

**Muammar Al
Qathafi**

**The
Green
Book**

Part One

**The Solution of the
Problem of
Democracy**

**'The Authority of
the People'**

3211
Q-10
w95
ع. زاهد
8771

Muammar Al Qathafi

THE GREEN BOOK

Part One

The Solution of the
Problem of

Democracy

'The Authority of
the People'

THE INSTRUMENT OF GOVERNING

'The Instrument of Governing is the prime political problem which faces human communities.'

Even the conflict within the family is, often, the result of this problem.

'This problem has become serious since the emergence of modern societies.'

Peoples, nowadays, face this persistent problem and communities suffer from various risks and grave consequences to which it leads. They have not yet succeeded in solving it finally and democratically.

The GREEN BOOK presents the final solution to the problem of the instrument of governing.

All political systems in the world today are the product of the struggle for power between instruments of governing. The struggle may be peaceful or armed, such as the conflict of classes, sects, tribes, parties or individuals. The result is always the victory of an instrument of governing — be it an individual, group, party or class and the defeat of the people, i.e. the defeat of genuine democracy.

Political struggle that results in the victory of a candidate with 51 per cent of the votes leads to a dictatorial governing body disguised as a false democracy, since 49 per cent of the electorate is ruled by an instrument of governing they did not vote for, but had imposed upon them. This is dictatorship. Besides, this political conflict may produce a governing body that represents only a minority, for when votes are distributed among several candidates, one of them polls more than any other candidate. But if the votes polled by those who received less are added up, they can constitute an overwhelming majority. However, the candidate with fewer votes wins and his success is regarded as legitimate and democratic! In actual fact, dictatorship is established under the cover of false democracy. This is the reality of the political systems prevailing in the world today. They are dictatorial systems and it seems clear that they falsify genuine democracy.

PARLIAMENTS

Parliaments are the backbone of traditional democracy as it exists today. A parliament is a misrepresentation of the people and parliamentary governments are a misleading solution to the problem of democracy. A parliament is originally founded to represent the people, but this in itself, is undemocratic as democracy means the authority of the people and not an authority acting on their behalf. The mere existence of a parliament means the absence of the people, but true democracy exists only through the participation of the people, not through the activity of their representatives. Parliaments have been a legal barrier between the peoples and the exercise of authority, excluding masses from power while usurping sovereignty in their place. Peoples are left with only false external appearance of democracy manifested in long

No
representation
in lieu of the
people

Representation
is a denial of
participation

queues to cast their votes in the ballot boxes.

To lay bare the character of the parliament, we have to look to the origin of such a parliament. The parliament is either elected from constituencies or a party or a coalition of parties, or is formed by some method of appointment. But all these procedures are undemocratic, for dividing the population into constituencies means that one member of parliament represents thousands, hundreds of thousands or millions of people, depending on the size of population. It also means that the member keeps no popular organisational link with the electors since he, like other members, is looked upon as a representative of the whole people. This is what the prevailing traditional democracy requires. The masses, therefore, are completely isolated from the representative and he, in turn, is totally separated from them. For immediately after winning their votes he himself usurps their

Representation
is a falsification
of democracy

sovereignty and acts instead of them. The prevailing traditional democracy endows the member of a parliament with a sacredness and immunity denied to other individual members of the people. That means that parliaments have become a means of plundering and usurping the peoples' authority. Hence the people have the right to struggle, through the popular revolution, to destroy instruments which usurp democracy and sovereignty and take them away from the masses. They also have the right to utter the new principle, *no representation in lieu of the people*. If, however, the parliament emerges from a party as a result of winning an election, it is a parliament of the party and not of the people. It represents the party and not the people, and the executive power assigned by the parliament is that of the winning party and not of the people. The same is true of the parliament in which each party holds a number of seats. For the members of the parliament repre-

