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For two decades I have been committed to the defence of Direct Democracy and the Libyan Jamahiriya, regularly I get asked the question: “Why are you, European, interested in a revolution and a doctrine born in an Arab country?” Poor Europeans who have forgotten their history!

Because direct democracy is an old idea in Europe. Where it was in Greece, in the Rome of the Republic, or among the Germanic, Celtic or Slavic peoples, the original form of political organization. Citizens’ Assembly, free men, ready to take up arms and give their lives to defend the community.

Then, after the dark ages of feudalism and monar­chism, the peoples of Europe will remember this old idea and try tirelessly to revive Direct Democracy on the political scene. Let us remember the experiences of the second Commune of Paris in 1871, of the first Soviets or also of the socialist Yugoslavia of Tito. Everywhere the same idea: the government of the people by the people! And the municipality as basis of organization.

The first in modern times are the Jacobins of the First Commune of Paris, the heroic days of 1793 and Robespierre, the Incorruptible.

It will also be Muammar Gaddafi to give us the memo­ry of Robespierre. To mark the arrival of French President Chirac in Jamahiriya in 2004, the walls of Tripoli were covered with posters, incredible for the French, paying homage to the French Revolution, to 1793 and the Incorruptible.

Poor French who have forgotten their history!

Let us add that a few weeks ago, the Social Democrat mayor of Paris, the dreadful Delanoë, refused the name of Robespierre to be given to a Paris street. Involuntary homage of the Social Democrat Vice to the Jacobin Virtue!

Among the European experiences of direct democracy, there was also formerly Switzerland. I say “formerly”, because Switzerland was transformed into a parlia­mentary system and has nothing to do with the model that some would like still to find there. Two symbols: the Municipality, the basis of direct democracy in Switzerland yesterday, will soon be abolished! And the second, revealing what has become the Switzerland of the twenty-first century, which however is not a member of the NATO: Military Swiss participation in the aggres­sion and occupation of Afghanistan!

For us, European activists, the Jamahiriya of the “Green Book” is a pilot-experience that can’t be ignored! But our interest in the thought of Muammar Gaddafi does not stop there. We also welcome Gaddafi as a great European, who has always supported the unifica­tion and empowerment of the European continent, where he sees an essential part of a multipolar world, free from imperialist domination.

And whose pioneering vision already combines African and European unities. In this vision, Gaddafi conceives Libya as a bridge between Africa and Europe. We must emphasize how much that vision is different from that of Atlanticist politi­cians of the European Union who, they, do not build bridges, but erect the walls of a fortress. In Brussels or Strasbourg, these politicians as arrogant as incapable give lessons to the entire world. “Human rights, free movement, freedom” they tell us. But in reality these are the walls of a fortress that they put up! Schengen wall to the east that cuts Europe in two. Schengen barred wire also at the border between Morocco and Spain. And even within the European Union, two-tiered citizenship. Complete for the coun­tries of the old EEC. Limited rights for Bulgarians, Romanians or Poles...

Shameful treatment of the European peoples catego­rized in superior peoples in rights and peoples who are denied equal rights. Between 1933 and 1945 under the Nazi Reich it was not something else. But they said more bluntly ... “People of Lords” and “subhuman Slavs”!

The European Union also intends to make the Mediterranean a border, one more! The “Barcelona Process” or the “Euro-Mediterranean Partnership”, which Libya has refused to participate, has no other meaning. Given this vision, there is that of Muammar Gaddafi. Who sees the Mediterranean as a place of culture, of sharing and exchange. There too Gaddafi has the memory of the past. The one when the Mediterranean was a unity. Libya, who also remembers its Roman past, who knows Leptis Magna has given the Roman Empire emperors of the dynasty of Severus. European politicians have also forgotten! Yes, we European activists, we prefer to follow and lis­ten to Gaddafi, who wants to build bridges to unite than to politicians of the European Union, who build walls to separate!

But it is time to move from these theoretical con­siderations to practical action. Because we do not conceive the theory without praxis! Across Europe, the disillusionment was deeply installed. Not only because of the economic crisis, inequality and poverty that affects a growing part of the European masses. But also and most importantly because of the gap everyday larger between European peoples and politicians of the system and of corrupt bourgeois parliamentarism.

The time has come to offer our alternative! Direct Democracy is an idea of future in Europe! Europe is fertile ground and a mission land. But we must also fight the propaganda against Muammar Gaddafi and the Jamahiriya.

What we need in Europe is primarily organization and...
a realistic and serious work program. Let’s start by saying two important things, because they will serve to define our organization. The first: We no longer recognize the borders! Our action will be transnational. We need to think in continents (*) ...

The second: Europe is not confined to the European Union! Not even to states that are now associated, such as Moldova and Serbia. Russia, which regained its independence with Vladimir Putin, which is again a close ally of Libya, is also Europe! A SECOND EUROPE. ANOTHER Eurasian EUROPE stands now in Moscow in face of the Atlanticist Europe of Brussels. A second Europe (**), which draws to it several former Soviet republics. Russia has indeed established an aggregator process similar to the European Union, with unions around the transnational organizations that form around Moscow: Eurasian Economic Community (EAEC: Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan, Uzbekistan, Russia and Tajikistan), Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO of the Commonwealth of Independent States, military alliance of the type of the Warsaw Treaty Organization), Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO: Russia, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan, China, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan). Pakistan, Iran, India and Mongolia have observer status. China and Russia are playing key roles), Unified Economic Area (UEA: Russia, Belarus, Kazakhstan, Kirghizstan and Tajikistan).

We intend to unite all European delegations in a single network from Dublin to Vladivostok. With a coordinated program and a close collaboration of all for the common unitary project.

The European Network of the Association will be with a central European Coordination. We intend to use the experience gained in this area since 2004 with the Network MEDD-RCM, the “Movement for European Direct Democracy”, which already operates on a unified and integrated way within the French-speaking area, in France, Belgium and in Switzerland, but also in Moldova and Bulgaria. And which already has collaborated with numerous European delegations in Ukraine, Belarus and Serbia. Particularly, with a Liaison Bureau EU/Balkans/CIS, installed in Kishinev, where the MEDD-RCM also has a Franco-Russian Liaison Secretariat. Regarding the Brussels Centre, we already have our structure, a headquarters, websites, and a transnational and multilingual framework. And our Liaison Bureau in Kishinev, Moldova, which is already operational. Finally, we are already on social networks Facebook and Twitter, which serve as major element of coordination and information, not only for the European network, but also for the other continents. We intend to put our work at the forefront of technological progress and at the time of Web.2.0!

On the plan of activities, we want to act in two directions: On the one hand integration and collaboration of the managerial staff of the different delegations, training of members. On the other hand, the dissemination of our ideas to intellectual circles and the crystallization of an intellectual Network of support.

For the integration of the managerial staff, we will reinvigorate the organization of “Summer Universities of supporters of the Green Book”. For the record, since 2000, the MEDD-RCM organized “Summer Universities for the green, pacifist and alternative movements” in Hungary, Germany, France and two in Belgium. And several delegations led locally similar initiatives.

To disseminate our ideas, various actions will be taken. Starting first with a more massive action of the MEnD-RCM on the Net and the Social Networks. A Dutch statesman, William of Orange, once aptly stated: “Where there is a will there is a way” ... I call on all European delegates to demonstrate this commitment!

To conclude, I want to emphasize the essential relationship of the transition from theory to practice. To paraphrase the great philosopher Goethe, I would say that grey is the tree of the theory. And green, the tree of Praxis, the thought into action, the one that bears the fruit of the future.

In its conclusion of THE CAPITAL, Marx argued: “the time had come for philosophers to transform the world and not just think it” ...

That’s what Muammar Gaddafi did in Libya, building in the reality of the modern World the Jamahiriya, that Republic of Masses straight out of his “Green Book”. Muammar Gaddafi has shown us the path. The alternative to the old world, grey, gloomy and cold, of financial capitalism and corrupt bourgeois parliamentarism exists. This old world is dying; let’s help it to die!

For Direct Democracy!

For the Third Universal Theory and the “Green Book” of Muammar Gaddafi!

FORWARD!!!

