

## **CA FACT SHEETS # 8 and #9**

### **Fiction Wrapped in Fact Sheets.**

There are 14 of them posted on the CA website. In hard copy they are distributed at the CA public hearings and elsewhere I presume. They are pompously labeled the CA "Fact Sheets".

They serve a dual purpose. One is to align the thinking of the CA members to that of the Fact Sheet authors. The other is to "soften the target", that is to say, to make the public receptive to the verdict the CA will concoct by following these "Fact Sheets".

The authors have not expressly claimed infallibility, yet they have neither invited debate nor exposed otherwise these Fact Sheets to scrutiny. Yet, the need to test the "facts" served on these sheets is pressing, for their potential to mislead is large and the consequence of that grave.

Alcyone News has emerged as the voice of "Opposition" to the CA Managers and from that position will challenge the factuality of these Fact Sheets. This series of articles we will call "Fiction Wrapped in Fact Sheets"

Tom Varzeliotis

---

## **CA FACT SHEETS # 8 and #9**

The title of Fact Sheet #8 is:    **"Majority Systems"**

The title of Fact Sheet #9 is:   **"Plurality Systems"**

These two "families" are so closely related, they could be combined into one without much loss of identity. The main difference between the two is that the Majority Family would not allow anyone to sit in parliament unless endorsed by a majority of constituents -the Plurality Family is less discriminating for it would allow whoever gets most of the votes, even if less than 50%.

The Majority Family is legitimate because the basic tenet of democracy is majority. However, Plurality, although illegitimate, and as poor a reputation as it has, may be a tolerable substitute for Majority. This because the candidate who comes first past the post is the most likely to win a rematch election staged to ensure majority representation. After all, even picking a parliament by lot has been occasionally suggested - indeed, that was the system employed to select the CA. A first past the post election is likely to result in a more popular member of parliament than a lottery would.

What makes both these Families rather objectionable are the consequences of political party interference in the elections. It is the parties who mess up these

systems, mainly by bribing election candidates and by ensuring that candidates who refuse allegiance to a party would not get elected. In other words, the parties have hijacked the electoral system of the society and use it to turn parliament into an assembly of Party mercenaries which is vastly different from what parliament is meant to be, and which is an assembly of peoples' representatives. Democracy is thereby incapacitated and the society is delivered to party-o-crazy.

This is not to say that party-o-crazy is the worst system around, for there is the "Dictatorship Family" as it may be called by FS writers. Nonetheless, party-o-crazy is substantially inferior to democracy as recognized by people calling it "elected tyranny".

Perhaps at this point a reminder is in order. What Poli Sci Profs call "Electoral systems" are really "ways votes translate into parliamentary seats". In reality electoral systems are composites of many subsystems, "the way votes translate into seats" being one of them.

FS#8 describes various ways, such as "second ballot" and others means leading to an eventual winner consented to by the majority. These variations to Majority system are introduced in FS#8 as the members of the "Majority Family".

FS #9 describes the Plurality Family. There are no family members to this family. Yet academics have not been deterred by reality, they categorize as family members the various ways politicians tip the election scales by shrinking or expanding ridings, rigging multi-seat ridings, etc.

Dwelling on political trickery and academic nuances is not a productive utilization of one's time and I will not do it. What is comment-worthy is the impropriety of party interference with elections. Not only because this impropriety is in itself of paramount significance, but also because the FS authors do not discuss it, indeed they do not mention it at all. They deem the political parties being God-sent or Devil-imposed, something we must all "enjoy" like that show our partner insisted we see and endure through the duration, stoically as we do, the "perfume" potpourri of people in adjacent theater seats.

What is important is recognizing the damage done by politicians ganging up into parties in their rush to subvert democracy. For this indicates the route to recovery, which is simple: Take the profit out of politic. The profit sought by parties shields the candidates from party advances like we shield judges and police from bribes. Keeping the parties away from the election campaign trail, would give democracy a chance. Doing this is important for it is similar to taking the pimps out of the sex trade and driving the drug pushers from the nations' schoolyards.

Reading the FSs, not unlike the rest of the CA management literature, leaves one perplexed and worried. This because of the FS authors failure to heed the McGill Law School credo: "Leave no stone unturned", which would have led them to expose the culpability of the political parties in messing up the governance of the society.

The other concern is about the CA literature being void of prompts to innovation, failing to challenge the creativity of the people, but keeping on, instead, regurgitating the textbook stuff. There is no vision, no inspiration, no attempt to sail the mind out of the stale waters of the textbook slough into a journey of exploration. Such intellectual sterility is worrisome. Such uninspiring literature does injustice to the pioneering nature of the CA.

In closing please let me draw your attention to two more insertions of the CA Managers' "commercial" for resources supporting the management line. By now it has appeared in four FSs. I would equally draw your attention to the absence of any mention, save promotion, of any resources dissenting from the CA management's "official line".

Tom Varzeliotis