

Q&A on the economic model of Inclusive Democracy*

A general point about the questions asked by the workshop

The questions in general show a significant degree of misunderstanding about the nature of the ID project which, unlike for instance Parecon, is *not* just a narrow economic model expressing the “vision” of some intellectuals about an alternative economy, supplemented by some half baked ideas about the political institutions which are compatible with the economic model —a sort of so-called “participatory democracy”. Instead, the Inclusive Democracy project is a full-fledged political project with its own historical analysis of present reality, and a proposal for an economic democracy as part of an Inclusive Democracy (direct political democracy, ecological democracy and democracy in the social realm) which is not just a “vision” but a synthesis as well as a transcendence of the historical trends for autonomous forms of social organisation which re-appear in every major insurrection or revolution. Finally, the ID project is complemented by a new transitional strategy leading us from here to there.

So, the following answers represent a clarification of some of the questions raised, which however betray a kind of demand for full details on various very specific points ignoring the fundamental fact on which economic democracy is based, i.e. that, at this stage, all we can do is make some proposals on general principles which show the feasibility and desirability of an ID-based society and not provide a “cookery book” for the future society. It is the function of the assemblies of the future to fill in the details of economic organisation and not ours!

1. ON PLANNING

a) Who can become a member of the planning group, that connects the workplace and the demotic assembly?

This is a question arising out of Parecon not ID!^[1] We do not envisage a special planning group, since planning plays a role only with respect to meeting the basic needs of citizens in ID, whereas non-basic needs are covered through the revealed preferences of citizens as they use their vouchers (or credit card points), and the preferences of specific demotic enterprises. There are no planning groups in ID connecting workplace assemblies and the demotic assembly, although of course there is a lot of feedback from the former to the latter and vice versa, particularly so as many (though not all) members of the demotic assemblies are also members of the workplace assemblies. Planners simply provide their technical expertise on the feasibility and desirability of the assemblies’ decisions and particularly design feasibility plans on alternative ways of allocating resources, based on the assemblies’ wishes.

b) How is it possible to calculate in advance?

In an ID-based society, such calculation in advance is needed only for basic needs so that the number of basic vouchers (BVs) (or “basic credit points”) could be estimated. The overall number of BVs that are issued is determined on the basis of criteria which satisfy both demand and supply conditions, at the confederal level.

Thus, as regards demand, planners could estimate its size and mix, on the basis of the size of the population of the confederation, the size of the “basic needs” entitlement for each citizen and the “revealed preferences” of consumers concerning satisfiers, as expressed by the number of vouchers used in the past for each type of satisfier.

As regards supply, planners could estimate, on the basis of technological averages, the production level, the mix, and the resources needed, including the amount of work that each citizen has to do. Thus, every member of the confederation, if he/she is able to work, will have to work a “basic” number of hours per week, in a line of activity of his/her choice, to produce the resources needed for the satisfaction of the basic needs of the confederation.

Draft plans could then be drawn on the basis of these estimates, and the confederal assembly could select, on the basis of the decisions of the community assemblies and workplace assemblies, the plan to be implemented and the implied amount of resources needed for its implementation.

Each citizen is then issued a number of BVs according to the special “category of need” s/he belongs. Thus, the confederal assembly will determine a list of categories of basic needs for each section of the population using multiple criteria, including sex, age, special needs, etc. Then, in cases where this “objective” allocation of BVs has to be amended to take into account personal circumstances, the community assemblies could make appropriate adjustments.

c) How can one make sure, that they won't gain much more power than others?

Again, this is another example of a question arising out of Parecon, where planners do have a special role to play and consequently such a problem could arise — not out of the ID project, within which planners are just like any other specialists (engineers, doctors, etc.), whose advice is valuable but is assessed first by their colleagues and counterparts and then by citizens who can listen to alternative views on the same issue and then decide accordingly! It is the demotic assemblies which make the final decisions based on the equal distribution of power so that none can overpower the others. Furthermore, equality of power that is secured through the workplace assemblies, will abolish any hierarchy at the workplace with access to all job information and therefore abolish *hierarchical* divisions of labour.

2. ON THE INDEX OF DESIRABILITY AND THE ARTIFICIAL MARKET

a) How can you calculate the index?

The rate of remuneration for non-basic work, namely, the rate which determines the number of non-basic vouchers a citizen receives for such work, should express the preferences of citizens both as producers and consumers.

