

## **Constitution Proposal ~ 239 laws**

*(With reasoning for each law, the long version.)*

*Print version: 24 september 2014*

*“That democracy and extreme economic inequality form, when combined, an unstable compound, is no novel doctrine. It was a commonplace of political science four centuries before our era. Nevertheless, though a venerable truism, it remains an important one, which is periodically forgotten and periodically therefore requires to be rediscovered...”*

*R. H. Tawney, Equality (1938 edition)*

As quoted in: **Paul Foot, The Vote, p.340**

**Penguin Books Ltd, 2005, 0-670-91536-X**

---

Constitution, Draft / minimalist framework, 9 Tevet 5767 / 30 dec 2006

The below is meant to be used as a minimalist Draft version, but enough to present a coherent model. This model has as its main element trade, because trade is a direct protection against exploitation. A trade economy demands equal spread of power, without equal trading power for all people, the trading system becomes a problem instead of being a solution. Equal power is achieved on three levels of size: individual, group and all or country. For the country or all it means absolute democracy, the government can and should only do what the majority wants, good or bad. (When something turns out bad it is supposed to be a learning experience for future choices, meaning a growing opportunity for most people.) For groups it means that most businesses larger than some small size will be forced to become democracies after the first-starter goes away. This first starter will be fairly compensated in value and/or future profits, but while the first starter rules he can be a dictator if he/she wants to. However this is also has its limits when the company becomes larger. For the individual, power means the right to use and rent out raw resources. This right is important in order to deny power concentrations of ownership somewhere else. This right does not constitute anarchy, and the democratic central government can decide what can and what can not be done with whatever resources, in order to prevent chaos and disintegration. Some parts of productivity do not respond at all or poorly to market pressures because of inherently lacking or impossible competition. Such parts become nationalized productivity groups.

One interesting part about this constitution is the use of capital, larger sums of money. Money is made the slave of the absolute democratic government. Government has a right to protect the people against power imbalances by means of nullifying all money and transplanting minor sums and debts of common people to a new currency. This sudden destruction of hoarded money is a safety valve which will probably need to be employed when this constitution is first implemented in order to correct the extreme power imbalances in the current economy. This constitution sets a maximum on ownership, but does not set a minimum. It supports a minimum wage to which the wage of politicians is tied.

First the draft needs to be ratified (by you) as going into a generally desired direction. Parts which resist such ratification can be changed, altering the direction in major ways. When doing this, it might be useful to realize that the Chapters 5 to 9 strengthen each other: weakening one likely weakens all. The Chapters 1, 2 and 4 are stand-alone, can be changed without causing ripples. Chapter 3 needs at least enough democratic subjugation of Government to ensure the power of finance is used in the interest of the People, and not in the interest of profit / corruption.

Second the draft can be expanded with more detail articles. For example there are many human rights which can be added to Chapter 2, chambers of Government in Chapter 3, etc. I don't think it is a good idea to base Government (for long) on worker councils running companies, because these councils have a different task (running a company). Giving them two tasks is asking for trouble and power abuses, the two different responsibilities can conflict. Workers could elect a Government official together, but we shouldn't first elect company worker council, *who then also* elect Government officials. If a full scale revolution (tough against tough) is needed to achieve (more) democratic government, Government based on worker-councils might be a temporary solution because of the people temporarily stationed there (depending). This should be changed later. Government can be based upon constituencies of voters (not worker councils) grouped per company or groups of companies, or geographically or country-wide (depending on chosen representative system): Government directly based on the voting public, no intermediate layer that has other concerns. The below constitution proposes free formed groups of voters, who send in one delegate.

Thirdly a coherent body of common law, which is not to conflict with the Constitution, is needed for the details that need regulation. These laws are not part of the Constitution. Most of these laws can probably be taken directly from already practiced law, removing them only where they conflict with the constitution. This would provide continuity of culture, which makes a change more feasible.

Regions with different legal traditions can alter the draft in these three steps, so as to agree with the will of the local People, without altering the deepest goal, which is to make the Elected Government the only Government. End the "dual power" situation that the elected Government is in with the privatized financial sector, which acts as a second Government, a result of the revolutionary situation all parliamentary democracies are in. The most crucial of the draft is therefore Chapter 8 (finance). Taking that out is taking out the heart, without public finance the system will choke in the long term. When only enacting public finance Chapter 8, one is setting a country free from the choke hold on progress resulting from private finance, to complete the system you would also need to distribute resources as in Chapter 9.

