



Political parties as an obsolescent model

by Andreas Popp

In this essay I wish to dedicate myself to "political parties", as we receive many questions and comments on that subject due to our publications.

The term party originates from the Latin "pars", which simply means "part", and which already points to a peculiarity. Parties are not about the common good, as that is always non-partisan because it exists as a whole. A party offers people the opportunity to get involved in politics, which is then interpreted as an individual exercise of influence on the power structure. This train of thought is a fallacy, which I would like to prove. The remarkable French philosopher Simone Weil (1909 to 1943) in her book *On the Abolition of All Political Parties* describes three fundamental points:

- *a political party is a machine to produce collective passion*
- *thereby, however, it creates collective pressure against independently thinking people*
- *the purpose of the party is completely unrestricted growth whatsoever*

Because of these points any party is totalitarian at its core and in its striving!

Simone Weil goes on to say: "Parties are a fabulous mechanism which ensures that across an entire country not a single mind lends its attention to the effort of recognising goodness, justice and truth in public matters. Apart from very rare exceptions, this results in deciding and implementing only measures which are opposed to the common good, to justice and to truth."

Let's assume someone wished to join a political party and told the party chairman: "I agree with this or that point of the party platform that I have examined. However, I reserve the right to support and communicate views that may be different from or even contrary to points of the program I haven't yet examined." It's safe to assume that he will be rejected, or in any case shall not be granted any leading positions, as it would immediately be harmful if he were to turn against the program (possibly in public). If a party were to permit this freedom it would no longer be competitive because competitors would exploit that weakness. So the party member has to swallow the program and support it. A blanket program forces the party member to decide against his/her own will on many subjects, for instance when parliamentary votes are concerned. It may be doubted whether this ongoing self-denial contributes to positive character development.

This describes a situation similar to that of clerics who likewise are structurally prevented from independent thinking, and in this way are forced to relinquish their own possibly contrary views.

Parties vie for the power of legislation in order to realize the interests of their target group. Thus it is not about the interest of the general public, but about representing the interest of a part of the people, whereby logically a large part of the population is not at all or only slightly taken into account or even harmed. Interestingly, members of opposing political parties face each other time and again in private conversations in order to determine on how many points they actually agree.

Thus a party's task becomes comprehensible. It is primarily about increasing votes, in other words increasing one's "parliamentary market share", so that as a party member you move close to the well-paid manger, which only holds a certain amount of highly remunerated seats.

This chief motivation is easily recognizable in the constant sweeping defamations of political opponents who likewise have to fight for their market share. The term "party" thus describes an egoistically motivated structure designed to gain the parliamentary power of legislation for particulate interests of one's own target audience. How likely is it that within the scope of such interest reservoirs (and parties are just that) lobby activists, with their frequently infinite financial means, would attach themselves to these organizations in order to literally monetarily

inject their own goals. Lobbyists of course know that "delegated" party members are no representatives of the people but are "party representatives". Examples for this assumption abound.

Let's take the delegate Frank Schäffler of the FDP (Freie Demokratische Partei) who had realized that our financial system leads to a process of redistribution of wealth from hard-working to rich and thus to huge injustice, if one bears the common good in mind and feels bound to one's conscience. I agree on various points with Mr. Schäffler's verbose analysis, and I consider him a forward-looking thinker relative to many of his party colleagues, even though I disagree with his supposedly liberal solutions. I use this example to refer to the view of the media which describe him as a rebel within the FDP, because he obviously deviated from the party think guidelines. Being called a rebel, in other words a resistance fighter, because you act independently, in my view is an unambiguous statement of affairs. Was one possibly afraid of scaring away lobbyists vital to the party? This is a safe assumption. When I imagine a delegate of a parliamentary party wishing to positively introduce the Plan B of the Wissensmanufaktur * to the discussion, the term "rebel" would likely be replaced by far stronger terms.

