

Questions leading to

# Re-Thinking Democracy:

The sum of all minorities is the majority.

Gerhard K. Eichweber

Dealing with diversity as a fundamental right not to be repressed by anyone, also not on the grounds of quantitative criteria, be it because of being "better" or because of being "more" – and less because of being "more – and, thus, better" (or "more right" because of an incidental majority), leads to rethinking some of the basic concepts of current understanding of democracy.

Moreover, the same fundamental right of diversity, which in the end leads to all people being minorities and, thus, serving economy and prosperity with their different demand, dealing with diversity without repressing others is the central "problem" of thinking, developing and realising any truly "open society".

Regarding theory of economy, the undersigned has published papers explaining the role of diversity of values and attitudes as the origin of diversity of preferences to be corresponded to and served by diversity of offers. Such diversity of offers precisely fitting diverse groups and their preferences requires interest in and understanding of different people and the origins of their different preferences: Culture, dreams, aspirations – and concepts not even dared to desire...

Such diverse preferences, which at any given moment are still not catered to satisfactorily, constitute "latent markets". Developing latent markets for diverse offers better fitting diverse people and their different preferences constitutes special opportunities of success for those taking the interest and serving the latent groups liking, whatever it is, exactly like that, however that is. In the process, also a Bible word attributed to St. John and already quoted by Lessing as part of his "Paragraphs on the Religion of Christ" (*Paragraphen über die Religion Christi*) has been quoted: "The Lord also wants those, who warship him like that." – However that is ...

A German Nun, Roswitha of Gandersheim, (Lat. Hrotsvitha Gandeshemensis, A. D. 935 – 1002) is said to have expressed the fact of human diversity even more nonchalantly: "Everybody is differently ludicrous".

With other words: People have (or: should have, need to have) same rights – but people are not at all the same. Everybody is different. Not even monozygotic twins have the same dreams.

Not one human being ever has been exactly identical to any other person who has ever lived.

Of the many silly and misleading paradigms, the prejudice of equality (other than that of rights) needs to be eradicated in order to allow and nurture the context of prosperity for all:

The context of not only tolerating, but accepting and joyfully encouraging diversity as a – if not the – vital prerequisite of individual success as well as common prosperity and peace.

After all: Is "the economy" not the sum of all individual successes? Thus: Diversity and what drives it, the culture of qualitative distinction, are the "key" deciding over either continued and growing crisis or common and lasting prosperity.

In previous publications, the undersigned has also presented methodical "tools", leading to the understanding of latent "patterns of use" and the "matrix of life styles", in order to show the ways, how diversity can systematically be assessed and served in order to lead to innovation and uniqueness of offers – and to benevolently catering to target groups, exactly in the ways how these prefer it.

Moreover, in the named publications it has been shown, how offers meeting latent preferences so well, that they are welcomed enthusiastically, not only lead to quick decisions regarding their acceptance (*and, where necessary, to revisions of resource-allocations*) but hardly to discussions of their pricing. With other words: (Only) Where preferences are exactly met, do prices reflect the value for the target audience. (Only) Where this is not the case, do quantitative criteria prevail: Customers hesitate to buy. And if they can not avoid it, they chose the cheapest, the shortest delivery time, lowest maintenance or make their choices according to whatever other prevailing criteria.

With other words: In a society, where qualitative distinction prevails, beginning in perception – and its expression by a versed use of languages and their vocabularies – and not ending in the choice and rejection of offers; where, thus, people are educated to insist on their own being as they are, and to be served appropriately – there a sound economy and general prosperity will prevail and fund social security and the related treatment of people in their diversity by people in their diversity.

With regard to economy, in resuming the much more exhaustive papers published before, this can be explained as follows:

- 1) On the side of potential customers and users, Diversity of values, attitudes and situations leads to diversity of thought, preferences and dreams.
- 2) On the side of potential inventors and entrepreneurs, Diversity of values, attitudes, information and situations leads to different ideas and concepts.
- 3) On the side of potential inventors and entrepreneurs, interest in and understanding of diverse values and situations of users as potential customers plus the knowledge of diverse possibilities leads to the matching of not yet sufficiently served needs, dreams and preferences with possibilities ideas and concepts and their realisation as new, different offers perfectly aimed at serving potential users and customers better. And, thus, fostering the genesis and identification of new "target groups", self-defined by their diverse preferences, with the respective offers and brands.
- 4) The perfect matching of the qualitative diversity of users and customers with fitting offers enthusiastically greeted and preferred, leads to the generation of new market niches defined by the qualitative distinction of preferences served and to be developed and defended as market segments by the entrepreneurs.
- 5) Where qualitative distinction truly fitting diverse preferences is greeted with enthusiasm, decisions are eased and rapidly lead to a higher number of transactions. Economy grows. Moreover, as distinct offers, through their precisely responding and fitting the qualitative diversity of preferences, allow for prices to reflect the value for the customers (rather than costs of realisation) not only the number, but also the individual value of transactions are higher. This again makes economy grow.
- 6) The above statements, regarding numbers and values of transactions growing as result of the precise serving of diversity of demand through the diversity of offers, apply to both "micro-" and "macro-" economy: They regard the individual successes of entrepreneurial initiatives as well as their sum as "the economy" of any place, region, state and continent – and the world as a whole.
- 7) As diversity of values, attitudes, dreams and resulting preferences can hardly be sensed and truly understood by robots (or disinterested people acting like robots), and certainly not by egalitarian generalisation not even respecting diversity, serving diverse target groups better than others requires people interested in people. Thus, diversity of offers serving diverse demand leads to more (and more fulfilling) employment. Diversity of demand and offers, thus, is the prerequisite of employment for all. And, thanks to all citizens paying their dues, for functioning social security systems and national finances.

