



Is democracy

still a guarantee of affluence and peace?

University of the Nation

November 2017

By Markus Reichenbach

Abstract

Every fourth worker in London lives in poverty. Every fifth person in the South of Europe is without work. The mandatory health insurance should be a blessing but the people can no longer afford to pay the premium. People ask where the money should come from to pay my old age pension? Debts are rising to heaven and everybody asks, who will pay it back. What is wrong with the West. Would it be not time to rethink, about our basic assumption how nations can perform in a good way?

Content table

1	Introduction	3
2	Democracy	4
2.1	The Swiss system	6
3	Expertism	9
4	How can it work?	10
5	Human rights	11
6	Let's think about it?	14

1 Introduction

The West think that democracy and human rights are the guarantee of affluence and freedom. But is it true? What does democracy and human rights exactly mean? The West knows to spell the world and know the structure of it but do people know still the spirit behind it? Do they know why a democracy is working and why not?

The West is losing his favourite role in the world. People feel that something is wrong. Every forth worker in London live in poverty. How can it be that the Mecca of finance is in such a situation? In a lot of Western countries, it's look like the same. Every fifth person in the South of Europe is without work.

The West is proud for its social system but the coast exploded. The social state is on its limits. The mandatory health incurrences should be a blessing but the people cannot pay the afford to pay the premium. The retirement pay seems to be a greet invention. The West get now older an older and the demography changed. There are to less young people who could pay for the retired once. Where the money should come from?

The European Central Bank is baying government bounds and print money. The debts rise up to heaven. Is it not an illusion that when you have not enough, just print money? In the past criminals get kept in prison when they printed money. It seems Europe acts like a street kids who has to steal to survive. Probably it is not illegal but is it good? Every child knows that when you have 20 apples and you cannot take 30 away. It will not work. In what kind of situation is the West?

The West is proud of its democratically, social system but now China without this system seems to have more success. It seems that in many parts in the world a brighter middle class rise up but the West goes in the other direction. Poverty seems to become a plaque raged in the Western World. Some Western countries are in worse condition that in other parts of the world. What the Western knows from visiting India or Africa they can find now in Athens and London.

The European Union wants to unity Europe and promise them affluence and freedom. An open market, people free movement and a common currency should be the guarantee for it. More and more regulation and laws help to hold the wild Europeans together. But the people feel that something is curios. They lose more and more affluence and democratically rights.

The European Union try everything to hold the construct together. They put sanction on the countries who want to leave, print money out of nothing, centralise, build unions and agreements and now want also a European army. Of course, they tell us that it is necessary. But is this the way of freedom?

Instead of gaining of what they promised people lose more and more of it. Do we have not to rethink?

2 Democracy

Not everywhere we see the name Coca Cola on it is Coca Cola in it. The name is not a guarantee that the right thing is in it. So, it is the same with democracy.

The democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) is obviously not what we understand under a democracy. Probably the name socialistic dictatorship of North Korea would fir better.

Some people may say that socialism would be the solution for freedom and other see the opposite. But both claim to be democratically. Obviously not all will understand the same thing under it. But how can a democracy work in a good way?

In the last century most of the African nations became independent. They received a constitution a parliament and so on. A democratically system as the West has. But did it work? Almost every country became a dictatorship even the name democracy was written on it.

Let's look to the middle east. The West try to install a democracy in Syria, Iraq or Libya. What happen with the Arabic spring? Is it better than before? What happen with Egypt? Was Hussein, Mursy or Assad the solution?

The American spend a lot in the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. But it seems to be worse than before. They spend money to help them to establish a democracy. A system like the west have. But it didn't function. In the end the Taliban and the ISIS took the land and destroyed it. Is seems that a democratically system didn't work in the other parts of the world. But why does a democratically system do not work in these countries?

Do the West still understand the spirit of democracy or just it structure? Does the western democracy still work in this way that it works in the past? Or, what is exactly a democracy?

John Wycliffe wrote in the interdiction of his bible that a democracy is the government to people through people and for people. But does the West still think that this would be the best idea?

