

Studies
Leading to
DIRECT DEMOCRACY
A Brief Outline of
A Theory of Direct Democracy
and References to
Other Democratic Theories

George S. Sagi

Community Church College

2000 Spring Semester

STUDIES
Leading to
DIRECT DEMOCRACY

A BRIEF OUTLINE OF
A THEORY OF DIRECT DEMOCRACY
AND REFERENCES TO OTHER
DEMOCRATIC THEORIES

by George S. Sagi
edited by Charlie McDougall

Community Church College
2000 Spring Semester
An abridged and revised edition
of *A Theory of Direct Democracy*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD.....	Page 5
Part 1.	
HUMAN NEEDS, WANTS AND DRIVES.....	6
Fundamental Needs and Drive Basic Needs and Drives Tertiary Wants and Drives.....	7
Part 2.	
SURVIVAL MORALITY.....	8
Just Standards in the Interest of All.....	9
Rights, Freedoms, and Equality.....	10
Part 3.	
GROUP THEORY OF SOCIETY.....	11
Early Groups — The Grouping Imperative	11
Growth of Groups 1 3	
The Increasing Role of the Brain, Diversification, Differentiation, Emergence of Leaders	
Part 4.	
GROUP ANALYSIS OF MODERN SOCIETY	15
Social Groups or Social Classes?	
Nation-states	15
Municipal Governments	16
Business Associations	
Professional Groups.....	17
Trade Unions	
Churches as Group Organizations.....	18
International Groups.....	18
Part 5.	
PARADOXES of POLITICAL CULTURE ..	19
The First, The Second, The Third.....	20
The Fourth Paradox	

Part 6.	
DEMOCRATIC SYSTEMS DESIGN.....	21
Well-informed, Knowledgeable, Decision-making	
Democratic System Design Principles ..	22
Operating Principles and a Method of Implementation	23
Self-regulating Societal System; Socio-Cybernetics	24
A Model of Direct Democracy	26
The Parliament of Priorities	27
The House of Implementations The Senate	27
Figure 1.....	Omitted
Civic Forums	28
Local Administrations Electronic Communications	28
Self-Governance of a Nation	29
Parliament of Priorities Procedures and Rules of Conduct	
The House.....	30
The Senate	
The Presidency.....	31
Elections and Referendums	31
The Administrative Branch.....	32
Conflict resolution.....	33
The Judiciary	35
Law Enforcement and Defense.....	35
Facilitators	36
Selection of Lawmakers	37
Transformations Into Direct Democracy	38
Direct Democracy in a Small Community.....	39
The City of Winnipeg	

Having lived through turbulent times and deprivation left behind by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Nazism, communism, war, revolution, and exile as a refugee, I have finally found peace in Canada. These events aroused in me a sense of social justice. This abridged version of my book, *A Theory of Direct Democracy*, gives you a glimpse into my concerns. Within these pages, I try to answer some puzzling questions: why is our society so fiercely competitive and confrontational? How can we live cooperatively in peace?

The most crucial issue of our civilization is the prevention of the negative outcome of its 'dual potential'. The scientific, technological, and economical infrastructure has two potentials. We could create unprecedented material and cultural well-being if we exploit the positive potential, while the negative potential could end civilization. Humanity must adopt true standards of justice and stop destructive societal conduct that is responsible for the declining characteristics of our era.

Being scientifically educated and studying socio-political science, economics and philosophy, I began the search from the ground up. It is now clear that we are truly equal only in our 'primary needs and interests'. However, our 'wants' and desires to possess or to achieve are significantly different. These 'tertiary' drives for wanting things above our needs are responsible for all the good and magnificent achievements of humankind and most bad aspects of our civilization, such as a modern means of mass destruction, as well as the common reality that deprivation, starvation and death lie in the shadows of luxury in many societies. Human needs and wants are responsible for all good and bad things in life. Therefore, I relied on them in the rational development of societal ethics, a concept of 'survival morality' that, if implemented, could protect the future of civilization.

How did we arrive at this threatening era? Our fiercely competitive and confrontational era is a paradoxical departure from the sharing, cooperative life of early human groups. The study of groups from early beginnings shows, with convincing clarity, the enormous influence of Leaders (capital L) in the evolution of human civilization.

The most clever and positive-thinking Leaders have invented and created things beneficial to themselves as well as to society. The most clever, but unscrupulous Leaders are responsible for most of the negative aspects of our civilization.

The solutions to transform society into a peaceful and cooperative moral democracy emerged from these studies. My 'group theory' reveals that political systems and Leaders are mostly responsible for the defective aspects of the present era. Social morality and governance could be significantly improved by ordinary citizens. New Leaders that are dedicated 'Facilitators', such as the 'founding fathers' of the United States, will write improved constitutions. They will be paving the way toward true democracy. The first changes may begin in foreign countries and/or in small communities, and when proven, will likely spread.

I have worked out some principles for peaceful coexistence and a model of self-governance. However, it is not carved in stone. I also refer to theories and models of improved democracy that were created by others. Taking the time to study this booklet can be rewarding. It may inspire some readers to improve its conclusions and others to create better theories and models. My most fervent hope and the purpose of my work is to help reverse the negative potential of the current political era.

George Sagi
January, 2000.

PART 1. HUMAN NEEDS, WANTS, AND DRIVES

Fundamental Needs and Drives

Is the assumption that we are all equal, true? Not really. Not even politically. We are born unequal in mind and in body. Nature, however, imposes a set of common needs on all living creatures and with respect to our 'fundamental needs', we are all equal. Society imposes additional 'basic needs' and challenges us with desires 'wanting' to possess things and to achieve certain goals.

Fundamental and basic needs and wants are manifested in human 'drives', urging us to satisfy them. Fundamental needs are natural, thus unchangeable while the objects and the intensity of basic needs and wants are changing under various, personal, historical, and geographical conditions.

The instinct of survival manifests itself through the fundamental drive. All species must fulfil their fundamental needs to survive. It is obvious that satisfaction of our fundamental needs is a vital condition of sustenance and peaceful coexistence. These are common and equal needs.

When the fundamental needs are not satisfied, then the survival instinct and desperation will lead to aggression. It can be concluded that **for the sake of peaceful coexistence, a rational society should secure equal rights and opportunities for its members to sustain themselves.** The foregoing draws attention to one of the root causes of violent acts.

Basic Needs and Drives

In an interdependent society, additional needs of sustenance arise. These are 'basic needs' that are above the bare minimum. These additional needs of sustenance are imposed by a particular society. The ease or difficulty of living in a country depends on the size and natural resources of its territory, climactic conditions, the number and cultural level of its population, and its political system. These conditions are changing with time and in places, thus fundamental needs are 'historical conditionals'.

Today, most people are compelled to work for a living and must have money. Nobody can hold a job or become an entrepreneur without being educated. Thus **the opportunity to earn a living, the possession of money, and education became basic needs.** These are just typical needs, but there are many others. For instance, transportation is a basic need in large modern cities. In modern society, without money, people cannot support themselves and their families — regardless of the means of obtaining it. The standard of minimum income, if any exists, has a decisive influence on the living conditions of the least capable members of society. Besides personal abilities of individuals, the constitution and laws of a country greatly affect the material and cultural resources of a nation.

People need to share a 'sufficient portion' of society's resources, which means satisfactory living conditions. General welfare is secured in most industrial democracies, but there is an urging need to strive for better living conditions elsewhere. Sufficient portion does not mean that every individual should have an equal part of the available resources in a country. It implies that even the least capable members of society should be able to satisfy their basic needs and enjoy a satisfactory level of sustenance. Such standard could be created in many countries without penalizing individuals who elevate society's general welfare thus enjoy higher personal benefits above the basic norm.

The availability of material and cultural resources are uneven within different countries and regions of the earth. Consequently, sufficient portion is not the same everywhere. In spite of the present unequal distribution of the earth's

resources, citizens should be able to satisfy their basic needs equally within any country.

There are crying inequalities in some parts of the world where people are dying of starvation. These injustices could be eliminated if improved democratic leaderships would make rational changes. The future of suffering nations depends on **the effective meaningful assistance** of the developed nations. Regardless of how rational and moral the thought is, one cannot expect that the world's resources will soon be available on an equal basis. However, it is a rational and a moral aim that out-crying injustices be corrected.

Tertiary Wants and Drives

I refer to human desires wanting to possess things and to achieve certain goals as being tertiary. Human wants are not necessarily essential needs. They generate drives beyond basic needs and are not essential, yet they are very important in influencing living conditions. Tertiary is a distinct category of wants. It does not imply lesser importance than the fundamental or basic categories of needs. Rather, dominant positive and negative tertiary drives have been having enormous consequences on the evolution of human civilization.

Personal goals and ambitions are strongly influenced by cultural conditions and conditioning with far-reaching consequences. Some people strive for wealth, power, and status, or are motivated by similar egocentric drives. Others are inspired by some of the sciences or arts and take pride in their achievements. Unselfish individuals help others to live better, healthier, well-fed, and properly housed. The number, variety, and types of human desires wanting to achieve some goals are countless. We can strikingly recognize the tertiary nature of these drives through imagining a solitary person isolated from society. He or she would not have tertiary drives. A person who is utterly isolated from society would not hoard riches and would not have opportunity to control and rule others. Money, power, and status would become meaningless, and this person could not take public pride in any achievement, only personal satisfaction.

The tertiary aspects of human behaviour spring from the biological tendency to think and act creatively, to explore, to utilize, and to achieve something primarily for one's own benefit. In isolation, this great biological tendency serves only the primary interests of an individual and, most importantly, does not affect others. In society, however, tertiary aspects of behaviour have enormous consequences on the life of the community.

The most magnificent and beneficial achievements of humankind as well as all regressive and destructive creations are due to tertiary wants of leading individuals and their organizations. Blind pursuit of money, growth, profit, and status, may become obsessive when it goes beyond personal utility. Enterprises can be either socially useful or harmful. Whether a society progresses, prospers, or declines and heads toward extinction, depends on the extent of freedoms. A moral society should not regulate the creation of harmless and useful things. But it must restrain harmful and destructive activities motivated by tertiary drives.

When a society is well-fed, adequately housed and clothed, and the masses share a sufficient part of the available resources, then societal life is peaceful. Arts and sciences also flourish under pleasant societal conditions. Conversely, when a society's leading individuals are possessed by negative tertiary drives, then many people have to struggle for survival. In such bad societies, the masses starve and many people are homeless and uneducated. Under those conditions, societal life becomes hardly bearable and turbulent.

The future of humankind may depend on how soon the leaders of nations realize the need to limit the excesses of negative human drives. Satisfactory provision of basic needs and socially positive wants are considered to be the *'primary inter-*

ests' of all of the people. Human evolution and positive tertiary drives have created a sufficient resources base that could close the huge gap between the have and the have-not peoples and nations. Denying the essential needs of human beings and ignoring their suffering is not necessary and is not logical. It is now threatening the long-term sustenance of human civilization. The Darwinian question is open: is the human race fit to survive? That will depend on proper use of our thinking ability. We have evolved from ancient food-gathering independence and become totally interdependent members of complex societies. If create the right conditions that make the world's population well-provided and find the means for peaceful coexistence, then human culture will flourish. That is why we examined the fundamental and basic elements of sustenance and its undesirable tertiary aspects.

PART 2. SURVIVAL MORALITY

Survival morality is derived from the conclusions of Part 1. Its purpose is to find some guidance for good moral standards that can lead to satisfactory living conditions and peaceful cooperative coexistence. Morality is a concept regarding good and bad conduct. Religious moralities are commandments of God and other spiritual entities, and need not to be justified for believers. But good and bad societal morality has to be justified by reason. Societal moral standards are defined by national constitutions and laws. In addition to moral doctrines, derived principles, and laws, personal conduct is also influenced by customs and taboos.

Good social standards could establish general welfare to all people. In a morally good civilization, no person would be deprived. Being free from deprivation is an elementary and minimal requirement that must be protected by law. Constitutionally assuring the provision of fundamental and basic needs would be an important condition for social harmony and peaceful coexistence. This would mandate the enactment of certain limits on the extent of rights and freedoms. When certain rights and freedoms are ill-defined or too liberal, bad conditions could develop. If rights and freedoms were absolute, anarchy would rule. The *'golden rule'* of Aristotle is moderation, and accordingly, the socially harmful rights and freedoms should be curtailed.

