash are a kind of state because they do not only fight the Israeli state but are also active in education, health, housing, social services and production. That is also the case with the IRA, the ETA, the FARC and even the Red Brigades. These organisations are active in kidnapping, drugs, smuggle, white collar criminality and corruption and resemble existing states and multinationals. Israel (abduction of the nuclear scientist **Vanunu**),

France (kidnapping of the plane with Algerian resistance leader **Ben Bella**), the USA (smuggle of weapons to Iran and the contra's in Nicaragua), Heineken (production and distribution of the drug alcohol), Shell (smuggle of oil to South Africa) or Enron (huge enrichment by the top management just before Enron collapsed) show that unlawful behaviour is inherent to hierarchical organisations. Guerrilla organisations strive for comparable systems in which new leaders will replace old ones.

Resistance organisations are not completely comparable with existing states. They do not have armies with tanks, planes or heavy weapons. They use weapons that easily can be hidden. Because their military strength is small they have to resort to other tactics including terrorism. In Vietnam guerrilla tactics defeated the Americans. In the first Gulf War however the Iraqis did not resort to an underground war and fought a conventional war. Many Iraqis were unnecessary killed by the superior American weapons. High-flying planes destroyed ground forces with precision bombs. Conventional armies sometimes use guerrilla tactics when elite-troops are dropped behind the lines to sabotage installations or even kill enemy leaders. But all past wars brought new elites to power by destroying competing elites. Al Queda uses also elitist terrorism. Its followers are summoned to kill any American and not only leading Americans. It is evident that in elitist wars more masspeople die than well-guarded elitepersons. Most terrorist violence is elitist violence because it is directed against masspeople and aims to preserve or improve the position of an elite.

The use of terror by the elite is an important element in the continuing inter-elitist struggle for more power (and wealth). Everything is permitted in this struggle. The media reject terrorist actions of the 'enemy' even when the own elite uses similar methods. But sometimes a certain balance of power is reached and some weapons are not used. This was the case with chemical weapons in World War II and nuclear weapons in the Cold War. Relatively weak groups can now also make mass destruction weapons to attack the masses of the adversary. A Japanese sect used the killing gas Sarin, **Saddam Hussein** was accused to possess chemical weapons and Iran of making nuclear weapons. All these weapons kill in the first place masspeople. In the civil war in the Congo more than three million people died, most of them because of indirect causes as the lack of food and medicine. The USA destroyed in the first Gulf War more electricity plants and bridges that are used by the civil population than military installations. In the second Gulf War hospitals were crowded with wounded civilians. Nationalistic movements in the whole world attack more often masspeople than elitepeople. The idea that only an attack on the top will bring victory nearer is beyond the scope of nationalist leaders. The centre of power remains untouched and thus a change in the balance of power can hardly be expected.

Guerrilla struggles in the Third World are nevertheless sympathetic because they aim to improve the situation of the masses. But in the end only the top changes. **Friedrich Engels**, the friend of **Karl Marx**, wrote nearly only about state violence that was initiated by elites. It is violence of an army, an extreme hierarchical organisation. Leaders decide and masspeople have to follow. The communist vanguard that leads the masses to a new era neglects the individuality and the creativity of masspeople and is contrary to the coming into existence of an autonomous mass power. No new independent power factor is introduced because all is still controlled by leaders.

China, Vietnam, Cuba, Laos, Nicaragua, Brazil, the Philippines, Angola, Mozambique, Colombia and India are some of the countries that have known a protracted peoples revolt. Many masspeople developed a self-consciousness they never could have acquired under the rule of a despotic elite. The first goal of the struggle was a liberated area in which resistance leaders founded a guerrilla state (under the leadership of a new elite). Sometimes this embryo of a state was expanded to the whole country. The new states were still hierarchical organised and only in the first decade after the revolution new leaders were friendlier for the masses. After the guerrilla was won most old leaders were allowed to go into exile with most of their wealth. The old Chinese elite fled to Taiwan and suppressed the original island population for many decades. The old Vietnamese elite could emigrate to the United States. Just as people like the shah of Persia and Somoza of Nicaragua.