The first time the word democracy got used, was by Cleisthenes 508 BC a Greek thinker. Even Greeks invented the word Greece never was a democracy. Not more the 10% of the population or probably much less were ever involved in political decisions. Only the citizens, the one who had possessions, had a voice, the rest were women, children, slaves, farmers or foreigners who didn't had rights. It is not to compare to the today idea of democracy. Today is that everybody has right like, all are equal before the law, freedom of speech and so on.

Democracy comes from the Greek world Demo, what means people and the Greek word cray, what means ruling. The people are the government the ruling power¹. In Greek it didn't work out. Socrates blamed the politician because of their power game that they played in this so called democratic system. He proposal therefore an Aristocracy². Aristocracy places power in the hands of a small, privileged ruling class. Rule of the best and this were the philosophers. They have the most understanding who a nation can work in a good way. The politicians didn't like Socrates and forced him to drink poison or leave the city, so called polis. He chose to drink the poison rather to leave the polis.

The 10% democrats in Greeks had no common law. They didn't have the understanding that everybody is equal before the law. They did what they thought to be the best for the city or let's say for them self. Who was deciding what is the best? It ended in a power game where people try to connived others trough rhetoric games or money.

Is not the best democratically system an anarchy where everybody is free, get not forced and have all their rights? Because with a government always people will face limits and are not free any more. Somehow, it seems that the idea of the Greeks has a problem. Both, an anarchy or an aristocracy, were in history not a blessing. How does it can work?

Also, in Rom it didn't work out. The Romans didn't talk about a democracy but the try to stablsh a republic. But it ended in a chaos. It ended in a dictatorship under

¹ Greek: δημοκρατία, *dēmokratía* literally "rule of the people"

² Greek: ἀριστοκρατία *aristokratía*, from ἄριστος *aristos* "excellent", and κράτος *kratos* "power"

Cesar. The romans had the same problem as the Greeks. They didn't have an understanding that everybody is the same before the law and they didn't have a common law. Even they had the 12 tablets the first idea of a civil law. but it didn't function.

May some think the French revolution brought democracy. It is probably the best application of democracy, where everybody could do what he wants to do. But it was horrible it was an anarchy where in the end everybody killed everybody. Napoleon jumped in to solve the chaos. But instead of the promise of Liberté, fraternité, égalité it was a dictatorship but not only for France. Europe became a new Empire under Napoleon. The young prosperous country east of France got devoured by the brutal ideology of France. The anarchy idea of the French didn't work out. Instead bringing freedom it brought oppression and war.

Also, the Idea of the socialists didn't work out. Their idea followed the French revolution that all are equal and all have same right. Marx thought that the evil in the world is because people have something and others not. The enemy of freedom was therefore private property. It didn't work out. The communists forced people to give up their own property. Farmers have no more land they worked just for the community. Everybody should just work for the community. But it ended in poverty. Every country that became socialistic ended in poverty. Man was not so selfish and he didn't go to work when he knew that he had to work for others how probably don't do anything. It killed every creativity and motivation to start new things. Even communism felt the ideology was picked up by the social democrats. The social democrats want to have a democracy but their understanding is that democracy means that everybody has the same right. Equality. No one is allowed to give anymore a standard. Like what a family would be. Or that man is only male or female. Democracy for them is that everybody has the right to be or do what he wants. Even they see that it didn't work out in the past they hold strong on this ideology. But we realise more and more that it brings a chaos and instead of freedom people have more and more to be forced that it can still function.

2.1 The Swiss system

The Swiss have a good application of democracy. They call it direct democracy. The supreme are the people. The people have the right to oppose with a referendum when the parliament made a law that is not good for them. The parliament knows, that even when they won the case, a referendum could change it again. The Swiss

even can stand up for changing the constitution. It called the popular initiative. After a voting the Swiss communicate; the sovereign decided.

But is this the most important issue for freedom in Switzerland? Is it not more important that the Swiss are a confederation³. Switzerland is an assembly of different sovereign states. The constitution makes clear that only the thing that the sovereign state not can do should be regulated by the Swiss confederation⁴. So, the Swiss think that the best way would be, when people can solve the problems on the deepest level. Switzerland is only an example, but probably the strongest federalist, democratic state in the world.

