

Manifesto
For a true global democracy

Or

Democracy usurped

Yves Marineau

1,3 version (need corrector)

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
1 - The economy	5
1.1 - The Environment	6
1.2 - Health	8
1.3 - Grants	11
1.4 - Taxes	13
2 - The cultural	16
3 - Politics	27
Conclusion	24

Traduction by Google Translation and Yves Marineau

Correction by:

(Need correction, please contact us:

<http://edition.qualitaspro.net/Contact.php>)

All rights of reproduction, translation and adaptation, without permission, reserved for all countries.

© Qualitas Publishing, 2005
2146 Montgomery, Montreal, H2K 2R8.

Introduction.

Who says markets globalization, says globalization of problems.

Global problems requires a global solution.

The global political, economic, environmental and cultural protection are now the same everywhere on the planet.

States are now competing each other on direct financial issues (including subsidies, for example, or low rates of company taxation, anti-pollution standards, etc..) And must go against their wishes to avoid capital flight. Then they should have common goals to promote healthy competition financially respecting all citizens, their cultures and the environment.

The economic dogma is now the new church of the ideology of the modern world. The scale of values has now reversed to the point that the economic front such fundamental values as respect for life.

The "democracies" of representations, too largely financed by multinationals, have contributed to excess this reversal of values.

Yet, the vast majority of world citizens are in favor of direct International democracy¹. All citizens of the world are followers of a true global democracy.

Is this not the best way to define the area within which the economy should grow?

¹ A direct democracy means democracy where the laws are decided by all citizens. As opposed to representative democracy, where laws are passed by elected officials, unfortunately, too often defending special interests - in order to fund their re-election - to the detriment of common interests.

1 - The Economic

The field of economics has quietly taken over the culture and politics since the French Revolution.

Everything is subordinate since the establishment of "democracy" of representation.

Democracy

"Democracy" modern "democracy" of representation, has usurped the ancient Greek term of "democracy". At the origin, in true democracy, the democracy of ancient Greece, or "ideal" democracy, all citizens had the right to take a stand on all decisions and pass laws.

Bourgeoisie

The bourgeoisie can not manage both its business and that of the state, has replaced the monarchy with an elected representative of puppets. The "leaders" or claimed their parties, are largely financially advantaged by the bourgeoisie. And today countries are run by political parties funded by the multinationals or the haute bourgeoisie, the "corporocracy".

Multinationals

It is therefore not surprising that governments are subject to the guidelines of multinationals. Some governments have no other choice but to meet the expectations of multinational companies in order to be reelected. Today, the political success is first and foremost by the visibility, so by advertising, so by the party financing. In some countries, the visibility provided by advertising alone is sufficient to focus attention on one or two parties funded by multinationals and to sink into oblivion third parties.

The programs of third parties, like the interests of individuals, thus pass into second behind the interests of the representatives who want to be reelected, and their funding sources or multinationals.

Therefore, any measure economic, environmental, political and cultural that would be agreement among all the citizens can not be implemented. Because, until now, no authority could impose international standards.

Hence the need for a global power to regulate the area of economic development.

By Who? But **who should define these international norms?** The World Trade Organization (WTO)? The United Nations (UN)? A representative democracy? Or a True Global Democracy is a direct democracy?

● 1.1 - The environment

The environment is the loser in the power of economics. As states compete among themselves, rather than cohesion between them, no state will regulate too severely organizations neither individuals in their daily practices.

As it is urgent, and that self-polluting emissions is a failure in the short term, only coercion can be effective, but any state that would be too harsh face competition from other States would shout themselves in the foot. Any struggle against the pollution, that would raise the cost of production, would harm the competitiveness of any company in the country would be the most restrictive pollution.

States may therefore either to harm their own economies, or to boycott products from polluters States may themselves be victims of economic retaliation. Or then, states must agree on standards compliance to common international environmental norms and to apply them.

Unfortunately, States, whose parties are funded by multinationals, seem less committed than citizens to move forward.

Yet, it is a pollutant or pollution level is banned in one country is less polluting in another? Is it less harmful?

Faced with a serious pollution problem worldwide, which is growing exponentially, do we have other options than global alternatives?