When masspeople use violence, they must always think about the question who benefits most and who suffers most. Terror of the elite hurts mostly masspeople and must be rejected. Therefore the second Gulf War has to be opposed. Violence from people's guerrillas must however also be rejected because it neither weakens the power of the sitting elite nor strengthens the power and the individuality of masspeople. All violence that aims to replace a hierarchical system by another comparable system must be rejected.

**The most important factor to judge violence is the question of this violence contributes to the coming of a new kind of society without a privileged class and with autonomous masspeople.**

## Chapter 18. MASS TERROR

While violence of the elite is hardly influenced by masspeople, the elite often controls violence of the masses. Nevertheless there is some independent mass violence against leaders. Most mass terror is not revolutionary because activists do not consciously try to get a fundamental different society though they undermine somewhat social stability. Masspeople do not realise that they have the power to get real changes. Even in the unruly times before the French or the Russian Revolution when the feeling grew that time was ripe for a change, masspeople still did not consciously organise a revolution.

The elite often controls Social Movements that are hierarchical organised. Actions are subordinate to the interest of elitepeople, as is the case with most strikes and demonstrations. When Movements are predominantly independent actions can cross the boundaries of the democratic order. To safeguard some squatted houses parts of the Squatters Movement attacked house owners in their private living sphere and invaded offices of real estate agents. The Anti-Nuclear Movement disturbed official meetings and attacked firms that were connected with the building and the maintenance of nuclear plants. But the results were meagre because actions were too incidental and mostly directed against dead objects. Attacks on living beings who cannot defend themselves against infringement on their brains were exceptional. Mass terror is an action method that attacks elitepeople while masspeople remain untouched. Elitist terror attacks masspeople and leaves elitepeople undisturbed.

In a hierarchical society only the top is responsible for decisions. Targets must therefore be carefully chosen. Many masspeople earn their living by serving leaders. To a great extent they copy the life style of higher circles. Some obedient servants can of course also come under attack but most actions must be directed against the top in order to undermine the power with which the top controls lower-placed people. The mayor of Amsterdam, **Van Tijn**, time and again repeated that squatting was the greatest problem in Amsterdam – thus not drug trade or corruption of civil servants. Not police officers that beat up squatters should be attacked but the top of the police and of course the mayor and his clique. They created a climate in which subordinates maltreated masspeople. The Squatters Movement disappeared (not because of police repression) but drug problems and corruption have grown in Amsterdam. The elite is more afraid of a few independent squatters than of the profitable drug trade. When the elite remains in power, serving masspeople will continue to mistreat fellow masspeople. The first target of mass terror must be individuals at the top.

In 1985 squatter **Hans Kok** died in an Amsterdam police cell. The media gave some attention to this strange death but soon lost their interest. After a year some stones were thrown through the windows of houses of involved people. Then an unsatisfactory report appeared that stated that **Kok** had died of accidental circumstances. Some juridical action was undertaken but the case seemed to be covered up. After some time posters appeared in the city that asked for violent

actions against responsible individuals. The death of **Kok** became part of the struggle between elite and mass. The posters carried the text "We will get you!" and included the names of more than forty individuals. But too many names secluded the fact that only some elite people were responsible for what had happened with the squatter. Though some actions took place the question why **Kok** had died was not solved. The elite accepted the actions as a ripple in its existence, as a risk that belongs to its prime task, the preservation of the privileged position of the elite. After a Molotov cocktail was thrown – the cocktail did not cause much damage – **Van Tijn** even said that it was only a deplorable incident. The short-lived actions did not change his mind and he climbed even higher in the hierarchy of the political elite by becoming senator.

As long as the elite maintains its power over serving masspeople, internal mass struggles will continue to exist. Of course it gives some satisfaction to hurt a wrongdoing servant but it does not solve anything, the power balance remains unchanged. All energy spent on such actions cannot be directed against the elite. The elite uses even the suffering of the own servants to initiate a struggle inside the masses. After World War II most attention of the masses was directed against small collaborators while the highest collaborators behind the screens remained untouched. Philips produced goods for the Germans by using forced labour of people imprisoned by the occupiers. Nazi-king **Koen Visser** became rich by producing food for the German army. Civil servants mostly worked on as before and many of them indirectly helped the German occupation. After the War the industrial elite continued to be in close contact with the German industrial elite that had supported and financed the **Hitler**-regime. As long as the centre of power is not attacked most actions are futile. The example of the death of squatter **Kok** is evident. The actions should have been more effective when only a few high-placed people as the major, the public prosecutor, the head of the Civil Medical Service, the head of the police and the investigating judge should have been attacked. Now the target was too wide and moreover the actions lasted only a few weeks. Without long-term activity targets can never be influence.