As regards their preferences as producers, it is obvious that given the inequality of the various types of work, equality of remuneration will in fact mean unequal work satisfaction. As,

however, the selection of any objective standard (e.g., in terms of usefulness, effects on health, calories spent, etc.) will inevitably involve a degree of subjective bias, the only rational solution may be to use a kind of “inter-subjective” measure, like the one suggested by Baldelli [2], that is, to use a “criterion of desirability” for each kind of activity. But, desirability cannot be simply assessed, as Baldelli suggests, by the number of individuals declaring their willingness to undertake each kind of work. Given the present state of technology, even if we assume that in a future society most of today’s hyper specialisation will disappear, still, many jobs will require specialised knowledge or training. Therefore, a complex “index of desirability” should be constructed with the use of multiple rankings of the various types of work, based on the “revealed” preferences of citizens in choosing the various types of basic and non-basic activity. The remuneration for each type of work could then be determined as an inverse function of its index of desirability (i.e., the higher the index, that is the more desirable a type of work, the lower its rate of remuneration). Thus, the index will provide us with “weights” which we can use to estimate the value of each hour’s work in the allocation of non-basic vouchers. However, the index of desirability cannot be the sole determinant of the rate of remuneration.

The wishes of citizens as consumers, as expressed by the “prices” of non-basic goods and services, should also be taken into account. This would also have the important effect of linking the set of “prices” for goods and services with that of remuneration for the various types of work so that the allocation of work in the non-basic sector may be effected in a way that secures balance between demand and supply. We could therefore imagine that half the rate of remuneration in the production of non-basic goods and services is determined by the index of desirability and the rest is determined by the “prices” of goods and services.

b) How can you make sure, that the vouchers can't be traded, or even made to things that work like money (with interests or even option businesses) or is that no aim of yours?

It is obvious that the ID system proposed has nothing to do with a money economy which is ruled out because money, or anything used as an impersonal means of exchange, cannot be stopped from being used as a means of storing wealth. A money model is not compatible with an ID system of vouchers in which “all (of the vouchers are) issued on a personal basis, so that they cannot be used, like money, as a general medium of exchange and store of wealth”. [3] So, vouchers being personalized and possibly having an expiration date —this could work easier with a special credit card scheme issued by the demos— cannot be traded or function as money. Furthermore, there are no banks to offer interest (only demotic banks that work as intermediary bodies and lend goods or services to demotic enterprises). There are no hedge funds. There is no stock exchange. In addition, no one can collect them for his/her children. No one can make profit using your manpower. No one can get the ID vouchers to a capitalistic bank outside an ID community. Vouchers are not exchanged in the international stock markets. In ID there is no private property so there is no profit on property. No private business. No profit of other people work. No stock market. So no profit of shares, etc.

3. ON THE TRANSFORMATION OF SOCIETY (TRANSITION PROBLEM)

a) Whose interest is it to start the transformation?

In short, the people who are the victims of the system and those with the political awareness to re-make society^[4].

The social groups, who have an interest in overthrowing the systemic status-quo, are all those different social groups who find themselves disenfranchised by the ever-increasing process of concentration of power taking place because of the dynamics inherent in the current system. The concept of the “Social Group” is central in the ID expanded class-theory and is not to be understood purely in economic terms, but it may also incorporate political and social groups that belong at the middle, lower-middle and bottom levels of the social pyramid and, as a result, find themselves eliminated from all the sources of institutionalised forms of power in the current hierarchical totality. Class distinctions in ID theory are not to be seen as merely the byproducts of capitalist productive relations (as happens in Marxism which limits itself to an examination of power relations in the sphere of the economy), but also as the result of an uneven distribution of power in the political, social and cultural fields, in which class distinctions arise from the different ability of social groups to influence the overall framework and development of those respective fields.

Social groups form sub-totalities which belong to the overall systemic hierarchical totality and are characterized by the sharing of ideas, interests and aspirations among the members that comprise them. To the extent that these groups have no access to the sources of real institutionalized power, they are forced by means of physical, economic coercion and the cultural/ideological coercion embedded in the socialisation process to adopt as their own ideas, interests and aspirations which are compatible with the hierarchical social structure which keeps them subservient to the system and are in reality transmitted to them by the elites and the dominant social groups at the top. In so doing, they submit to the institutionalised power relations, which are characteristic of all heteronomous societies and they forego their right to control their lives, to formulate the basic choices that affect their social and individual existence, in short, to determine the boundaries of their development as distinct social units.

