

FACT SHEET #13

IMPLICATIONS OF ELECTORAL SYSTEMS

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 the CA "Fact Sheets".

They serve a dual purpose. One is channeling 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 have exposed otherwise to scrutiny these Fact Sheets. 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

The title of Fact Sheet #13 is: **"Implications of electoral systems"**

1. Introduction:

FS#13 is awfully interesting. It is a list of "implications", 41 in total, appertaining to the already familiar "five families of electoral systems". These "implications" are intended to navigate the CA on its unique voyage of exploration in search of the ultimate electoral system. I will copy the introduction here, because it sets the stage for what is to follow. Here then it is in its entirety.

“Every electoral system is structured differently and, as a result. each produces different results. Depending on your perspective, your results can be seen as either positive or negative. Yet it would be fair to say that each system has positive and negative implications. In thinking about electoral systems, we need to keep in mind these implications and think about the ‘trade-offs.’ “

Please read it one more time. It took several readings for me to fathom the message that it is meant to convey -I doubt I succeeded. Any way, all I have to work with is whatever I read in it.

Take the first sentence which informs us that different electoral systems produce different results. Since the purpose of all electoral systems is one and the same, all electoral systems under consideration ought to produce one and the same result.

Consider the old trappers adage “there are many ways to skin a cat”. Indeed there may be, and learning about them may be worthwhile to aspiring trappers, because no matter which way one does it, the result is always the same, a cat’s skin. But in the case of vote counting systems the CA Profs inform us of the “fact” that each of them *“as a result” of being different ways of vote-counting “each produces different results”*.

If the outcome of an election is to be decided by the way the votes are counted, if that is what the Profs mean by “electoral system”, then something has gone really sour. For in a democracy the outcome of any election is to be decided by the citizens casting ballots. The “electoral systems” are not to be determinants of the election outcome, for if they are, the system of governance is not democracy.

The assertion that the different electoral system produce *“different results”* is bothersome as the news would be, were to come, that skinning a cat in various ways would produce different animal skins. But sorcery is not common in the cat skinning business and should not be allowed in elections. Because, as the Greeks discovered when building western civilization, while the truth is singular, falsehoods are infinite. Accordingly, the “electoral systems” the CA Profs refer to are either all false or they are all false except for one. (“Additional Resources”: Bertrand Russell and Alfred Whitehead: Principia Mathematica).

The second sentence of the FS#13 introduction affirms that receptiveness to something is relative to one’s position. Indeed it is so, thieves and muggers

are known to be averse to stiffer penalties for theft and mugging, respectively; heavenly people enjoy temperate conditions, the Devil, fire and brimstone.

In essence, “*different results*” generated by different “*electoral systems*”, cannot (with the possible exception of one of them) result in other than deformations of the public will. But the purpose of an electoral system is to be the “messenger” of the public will and must deliver it raw, unprocessed, unmodified.

By embedding this in the FS the CA Profs generate the strong impression that the CA members have the luxury of catering to their personal inclinations and preferences. It suggests that they should decide which of the “*different results*”, is “*positive or negative*”. Like they suggest elsewhere that the CA members may decide “what kinds of politicks they want”.

Well, while one should follow personal inclinations in selecting fashions to wear, dinner to order, or palay to see, it is not appropriate to do so while shopping for an electoral system on behalf of the society. When people engage in public service they surrender their personal inclinations and interests and take guidance from their higher calling, which in the CA instance is to search for ways and means to democratize the electoral system of the society. **At issue is not the destination, at issue is the route, the roadmap to getting there, the destination being fixed, it being Democracy.**

The mission of the CA is not to formulate “*What kind of politics you want*” like the Profs taught the CA members at the CA boot camp - it is to come up with an election system that will result in a democratic parliament, each and every time. Plain, simple, precisely defined!

The third sentence of the introduction may be equally misleading and accordingly dangerous. It goads the CA members, and us all we should say, into believing that none of the systems is bad or good, that each of them “*has positive and negative implications*”, that is to say, it is six on one hand, half a dozen in the other, in choosing any of the systems. In other words, do not search for the “perfect system”, be content to select from the “five families” of vote counting systems politicians have concocted and on which we instructed you at the CA School.