Groups as the RAF and the Red Brigades attacked elite persons with big violence. These actions could be classified as mass terror but the organisations were strictly hierarchical. The RAF wanted to be the vanguard of the people. That action model is not suitable for ordinary citizens because actions are too dangerous, difficult and specialised. A town guerrilla should not be a war between a hierarchical elitist organisation and a hierarchical mass organisation. Masses should be active in small independent and creative groups while they continue to live their daily life. A new society can only be reached when masspeople learn a new way of acting, learn to be autonomous. By the way, the targets of the European town guerrilla groups were also too diffuse. Sometimes foreign interests were targeted, then the government was the goal, then Third World guerrillas were supported or propagandistic actions carried out against the use of nuclear energy. Energy spent in so many directions remains powerless.

Actions of this kind of town guerrillas contributed little to the undermining of the power of the elite and did not activate the masspeople. The actions got ample attention in the media because a (deadly) attack on one elite person is more important than thousand dead masspeople by alcohol abuse (supported by the state) or ten thousand dead masspeople in a war between two states. Though only some

elitepeople were attacked the media gave the idea that town guerrillas endangered the continuing existence of humanity. In this way the elite tried to confront one part of the masses against the other. This Machiavellian policy of divide and rule is one of the weapons of the elite.

The leaders of the democratic left have the same opinion about town guerrillas as the elite. After a top civil servant was killed by the RAF the German leftist Tages Zeitung said that the man was sympathetic in regard to demands of the masses. It did however not criticise his high living standard nor did it analyse his pro-elitist attitude. Maybe he was more sympathetic than other leading people but all in all he supported the continuing inequality in wealth and power. The leftist mayor of Amsterdam ordered the police to use violence against demonstrators that criticised the speculations with houses. The speculators remained untouched. After the communist uprising in Germany in 1919 leftist Prime Minister **Noske** ordered the killing of thousands of masspeople. Such people must never be allowed to take even part in discussions about a new kind of society. Masspeople must stand central and discussions about change must take place between masspeople. Elitist newspapers as the Tages Zeitung even when they are sometimes sympathetic to the masses may not play any role.

The theory of the RAF was guided by the contradiction between left and right while the contradiction between mass and elite was less important. The masses are of course divided – by the continuing propaganda of the elite – but attacks must exclusively be directed at the elite. Lower servants of the elite that belong to the masses must remain untouched even when they have extreme rightist opinions. There are only rulers and ruled, elite and mass and that has to be emphasised in all actions. In the second Gulf War the question is not whether **Bush** or **Saddam** is the best but whether a war hurts masspeople. Elitist media demand that masspeople choose between the American or the Iraqi elite while the real choice must be made between the American and Iraqi masses on the one side and the American and Iraqi elite on the other side. The contradiction between masses and elite is not solved by elitist wars. But the media publish only elitist arguments, the plight of masspeople is inferior to the interest of warring elites.

Activists use dogmatic leftist jargon in their written explanations. It is evident from these incomprehensible writings that they think that masspeople are stupid and cannot take independent initiatives. The text hardly points to the most important argument, the attacked person belongs to the elite, lives on another world and keeps masspeople in an inferior position. The masses will understand actions when targets are clear. Declarations have not much influence because the elite overwhelms the masses with contrary information. Masspeople know already that something is rotten. Bin Laden does not need to explain why an American warship is attacked in the Islamic republic of Yemen. Nobody can ever attack Arab warships in American waters. They just are not allowed to come close to the American coast. Most people understand that the Gulf Wars improved the American domination of the world.