In Switzerland every community has a parliament. When there is a case the people vote and then the sovereign decided. When this cannot be solved they brought the case up to the higher level. First to the level of the state (Cantons) and in the end before the confederation of Switzerland. This idea is not new. 3500 years ago, the Israelites invited such a system. They thought the best way for a functioning nation is when people how have responsibility also can decide about them self. Make decisions on the deepest level of government. So, the Swiss may went back to this advice, what seems to be a good advice.

But somehow this system seems to become more and more problematic. In a village in Switzerland some want to build a minaret. The people came together and raised their hand for a no. They don't want it. But the initiators went before the European human right court. They claimed that it would be their human right to build a minaret. They became right in Strasbourg. Now the community in Switzerland should be forced to allow something that they don't want. What do you think? Is this still democratically? The Swiss had then a popular imitative and the sovereign decided, that the constitution will forbid to build minarets. The world was in a shock. Switzerland stood against the human rights. Or did they? Does probably human rights and democracy contradict each other? Switzerland lost in the human right rating again some positions.

The Swiss thought about to quit the agreement of Schengen, persons free movement in Europe. The agreement is for the European Union one of the most important agreement. The Swiss have to be part even they are not part of the

³ Confederation Helvetica (CH)

⁴ Art. 43 Tasks of the Cantons. The Confederation shall only undertake tasks that are beyond the cantons or what the Swiss constitution regulate.

European Union. The Swiss people get called for a voting and stood against persons free movement. What the sovereign decided the Swiss government could not put in praxis. The European Union will not allow it. So, what is the use form a direct democracy, when anyway the powerful will win. Is it still democratically?

Is it really better, when people or nations lose more and more sovereignty just to have a free open market?

Great Britain or Catalonian decided to be independent but they are not allowed to be. It seems that Europe and Spain try to force them not to leave. Spain send the police to hinder the voting and put the leader of Catalonia into prison. Is this democratically? Venezia and the Lombardy want to have more autonomy. They want to decide about their own taxes. In a voting they decided with more the 95% for more autonomy. But Rom ignores it. They rather allow the Mafia to do whatever they want and force the honest people to do what they don't want. Is this still democratically?

In Switzerland some communities didn't want to stay in the Kanton of Bern any longer. They had a voting 2017 and one went out of the Canton of Bern and joined Canton Jura. The other two rested in the old Canton. Would it be not legitim and better when people get ask if they want to go when they felt that the bigger brother doesn't look to them anymore in a good way? Is it really better to force them like Spain and the Europeans? Did they not react more like dictators then partners? I think Switzerland chose the better way.

The Swiss claimed in their founding letter that nobody form outside should rule them⁵. They claimed the best way would be that the people rule them self. It is not amazing to see that Switzerland never had a King and never ended in a serious civil war. Why Switzerland stood beside the 30-year war, the First and the second World war. Since more the 700 years Switzerland get ruled by the people through people and for people. Did the Swiss see something that others not do see?

⁵ We have also unanimously praised and established that we adopt in the valleys no judge who has acquired the office somehow about money or money's worth or not our fellow citizens or is intended. – Dispute arises among Confederates, so to convey the clear-sighted among them, and the part that rejects the award, the other counter. The public image and well-being requires that the proper establishment of peace given. These Regulations shall, God willing, endure forever. (In the year 129)

Switzerland seems to have one of the world's best democratically system but even it seems to be on its limits. Something is in the air in the West. It feels that the West is turning back into the middle age and loss more and more affluence and freedom.

Forcing people was in history always a failure. The Western history is not too old to understand that. The Soviet Union try to do that. They were convinced that socialism will be the best for everybody. People who not gave up their land or accept it get killed or got stored in gulags.

Hitler did a horrible thing even he was elected democratically. It was not illegal but today almost everybody would say it was wrong. The democratically system could not hinder it. Because Hiller promised affluence people were willing to stay behind him and gave him the right to do this horrible thing.

3 Expertism

There is another attack to the democratically system of the West. Expertism. Probably you never heard this word before but it has existed for 2500 years. Socrates and Plato were vehement detractors of the democratically idea of the Greeks. They thought it cannot work and observed that in the end it is only a power game of the powerful. They suggested therefore, an aristocracy. The best educated people should rule a country, what meant the philosophers. Today it seems that this idea become popular again. More and more matters are being decided by experts, who claim that normal people cannot understand it. Global warming is just one of this example. some doubts about it they are silenced because they anyway cannot understand it. People have to believe it and not to think about it. Even people have Normal people are more and more excluded from the debate. The experts decide now what is the best for the people. They allowed even themselves to predict the future. They proposal laws and taxes for people in a no more democratically way. Is this still democratically?