The fourth and last sentence of the FS#13 introduction, carries the impropriety further as it regurgitates the “*trade-offs*” bit. This is conducive to making fence-riders of those looking for wisdom in these FSs. Fence riding, is a valued tactic of “consent manufacturers” for after making fence riders of the people, it takes little effort to make them fall on the side of the fence the instigators want them to fall.

These assertions of the Introduction, are followed by lists of “implications” of each of the “*five families of systems*”. Many of these “*implications*” appear being “factual” if one proceeds from the assumption that party-o-cracy is the best we can do, that democracy is forever lost to British Columbia. Other “implications” are guesses, often wild ones, more than they are “facts”. The whole array of “*implications*” are repetitions of previous presentations. The “*implications*” are offered un-categorized, that is to say, they are not labeled “good” or “bad”, although the “goading” in them, is often transparent and despite the propaganda about them overtly disseminated at the CA Boot Camp. The authors of the FSs pretend leaving it to the readers to judge which are “positive or negative”, as the FS authors, proclaimed in the introduction. I will discuss them in the following.

Implications of Majority Systems

A dozen “implications” are listed for this “family”.

1st *Implication:*

“Regularly produce one-party majority governments or coalition governments.”

A reminder that the FS authors use “majority” to denote majority of members of parliament, not of citizens. This is significant because “House majorities” are often manufactured majorities, they are really a minority of votes alchemized by the electoral system into House majorities. **In a democracy, a majority is a majority of the “demos”, i.e. the citizens.**

A democratic parliament is free of pre-manufactured majorities and minorities. In a democratic parliament, majorities form ad hoc, centering on particular issues, overlapping, evolving through the study and debate of issues. Each issue coming before parliament seeks its own majority and prevails if it succeeds, or it does not succeed and fails.

To prevail against reason on implementing their hidden agenda, parties seek to pre-manufacture “parliamentary majority”. Having worked at it for a long time they now uniformly succeed, the resulting subservient parliament routinely legitimizing their agenda, be it “right or wrong”. The parties, through “owning” its members, de facto neuter parliament.

Party-o-crazy tends to generate house majorities. This is the result of people coalescing to dispose of, or to prevent from acquiring power, the “worse evil” political gang.

2nd “implication” :

“Identifiable local representatives are chosen in and for each area.”

It appears “factual” only because it is wrapped in ambiguity. One is left with the impression that the process is democratic, and this may be the reason for the ambiguity.

No it is not the people who do it, unfortunately it is the parties who “chose” their representatives, or “party agents”, if you prefer, *“in and for each area”*.

The mission of the CA it is to ensure that citizens may run in democratic elections without party interference, thereby attaching meaning to local representation and accountable government.

3rd “implication”:

“Limit the representation of minor political parties but reduce the significance of ‘wasted’ votes for these parties by enabling their supporters to contribute to the choice of large party candidates.”

Sophistry recognizes no boundaries. Joseph Stalin reduced to zero the “wasted vote” by having all citizens vote for the Communist party, did he not? He had the potential supporters of many parties, all *“contribute to the choice of large party candidates.”*

4th “implication” :

“Government and members are accountable through direct electoral contest.”

Nonsense! Bundling parties with candidates confuses responsibility and blurs the lines of accountability. But even if this was an effective means of holding politicians accountable, it would leave the issue wanting; the interval between “electoral contests” is long enough for politicians to do great damage to the people and too long for the people to endure the ugly sight of rampaging politicians, and suffering quietly unable to stop them.

That is why democracy provides for control of the government through parliament. It is immediate, effective, pre-emptive and preventive. It is to escape parliament control, that parties were formed and this they do by stuffing parliament with party mercenaries.

Remember, we held the Glen Clark NDP “accountable” for the Pussy-ficat ferries! As a result we are now waiting passively, in pain, to hold the Gordon Campbell Liberals “accountable” for selling out BC Hydro, BC Rail, etc. Endemically waiting to hold “accountable” the government, one after the other, is a dog’s life and this we should spare ourselves.

5th “*implication*”:

“Allow the governing party or coalition to dominate parliament.”

No, this “fact” is false, like many others in these FSs. The “*domination*” of parliament by the “*governing party*” is not at all an “implication” of the majority system, the two are absolutely unrelated.