The attacks of town guerrillas are so difficult and dangerous that such groups always remain tiny. Moreover too much time is needed for the technical acquirement of data and money for safe houses, false documents, expensive weapons and unrecognisable cars. Banks have to be robbed to get enough money. Recruiting and

training of new members cost also a lot of time. There is hardly time for political actions and thus political pressure remains low. The group headed by **Osmana bin Laden** perpetrated only a few impressive actions but it is more a nuisance than a real threat to the power of the elite. Earthquakes are more damaging. Even when all actions should be directed against the private life of elite persons, they know that the chance is very small that they are targeted. Elite people protect their life by some indeed unpleasant methods and accept that security officers and thick walls always surround them. A continuous pressure on the private life of leading persons that endangers their privileged position can not be accomplished by groups that predominantly live underground.

Security considerations force town guerrilla groups to be hierarchical organised. They resemble the social organisations they attack. The struggle does not include a promise for a new kind of society. Mass people can hardly enter such groups. Only a few mass people know much about weapons, explosives, rockets or fast cars. They do not want to go underground because they want to keep contact with their loved ones. Town guerrilla actions demand that activists become specialists and specialism is contrary to the essence of mass people. They have of course some special skills and knowledge but the group demands that they learn new skills to carry out actions thought of by someone else. Actions should be adapted to the skills of active mass people, they should be subordinate to the creativity of living beings. Most leftist terrorism does not agree with this rule. Though town guerrilla groups contribute something to the destabilisation of society they will never become the revolutionary power that brings a society with free and creative mass people nearer.

The Red Brigades introduced some new theoretical ideas. They said that by attacking powerful individuals the social power structure could be attacked. The Italian Mafia bribed, pressurised, attacked and even killed powerful persons that did not want to co-operate. While the Mafia wanted to control elite people for concrete targets – for example to get false documents, to whitewash illegal profits or to protect arrested members – the Red Brigades had a longer term target, another kind of society. The result was comparable. The elite started to defend itself. It acknowledged that the Mafia as well as the town guerrilla threatened its dominant position. It is however remarkable that the elite spend more money in fighting terrorism than for combating crimes related to drugs, corruption or trade of women. But terrorism attacks the elite and leaves the masses unhurt while the Mafia only sometimes attacks elite persons but damages more the life of mass people. Moreover quite a few elite persons profit from Mafia-related crimes while terrorism is not advantageous. The masses had sympathy for the Red Brigades than for the Mafia but did not take part in the struggle.

Italy did not only give birth to the hierarchical organised Red Brigades but also to the diffuse guerrilla of independent groups of mass people that carried out low-violent actions in their free time. In 1968 in Germany the Wandering Hash Rebels (die umherschweifenden Hashrebellen) came into existence and later the Red Cells (Rote Zelle). Social Movements had many followers and some people wanted harder actions, including violence. In Holland the Provo and the Squatters Movement knew a similar development. The diffuse guerrilla groups were to some height clandestine but not subordinate to a centralised leadership. Action groups like the English Animal Liberation Front use indeed unorthodox means of action to reach a restricted target,

the freedom of animals. The ALF attacks people that misuse animals in the cosmetic or fur industry. They are however also more or less hierarchically organised.

In the eighties the action group Rara used firebombs to burn down the Dutch Makro in Nuth. It caused the highest damage (50 million euro) of all actions in Western Europe. The owner, top eliteperson **Fentener van Vlissingen**, later decided to withdraw his investments from racist South Africa. If attacks in the private living sphere of this eliteperson played a role in this decision is not known. The house of oil trader **Deuss** who smuggled oil to South Africa was also fire. Other diffuse guerrilla groups attacked more than 200 Shell petrol stations by cutting hoses and adding water to petrol tanks. Assurance companies paid most of the damage and the support of the South African freedom struggle remained marginal. The pressure on Shell had some remarkable consequences. Some people broke contact with friends that worked for Shell and some children of Shell-workers did not dare to tell school friends their fathers worked by Shell. It is an example how an action can initiate creative actions from others.

Violence can be successful. That was already known because the Palestinian freedom struggle became widely recognised after the kidnapping of some planes in Lebanon. By taking three French citizens hostage Iran forced France to expel the Iranian opposition from France. The threat of violence against bookshop owners and editors slowed the publication of the book of **Salman Rushdie**. But most of these actions had only result in the short term. They did not influence the minds of leaders.