In spite of different origins, the moral doctrines of major religions and moral principles justified by reason can be in agreement. For instance, murder is forbidden by *'The Ten Commandments'* and by most major religions, democratic laws, and survival morality. However, the nature and extent of what constitutes murder are not stated specifically in the doctrine *'do not kill'*. Looking at this commandment as a principle, it focuses on the act of killing itself and does not specify the scope of murder. If the *'fundamental and basic needs of survival'* were enacted in a constitution and protected by laws, then it would expand the scope of the protection of life. Survival morality broadens the protection of human existence by focusing on our survival needs.

Life can be violated by society long before death occurs. The more than 300-hundred-year-old revolutionary notion *"that all men are created equal...with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness"* do not fully protect life. The scope of these rights are not defined. People can die early, imperceptibly, slowly, from lack of nutrition, bad health system, or from being deprived of other basic needs of sustenance. Liberal rights allow organized groups to be lead by bad leaders to murderous violence against racial, religious, and ethnic minorities.

In our affluent and wasteful societies, we well-fed individuals witness the

plight of many people who are deprived of primary needs and are fated to an early death. We are also viewing TV news, in comfortable living rooms, and see death of millions of starving people. We are imperceptibly becoming immunized to such horrors through the mass media. Common sense concerned with long-term sustenance and human compassion are urging forward-thinking individuals to strive for improved standards of social morality. Contemporary democratic constitutions and laws don't fully protect these vital needs of people

Survival morality relies on the elementary truth that every individual is born unique and endowed with unequal physical and mental capacities. And despite these inequalities, it holds that the sustenance of human life, in its full scope and extent, is paramount for both compassionate and logical reasons. We are equal only in our fundamental and basic needs. We maintain, therefore, that **all individuals have equal primary needs and vital interests that must be secured for survival, for the full protection of life, and for the sake of social harmony.**

Just Standards in the Interest of All

A prerequisite of long-term sustenance of our civilization is the creation of peaceful conditions. These, in turn, require the enactment of constitutional guarantees and just norms, in other words, good social morality. If these positive conditions were introduced by society, the present scientific and technological resources base could provide the foundation for universal material and cultural well-being. Then we would build on the 'positive potential' of our culture and could make progress toward cooperative coexistence. To achieve these goals, society would have to transform itself by adopting socially good standards and eliminate socially wrong conduct.

People have lived under various rulers and different political systems. History demonstrates that significant societal changes have been achieved in the past and indicates that laws and social standards can be further improved. According to the previously developed definition of survival morality, societal conduct is being judged as good or bad, right or wrong, just or unjust, and whether it is based on the '*primary needs and interests of all of the people*'. Laws must protect the 'total' human environment, including both the social and the natural environments. Humanity will not be able to sustain itself if we continue to destroy both our environment. Furthermore:

- Individual survival depends on the sustenance of the 'total' environment, both the natural and the social.
- The sustenance of the human civilization is of common interest to all members of society.
- The '**morally good**' serves the '**fundamental**' and '**basic needs**' of the people, for these are common and equal 'primary needs and interests' of all members of society.
- The '**morally bad**' violates the primary needs and interests of the people.

The enactment of these principles would protect every person's cardinal needs and create equality with respect to the primary needs and interests of all members of society. These standards do not impede positive drives and higher rewards for useful achievements.

Legal enactment of just standards can be derived from these principles, but their implementation is difficult. The greatest obstacle is that the world's population lives in different countries. Some of these have bad leaders, bad laws,

small territories, adverse climactic conditions, and insufficient natural and human resources.

Rights, Freedoms, and Equality

Demands of rights, liberty, equality, and brotherhood, have been part of all reform movements. These revolutionary ideals have stirred up flaming emotions throughout history. The oppressed rebelled and have marched, shouting these slogans, waving red flags; the symbols that have become soaked in the blood of social revolutions. Radical humanism created these slogans, now embedded in the constitutions of several democratic nations, but without a realistic theory of 'means' and 'ends' of implementing them. These undefined goals remained only as unsubstantiated ideals of rights, freedoms, and equality.

Parliamentary democracies are much better than dictatorial political systems. But rights, freedoms, and equality have not been specifically protected by their constitutions and are greatly limited for many people. Not all citizens have equal opportunities to get education and to get jobs. Women are still not treated equally and money influences judgment in the courts. Many people have no health care and face discrimination in other important areas. Inequality also exists in taxation.

In contrast, a relatively small minority has special rights and freedoms. In many countries, inadequate limits allow rampant exploitation of people and natural resources. The manufacturing and sale of arms for purposes other than defense is the privilege of a few and against public interests. Laws also allow the production, advertisement, and sale of products harmful to health. The once sacred notions of freedom of expression and freedom of the press are abused by the media.

How can justice be served for individuals who are born unequal? Isn't the instinct of survival imposed on all of us with equal strength? Only the combination of moral and rational considerations can resolve this antagonistic situation. Moral compassion mandates that every human being be well-provided-for and happy. It is also rational to satisfy our '*primary needs and interests*' because they are survival needs of all and prerequisites of social harmony and peaceful coexistence. These goals can only be achieved by limiting those rights and freedoms that would harm the rights and liberties of others. This conclusion is the same as it was with just standards. Derived from survival morality, **the extent of rights, freedoms, and equality, should not harm 'the primary needs interest of all of the people'**. Specifically:

- Equal constitutional rights, freedoms, and opportunities should be available for every individual for the fulfilment of the '*fundamental*' and '*basic needs*' of life.
- No individual, group, organization, or government should have the right to prevent others from having access to an adequate portion of available resources to sustain themselves.
- Every individual should have an equal right, freedom, and opportunity to benefit from society's material and cultural resources to satisfy socially harmless personal '*wants*'.
- In the struggle for wants, extra benefits, and privileges, no individual or special interest group should have the right to harm the primary needs and interests of the people.
- Lies, innuendoes, unsubstantiated accusations or news, threats, or violence against individuals or identifiable groups, should be against the laws.
- A democratic society's just duty is to safeguard these rights and enforce restrictions on harmful privileges.

Some of these principles are not protected by the laws of contemporary democracies. Although these principles are incorporated in the form of noble ideals, they remain unfulfilled, and are not protected by the full extent of the law. In some respects they are like the Biblical Commandment “*love thy neighbours*” which is a magnificent moral demand, but it is hard to fulfil and it is not enforceable.

Noble constitutional principles should be supplemented by laws as well-defined means to reach desired ends. For long range sustainability of our civilization, constitutions and laws must be specific — not just advocating rights and freedoms — but they should provide fair opportunities to secure these privileges. Love and respect for our fellow human beings and common sense concerns for our future are only effective when expressed in factual, codified norms.

These requirements are especially urgent in countries where people are deprived. Contemporary democracies should also make improvements. As they are now, constitutions grant certain rights and freedoms and contain noble ideals of justice, freedom, and equality, but they also allow abuses. These should be remedied everywhere before it is too late.

PART 3. GROUP THEORY OF SOCIETY

Early Groups — The Grouping Imperative

This study begins, as before from the ground up, with food gathering ancestors, the emergence of families, clans, tribes, and an ever growing concentration of people into larger and larger groups. The analysis focuses on:

- The reasons for ancient group formations.
- The causes of ‘*differentiation*’ and ‘*diversification*’ of groups.
- The emergence, role, and influence of leaders.
- Evolutionary shift from early self-reliance to total interdependence.
- And the shift from cooperative to adversarial competing coexistence.

Human ancestors began gathering into cooperating groups for the enhancement of their survival. This biological tendency is seen as a ‘*grouping imperative*’ for the protection and enhancement of life. Members within isolated early tribes shared resources and lived cooperatively and in peace with one another. Cooperation was common interest for the sake of survival. Tribal leaders emerged spontaneously by merit for mutual benefits to both the leader and of the led. Ancient cooperative coexistence is in stark contrast to present adversarial relationships that typify contemporary civilization. Naturally, the question arises: Why don’t we live in peace anymore?

Anthropology provides a credible account about the life of early human beings. Lone, isolated food-gathering ancestors don’t provide a basis for group analysis, but provide a sharp contrast to communal coexistence. The first food-gatherers began to live spontaneously in small communal groups. For this study, it is not important to decide which was more significant: the role of human instinct or intellect in the tendency to form families and gradually gather into clans and tribes. It is more **important to recognize the fundamental impositions of nature, human needs and the instinct of survival, as the imperatives of grouping.** This drive improved the chances of survival and general welfare of individuals who lived in isolation from one another before joining together into sharing cooperative groups.

Group living also helped to perpetuate survival of the human species by mak-

ing sexual gratification easier, and thus contributed to the steady increase of human population on earth. The imperative to gather into early communal groups not only increased the chances of survival, but also gave rise to previously absent interactions, mostly ‘positive tertiary drives’. Outstanding physical abilities, mental superiority, and drives that invented primitive hunting weapons and utensils, have invoked respect, appreciation and even envy of outstanding abilities and talents. The strongest and most talented individuals gained more benefit from their inborn gifts, but every member of the group also benefited from their achievements.

These are early examples of the positive manifestations of the socially useful, positive, aspects of the tertiary drives. They indicate their important role in the progress of human civilization. Survival was the primary reason for communal living. But societal life also developed the feeling of belonging to one’s own enlarged family, a feeling of being protected and cared for.

How can one be certain about the life within ancient societies? Fortunately, many isolated, primitive, aboriginal tribes existed in North and South America and Australia at the time of their discoveries. Some tribes remained in isolation until recent days in the huge rain forest of the Amazon in Brazil. An encyclopedic² summary describes the life of Eskimo (Inuit, in native language) tribes found in the Canadian north, Norway, Greenland, Iceland, and Alaska: “*Social organization among the Eskimo is a sort of primitive communism. Only raw materials such as game and fish are collectively owned; however, manufactured articles such as hunting and fishing equipment, domestic utensils and clothing, are considered private property. The Eskimo have no kings or chiefs, no tribal organizations, no military or police, and no jails.*”

Evidence of much older communal living conditions have been unearthed since 1970. Archeologists Mary and Richard Leakey and their followers have unearthed evidence of cooperative activities of early hominids, two to three million years ago.³ These protohuman ancestors were sharing food, had a distinct territory and home base. They hunted in groups and “*They formed bonds, we call ‘Marriage’, involving reciprocal economic ties, joint responsibility for child-rearing and restrictions on sexual access.*” These were long-term mating bonds between a male and one or more females. Other authoritative papers also describe cooperative communal life within groups studied in more recent times.

Today, we live in much larger communities, cities and nation-states. Innumerable sub-groups have been forming and exist within these larger group formations. Total independence of the food-gathering past has been transformed by evolutionary changes into total interdependence. We all rely on others for the provision of our needs and wants.

The evolution of civilization has been driven by the grouping imperative and the thinking and creative abilities of human beings. Human beings have given up their independence voluntarily and have gradually become members of totally interdependent and interreliant modern societies. But **paradoxically, human inventiveness gradually led to competing adversarial coexistence.**

We now have laws, restrictions, concepts of rights and justice and weapons of mass murder. We can now be seen as ‘civilized barbarians’ living within hostile life-threatening national groups. Life has become loaded with complications and uncertainty of the future.

In summary, it became important to adopt communal living formations because:

- Chances of survival are increased for individuals.
- Sexual gratification and reproduction are more easily secured.
- Reciprocal responsibilities to raise children are introduced.

- Defenses against animate and inanimate nature are increased.
- Food supply is increased through coordinated hunting efforts.
- Quality of life is improved by food-sharing and learning from the resourcefulness and innovation of others.
- Cooperative coexistence is developed with mutual benefits between the gifted leader and those who are led.
- A sense of togetherness, a feeling of security and safety, and a sense of belonging to ones 'own' group is developed.
- Altogether, communal life has served the *'primary needs and interest of all members of the group'*.

Growth of Groups

Security and well-provided communal life was peaceful and harmonious within isolated groups. It allowed time for leisure, thinking, discoveries, and improvement of living conditions. Individuals with superior thinking abilities and skills have given the group hunting weapons, tools, and utensils. The population of tribes began to increase under these satisfactory circumstances. Growth led to increased needs of food supply and hunting grounds. Concurrently, neighbouring tribes also had to expand their territories.

Paradoxically, general well-being and growth ended the era of peacefully living isolated groups. Increased need for food and territory led to clashing interests and confrontations. These were the first negative consequences of growth that ended the era of harmonious coexistence. The common root of hostilities was fear, the threat to survival, shortages of food supply that led to intrusions into the hunting grounds of other tribes. The threat to sustenance caused early aggression. Agriculture and animal husbandry were not yet discovered the only way to survive was to increase hunting grounds by force for the defense of life. Tribal aggression was a blind animalistic struggle for survival.