sent their party and not the people, and the power established by such a coalition is the power of the combined parties and not of the people. Under such systems the people are victims, fooled and exploited by political bodies. The people stand silently in long queues to cast their votes in the ballot boxes in the same way as they throw other papers into the dustbin. This is the traditional democracy prevalent in the whole world, whether the system is one-party, two-party, multi-party or non-party. Thus it becomes clear that *representation is fraud*. Assemblies formed by a method of appointment or hereditary succession do not fall under any form of democracy. Moreover, since the system of elected parliaments is based on propaganda to win votes, it is a demagogic system in the real sense of the word, and votes can be bought and falsified. Poor people fail to compete in the election campaign and it is always the rich — and only the rich — who come out victorious.

Philosophers, thinkers and writers advocated the theory of representative government at a time when the peoples, without realising it, were driven like sheep by kings, sultans and conquerors. The ultimate aspiration of the people of those times was to have someone to represent them before such rulers. Even that aspiration was nullified. Peoples went through long and bitter struggles to attain what they aspired to. After the successful establishment of the era of the republics and the beginning of the era of the masses, it is unreasonable that democracy should mean the electing of only a few representatives to act on behalf of great masses. This is an obsolete theory and an outdated experience. The whole authority must be the people's. The most tyrannical dictatorships the world has known have existed under the shadow of parliaments.

THE PARTY

The party
system aborts
democracy

The party is the contemporary dictatorship. It is the modern dictatorial instrument of governing. The party is the rule of a part over the whole. It is the latest dictatorial instrument. As the party is not individual, it exercises a sham democracy through establishing parliaments and committees and through the propaganda of its members. The party is not a democratic instrument at all because it is composed of people who have common interests, a common outlook or a common culture; or who belong to the same locality or have the same belief. They form a party to achieve their ends, impose their outlook or extend the hold of their belief on the society as a whole. A party's aim is to achieve power under the pretext of carrying out its programme. And yet, democratically, none of these parties should govern the whole peo-

To make a
party you
split society

ple because of the diversity of interests, ideas, temperaments, localities and beliefs, which constitute the people's identity. The party is a dictatorial instrument of governing that enables those with one outlook and a common interest to rule the people as a whole. Compared with the people, the party is a minority.

The purpose of forming a party is to create an instrument to rule the people; namely to rule over non-members of the party. For the party is, fundamentally, based on an arbitrary authoritarian theory . . . i.e. the domination of the members of the party over the rest of individual members of the people. The party presupposes that its accession to power is the way to attain its ends, assuming that its objectives are the objectives of the people. That is the theory of the justification of party dictatorship, which is the basis for any dictatorship. No matter how many parties there are, the theory remains one and the same. But the existence of many parties escalates

the struggle for power and this results in the destruction of any achievements of the people and of any socially beneficial plans. Such destruction is seized upon by the opposition party as a justification to undermine the position of the ruling party so that it may take over from them. The parties in their struggle resort, if not to arms, which rarely happens, then to denouncing and stultifying the actions of each other. This is a battle which is inevitably waged at the expense of the higher and vital interests of the society. Some, if not all, of those higher interests will be victims of the power struggle of instruments of governing. For the destruction of those interests supports the opposition party or parties in their argument against the ruling party. The opposition party, as an instrument of governing, has to oust the ruling body in order to have access to authority. To prove the unfitness of the instrument of governing, the opposition party has to destroy its achievements and

to cast doubt on its plans, even if those plans are beneficial to the society. Consequently the interests and programmes of the society become victims of the parties' struggle for power. Such struggle is, therefore, politically, socially and economically destructive to the society, despite the fact that it creates political activity. Besides, the struggle results in the victory of another instrument of governing, i.e., the fall of one party and the rise of another. But it is a defeat for the people, a defeat for democracy. Furthermore, parties can be bought or bribed either from inside or outside.