Small Violence in the private living sphere is an excellent method to increase the pressure on elitepeople. The method of Creative Disturbance does not kill elitepeople but makes it impossible that they can go on living as before. The powerful position by which the own group benefits in the first place must be undermined. These kinds of actions can be carried out by small temporary groups of involved masspeople that act autonomously. These actions promote the myth of a mass power that is independent from any elite.

**Creative Disturbance is an expression of the individualisation of masspeople who through temporarily groups invade the minds of individual elitepersons.**

## Chapter 19. CREATIVE DISTURBANCE

Strikes have become obsolete in Western Europe. In the past they had some success because director-owners lost earnings. Now the relation between production and earnings is not important for most directors. For high-placed civil servants this relation even never existed. A strike could result in a temporary shift in the partition of material wealth but it never interfered with the foundations of our society, the elite remained on top and the masses remained at the bottom. The elite has legalised strikes because they do not endanger its privileged position and serve as an outlet for angry feelings of masspeople. Trade unions have changed to organisations that help members to settle individual disputes in court. They have become part of the elitist democratic society.

For leftists the carrying out of an action is often more important than the result. It is more important to ventilate frustrations than to take away the cause of grievances. After each unsuccessful action the feeling of powerlessness grows and activists are less disposed to become again active. Social movements grow fast but because results are disappointing they never exist long. In the beginning action leaders are independent and introduce new kinds of action. But after initial successes, people connected to political parties infiltrate the leading body. A more hierarchical structure is introduced and the creativity of activists is curtailed. Spontaneous actions change in peaceful, protesting and dignified actions that fit in the democratic idea that masspeople only may ask and never demand improvements. It is striking that the media appreciate these controlled actions even when the result does not conform to the vast amount of energy activists have put into it.

The present action methods deny the growing individuality of masspeople. The group dominates over the individual. This is inherent to leftist politics in which the well being of groups dominates the well being of individuals. Leftist mass actions are in agreement with the elitist idea that masspeople form a group that does not consist of individuals. The elite proposes to flog or deport soccer hooligans as if they are a herd of animals even when it can be proven that the majority of hooligans did nothing wrong. It uses zero tolerance against masspeople that make insignificant infringements on the law and prisons are overfilled with masspeople. When elite persons do something wrong, group behaviour is disregarded. Whiteboard criminals, polluters or corrupt directors are treated as individuals and violence is never used against them. Other actions are needed. Masspeople must direct their actions against a few individual wrong-doers in contradiction with elitist violence that is directed at the masses as a group.

Mass organisations must not copy the hierarchical organisation of the elite. The masses should act in small independent groups in which a minority from the masses attacks a few leaders (also a minority) from the elite. Most people live their own life and are not interested in what happens to other people when this does not influence their life. They do not meddle in the affairs of their neighbours and do also not mind when this neighbour is active to improve his own situation. They will also become

active when the time is ripe. Then they will form their own temporary group of masspeople that attacks nasty elitepersons. The present mass organisations demand that their members become even active when they are not interested. In the new action method masspeople decide autonomously when, why, where and against whom they become active.

It is always difficult to determine if an action has been successfully. There are two components, success on the short term and success on the long term. Both must be visible during an action. The Squatters Movement contributed to a short- as well as to a long-term success. Young people got a place to live and in the long term the monopolistic ownership of houses was attacked. The elitist world of house owners was disturbed. When the short-term success fell away because of lack of empty houses, the Movement disappeared. Actions against cruise missiles had no success on the short term And also on the long term the massive demonstrations did not bring the removal of nuclear weapons nearer. The Movement was therefore very short-lived. Success is imperative.

Strikes and massive demonstrations do not lead to a fundamental different society, to a new future. This kind of mass actions that do not contribute top a fundamental change are actions from the past. They must be replaced by individual activities against individuals in which perpetrators do not have to account to some leader for their actions. Of course actions must never hurt fellow-masspeople. Moreover an important part of the masses must understand why actions take place, actions must fit in the contemporary social situation. The ethical consciousness is so much influenced by Christian-elitist ideas that some things cannot be done. The use of heavy violence by masspeople will only split the masses. The killing of an eliteperson does not fit in our society, the use of psychological violence is on the other hand mostly seen as a practical joke. Moreover big violence has to be planned meticulously and has less spontaneity, originality and creativity. It increases the chance that activists are arrested and sentenced to long prison terms. And in prison it is hardly possible to contribute anything to a fundamental different society.