● 1.2 - Health

Not only are health care costs exploding in industrialized countries due to the aging of the population. But in addition, nearly 20 million people die prematurely every year because of pollution by the World Health Organization. This means that tens of millions of new people are affected by diseases such respiratory diseases, every year. With the ensuing social costs (medical costs, lost productivity, lost sales tax revenue for various levels of government, etc.) And these costs will grow, exponentially, if the rate of pollution grows as predicted.

This means that, by polluting we are all collectively participating to the biggest genocide in history.

Never, so many people are dead "murdered" every year because of certain individuals. If we kill 20 million people per year this means that we "execute" collectively, during an average lifespan of 80 years, 1.6 billion people!

This means that each individual, in the major industrialized countries, is a murderer responsible at different levels, from the death of a person during his life.

At current pollution levels, we will all be responsible for the death of a person. And if the rate of pollution continued to increase exponentially the number of dead could increase tenfold.

That would mean we could be responsible for the deaths of four people, each, over the next 40 years. Needless to say that some of these people could be close, since pollution is higher in industrialized countries and one of his people could be ... yourself!

As there is an emergency, and that we can not wait 50 years to change behavior of more conservative people², we should impose taxes on Harmful Products and Services (THPS)? To reduce pollution to a more than acceptable level and, in turn, use the income of THPS to finance health care required because of pollution?

Is it not normal, that polluters pay for their damages? We still can not ask those who make an effort to reduce their emissions (pedestrians, cyclist, etc.), to pay for medical expenses caused by enterprises and individuals "assassins-polluters"? Is it not those reckless, handled by the automotive advertising for example, if " self-suicide "in their car of" Gino-in-car " that must pay the medical expenses of people they hurt and make sick? Or, to ask the citizens of the Third World to pay for environmental damage done by companies that are established abroad, to enjoy not only labor-cost labor, but also, of laxer environmental standards .

But, again, no state can afford to take steps that would make them uncompetitive and would relocate businesses in countries where standards are more lax. That would only relocate the problem without a settlement.

Only an international power would establish standards that are disadvantageous to most any state to the detriment of another, which would ensure uniform environmental standards across the globe.

Although most companies are willing to pollute less, if their international competitors are doing the same.

And let be prospective. What our descendants will think about us, in 50 years? When they will say that we kill for us to move and buy our luxury at lowest cost? ... That we didn't get out of the cave a long time ago?³

² Only a minority of people have reduced their energy consumption significantly in recent years. People most progressive react quickly but the most conservative elements do not change their habits before the majority of the population has done it, which may take 25-50 years.

³ On our thinking even more primitive than we think see my article entitled:

« [L'ORIGINE DES RELIGIONS... ARABES ou POURQUOI LES ARABES SONT TRÈS](#)

1,3 - Grants. WTO and subsidies?

The WTO can not regulate itself. Let us take the example of subsidies, all Multinational would never consider abolishing them so that all citizens and governments opposed to such practices.

All multinationals would never consider abolishing. Since, even cover the costs of research and development, subsidies are provided to save on costs that would have required indebtedness, with all the ensuing costs, such as interests. Subsidies thus avoid the charge that can transform raw products into profits. And, even some grants, may be transformed into profits when research costs are lower than expected, or... illegally inflated!

If companies paid their share of fees and taxes, firms could, perhaps, require a fair return for what they pay. But, in the present context it is individuals, who pay more taxes and, who see these billions of tax dollars given in "gifts" to multinationals.

While, in a true direct democracy, all citizens and international governments oppose such practices, and subsidies would be prohibited. Ultimately, states may invest in companies, provided they receive their share of dividends, as well as all shareholders with the opportunity to resell the shares. In order, to be able to recover the invested money, by selling the shares at market price.

But, until there is no international power, there will be an international dictatorship of multinationals, to perpetuate the "theft" of grants to citizens.

Third World

And the countries which suffer most, are the countries of the Third World, who would normally be the most advantaged in terms of economic development, due to their low wages. But they are penalized because they lack financial resources. The poorer states, can not give grants. It follows a vicious circle, which limits their development, because, in addition, local markets have an unemployment rate too high to create a regional market worth.

● **1.4 - Taxes.** WTO and Taxes

Same thing with regard to the taxation of income. There is no reason that, the wealthy enjoy a lower tax rate than the middle class. In a true democracy, international direct, all citizens and governments oppose such

practices and, tax rates for the richest would be equal, or superior, to that of the middle class.