By Luc MICHEL, President of the MEDD-RCM

Notes for the written version:

(*) I borrowed my title “Thinking in Continents” in the French version of the German book of geopolitics “Mut zur Macht. Denken in Kontinenten” of General Jorids von Lohausen. The Austrian general and geopolitical expert Lohausen (1907-2002), former member of the General Staff of Marshal Rommel, close to the anti-Nazi patriots of July 20’ 1944, follows on the geopolitical theories of Jean Thiriart, the father of the New Eurasian Geopolitic (also known in Russia as “Neo-Eurasism”), on “Europe from Vladivostok to Dublin”. He has written pages full of praise on the European project of Thiriart of the Years 1960-75. Lohausen talks notably of “Europe from Madrid to Vladivostok.” In the copy offered by Lohausen to Thiriart in 1983 (and which I was left with his library in 1999) contained the following dedication: “In respectful tribute to a great European.”

(**) I theorized the fundamental geopolitical concept of “Second Europe” about Putin’s regenerated Russia in our magazine LA CAUSE DES PEUPLES, Brussels, Paris, No. 31, December 2006. Text available at the PCN-NCP website, under the title “Why are we fighting for?": http://www.pcn-ncp.com/why/pourquoi1.htm
The RCM – Revolutionary Committees Movement – is a mass international organization, present in Africa, in Europe, in Americas and in Asia. Its seat is in Tripoli in Libya. The RCM gathers the partisans of the Direct democracy and its pilot experience, the Libyan Revolution. The RCM is present in 17 European countries, in the West as in the East.

THE FOUNDATION OF THE MEDD-RCM

From September 20 to 23 was held in Libya the IIIrd International Convention of the world “Movement of the Revolutionary Committees”, with the participation of several hundreds of coordinators of the RCM who came from the four continents. This convention pointed out the large axes of the fight of the RCM against imperialism, Zionism, neo-colonialism, liberal globalisation and exploitation. It also reaffirmed its support to Palestinian and Iraqi Resistances.

The third Convention insisted on the capital place of the European revolutionary Movement within the unitary quadricontinental Front of the people in fight for freedom and dignity. And it underlined the driving role of Muammar Gaddafi, with his conception of Libya as a bridge between the European Union and the African Union, in the advent of a united and peaceful Mediterranean. At the end of this IIIrd Convention, Luc MICHEL (*) received the responsibility, a new creation, of Coordinator-General of the RCM for Europe. With as priority mission the unification and the integration of all the Revolutionary Committees of Europe in a single, unitary and transnational network.

The Revolutionary Committee of the French-speaking Space, which gathers since 1997 on a transnational basis the RCM militants of Belgium, France and Switzerland, as well as the Arabs, Turks and Africans living in these countries, will be used as model within the new unitary Network.

The whole of the European Revolutionary Committees, which acted until now autonomously and under various names, will thus be constituted in only one organization, whose head office is installed in Brussels: the MEDD-RCM – “Mouvement Européen pour la Démocratie Directe” (in English: “Movement for the European Direct Democracy”).

The Internet site of the French-speaking Committee (www.medd.info) becomes the single site of the MEDD-RCM in Europe and will transform itself into a multilingual portal.

The head office of the MEDD-RCM will publish the connection bulletins: “DEMOCRATIE DIRECTE” in French and “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” in English!

THE DECLARATION-MANIFESTO OF THE MEDD-RCM

In its first Declaration-Manifesto of October 2004, the MEDD-RCM intended:
- to militate for the Direct Democracy as an alternative to the bankruptcy and corruption of the pseudo parliamentary democracy.
- to join again with the European roots of the direct democracy (Swiss experience, theory of incorruptible Robespierre in 1793, etc.) and to ensure their synergy with the modern pilot experience of direct democracy developed by the Libyan Revolution of Muammar Gaddafi,
- to fight for the Peoples’ Cause and particularly the unity of thought and action between the Revolutionaries of Africa and Europe.

THE PRESS GROUP OF THE MEDD-RCM

In March 2005 was issued the number 11 of “DIRECT DEMOCRACY”. With this number 11, which answers to the unification of the European Networks of the RCM in the unitarian structure of the MEDD-RCM, we started a new series of the European Mouthpiece of the “Revolutionary Committees”. And to the French-speaking edition “DEMOCRATIE DIRECTE” will be added henceforth a second transnational edition “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” (centered on English and Spanish).

The passage to the PDF digital format, which combines the advantages of the digital high circulation distribution with those of the old fashioned traditional printed publication, will give a new allure to our Transnational action and will offer a new tool of effective agitprop to our camp.

But the action of MEDD-RCM also requires the support and collaboration from multiple projects and media:
- THE PEOPLES’ CAUSE, newspaper co-published by the MEDD-RCM, Tribune of the Peoples and Movements in struggle against imperialism and exploitation.
- Since 2009, the MEDD-RCM is present on the global Social Networks.facebook with a page (www.facebook.com/medd.mcr) and Twitter, the site of micro-Blogging known worldwide (twitter.com/meddmcr).
- We are currently working in collaboration with the Peoples’ Cause, to create a militant training political school.

Our perspective is also, before all, Transnational and our fight is placed in the quadricontinental struggle for the Peoples’ Cause. The RCM is a great planetary and fraternal community. “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” is thus conceived also as the platform and the body of reflection of all the supporters of the alternative of the Era of masses.

We thus call the executives of the RCM of Africa, Asia and Latin America to take part in the writing of “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” and to forward to us regularly their contributions. Special thanks to our friend and comrade, Gilbert Rochetteau, of Tripoli, Panafriican militant, who was among the first to collaborate with our press and understand the importance and need for a transnational work.

MEDD-RCM AND CEREDD: A “THINK-TANK” FOR DIRECT DEMOCRACY IN EUROPE

The “European Centre for Study and Research on Direct Democracy” (Centre Européen de Recherches et d’Etudes sur la Démocratie Directe / CEREDD) was created in 1996 by the MEDD-RCM-RCM driven by Luc Michel and Fabrice BEAUR to have an analytical structure, reflection and proposals to put forward the concept of direct democracy as an alternative to the corrupt system of parliamentary Westerns.
The CEREDD also has a web page where you can download certain issues of LIBYA NEWS & FACTS and is also on the global social network Facebook.

**MEDD-RCM: THE ALTERNATIVE TO DIRECT DEMOCRACY MARCHING ON FOR ANOTHER EUROPE**

Our militant Community develops today its action in more than twenty European countries, the provinces of the Great European Nation, committed from Reykjavik to Vladivostok, in the decisive process which leads to its liberation and its unification.

The role of the European Revolutionary Movement, our role, of all of us, is to bring the key idea of direct Democracy in the European process of unification, conceived as an alternative to the bankruptcy of the “Western-style” parliamentary pseudo-democracy, of which corruption and inefficiency reveal each day more the true oligarchical and plutocratic nature.

In face of the temptation of the Europe-fortress, of egotistic and sterile withdrawal which is advocated by the upholders of liberalism and xenophobia, and against them, our role is also to defend the generous idea of fraternal Europe, extending the hand of friendship to the people of the four continents, solidary of Africa, Eurasia and the Middle East: the new Great Nation!

Accordingly, the defense of the Libyan Jamahirya, pilot experience of direct Democracy and bridge between Europe and Africa, linked by a Mediterranean Sea of peace and solidarity, the new Mare Nostrum, is at the same time a priority and an obviousness.

| Fabrice BEAUR, European Secretary-General of the MEDD-RCM. |

---

**Some participants for the First European Conference of the MEDD-RCM, in Wallonia (Belgium) on August 20-23’2005.** On the front center Fabrice BEAUR, Secretary-General of MEDD-RCM and on the right, Luc MICHEL, President of MEDD-RCM.

---

**THE “FIRST EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OF THE MEDD-RCM”**

Within the framework of the 5TH EUROPEAN SUMMER UNIVERSITY FOR ALTERNATIVE, GREEN AND PACIFIST MOVEMENTS- (WALLONIA, BELGIUM – JULY 27-31, 2005, the afternoon of July 30, was devoted to the “1st EUROPEAN CONFERENCE OF THE MEDD-RCM”, present in 17 countries of Europe. The Conference began with a work in committee of the Coordinators from MEDD-RCM, bringing together European delegates (from East and West) and Libyans, where were defined:

- on the one hand principles of organization and work of the MEDD-RCM;
- and on the other hand the great ideological axes of its action (which will be summarized in a “Manifesto for the Direct Democracy in Europe”).

The 1st Conference then continued in plenary session, opened with the "political and organisational Report" of Luc MICHEL, founder of the MEDD-RCM and coordinator-General of the RCM for Europe, entitled “The unitarian, eurasist and transnational vocation of MEDD-RCM”.

In a vigorous and militant speech, which strongly contrasted with the more academic tone of the work of the 5th Summer University, Luc MICHEL defined the main themes of the action of the new Pan-European Movement.

