

## PROPOSAL TO THE CITIZENS' ASSEMBLY TRUE ELECTION REFORM: DEMEEKRACY

In my old dictionary democracy is defined thusly:

1. government by elected representatives.

Or

2. government by the people.

But how can you have it both ways? #1 and #2 are at opposite poles, pun intended. Definition #1 is government by the top down and #2 is government by the bottom up. But you know, elected representatives having been voted to be #1 always think that they know better than the ignorant masses and so rarely do they allow #2 to govern by referendums. Once in power, #1 just prisses on #2. And why not? Representatives once elected may learn through debating with the opposition that their constituents idealistic proposals were ungrounded or unfinancable. Hence broken promises. So the people's vote swings from leading party to leading party and back again seeking the promise of change which could only be accomplished by a fundamental overhaul of a necessary decaying economic system leading us ridiculously in debt to the few rich who fund the government, the media and the campaigns of the major parties; Rich and richer don't want any real change that might threaten their ability to stay rich. That's why since the bank act of 1913, there's been so little big change. (The Bank Act gave the chartered banks the right to create money by way of issuing credit against bank notes despite the Canadian constitution which clearly stated: "Only the federal government shall have the right to create coin, credit and currency." Read the short: "The Regina Manifesto," "Billions for the Bankers, Debts for the People" and "None Dare Call it Treason.") All the issues are fought over money whilst ignoring the big issue of the issuance of money itself! Forgive my digressing from election reform. On to the point...

Today, Democracy #1 is run from the top down. But I believe democracy #2, governance only by the people could be chaotic bottoms up for all of us! Every populist idea of the poor ignorant masses no matter how unworkable could become law. Jesus Christ could be elected king, Buddha president, and the first law might be simply: "everybody share."

Yes, there's no perfect electoral system. We have to invent one.

But it's shocking how a few fundamental changes to our electoral system could radically change our government, our culture, our world for the better. Therefore I propose a system be developed called *Demeeocracy*

*Demeeocracy* I define as:

1. government by the people *through* elected representatives.
2. A philosophy of meekness where persons delegate authority to mentors.

Notice it is written 'through elected representatives' not 'by elected representatives.' This is possible through the Internet. A paper-ballot-polling station is not as accessible as a computer; a librarian can help those unaccustomed to computer use. A word on computers: If a computer operating system is designed upgradable, hackers and viruses may penetrate to tamper with it; Hackers and viruses tamper by little programs to 'upgrade' the system. If the program is un-upgradable or even hard-wared into a main frame and inspected by independent technician teams it would near impossible to rig an election. Paper ballot counting is comparatively expensive, inconvenient to voters, and vulnerable to rigging.

Democracy requires but three changes to the electoral process. A democratically elected government would then likely improve the parliamentary system and house rules to fit democracy. Democracy is difficult to imagine if you hold to preconceived false notions programmed into us through schooling, media and culture. Think outside the box and don't call it nonsense until you see the whole of the vision.

#### DEMOCRACY:

1. Let us have the right to secret computer votes and secret polls and the right to show them to whom we will.

Think: If one were hoping to rig the ballot boxes, he would certainly want secret ballots stuffed into non-transparent stuffable boxes. And think of how troublesome and expensive it would be to buy an election by buying individual votes. Illegally yet. Isn't it easier to buy them with campaign promises?

2. Let us have the right to change our roles everyday and our votes every month.

Think: If an elected representative were corrupt he would certainly want to be locked into his seat for years by a complex expensive difficult to muster recall process giving him time to line his pockets with broken promises. "You must give me time to prove my self, trust me for years, or else the government will change every day; what chaos!" he'd say.

3. Let us have the right to delegate our rights to vote to any mentor willing to receive it, who then may redelegate the voting rights they have collected to their mentors who redelegate and so on. Let the mentor who gathers the very most votes accept the position of Prime Minister, and let those who gather the most votes accept chairs in the House. Let them have voting powers and speaking powers in the house equal to the number of votes they collected. Let them be paid for each day they sit in session.

This way, as long as I delegate my vote, and my mentors redelegate, I always have an elected representative on my side on the issues most important to me or I change my mentor. Hence voting power in the House of Representatives always best mirrors the will of the people. Let the laws be made by representatives who must sit and hear all sides; not by the people. Representatives and mentors who change opinion through debate will e-mail their constituents sound reasons or lose votes. Hence, government by the people **through** elected representatives. Every month voting power of the representatives would change and seats may change to up and comings. But law would only change when changing consensus brings it up on the agenda. Ministers of the different departments could be elected by the house on ability to lead and follow and need not hold a seat. A shift in power should not require an experienced minister to be expelled from a job well done.

BUT IT WOULDN'T QUITE WORK, WOULD IT? BECAUSE IT IS ENTIRELY A MALE PRINCIPLE! MOST MENTORS WOULD FIGHT TO BE PRIME MINISTER LIKE SO MANY SPERM PUSHING ON IN THE DARK TO BE THE ONE TO REACH THE EGG. THEREFORE TO MAKE DEMOCRACY WORK, THE GOVERNMENT WOULD HAVE TO INSTITUTE AND INSTALL THE BALANCING FEMININE PRINCIPLE PROGRAM OF...