But, the multinationals, take advantage of this moment in the absence of international standardization and, the resulting competition between states seeking to attract capital to their country.

Even if state where party financing by companies are prohibited by governments, they are subject to international competition, which gives no scope to their economic policies. All citizens, and all governments, want to abolish subsidies to enterprises, and establish a corporate tax rate at least equivalent to that of individuals. But no government can do it, if all other governments do not. For example, if a state increased the tax rate on corporations significantly, or increases its anti-pollution standards, or if it increased taxes on pollutants such as oil and coal, or it abolished the subsidies, it would be economically suicidal for any government. Because businesses were moving to the state most favorable to their economic interests.

While, the end of subsidies, and taxation of multinationals would enable States to withdraw the taxes to which they would normally be entitled. And above all, make the competition healthier, with small and medium enterprises(SME's), because they are in "tear" against multinationals since they must pay taxes at individual rates. What makes SME's less competitive, profitable, and prevent them from growing at the same pace as multinationals. This often leads to bankruptcy, low salaries, the regional depletion area, etc. This has the effect that, the goods are exported from one end to another of the world, by multinational corporations that pollute with many times more fatality, instead of producing regionally, avoiding the transportation over-pollution.

And, who do you think, that is favored by the taxation of small and medium enterprises at the rate of individuals? Multinationals! Those same who finance the parties which in turn promote the dictatorship of big industries and big landowners.

● **1.5 Democracy in enterprises.**

When is democracy in enterprises? When those shareholders will vote the major administrative decisions, including salaries of executives? When will be more democracy? Would it not be more honesty in this way? In the interests of shareholders, and citizens? Rather than seeing all, be first, in the interest of business executives and shareholders?

Is this not further proof that we are not in a democracy but in a bourgeois dictatorship. Where the wealthy, appropriating all the powers, political and economic, as well as within the governments or the companies that they share with small shareholders who receive meager pay dividends to the

benefice of executives.

Small shareholders do in fact serve only to obtain more capital, allowing greater profits, which will first and foremost be "given" for greater salaries, bonuses, severance pay and new shares to executives.

2- The cultural.

The regional culture is threatened by the economic. The dictatorship of multinationals being the primary cause, while the economy should be subject to cultural norms of each state culture.

If the economic standards were agreed by all citizens, rather than multinationals, multinationals pay taxes, they would grow less rapidly than the SME (small and medium enterprises) that they are developing locally and respecting local cultures.

All agree, is the cultural markers that should govern the economic, not the opposite.

But the steamroller and standardizing multinationals would, again, impose its diktat.

3 - Politics

The policy should govern the cultural and economic. But now, the powers are reversed. It is the economical power, the multinationals, if not the rich who decide the laws of economics, cultural and national policies.

While in a true democracy, all citizens would give the rule of law and cultural policy winning over the economic law power.

Since the economy is supposed to be an exchange tool since time immemorial, which dates back to the family economy. Except as before the exchange of goods and services were equal. And exchange were not used to enrich a person over another, neither to the detriment of the entire community. While today's, economy has become a tool of power and enslavement.

But beware, a true democracy would not necessarily be anti-capitalist, not inevitably cons market economy.

If someone want to lose his life to get rich ... It did not want to take it and that is its business. As long as it does not harm others and do not lead to poverty of people in need. The main problem with capitalism is not necessarily capitalism either. The main problem of capitalism is when the capitalists, the corporatist themselves decide the rules of the capitalist economy. Where all excluded, over 99% of the population are evicted from the democratic process of enactment of the rules of the "game".

Ancient Greece was very prosperous, but the gap between the rich and the poor was much less than today because democracy was everyone's business.⁴

And problems at the political level are they not the same? (Corruption, favoritism, back lift, etc.).

That governments make the laws that citizens must submit do not necessarily pose a problem. As long as people accept democratically in a referendum, to surrender their power to make laws to officers.

But who should decide which standards the government must submit? Governments themselves? Or all citizens?

Right now, is it not the corporatocracy deciding?

So, politically, are we in a democracy? Or in a dictatorship corporatocracy?

A true democracy would determine the limits within which capitalism can

⁴ Apart from the women and slaves. Of course, today there is no going back to that old customs and forgotten to include women in the democratic process. But also to end the enslavement of workers and small farmers by giving them a true democratic voice.

thrive. And one of the first values that would be wishing that life must take precedence over profit.