Originally, the party is formed to represent the people. Then the leading group of the party represents its members and the supreme leader of the party represents the leading group. It becomes clear that the party game is a deceitful farce based on a sham form of democracy which has a selfish content based on

manoeuvres, tricks and political games. All these emphasise that the party-system is a dictatorial, yet modern, instrument. The party system is an overt, not a covert, dictatorship. The world has not yet passed beyond it and it is rightly called 'the dictatorship of the modern age'.

The parliament of the winning party is indeed a parliament of the party, as the executive power assigned by this parliament is the power of the party over the people. Party power, which is supposed to be for the good of the whole people, is actually a bitter enemy of a part of the people, namely the opposition party or parties and their supporters. So the opposition is not a popular check on the ruling party, but is itself seeking a chance to replace the ruling party. According to modern democracy, the legal check on the ruling party is the parliament, the majority of whose members are from that ruling party. That is to say, checking is in the hands of the ruling party and rule is in the hands

of the checking party. Thus become clear the deceptiveness, falsity and invalidity of the political theories dominant in the world today, from which contemporary traditional democracy emerges.

The party is only a part of the people, but the sovereignty of the people is indivisible.

The party governs on behalf of the people, but the principle is *no representation in lieu of the people*.

The party system is the modern tribal and sectarian system. The society governed by one party is exactly like that which is governed by one tribe or one sect. The party, as stated above, represents the outlook of a certain group of people, or the interests of one group of the society, or one belief or one locality. Such a party must be a minority compared to the whole people just as the tribe and the sect are. The

minority has common interests or a sectarian belief. From such interests or belief, the common outlook is formed. Only blood-relationship distinguishes a tribe from a party and even at the foundation of a party there may be blood-relationship. There is no difference between party struggles and tribal or sectarian struggles for power. And if tribal and sectarian rule is politically rejected and disavowed, then the party system must similarly be rejected and disavowed. Both of them tread the same path and lead to the same end. The negative and destructive effect on the society of the tribal and sectarian struggles is identical to the negative and destructive effect of the party struggle.

CLASS

8771

The class political system is the same as the party, the tribal, or sectarian system, i.e. a class dominates the society in the same way that a party, tribe or sect does. The class, like the party, sect and tribe, is a group of people from the society who share common interests. Common interests arise from the existence of a group of people bound together by blood-relationship, belief, culture, locality or standard of living. Also class, party, sect and tribe emerge from similar factors leading to similar results, i.e. they emerge because blood-relationship, belief, standard of living, culture and locality create a common outlook to achieve a common end. Thus emerges the social structure in the forms of class, party, tribe or sect that eventually becomes a political conception directed toward realising the outlook and ends of that group.

In all cases the people are neither the class, the party, the tribe nor the sect; these are no more than a part of the people and constitute a minority. If a class, party, tribe or sect dominates a society, the whole system becomes a dictatorship. However, a class or tribal coalition is better than a party coalition because the people consist originally of a group of tribes. One seldom finds people who do not belong to a tribe, and all people belong to a certain class. But no party or parties embrace all the people and therefore the party or party coalition represents a minority compared to the masses outside its membership. Under genuine democracy there is no excuse for one class to crush other classes for its own benefit, no excuse for one party to crush other parties for its own interests, no excuse for one tribe to crush other tribes for its own benefit and no excuse for one sect to crush other sects for its own interests.

To allow such actions means aban-

doning the logic of democracy and resorting to the logic of force. Such an action is dictatorial, because it is not in the interest of the whole society, which does not consist of only one class or tribe or sect or the members of one party. There is no justification for such an action. The dictatorial justification is that the society is actually made up of various parts, and one of the parts undertakes the liquidation of other parts in order to stand solely in power. This action is then not in the interest of the whole society, but in the interest of a certain class, tribe, sect or party, i.e., it is in the interest of those who replace the society. The action of liquidation is originally directed against the members of the society who do not belong to the party, the class, the tribe or the sect which undertakes the liquidation.

The society torn apart by party struggles is similar to one torn by tribal and sectarian struggles.