Now there may be one or another party representative who clearly distances himself from lobby influencing. But this can only be a member of a splinter party that can never present a serious danger to the actual power system which, as is generally known and as we have clearly articulated in Plan B, has to be ranged above parliamentary political performers. A refusal of lobby influence would mean a massive distortion of competition vis-à-vis the "taking" parties. Licensed media outlets then hardly mention such a maverick let alone present him in a positive light.

The crucial thing to bear in mind here is that the separation of powers of democratic principles within the framework of a republic, in the light of the aforementioned portrayal, has already been debunked as non-existent. Parties nominate those members conforming to the statutes and possessing appropriate character traits and list them as potential candidates for election.

Politicians oriented toward the common weal may also have been "undetectedly" nominated. But should delegates indeed act contrary to party guidelines, due to their conscience for instance, they are virtually ostracised within their own ranks which can be seen as a form of mobbing, such as many individualists in companies have to suffer.

The power of the party over its members is in evidence, and that, in my opinion, is highly dangerous. Suddenly problems all over the world become more intelligible, whether it's the many wars, genetically modified farming, pharmaceutical vaccination programs, or whatever else.

Would these activities directed against the general public's interest be as easily and "profitably" realizable, if each parliamentarian only had to answer to his or her conscience? Of course not. It's the party machinery upon which the ordinary delegate has no influence that makes it possible.

Why do so few citizens ask themselves for what reason a sort of parity staffing of experts or even judges is being infiltrated in certain committees, such as parliamentary investigative committees and even in supreme courts?

An indication of the power of party influence even over the judiciary couldn't be clearer.

This is the perfect basis for the real powers that be, the capital-intensive lobbyists above the parliamentary party apparatuses, to exert influence since one doesn't have to deal with all the individual representatives, but instead can focus directly on the omnipotent party leadership machinery.

To speak of a democratic order after these insights can only stem from uninhibited ignorance since the particular interests, or rather the individual perspective of putative representatives of the people, is no longer relevant in the context of a majority decision according to specification.

In August 2015 president Obama made it clear that there would be war with Iran if the conservatives didn't approve the nuclear deal with Iran. The madness couldn't be more explicit in that a party vote decides on the fate of millions of human lives. With that perspective in mind, it should be questioned whether Syria, a friendly nation with Iran, could have been bombed by the "western community of values" that same year, had there been parliaments in which only individuals without party affiliation had been asked to consult their conscience. Would there then be the large scale evacuation of Syria, whose desperate population is now migrating to Europe? Of course these questions are not asked. Who would ask such questions? Party representatives happen to be subject to lobby-parties, who present themselves under the misnomer of "people's party".

But how might this dilemma be solved?

The crucial issue is the omnipotence of the parties in legislative processes.

He who has the majority asserts the interests of the corresponding sponsors. The supposedly complex structures of political processes won't change this. The shallow, insubstantial arguments regarding specific issues by the political performers in the Bundestag (German federal diet, the parliament) or the Bundesrat (German federal council) as well as those of the European lobby circles are all part of the smokescreen game. Simone Weil writes that the abolition of political parties urgently belongs to the objective debate as this would end the massive evil of today's elite-guided officials. Within the context of true democratic principles, it would be easy to establish which deputies agree with their colleagues on what specific issues serving the general public, in order to declare their solidarity in individual instances. Completely different individual coalitions might form for other decisions. Then there would also be more fundamental debates with precise votes instead of the current situation where it's simply about being for or against a particular proposition. The farcical election campaigns, in which the most incapable people are permitted to flaunt themselves under the party label, would then belong to the past. What a perspective. It's also essential that the press is not permitted to speak out for or against nominated candidates. Within the scope of a free and thus non-commercial media landscape the attraction of exerting influence would be limited. Of course secret agreements would still take place behind the back of the people, but they would be prohibited and liable to criminal prosecution, which would curtail these machinations. Nowadays this propagandistic exertion of influence by means of financial intertwining unashamedly takes place out in the open. Secret "party circles", by the way, would be less harmful for the polity than the permitted parliamentary structures of today, which in my opinion have poisoned nearly all areas of life.