It follows, that the end-product of class-divisions as envisaged by ID theory, is the inability of social persons and social units at the bottom of the pyramid (dominated persons and units) to choose their own path of development, to determine their own priorities and formulate their own value-systems consistent with their desires and aspirations. Instead, they must submit to the will of the elites and the dominant social groups and act in accordance with predetermined ends, within the boundaries set for them by the elites, which naturally may never exceed or upset the fundamental parameters of the existing power structure. The divergence of aims and interests between the elites/dominant social groups and the dominated social groups is created precisely because of the class divisions which by definition exist in every heteronomous society.

The most characteristic example that comes to mind is the Iraq war. This was an aim fervently espoused by the political, economic and cultural transnational elites of the advanced market economies, but was overwhelmingly opposed by huge social majorities, particularly in European countries. Yet, the invasion could not be averted and it was soldiers drawn from the lower social strata who were sent to Iraq to risk their lives and fight the elite’s dirty battles and not members of the transnational elite themselves, who decided to prosecute the war in the first place.

The same applies for the anti-popular economic measures currently being implemented by governments in the less advanced economies of the European South, who hurt the poorer social strata, only to benefit the privileged minorities of the system of the internationalised market economy, because it is on them that the system depends for achieving the economic “development” which is necessary for its reproduction.

Last but not least, one may refer to the grim reality of ecological destruction, which while “invisible” to the economic transnational elites who are largely responsible for the destruction of the environment and take all the important political and economic decisions within the system of the internationalised market economy, it has already led to ecological devastation in the regions of the poor global South (with the consequent toll in human casualties and mass migrations) and poses a real threat to the overall health and survival of the poorer social strata in the North.

The way ID sees it, social groups who are at the bottom-part of a heteronomous hierarchical totality, have a vested interest in the overthrow of the status-quo. Because, the class-identity of each social individual in contemporary market societies is not monolithic and modern individuals are subjected to domination and power relations in more fields than one, single-issue campaigns can never be enough. This is because of two reasons: a) power relations are diffuse and exist in every social sector where a hierarchical organisational structure exists (for example, domination is expressed by hierarchical structures in the economy, but also, in the political, social and cultural sphere where common citizens are totally excluded and are unable to influence institutional decision-taking processes in any meaningful way) and, b) because the improvement of the social situation of a single social unit is by definition achieved at the expense of the other social groups at the bottom of the social ladder, either because it signifies only a partial improvement in one area of social life (i.e. the abolition of sexual repression of a minority group, does not mean the elimination of heteronomy in the larger political, economic and cultural spheres), or by allowing the hitherto disadvantaged social group to be admitted into the ranks of the elite social units, without affecting the domination and exploitation of the other disadvantaged social groups on which the power of the system is based. Therefore, ID maintains that single-issue and identity movements are not true emancipatory projects because they only aim at the improvement of one’s own situation and admission into the ranks of the dominant social groups. Genuine emancipation presupposes the coming together of all disadvantaged social groups in one single anti-systemic movement united by a common analysis of the current situation, a common world-view and an militant political commitment to the abolition of all hierarchical institutions and the creation of an autonomous social order in which all forms of power will be distributed equally between all citizens irrespective of their sex, economic class, race, ethnicity and so on. But, this is an axiomatic choice that the disenfranchised sectors of society will have to make for themselves.

b) How could the transformation actually happen?

By people organising themselves “from below” (rather than from above as in historic transitional strategies) and starting to build the new ID institutions here and now, possibly after conquering a number of municipalities in local elections on an ID program. However, the ID ideology has to become HEGEMONIC before the total transformation of society (unlike the historic transitional strategies)[5].

4. ON SOCIAL SECURITY

a) How can you make sure, that people, who can't work, get enough (without vouchers)?

As regards caring for the needs of the elderly, children and disabled, those unable to work are entitled to BVs, in exactly the same way as every other citizen in the confederation is. In fact, one might say that the BVs scheme will represent the most comprehensive “social security” system that has ever existed, as it will cover *all* basic needs of those unable to work, according to the definition of basic needs given by the confederal assembly. It is also up to the same assembly to decide whether, on top of these BVs, Non Basic Vouchers (NBVs) will be allocated to those unable to work.

So, people who cannot work would, at least get vouchers which cover their basic needs in accordance with the principle “from everyone according to her/his capabilities to everyone according to her/his need”.

b) What happens to people, that don't want to work (and is there some kind of control)?