Even in Switzerland voiced becomes loud how say the vote topics are to complex that normal people can decide. So, let it decided by experts and not by democratically decisions. Are we so far away from the Greeks?

The people in the past fought over century for freedom. The Magna Carta 1000 years ago made the beginning of limiting the powerful. The government the Kings could no more take what they want. The reformation stopped the power game of the clerics. The revolution fought for freedom but it seems that more and more the

people are willing to give up their freedom just for personal peace and affluence. Francis Schäffer⁶ said 50 years ago that the Western people will be willing to give up political freedom just for affluence and personal peace. Is not this exactly happening?

Does not the West start to think it would be better let the philosophically establishment decide rather the people. Are we standing before the end of democracy like the Greeks did?

Do the West still believe that it would be better that all people are involved in the debate and not just the chosen one? The cleric always will tell us that it has to be this way otherwise it ended in a chaos and misusing of people. Somehow people feel that there is sand in the gears.

Are the ecclesiastics willing to bow down, explain the cases and make it as easy as possible, that everyone can be part of the debate.

4 How can it work?

Is not the real problem that there is no more absolute truth where everybody can hold on? In the past it was God how stand over people and everybody has to give account to. Today God is abolished and people cannot know the truth anymore. People have to trust experts. But they have a lot of different opinions so, who is right? Is it not, that in the end the one will receive right who has the loudest voice? The one how is able to influence or let's say manipulate for his own case. Is it the end of democracy?

Friedrich Nietzsche understood that without God there will be no moral. The only moral will be that the one who has power will use his power. Was he, not right?

Democracy means that people are willing to take time to give to the people a tool that by themselves they can find out what is right and wrong. In the reformation time it was the bible. Everyone could stand up with the bible in the hand and tell the King and priest it is wrong what you do. The reformer humbles themselves and teaches the people to right and right. They translated the bible and send copies in every corner of the world. They taught the people how to read the bible and understand by themselves what is right and wrong. They had an absolute moral standard a world constitution where everybody has to give account to. The reformer understood who a

⁶ Francis Schäfte, who should we then live? 1976

democratically system can work. It can only work when there is a common law. but this common law cannot be made through people it has to stand over them. The reformed church in Geneva was the first adequate democracy based on the separation of powers and based on a constitution the Geneva catechism. This understanding changed the Western idea how a nation can work in order and freedom. It spread to Scotland, England, America and in the end to the whole world.

The today democratically systems were also an invention form the reformer, or better to say form the 3500 old Jews bible. The question would just be, if it can work without this understanding of the Reformer. Without Christians influenced it never worked out in history. Do you think it would work out without today?

5 Human rights

Could human rights help us in this situation? The human right council of the UN has 47 members how should make clear that human right finds their ways in the world. States like South Arabia, Nigeria, Venezuela, Kongo, Qatar or India. India with its caste system is probably the biggest missuses of the human rights in the world. How can South Arabia, Venezuela make sure that the human rights get implemented, when these countries didn't do it by them self? Do people trust any longer in such a system? The European human right council seems to be more trustworthy but the question is still open, if human rights not contradict democracy?

Where does the human right are coming from, when in a democracy always the majority win about the minority? Can it come out of a democratically system? Why is the West taking so much care of the handicapped and the weak who not can influence a majority? In Africa the cases are won by the people how has power in the west by the people how are able to influence the majority. But both systems have essential the same problem. The powerful will win the case.

Some people may think that human rights come from nature. When people look into the nature it is obviously different. The lion kills the lamp. The Vulcan destroy a city. It does not take care of the weak once. In nature the powerful will win over the others. If people just would react like nature they would more react like Hitler or Stalin. Like animals who kill one another. What would be wrong, form a natural point of view with the Nazis? Ok, we feel it is not ok, but why? How can the human rights develop from an evolutionary process?