The party that is formed in the name of a class automatically becomes a substitute for that class and continues until it becomes a replacement for the class hostile to it.

Any class which becomes heir to a society, inherits, at the same time, its characteristics. That is to say that if the working class crushes all other classes, for instance, it becomes heir of the society, that is, it becomes the material and social base of the society. The heir bears the traits of the one he inherits from, though they may not be evident at once. As time passes, attributes of other eliminated classes emerge in the very ranks of the working class. And the possessors of those characteristics take the attitudes and points of view appropriate to their characteristics. Thus the working class turns out to be a separate society, showing the same contradictions as the old society. The material and moral standards of the members of the society are diverse at first but then there emerge the

factions that automatically develop into classes like those which had been eliminated. Thus the struggle for domination of the society starts again. Each group of people, then each faction and finally each new class, tries to become the instrument of governing.

The material base of the society is not stable because it has a social aspect. The instrument of governing of the single material base of the society will, perhaps, be stable for some time, but it will pass away as soon as new material and social standards emerge out of the same single material base. Any society with class conflict was in the past a one-class society but, due to inevitable evolution, the conflicting classes emerged from that one class.

The class that expropriates the possessions of others in order to maintain the instrument of governing for its own interests will find that material possessions have

brought within that class what material possessions usually bring about within the society as a whole.

In short, attempts to unify the material base of the society to solve the problem of government or to put an end to the struggle in favour of party, class, sect or tribe, have failed, such as the efforts to satisfy the masses through the election of representatives or by organising plebiscites to discover their views. To go on with these efforts has become a waste of time and a mockery of the people.

PLEBISCITES

Plebiscites are a fraud against democracy. Those who say 'yes' and those who say 'no' do not, in fact, express their will. They have been silenced through the conception of modern democracy. They have been allowed to utter only one word: either 'yes' or 'no'. This is the most cruel and oppressive dictatorial system. He who says 'no' should give reasons for his answer. He should explain why he did not say 'yes'. And he who says 'yes' should give reasons for approval and why he did not say 'no'. Everyone should make clear what he wants and the reasons for his approval or rejection.

What road, then, must human groups take to get rid, once and for all, of the tyrannical and dictatorial ages?

Since the intricate problem in the case of democracy is the instrument of governing, expressed by conflicts

The fallacy
of a 'Yes' or
Plebiscite

of classes, parties and individuals; and since the electoral and plebiscite methods were invented to cover the failure of those unsuccessful experiments to solve this problem, the solution lies in finding an instrument of governing other than these which are subject to conflict and which represent only one side of the society. That is to say, an instrument of governing which is not a party, a class, a sect or a tribe, but an instrument of governing which is the people as a whole. It neither represents the people nor speaks in their name.

No representation in lieu of the people and representation is fraud. If that instrument can be brought into being the problem will be solved, popular democracy will be realised, mankind will have put an end to tyrannical eras and dictatorial systems, and the authority of the people will have taken their place.

The Green Book presents the

solution to the problem of the instrument of governing. It indicates for the people the way to pass from the eras of dictatorship to the eras of genuine democracy.

This new theory is based on the authority of the people, without representation or deputation. It realises direct democracy in an orderly and effective form. It differs from the older attempt at direct democracy, which could not be applied in practice and which was frivolous because it lacked popular organisation on the lower levels.


POPULAR CONGRESSES AND PEOPLE'S COMMITTEES

Popular congresses are the only means to achieve popular democracy. Any system of government other than popular congresses is undemocratic. All the prevailing systems of government in the world today are undemocratic, unless they adopt this method. Popular congresses are the end of the journey of the masses' movement in its quest for democracy.

Popular congresses and people's committees are the final fruit of the people's struggle for democracy. Popular congresses and people's committees are not creations of the imagination so much as they are the product of human thought which has absorbed all human experiments to achieve democracy. Direct democracy is the ideal method, which, if realised in practice, is indisputable

No democracy
without
popular
congresses

THE AUTHORITY OF THE PEOPLE



KEY:



General Secretariat of the General People's Congress

General People's Committee

Secretariat of the Congress

People's Committee of Different Executive Sectors
(Agriculture, Education, Health, Housing, etc.)