Here the distinction ID makes between basic and non-basic needs is crucial. All that is needed from an ID citizen is to offer a few hours of work per day (with modern technology it should not be more than 20 to 25 hours per week) in the production of the basic needs, goods and services to which every ID citizen is entitled. So, if a person works in the non-basic needs sector and refuses to work, then he/she can move to basic needs but if he/she does not want to put even the minimum effort needed for meeting his/her basic needs sector, despite the fact that s/he is perfectly capable to do so, s/he will obviously have to be excluded from ID.

5. ON ENVIRONMENTAL DEMOCRACY

a) What is that?

First of all, in the ID project nobody talks about environmental democracy but about *ecological Democracy*^[6], which can never be achieved within a system of democratic planning, which shares the growth objective as well as the implied meaning of *efficiency*, within which ecological problems are just treated as a problem of externalities, (exactly as Parecon but also orthodox economists and environmentalists do!), and are in effect reduced to secondary problems like those caused by pollution! The main ecological problems, like that of the greenhouse effect, require a change in the very lifestyle of citizens and necessitate abandoning economic growth as the main objective of production. In other words, they require a new production and consumption model and this means that only the institutions of a real democracy, like the ID-based society which is a completely decentralised society, can secure an ecological democracy and not any kind of society based on “democratic planning,” etc, which is in effect a centralised society (even if workers’ and consumers’ councils play a significant role in decision-taking).

b) Who will fight for the rights of the environment?

Again, this is a question arising from Parecon rather than from the Inclusive Democracy project, which is not based on “rights” (that are always *granted* —and therefore easily

reversed as well) by the state and elites— even if they have been conquered after bloody fights. The present case of the reversal of almost all “social conquests” of the last hundred years or so, within the context of neoliberal globalisation and the policies implemented by the European Commission, the IMF, etc. is indicative! ID fights instead for individual and collective autonomy which can only be secured within a system of equal distribution of all forms of power among all citizens, through the direct exercise of power by themselves. With the equal distribution of power secured, rights are not an issue, apart from the need to secure the protection of minorities, for which there can be safety valves as are provisioned by ID (separate minorities’ assemblies and the right to veto certain decisions that can be shown to affect them, etc.). Within an ID based society *it is the democratic institutions themselves* (and the values consistent with them) which secure an ecological democracy and there is no need for somebody to “fight for the rights of the environment”. This is how it works:

At the political level, there are grounds for believing that the creation of a public space will in itself have a very significant effect on reducing the appeal of materialism. This is because the public space will provide a new meaning of life to fill the existential void that the present consumer society creates. The realisation of what it means to be human could reasonably be expected to throw us back toward Nature.

Also, at the economic level, it is not accidental that, historically, the process of destroying the environment en masse has coincided with the process of marketisation of the economy. In other words, the emergence of the market economy and of the consequent growth economy had crucial repercussions on the society-Nature relationship and led to the rise of the ideology of growth as the dominant social paradigm. Thus, an “instrumentalist” view of Nature became dominant, in which Nature was seen as an instrument for economic growth, within a process of endless concentration of power. If we assume that only a confederal society could secure an inclusive democracy today, it would be reasonable to assume further that once the market economy is replaced by a democratically run confederal economy, the grow-or-die dynamics of the former will be replaced by the new social dynamic of the latter: a dynamic aiming at the satisfaction of the community needs and not at growth per se. If the satisfaction of community needs does not depend, as at present, on the continuous expansion of production to cover the “needs” which the market creates, and if the link between economy and society is restored, then there is no reason why the present instrumentalist view of Nature should continue to condition human behaviour.

Furthermore, democracy in the broader social realm could also be reasonably expected to be environmentally-friendly. The phasing out of patriarchal relations in the household and hierarchical relations in general should create a new ethos of non-domination which would embrace both Nature and Society. In other words, the creation of democratic conditions in the social realm should be a decisive step in the creation of the sufficient condition for a harmonious nature-society relationship.

Finally, the fact that the basic unit of social, economic and political life in a confederal democracy would be the demos (as expressed by the demotic assembly) might also be expected to enhance its environmentally-friendly character. It is reasonable to assume —and the evidence of the remarkable success of local communities in safeguarding their environments is overwhelming— that when people rely directly on their natural surroundings for their livelihood, they will develop an intimate knowledge of those surroundings, which will

necessarily affect positively their behaviour towards them. However, the precondition for local control of the environment to be successful is that the community depends on its natural surroundings for its long-term livelihood and that it, therefore, has a direct interest in protecting it —another reason why an ecological society is impossible without economic democracy.