The “*domination*” of parliament by the “*governing party*” is a direct “implication” of party-o-cracy. After all, if parties did not exist, no party could conceivably “dominate the parliament” which means that the society would be governed democratically.

By definition, parties exist to dominate parliament, that is why they are formed, that is their basic *raison d’être*. Any relief from the pain of such “domination” cannot be but temporary within party-o-cracy. Like the five years hiatus of the Pearson government, and the current one of the Paul Martin “minority”.

For the CA Managers to mis-attribute this “fact” is one thing. It is another when they present it as being simply a mere “implication”. Consenting, even if tacitly, to such a crime against democracy, as the “domination of parliament” is reprehensible.

You cannot allow the drug dealers to form syndicates to control the school yards. The only way to ensure parliament is democratic is to disperse the gangs who seek to control it, to open the doors of the House to citizens of direct allegiance to the people. Otherwise the parties, these peddlers of political influence, if allowed to loiter, one or the other way will manage to corrupt the parliament.

Anything that may result in the control of parliament by anyone, is not an option for the CA. The mission of the CA is to restore self-government to the citizenry, that is to say, democracy.

6th *“implication”*:

“Distort the seat/vote relationship; there is no obvious predictable connection between the two except that there is usually a large bonus in seat-share to the party with the most primary votes”

Are the CA Profs suggesting consideration be accorded a “family of electoral systems” that *“distort the seat/vote relationship.”* ? *Think about it if you please.*

Upon recovering consciousness, it occurred to me that the Profs may be profoundly confused. The requirement that members of parliament are selected by a majority of the constituency they are to represent in parliament, in no way does what the CA Profs say it does.

Again, this “distortion” of the electoral result is entirely party afflicted, it is a result of party-o-crazy. It is the high calling of the CA to ensure that the democratic “relationship” between citizens and their representatives in parliament be maintained intact. **The House is an assembly of peoples’ representatives, not a harem of party leaders’ concubines.**

7th *“implication”*:

“No representation of minority interests - unless these are geographically concentrated.”

In all likelihood, in a parliament of peoples’ representatives, “all minority interests” will be represented, whatever “all” may include - if not found in one parliament, then it will be in another.

But representation of minorities is not awfully important. Of paramount importance is that in a House of free representatives, unlike in one populated by party disciples, all views will be aired and considered with an open mind, none will be blocked by a party’s ideological barriers or a capricious party leader.

8th *“implication”*:

Provides a mechanism for eliminating candidates and redistributing voter support so a majority winner can be achieved: either by a second ballot or using alternative vote."

I am not sure of the meaning the message conveys, or the purpose it is to serve.

In a democracy the system must be "majority". And, in a democracy, it is the voters who may not want to be represented by a certain candidate, it is not the political system that "*eliminates*" candidates.

When the Profs refer to "*majority winner*", what they mean is an "elected tyrant with a majority of party disciples to usurp the peoples' parliament". Seeing the subversion of parliament presented as "*achievement*" in the FSs aimed at guiding the CA, is highly worrisome.

9th "*implication*":

"Under the second ballot, two election periods are required."

This is only a means of arriving at the essential goal of majority selection of a constituency's representative in parliament. It is a "technicality" of minor consequence. Once the decision is made to ban "minority alchemy" a society may experiment with methods for securing majority support.

10th "*implication*":

"Ballot format for alternative vote (AV) requires a ranking of candidates, so is relatively complex."

Fear not, such "complexity" we, hoi polloi, shall overcome!

11th "*implication*":

"Generally, voters for minor-party candidates have a second chance to have their preferences counted; but not those who vote for the larger parties."

Le quelle dommage!

In a democracy the statement is, of course, irrelevant, in a party-o-cracy situation it is incorrect.

Under the “*alternative vote (AV)*” arrangement all voters who return to the polls have a chance to do course correction. A second kick at the can if you prefer. That could be beneficial to the whole society. In the 2001 BC election, for example, voters in TOM — ridings, would have considered the fact that already, from the first ballot, the Liberals had elected — MLAs to — NDP and could have sought to moderate the trend. As a result they would vote to mitigate the effects of “absolute power” and spare society its consequences. It is likely they would have ended up with a decent Opposition in the Legislature, to the benefit of all, including the Campbell Liberals who would have gained by having been compelled to behave a tad decently.