Elitepeople experience even small actions in the private sphere as violence but masspeople are so often subject to violence from above that they see it as quite normal. The general sense of justice of masspeople may not be violated but the boundaries set by the elitist democracy must be crossed. Small Violence or Creative Disturbance does not hurt the masses because it targets only individuals from the elite. The goal of Creative Disturbance is to change the minds of leaders so that in decision-taking the needs of the masses are also taking into account. In the concept of Creative Disturbance masspeople can determine their own activities. When their interest weakens masspeople can stop being active and withdraw in the anonymity of the masses till they are again annoyed by some decisions from above. In the meantime they know other masspeople will continue to fight the suffocating hierarchical system. Often actions will occur because masspeople are emotionally disturbed. Emotion is short-lived and leads to instantaneous actions that must give the perpetrator some pleasure. Masspeople must stay aloof of hierarchical constructions that belong to the old society and start to decide for themselves what they are going to do. In a future society hierarchical structures will be obsolete.

Creative Disturbance does not aim to eliminate elite persons because many of them possess knowledge and skill needed for the present and the future society. Specialised organisers are needed to build aeroplanes. Now organisers decide and builders, buyers, future passengers and all other people who are sincerely interested in planes have hardly influence. Organisers are lavishly paid and this determines their minds. They will at all costs maintain the present unequal situation. When all people should have the same status people will only differ from each other by their own individuality and creativity. Now masspeople are considered to be herd-animals that differ from the higher echelons of our society by the possession of dead money.

In democracies not the best people reach the top but those who with the best starting position. The better this position the more chance on an influential post. The aim of actions is however not to appoint better leaders but to create the possibility that third persons can control, correct and eventually remove leaders. That is impossible in democracies because only a few leaders are elected. It is better to abolish elections and let able people co-opt other leaders. The masses must not only control these people in their activities but also in the field of an eventually surplus of wealth in comparison to other workers. The annoying presence of active masspeople can include the use of some violence. Now fellow elitepeople control leaders only in regard to their contribution to the continuation of the privileged position of the elite. Less capable leaders get a golden handshake and remain in the wealthier circles of the elite even when they have proven to be unfit for the high positions they occupied.

A prolonged period of Creative Disturbance put elitist persons under pressure. Masspeople can harass leaders in the private sphere by calling their house in the middle of the night, writing letters about them to other people, sending packages that they do not want and do all by which leaders in their private houses perceive that unknown people indeed exist. They perceive that they are not taken decisions about statistical numbers on computer lists but about living people who repay the nuisance with their own coins. Even small actions increase the mental pressure that in the end will influence the minds of the attacked. It is annoying when the GSM of a leader is stolen and a big amount of cash is spent on worthless calls. Telecom will not be disposed to settle easily an account of a few thousand euros. More impressive is however damage that cannot be met by monetary compensations. When careful cultivated beautiful roses are cut down, the leader shall realise that he must have done something very negative to unknown nobodies.

The annoyed elite persons will try to protect themselves by security forces but most actions are hardly punishable. They will find it difficult to counter Creative Disturbance with actions against the perpetrators and will start to look for other ways to minimise the pressure. Their work is deteriorating under the unknown and unexpected pressure. They will realise pressure can only be relieved when they take other decisions, when they are going to behave different in regard to masspeople.

Creative Disturbance pressurises elite persons on a comparable way as masspeople are pressured by the activities of leaders. The only difference is that elitepeople are disturbed by anonymous people from below while masspeople are disturbed by decisions from the top that are carried out by people who mostly belong to the masses. After some time the elite person perceives that he is attacked in all aspects of his life. He does not appreciate rumours that are spread in his sport club, he does

not want to be confronted with unknown people during a business dinner, he does not want to be followed on the street while he is on holiday. He will discover he will never be alone. Actions become even more personal when the pond in his garden is coloured blue, when the walls of his second house are covered with cow faeces, when he is stopped at the border because he is anonymously accused to transport drugs, when sugar is thrown in the petrol tank of his car, when his business papers are coloured red by some paint that miraculously was thrown through a window, when his photo albums are stolen etceteras. A long series of small actions will penetrate his mind and suddenly something unexpectedly will happen, a kind of catastrophe will occur that has far-reaching consequences.