So, although the institutional framework of an ID-based society constitutes only the *necessary* condition for a harmonious relation between the natural and social worlds and the *sufficient* condition refers to the citizens' level of ecological consciousness, still, the radical change in the dominant social paradigm which will follow the institution of an inclusive democracy, combined with the decisive role that *Paedeia* will play in an environmentally-friendly institutional framework, could reasonably be expected to lead to a radical change in the human attitude towards Nature.

6. ON DEMOCRATIC ASSEMBLIES

a) Are people forced to join them? and

b) Do you think it is possible to answer all the questions of what you need and how often would you suggest to talk again about this topic?

Of course people are not forced to join the democratic assemblies in ID. It is just their political and moral duty as citizens (if they wish to be called citizens) to take part in the assemblies as much as they can. Particularly so as this will not be a time-consuming exercise since a monthly meeting of demotic assemblies will usually be adequate in order to set the principles to solve most problems, which will then be incorporated in detailed proposals (made by committees delegated by the assemblies) which will be approved or not by subsequent meetings. As regards decisions of economic nature in particular, only decisions referring to meeting basic needs have to be taken by the assemblies collectively, whereas decisions about non-basic needs are taken by citizens individually through the vouchers or credit card scheme, as described by our proposals on economic democracy. This way in ID, unlike in other schemes of democratic planning, etc. basic needs are met according to the principle “from each according to ability to each according to need”, whereas non-basic needs are satisfied according to the principle of freedom of choice.

Given that the ID Confederation is envisaged to consist of demoi of about 50,000 citizens each (confederated at the regional and confederal levels) this is a perfectly feasible proposal which in fact has worked for more than a century in classical Athens, with a citizen population of about the same size. So, people are not forced to join the assemblies, but of course, as long as they wish to rule themselves through the democratic decision taking process, they have to take part, otherwise they will in effect leave to others the power to decide for them, as they will obviously have to implement the decisions of the majority, even if they do not bother to take part in decision-taking. In case they do not like to be bound by the democratic decisions of the community (and the procedures to change them) they cannot obviously be members of that community.

7. ON SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

a) Do you think, that parents and children should have the same rights (or teachers and students) - and if yes: What effects will that have?

Again, in an ID-based society we do not talk about “rights” as this is a non-hierarchical society in which all citizens are autonomous and rule themselves either collectively (as members of the demotic assemblies and the assemblies at workplaces, education places, etc.) or individually. So, children/pupils, before reaching the age of maturity which will make them able to take part in demotic assemblies as full citizens (this age is determined by the assemblies themselves), can only take part in school assemblies where, together with parents and teachers take part in decision-taking (according to arrangements determined by demotic assemblies about the sharing of power among teachers-parents and pupils) on the day-to-day running of the schools, advise demotic assemblies on the content of education, etc. As regards students in higher education, they take full part in university assemblies together with university teachers (according to arrangements determined by demotic assemblies about the sharing of power among them) on the day-to-day running of the universities, on the specific content of their field of study, advise demotic assemblies on the content of education, etc.[\[7\]](#)

Both children and students are treated as autonomous individuals by parents and teachers and there is no hierarchical power exercised by parents and teachers on children and students although the latter have to recognise and respect the “authority” of the former arising from experience, knowledge and judgement —and act accordingly.

8. ON PEER TO PEER ECONOMY

a) What do you think about Peer Economy? Would you say, it is a further development of ID?

A peer2peer economy is completely irrelevant to ID, as it is implicitly or explicitly taking for granted the market economy, the state and hierarchical society as such, given that any kind of class analysis and social hierarchies is missing. In fact this is an attempt to assume that the pseudo-democracy, which institutions like Wikipedia and Indymedia create, could in fact be expanded to society at large to cover social needs as a whole. But real democracy can only mean face-to-face assemblies and not a pseudo-democracy based on “virtual assemblies” as this reactionary idea implies.

9. SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

a) How can you make sure, that people still have the right EDUCATION for their work (and that not everybody becomes p.e. an artist)? (I've read, that in the system of participative economy [PARECON] they believe, that many more people can for instance make operations, like nurses, and not only doctors - whereas Takis Fotopoulos wrote, that he doesn't think a doctor would clean [which I don't understand]).