Fabrice BEAUR, assistant coordinator-General of the MEDD-RCM in charge of the Communication and Internet, then presented the Report “Communication-Internet-Media”. Significant topic since for a Pan-European movement present from Spain to Russia and Turkey, the media Complex envisaged - central Internet site – Digital press – Newsgroups – Radio-TV on line – will be the collective Organizer and the link of the MEDD-RCM.

The 1st Conference ended in various interventions of European and Libyan coordinators and many questions of the audience.

From Spain to Russia, the MEDD-RCM is moving!

---

**Luc MICHEL : “THE UNITARIAN, EURASIST AND TRANSNATIONAL VOCATION OF MEDD-RCM”**

Political and organisational Report

For the “1st European Conference of the MEDD-RCM”

- The Greater Europe from Reykjavik to Vladivostok is larger than the European Union and includes also the countries resulting from the late Soviet Union. The MEDD-RCM does not recognize any more borders in Europe, as Gaddafi does not recognize any more ones in Africa;
- The Direct Democracy is the only true and sincere alternative to the failure and the imposture of bourgeois parliamentarism in Europe;
- The defense and the promotion of the Libyan Jamahirya, pilot experiment of the Direct Democracy, is an essential priority;
- The Direct democracy is inseparable from Socialism and social Justice;
- The combat of Europe for its unity and its independence is an inseparable part of the fight for the Peoples’ Cause from the four continents;
- The African and European Unities are in particular interdependent and the Mediterranean – as also Gaddafi wants it who conceives Libya as a bridge between Africa and Europe – must become a Sea of peace and unity between the peoples of its two shores;
- Peace must be a top priority for the incipient century. It is necessary to outlaw the imperialist powers and in particular NATO which strikes three continents today.
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**The Direct Democracy in Europe:**

**Theories and Praxis**

An old idea which is the alternative of the 21st Century!

**I: OW TO DEFINE THE “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” IN THE 21st CENTURY?**

I am a militant involved in the spreading of the Alternative that is Direct Democracy in Europe. I am frequently confronted with an objection and a question - always the same - that reflect a fundamental misunderstanding of Direct Democracy and its long social and political history.

The question is: “Why Europeans are interested in the political theory of an African country like Libya?” The objection - which is included from the wording of the question - is: “Direct Democracy may be applicable in a small state like Jamahiriya. But it has no future in Europe.”

What an abysmally ignorance of the history of European peoples reflects these assertions!

**II: THE EUROPEAN SOURCES OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY**

As Luc MICHEL underlined it in his communication of introduction, “Direct Democracy is the true and original popular power form of the people”, direct democracy is the natural form of government of the European peoples.

Direct democracy rests on a basic concept, it is the mode of the responsible and committed nation which is ready to risk its life for the community. The sovereign people are people in arms. For the theorists of the direct democracy the armament of the people is a basic concept.

Let us recall the history of the Direct Democracy until the modern time:

In the antiquity and until the beginning of the European Middle-Age, direct democracy is the natural mode of government of the European populations, whether in Greece, in Rome, in the Celtic tribes, in the Germanic tribes. It is the assembly of the armed men which decides and which chooses the head. This form of government will exist in Europe until the time of Charlemagne i.e. until the eighth century. A constant phenomenon of direct democracy is that it finishes by being confiscated. At a given time, an oligarchy monopolizes the power and generally direct democracy is transformed into a monarchical or feudal system. In Europe for example starting from the eighth century, feudality is the degeneration of direct democracy. Why? Because they are always the men-at-arms who decide government, for example the king of France or the Germanic emperor is the first of the nobles of the Kingdom, but the problem is that the function of defense of the fatherland is monopolized by professional soldiers. Is there the Nobility in Europe?

Those who have the monopoly of defense. All the other categories of the population, those who do not fight any more, those who are not armed any more, that becomes subjected citizens, exploited, who do not have any more political rights. It is the phenomenon of oligarchies and it is already one can say an early Bonapartism since it is the monopolization of the government by the military.

**II-2: THE SWISS EXCEPTION**

Direct democracy will survive in only one state, after year 1000 it is precisely Switzerland. Switzerland escapes feudality, it is a whole of Cantons one could say now a whole of the municipalities (obviously the women are excluded from it, but in the majority of the societies of antiquity the woman is regarded neither as a full citizen nor even like an active member of the community, the woman is often regarded as an object, goods or a minor). In Switzerland, to have the right to vote, make decisions, one returns to the concept of armed people, it is necessary to submit to the assembly of citizens with a weapon, it should be proven that one is ready to defend the fatherland. It should not be believed that the Swiss system will last until the current time. It is a degeneration and it will be transformed into a semi-feudal system quickly. But the Swiss, at the end of an evolution, quickly as soon as feudality will be cut down in 1789, will remember their experiences and will go back to a partial system of direct democracy which is a model in Europe.

For certain European theorists of the modern direct democracy like Jean Thiriart, Switzerland is in Europe the only state which can say that it has a democratic legitimacy; Switzerland is the only country in Europe – with in modern age Yugoslavia of Tito and socialist Albania - where the people is armed it is the only state in the world, because even Libya did not adopt this system, where the citizens have their armament of war on their premises including the heavy armament, the Swiss have at home their rifles of attack, the armament and for some heavy machine guns.

**II-3 : THE FALL AND THE DEGENERATION OF THE SWISS MODEL:**

**HOW THE BOURJOIS PARLIAMENTARISM DENATURES, CORRUPTS AND KILLS DIRECT DEMOCRACY!**

But Switzerland is far from being an exemplary model, especially because its Direct Democracy is polluted with bourgeois parliamentarism.

“The infinite slow of parliamentary debates in Switzerland” was denounced by the Geneva daily “Le Temps” (Tuesday, 7 March 2008) which reported a book by a pamphleteer which broke the myth of a model Swiss Democracy: “Politics? Reduced to “a pitiful helpless.” Federal and cantonal parliaments? Immersed in “vain and futile gestures.”

In a book entitled “LE BAL DES EUNUQUES”, (Ed. Slatkine, Switzerland, 2006), Geneva liberal MP Renaud GAUTIER and journalist Pascal PRAPLAN draw up a report for the least severe of the Swiss political life.

**II-4: 1793 AND 1871:**

**THE FIRST AND SECOND “COMMUNE” OF PARIS**

One will re-examine the idea of direct democracy to reappear with the destruction of feudality. In 1793, the French revolution arrives at its paroxysm. A fraction which is at the time the most progressist, the Jacobins, arrive at power with Robespierre. Robespierre, in particular in the first Commune of Paris in 1792-1793, founds and speaks about direct democracy Robespierre contrary with all the remainder of the process of the French revolution in 1789 refuses the principle of the parliamentary delegation. The experience is very quickly fallen through since Robespierre underwent a coup d’etat and was executed.

At the time, there is a fraction even more radical: the Babouvists. They are the followers of Grachus Babeuf, whom Marx or Lenin regarded as the first Communists. They want the integral direct democracy according to a mode which reminds enough that of the Libyan Jamahiriya. It is known that for Muammar GADDAFI, 1793 is the great reference. When French president Jacques Chirac went to Libya the previous year, Tripoli was covered with posters doing the parallel between the French revolution and the Libyan revolution and GADDAFI said “our revolution is the following stage, the result of yours”.

The idea of direct democracy will precisely survive thanks to the teaching of the Babouvists. In 1870, it is
the war between Prussia and France, and the bourgeois regime which is that of Napoleon III, breaks down. One sees in Paris a popular insurrection which creates a self-government, the Commune of Paris (the second), which will last a little more than one year before being crushed by the armies of the bourgeoisie and this government is controlled by a mode of people's democracy; it is significant because it is the first time in modern age that the direct democracy will be actually applied.

II-5: THE SOVIETS: DIRECT DEMOCRACY AND LENINIST PARTY

The experience of the Commune of Paris is very significant because one is unaware of it too often that it is from it that will be conceived the concept of “Soviet” in Russia, you know that for the Russian revolutionaries, who called themselves Marxists, the true reference is the Jacobinism and the French revolution. And the form of direct democracy which is practised in the commune of Paris will be applied to the Soviets. When do the Soviets appear? During the first Russian revolution of 1905. The people rises up against tsarism and set up a system of direct democracy which is defended by workers militia. The problem is that the revolutionaries are divided and that the army contrary with what to occur in 1917 does not topple over on their side. The tsarist power thus will crush the Soviets. Comes 1917. And in 1917 when the tsarist power breaks down it is a liberal and bourgeois republic which founds a system of multipartism: the duma; but parallel to this bourgeois revolution there is a self-organization of the people, and one sees the Soviets reappearing. A party, which is the Bolshevik Party, decides to lean on the Soviets in order to pass to a revolution which is not bourgeois any more but popular, it is this party which carries it but which carries it under the conditions of a civil war and a foreign intervention. At the time there are French, American, Japanese, British armies which are present on the Russian ground to crush the revolution, there are armies against the revolutionaries; at a time given for example the Bolshevik power controls only Petrograd and a small zone of approximately a thousand kilometers around Moscow.