A small Molotov cocktail introduces a violent aspect but such actions are not really necessary. Against direct violence elitepersons can protect themselves with security forces but small and comical actions are more dangerous. The police is not very interested and will even laugh when they see that a distinguished gentleman is disturbed by the same things they have to endure all their life. Then the eliteperson will try to mobilise his fellow-members by asking the media to publish about his plights. But this will cause an avalanche that will destroy the eliteperson. The rest of the elite will perceive that some leaders have some minor problems and do not give all his energy to their real task, the defence of the interests of the elite. In the end he will be removed from his post. But this will start another avalanche. When the mind of one eliteperson has changed, others will follow.

The elite will find it difficult to defend itself against small pinpricks. Some elitepersons start to change their behaviour because they want to be freed from the constant pressure. The end of the dominating power of the elite comes nearer because internal unity is breaking down. In the meantime masspeople become conscious of their power. But without some violence the fortress of elitist power cannot be demolished. Without violence masspeople remain subordinate to the elite, the world will petrify and humanity will approach its end. The barrier between eliteworld and massworld can only be pulled down when the Creative Disturbance of the masses is stronger than the Big Violence of the elite.

**By personal activity the energy of masspeople will grow in such a way that a jump towards a freer society of autonomous people will be possible. How, where and when this jump will occur is hidden in the unknown future.**

## Chapter 20. **WHAT IS TO BE DONE**

Democracy begins to petrify, a growing number of dead rules and laws determine the life of living people. In a fundamentally different world masspeople will be freer, more autonomous and more capable to use their individuality and their unique creativity. In this new world an elite can never control or suppress masspeople.

To reach this new world masspeople must develop a power that fundamentally differs from the power the elite uses in the present society to preserve its privileged position. Life of masspeople must be determined by their own autonomous creative ideas and activities and not anymore to a great height by rules of mass organisations that are in the end all dominated by members of a privileged elite. This can be accomplished by forming temporary alternating minorities of active, independent, involved and interested masspeople that exercise direct pressure on leaders. Decisions based on majorities must be replaced by decisions based on involved minorities.

The road to the future is unpredictable. Many small independent activities of autonomous people will undermine the existing social ordering that seems to be unassailable and eternal. But many small events can have big effects and a catastrophe will occur that will change society. After a chaotic period the present separated worlds of elite and mass will merge in one world for all people.

In the present elitist democracy the elite possesses much more power than the masses. The hierarchical organisation of society leads to top-down decisions in which the influence of lower-placed masspeople on higher-placed elitepeople is negligible. Democracies will never change into a different kind of society. What is up stays up, what is down stays down. When masspeople want a fundamental change it is useless to spend time and energy to improve the situation within the limits set by democratic rules. They should develop an own policy that is independent of any elite.

Taking part in elections is futile. In a new kind of society elections will not be necessary. Citizens can never judge in advance if specialists are capable enough so it can be trusted to experts to appoint specialists needed for our complicated society. In the present democracy most specialists are also not elected. Every citizen should however have the right and the possibility to interfere directly when specialists are not taking right decisions. Now the in between layer of elected representatives prevents direct interference of masspeople. One of the instrument is the division of the masses in two opposing parts based on the artificial contradiction between left and right. I am not left, I am not right, I am autonomous and I want a fundamentally different kind of society in which the principal contradiction between elite and mass is solved.

The purpose of any action is not to remove leaders and specialists but to influence their mind and their activities in such a way that all people benefit. This will be reached by using power that in the end always is based on a certain use of violence. Because citizen groups will be fairly small the violence used is not more than

Creative Disturbance of leaders that can be exerted on the time, the way and the place citizens determine without any interference from above. On the road towards this new society masspeople will get more freedom and autonomy.

By penetrating in the private living sphere of leading individuals elitist leaders will be forced to take into account the interest of all people and not as now in the first place the interest of the elite.

**But only when free and active masspeople use their independent individuality and creativity a new kind of society will come into being.**

**Joost van Steenis**

**May 2009**