The smartest and most powerful groups managed to extend their territories, and their populations grew faster and greater in number than those of the less capable groups. Skillful groups lived better and, in general, their talents assured them a privileged position with respect to other groups. From this period of time on, the positive features of human evolution grew together with its negative aspects. A new era of clashing interests began to evolve — an era of growing differences between the less and the more capable groups. This primitive civilization of competing early groups with clashing survival drives had been the forerunners of modern nation-states.

The Increasing Role of the Brain, Diversification, Differentiation and Emergence of Leaders

The evolution of early civilization led to classing tribal needs that had been multiplying first externally only between different groups. But gradually, peaceful coexistence had also been deteriorating internally. Differences between individual abilities have been giving rise to clashing internal interests within previously harmoniously living groups. In addition to instinct, the human brain has been leading humanity from ignorant animal existence to mushrooming activities and interests to the present culture.

The most gifted individuals have been the leaders of human civilization. The smartest members of early groups recognized how to utilize the resources of nature. They have been creating useful things, early inventions for themselves and for other members of the group. These smart individuals eventually also recognized opportunities to draw special benefits from their exceptional abilities. They became both the leaders and main beneficiaries of the

evolution of civilization.

The purpose of this section is to illustrate broadly, without details, that human intellect helped advance human evolution with two major, but different consequences. Initially, the utilization of natural resources and the fruits of inventions had been positive. They were shared and were beneficial to the whole group because they increased general welfare and the chances of survival for all of its members. But subsequently, the negative creations of human intellect changed the early cooperative culture into competing and confrontational societies.

Even the least educated person is capable of learning through observing or communicating with others and is far more resourceful than any other primate. We also dream and hypothesize, invent fantastic creatures, things, and events. The mind can invent myths, good and evil powers and spiritual beings. These imaginary abstractions of the human mind are inferences from the known into the unknown. The workings of the human brain have far reaching practical consequences. Like physical skills and power, superior mental capacities enable creative individuals to secure some privileged leadership⁴ positions for themselves.

Talents, ideas, inventions, and activities, can be either beneficial or harmful. Thus, exceptional people can, and have been, affecting the life of societies from the early days of human civilization. Unfortunately, human intellect has been producing — along with positive achievements — an increasing number of negative consequences. These are *'negative tertiary wants'*, such as satisfying self-interest regardless of its bad consequences for others, ambition to gain power and dominate, and also include emotions such as greed and envy.

Most societal problems, throughout written history, can be associated with the negative drives of leading individuals and leaderships.

Some of the brainiest members of society have been using their superior abilities strictly for themselves regardless of the negative consequences on other members of society. The leaders of this evolution enhanced their power by forming guilds, professions, and eventually, manufacturers organizations, labour unions, and countless sub-groupings within larger group societies. The era of cooperative groups has changed and become divided by different interests and competing sub-groups.

These special interest groups and their leaders have been promoting and protecting their own concerns and power. They have been creating social, economical, and political problems. These are the consequences of the diversification and differentiation of society into self-interested sub-groups. The production of goods and services has been growing exponentially. Increases in food production has also been growing with the growth of population. Housing, sanitation, medicines, better clothing, and countless other improvements, increased the average length of human life about threefold in a few thousand years.

These facts demonstrate the collective achievements of human beings. But this progress has been created by a relatively small number of leading individuals. Some of these worked by themselves and created the arts, others built churches, mines, factories, and created modern services, and a few learned how to rule entire nations. They were all using ordinary people fitted into cooperative groups — experts and labourers for a specific purpose — for their own material benefit, status, and power. Although, leading individuals have been benefiting society in many ways, the primary beneficiaries were the leaders themselves.

Today, **the leaders** of industry, commerce, people in high positions, **lost sight of**

the rational goal of creativity. The original purposes of work and production were to satisfy human needs. Today, we are also producing destructive things. Many leaders have become slaves of mindless tertiary ambitions, and are leading humanity in negative directions, unlike early leaders, who served the common needs and interests of their people.

The masses usually follow their leaders blindly or can be coerced by their leaderships. Michael Blake illustrates the behaviour of masses in his literary work: *"I could not understand — I still don't — how so many people could want to be part of an event with which they have so little connection...and while I could enumerate the individual causes of such craving I still cannot account for the phenomenon itself."* This 'craving' is one of the manifestations of the undiminished grouping imperative; the feeling of belonging to one's 'own' group and to follow its leaders.

The conclusion that one can draw from the evolution of groups and history is instructive. **Humanity needs new unselfish and dedicated leaders.** Noble-minded and rational leaders that can reunite the majority to stop and reverse the decline of our civilization. The elimination of the 'negative potential' of our era could only happen through a more rational application of human thinking and creative abilities.

PART 4. GROUP ANALYSIS OF MODERN SOCIETY

Social Groups or Social Classes?

Organized social groups can be *defined as 'representatives of special interests'*. This 'group' definition is also valid for all kinds of informally organized groups. Some of these, like various hobby groups, have little or no influence on society, while others have enormous power of influence. The most significant formal group organizations are pursuing and protecting, cultural, social, economic, and political goals and interests. From a socio-political and economic point of view, states, military, industrial and commercial enterprises, and even churches, can be viewed as organized groups, all promoting and protecting their special interests.

Social classes cannot be precisely defined. With the emergence of the industrial era, the borderlines of class categories gradually lost their clear meanings. Today, the concept of social classes are broad generalizations and class analysis does not reveal the enormous influence of group organizations on the life of our civilization. The broad concept of social classes has to be broken down into specific influential sub-groupings. Group analysis provides a much clearer view of the forces shaping social conditions than class analysis can provide.

Modern society has become widely split and differentiated by group organizations. The largest groups are led by influential leaders. They are well-organized and exercise enormous power and influence on life and conditions within nation-states and on the global community. The activities of organized groups can be scientifically analyzed. Group analysis reveals the forces shaping economic, political, and social conditions, from both positive and negative points of view. An anomaly exists because all of our needs are provided by cooperatively working people, while corporations that employ them are viciously competitive and confrontational. In the following sections, group analysis will begin with nation-states and will continue with the most influential special interest groups and sub-groups.

Nation-states

Nation-states are among the largest of historical group formations. All spe-

cial interest groups are essentially sub-groups within nation-states. According to conventional wisdom, the state is the protector of the welfare, safety, and security of its citizens. This should, indeed, be the true function of the state and all of its regional sub-units. Deep feelings of belonging to one's own state, the pride and love of its national anthem, the flag, and other symbols of identity, convey a sense of being protected by one's own state. These feelings are subjective. One may feel comparatively fortunate living in a rich country, but that does not justify the notion of being protected by the state.

The fact is, that national and other governance are strongly influenced by powerful interest groups through political representatives or autocratic regimes. Primarily, the state becomes the promoter and the protector of the most influential special interest groups. And only secondarily, does the state look after the needs and primary concerns of its citizens. Living conditions are markedly different between rich and poor countries, and between democracies and dictatorships.

Nation-states also have the greatest influence on external affairs. **The political state is actually the top representative of the most powerful economical and political special interest groups.**

The controlling power of the central state has been divided between regional and local interest groupings. These local states, provinces and other regional governance, are also politically governed sub-groups. They pursue their own policies and create laws protecting powerful local interests. But the protection of the primary needs and interests of the citizens maintains its status as a secondary priority.

A good state should be equally just and compassionate for all of its citizens, regardless of what part of the country they happen to reside. Citizens have the same 'fundamental and basic needs and primary interests,' in every region of a country or the world. Under a truly democratic constitution, all laws and policies would be identical throughout a 'just' central state. In a moral and rational state, there would be no reason to have sub-units of governance. **In a true democracy, there would not be different regional legislative authorities different laws and justice systems.** There would be no need for local states, provinces and regions.

Municipal Governments

Segregation of governing political groups continues down to the municipal level. The seats of power in most municipalities are occupied by lawyers, business representatives, and career politicians. Most of these are representatives of powerful local economic group interests, such as real estate firms, land and housing developers, major contracting and consulting firms and local manufacturers. Their elected representatives dominate the municipal scene of public affairs. Labour delegates are typically rare and in the minority at this level.

The majority of people pay municipal taxes, but citizens have little or no influence on how municipalities are governed. Residential, commercial and industrial designation and zoning regulations of land and buildings are vital profit-motivating areas for speculators, land and housing developers, contractors, and realtors. The decay of downtown and old central areas, caused by urban sprawl in many cities both in Canada and in the U.S.A., are direct consequences of policies supporting econo-political⁶ interest groups.

Business Associations

The main goal of business corporations is profit-making. Businesses form trade-promoting and protective groups for enhancing their special interests. They combine their power to advance and to protect their business interests

jointly. They use methods such as paid media campaigns, paid political lobbyists, as well as candidate and party financing to garner political favours from elected seats of power. From the viewpoint of group theory, business associations are sub-groups within the larger national groupings. Money and paid propaganda campaigns as well as dishonesty and deceit unduly influence both the public and the government in their own favour⁷.

Professional Groups

Professional groups are also protectionist associations, but hypocritically, they are claiming to be the protectors of public interest. In many countries, a university degree qualifies one to practise a profession. However, in Canada and in the U.S.A., membership in an association is also required before experts can practise a profession. Professional groups achieve licensing and regulatory powers under provincial or other state laws. Doctors, pharmacists, engineers, architects, lawyers and other experts are allied in professional associations for the protection of their special interests.

Although these elite group organizations have a code of ethics, active protection of the public takes place only when a complaint is filed against a member. Impartial laws could protect the public against unethical and bad professional conduct with respect to any and all professions requiring expert qualifications. It is clear that econo-political interests are the motivating powers in granting special legal powers for professional associations. They would be unnecessary in true democracies where all civil and human rights and vital public interests, including unethical and expert professional misconduct, are protected by law.

Trade Unions

Workers began forming trade unions at the beginning of industrialization. Long working hours, low wages, exploitation of child labour, and unhealthy workplaces, were typical in that period. Workers, and many other citizens, had no paid vacations, health care, unemployment insurance, or welfare protection. Such deplorable working conditions have been the main causes of rising socialist and labour union movements.

Factory and mine workers became united in order to increase their weak individual powers through combined group actions. Strikes against the owners were broken by the police, often by the use of force. The Bolshevik revolution and birth of the first communist state in 1917, as well as the great global depression during the period of 1930's were great warnings to business and governments. In the democratic countries, labour movements have been forcing politicians to enact laws protecting workers. Classical capitalism has been forced by organized labour demands to give up its rigid ideology. Capitalism has been softened and became 'socialized' by introducing so called 'social safeguards', thereby avoided the overthrow of its econo-political system.

Today, large and well-organized labour unions have great political power and influence. Trade unions can stop services vital to a nation even globally. Public transportation, shipping, postal, and other services, can be brought to a halt by a relatively small number of strikers. In the distant past, the labour movement protected the poor, defenseless workers and disenfranchised masses. Now, in industrial democracies, powerful trade unions protect reasonably well-paid, comfortably living, 'middle class', employees. The plight of the poor and major public issues are not the priorities of their agenda.

The definition of groups also applies to organized labour for they have become the promoters and representatives of special interest. In Canada, the U.S.A., and in other industrial democracies, the original humanistic goals of

trade unions are neglected. They are just one of the many groups among the most powerful self-interest organizations.

Churches as Group Organizations

Religious beliefs can be separated from organized church activities that are not related to religious faith or to any particular denomination. We will discuss church influences on society apart from theological doctrines and religious practices. The earlier definition and characterization of groups apply, regardless of the fact that some societal church activities may have no material goals to attain.

Most churches are teaching good societal morality and advocate peace and brotherly love. They enrich the emotional and spiritual feelings of the faithful, create peace of mind, charitable attitude, and harmonious social coexistence. Most believers are good peace-loving individuals, but can be easily misdirected by anti-social rhetoric of clergy. Many church activities are political and have marked effects on societal coexistence, peace and harmony.

Throughout history, most churches have been collaborating with oppressive political systems. Religious wars have been fought, witches have been burned, and Inquisitions have sent many people to death. Extremist churches incite their members against declared enemies, organized terrorist acts and murder. Today, several countries are 'theocracies' ruled by fanatical church leaders. Others have been organizers of uprisings and religious civil wars, causing death and sufferings to millions of innocent people.

Even in many democratic countries, some churches have political representatives in governments. They influence language rights, teachings in schools, restrict certain books, operate money-making enterprises and influence social affairs to suit their own agenda. There are intolerant political church movements against human rights issues, such as women's rights to control their bodies, gays and lesbians, scientific and secular educational matters. Some teach intolerance and imply hatred against other religions, which have been a hidden source and trigger for violence. These have nothing to do with religious faith and good morality and clearly organized group activities.