When the Soviet experience is studied, we have in the West a distorted vision. Why? Criticism, the historical study that one makes in the bourgeois world that one makes in the bourgeois world of the Bolshevik revolution it is based in fact on an analysis, that of Leon Trotsky. In the years the 1922-1928 conflict exists between Trotsky and Stalin. Trotsky loses, he is exiled and to explain his defeat produces a book of propaganda against the Soviet regime which is entitled “THE CONFISCATED REVOLUTION”. The great idea that one finds in the bourgeois media is to topple over on their side. It is not exact. What Stalinism liquidates is the multiparty system. But in the remainder of the organization, i.e. the government of the municipalities, the application of justice, remains the forms of direct democracy, that of the Soviets it is for example under Stalin that will be set up the Soviet system of justice which will be used as model to the Libyan one, the Soviet system of justice is a system of direct democracy, it does not have (or little) professional magistrates for example, they are magistrates elected in the people.

II-6: JEAN THIART AND THE “EUROPEAN COMMUNITARIANISM”: A RADICAL CRITICISM OF PARTYCRACY AND BOURGEOIS PARLIAMENTARISM

The years pass and in modern age, it is necessary to wait the Sixties to see re-appearing the idea of direct democracy. Between 1960 and 1966, Jean Thiriat the founder and the first theorist of European Communitarianism thinks on a criticism of the parliamentary democracy and the solutions, with the alternatives to be applied to it. In a fundamental editorial, entitled “Armed citizens and disarmed voters” (published in “LA NATION EUROFEENNE” (November 1968), he summarizes his thoughts on the subject, where returns the key concept of “armed people”.

Thiriat indeed particularly opposed the “disarmed voters to the armed citizens” and makes of the arming of citizens - a key concept of Direct Democracy - the center of his reflections: “Periodically returns to the public in the United States, nation-beacon of liberal democracy, the debate over free trade in firearms. Here in Europe, the debate never even occurred. People who deplore the open sale of weapons, quite involuntarily, recognized the state of immaturity of the populations they are also, by the “ELECTION RELIGION”, the source of political legitimacy. How can they support, at the same time that the American “people” is adult in subjects of election and childish for weapons? It is obvious that a man sane, balanced, WELL INTEGRATED in his social group or national group, without the slightest inconvenience can own a gun or a bazooka at home. Switzerland, in this respect, gives us the example. Every Swiss soldier has at home, permanently, in peacetime, his personal endowment of weapons of war. They slaughter in Switzerland far less, far less than in countries like Belgium or France, where gun ownership is severely limited.”

Now for the principles. Thiriat developed. Thiriat distinguishes Citizen and voter: “A voter is not a citizen. In the high conception of the concept of the citizen is understood the mutual commitment between the individual and the State, between the individual and the Republic - between the individual and the king - in a word, between the individual and the representation of the time of sovereignty. A pact binds the man who receives the protection of the State - including the guarantee of certain freedoms - and the State must rely on this same man to defend himself from the outside. This elementary evidence was well known in ancient Europe, where only was free a man capable of bearing arms: physically and legally capable.

Initially only voted the individual capable of participating in the defense of the community. The first “ballots” were spears and swords. So much so that very late, until the late Middle Ages, in several regions of northern Europe - Switzerland in particular - people had to report at meetings armed, people had to DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY OWNED A GUN. The degeneration of the principle of POPULAR CONSENT - we purposely avoid the adulterated and debased term “democracy” - is particularly the fact that at some point the “citizen” had to say amen from time to time for a measure of wheat, - in Rome already - against demagogic promises now, and nobody asked him absolutely to participate in the defense of the community. In fact, the modern voter is an absolutely degenerated version of the free man of the past. Today we will refrain from criticizing the principle of legitimacy of a majority - 51% of a given group can decide to eat raw the 49% - to apply ourselves only to the phenomenon of CONSENT. The phenomenon of consent was originally very real: a king actually asserted himself by the consent, he was the leader of free men, armed men. Today, no democratic head of State can say that. First, we make a public opinion by well known means of conditioning, but this opinion having been acquired, we do not trust the “people” and must rely on a political police and gendarmes. A power that REALLY has the consent of the people should not be afraid to distribute weapons. Few countries meet these criteria today. Switzerland is virtually the only country where power can say it does not fear its people: in Switzerland, over 500,000 most modern automatic rifles are carefully stored in closets and cabinets of citizens.”

Thiriat raises the problem of the people’s maturity, for him the Direct Democracy rests on informed and responsible citizens; “After discussing the issue of CONSENT, let us now see that of maturity. It appears that if one fears to entrust weapons to citizens, this means that one doubts of their maturity. Indeed, we would not trust a gun to a kid of 14, or a paranoid, or neurotic, or insane. Being afraid to entrust a weapon to a citizen, it is clearly to recognize that this citizen is still a child, or is a fanatic. A little consistent logic with itself that simultaneously on one hand we do not recognize the condition of BALANCED ADULT to every man when it comes to weapons and that we recognizes this condition of balanced adult when it is to secure his vote.
Indeed, we can not give arms to the people as a result of a demagogic phenomenon created by the ABSOLUTE NEED FOR ONE UPMAINSHP the need to create frustration, the need to create civil hatred for parties to live inside of a nation. Prior to the vote, they must be somewhat excited (,...)

We see here the influence of the thought of Rousseau and Robespierre on THIRIART the famous “right to revolt against the arbitrary.” When the government violates the rights of the people, insurrection is for the people the most sacred and most indispensable of duties,” said Robespierre!

Caustic critic of bourgeois parliamentarism, THIRIART denotes what he calls “ELECTION THEOLOGY.” For nearly two centuries, the authority derives its justification from the “PEOPLE’S WILL.” You will notice the quotation marks. Previously, power came from God. In both cases, it is metaphysics, theology. Everyone knows how popular will, now called public opinion is made, blunt fake, abused by the thirty six means of classic fraud of the different parliamentarisms. For centuries, power is justified by the mere invocation of the divine source. Today, another theology took its place, another fiction: the “public opinion”.

So the coronation of the kings of France was replaced by the consecration of the ballots. Those who hold the votes and those who benefit generally do not have direct responsibility for their actions. A journalist can with impunity see the civil hatred, wishes external wars under form of ideological crusades, give its backing to the colonial wars imposed by the occupation: he does not risk anything, he should never steer her typewriter against a gun- former. Formerly, in these “barbarians’ times”, those who voted for the war did it and those who demanded to undertake it, took the risk in taking the lead.

The opinion of a man has value only to certain specified conditions, including being informed, inseparable from being intellectually capable to receive and understand the information, being coordinated, being committed (to be “accountable”).

For THIRIART, “A voter is not necessarily a citizen. He is even very rarely. An armed people is made up of citizens who are citizens every day. A disarmed people the most sacred and most indispensable of duties,” said Robespierre!

III-1: MUAMMAR GADDAFI
AND THE “THIRD UNIVERSAL THEORY”: DIRECT DEMOCRACY FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

On September 1, 1969, it is the Libyan Revolution and between 1969 and 1976 is set up the Jamahiriya, in modern times the only experience of direct democracy which is integral and has survived. MUAMMAR GADDAFI is also a theorist, the one of the GREEN BOOK and the “Third Universal Theory.”

This is not a sign of demagoguery to say that the “Third Universal Theory” applied in Libya is a practical example of DIRECT DEMOCRACY that deserves our attention in order to define an alternative within our European societies.

The “Third Universal Theory” does not rely on the parliamentary dialectic (jargon), but on a practical reality, which gives man another dimension than the cathode and consumerist bliss. The participation of all in true citizens is the key structure of this revolutionary socialism with a human face!

Carefully analyzed, the “Third Universal Theory” of Muammar GADDAFI has considerable potential. The “Third Universal Theory”, politically realistic and pragmatic, has the merit of having analyzed the concepts of the French Revolution of 1789, the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 and the various social and socialist movements of the nineteenth and twentieth century.

III-2: THE INTERNATIONAL INFLUENCE OF THE “THIRD UNIVERSAL THEORY”

The extent of participation in international symposiums devoted to the thought of Muammar GADDAFI (the largest held in Madrid and Caracas in the early 80) highlights the international influence of the “Third Universal Theory”.