In any case, this is a detail. Let’s not waste time counting the spacing of angels on pinheads.

12th “*implication*”:

“Even though the second preferences of minor-party voters may count in the selection of winning candidates, voters do not count equally in electing members, and many votes - those cast for losing candidates - do not contribute to electing anyone.”

Here again, they are talking details, effects from variations to the theme, so to speak. The comments to 11th “*implication*” apply here as well.

The 12 “*implications*” of “Majority systems” are now done. I would like to reiterate that the important thing to hope for is that the CA affirms that our system of governance is Democracy, thereby ensuring that the essential means of the political system is “majority” .

B. Plurality systems

This “Family”, we are informed, has nine “*implications*” Nos 13 to 21. (I have numbered all of them consecutively, through the five “*families*”).

13th “*implication*”:

“Regularly produce stable one-party governments which are able to easily dominate parliament.”

Compare this to 1st “*implication*” above. Must we deduce that “majority” systems do not result in “governments *which are able to easily dominate parliament*” and that they do not produce “*stable governments*”? Must avoid them lest they do not produce “majority government”? Or what? What is the difference between “*Regularly produce stable one-party governments*”,

produced by the Majority family of electoral systems, from those produced by the Plurality “family of systems? Do such differences really matter, or do they matter only for as long as the party-o-crazy displaces democracy? Pray tell!

14th “*implication*”:

“Identifiable local representatives are chosen in and for each area.”

This is identical to the 2nd “implication” - see above.

15th “*implication*”:

“Limit the proliferation of small political parties.”

This is not materially different from the 3rd “*implication*”: This problem, too, is cured with elimination of party interference with the election process.

16th “*implication*”:

“Government and members are accountable through simple electoral contest.”

The same, really with the 4th “implication” above. It flies directly in the face of reality for it is pure fiction.

17th “implication”:

“Systems are easy to use and to understand; voters have a simple either-or choice, often between two major parties.”

Are the CA Profs suggesting we go for Plurality so as to spare taxing our minds to mark an “X” on other than the simplest of ballots?

18th “*implication*”:

“Systems are familiar, we know how they work in our society.”

This is the silliest defense of staleness as opposed to change, innovation, progress, evolution... This is the defense of “evils” who cannot fight other than by inducing scare of change.

Are the Profs suggesting we are too dumb or too lazy to learn other systems? Must we reject or adopt an electoral system on the basis of its

complexity? Why do not they suggest we spare ourselves thinking altogether by succumbing to some dictator?

The CA Profs are wrong to perceive British Columbians as being “simpletons” but even if we were, the Profs are wrong, again, for they should have suggested we be thrown in at the deep end of the pool so we learn to swim. (“Additional Resources”: Pericles: The Epitaph).

19th “implication”:

“Distort the seat/vote relationship so there is no obvious predictable connection between the two

No different really from the 6th “implication”, above. That is why plurality should identify candidates for a second stage election that would generate a majority-identified representative for the constituency.

20th “implication”:

“Minority interests and small voices often get shut out.”

Repetition really of the 7th “implication”, above.

21st “implication”:

“Votes do not count equally in electing MLAs; many votes do not contribute to electing anyone,”

See the 6th “implication”, above.

This concludes the Plurality Family “implications”. The next family of systems is

Proportional representation list (PR-List) systems

The Implications of this family are eight in number, Nos 22 through to No 29, in the list.

22nd “implication”:

“Party representation in the legislature is determined by voters, the distribution of seats more closely reflects voters support for parties.”

“more closely” than it would under systems from the other families, one assumes they mean. But, is that *“more closely”* good enough, acceptable, rejectable, or what?

The answer depends, partially at least, on how *“more closely”* the representation materializes. If there are two parties, the representation is “closer” than if there was only one party. If there are ten parties the “closeness” becomes even “closer” - the more the parties, the “closer” the representation may be.

I said “may be” because there are other factors entering to distort representation. Such as a reputation of a leader or the need to dispose of an “evil” etc.