International Groups

Multinational corporations and a number of policy-making institutions are international group organizations. These have an enormous influence on world affairs, thus affecting the life of every individual on earth. The largest organization of nation-states is the *United Nations* (UN). The noble purpose of the UN is to end all wars, to settle international conflicts by peaceful means, and to aid poor and underdeveloped countries to rise from poverty.

The UN is supposed to be impartial, but it cannot fulfil its mandate. The simple reason is that it is a representative parliament of political states. The UN is strongly influenced by the special interests of each national group and the most powerful econo-political interest groups in the world. If the UN were impartial, there would be no need for military alliances.

Although smaller in the number of participating countries, but much greater in power are the military group-alliances. These have been having greater influence on international affairs than the UN. Nazi Germany formed such military group, the 'Axis', to fight and win an aggressive war. The 'Allied Forces' were formed by England, France, the Benelux states, the U.S.A., and the former Soviet Union for defensive purposes against the aggressors. After the Second World War (WWII), the 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization', NATO, was formed

against the 'Warsaw Pact' countries. At the publication of this booklet, the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact no longer exist, but NATO has already accepted three former Soviet Bloc countries into its group-alliance.

The ultimate cause of political struggles and wars is economic interest. The 'European Common Market' and the recently formed 'European Monetary Union' are primarily economic-political group formations. The 'North American Free Trade Agreement', NAFTA, a similar group formed by Canada, the United States of America, and Mexico. Japan, and more recently, China has also been extending its influence in 'Pacific Rim' countries.

The collapse of COMECON, the trade bloc of former Soviet dominated countries, caused a dramatic reduction of economic well-being in these countries. The 'World Bank', the 'International Monetary Fund' (IMF), and the economically powerful 'Group of Seven' (G7) nations are the most significant international group organizations. The former GATT group was recently replaced by the World Trade Organization (WTO). Its 1999 December meeting, in Seattle, Washington, was interrupted by civil disobedience and violent police reprisals. These violent events, just one of many that happened in the past, are demonstrating the enormity of clashing group interests.

PART 5. PARADOXES OF THE POLITICAL CULTURE

The First Paradox

The first paradox of the political era is its potential to destroy itself. The terms political era and political culture characterize our civilization in which societal conditions have been strongly influenced by powerful special interest groups through their political representatives in governance. At the beginning of civilization, the 'grouping imperative' brought people together to enhance the chances of their survival. Antagonistically, human creativity has been gradually reducing the effectiveness of the original motives of cooperative coexistence. Leading individuals and their special interest groups have been differentiating society into special interest groups.

Now, we are living in a political era amid extreme competition and confrontational coexistence. Paradoxically, the grouping imperative created hostile nation-states and fiercely competing sub-groups within and among nation-states. The proliferation of special interest groups and their blind pursuit of self-interest led to the present anti-survival tendency now threatening the future of civilization.

The Second Paradox

The 'primary needs and interests' of the led and the leaders are conflicting. The leaders of the world are at the helms of fiercely competing economic and political interest groups and in the seats of political power of rival nation-states. Paradoxically, cooperative isolated tribal culture came to an end by its own success. Our culture has become an antagonistic political civilization. The needs and interests of ancient tribal leaders were the same as that of the led. Contemporary leaders are driven by self-interest and the interests of their economic supporters.

Modern leaders are most responsible for the declining aspects of our culture and the potential of self-destruction. Today, the sad paradox is that neither the economic nor the political leadership is able to rationally utilize the existing infrastructure of the world that they themselves control. Leaderships are not in the hands of the most gifted, but the most powerful individuals whose narrowly focused interests prevent them from caring for the general interest.

The world's leadership has been shifting modern culture toward increasingly negative potentials. The future of human civilization is in the hands of economic and political leaders, a relatively small minority. They are in blind pursuit of extreme 'tertiary wants', growth for growth's sake, which prevents them from having rational foresight of the threat endangering long-term sustenance of our civilization.

The Third Paradox

The third paradox is the incessant struggle of groups for dominance. This adversarial and vicious relationship of competition is worldwide. The confrontational coexistence of special interest groups is an anomaly while the positive potential to create harmonious coexistence exists. This is a mindless condition because through rational means of competition, in the Olympic spirit, the world's population could be free of deprivation. Positive talent and outstanding creativity could satisfy extra wants, 'tertiary' benefits, well above the satisfactory norm.

Fierce competition for market dominance is now inherently reliant on political methods. This prevents the positive potential of our culture from becoming reality. As long as corporations are aided by political systems in securing dominant positions, the life of this anomaly is extended. Modern technology has opened a unique opportunity to make a profit and to earn privileges in a rational and ethical manner.

One day, in the not too distant future, limitless acquisition of power and riches may come to a halt by itself. But for now, taking the risk of continuing this merciless race for dominance is illogical because it can cause violent upheavals and wars. It would be a misuse of the human intellect, a paradox, to continue toward disaster. The positive use of our thinking ability should be directed toward the elimination of confrontational group struggles both internally and externally.

The Fourth Paradox

Armed defense is supposed to protect a society against attacks. Today, paradoxically, armed forces have become the instruments of confrontational politics. Military might, in the hands of some shortsighted and unscrupulous leaders, seems to be the ultimate means of settling disputes. Armed forces are supposed to defend the people from attacks or to be used for police protection against criminal elements.

Historical evidence demonstrates that countries with a powerful military have been aggressive, not defensive. In the not-too-distant past, most of the world was colonized, including the American continent, Africa, Australia, large parts of Europe and Asia, the Middle East, and most of the Far East. The borders of nation-states have often been changed by aggressive wars fought throughout the world. Many nations have lost their independence.

Although colonization is now virtually over, armed clashes and the slaughter of innocent people in wars between states, ultra-nationalist, and ethnic groups are still raging in more than one hundred regions of the earth. Many of the ongoing theatres of bloodshed have been instigated and directed by power-hungry leaders, who are lending their open or covert support to fulfil their own selfish ends.

Political leaders backed by confrontational economic-political group interests and military forces, are paradoxes of the political culture. Contemporary states spend huge amounts of money on armament and maintain large military forces. In some countries, the magnitude of military expenses are far greater than the amount spent on health care, education, and social programs. Tragically, the livelihood of many experts and workers comes from the industries of war and

destruction for the enrichment of a few. The magnitude of destructive forces has become so gigantic that it now threatens the future of civilization. Such irrational thinking and behaviour are the darkest anomalies of the human intellect — the forces that created civilization, now have the potential to destroy itself.

Yet this paradox exists, despite the presence of a scientific-technological resource base that would be capable of creating general well-being and peaceful coexistence. Many sound-thinking leaders of the economic and cultural superstructure, including military leaders as well as some politicians, can see the irrationality of spending so much money on armaments instead of using resources for the creation of peaceful and satisfying conditions. But they have not found sound methods for changing the current state of affairs. They are caught up and swept along by the current of the prevailing political culture — deeply ingrained practices and political indoctrination are obscuring common sense.

That the media is now owned and largely controlled by economic-political concerns, is partly responsible. The media is restrained, they are no longer free to disseminate rational ideas that would free the world from bloodshed. These tendencies mirror the illogical and declining state of the warring political culture.

The peaceful creation of harmonious relationships between the leaders and the led is still possible. Such a transformation would need the protection of military forces whose duty and honour is to serve the people and not the economic-political masters of society. Honourable military personnel should protect the people. If and when the time comes, they should bravely turn their weapons against attacks by vast economic-political powers.

The political era of confrontations, wars, deprivation, suffering, death, and the paradoxes of the culture can be ended. The armed forces can be turned into true defenders of the people and peace. There should be no doubt about the possibility of peaceful cultural transformations. Military oath and honour should imply defense of the people and their primary needs and vital interests. Peaceful coexistence will be possible when truly democratic principles become law, protected by true defense forces. Enlightened moral individuals, including leaders of the military, must work together to eliminate the paradoxes of the political culture.

PART 5. DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM DESIGNS

Well-informed, Knowledgeable and Rational Decision-making

The question is raised, can contemporary democracy be radically improved? Most people think that it could be enhanced but would be very hard to accomplish. Social and political philosophers as well as political science professors are apprehensive about the direct involvement of ordinary citizens in policy-making. Conventional wisdom maintains that wise political decisions are the results of thoughtful deliberations by career politicians, even when they make compromises. Dr. Lynn Carson, an expert on government and administration, wrote to me from Australia; *"I am interested in direct democracy (citizen policy makers) but it loses me every time it ignores the deliberative component — (it is) too easily hijacked by populism otherwise."*

Assuming that the thoughtful deliberations taking place in political parliaments is wrong. Parliamentary debates are biased and should not be equated with impartial presentations of facts and rational views. Elected representatives are neither experts nor impartial. What appears to be a rational deliberative process is actually heated and biased arguments of individuals clashing special interests and intolerant views. Legislative decisions are made by majority votes, and the outcome is slanted in favour of political power, regardless

whether the decision is right or wrong.

Sound decisions can only be made by knowledgeable impartial individuals about some issue or issues. Knowledge can be personal or acquired through learning. Proper judgment arises from knowing the subject at hand. Well-informed decisions are made by learning through personal experiences or from knowledgeable persons and sources. Students learn from their teachers. They are not debating anything, but acquiring knowledge, and use subjects learned in their career. Ordinary people can and do make many sound decisions.

The decision-making process in the market is more democratic than it is in political parliaments. Housewives make intelligent product choices. They know what their family needs or wants and choose accordingly. Before 'electing' what to buy, they compare prices and qualities. If a businessman needs a new warehouse, he will hire an architect to learn what his best options are before deciding what to do. The producers, as decision-makers, respect the choices — the will — of ordinary people with no debate or deliberation, and manufacturers produce what the public prefers. Otherwise, their products would not be bought.

Similarly, lawmaking assemblies do not have to be places for political battles. Citizen lawmakers could make intelligent decisions about matters affecting their lives and the life of the community. Ordinary people can become well-informed and make rational choices. If they need help, they can summon impartial experts to advise them. Lawmaking assemblies can be quiet learning chambers. Initially, uninformed citizen legislators could learn about issues from various points of view.

The parliamentary battlefields of clashing interests could be replaced by impartial citizen legislators. Formal submissions from political parties, other special interest groups and individuals would be studied by the new lawmakers. Verbal submissions could also be presented to quietly listening legislators. Citizen lawmakers would also request and learn from unbiased expert advice. Once well-informed, each legislator would decide what is good or bad for the community and vote accordingly by secret ballots. There would be no undue influences, lobbying, debates or discussions.

The selections of citizen legislators would be made according to the rules of mathematical statistics. Thus, their collective judgment would be identical with the views of their community to a high degree of mathematical probability. In the new parliaments, citizen legislators would likely vote to satisfy the common 'primary needs and interests' of the people.

Democratic System Design Principles

The Greek origin of democracy means: government by the people. In other words, democracy is a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people. Contemporary democracies are based on indirect representation of the people through elected political representatives, but their constitutions protect certain human rights.

If the people would want to directly exercise their supreme power to govern, then the following is presumed:

- a) Approved by citizens, people want a constitution that they can vote to change or modify.
- b) The people would likely approve the following constitutional principles that can secure:
 - Peaceful and cooperative coexistence.
 - Long term sustenance of civilization.
 - The 'primary needs and interests' of all members of society.

- Impartial societal justice, rights and freedom for all people.
- Economic freedom for fruitful and beneficial growth.
- Exclusion of negative economic and harmful social and political activities.

These principles are in harmony with the earlier notions of morality and rational consideration.

No principles and methods of implementation can provide absolutely perfect ideal solutions to any real problem. However, good principles can improve civilization to the satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the people. It is unlikely that the first three points would be opposed by the people. With regard to points 4. to 6., the foregoing analysis clearly indicated that only impartial governance could assure fundamental principles of morality and secure societal justice, rights, and freedom for all of the people. **Impartiality mandates the exclusion of biased political representatives from governance.** Consequently, **a just and fair system of democratic governance implies direct judgment of the people.** The question is, how can such direct democracy be achieved?

Operating Principles and a Method of Implementation

The best principle of establishing 'just democracy' can only be achieved when **society regulates itself.** This calls for a method that allows **direct participation and control of governance by the people.** There are several methods by which these principles can be implemented. Before describing my system design principles and method of implementation, a few other proposals are introduced.