The West killed millions of babies. It is democratically legal but is it good? Why the West allowed to kill what need the most protection. What kind of society is it when people abort life because of their own gain? Is this really according to human rights? Was not the greatest invention of the West that every human has the right to live. This invention was unique and made the West strong. No King, no parliament, nobody stood over this law. But do not the West go back behind this invention? Now the powerful have the right to abort what cannot react. Do not lose the West its humankind, its soul? What would over next generation think about it?

So, what are exactly Human rights? In the West people think that every individual has the rights for everything. China on the other side have a collective understanding of human rights. They think what is the best for the community is right. But is it worse than the individualistic understanding of the West? Can it work out, when everybody just wants to have his own right? My children understand, that this will not work. But, it seems the high educated cleric do not?

Does not every right need an obligation, that living together would be possible? The inventor of the human right declaration claimed that these rights are coming from the Jewish idea 3500 years ago⁷. The Jewish human rights were given with an obligation. People had only the right if they do their obligations.

Do they human rights today also have obligation? Not necessarily. Everybody can appeal to the human rights without any conditions. Saudi Arabia, Nigeria or Venezuela can appeal to it. But does it work? Do the human rights not standing in a dilemma? Is it not an illusion to think everybody can just have rights? How can it work?

Human right has to come from outside. Otherwise it will be not a human right. It will be just a power game of the once who has power like Nietzsche claimed. But the Jewish had a solution. They believed in a God. Human rights have to stay over everybody and nobody is allowed to go under it. Even the circumstances changes people were not allowed to change it.

⁷ René Cassin (1887–1976); *Centuries have passed. Judaism has, throughout unparalleled trials, preserved its passion for justice and its desire to contribute to the defence of the rights of men of all races and origins, along the lines of the very principle with which it was entrusted two thousand years ago. The Ten Commandments, the first Code of the essential duties of man, have suffered many an outrage in history and continue to suffer. Their moral authority remains intact.* (www.udhr.org/history/tencomms.htm)

The Christians adapted the Jewish idea. The American Declaration of independence letter testifies in the preamble that all men are created by the Creator⁸. Therefore, all have the same rights. Henry Dunant, founder of the Red Cross was inspired of the bible and laid therefore the foundation of the Geneva convention⁹.

The Jews had to give account to God and not just to people and therefore could live in freedom and order. Nobody was over these Human rights and it seems that this worked out the best. They had not only the right but also the obligation. If someone did not fulfil the obligation he also had not the human rights.

Secularism claim that human rights come from the French revolution. The French revolution didn't work out. Everybody in the end get killed. It was an anarchy where Napoleon stood in and ruled with iron hand. The anarchy was probably a democracy, ruling of the people, but it was horrible. The consequences were a dictatorship again and was probably worse than before. Human right can also only work if people have an obligation.

2017 is the 500 years celebration of the reformation and the 100 years remembering in the Russian revolution. Why nobody celebration the Russian revolution but the reformation. Because the Russian brought not freedom, human rights or democracy. They still owe us their promises. What communism touched ended in dictatorship and a massacre. They communist want to force people to leave in freedom but it didn't work out.

So, how can a political system work? Do they West not have to rethink?

⁸ The American Declaration of independence (1776)

⁹ Geneva convention from 1876 the foundation of the red cross

6 Let's think about it?

Theses I: The people in the West lose more and more affluence and freedom. They lose political freedom, their self-responsibility and become dependent to the state. The social state should help them but it cannot pay any more.

Question I: Are we facing the end of democracy? When yes, what have to be changed that a democratically system can work in future?

These II: The West have to do re-expertism. That means, experts have to bow down to the normal people and help them to understand the discussion. The West have to believe again that it will be better, that all have to be involved in the decision and not just the experts. Probably it will be slower but it will be better.

Question II: Do we see that as a danger for democracy, when the trend is always going in direction of more centralisation and expertism and less involvement of the people? What do we have to change?

Theses III: Human rights cannot work without an "independent truth". We have to go back to the original understanding of human rights.

Question III: Do not the Christians should stand up for human rights and democracy, who would have the solution of its essential problem?

Question IV: How do Christians then should work with the United Nations, European Union and the Court of Human Rights together? What can they contribute to become relevant rather stay in their subculture?