8) As the prices of offers precisely corresponding to preferences reflect the value for the customers, the resulting margins allow companies to pay people employed adequately and to invest, allocating more resources into research and development of innovations and markets leading to even greater successes. And to even more fulfilling and well paid employment. Not to speak of the satisfaction of being part of something "good" and successful, rather than under constant pressure leading to repression of others.

9) On the other hand: Where diversity of preferences is disregarded and offers seek to just somehow correspond to demand in a generalised manner – thus: where egalitarian concepts and treatment of people and peoples prevails, and where offers lack distinction and are fully comparable – desires and preferences of fewer people are precisely met.

This leads to fewer transactions, because purchases only take place, when unavoidable.

And it leads to lower prices, because in the case of missing enthusiasm about the qualitatively perfect fit of an offer, when a purchase can not be avoided, only quantitative criteria prevail: delivery times, operation costs and, above all, price.

This distorts competition from qualitative distinction to quantitative criteria and, as price competition can only be survived by winning the costs-competition, to extreme productivity, automation and "rationalisation", eventually turning the term "productivity" into a synonym for unemployment.

This hurts society and its economy further, because robots don't pay social security dues. And because robots don't pay anything. Eventually, this leads even "shareholder-values" to tend towards zero.

10) With the "culture" of dealing with qualitative distinction, thus, deciding over continued crisis or lasting sustainable prosperity, also the roots of crisis become clear: They lie in the concept behind the ideology of "Materialism", ever since Hegel, Marx and Engels infecting the world, including the theory of science and what is regarded as "scientific". After bringing down socialism, the same errors of thought also endanger "capitalism" which, after all, as a term and ill concept is also fruit of Marxist ideology. What is needed is not capitalism but entrepreneurship. But first of all the education and encouragement of accepting, respecting and living of qualitative distinction as vital elements of a "post-materialistic society" characterised by general prosperity and peace.

The above repetition of concepts reiterated on various occasions can be complemented by another concept equally often presented: The concept proposed for turning around the Spanish Basque economy, and its successful implementation. Actually: The findings on economy partly resumed above have their origin in the thoughtful search, why the by now so called "Bilbao Effect" or "Miracle of Bilbao" has been achieved, overcoming extremely high unemployment so quickly. In their quintessence the rules brought to the attention of entrepreneurs and public in that process can be resumed as: "Be!" – "Be different!" – "Different is better!"

Now, such concept must be reflected in the political approach to society, which the author in another publication has described as a vision and obligation for entrepreneurs in German under the title "The Open Post-Materialistic Society". Thus: A society in which sense and qualitative distinction come before quantitative criteria and their numbers. It is qualitative distinction, which results in numbers.

This however requires an open analysis and redesign of democracy, starting from criticism of all what currently is. Thus, regarding democracy, various thoughts jump to mind. Behind the common remark of Democracy being "the least bad system of government" a number of different however potentially equally conflicting and conflictive ideas stick out, but only as a kind of tips of an immense ice-berg. . .

The term "political class", denominating a self-established "political class" as such, clearly invokes criticism. To many observers, current practice of democracy reminds of Orwell's "Animal Farm":

Elections resemble a kind of roulette game deciding over the access of different pigs to the troughs to be filled by all others. . . The citizens serving and maintaining politicians. But: Aren't politicians and civil servants exactly that: Servants? Are the citizens not the only sovereign? Don't we "keep" those servants?

In resemblance of the metaphorical architectural example comparing the options of rebuilding and adapting existing structures versus planning and erecting a new building on "carte blanche", we can say: The historical development of democracy, substituting monarchy with a different reign, in which the nominal sovereign has little more to say than before, calls for rethinking Democracy "from scratch" on blank white paper.

Namely the high esteem of leftist democrats for the Prussian system and spirit of civil servants induces thoughtful doubt: Is the servants' air of superiority, treating citizens, thus their sovereign, as subordinates, really reflecting the quintessence of democracy as the reign of the people?