Parecon’s idea that an eye surgeon could also work as a nurse and a cleaner, within the context of job complexes, is based on the practically silly idea that rotation of jobs is always possible, something that assumes that either we talk about jobs where no special knowledge is needed, or that the special knowledge required can be obtained by so many people so that no shortage of skills will ever arise. Both these two assumptions are wrong. Even if the study

facilities were available to all able to do specialised surgery, nobody can guarantee that an adequate number of people will always be willing to do such specialised jobs. So, scarcity of specialised people will always exist and everything else is just wishful thinking. If this is so, then job complexes within which e.g., brain surgeons will also spend some of their valuable time doing cleaning jobs, etc. will obviously be utter social waste (and possibly life-threatening too!). Job complexes may be possible in some areas of activity where general knowledge is sufficient for the exercise of some duties, but in areas where a specialised knowledge requiring long years of study and expertise is needed (and these areas multiply with the present technological development) generalised job complexes are a silly waste of social time. Furthermore, job complexes are only possible within a narrow range of activities. Obviously, there can be no rotation of duties among dancers and miners or between economists working as planners and builders!^[8]

b) Do you think, there might be FIGHTS between different areas because of envy? (my local assembly doesn't want to produce the right products and it's too expensive to buy it via extra vouchers) or more importantly: My area doesn't have the natural resources like oil? And if yes: How can you prevent them?

There may of course be different opinions between demotic assemblies and such differences should be sorted out at the regional or the confederal level by the democratic decision-taking of the delegates of all assemblies involved. For example, there may be differences in opinion arising out of a high diversity in the distribution of natural resources. That is why we propose that the confederal assemblies will take care —when they decide the resources available in the confederation— of these diversities. In fact, they will take explicit action to distribute equally the benefits from the natural resources in various areas, because, otherwise, you cannot talk about individual and social autonomy being achieved by all members of the confederation but, instead, you are talking about another jungle being created, with rich areas becoming even wealthier and poor areas becoming perhaps even poorer than before! So, it is within the duties of the confederal assembly to redistribute the benefits of natural advantages equally among all members. Actually, this is being done, or is supposed to be done, even today, within, for example, the European Union, that is, they are supposed to be trying to redistribute the benefits (arising out) of the inequality (in the distribution) of natural resources between various countries in Europe, through subsidies and so on. So, we suppose, if even in a capitalist union like the European Union, at least they are supposed to be doing this, then it could be done even more so in a confederal Inclusive Democracy!^[9]

* This is a slightly edited version of the questions asked and the answers given by Takis Fotopoulos on the economic model of Inclusive Democracy. The questions were submitted in writing by the ATTAC ACADEMIE WORKSHOP (Madeburg, Germany, July, 2010).

[1] Takis Fotopoulos, "Participatory Economics (Parecon) and Inclusive Democracy," *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 1, No. 2 (January 2005), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol1/vol1_no2_IDvsParecon_PRINTABLE.htm

[2] Giovanni Baldelli, *Social Anarchism* (NY: Penguin, 1972), pp. 144-45.

[3] Takis Fotopoulos, *Towards An Inclusive Democracy* (London/NY: Cassell/Continuum, 1997/1998),

p.261.

[4] Takis Fotopoulos, "Class Divisions Today: The Inclusive Democracy approach," *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 6, No. 2 (July 2000), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/dn/vol6/takis_class.htm

[5] see Takis Fotopoulos, "The transition to an Inclusive Democracy," *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 6, No. 2/3 (Spring/Summer 2010), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol6/vol6_no2_takis_ID_meeting_Barcelona_2010.htm

[6] See Takis Fotopoulos, "What is Inclusive Democracy? The contours of Inclusive Democracy", *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (October 2004), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol1/vol1_no1_what_is.htm

[7] See Takis Fotopoulos, "From (mis)education to *Paideia*," *Democracy & Nature*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (March 2003), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/dn/vol9/takis_paideia.htm; see also John Sargis, "Education, Paideia and Democracy: Experiences of the U.S. Educational System," *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 2, No. 1 (September 2005), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol2/vol2_no1_sargis.htm

[8] see Takis Fotopoulos, "Participatory Economics (Parecon) and Inclusive Democracy," http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol1/vol1_no2_IDvsParecon_PRINTABLE.htm

[9] see Barry Seidman interview with Takis Fotopoulos, *The International Journal of Inclusive Democracy*, Vol. 4, No. 1 (January 2008), http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/journal/vol4/vol4_no1_seidman_interview.htm
http://www.inclusivedemocracy.org/fotopoulos/english/brinterviews/seidman_interview.htm