#### DEMOCRACY.

Democracy's rule #1:

At least half the time in the house should be for debating the merits and deciding upon the most popularly polled laws proposed by the country on the statistic bureau's website.

Democracy's rule #2.

Any proposed law polled in favor by 63% of half the country must go to a referendum, and becomes law if more than 63% of the country votes in favor of it.

63% is when the majority over the minority equals a little better than the total over the majority. A principle found repeated in nature.

## HOW IT WORKS:

Any day you go to the polling website and use the search engine to find the most popularly polled laws proposed in your areas of interests. Click on the flags to read popular arguments ye or nay. Enter your sin number and passcode. Click on your favorite arguments. Most popular arguments are listed first. Click your vote ye or nay, rating its importance to you in percent. Most highly voted upon proposals are listed first. If you are a mentor having collected oh say at least 20 votes, propose your own laws, principles, recommendations. The statistics bureau's program e-mails you back to tell you where your proposal has been categorized. If the statistics bureau judges that the essence of proposal #234 is contained within proposal #654, then votes for the latter are added to the tally of the former. Click GROUPS to find groups of like mind and work with them to write proposals and compelling arguments to flag proposals. Or click PERSONS to find people of like mind in your area with whom to relate. For it's when people of like mind meet to gather ideas that power of the people gets a head. And we need a good head at the top. Then click MENTORS to find WebPages of popular mentors of like mind. Compare computer generated charts and graphs to try to find a mentor of the closest match to your mind by the issues you rated most important. Compare how they polled on their issues, and laws they proposed. Read their arguments on their websites. E-mail them with your arguments against minor proposals on which you differ. If they don't reply, link them to see how closely you polled to them to show you might give them a vote. His program sends you e-mails explaining why he differs. Develop relationships on line and in person to learn more of the issues, and teach as well. Choose a mentor on-line, or in person or from media, from a party, or special interest group or choose anyone you like who knows and cares more about politics than you. View how your mentor polled, how his mentor polled, and so on up to see how your elected representative voted and affected the laws. When a law passes it's proponent gets a little honorarium. View new laws and acts and upcoming agendas. If you are a mentor, the more votes you have, the more likely elected representatives will take time to listen to you, because they want the voting power you have collected. If you are not a mentor, you might be wise to choose a mentor close in mind, and close in proximity with not too many votes that you are insignificant to meet with him or her. Thereby you can greater affect politics, by affecting minds who affect minds who affect the votes in the house. Our mentors becomes our teachers to inform us what is going on through their web-programs' selected emails to us and is our mouthpiece up the line to our representative. Our lobbyist. Whether you delegate your vote to a mentor collecting but five votes or vote up the line of mentors for his representative directly the result is the same. Every significant special interest group would tend to get a voice in a representative. Imagine parties of parties of independents making coalitions together over the issues rather than divided across party line dogmas dictated to them by party leaders. Free thought. Elected members could be part of this coalition over this issue and part of that coalition over that issue. Ministers of different departments, committees, caucuses, etc could be elected by the house. Parties could still exist, but I believe in time they would fade away. Discussion agendas could be set in any ways the house rules, but half the agenda should be set upon the most popularly proposed laws. If a popular law is foolish, the representatives would have to explain why so or lose votes. One must be meek to learn from another. Demeeocracy married to Demomcracy promotes learning. Do you want your representatives and voting pubic well learned? Or arrogantly stupid? Democracy is ego driven: "Elect me!" Demeeocracy is humbly driven: "I delegate my authority to you." Let the meek inherit a seat in the house.

Let there be a television station or two where mentors who have won a seat in the house get to talk to us through the microphone on whatever they wish- time allotted according to their voting power in the house. Call it demikracy.

We could go on forever complaining about the electoral processes of today or build a new one not from Band-Aids on flawed systems but from seeing together, our desires and imagining what is possible. Every problem presents a solution. I believe this is a right solution because it's based on the right to do what you want with your vote. Yes, it is complex, but the essence and freedom of demokcracy married to demomcracy is simple. I think it is the very essence of what the grandfathers of confederation had in mind: People give their vote to representatives; representatives give their vote to party leaders. But without the aid of computers, the essence of true democracy had to be over-simplified for the time being. It was a compromise.

Democracy is not corrupt; it is weak, due to limitations on freedom to do what you want with your vote. Most politicians are not corrupt; they are deluded by having to compromise true principles to gain power in a demoncratic system of compromised principles. Hence con-promises.

I dare you 160 members of Citizens' Assembly to take control of the process so that you may meet to put together-Assemble the ideas you can mostly agree upon into a whole new democratic system proposed to Canada and the world and publish it yourselves. And if you could agree to officially recommend to the politicians that they stuff their mandate of double-loaded questions up their f-arse it would make enough news that the world would be very interested to read what you publish. Wouldn't that make wonderful historic hysterical world-rocking news?

May God help us to think and plan together in love.

I welcome your comments and questions at  
[beknowit@yahoo.com](mailto:beknowit@yahoo.com), or 604-589-2124

Hopefully yours;

Rick Benoit, Doctor of Thinkology. (an award the Wizard of Oz gave me)

PS: If you see Dorothy, tell her "The rainbow is not somewhere over yonder;  
It is in your mind. The pot of gold is in your heart."