Life before profit. Economic development must be done in respect of the right to clean air before profit, and respect of environment, healthy water, etc.

Or, just the opposite of the "so-called current democracy" that can produce at lower cost, rather than the most clean, and respectful of our environment is possible.

True democracy, or "democratic dictatorship"?

On a scale of 0-10, where 0 mean a dictatorship and 10 a true democracy, a direct democracy, we can say that **we live (in the West) in a "democratic dictatorship".**

A dictatorship where one can choose a dictator for a few years. Regardless, the level 1 of a democracy. In other words, a score of 1 on 10, which means a failure of democracy.

And the result is precisely what we see in our societies, so-called "democratic", neglect, or rather a disappointment in the political sphere in its present form is, representative "democracy". All people want more democracy. And not a dictatorship pretending to be "democratic" one advantage over a dictatorship is the power to change if a dictator is too "bad".

Nevertheless, a "democratic" dictatorship is a dictatorship or the interest of certain individuals should in the first place. Since political parties rely on the more affluent, to provide the funds to their media exposure, that will lead to their re-election, and everyone's interest is secondary.

Democracy improved. Democracy could be improved by one or more of the following ways:

- 3.1 proportional elections.
- 3.2 The prohibition of donations from businesses, organizations, unions and even private individuals. Since, it is always the rich who fund the parties with the maximum contributions allowed by the law. There are not many welfare recipients, students, unemployed or low earners who manage to give a maximum contribution! Unlike the better-off.
- 3.3 Pour equal funding to political parties or even better, equal to all candidates.

- 3.4 An equal visibility for all in the media.
- 3.5 The prohibition of parties. Not for the establishment of a single party, however, that all elected representatives to vote freely on all issues and not being allowed to create a party on more than a bill at a time. Otherwise, what is the point of electing representatives if they all vote as a single person? ... as the party leader decides? If we elect more representatives, is to ensure that they vote for good laws, and that everyone can exercise critical judgments, to introduce amendments that improve the laws. Not to follow the party line which, in fact, is too close to one-party dictatorships. Better 100 elected, with critical thinking, that modify the proposed legislation for the better, than having a single opposition party.
- 3.6 Banning advertising, and sending to all citizens, a program summary of all candidates in each county. So, citizens could vote for candidates from the programs, ideas, in one word the contents and not the container, visibility, advertising and posters on the poles! Whether one last appeal to human intelligence to vote and that it takes no more voters are stupid.
- 3.7 Having at least referendums (at the same time as elections, as a measure of savings) on major decisions.
- 3,8 Have at least referendums to determine a substantive right to which must obey the leaders.
- 3.9 Or referendums on all legislative and administrative decisions on the Internet. Because now this media is available and secure.

A true democracy. What would be much simpler and effective would be, what all citizens want, a true democracy. Where everyone could participate in legislative and administrative decisions and elect the executive.

All the debates would be in the population. The major issues would move the population much faster than when they are submitted and debated in parliamentary chamber only.

All citizens are increasingly concerned about politics and increasingly non-partisan. More and more disappointed with the representative democracy and more and more ready for a true democracy, direct democracy. And even if only 100,000 people were prepared to vote on an issue, with a population of millions or billions of people, the vote could only be more representative than 100 elected officials, who vote according to special interests or order to be reelected. **100,000, 1 million or 1 billion people can only vote in the interests of all citizens, and make it almost impossible any form of bias or legislation corruption.**

Some oppose the fact that citizens are less progressive than politicians, others might object that things are moving much faster when the debate takes place in the population. And it is better to a changing society in practice, in everyday life, in its practices and attitudes, than only in its laws.

The reality is changing more and more rapidly, and no elected government can never follow the reality, the "Vernunft"⁵, and the population can not follow if the debate don't descends into the population.

Usurpation of democracy.

Meanwhile, as long as we have not asked all citizens, whether they prefer to live in a direct democracy or representation one, any constitution that has not been approved in this way constitute a usurpation of democracy.

Because all citizens of the world's are sovereign of the type of democracy in which they want to live in.

⁵ In German Vernunft means reality and truth because of course there is no other truth than the reality.