Syndicate or Association or Union

and noncontroversial. The nations departed from direct democracy because, however small a people might be, it was impossible to gather them all together at one time in order to discuss, study and decide on their policy. Direct democracy remained an Utopian idea far from reality. It has been replaced by various theories of government such as representative assemblies, parties, coalitions, and plebiscites. All led to the isolation of the people from political activity and to the plundering of the sovereignty of the people and the assumption of their authority by the successive and conflicting instruments of governing beginning with the individual, on through the class, the sect, the tribe, the parliament and the party.

The Green Book announces to the people the happy discovery of the way to direct democracy, in a practical form. Since no two intelligent people can dispute the fact that direct democracy is the ideal — but its method has been impossible to

apply — and since this Third Universal Theory provides us with a realistic experiment in direct democracy, the problem of democracy in the world is finally solved. All that the masses need do now is to struggle to put an end to all forms of dictatorial rule in the world today, to all forms of what is falsely called democracy — from parliaments to the sect, the tribe, the class and to the one-party, the two-party and the multi-party systems.

Democracy has but one method and one theory. The disparity and dissimilarity of the systems claiming to be democratic is evidence that they are not democratic in fact. The people's authority has only one face and it can be realised only by one method, namely, popular congresses and people's committees. *No democracy without popular congresses and committees everywhere.*

First, the people are divided into

basic popular congresses. Each basic popular congress chooses its secretariat. The secretariats together form popular congresses, which are other than the basic ones. Then the masses of those basic popular congresses choose administrative people's committees to replace government administration. Thus all public utilities are run by people's committees which will be responsible to the basic popular congresses and these dictate the policy to be followed by the people's committees and supervise its execution. Thus, both the administration and the supervision become popular and the outdated definition of democracy — *Democracy is the supervision of the government by the people* — comes to an end. It will be replaced by the right definition *Democracy is the supervision of the people by the people*.

All citizens who are members of those popular congresses belong, professionally and functionally, to categories. They have, therefore, to

establish their own unions and syndicates in addition to being, as citizens, members of the basic popular congresses or the people's committees. Subjects discussed by basic popular congresses or the people's committees, syndicates and unions, will take their final shape in the General People's Congress, where the secretariats of popular congresses, people's committees, syndicates and unions meet. What is drafted by the General People's Congress, which meets annually or periodically, will, in turn, be submitted to popular congresses, people's committees, syndicates and unions. The people's committees, responsible to the basic popular congresses will, then, start executive action. The General People's Congress is not a gathering of members or ordinary persons as is the case with parliaments. It is a gathering of the basic popular congresses, the people's committees, the unions, the syndicates and all professional associations.

In this way, the problem of the instrument of governing is, as a matter of fact, solved and dictatorial instruments will disappear. The people are the instrument of governing and the problem of democracy in the world is completely solved.

THE LAW OF SOCIETY

Law is the other problem parallel to the problem of the instrument of governing. It has not yet been solved in the modern age although it has been solved at certain periods of history.

It is invalid and undemocratic for a committee or a parliament to be entitled to draft the law for the society. It is also invalid and undemocratic for an individual, a committee or a parliament to amend or abrogate the law of the society.

What, then, is the law of the society? Who drafts it and what is its importance to democracy?

The natural law of any society is either tradition (custom) or religion. Any other attempt to draft law for any society, outside these two sources, is invalid and illogical. Constitutions are not the law of the society. A constitution is a basic

man-made law. That basic man-made law should have a source for its justification. The problem of freedom in the modern age is that constitutions have become the law of society, and constitutions are based on nothing other than the views of the instruments of the dictatorial rule prevailing in the world, ranging from the individual to the party. The proof of this is that there is a difference between constitutions although man's freedom is the same. The reason for the difference is the disparity in the conceptions of the instruments of governing. This is the point where freedom is vulnerable in the systems of the contemporary world. The method by which the instruments of governing seek to dominate the peoples is established in the constitution and the people are compelled to accept it under the force of laws derived from that constitution, which is itself the product of the temperament and outlook of the instrument of governing.