One of the best is described by Dr. Jiri Polak in his book, **Democracy; Direct or Indirect?**⁸ Briefly, he presents a "Representative Body (R/B) and decision-making system" in which "There are no parties, no nomination, no election campaigns, and no elections. The members are selected by chance... Thus the R/B... functions as a sample of a category of citizens". Dr. Polak's system is very similar to my proposal. I think he should drop the term 'Representatives' and instead he may find a better way to describe his parliamentary delegates. Readers may associate the role and functions of randomly selected facilitators of his "representative body" with political representatives. This becomes clear in reading Dr. Polak's book.

Another interesting modification of the system described in my book was made by a Canadian man, Thomas McArthur. He writes, today "Accountability of party MLAs (representatives) is to the party, not to their constituency and therein lies the problem for special interest groups — expose all parties to the evil of corruption from the outside." He wants to retain political representatives, but to retain only a random selection of them. These political representatives would be "accountable directly to them (the electors), not a party, and enforceable under a legal contract. The contract would be ... between the electors and their representatives." He also proposes a system of "customer feedback" similar to the market system, as in my design. Here, the customers are the electors and the party would have to obtain their approval, which would be mandated by contractual agreement. Under McArthur's plan, there would be no need to change the Canadian Constitution or existing legislative assemblies.

Former Alaskan senator Mike Gravel started a movement called Philadelphia II (P II) to empower Americans to govern themselves. Don Kemner, Secretary of PII, gives an account of the evolution of PII, now called Direct Democracy Initiative (DDI). Some of his points follow:

"a. Democracy has a commonly accepted meaning. Etymologically — Democracy is comprised of two Greek words: *demos* = people and *chratein* — to rule.

Philosophically — Webster's dictionary meaning of democracy: 'government by the people; a form of government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and

exercised directly by them or by their elected agents under a free electoral system.' Further he writes:

"c. Direct Democracy consists of collective legislative governance directly by the electorate; indirect and/or representative democracy consists of same through an elected substitute."

"...All participation of the electorate in the processes of representative democracy are citizen acts of indirect, not direct democracy."

"... Philadelphia II understandings, which base the qualitative difference between a Sovereign and a Mendicant democrat. Basic to this distinction are the following:

1. A key constitutionally grounded appreciation is that... **collective self-governance is the preeminent goal**, which is enshrined in the Preamble of our Constitution... the implementation into law ... structural and procedural advance which best implements collective self-governance is precisely the political tool that Philadelphia II enshrines and is bringing forward, in principle, in the DDI.

Quite specifically, Philadelphia II... (is) for the institutionalization in law of Initiative Democracy ..." (my underlining G.S.S.)

Another American, Triaka⁹, summarizes her solution briefly and clearly as, "Congress will be advisory to the People (holding hearings, taking testimony, and making recommendations), and the people will be lawmakers (approving or rejecting the recommendations of the Congress)."

The proposals of Polak, Gravel, McArthur, and Triaka grant far greater rights and opportunities to the people to control their governance than contemporary democracies do. Any of the proposals would result in radical improvements in making legislative decisions by the People.

Numerous other proposals and movements exist. Their numbers are growing all over the world. The majority of these are aiming at partial improvements within the existing representative system. Although they are calling themselves direct democracy movements, only a few want to give sovereign power to the people. Instead, they propose improvement within the representative systems, calling for enactment of citizens initiatives, referendums, and the recall of unworthy political representatives.

A book by professors Becker and Christa Stalon presents a monumental global overview of direct democracy movements and projects¹⁰. Selections from their book will be presented in my college course. Becker provides a tremendous amount of useful DD information in Teledemocracy Action News and Network, as well as in his Web-pages which offer links to other DD sites.

Self-regulating Societal System; Socio-Cybernetics

The term 'socio-cybernetics' is borrowed from science and implies that society can also govern itself successfully by monitoring and correcting its performance according to public mandates. Science and technology have developed and have utilized the principle of 'cybernetics' for automated controls of inanimate systems. Such an apparatus can be designed to function according to desired performance requirements. Just like customer preferences on the market, a cybernetics system monitors itself and, through a permanent feedback arrangement, can automatically regulate itself. The system can quickly correct its errors by steering itself back to the required operational criteria.

Autonomous self-governance must operate similarly by pre-defined constitutional principles adopted by the people. The following principles of the design would fulfil socio-cybernetic requirements:

a) A small body of experts have to prepare a constitution in advance. It would be irrational to think that the entire population could conceive and write a democratic constitution. When the draft of the democratic constitution is prepared, it would have to be presented to the people for approval.

b) Governing principles and goals of the constitution would likely be accepted by the public if they satisfy the 'primary needs and interests of all of the people'.

c) A society can only coexist soundly if it has a governing body that fulfils the expectations of its population. The idea is much like an automatic heating system (designed by cybernetics principles). The user sets up the required temperature, a thermostat monitors temperature and feeds information to the control apparatus, which in turn maintains the pre-set requirement.

d) Similarly, the public should be heard by impartial lawmakers selected from their own ranks. The people should be able to criticize the system, make proposals, and express their opinion through a permanent system at their disposal. This monitoring and feedback system should allow for automatic correction of bad policies. Therefore, the control system should be designed so that it must be able to maintain the constitutionally set requirements.

e) A governing body that can assure that the will of the people is carried out faithfully and in an orderly manner. Lawmaking assemblies must be impartial and limited in size. This implies that its members have to be ordinary people and impartial. Selecting citizen legislators by lot would assure impartiality.

f) The legislators of self-governance would have to be well-informed and knowledgeable to make sound recommendations and rational decisions. Therefore, the public, political parties, and other special interest groups, as well as impartial experts, should have opportunities to make formal proposals to the legislative assemblies. This would give the legislators an opportunity to learn about the pros and cons of issues and make the best decisions for the community.

In cases when citizen lawmakers would not vote for or against requests with an overwhelming majority (for example, a minimum two-thirds majority) the issue would have to be put to the public to vote on. The electronic monitoring and feedback system should allow for secure secret balloting as well.

Socio-cybernetics-based governance could assure cooperative communal coexistence at any level and would function autonomously. These **system principles would be based on the will of the people with constitutional assurances for basic human rights. The design is not rigid, not pyramidal, as present hierarchical governing systems are, but constitute a distributed interacting integrated system.** As illustrated, a self-regulating system consists of several subsystems with distinct functions, but integrated and working harmoniously together to maintain sound operations. **The foregoing self-regulating governance involves the entire population in governing itself.**

In summary, for the sake of societal harmony and cooperative societal coexistence, these methods are likely to gain public acceptance:

- a) The goal is to assure that the common needs and interests of the people are fulfilled.
- b) The people should be able to influence policy decisions and to have a right to vote for or against any law.
- c) The public should be able to express its views, satisfaction and or criticism, through modern electronic facilities; for example, a monitoring and feedback system to their own legislative body.
- d) Have a control system **'of the people, by the people, for the people'** that can govern society accordingly.

e) Policy-making must be based on in-depth learning about issues and their affect on the lives of the people.

f) Legislators shall become well-informed and knowledgeable for making decisions.

g) No one person should rule, the laws as given by the constitution should govern society.

h) The governing system must be impartial, free of conflict and guarantee that the public interest is upheld by an overwhelming majority. The system must prevent the abuses of the governance at any level and in any function.

These self-governing principles and methods can be applied in a small community as well as in towns, cities, or countries. In fact, the people of the earth could govern themselves directly by the same or similar democratic principles and methods. This, however, is not likely to happen in the near future. It is more likely that direct democracy will first be implemented in a poor country and/or in a small community. When self-governance of the people has proven itself somewhere, it will likely spread and gradually be implemented throughout the world.

A Model of Direct Democracy

Before presenting the model, it is worthwhile to make comparisons of the features of political (representative) democracy with the foregoing goals of direct democracy (DD). Consider:

- a) Political representatives have different and often clashing goals, unlike the common interest of the people.
- b) Representative democracies have only partial public monitoring and cannot be directly influenced and controlled by the people as in direct democracies.
- c) Representatives are strongly influenced by special interest groups. They are financed and promoted in order to get elected and can be easily corrupted. Randomly selected delegates are not promoted, they are unknown — like jury members — and thus cannot be easily corrupted.
- d) Members of the *legislative*, *executive*, and *judiciary* branches are political appointees, and thus cannot be impartial. They are not directly monitored or supervised by the public. In DD, these branches are impartial and closely monitored and supervised by the public.
- e) The political control apparatus has no firm direction because the representatives have clashing interests. Therefore, they are swayed by the 'dynamics' of economic-political pressures. DD has firm principles, goals, and directions and its self-governance is safeguarded against economic-political pressure.
- f) In addition to being biased, political representatives have multiple powers:
 - They select and set the priorities of issues. In DD, the entire population is involved in selecting priorities.
 - Representatives debate issues whether they are knowledgeable or not. DD Parliamentarians are not debating, but learning about issues, become knowledgeable and voting by secret ballots.
 - Political representatives also make decisions without giving a chance to the public to get involved.
 - Most democratic governance enact laws with no public participation. DD lawmaking begins with full public participation and the public has a right to change, discard, and make new laws.

These functions are combined in a representative political system. The merits of issues are not considered by thoughtful deliberation, but are fought for in fierce debates in a confrontational atmosphere. The forthcoming model of DD separates these functions. In place of hostile arguments and biased decisions,

the people would make well-informed and impartial decisions.

One of the *'Founding Fathers'* of the United States of America, *James Madison*, wrote about the "mortal diseases" of "factions" (political parties and special interest groups).¹² He was concerned about the "common impulse of passion, or interest (negative 'tertiary drives'), adverse to the rights of other citizens, or the aggregate interest of the community." More than 200 years ago, small scattered settlements and horseback communication made it impossible for the public to participate in democratic policy-making. This was one of the main reasons that the United States of America became a republic and not a democracy.

After more than 200 years of historical change, the adverse features of the representative system have clearly manifested themselves. Today, true democracy can be supported by the economic and technological infrastructure. Modern communication and transportation facilities allow public monitoring, feedback, and direct participation of the people in policy-making. In light of the threatening 'negative potential' of our civilization, **transformation toward direct democracy is not only possible, but it has become necessary for survival.**

The most important features of direct democracy is that: **it insures the common needs and primary interest of all of the people, protected by its constitution. The self-governing system must assure that the law rules, not individuals.** The model shown in Figure 1. is based on the constitutional and design principles proposed earlier. The following methods would further insure true democracy, an unbiased system of self-governance of the people:

- a) This model of direct democracy illustrates self-governance by the people with the participation of the entire community.
- b) A representative number of individuals to be **randomly selected** from the members of the community. The aggregate composition of the delegates selected for lawmaking functions should be identical with the common needs and interest of the community, to a great degree of mathematical probability (perhaps 70-80 per cent or greater), thus their **decisions will be impartial** to a high degree.
- c) The new lawmaking apparatus must **be free of the direct participation of representatives of special interests.**
- d) **All members of the community**, including political parties and special interest groups, **should be able to submit formal, well-reasoned, proposals for legislation, changes to laws or the Constitution.**
- e) In order to make thoughtful and rational decisions, **the legislators should become well-informed and vote knowledgeably by secret ballots about all issues.**

The Parliament, The House of Priorities, Senate, Presidency

In this model, the **legislative assemblies are separated into four different functions.** The four functions are separated in different legislative assemblies. In this manner, undue outside interference is prevented to a high degree. In each assembly, the legislators could focus on each specific aspect of the agenda and thus would become knowledgeable and well-acquainted with details. Consequently, parliamentary decisions would become impartial and rational:

1. The first function: the **Parliament of Priorities** (the Parliament) would receive all public proposals for legislation.
2. The **House of Implementation** (the House) would choose the best methods to implement the recommended priorities.
3. The **Senate** would formalize regulations and laws.
4. The **Presidency** would approve and declare laws and formally represent the country.

In order to eliminate undue personal influence, the lawmakers should not debate issues but learn only from formal presentations, including invited **impartial experts** and, when well-informed, to **vote by secret ballots.**

When politicians will be removed from legislative functions, the new parliaments will no longer be the houses of confrontational power struggles, but as randomly selected delegates of the people, will become cooperative forums, making well-informed decisions. They will protect the cardinal interests of the entire community. It is highly unlikely that they will not suppress the rights and freedoms of special interest groups and free market economy, provided they will not harm, but enhance public concerns.

The Parliament would have the greatest number of delegates. At the end of the first session, the Parliament would select legislators to the House from its own members. No volunteering, nominations or promotion by any means would be allowed. The selection by ballots would follow immediately after voting for priorities. In **Figure 1**, The size of the frames around the captions illustrates the decreasing number of citizen legislators in the legislative divisions.