It is probably easiest to read the constitution one Chapter at a time starting from Chapter 9 and then upwards to 1. The last chapters contain the economic system, the first chapters just round it of to make it a coherent constitution for immediate use.

See 'Constitution Proposal' (same author) for ideas on which this Constitution is based.

## Table Of Contents:

Chapter [1](#): Structure of [Constitution](#)  
Chapter [2](#): Structure of [Individual protection](#)  
Chapter [3](#): Structure of [Government](#)  
Chapter [4](#): Structure of [Disaster Relief](#)  
Chapter [5](#): Structure of [Monopoly Sectors](#)  
Chapter [6](#): Structure of [Free Markets](#)  
Chapter [7](#): Structure of [Special Markets](#)  
Chapter [8](#): Structure of [Finance](#)  
Chapter [9](#): Structure of [Resources](#)

---

Chapter [1](#): Structure of Constitution  
Articles [1.1](#): Power of the Constitution

[1.1.a](#) Power  
    [1.1.a-1](#) Changes  
        [1.1.a-1.1](#) Changes, warning  
        [1.1.a-1.2](#) Changes, delay  
[1.1.b](#) Scope  
    [1.1.b-1](#) False law  
    [1.1.b-2](#) Unity of Law  
[1.1.c](#) Flag  
    [1.1.c-1](#) Flag of war  
        [1.1.c-1.1](#) Flag democracy  
Articles [1.2](#): Territory  
[1.2.a](#) Territory  
    [1.2.a-1](#) New Territory  
        [1.2.a-1.1](#) New Territory, lost  
        [1.2.a-1.2](#) New Territory, border  
        [1.2.a-1.3](#) New Territory, more  
    [1.2.a-2](#) Larger Territory  
    [1.2.a-3](#) Territorial Limits  
    [1.2.a-4](#) International Territory  
Articles [1.3](#): Nation of Law  
[1.3.a](#) Equality  
    [1.3.a-1](#) Lasting Freedom  
Articles [1.4](#): State of Chaos  
[1.4.a](#) King Rule  
    [1.4.a-1](#) King Rule, Banner  
    [1.4.a-2](#) King Rule, Stability

---

Chapter [2](#): Structure of Individual Protections  
Articles [2.1](#): Individual Protections

[2.1.a](#) No Harm  
    [2.1.a-1](#) Compensation  
    [2.1.a-2](#) Animals  
        [2.1.a-2.1](#) Wild Animals  
[2.1.b](#) Free speech  
    [2.1.b-1](#) No insult  
[2.1.c](#) Freedom of Assembly  
[2.1.d](#) Property Right  
[2.1.e](#) Privacy

Articles 2.2: Justice

2.2.a Fair trial

- 2.2.a-1 Presumed innocent
- 2.2.a-2 Equal pleading effort
- 2.2.a-3 Competent Defense
- 2.2.a-4 Observe Trial
- 2.2.a-5 Trial not Punishment

2.2.b Fair punishment

- 2.2.b-1 Fair punishment, reading

Articles 2.3: Additional rights for Children

2.3.a Right to be cared for

---

Chapter 3: Structure of Government

Articles 3.1: Structure of Government

3.1.a Government Intention

- 3.1.a-1 Declare opinion
- 3.1.a-2 Task Accountability

3.1.b Referendum

- 3.1.b-1 Initiative Referendum
- 3.1.b-2 Scope Referendum, particular
- 3.1.b-3 Scope Referendum, law
- 3.1.b-4 Transparency
- 3.1.b-5 Decision Repealed
- 3.1.b-6 Representatives Repealed
- 3.1.b-7 Authority

3.1.b-7.1 Vote Decay

- 3.1.b-7.1.1 Vote Decay, speed
- 3.1.b-7.1.2 Vote Decay, addition

3.1.c Electing Government

3.1.c-1 Electoral Committee

- 3.1.c-1.1 Electoral Committee, mandate
  - 3.1.c-1.1.1 Electoral Committee, mandate eject
- 3.1.c-1.2 Electoral Committee, vote
- 3.1.c-1.3 Electoral Committee, sovereign
- 3.1.c-1.4 Electoral Committee, free
- 3.1.c-1.5 Electoral Committee, salary
- 3.1.c-1.6 Electoral Committee, immunity
- 3.1.c-1.7 Police Loyalty
- 3.1.c-1.8 King Elect
  - 3.1.c-1.8.1 Duty of the King
  - 3.1.c-1.8.2 Sovereign Inspector
  - 3.1.c-1.8.3 Speaking to the King
  - 3.1.c-1.8.4 Protect the Throne
  - 3.1.c-1.8.5 Protect the King
  - 3.1.c-1.8.6 End of Reign
  - 3.1.c-1.8.7 Start of Reign
  - 3.1.c-1.8.8 King Income
  - 3.1.c-1.8.9 King Election, fraud