A general ban of political parties would as a first step impede the extremely easy exertion of influence by capital reservoirs [loci controlling the confluence of vast streams of capital] over the legislative processes.

In my view, compliance with a real subsidiarity **, that is to say the maximum self-determination of the people in a country, is important. First steps should be in the interest of transparency of regional, political structures that are to be newly erected, and which would disempower national parliaments to the greatest possible extent, especially the lobby constructions operating above them, such as for instance the EU or the USA.

Parliamentary legislative processes should be limited exclusively to fundamental needs of the population which primarily is "security". Every citizen will appreciate leaving to the parliament responsibilities of public administration, such as a national police force or an army to secure national borders. Furthermore, I consider the four components of the Wissensmanufaktur's Plan B to be elementary in eliminating the unjust process of redistribution of wealth from industrious to rich. The legal paternalism, ranging from regulations on insulation of buildings, criminal sanctions for doping in sports, compulsory vaccination for the population, preventive medical check-ups proscribed by law, all the way down to the absurdity of degrees of curvature for cucumbers etc., has to become a thing of the past.

Statutory health insurances and pension insurances should be put to the test as well. I'm certain that all these things can be sorted out regionally between people themselves, without statutory provisions which underscores the relationship between the authorities and subjects.

Legislation can certainly remain in the hands of parliamentary legislature which will also work and be expedient, without parties. Then only persons with legal expertise and a sense of the common welfare would be allowed to participate in legislative procedures. In the event of a ban on political parties, these sustainably thinking people in the population would quickly be identified. At last the judiciary would again assume the task of defending the law against political influence by party representatives, as the ancient democracy of Greece stipulated. Representatives would be held accountable for politically nonsensical decisions and legislation which after being enacted has proven to be opposed to the welfare of the general public. They'd be liable to prosecution and could be prosecuted in a fair trial in which evidence of either intent or negligence would have to be provided.

Accountability should extend to acts of wilful default on certain decisions when this entails damage to the general public.

Today's party democracy is merely a facade of plutocracy, just more clever and subliminal. Instead of finally tackling the fundamental task, we waste valuable time watching party representatives cast blame on each other on TV talk shows. If there were no more political parties, one would have to get busy dealing with actual factual issues.

Of course I'm aware that the commercial media landscape also needs to be completely re-structured to achieve the basis for objective, free reporting. Only when the "silent treatment method" in the form of a TÜV-like (German technical inspectorate) attitude inspection which keeps alternative system thinkers under wraps - something I consider a form of highly developed censorship – has been eliminated, will there be a chance to end this global insanity.

That way the military-bureaucratic transactions of various nations on our planet could also come to a rapid end.

In this sense, yours

Andreas Popp

December 2015

* The Wissensmanufaktur, a German think tank composed of a number of experts in various scientific fields such as physics, finance and banking, constitutional law, economy and politics, have developed Plan B in 2011. This plan, based on four basic components, 1) an unconditional minimum income, 2) a financial system based on circulating money (no more debt and interest), 3) a socially conscious real estate legislation, and 4) a free press, describes on 20 pages the rationale of a model for an equitable, sustainable and free society.

** Wikipedia: Subsidiarity is a principle of social organization that originated in the Roman Catholic church, and was developed following the First Vatican Council. It has been associated by some with the idea of decentralisation. In its most basic formulation, it holds that social problems should be dealt with at the most immediate (or local) level consistent with their solution. The Oxford English Dictionary defines subsidiarity as the idea that a central authority should have a subsidiary (that is, a supporting, rather than a subordinate) function, performing only those tasks which cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level. The concept is applicable in the fields of government, political science, neuropsychology, cybernetics, management and in military command (Mission Command). In political theory, the principle of subsidiarity is sometimes viewed as an aspect of the concept of federalism, although the two have no necessary connection. The principle of subsidiarity plays an important role in the political rhetoric of the European Union concerning the relationship between the EU governing bodies and the member states.