In any case, it is a matter of degree. If it is desirable to have people in the entire political-ideological spectrum *“more closely”* represented in the House why stop there and why not go all the way? One way to achieve that, likely the most “fool proof”, is to make resources available to form a party to any group of people who apply for them. After all, wealth is no consideration of citizenship. Imagine the fun we would have! Among other “implications” it will displace voter apathy with vigorous partying.

23rd “implication”:

“Minority voices are heard in parliament”

Is this not implied by the previous, the 22nd “implication” ?

24th “implication”:

“Almost all votes contribute to electing legislators”

So what? All these “legislators” will blurb a bit and that is all that they would do - the mercenaries of the governing party, or coalition, will walk all over them at the end of the day. In a party-o-cracy, being represented in the legislature is of rather superficial value, what matters is being represented in government, or, better yet, in the Prime Ministers Office,(PMO) for that is where the decisions are made.

All the voters will be much better served by legislators of integrity who are loyal to the people, than by rigid-minded ideologues, committed to the party sponsors, oblivious of the world beyond their blinkers.

25th *“implication”:*

“Strengthen the role of parliament in choosing and checking the government”

Is it a “fact” or a hallucination? Has parliament had a *“role in choosing the government”* ? When was the last time a prime Minister wasn’t chosen and imposed by a party?

Is it a “fact” or a hallucination? Parliament “checking the government”? Joe Clark wasn’t brought down by parliament, he was brought down by the Liberal Party and bad luck. It happen because Clark’s was a “minority” government and because at the moment of that crucial vote, some of Clark’s mercenaries were junketing around the Globe. Irrespective of whether the fall of Clark was objectively good, bad or indifferent, disposing of a government that way is only marginally more civilized than the disposing of Kings by dagger, which was happening not too infrequently in centuries past.

De facto the right of parliament to “choose and check the government” has been usurped by the parties and, the mission of the CA is to take it back from them and return it to the citizens - Nothing more, nothing less, nothing else, that is all.

Facilitating the creation of more parties than there would otherwise be, would affect some relief from the pain of the system that maintains two evils. But why, why do that, why stop there, why not chase the usurpers of parliament out of the Temple of Democracy?

26th *“implication”:*

“Voter turnout tends to be slightly higher”

“Higher” than “Majority” and “Plurality” systems, one presumes. It is only “slightly higher”, because Proportional representation is only a “slightly” higher caste “family” than the others in “Party-o-cracy-Ville”.

In contrast, a change from Party-o-cracy to Democracy would be great and then “Voter turnout” would be much higher than it is under party-o-cracy.

As I suggested elsewhere in this series, provision for NOTA (None Of The Above) on the ballot, even if everything else remains the same, would increase substantially voter turnout for they would use it to fight for Democracy, against

party-o-cracy. Indeed, that is why the Politicians, and CA Prophs (Prophets of the system) avoid NOTA like the Plague.

27th *“implication”:*

“Do not produce identifiable one-party governments, so electoral accountability is reduced”

Reduce the extinct? Wow! How?

28th *“implication”:*

“ Do not produce identifiable local representatives”

In a party-o-cracy the parties matter, the representatives are what Mulroney called “trained seals”, Trudeau called “nobodies” and the people refer to as “rubber stamps”. Such loss of “identifiability” is nothing to lament.

29th “*implication*”:

“Individual politicians cannot easily be held accountable by voters”

There is little if any accountability in party-o-cracy. Whatever there is of it, peeks out when voters manage to dislodge the Worse Evil, by “electing” the Lesser Evil. Unfortunately it is not lasting, for they will watch it transform into the Worse Evil, for the cycle to be repeated. Moreover, bundling candidates with parties blurs the lines of accountability, thereby reducing any accountability that may be otherwise available.

Here end the implications of this family and the Profs usher us into the next one which is:

Proportional representation by the single transferable vote (PR-STV) system

This “family” has nine “*implications*”, Nos 30 through to 38.

30th “*implication*”:

“Produces a close match between a party’s seat share and its vote share - but this varies with district magnitude.”

Not much different really than the 22nd “implication”, of the previous family.

31st “*implication*”:

“Gives voters the opportunity to vote for individual candidates as well as for parties, and the opportunity to choose among candidates from the same party or different parties”

Not a big deal really. The overall consideration no matter how or who the voters choose , parties will rule.