Constitutionally governed direct democracy should have legislative and administrative organizations for knowledgeable and orderly conduct of societal affairs. In the functional divisions of the proposed model, all issues would be illuminated from every point of view to the citizen legislators. Concerned individuals, political parties, and groups protecting economic, environmental, racial, religious, gender, and other special interests, may want to put their views forward to the proposed Parliament before votes are taken. Good legislation also requires advice from experts to shed light on scientific, technical, financial, legal, or other professional point of views on policy matters. These are shown in **Figure 1**. As **'special interest groups'**, and **'Unbiased Experts'** respectively. The main features of the model are:

1. The system allows full participation of the people in their own governance.
2. It is an orderly and impartial legislative system.
3. Lawmaking is rational, based on informative education leading to thorough knowledge of issues.
4. It greatly reduces the chances of underhanded methods and influences in policy-making.
5. Randomly selected lawmakers bound to protect the common good of all citizens.

Civic Forums, Local Administrations, Electronic Communication

In further compliance with socio-cybernetics principles, Figure 1. shows Citizen Forums, Local Administrations, and a Public Access Communication System. These will provide the people with facilities and practical means to directly monitor public affairs. The main functions of the *'Civic Forums'* (Forums) are:

1. The orderly supervision of local administration.
2. Under the constitution and uniform laws, the resolution of local policy issues.
3. The resolution of local conflicts.

Like all effectively managed enterprises, self-governance of the people also needs a uniform system of administration throughout the country. Uniformity would eliminate presently existing regional injustices. The same law and justice would be carried out in every community. This would be man-

aged by 'Local Administrations' under the direction of the 'Executive Branch', supervised locally by the Forums.

Governance throughout a country are uniform under this arrangement, yet are distributed not hierarchical. **The public supervises, monitors, participates and can continuously influence the lawmaking assemblies.** The permanently available 'Public access Electronic Communication System' makes public participation easy in policy-making, serves as feedback of public opinion and is used for balloting.

In summary, **Figure 1 shows** these additional system requirements:

- **Civic Forums that are ideally suited to be the local extensions of self-governance.** Forums would have to be in every small community and district in cities. **These would be new and important non-hierarchical, distributed, functions of direct governance of the people.**
- **Local Administrations** would carry out constitutional requirements of the law throughout the country, and thus **eliminate presently existing regional inequalities, injustices and political fights for privileges.**
- **Modern electronic communication facilities,** connecting to a special branch of the legislative **to enable the public to be heard and to vote on issues.**

The **Forums would be manned by ordinary citizens, also selected randomly** to hear all sides of the issues, somewhat like present legal juries. The public, the Forums, and the administration, would all be linked together and with the legislative through the proposed communication system. **Municipal and County policies would be provided by Central Forums,** similarly to town and city councils as well as regional policy-making bodies.

If a Forum could not resolve an issue, depending on the nature of the case, it would forward it to either the local administration, to the courts, or to the first level of legislature for resolution. Such an extensively distributed, linked, and harmoniously functioning governance, being in direct contact with the public, would fulfil the monitoring and feedback requirements of a good self-regulatory system design.

Citizen delegates of the Local Forums would form the Central Forums of each community and county. They would review and approve local plans and yearly budgets, determine the level of municipal services and local taxes. Forums would also have unbiased **expert studies and advice.** Monitoring and feedback requirements would be extensive through the Forums and the communications facilities as required by socio-cybernetics system design.

Self-Governance of a Nation

Comparing political representation with self-governance, political representatives have different interests and goals, the people have common 'primary needs and interests' and goals. Today, the public has no direct access to influence the government. The representatives are strongly swayed by special interests. The legislative, executive, and judiciary control apparatus is politically biased and the public has no direct monitoring, feedback or influence on making policies.

The implementation of truly democratic ideas require a new or improved constitution that protects all of the people and secures full development of positive individual talents. It can be concluded that one of **the best methods to achieve peaceful coexistence and the long term survival of civilization is through self-governance of the citizens** as shown in Figure 1.

Parliament of Priorities

Procedures and Rules of Conduct

In the legislative assemblies, no debates and no political power contests would take place and thus biased arguments could not sway the lawmaker's opinions. No lobbying would be permitted under the new constitution. The opportunities for bribery would be virtually eliminated. Firstly, because the legislators would be unknown, as in juries. Secondly, because they would have no personal opportunity to influence decision-making other than by a single vote on an issue by secret ballot. This arrangement would end unethical methods of influence on lawmaking. **The parliamentarians would be a silent audience, just listening, learning, and drawing conclusions from formal presentations.**

The Parliament and the other divisions of the legislative body could invite submissions from 'Unbiased Experts' (See Figure 1). When the Parliamentarians become well-informed, they would be able to vote intelligently on the priorities of issues, according to importance to the community. Since they are randomly selected citizens, their aggregate choices would be for the common values of the community to a high degree of mathematical probability. Therefore, **votes would protect the primary needs and interest of all citizens.**

The recommendations would be sent from Parliament's 'House of Implementations', to the 'Senate', and then to the 'Presidency'. In cases of no overwhelming approval, **the Presidency would order a national referendum.** And if the public would not vote for or against an issue by at least two-thirds majority, then the issue would be taken off the agenda. After a period of about two years, a similar recommendation could be put through the legislative assemblies again.

The House would study the recommended legislative priorities of Parliament and would consider the best methods of implementing proposals. Unlike presentations in Parliament, sessions of the House would be conducted **without the presence of political parties and other special interest groups.** Arguments over the legislation's impact on society would be evaluated on the basis of documentation sent by the Parliament as well as expert advice. **The House would invite submissions from at least three unbiased, highly esteemed professional experts or firms of experts,** which are not connected with special interest groups in any form.

The experts would be requested to study the issues and to submit recommendations, plans and written comments for or against the proposals. The members of the House should be allowed to ask the experts to explain the merits of their proposals. However, **there should be no discussion or debate** among members of the House, or among members and experts. Questions are used to gain in-depth knowledge and the answers are used to provide the required information. From these expert reports, the House would formalize the ways and means to implement the recommended issues.

The Senate would review all previous recommendations, submissions and formulate laws. **Senators would further request professional advice** and appoint independent legal experts to recommend modifications to the previously approved policies by the Parliament and the House. This arrangement is necessary because the citizen members of the Senate are not qualified to write the formal text of laws.

For increasing the depth of the learning process, the experts would question one another and openly deliberate the reasons leading to their conclusions. Listening to such objective considerations of the **experts would provide in-depth information through the formal text** of laws to Senators. As in the previous divisions, the Senators would not be allowed to participate in the exchanges of

experts. They would **just listen, learn, and make decisions in the interest of all citizens**, based on the in-depth information they now possess.

After these presentations, the Senators would vote by secret ballots. If the Senators don't approve a recommendation passed by the Parliament and the House by at least a two-thirds majority, then such issues should be presented to the public for a referendum.

The Presidency

The Presidency is proposed to have **three members elected by the public**. It would be headed by the '**President**' and two '**Vice-presidents**', each one of them having equal voting power. The President should be the chief guardian of the '**Constitution**', the laws, and the supreme commander of '**Law enforcement and Defense Forces**', and the '**Executive Branch**' of the government shown in **Figure 1**. The **President would have no personal power** beyond the authority given to him by the Constitution.

All Presidential decisions should be approved by the Vice-presidents. In cases when not voting unanimously, the citizens would decide by vote. The Presidency of self-governance should be the protector of the people and the supporter of the hopes and aspirations of the people to improve their lives. **The President, with full consent of the Vice-Presidents, should sign laws.** The Presidency should also have the right to veto and to send law proposals back to the Senate for review.

The Presidency would appoint the heads of the Executive Branch of the government and the members of the Supreme Court. The Senate would have to approve their appointments. Again, in cases when there is no unanimous approval, **the citizens would vote for or against the nominees.** As the supreme head of the state and the government, the President would be the formal, state-ly, representative of national and international events. The President would have to reflect the conscience of the nation, and speak, educate and advance the cause of humane, non-political, cooperative culture.

It is advantageous for a country to be formally represented by its President. Contemporary democracies have formal heads of their states. Self-governance of the people would also need a highly respected moral office, one that the people can trust as being the highest guardian of Constitutional rights. It is also needed for the implementation of laws and for management of the daily affairs of society.

Elections and Referendums

In cases when the Senate did not reach two-thirds majority vote on matters passed by the Parliament and the House, it should inform the public of the reasons in a brief summary. The Constitution will likely have restrictions for individuals and the media to spread lies. It would end the present era of 'spin'; innuendoes, hints, insinuations, or any unsubstantiated publicity. Freedom to lie and distort would apply in general and about societal issues and referendums in particular.

In this manner, **the whole nation would become well-informed before voting.** If and when a referendum fails to receive at least a two-thirds majority, the issue would have to be taken off the ongoing legislative agenda, but could be submitted (perhaps in modified form) again to the Parliament.

The nominations and elections for members of the Presidency can be undertaken by several methods. In this case, **the citizens would nominate Presidential candidates** through the local Forums, the Parliament, the House, and the Senate. The Senate would call for national election not more than eight weeks before the date of elections. This period would allow sufficient time for the purpose, in

sharp contrast with the present seemingly never-ending manipulations, hoopla, and electioneering battles.

In order to secure neutrality in selecting and electing outstanding, well-respected, trustworthy, and wise persons to the Presidency, **no self or political nomination, promotion, financial support, and election propaganda would be permitted.**

A minimum of five and not more than nine candidates should emerge, with a minimum of two-thirds of the votes at each level. Alternatively, nominees for Presidency could be selected only by the Senate. The first method is recommended, thus assuring full participation of the people in nominating the most capable and honourable individuals of the country for Presidency. Naturally, the '**Public Access Communication System**' could be used for balloting. At the end of this process, the Senate would formally document the selected nominees' background, family situation, accomplishments, honours, and other pertinent data, and would officially inform the nation about the candidates and call for an election.

No promotion of the nominees, propaganda, or other interference would be permissible before and during presidential elections and referendums. Once the candidates are nominated by the public and passed through the legislative assemblies, factual data would only be publishable by the media, without any sponsors, to assure unbiased public information. Influencing the outcome of any selection or election processes, including presidential elections, should be against the law. Historical demands for the '**freedom of the press**' should be highly respected by self-governance of the people. But vicious and unethical competition by the paid employees of contemporary media-barons should not be permitted. The media and others should have no freedom to distort the truth on behalf of political or other special interests or for any other reason.

The presidential nominees would be requested to attend a formal informational publicity event organized by the Senate. Delegates of the media could ask questions that each nominee should answer. In this manner, the public would become acquainted with the achievements and personal views of the nominees and their background. A nationwide publication of questions and answers would be made during and after this event. This system of presidential election would provide sufficient factual information about the candidates, replacing today's years-long, never-ending electioneering, distortions, lies, and accusations. **The election should be held by secret ballot.**

The Administrative Branch

An important principle for democratic equality is that **the Constitution, laws, regulations, and policies be the same throughout the nation.** This would eliminate regional differences and injustices. Presently, provinces, local states, and regional sub-units can and do create local laws and policies, resulting in different living standards. Justice is also served differently in various local jurisdictions.

These national sub-groups are engaged in continuous manipulations and fights for privileges and perks from the national budget. Sound system design mandates the elimination of unjust inequalities, privileges enjoyed by special interest groups, and local ambitions for power and various advantages. This mandates the application of just principles, uniform laws, rules and regulations as well as a judicial system and enforcement throughout a country. Cooperative coexistence could only be established if regional injustices are eliminated.

The historical roots of injustice are due to negative '**tertiary drives**' and the paradoxes of the '**grouping imperative**' that lead to regional political and economic divisions in countries. For instance, Canada has ten provinces and three territorial jurisdictions, thousands of legislators, and hundreds of thousands of

civil service and civic employees. They are housed in ten legislative buildings and thousands of offices. All thirteen jurisdictions have different policies and laws, enormous differences in living standards, different educational requirements, language laws, delivery of health and educational services. A similar situation exists in the U.S.A. to a greater extent, in fifty-two states of the Union. Other democracies suffer from the same regional injustices. These are negative consequences of the sub-groupings within political systems. For the sake of cooperative coexistence, self-governance will eliminate these disparities and will create uniform justice and laws.