● Conclusion

The dangers faced by rapid changes, require quick decisions to counter the devastating and irreversible effects that may occur. The effects of pollution today on the greenhouse effect are just at their beginning and will be more and more dangerous over the years. So, we have to act now.

We can no longer live in a "society of the precipice." We can no longer run into the empty space and stop at the last second fraction, when we have one foot over the precipice. Because, now, the cliff is coming to us much faster than we will towards him. This means that environmentally, we should back now rather than go forward faster.

Since only the most progressive people change their habits quickly, we have to act quickly. We have to act with coercion quickly, to be sure of that every one to be sure every one obey to the new reality norms. Because the reality change to fast now to expect people to change their obsolete, and even more obsolete habits will time is running, and will be increasingly disastrous for all.

Since the problems are now global, we must now take to the idea that only a true global democracy can afford to develop norms using a new international law.

Should we wait for governments to set up an international regulatory authority, or, all citizens should they not invest the power that is rightfully theirs?

Because if we look after governments to put their legislative power in the hands of all citizens ... we may wait a long time!

Enter now in great numbers, all questions of international referendum on the website www.internationalreferendum.org

Make your voice heard on various major issues of the 21st century and centuries to come.

Governments that claim to be democratic, and even others will only have to accept the decisions taken by all citizens. Otherwise we will know what are the governments which are in fact false democracies serving special interests, the "democratic" dictators.

Some of the questions you can vote: Issues and preliminary results at 12 August 2005:

Who should decide international norms?

All citizens? A **87%**. government elected? 13% I do not know? 0%

"Are you for the creation of world government with power to legislate international standards? Yes? **83%**. No? 17% I do not know? 0%

Do you prefer to live in a direct democracy? **100%**. Or representation democracy? 0% I do not know? 0%

"Is that all governments must submit to the International Criminal Court? Yes? **100%**. No? 0% I do not know? 0%

"Is that all the armies of the world must be under the aegis of UN peacekeepers?

Yes? **67%**. No? 0% I do not know? 33%

-Does the international referendum via the Internet should be permanent and do all citizens can change their votes any time?

Yes? **100%**. No? 0% I do not know? 0%

-All forms of subsidies to companies are prohibited in all nations? Yes? **100%**. No? 0% I do not know? 0%

-All kinds of weapons and ammunition may be sold to peacekeepers and police only? Yes? **100%**. No? 0% I do not know? 0%

-The freedom of a person stops here or freedom of another begins? Yes? **100%**. No? 0% I do not know? 0%

And in a true democracy you can submit draft international standards, and vote ... change their minds at any time 24h/24.

Instructions

1 - Read the manifesto.

2 - Please email if you want to be a signatory of the manifesto?

To: [Email](#)

-Be sure to include your names, country and occupations.

3 - All comments, amendments and suggestions are welcome.

**A financial contribution or volunteer site development
www.internationalreferendum.org would be appreciated.**

[Donations](#)

Volunteers: [Email](#)

Thank you

Yves Marineau
Founder
International Committee for a True Democracy

N.B. If you want to do the translation, or corrections, to your mother language, please contact us.

Should we wait for governments to set up an international regulatory authority, or, all citizens should they not invest the power that is rightfully theirs?

Because if we look after governments to put their legislative power in the hands of all citizens, we may wait... a long time!

Vote online at:

www.internationalreferendum.org

Politics is too important to be left in the hands of politicians.

It is high time that everyone get involved:

- 1 - Send this page to all: <http://www.internationalreferendum.org>
- 2 - Spread the eBook version of the manifesto:
<http://edition.qualitaspro.net/English.php>
- 3 - Join the Facebook group: <http://on.fb.me/i4Z8kU> and Twitter:
[@TDemocracy](http://twitter.com/#!/TDemocracy)
- 4 - Invite all your friends on Facebook.
- 5 - Follow me on Twitter: <http://bit.ly/i1U5xy> (French)
and on Facebook: <http://on.fb.me/h1hyna>
- 6 - Become a volunteer: <http://mtgd.qualitaspro.net/Volunteers.php>
- 7 - Make a donation: <http://mtgd.qualitaspro.net/Donations.php>
- 8 - Contact us to offer your translation services:
<http://edition.qualitaspro.net/Contact.php>
- 9- Bookmark my blog: www.yvesmarineau.com

Movement for a true global democracy