It appears clear, that in a democracy the people as the sovereign hardly conscientiously elect and pay others, politicians and bureaucrats, from among them to be patronised, bossed around or otherwise mistreated and abused by them... (Here, the double-r in "bureaucrats" is no miss-spelling, but rather a humourist sarcasm: In Spanish, "Burro" means donkey. Thus: Burrocracy is the "Reign of the Donkeys".)

**"Serving all minorities is serving the majority"** (Gerhard Eichweber, 1978) still is a valid Leitmotiv:

Can any democratic system not respecting minorities at all be acceptable?

How can the current paradigm of democracy, related to the marxist "materialist" focus on generalisation and quantification of all matters, at all be accepted for any "open society"?

And how can societies be detached from such prejudice-brainwash?

Is the Swiss form of government, in which all relevant parties send ministers into the government, forcing these ministers into a collegial consensus of supposedly best solutions, an example to follow?

How to develop a new concept thereupon?

How and by which means as elements of a hidden agenda are current US-american interests undermining Europe's strengths by inducing rules and regulations counterproductive to prosperity and self determination? How is that further deteriorated by a future "free trade" agreement currently under negotiation? Is a democracy, in which lately twice a president was not elected, but with help of falsification and legal procedures installed against the majority vote, at all an example to follow or rather an auspice? And: What does it tell the observer, if bluntly fascistic reigns en route to copying the regime of Pol Pot are absolved as "perfectly democratic" by European politicians? (E.g. Chaves et al. in Venezuela and Morales in Bolivia.)

Studies, quoted by researchers on peace, like Egon Bahr, show, that majorities of people appear to give much higher importance to "dependable sets of rules" than to democracy as such. Now what is this:

Another justification of the political class to act as they do?

Are humans really born followers just requesting a set of rules from their rulers?

Is slavery as desire of bossing others, or submission to such being bossed around, only a desire of certain tribal traits of caucasian diversity? Or of all? Stemming from a North-German population, where the proverb: "*Leever doodt as Slaav!*" ("*Better dead than slave!*") over many centuries has been a principle, by which one lived and was united in defence of liberty, the etymological question regarding the proximity of the terms slave, slavonic and slavery may arise. While this may lead to further thought regarding the universality of rules imposed on peoples limiting their right for cultural diversity – does it also allow to look away from injustice? How do people and peoples serve peace more sustainably? Is, what civil courage demands from us as neighbours on the local level, for instance when we hear or see a woman or child mistreated, not also applicable among peoples? Or is the growing repression of civil courage (and civil disobedience), even at the local level, an indicator, a carte blanche allowing foreign rulers to act against their peoples as they like?

So far, the questions raised above, seriously, but not without humour, appear to be more well grounded than any of the answers seen so far. After all: There are no stupid questions. But answers often are not satisfying sober reasoning. This paper does not provide any answers either. But it aims at posing the questions. And it invites to more clearly orient the criteria to be met versus the fact, that people are different, and that, thus, qualitative distinction has to be a governing “Leitmotiv” of thought leading to a more open and flexible concept of democracy and society. Moreover, (or: meanwhile?) understanding of the role of a “culture” of qualitative distinction as the key to individual success and common prosperity should entice even the most autocratic leaders to adopt and promote the concept of diversity, because only prosperity can stabilise their reigns. Some seem to have understood this. But not the role of qualitative diversity, in order to achieve their objectives.

In fact the error of criticising and lamenting diversity with terms like “individualism” is imminent in many schools of thought, not only since Marx. Thus, this original error also is imminent to religions, such as the Christian since Constantine, because this is when it has been transformed into a set of rule for ruling, a means of power, rather than a guideline for individual search of a way to the truth, as originally inherited from Judaism. A way long lost, ever since someone not learned enough to understand, had tried to understand and interpret the old testament in his way – and proposed (if not imposed) it as the only “right” way. Thus, what was not Judaic, and originally also not Christian, has now even infected Judaism: Orthodoxy. Reminding us of the quote: *“The Lord also wants who warship him like that”* may invoke tolerance even towards the intolerant. But it must not allow the intolerant to repress the tolerant. Liberty must end, where it interferes with the same liberty of others. Demagogic populism must be stopped where, instead of empowering all in their diversity, ideology aim at equalising all under one egalitarian concept. And education, including education in qualitative distinction and expression certainly is the most important weapon against unquestioned prejudice becoming “law”. Also, because democracy without sufficient and steadily maximised education always risks to be open to demagogy. Here, even Switzerland is an example of how far populism can unite majorities behind silly concepts. Without education, democracy is always at the verge of fatal errors. A Spanish proverb may explain it: *“The errors of the many are the errors of the stupid”*. A sentence also suitable to question the fashion of supposing a “wisdom” of crowds... But certainly an argument for rethinking democracy towards respecting the diversity of the people. Because otherwise it can never be the reign of the people.