The law of the dictatorial instru-

ments of governing has replaced natural law. Because man-made law has replaced natural law, standards are lost. Man is the same everywhere. His physical constitution is the same and so is his instinct. For this reason natural law became a logical law for man as one and the same. Then the constitutions, which are man-made laws, began to look at man as not one and the same. They have no justification for that conception other than the will of instruments of governing — the individual, the parliament, the tribe or the party — to dominate the peoples. So we see that constitutions are usually changed when the instruments of governing change. This proves that the constitution is the product of the temperament of the instruments of governing and exists to serve their interests. It is not natural law. This is the impending danger to freedom latent wherever the genuine law of human society is absent and is replaced by man-made laws designed by the instrument of governing to

rule the masses. Properly the method of government should be in accordance with the laws of society, not vice versa.

Therefore, the law of the society is not subject to drafting and codification. The significance of law lies in the fact that it is the decisive factor which distinguishes between the true and false, the right and the wrong, and the individuals' rights and duties. Freedom is threatened unless society has a sacred law based on stable rules which are not subject to change or substitution by any instrument of governing. On the contrary, it is incumbent upon the instrument of governing to abide by the law of society. Nevertheless, peoples throughout the world are now being ruled by man-made laws that are liable to change and abrogation because of the struggle for power between instruments of governing. Plebiscites on constitutions are not enough because plebiscites in themselves are a sham democracy, permitting only yes or no. Under

man-made laws, peoples are compelled to accept plebiscites. A plebiscite on a constitution does not mean that it is the law of society; it means that it is only a constitution, or that 'thing' subject to plebiscite, nothing else.

The law of the society is an eternal human heritage that is not the possession of the living only. Hence, the drafting of a constitution and holding a plebiscite by present voters are farcical.

Encyclopedias of man-made laws derived from man-made constitutions are full of material penalties against man while traditional law seldom has these penalties. Traditional law imposes moral, not material penalties, that are appropriate for man. Religion embraces and absorbs tradition. Most material penalties in religion are postponed until the Day of Judgement. The major part of its rules are exhortations, instructions and answers to

questions. This law shows proper respect to man. Religion does not acknowledge temporal penalties, except in extreme cases where these are necessary to protect society.

Religion embraces tradition, which is an expression of the natural life of the peoples. Thus, religion, embracing tradition, is an affirmation of natural law. Non-religious, non-traditional laws are invented by one man for use against another. Therefore they are invalid because they are not built upon the natural source of tradition and religion.

WHO SUPERVISES THE CONDUCT OF SOCIETY?

The question that arises is: who preserves the society from any deviation from the law? Democratically, there is no group whatever that can claim the right of representative supervision over the society. *'Society is its own supervisor.'* Any pretension by any individual or group that it is responsible for law is dictatorship. Democracy means the responsibility of the whole society, and supervision should be carried out by the whole society. That is democracy and its proper implementation is through the democratic instrument of governing, resulting from the organization of society itself in basic popular congresses and from the people's rule through the popular congresses and the General People's Congress (National Congress) in which come together the popular

congresses, administrative people's committees, unions, syndicates and all other professional organizations. According to this theory, the people are the instrument of governing and in this case they are their own supervisor. In this way self-supervision of the society over its law is realized.

HOW DOES SOCIETY READJUST ITS DIRECTION IN CASE OF DEVIATION FROM ITS LAW?