32nd “*implication*”:

“Permits candidates to be elected who appeal to a particular constituency”

I presume this may mean that a Yogi Flier may be elected from the list by the combined votes of Yogi Fliers and Yogi Flier lovers from all parts of the province. This too, is good, but not a big deal.

33rd *“implication”:*

“Does not discriminate against independent Candidates”

This justifies the widespread belief that Ivory Tower Profs loose contact with reality. The reality is that parties have de facto eliminated the election of independent Candidates.

Parties have been doing that for a long time now, they have been more vile to independent candidates than Big Box stores are to local emporia.

34th *“implication”:*

“Requires a preferential ballot which is more complicated for voters”

Let me disperse your fears dear Profs: The people are smarter than you think, much more so, take my word.

35th *“implication”:*

“Does not have single, geographically-defined local members”

In Party-o-crazy it hardly matters, government goodies will go, predominately, to the areas where they will “buy” more votes for the party who dishes out the goodies.

36th *“implication”:*

“Is more likely to produce coalition governments”.

Again, they are of marginal value. What is of immense value is the restoration of democratic government.

37th *“implication”:*
 “May encourage regional and/or sectional politics and/or brokerage politics rather than politics based on province-wide issues”

Does that mean that other “families” produce governments who cater to “*province-wide issues*”? Have a look at the current government, “77/79 majority” which acts against every major anti- “*province-wide issue*” such as selling out BC Hydro, BC Rail and exporting jobs to foreign shipyards.

38th *“implication”:*

“Has the potential to weaken party control of candidates and MLAs.

What are we to make of this? Any system that infringes upon the freedom of “*candidates and MLAs*”, facilitates or “commits” treason and should be outlawed. This even if the “*party control of candidates and MLAs*” is weak or “*weakened*.” In a representative democracy of the parliamentary variety, the parliament controls the government, anything else is reprehensible.

This exhausts the “*implications*” of the four homogeneous families of electoral systems and all that remains to do is the fifth and last family, one having only three distinct implications, or so presented.

Mixed systems

This one, unlike the other four families’ implications lists, starts with a preamble which is very interesting. It reads:

“Mixed systems are, by definition, various combinations of other electoral system families. As a result, the implications of any one mixed system are the implications of its component systems. Because the systems are mixed, these implications can interact in sometimes unpredictable ways. The most widely used mixed systems attempt to balance local representation and some measure of proportionality.”

What does it say? The “deductions” are really wild, the logic feeble! One cannot assume that a combination will retain the characteristics of its components. One cannot deduce from the occurrence of a “combination” that the resultant would possess characteristics of what is brought into the combination. The deduction combination may not inherit all, indeed may not inherit any, of its component “implications” or whatever it is each

component may bring into the union. Mules have “implications” different from horses and donkeys.

Let's now look at the three “implications”
39th “*implication*”:

“Proportional representation systems generally increase the number of parties and the possibility of coalition governments”.

Well, what is new? The authors of the “implications” FS have already listed this “implication” under the pair of “proportional representation families”. Here one expected to find “implications” of “Mix and match families”

Bear in mind that the Profs have told us that members of other families brought together in electoral wedlock bring along their “implications”. What would have been constructive would have been to outline some of the interaction effects of imported “implications”, to which they alluded earlier.

40th “*implication*”:

“Some mixed systems create two types of members of the legislature: constituency members responsible to the electorate and list members who owe their position to the list party list makers and have no constituency responsibilities”

Is it good, bad or indifferent to have two kinds of “members”, some indebted to the party the others loyal to the voters? Who knows? We, the people, do not know, all we know are “party agents” who are not quite like angels. Now, if the second breed of “representatives” owe more loyalty to the parties than the ones we are experiencing, well things ain’t no looking no good.

41st “*implication*”: the last on the list is.

“Creating two types of members can create two types of parties; large ones that do the constituency work and small ones that promote particular issues.

Sound good does it not? Two types instead of one. On second thought, it is scary....

This wraps up the lineup of the “implications” from the “five families of electoral systems”. What use are we to put it to? May be they unearthed no more “implications” or they may have cut the list short to make room for the ninth and last insertion of the “Additional Resources” commercial which they started with FS#6 and run through all the FSs up to this, FS#13. Quite a run!

I digress.

Tom Varzeliotis.