Thus, the system of Direct Democracy put in place for 3 years, step by step, by Hugo CHAVEZ, a close ally of GADDAFI, in Venezuela to strengthen his “Bolivarian Revolution” is inspired directly from the Libyan experience.

III-3: THE LIBYAN VERSION OF “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” SEEN FROM EUROPE: A PILOT EXPERIENCE

How was implemented Direct Democracy in its “Jamahiriya” version? Its steps inform both its revolutionary process and its ideological foundations.

“The trajectory of the Libyan regime since 1969 can be regarded as a constantly renewed attempt of revolution from the top to promote the government from below, ie the direct government of the people, by the people, for the people.”

From an institutional perspective, it is possible to distinguish five phases in this kind of permanent revolution from the top:

- First phase, Arab nationalism:
  Until 1973, the regime, which harbored the intention of the union with the Egyptian neighbor, wanted to follow the model of the Arab Republic of Egypt. The Provisional Constitution of the “Libyan Arab Republic” (LAR) proclaimed the sovereignty of the people and entrusted the exercise of power to a collegial body, the “Command Council of the Revolution” (CCR), itself assisted by a Government under its control. During this period, the “revolution”, through the CCR, endowed the people of a single party on the Egyptian model, the Arab Socialist Union (1971), and offered the possibility of direct contacts with the rulers, “real happening where the crowd questioned the head of State or ministers who answered questions as well as interruptions.”

- Second phase: the Cultural Revolution:
  On April 15, 1973, when the union proclaimed between the LAR and Egypt (August 1972) went unheeded, a speech by Colonel GADDAFI in Zuara expressed and aroused the tensions within the CCR as noticeable since December 1969.
  Like MAO and the Chinese Cultural Revolution, the Colonel called for “people’s revolution.” He particularly wanted to transform the people’s committees into “people’s committees” to fight against bureaucracy (removal of administrative officials, occupation of radio and television stations ...)

- Third phase: the Power of the People:
  This new phase, whose orientations have been recorded in the first volume of the GREEN BOOK published in September 1976 by GADDAFI saw, during the Congress of Sebha in March 1977, the advent of the Jamahiriya. The way was thus open to a revival of the revolution from the top to the government from below, advocated by the Colonel. This will be, revolution in the Revolution, the “establishment of people’s power” on March 2, 1977.

Fourth phase: the “Revolutionary Committees”
But the lack of organized support for this Revolution led to the creation of “REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEES”!

“From 1979, year of the abolition of the Command Council of the Revolution, a new impetus was given to the revolution by the top with the development of “revolutionary committees”, originally created to “facilitate” the establishment of the system of people’s congresses and committees. The “revolutionary committees”, whose members are co-opted from the unconditional supporters of the colonel, lack of formal powers but guide the exercise of the “people’s power”. Muammar GADDAFI defines their role: “It is up to the people’s revolution to destroy the traditional instruments of power, the role of the revolutionary committees being to push for this revolution. The Revolutionary Committees are the melting pot in which the revolutionary forces are found and organized. Their job is completely different from the political organizations that preceded them in history and which campaigned to take power instead of the masses. The Revolutionary Committees are a unique strength in its kind, in that they do not propose to take power but to encourage the masses to make revolution to take power themselves and exercise ad vitam eternam.”

- Fifth phase: “Jamahiriya Socialism”
  Finally, “This revolution from the top making a reconciliation between the State and a-statism has found its principle of unity in “socialism”, in egalitarianism that may avail itself of Islam and eliminate disparities between regions . At its various stages of development, the regime has sought to maximize the distribution capacity that allowed the oil revenues. It was from this point of view, it reaches its climax when, with the release of the second volume of the GREEN BOOK in 1978, private property and wage labor were abolished and the economy state-controlled.”

III-4: THE JACOBIN ROOTS
OF THE LIBYAN DIRECT DEMOCRACY:
FROM ROBESPIERRE TO GADDAFI

The Libyan Direct Democracy largely mirrors the experience of the Direct Democracy in the First Commune of Paris (1792-1794) and of the Committee of State Security. References are public and many in the revolutionary government of Robespierre. To mark the arrival of French President Chirac in Jamahiriya in 2004, the walls of Tripoli were covered with posters, incredible for the French, paying tribute to the French Revolution, to 1789 and the Incomparable Robespierre.

The role played by Muammar GADDAFI in the Libyan institutional system corresponds closely - what nobody seemed to see before me among the analysts of the Libyan system - to that played by ROBESPIERRE between the Paris Commune and its sections, the Committee of Public Safety and the Committee of State Security. At once inspirer and ideologist, spokesman and supreme arbiter.

For whom is familiar with the Libyan system and its actual operation, the presentation by Francois Furet (in PETAIN, A REVOLUTION FRANCAISE (THINK THE FRENCH REVOLUTION)) of the role of Robespierre in power from 1793 to Thermidor makes invariably think to
that played by Gaddafi, the Leader of the Revolution in Libya:

“He carries an extraordinary syncretism between the two democratic legacies. Like some Jacobins (...).

He alone has mysteriously reconceived direct democracy and the principle of direct representation, settling in at the top of a pyramid of equivalences which word guarantees, day after day, the continuation. He is the people in the sections, the people at the Jacobins, the people in the national representation; and it is that transparency between the people and all the places where one speaks in his name - starting with the Convention - that must be constantly established, 

controlled, as the condition of the legitimacy of power, but also as his first duty.

He claimed to adhere to Islam but claimed to reform it by denouncing its interpretation by the retrograde intermediaries, and more, he worked in favor of State autonomy, the political references to Islam mostly being in the Sunnah.

His vision is there also neo-jacobine, of an Arab form of secularism in fine. One of many observers of the Jamahiriya, Alain LELUC spoke in GEO magazine of “a socialism between Marx and Allah.” Let us hear an Arab voice - identifying the Arabs to Islam, as will also do the ba’athist theorist (Syrian Greek Orthodox) Michel AFLAK - to socialism, where Islam plays the role of national and cultural referent.

In a process reminiscent of the role of the Russian Nation (also with the use of Orthodoxy) in the Russian-Soviet “National Bolshevism” of STALIN in the Years 1941-45.

Socialism which means “building a modern nation around citizens become ‘revolutionary producers’ from a command economy”, writes Alain LELUC. It sounds like much more Jean THIRIART than MARX ...

As for “Allah”, the religion, as ferment of the Arab identity, is put at the service of the Jamahiriya and its political and social project.

III-5: FROM THE PARIS SECTION MOVEMENT OF 1792-94 TO THE LIBYAN “REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEES”

The influence of Robespierre and the first Paris Commune also appears in the role and functioning of the “Revolutionary Committees”, which is clearly in line with the Paris section movement of 1792-94.

“Who will drive the masses to seize power and achieve their own political, economic and social goals? Who will defend the new regime?” questioned GADDAFI himself.

The “revolutionary Committees”, whose members are co-opted from the unconditional supporters of the colonel, lack of formal powers but guide the exercise of the “people’s power”. In fact controlling the workings of the “people’s” authorities and the “permanent revolutionary court”, they act as “watchdogs of the revolution”, according to hostile observers to Jamahiriya (Burgat, Hinnebusch).

As under the Jacobin regime of 1792-1794, the self-purge is an important renewal. So in 1966, in the context of the U.S. bombing of Tripoli aiming at the person of GADDAFI (and presumably coordinated to a failed coup according to some observers), the revolutionary committees have been the subject of a purge.

The colonel, writing in the weekly of these committees, denounced the confiscation of power by a “party” and called to the formation of a “party” to eradicating this “cancer” and to make “a qualitative leap, a new revolutionary transformation.” Similarly, a movement against the bureaucracy and the adoption of bourgeois attitudes of the staff of the “revolutionary committees” was completed in 2002-2003.

III-6: JAMAHIRIYA AND THE “EUROPEAN COMMUNITARIANISM”

GADDAFI, as did Jean THIRIART and in closely similar terms, emphasizes the role of arming the people in the construction of Direct Democracy in Libya: “On the other hand, it is the people who defends the new regime. When it had the power, the capitalist class had created an army to protect itself, security forces to ensure its domination. At its advent, bureaucratic capitalism has done the same. But under the power of the people, it is up to each individual to bear arms to defend his own power. Insofar as the people as a whole and has, is the people as a whole who must defend its power and wealth and thus power, wealth and weapons will be in the hands of the people.”