The new **'Executive Branch'** (Figure 1) would implement the Constitution and establish uniform administration and identical laws and policies throughout the nation. National policies would be carried out through the **Local Administration** in every town and city. **Equal services and identical systems of justice, liberty and equality would be maintained throughout the entire nation.**

Through these measures, the size, and therefore, the cost of administration would be reduced significantly. The power of local elite and inequalities would be eliminated. The public would not have to carry the tax burden of enormous duplicate and conflicting administrations. Through new just administration, **self-governance would be able to create cooperative conditions, in place of adversarial, unjust and costly political jurisdictions.**

Conflict Resolution

Conflicts of interest cannot be eliminated among competing business enterprises and among special interest groups. Under the new system, they would not be able to have political representatives in the seats of power to promote corporate and private interests. The new governance would let business enterprises compete on their own, with opportunities for lobbying and getting governmental support. Business competition would be truly free, strictly a private matter. Concerns of other organized groups, such as race, gender, religion and other related matters, would be settled through new non-confrontational means. As described earlier, and shown in Figure 1, political parties and other special interest groups could influence governance peacefully, relying on the power of reason through the *Forums*, the *Parliament*, as well as through the *'Public Access communication system'*.

In a peaceful society, the Law would not allow any person or organization to adversely effect the *'basic needs'* and *'primary interests'* of the people. The resolution of inherent conflicts that exist between various special interest groups would be settled peacefully by rational methods. Laws would not permit or tolerate the violation of the rights and freedoms of individuals and would not allow unethical and negative practices in any field of endeavour. Laws would not allow the promotion of prejudice, hate, and intolerance, against the primary needs and interests of any person or groups. Organized mass rallies to promote special interests would become echoes of the past. First of all, there would not likely be reason for street protests and demands. But if one was to be held, it could take place, for instance, in rented arenas and fields without blocking streets or other private or public facilities.

The new system, as described, provides ample opportunities for anyone or any group to be heard and to influence self-governance in a peaceful and educational manner. Besides the ample opportunities described, they could also influence public opinion and governance through the media except, under the new law, only in an ethical manner. No false or misleading advertisements would be allowed. No subtle or open expression of hatred, propaganda or violence would be permitted against races, religions, sexual orientation and similar issues. These are combative political methods in which the politically

stronger powers prevail.

Mass demonstrations and violence are on the rise in the most advanced democracies. Surely, there have to be better methods to settle conflicting interests than uncivilized, confrontational and violent methods. The entire political culture is based on unrestrained and fierce competition by indiscriminate means for economic and political advantages. These are harmful liberal interpretations of freedom, personal liberties, rights, and justice, in which power prevails. Such systems may defeat themselves in the long run unless moderation wins, and new moral and rational law is introduced.

In democracies, efforts of direct democracy movements could lead to orderly and gradual transformations toward peaceful and cooperative self-governance of the people. Organized political and other representations would not be unlawful for the simple reason that the grouping imperative to promote and protect self-interest cannot be eliminated. It is a strong force that pulls like interests together. Therefore, they could not be wished away and legislated out of existence. But political parties and other self-interested groups could be separated from policy-making. They would have to compete fairly without benefiting from promoting their self-interest as policy-makers through their representatives. Their conflicts would have to be resolved through civilized methods for the peaceful settlements of opposing interests.

As in Olympic sports, the same rules of the game would apply equally for every citizen or group. Impartial laws and institutions would insure fairness. Consequently, the best persons and teams would emerge as winners and the losers would not be ruined. Civilized economic competition should also be characterized by excellence, not supported by corrupt political methods, or by the power of capital or the power of the street, and certainly, not by violence.

Direct democracy of the people would establish just methods for all to peacefully resolve conflicts between groups, such as:

- Matters relating to public services would be handled by the *Local Administrations*. Complaints would be investigated by *Citizen's Forums*.
- Requests to settle local disputes and to resolve conflicts, to gain special rights and privileges, or to impose restrictions on others would have to be made through Forums or the courts and not by political means or force.
- Concerns with broader interests than local issues would have to be submitted to *Parliament*.
- All submissions, either to the Forums or the Parliament, would be in writing with a brief summary of requests and the reasons for them. The requests should explain how their implementations would affect the rights and freedoms of others.
- Upon receiving the request, the Forums and the Parliament would make all submissions publicly known and would invite and accept written briefs for opposing views.
- Members of the Forums would first discuss the merits of submissions in private. Then they would invite all parties to answer questions in order to further explore the merits of and objections against the requests.
- In a separate session, without the active participation of outside parties, Forums could invite unbiased experts for professional advice before making decisions.
- Members of the Forums would vote by secret ballot to accept or reject requests and proposals with a two-thirds majority. In such cases, the decision of the Forum would be final and legally binding.
- When the votes are split with less than a two-thirds ratio, the matter on hand would be transferred to the Parliament to vote on. In such cases, the

results would also be passed through the House, Senate, and Presidency for final decision.

- All costs of these activities should be borne by the requesting and opposing special interest groups. Requests from individuals would be handled free of charge.
- The courts would have no jurisdiction over matters that had been settled by a Forum. However, **the Supreme Court could be requested to express an opinion**, but should have no power to overrule the Forums decisions.
- **The supreme court would forward its reasoned opinion to Parliament.** If Parliament so decides, the issue would be passed through all legislative levels for review and decision-making.
- No individual or the public would be impeded, in any form or manner, in exercising their constitutional rights and freedoms, as long as they do not restrict the rights and freedoms of others.

Just laws and these measures would greatly reduce societal conflicts. There is a seemingly incorrigible small aggressive minority in every society. Those who would still violate the new, just laws would have to face harsh punishment. One of the tasks of the civil Forums is to prevent the impositions of such punitive measures, and to settle conflicts in a fair and civilized manner. The primary duty of the entire self-governing system is to protect the cardinal interests of the whole population, thus cooperative, peaceful conditions are created.

The Judiciary

The structure of the legal system would remain in force regarding civil and criminal laws, but it would exist without political affiliation or interference, and would greatly improve efficiency, uniformity, and speed. Application of the tools of modern computer science and communications technologies would be extensively applied in aiding uniformity in the delivery of justice throughout the land. Laws would be nationally uniform and vastly improved. Today, equality under the law is only a written right.

The new laws would have to protect the rights of people regardless of their financial resources both in civil and criminal cases. The principle of providing equality under the law is an important issue for direct democracy. The aim is to eliminate presently existing judicial injustices. In today's courts, the prosecuting team of the state supports its cases with all its might and power. The team includes the police, investigators, criminologists, forensic scientists, medical experts, and a number of skilled prosecutors and attorneys.

Poor accused citizens do not have equal resources to defend themselves, and therefore do not have an equal chance for justice. In such cases, the innocent could be found guilty by the court. A state-appointed — and typically poorly paid — lawyer is provided to defend those who cannot afford counsel, but has no equal chance against the mighty power of the state. In a reversed situation, a wealthy accused can hire more skillful representatives than the State. In that case, the guilty could be found innocent by the court and escape penalty. These preconditions resulting in injustices would have to be eliminated.

Law Enforcement and Defense

The most magnificent duty of the armed forces is to protect people from internal and external enemies and from violators of the constitution and laws. No significant societal improvements can be achieved without true defenders of the people. The most respected, noble and the most honourable duty of the members of the armed forces is to defend the vital needs and primary interests of the people.

It is important for the pioneers of true democracy to identify and to have good working relationship with genuine democratic leaders and members of police and defense forces. True justice, law and order cannot be maintained unless society is protected by police from violators of the law and criminal members of society. It is expected that the violators of the Law will be gradually reduced in number in direct democracies. Moral forces of defense under a single command would protect the people from internal and external enemies.

Facilitators

No historical changes had ever been achieved without individuals determined to restructure society. Monarchs, kings, dictators, or political organizations led by strong-willed individuals have initiated historical changes for better or worse. The *'founding fathers'* of the United States of America were such pioneering leaders of progressive change.

Transformation toward a moral democracy and for a sustainable civilization also needs new types of unselfish and dedicated leaders. **Ideally, these Facilitators should be generous-minded individuals**, working toward direct democracy. They should believe in the possibility of achieving universal peace, cooperative social coexistence, with equally just, humane and satisfactory living conditions. **These new leaders must not be aspiring to self-enrichment, power and ruling positions but must be devoted to enable the people themselves to govern their own society.**

Skeptics maintain that no such generous and unselfish people can be found. The critic, indeed, is correct, for such perfection is almost nonexistent among human beings. We are not infallible. People are temptable, faltering, imperfect and corruptible individuals. Nevertheless, human history demonstrates that we can create near-perfect, certainly, acceptable systems. We designed and have been operating successfully, sewer, water, transportation, electrical generation and distribution systems, just to mention a few.

These systems have greatly improved human health, reduced the drudgery of hard work, eased the supply and delivery of goods and services, and, in general, they have improved human conditions on earth to the satisfaction of most people.

The foregoing social systems design, if implemented properly, could achieve similar goals. This requires talented leaders, dedicated facilitators, who can organize people to make the desired transformations. These dedicated facilitators would have to make a living and would have to be protected from their own weaknesses, failures and outside temptations. Therefore, the design must protect community interests from betrayal.

The new organization, in pioneering self-governance of the people, must be protected against corruption. Therefore, its members, **the facilitators, would have to be under a binding legal contract, in which they would commit themselves to faithfully carry out their assignments** and, in failing to do so, suffer the consequences. Furthermore:

- **Facilitators would have no power.** They would arrange essential tasks necessary for the implementation of self-governance by the people.
- **Initially, the Facilitators would have to be members of a formal organization that aims to implement a specific system design for direct democracy.** They would elect leaders for the movement. After thorough deliberations they would vote for a system design. All decisions would be made by secret ballot, ideally electronically, and would have to gain at least a two-thirds majority. If not, deliberations should continue. After reaching a democratic decision, **each member would sign a binding contract to faithfully implement their**

assignments.

- The **Facilitators would have to prepare a proposed constitution in advance** and, after victory, submit it to the people's parliament for approval.
- The second phase begins when the organization becomes elected.
- Being in the seats of policy-making, the **Facilitators would gradually implement their commitment and make transformations toward direct democracy.** They would arrange random selection of citizens into the Forums, Legislative Assemblies, local administrations, and implement the many details of the plan that are inevitable for orderly changes. They would chair meetings, assuring quiet, informative hearings and learning sessions.
- The **Facilitators would make all necessary preparations for formal hearings by the Legislative divisions,** and assist them to set up the Executive, Administration, and other sub-units of society.
- When their term expires during the first four years of direct democracy, the Facilitators would head the Executive Branch, Local Administrations, and Forums. They would also prepare the agendas and preside over meetings of the legislative assemblies.

Selections of Lawmakers

Political elections are not truly democratic. They are biased political events promoting representatives of special interests into the seats of power. Professor Theodor Becker, a progressive political scientist, has characterized elections as political 'entertainment'¹³. People are misled by propaganda and are unable to make intelligent and informed choices. Citizens are misinformed and made to believe that the elected political representatives, a small minority, protect public interest. Direct democracy would replace political voting with unbiased non-promotional selections of citizen legislators. The best method is random selection because it would insure that the common interest of the people is protected by the delegates. Why? Simply because the vital interests of the people are common. A small number of individuals, having special interest in the randomly selected group, could not count significantly in the vote of the overwhelming majority.

Statistical or consensus-based methods should replace the influence of money, political power, propaganda and lies. Utilization of modern communications media could assure direct participation of people in selecting fellow citizens into legislative assemblies, holding unbiased national referendums and voting. In addition:

- Legislators should come directly from the adult population without discrimination, except for individuals with unsound minds or criminal records.
- Random selection of delegates would be conducted in a statistically meaningful manner by the Facilitators, either in one step or in a number of steps. First, a large group of citizens would be drawn, then gradually reduced in stages to a manageable number of legislators. They would have the same needs and primary interests of the population to a high degree of statistical probability. The last group of citizens would become legislators and sent to the parliament.
- Another possible method would begin in small communities and districts in cities, where people interact directly and know one another. Depending on the size of its population, they would send one or two best-suited persons to community halls for further selections. This method is not recommended because special interest groups and personal ambitions are likely to influence this type of selection.
- Under unbiased guidance and supervision of presiding Facilitators or Judges, impartiality would be assured.

- **Randomly selected citizens would be sequestered** for about two weeks, in a facility protected from outside influences. Through daily interactions and meetings, they would become acquainted with one another. The nominees would have daily orderly discussions under the chairmanship of Facilitators. Topics would focus on national and international events, social issues and controversial subjects. The facilitator would assure equal time for everyone to participate in exchanging views.