If an instrument of governing is dictatorial, as in political systems in the world today, the society's vigilance towards deviation from law will have only one way to gain readjustment. That is violence, which means revolution against the instrument of governing. This violence or revolution, even if it is an expression of the feeling of the society against deviation, is not carried out by the whole society. It is undertaken only by those who have the initiative and boldness to proclaim the will of the society. However, this approach is the way to dictatorship, for this revolutionary initiative increases the opportunity for an instrument of governing, representative of the people, to arise. This means that the instrument of governing is still dictatorial. Moreover, violence and

change by force are themselves undemocratic, although they take place as a result of the existence of a previous undemocratic situation. The society that is still entangled around this resultant is a backward society. What, then, is the solution?

The solution is for the people to be the instrument of governing — from basic popular congresses to the General People's Congress. The government administration is abolished and replaced by people's committees. The General People's Congress should be a national congress where basic popular congresses, people's administrative committees, unions, syndicates and all professional associations come together. If a deviation from the society's law takes place under this system, it should be dealt with through a democratic revision rather than by force. This is not a process of voluntary choice of the method of change or of treat-

ment; rather it is an inevitable result of the nature of such a democratic system. In such a case, there is no outside group against which violent action may be directed or which may be held responsible for deviation.

Democracy
means popular
rule not
popular
expression

THE PRESS

The natural person has freedom to express himself even if, when he is mad, he behaves irrationally to express his madness. The corporate person also is free to express his corporate identity. In these cases, the first represents only himself, and the second represents no more than the group of natural persons composing his corporate person. The society consists of many natural and many corporate persons. Therefore, when a person, for instance, expresses himself in an irrational manner, that does not mean that the other persons of the society also are mad. The expression of a natural person is only self-expression, and that of a corporate person is only the expression of the interests or viewpoints of persons forming the corporate person. For example, the company for the production and sale of tobacco only expresses the interests of the participants in that company,

i.e. those who benefit from the production or sale of tobacco although it is harmful to the health of others.

The press is a means of expression of the society and is not a means of expression of a natural or corporate person. Logically and democratically, the press, therefore, cannot be owned by either of these.

Any newspaper owned by an individual is his own and expresses only his point of view. Any claim that a newspaper represents public opinion is groundless because it actually expresses the viewpoints of a natural person. Democratically, a natural person should not be permitted to own any means of publication or information. However he has the natural right to express himself by any means, even if it is in an irrational manner to prove his madness. Any journal issued by a trading association or by a chamber of commerce is only a means of expression for this particular social group. It presents its own point of view and not the viewpoint of public opinion.

This applies to all other corporate and natural persons in society. The democratic press is that which is issued by a popular committee comprising all the various categories of society. In this case only, and not otherwise, will the press or any information medium be an expression of the whole society and a bearer of the viewpoint of its categories and thereby the press or information medium will be indeed democratic.

If the Medical Association issues a journal, it must be purely medical. Similarly this applies to other categories. The natural person has the right to express only himself and he is not entitled from the democratic point of view to express anybody else. In this way, what is called the problem of press freedom in the world will be solved radically and democratically. The continuing problem of press freedom in the world today is generally the product of the problem of democracy. It cannot be solved unless the entire crisis of democracy in the whole

society is solved. Only the Third Universal Theory can solve the intricate problem of democracy.

According to this theory, the democratic system is a cohesive structure whose foundations are firmly laid on basic popular congresses, people's committees and professional associations. All these come together in the General People's Congress. Absolutely, there is no other conception for a genuine democratic society.

Finally, the era of the masses, which approaches us at a rapid pace following the era of the republics, inflames the feelings and dazzles the eyes. As much as this era gladly announces the real freedom of the masses and their happy emancipation from the shackles of instruments of governing so much it warns of the approach of an age of anarchy and demagogy if the new democracy, which is the authority of the people, does not relapse and the

authority of the individual, class, tribe, sect or party again comes to predominate.

Theoretically, this is the genuine democracy. But realistically, the strong always rule, i.e., the stronger part in the society is the one that rules.