Like Jean THIRIART again, GADDAFI opposes radically the People’s Power to Parliamentarism - unlike, and we will come back to it, the “minimalist” supporters of Direct Democracy designed as an adjunct to the bourgeois regime - which they announce the end of. During his visit to Brussels in May 2004, Muamar GADDAFI ended his speech to the Belgian Parliament by a text explanation of the Libyan Jamahiriya, presented as a pilot experience of direct popular democracy. First having fun with this contemptuous conceit, typical of Western politicians, MPs and senators remained somewhat taken aback when he deftly characterized the representative system of “sham” and predicted with a smile that one day “the people will sit in your place.”

In an artificial country like Belgium, product of imperialism of the nineteenth century, with no national or popular legitimacy, these words rang like a disturbing prophecy to the ears of the Belgian patriarchy. In Belgium, where the political class has totally locked the political life, prohibiting any emergence of new forces, the crisis of the pseudo-western parliamentary democracy - in fact a plutocracy based on the monopoly of the media and confiscation of the state - is particularly advanced. And Direct democracy, is an alternative. These words of the Libyan leader have obviously been overshadowed by the media to orders IV- FROM THEORY TO PRAxis: THE OTHER EXPERIENCES OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY

At the same time as the Libyan Revolution, there are two other experiences of partial direct democracy. Besides the municipal self-management of TITO’s Yugoslavia.

IV-1: THE YUGOSLAV MUNICIPAL SELF-MANAGEMENT

It is most often overlooked, but the Yugoslav self-management developed under the leadership of Tito was also a great experiment of direct democracy, organized on the basis of the municipalities.

In 1950, the main theoreticians of the regime, KARDELJ, said: “The development of socialism cannot borrow another way than a constant deepening of socialist democracy in the sense of an ever-increasing autonomy of the popular masses”. KARDELJ added, in a language that announces THIRIART and GADDAFI, “We must explain to people, not control but to explain over and over. To order the people is worthless.”

“It is the self-management that characterizes the” Yugoslav way “to socialism.” On the other hand, Yugoslavia remained a one-party state where political and ideological monopoly continues to belong to the Communists. The regime also points out periodically that the principles on which it is founded are always those of Marxism-Leninism. “Since 1949, the Party insisted on its role as guide, education of the masses. To symbolize this change, it changed its name in its fourth congress in 1952: from the League of Communists of Yugoslavia. Its statutes give it aims to “develop the initiative of the masses for their wider participation in economic, social and political life of the country and control of the activities of organizations and social institutions of economic bodies and State bodies, but also to “act to ensure that decisions of the social organs are taken in the spirit of socialism and to actively fight the anti-socialist ideas and processes.”

Yet self-management is a reality in Yugoslavia! What is only paradoxical for the eye of bourgeois parliamentarism, which abusively aims to identify multiparty system and real democracy. “The country is divided into socio-political communities. It means not only a form of decentralized State power (eg, the power held by the elected municipal assembly, in a range of areas), but still the framework of the whole of self-management in a given territory. The recent abolition of the districts, whose powers had already been severely limited in the ‘90s, has strengthened the autonomy of municipalities and public pressure, such as it is expressed through the press, radio and television, and suggests that the solution of all problems depends of it.” We can roughly distinguish over twenty years, three main steps:

- The first is a period of trial and error during which, from 1949 to 1953 (when the Constitution was promulgated), worked out the outline of a self-management whose base is the municipality which overlap the district, the Republic and the Federation.

- From 1960-1961 began what has been called “the second Yugoslav revolution”: the new economic reform, prepared from 1961, approved in 1964-1965, takes a part of the economic management from the municipalities and passed it to the business: the profit motive prevails, a new Constitution was developed in parallel in 1963.

- From 1966 to the mid-80s (which promises to be the breakdown of Tito’s system), they discuss in particular the reshaping of the federal organization.

One last point yet! A French sociologist, A. MEISTER, conducted in 1960, about fifty kilometers from Belgrade, an investigation into the methods and problems of self-management, most of which is mentioned in SOCIALISM AND SELF-MANAGEMENT: THE YUGOSLAV EXPERIENCE (1964). Important book that guides very strongly - in terms of concepts and terms used - the economic theories of Jean THIRIART outlining the “definition of national-European Communitarianism” in LA GRANDE NATION, L’EUROPE UNITAIRE (THE GREAT NATION, UNITARIAN EUROPE) in 1965 (as shown in the annotated copy of his hand that was presented to me with his political library on the death of his wife in 1999).

IV-2: THE ELEMENTS OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY IN THE BA’ATHIST EXPERIENCE IN IRAQ

The first is that of ba’athist Iraq of Saddam Hussein. The BA’ATH is an pan-Arab revolutionary nationalist party, at power in Syria in 1965 and after in Iraq in 1968, since then, a rivalry opposing the ba’athist leaderships of Baghdad and Damascus is the great rival of Nasser, since then, a rivalry opposing the ba’athist leaderships of Baghdad and Damascus. It is the great rival of Nasser, since then, a rivalry opposing the ba’athist leaderships of Baghdad and Damascus. It is the great rival of Nasser, since then, a rivalry opposing the ba’athist leaderships of Baghdad and Damascus.
the beginning Ba'ath intends to replace the multiparty system by a political system of national front, it is a political system which copies the system which is founded in the German Democratic Republic, in East Germany, since 1948. What is this system? One accepts the existence of a series of parties said progressist around a leading party; in Germany, it is the SED, the Communist Party, in Iraq and Syria it is the Ba'aath of course. And these parties gather on a list known as national front to form the government. It is the system which will function in East Germany, Hungary or Bulgaria, until the fall of the Soviet block. It is still today the system which controls another ba'athi system, which is the Syrian Ba'aath.

In Iraq the things will not go off all right and since 1972, the regime will look at how to replace the progressist parties directly by the people in this national front. And ‘people’s congresses’ will be set up in Iraq, the same name as in Libya, which for example managed the Iraqi municipalities until the American-Zionist invasion of 2003.

IV-3: “PEOPLE’S POWER” AND “REVOLUTIONARY COMMITTEES” IN SOCIALIST ALBANIA

There is another experience at the same time, that of socialist Albania of Enver Hoxha. A symposium called “PEOPLE’S POWER” lengthily approached in March 1981 in Paris the comparisons between Albania and Libya. In Albania there is a leading Communist Party, that’s the difference with Libya, but for the remainder, the system functions according to what they call worker’s control which is a form of Direct Democracy, i.e. that all the country is organized with committees which are called the revolutionary committees with elected workers, who direct the factories, who direct the municipalities and who have a right of criticisms on the party. A concept that the Albanians introduce, which is interesting, is the rotation of the leaders, periodically. Nobody in Albania remains more than 5 years at a post. When somebody had got a post as important leader, plant manager, ambassador, minister, after 5 years he must obligatorily go to work again at the base.

V: THE “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” IN EUROPE OF THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

V-1: THE SUPPORTERS OF “DIRECT DEMOCRACY” IN EUROPE OF THE 21ST CENTURY: MAXIMALISTS AND MINIMALISTS

There are in fact three distinct camps among those who proclaim themselves of Direct democracy in today’s Europe:

- The MAXIMALISTS of MEDD-RCM, supporters of the liquidation of bourgeois Parliamentarism, related to the Libyan “Revolutionary Committees” (RCM), who claim both THIRIART and GADDAFI, and see in the Jamaïhriya a pilot experience.

- An anarchist tendency, coming from the anarchist current of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century (including from the bloody adventure of Nestor MAKHNO in Ukraine of the years 1917-1920, where an anarchist armed power opposes sharply with the Bolshevik), which sees in the anarchist version of Direct Democracy a tool for the destruction of the State. Louder than organized in the Years 1975-90, this current is now insignificant.

- Finally the MINIMALIST supporters of a sort of “Direct Democracy” conceived as an adjunct and lifeline of bourgeois Parliamentarism. These include supporters of pseudo “participative democracy” as Ségolène ROYAL in France, inspired by the theories tested in Brazil by Trotskists (from which comes the current President LULA DA SILVA), especially in Porto Alegre with its “participating budget”. The European Social Democracy fallen off in France and Belgium has seized falsely innovative concepts, assisted by senior Trotskyists who traditionally recycle since the 30s in social democratic notables. We also find among the Minimalists supporters of the Swiss model of bourgeois Direct Democracy, which dissolves slowly but surely in the Parliamentary system.