After two four-hour daily discussions, the participants would read newspapers, books, watch television or entertain themselves at will within the confined quarters. **The participants would get to know one another through daily discussions and communal living conditions.** At the end of two weeks, the Facilitator would conduct an election. No nominations or discussion would be permitted. Votes would be taken by secret ballots, ranked in order of selections, thereby a **smaller, predetermined, number of citizens would become Parliamentarians.**

Transformations Into Direct Democracy

It is not easy to change political democracies into direct democracies of the people. Good system design principles and methods are essential pre-conditions, but their implementation requires a dedicated group of people. These Facilitators (introduced earlier) must be true democrats with high integrity. They will be bound by legal contract not to gain power or special advantages. In this era of dual potentials, the pioneers of the movement should be moved by the urgent necessity to avoid the 'negative potential of our civilization' that may lead to catastrophic consequences. They should be moved by the magnificent task of developing the 'positive potential' by changing the political system into a more moral and more rational democracy.

To be successful, the right answers must be found for the following questions:

- What means are available for peaceful transformations?
- What methods could be utilized to succeed?
- What type of leaders and groups should spearhead these changes?
- How can the chances of betraying public trust by those who are selected for office be reduced?
- How can direct democracy be protected from its enemies?

Peaceful transformations may not be easy, but they are achievable in democracies. In recent history, even the mighty Soviet empire and its satellite autocracies were replaced, relatively peacefully, by multi-party political systems. Wherever it is possible to compete with traditional political parties, **the formation of an ethical party could be the trailblazer of self-governance of the people.**

Let's call this temporary party '**Social-Morality Party**' (the Party). After gaining a majority, the Party could implement radical democratic improvements by peaceful methods. The Party should spearhead real democratic transformations and not use its mandate to retain permanently its legislative positions and power.

In answering the questions in order, the seeds of changes have already germinated in many countries. Theories and models of improvements for establishing 'Direct Democracy' (DD) of the citizens already exist. Pioneering individuals and organizations held '**The First International Congress on Direct Democracy**' in August 1998, in the Czech Republic. The next '**Continuing Congress**' is to be held in Greece, in the year 2000¹⁴. Several individuals and independent groups continue refining the theory and practice of DD and implement it wherever it is possible.

Many DD organizations exist worldwide, with excellent leaders, dedicated to

make peaceful progress toward improvements. Some of these are working for radical improvements, such as those outlined in this booklet. Others are satisfied with more modest reforms, such as citizen's '*initiatives*' and collect signatures for '*referendums*'. Excellent accounts of these movements have been published by Dr. Jiri Polak, editor of the quarterly newsletter¹⁵, WORLDWIDE DIRECT DEMOCRACY. The Becker & Stalon¹⁶ book gives a great summary account of the worldwide movements.

In addition to publications, many DD organizations use the Internet and other electronic means of communication to make their lofty goals known. An important one is Philadelphia II, initiated by former Alaskan U.S. senator, Mike Gravel¹⁷. These efforts will have to be more extensive to become successful. Thus, broadening these movements and getting support from existing organizations to achieve common goals depends on local and regional efforts, resourcefulness and determination to succeed.

Another important requirement is the dissemination of the advanced ideas of democracy. Various means are available to educate people in the advantages of self-governance. People will see that the adversarial nature of the current economic-political system is not merely illogical and unjust, but it also threatens long-term sustenance of human civilization. Surveys already indicate that *all citizens would vote for a system that assures food, housing, decent livelihood, good health-care and education as well as peace, law and order in any country.* These are "*the 'Fundamental' and 'Basic' needs and interests of the people*". This shows that the confrontational political democracies can be transformed into cooperative direct democracies. Thus, **education — on a broad front — is an urgent necessity.**

Some ideas are already being disseminated through the media and are becoming known. For instance, participants of '*The First International Congress on Direct Democracy*'¹⁸ voted for the following resolution as a preamble to the statement of principles: "We (to be named) believe that all citizens have the right to directly perform all lawmaking and governmental functions in which they live. Therefore, we seek to develop and promote participatory processes which will allow people to exercise their right to manage their own government." The organization was not yet formalized and named, but meetings will be '*continuing*' with '*The Second Congress*' in Greece. Plans are being made to form a Worldwide Direct Democracy Movement (WDDM) to work out the best methods for real transformations.

Politicians are not likely to give up their seats and positions voluntarily. In spite of this, '*middle of the road DD movements*' will make small peaceful changes in democratic countries. Regardless of small improvements, the threat of war and the use of devastating means of destruction remain as long as the era of politics continues. Truly vanguard movements want to prevent this devastating outcome by advancing full participation of citizens in forming their own governance.

Direct Democracy in a Small Community

Some readers of my books have viewed my ideas as a well-intentioned 'utopia', impossible to implement. This prompted me to incorporate a part of Dave Brown's¹⁹ account, '*Politics in Sun City Center*' (SCC), which describes how personal ambitions and desires of power dominate the life in a small community. One would think, **why on earth would SCC have problems with its own governance?** The answer is simple: **because SCC has political type representative governance.** This can be easily replaced by direct democracy — the true self-governance of the residents. The same can be accomplished in any other community or city.

Dave Brown explains: (I have added my emphasis by underlining some parts)

"On the County and State level, Florida is almost as crooked as Maryland. Corruption is pervasive throughout the system — from the precinct level (yes, even in SCC) right up to the governor. Even the Republicans are crooked!

"For Sun City Center, the governance problems stem more from incompetence and egos, than from corruption. Each SCC resident is a member of the Community Association (CA), which owns all of the common facilities. The CA is administered by a nine-member Board of Directors, which is elected by the residents. As candidates, they promise to do the will of the people. Once elected, they feel that they have been anointed by the Father, Son and Holy Ghost to pursue their own agendas and the residents be damned!"

Dave continues with specific examples to illustrate his assertions. For instance, "A grass-roots effort was organized to hold a referendum ... The CA Board refused to allow our facilities to be used for such a vote." But they were held anyway, and "The ballots were printed in the newspaper ... The results were that 80-90 per cent were" against the boards. Even so "the CA Board still went ahead ..." ignoring the overwhelming majority decision of the people. "So much for the will of the people."

These events provide an example of my 'group theory'; the role of politically elected leaders, 'tertiary drives', wanting power and status, and its negative consequences. It also demonstrates the need to eliminate egotistic self-promotion and special-interests from leaderships through random selection of members of a community (or a country) into their own governance.

If the governance of this community were direct democracy, there would be more harmonious coexistence, and far more efficient management of communal affairs. The following is a brief illustration how SCC or other communities, towns and cities could be governed more democratically by self-governance of their residents:

- No one person or organization should be allowed to use political methods to help individuals attain seats of power. They should not be allowed to spend money, advertise and campaign for office. This rule would assure that neither personal ambitions nor economic interest could get representatives into governing positions.
- Members governing the community, the '*Board*' or city council (the CA in Dave's account) would be drawn by lot from eligible adults — those without criminal records — in sufficient numbers, according to mathematical probability, to reflect the concerns of the community.
- According to a new '*Charter*' (by-laws of the community), a paid independent expert — a '*Community Manager*' supervised by the Board — would perform all administrative duties according to 'job specifications'.
- The Board would hold regular meetings. Any member of the community should be able to submit formal proposals, requests, and criticism to the Community Manager. And, if not satisfied with his/her decision, then these remarks could be submitted to the Board.
- The Board would have hearings about the submissions of residents, and the community manager's regular reports would be part of the Board's agenda.
- The Board would also invite unbiased professional consultants, in cases when there is need for professional expertise, to make well-informed decisions. Additional experts could be volunteer advisors with different views to illuminate issues pro and con.
- To eliminate personal clashes, Board meetings would have no debates. They would be quiet learning assemblies about issues through formal presentations illuminating the subject from several points of view. The new gov-

ernance would become well-informed. It would cease to be a battleground of personal egos, ambitions and self-interests (tertiary drives).

- Meetings would be chaired by the '*President of the Board*' elected by all eligible residents. The President would assure orderly conduct and at the end of hearings would call for votes, but he/she would have no voting rights.
- All voting would be by secret ballot at Board meetings and in referendums.
- A two-thirds or more vote would be considered sufficient to approve or dismiss any issue. If an issue has less than a two-thirds vote, then it would be put to a referendum and decided by the whole community.
- When a referendum is not settled by at least two-thirds majority of the voters, for or against, the issue should be off the agenda.

The City of Winnipeg, Canada

The city suffers from urban sprawl, decaying downtown and core area, like many other North American cities. Boarded-up homes and businesses, graffiti and street crime are some of the visible consequences.

Building roads and costly infrastructure in subdivided virgin land, to be rezoned for suburban homes, shopping centers and schools is a costly undertaking. The political influence at City Hall of powerful land developers, large building firms, and real estate agencies is not only ruining the old part of the city and causing bankruptcies, but has also raised city taxes to one of the highest in the country.

It is quite possible to gain the support of the citizens, including the majority of the business community, to stop and reverse this decay. Our group, *Participatory Direct Democracy Association* (PDDA)²⁰ is pioneering similar changes in Winnipeg as outlined for Sun City Center. Our not-for-profit apolitical association is contemplating measures that could make transformation toward direct democracy throughout Canada.

REFERENCES

1. U.S.A., Declaration of Independence; A Declaration of Rights
2. Funk and Wagnalls, V. 9, p153, 1975
3. The Food-Sharing Behavior of Protohuman Hominids, by Glynn Isaac, Scientific American, Human Ancestors, Freeman Pub. 1979
4. Leaders and Leadership refers to special personal abilities that influences one's society for better or worse. A leader is defined as 'person whose activity has a significant effect on a group or groups or a nation or civilization.' The definition of leadership is essentially the same.
5. Marching to Valhalla. Willard Books, a Division of Random House. 1996
6. Referring to the representation of economic interest groups in governances at any and all levels.
7. Tobacco manufacturers' false testimony and the American Rifle Association's advertising campaign are such recent examples.
8. Dr. Polak's book is available for the participants of this course (free of charge). His address: Assarhusavagen 64, S-24736, S. Sandby, Sweden
9. Via the Internet <http://community.webtv.net/Triaka/doc>
10. The Future of Teledemocracy. London: Adamantine Studies of the 21st Century. Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing. Spring 2000
11. See details and live-links at my Web site: <http://www.pangea.ca/~sage2509/direct-democracy/>
12. Federalist Paper number 10
13. Dr. Theodor Becker, editor-in-chief, Teledemocracy action News + Network, URL: <http://www.auburn.edu/tann>
14. Scheduled June 21-25, 2000. Get information from Professor Theodor Becker, Auburn University, Department of Political Science, 7080 Haley Center, Alabama, 36849-5208. Phone: (334)-844-5370, Fax: (334)-844-5348, e-mail: becketl@groupwise1.duc.auburn.edu or George Kokkas, Local Organizer, Lawyer, Media Solicitor. e-mail: geoco@eexi.gr Reservations Phone Happy Times Travel Agency: 000301-3249039, Fax: 0003011-32228038
15. Volume 1, (No.0) Assarhusavagen 64, S-24736, S. Sandby, Sweden. e-mail: jiri.polak@swipnet.se
16. Ibid 10, page 41
17. phila2mike@hotmail.com
18. Held in the Czech Republic, between 25th-27th of August, 1998
19. The article is available on the Internet at: <http://www.icubed.net/dbrown/sscpolit.htm>
20. Web site: <http://www.pangea.ca/~sage2509/direct-democracy/index>

**The Back Cover of the Original Book:
A Theory of Direct Democracy**

This fundamental presentation on DIRECT DEMOCRACY (DD) should be compulsory reading in faculties of political science, sociology, and social philosophy. It is essential for pioneering members of DD movements, environmentalists, rights organizations and progressive-thinking individuals who want to secure the future of civilization.

A unique potential exists today. Civilization could destroy itself or it could create a universal material and cultural well-being for all people. A profound analysis from the 'fundamental imposition' on life by nature, and the 'basic imposition' of society, this book demonstrates the need for a new, uplifting, social morality for the peoples of the world to live cooperatively and in peace.

No other book exposes so clearly the 'group structure' of society, the 'paradoxes of the political era', the coming threat of global competition, the myths of free market and free elections and the inherently adversarial nature of the 'era of politics'. Profound analysis, as well as practical methods and models, demonstrate the need for radical and truly democratic changes to save the 'total environment'. Direct democracy can accomplish this. It requires self-governance by the people. Is it utopia? No, it is not. This book presents an alternative to an otherwise bleak future.

Dr. Magdolna Kovacs, President of Denes Gabor College.