

Socialist Democratic Forms II

*(How are decisions frequently made within
Capitalist Democracy?)*



*The Petrograd Soviet
1917 – is this the
answer to true
Democracy?*

Before going on to the possible socialist alternatives to bourgeois democracy, we must first address the question,

“How does decision-making work in both non-political and non-representative bodies, for these are widespread and powerful organisations within all Capitalist Systems in addition to the usually considered elective methods?”

We do know how capitalist Democracy works in political assemblies such as the UK Parliament, where the main mechanism for decisions seems to be almost entirely top-down, and only very rarely bottom-up. What is more, even the pre-election policies that secured the victory of one party over the others, can be radically changed, or even dropped once the majority in that assembly, and a guaranteed ticket-to-rule for the next five years has been secured.

With Party Whips, discipline and even the allocation of lucratively paid posts in government departments, the effect is to strongly bolster the top-down directing of what is made Law by such a “democratic” body.

Now, there should be a thorough analysis, criticism and outlined alternatives to this whole current system undertaken, but what I will commence with here are some descriptions of the less overt or controllable set ups, which nevertheless affect the general population significantly.

For example, what about the roles of the various Royal Colleges representing many important bodies of practitioners in the nation’s Health Services?

In the last week, it seems to be the case that those at the top of these organisations differ markedly from those at the “coal-face” that they are supposed to represent. And in some cases, though they had initially backed Government proposed legislation to open up the National Health Service (NHS) to competition from private companies, the tumult of hostile action from below has triggered actual meetings to reconsider the current positions of the leaderships, though it is not clear what they will discuss, whether any significant decisions can be taken, by whom, and with what, if any, binding mandates.

In addition, there has been, over an extended period, an increasing number of what are termed **Quangos**, which are organisations that seem to be appointed on ministerial aegis, and hence will surely reflect the views of those doing the choosing – most likely packed with the “right” majority, but with a couple of token oppositionists to give the appearance of some sort of balance.

Now, the usual reason given for such arrangements is that classic purely democratic representative committees with innumerable mandates are much too slow and reek of lowest common denominator decisions. So that not only is decision-making greatly extended in the time taken, it is also often taken by those “not qualified to decide”.

Thus top-down direction via the appointment of “Tsars”, or alternatively of groups or committees of experts, are believed to be the only way things can get moving quickly and appropriately.

But “experts” do not usually agree! And your experts may come to quite different conclusions to my experts!

Indeed the myth of the swift executive action of Mayors in Cities, or Presidents in Countries, boils down that kind of election process to a choice between a very small number of candidates, none of who represents any large section of the electorate, but only those of their political and financial backers. And, therefore, whose policies on the largest number of areas where they make decisions and direct actions **cannot** be known!

The election of the last Lord Mayor of London proves the point.

Of course, the real reasons are very different.

In political life, the techniques for getting elected are by now well known. With the money and the media, the riding of prejudices and the telling of lies (usually including promises that they never intend to keep). That system will mostly return majorities (if sometimes slim) for the owning Right. But, democracy behind closed doors, and truly quantitatively representative of the real majority of organisations is likely to occasionally come up with decisions that could threaten the usual Stability.

They, believe it or not, are the most dangerous for the powers that be.

Hence the preponderance of these extremely undemocratic forms!

Now it may be wondered how they get away with such blatant re-directing, but they are not fools. They know how to exploit most situations.

If, for example, the decisions that were taken in such bodies, threatened the current hegemony, then all hell is bound to break loose. For such counter-posing decisions will NOT fit in with the general overall system, and will simultaneously threaten it, while also failing to establish its decided objectives.

Such tumults are immediately pounced upon by the Right as proofs that their opponents cannot organise anything properly. And, with universal control of the media will campaign loud and long against such “incompetence”.

As you can see, by far the most telling skill in the Right’s armoury is the ability to lie, and to do it convincingly and with evident authority.

Hence the myth of Democracy must be exploded. It now reeks of its determining economic basis, and can never deliver what it purports to – the decisions reflecting the positions of the majority of the population.

Indeed, the lovers of Classical History never tire of informing us of Democracy’s birth in the Greek City States, but always omit to position it in its actual context – that of States based upon conquest, financed by booty, and worked for by slaves.

Such a “Democracy” was never “for all”!

And it worked well, within its constituency, because it was small and, crucially, also **in charge**. It was a level playing field for the ruling class, and their wholly dependant, though sometime large, periphery only.

But, the most damning feature of Democracy in the current World is that it is only the supervisors (totally subservient to their owning masters), who make the decisions, and do so in an Economic System NOT within their control.

It is a fictitious cork of equal rights floating upon a sea of wealth and power.

Now, as long as such a system of economic power continues, NO truly democratic system can deliver what it promises. Instead, every decision opposing that economic base will only cause tumult and the threat of general dissociation.

So, even when it is actually happening, as in a Revolution, the overall impression is of increasing Chaos.

And that is close to the Truth!

As spelled out in *The Theory of Emergences*, the first phase of such an Event is always a swoop towards Chaos. The forces, which had kept everything in check, begin to be increasingly undermined and start to disintegrate, and, one by one, the processes of control disappear. The losers in such circumstances shout ever louder about the certain “Doom” that can be the only possible outcome, and many, previously comfortable middle classes confronted with a clearly a seemingly unprecedented disintegration, will agree with them, as all sorts of unwanted happenings accompany the rulers’ increasing loss of control.

BUT, that phase is **never** permanent and **never** final!

After the clear descent to what the main losers would see as a swop to oblivion, the very opposite begins to appear everywhere.

Constructive, wholly new forms appear and begin to **self organise**. This crucial, creative Phase of every Emergence will have begun, and once having reached this very different form of positive feedback, nothing can stop the inevitable drive to a new Level.

For it is only **here**, that true alternative and entirely **new** forms appear, and the comparison with the “ideal democracy” of before becomes clearly evident.

Those who once ruled, and their supervisors, hangers on and policemen are summarily **disenfranchised**, and the new forms simply exclude them and seek to take their wealth for the public good.

Now, perhaps the most significant feature of an Emergence is that its innovations are **never** possible to predict from such a revolution, from within the preceding regime.

Many will have had their plans and their dreams within that prior period, but they will be as incapable of deducing what will occur, as were the inanimate processes were of revealing the Nature of Life when it first appeared on Earth in its own **Emergence**.

There is NO direct reductionist continuity between the Laws in one Stability to those created via an Emergence in the next.

So, the forms that will replace bourgeois democracy are impossible to define. All we can say is that they will be consonant with a transfer of power from the rulers of the past regime to those who overthrew it.

(1,421 words)