Note however that under the influence of the NEO-JACOBIN THEORIES of Jean THIRIART, who wanted to make of the unitarian and communitarian Europe the second “GREATER NATION”, the Maximalists of MEDD-RCM intend to introduce Direct Democracy in and by means of a Grand European State. And always following THIRIART fruitful theorist, who is also the father of the MODERN NEO-EURASIST THESSES (“Greater Europe, from Vladivostok to Reykjavik”), the MEDD-RCM acts within the Eurasian framework.

The radical followers of Direct Democracy are gathered in the MEDD-RCM – the Movement for a European Direct Democracy - which particularly intends “to militate for the Direct democracy as an alternative to the bankruptcy and the corruption of the pseudo parliamentary democracy ”, “to join again with the European roots of direct democracy (Swiss experience, theory of incorruptible Robespierre in 1793, etc.)” and “to ensure their synergy with the modern pilot experience of direct democracy developed by the Libyan Revolution ”.

V-2: WHAT TO THINK OF THE “PARTICIPATIVE DEMOCRACY”?

Electoral gadget and caricature of the true Direct Democracy, the pseudo “participative democracy” advocated by the bourgeois social democrat candidate - the French Socialist Party, like its European followers is anything but “socialist” - Ségolène ROYAL. In an article entitled “When the SP addresses the limited participative debates”, LE FIGARO (January 29, 2007) glanced thought on what amounts to political manipulation, “By emphasizing citizens’ top experts they live, “the Socialist candidate intends to put together a program closer to their concerns.” Far away from favouring the people’s expression, the social-democrat candidate uses it cynically to assure her power on the Socialist Party.
The origin of this pseudo-democratic theatricals is the experience of the Trotskysists of the municipality of Porto Alegre in Brazil and especially in the view of ROYAL, "La Fabbrica del programma" of Romano PRODI in Italy.

And "LE FIGARO" to recall the close ties of the process with the "media-cray", final stage of bourgeois parliamentarism, which the bourgeois Italy of the twin- rivals BERLUSCONI-PRODI instigated. The reference in the matter is the successful campaign of Romano Prodi, called "LA FABBRICA DEL PROGRAMMA". As in radio phone-in shows, everyone comes to defend his point of view: the organic farmer advocates organic farming, the opponent to nuclear power is opposed to nuclear, the ill-housed demands a housing and the battered woman an improvement of the lot of battered women".

VI: THE TWILIGHT OF BOURGEOIS PARLIAMENTS AND PARTIES IN EUROPE

VI-1: THE IMPASE OF BOURGEOIS PARLAMENTARISM:
THE CONCEPT OF "COUNTER-DEMOCRACY"

What remains, then, of the democratic pretensions of bourgeois Parliamentarism?
"Democracy is weakened but lives, elsewhere," says LE TEMPS (Geneva, October 5, 2006), introducing LA CONTRE-DÉMOCRATIE (THE COUNTER-DEMOCRACY) (Seuil, Paris, 2007), the book by Pierre Rosanvallon, who is interested in the archipelago of initiatives and reflexes of civil society, rich content, disturbing too. Note the role played in a Swiss newspaper in the debates on Democracy.

LE TEMPS (October 5, 2006) summarizes an essential book for whom intends to prepare the indictment of the bourgeois system, "Democracy is being eroded, it has lost its luster, its magic: On this theme of disenchantment, ... everything has been said in recent years, loss of confidence of the citizens in their leaders, abstention, civic passivity.

Many studies have already dealt with electoral and representativeness. Professor at the Collège de France, Pierre Rosanvallon approaches the subject from another side. He notes that parliamentary democracy has never ceased to be both a problem and a solution, because shared between the legitimacy of the rulers and the distrust of the citizens.

In this study, in a very university tone, the author refuses the ordinary laments on the political decadence. He applies to a closer look at the countless manifestations of distrust, where citizens take to the streets, demonstrate, rally - violently sometimes - against their elites, outside the regular institutional mechanism. Approach all the more original and revealing because operating a back-and-forth between the institutional experiences of the past and the picture, often disturbing, of the present, where civil society feels remote from power.

The author defines the key concept of "COUNTER-DEMOCRACY": "In the nebula of behaviors and initiatives that he calls the "counter-democracy", Rosanvallon discerns three postures. That of initiatives that he calls the "counter-democracy", Neomachiavellian theorists draw our attention to an apparent in the U.S. procedure of recall and impeachment".

This decentering of democratic life - alive, undoubtedly - away from parties and institutions, is not without risks: "The fall of the Berlin Wall, in particular, has resulted in making dull the ideological antagonisms. It transferred the attention of voters to the actors themselves (rather than to their programs). This situation also feeds the spirit of rejection, more than adherence to projects. So, it is primarily aimed at punishing the outgoing deputies, more than to vote for candidates. Adding to it, a whole space of political abandonment and indifference, no less disturbing. The other side of this "impolitics," as he calls it, is populism, which boos democracy and its leaders. The observation leads to a question: would there be a way to institutionalize this resistance?"

VI-2: BACK TO "NEO-MACHIACHELLIAN" CRITICISM OF BOURGEOIS PARLAMENTARISM

The theory of "Counter-democracy" leads us to the criticism of bourgeois parliamentarism developed by the school of the "neo-Machiavellians". This criticism which is precisely, with the study of the Swiss Direct Democracy, and the theories of Jacobinism, one of the sources of the thought of a Jean THIRIART on the "people's power", the "counter-democracy"

The school of "Machiavellians" means a sociological current which, following Machiavelli, in the early twentieth century, was mainly interested in the eternal and permanent appropriation of power by an elite: Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Roberto Michels, extended by Wright Mills, James Burnham.

They relate to the Machiavellian tradition, which considers that the masses are manipulated by ruling elites who use the force (ions) or cunning (foxes). Cf. Niccolo Machiavelli, THE PRINCE, Book IX.

The neo-Machiavellian theory of "circulation of elites" was developed in Italy and Germany in the late nineteenth century primarily to denounce the limitations and impossibilities of representative democracy. It was then, as it is again today, in a context of "crisis of parliamentarism," resulting in the difficulty of realizing a real political participation of citizens in civic affairs and a true representation of their interests. The criticism of the elite tackles the gap between democratic theory and practice of political representation.

Italy of the nineteenth century was one of the youngest and most corrupt representative democracies of the time. Erased the major projects of the "Risorgimento", leaving only the harsh reality of everyday, economic stagnation. The people had the feeling of a forfeiture of democracy by the political elite. Universal suffrage was far from being a process of expression of civic democracy.

"Neo-Machiavellian" criticism of the elites starts from the premise that "the domination of the majority over the minority is an immutable, intrinsic figure to the social order. Democracy, provided it is based on the principle of majority, is a deception, fraud, and in the best case, a mirage." Neo-Machiavellian theorists assert the separation of rulers and ruled and pose the problem of oligarchy by asserting the existence of a particular layer of persons constituting the elite.

The major criticism of the contemporary democratic anti-eliteism are Vilfredo Pareto, Gaetano Mosca, Robert Michels.

"Neo-Machiavellian" theories put the finger on a blind spot of the process of democratization, namely the oligarchic nature of political power, that is to say that political power is exercised, always and everywhere by a minority. The multiparty system does not delete this, since the election contributes to it.

Neo-Machiavellian theorists draw our attention to the mystification of a theory of parliamentary democracy as "government of the people, for the people and for the people." Parliamentary democracy as power of the majority, of all or of the most of it is an illusion. In reality, political responsibility is in the hands of minorities. The others are apathetic or secular and prefer to leave them the prerogatives. Political parties are organizations run by an oligarchy.
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Pour nos lecteurs francophones, tous les articles et éditoriaux de ce n°24 de DIRECT DEMOCRACY ont été publié en version française dans LA CAUSE DES PEUPLES n°42 (novembre 2010).
JOIN THE STRUGGLE OF IRAQ COMMITTEES: FOR THE ARAB IRAQI NATIONAL RESISTANCE! AGAINST IMPERIALISM, COLONIALISM AND BIGOTRY!

The “Iraq Committees” were created in September 2002, in preparation for the American-Zionist aggression which prepared against Ba’athist Iraq. In this disaster April 2003 when Baghdad fell by treason, the majority of the movements which had fought against the war and even some, which, like us, supported Ba’athist Iraq, were seized by discouragement. During many weeks, even many months, one hardly any more intended to speak about their support. Contrary to them, and because we have confidence in the revolutionary ideology of our Iraqi comrades, we committed ourselves immediately with the Resistance and with its first Arab supporters, we published the first statements of the underground Ba’ath party, of the “Resistance and liberation of Iraq” Movement which coordinates the military branches however antagonistic of this Arab nationalist party. Their ankle working is Luc Michel, leader of the National-European Communitarian Party (…) a “European nationalist”, anti-american and antisemitist without being anti-semitic. Luc Michel himself portrays him as a cantor of the regimes that are being hated by Washington (…) and denounces the terrorist action of the ‘radical islamists’.

FOR A FREE NATIONAL ARAB IRAQ!

As Luc Michel, president of the “Iraq Committees”, said in 2004:
“it is necessary to have a clear vision of the historical prospect in Iraq: the fight is today between the Iraqi Resistance and the American occupying forces and its collaborators. The Iraqi Kollabos, like the Kollabos of the Nazis, will break down as soon as the last American soldier, as soon as the last Western mercenary, as soon as the last Israeli secret agent leaves Iraq. Then the true political battle will come, that which will follow the military commitment of national liberation. It will be the fight for the construction of new Iraq. This fight will oppose two antagonistic visions of the world: on the one hand, that of Ba’ath, revolutionary, progressive, open and democratic and that of the Islamist reaction. We must never lose sight of this prospect.”

ACCORDING TO “LA LIBRE BELGIQUE”, THE IRAQ COMMITTEES ARE THE “MOST VISIBLE” NETWORKS TO SUPPORT THE “IRAQI RESISTANCE” “!

LA LIBRE BELGIQUE, Brussels, daily, March 19-20 2005 :
“the networks of support for “Iraqi resistance” is not missing in France nor in Belgium, although it is not very easy to distinguish their number and their support (…) trend, perhaps the most visible in Belgium, the nationalists who present themselves as ideologically inspired by the Baas (…) They animate the “Iraq Committees” and “Syria Committees” in an attempt to federate the branches however antagonistic of this Arab nationalistic party. Their ankle working is Luc Michel, leader of the National-European Communitarian Party (…) a “European nationalist”, anti-american and antisemitist without being anti-semitic. Luc Michel himself portrays him as a cantor of the regimes that are being hated by Washington (…) and denounces the terrorist action of the ‘radical islamists’.”

IRAQ COMMITTEES on Internet
WWW.FREE-IRAQ.ORG
The "3rd Congress of Polish Geopoliticians" examines the role of Libya in the geopolitical concepts of Luc MICHEL and PCN-NCP and their action of suport of the Libyan Jamahiriya!

Our theses meet more and more interest and attention, particularly among intellectuals and academics from Eastern Europe.

Thus the “3rd Congress of Polish Geopoliticians” - III Zjazd Geopolityków Polskich - held in Wrocław (Poland) on 21 and 22 October 2010, was an opportunity for a brilliant intervention of Kornel SAWINSKI (*) entitled “Znaczenie Libii w geopolitycznych konceptjach Naцjonal-Europejskiej Partii Komunitarnej (PCN)”, “Libya in geopolitical concepts of PCN-NCP”.

The Polish geopolitician and researcher develops longly the general transnational action of Luc MICHEL and PCN-NCP for 25 years, continued and amplified in the MEDD-RCM. And its foundations in the action of pan-European leader and theorist Jean THIRIART in the 60s. It outlines the important and influential role played by our Transnational Organization as a School of thought and “think tank”.

Finally, he gets to the heart of his presentation: the ties with the Libyan Jamahiriya, the proximity of the geopolitical thesis of Moammar Gaddafi and those of Luc MICHEL and PCN-NCP, on Eurasian Greater Europe, the necessary emergence of a multipolar world, the Mediterranean designed as a place of common civilization, or the role of Bridge of Libya among European and African Unions.

Sawinski finally evokes the theme of Direct Democracy in its Libyan and European versions, the role it plays in the thought of Luc MICHEL and MEDD-MCR as an alternative to the bourgeois parliamantarism.

The Polish version of the conference is already available on the public’s Facebook Page LUC MICHEL: http://goo.gl/qHW0f

French and English translations are planned soon. ■

(* Geopolitician, sociologist, analyst at the “Centrum Analiz Europejskiego Geopolitycznych”. PhD student at the Uniwersytetu Śląskiego - University of Silesia- he prepare a thesis on the “geopolitical ideas of Jean Thiriaart”.

The puppet regime in Baghdad is still furious against the Leader of the Libyan Revolution Muammar Gaddafi who asked in July, the Secretary General of the UN, for the opening of an investigation on the American invasion of Iraq and who intends to bring this issue to the agenda of the next Arab summit, scheduled in March 2011, in Baghdad. For the Kurd Hostyhr Zebari, puppet "Iraqi" Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Libyan demand "threats the security in Iraq, encourages foreign interference, hampers the efforts of national reconciliation"... Waffle that convinces no one, Iraq has become the "mother of all external interference" and "reconciliation efforts" nothing more than all just for show or a trap to kill the resistance fighters.

THE LIBYAN POSITION IS NOT NEW.

In October 2002, the Leader of the Libyan Revolution Muammar Gaddafi had distanced himself from the Arab League accusing it of "connivance with the United States" against Iraq. He then condemned the aggression and occupation of the country. After the execution of the legitimate President of Iraq, Muammar Gaddafi was the only Arab ruler to declare a national mourning, to erect a statue in Tripoli as a tribute to the martyr of the Arab cause.

Last year, Muammar Gaddafi had insisted on receiving officially a delegation of the Iraqi resistance with Ba'athist leadership. The Libyan media and the MRC, the “Movement of Revolutionary Committees”, which frame the Libyan Revolution, equate Saddam Hussein with Sheik Omar Mokhtar, the hero of the Libyan national resistance to Italian colonial occupation, martyred by the fascist regime. The leadership of MEDD-RCM, the “Movement for European Direct Democracy”, the European Network of the Libyan RCM (which boosts a global structure), having participated in the creation of the IRAQ COMMITTEES, the “most visible” organization of support for the Iraqi National Resistance (according to the Brussels daily LA LIBRE BELGIQUE, 19-20 March 2005). Aisha Gaddafi, his daughter, a lawyer, she, actively campaigned for the lifting of the embargo, participated in the group of lawyers defending Saddam Hussein. Secretary General of the charity Waatassimu, she gave the “order of courage” to Muntazer al-Zaidi, the Iraqi journalist who threw in December 2008, his shoes on George Bush, the sign of the utter contempt in the Arab culture.

Recently Muammar Gaddafi has proposed that the next Arab summit, scheduled for March 2011 in Baghdad, to be held in Cairo, no Arab king or head of state accepting, he said, to go to Iraq because of the situation in the country. Harith al-Dahri, President of the Association of Muslim Ulemas, one of the prominent leaders of the Iraqi Resistance, is of this opinion. In the Qatari daily AL-WATAN, he said that "to meet in an occupied country would be contrary to the charter of the

IRAQ COMMITTEES on Internet www.FREE-IRAQ.ORG
he Europe-Africa Summit to be held in Syrte/Tripoli next November 29, 2010 marks the centrality of Libya both politically as a driving force of the African Union - which Moammar Gaddafi was the main initiator - and Geopolitically as a bridge between the EU and the African Union. The central role played by the dialogue of cultures is also the answer given by Libya to the thesis of the “clash of civilizations.” 2010 and 2011 mark the 50th anniversary of the independence of 22 African countries. To commemorate this anniversary and to mark the occasion of the third EU-Africa summit, the European Commission and the Palais des Beaux Arts f Brussels (Centre of fine Arts), in collaboration with the African Union, will launch a multidisciplinary and itinerant cultural project: “VISIONARY AFRICA: ART AT WORK”. This initiative is the extension and the development in Africa of the festival “VISIONARY AFRICA” currently being held in Brussels.

This project is focused on the importance of culture and creativity as development tools and is directly in line with the Brussels Declaration. It includes an itinerant urban exhibition of contemporary African artistic practices, artists’ residencies and workshops. The exhibition will be presented in three African cities on the fringes of important institutional and cultural events. It starts off in Syrte (Libya) as a preview on 29th November at the same time as the Europe-Africa Summit.

A lengthy presentation of this central file in the relations between European and African Unions is developed in LIBYA NEWS & FACTS (# 2152), the Bulletin of the CEREDD, the “European Centre for Research and Study on Direct Democracy”.

To download it free: www.ceredd.com/accueil.htm

The vision of Libya as a bridge between Greater Europe and the African Union, that we were the first to develop in the early 90s, is now widely accepted and adopted by the great actors of the African and European Unions.

Note on this official logo adopted by the Brussels European Commission for the cultural project of cooperation between the EU and the African Union “Visionary Africa”, the Eurasian dimensions of the map of Greater Europe including Russia.
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