3.1.c-2 Decisions

3.1.c-3 Public Government

- 3.1.c-3.1 Public Government, finance

3.1.c-4 Structure

- 3.1.c-4.1 New Government
- 3.1.c-4.2 New Government, limit
- 3.1.c-4.3 New Government, delegates

3.1.c-5 Salary

- 3.1.c-5.1 Salary, bonus

3.1.d People Government

- 3.1.d-1 Government Body, minimum size
- 3.1.d-2 Closest Government Body

- [3.1.d-2.1 Council Agenda](#)
  - [3.1.d-2.2 Council Law Making](#)
  - [3.1.d-3 Further Government Body](#)
  - [3.1.d-4 Advice Council](#)
  - [3.1.d-5 Country Council](#)
    - [3.1.d-5.1 Country Council, Constitution](#)
    - [3.1.d-5.2 Country Council, Currency](#)
    - [3.1.d-5.3 Country Council, Core](#)
    - [3.1.d-5.4 Country Council, Local Law](#)
  - [3.1.d-6 Ministries](#)
    - [3.1.d-6.1 Ministries, Distributed](#)
  - [3.1.d-7 Immediate representation](#)
  - [3.1.d-8 Discipline Day](#)
  - [3.1.d-9 No Bribes](#)
  - [3.1.e Public Consultancy](#)
    - [3.1.e-1 Public Consultancy, Practicality](#)
    - [3.1.e-2 Public Consultancy, abstentions](#)
    - [3.1.e-3 Public Consultancy, Government Limit](#)
    - [3.1.e-4 Public Consultancy, Registration](#)
    - [3.1.e-5 Public Consultancy, Public Proxy](#)
    - [3.1.e-6 Public Consultancy, Demonstration](#)
- Articles [3.2](#): Law enforcement
- [3.2.a System of Justice](#)
    - [3.2.a-1 Courts of Justice](#)
      - [3.2.a-1.1 Courts of Justice, Judges](#)
    - [3.2.a-2 Judge Court](#)
      - [3.2.a-2.1 Judge Court, Judges](#)
    - [3.2.a-3 Law Court](#)
      - [3.2.a-3.1 Law Court, Judges](#)
      - [3.2.a-3.2 Law Court, Discipline](#)
      - [3.2.a-3.3 Law Court, strength](#)
      - [3.2.a-3.4 Law Court, removal](#)
      - [3.2.a-3.5 Supreme Law Court](#)
  - [3.2.b System of Police](#)
    - [3.2.b-1 Demonstration](#)
      - [3.2.b-1.1 Demonstration, Government limit](#)
      - [3.2.b-1.2 Demonstration, size limit](#)
      - [3.2.b-1.3 Demonstration, frequency limit](#)
    - [3.2.b-2 Company occupation](#)
      - [3.2.b-2.1 Company occupation, limit](#)
    - [3.2.b-3 Anti Pirate force](#)
      - [3.2.b-3.1 Weapons Authorization](#)
    - [3.2.b-4 Police and Privacy](#)
      - [3.2.b-4.1 Police Privacy, oversight](#)
      - [3.2.b-4.2 Police Privacy, Compensation](#)
- Articles [3.3](#): Equality of Government
- [3.3.a Inclusive](#)
- Articles [3.4](#): Space
- [3.4.a Local Space](#)
    - [3.4.a-1 Space protection](#)
  - [3.4.b National Space](#)
- Articles [3.5](#): Money oversight
- [3.5.a Money oversight](#)
- 

Chapter [4](#): Structure of Disaster Relief  
Articles [4.1](#): Purpose

- [4.1.a Purpose](#)
  - [4.1.a-1 Separation of Task](#)
- [4.1.b What war](#)
  - [4.1.b-1 local Battle](#)

- [4.1.b-2 No Police Tasks](#)
- [4.1.b-3 Inside the Land](#)
  - [4.1.b-3.1 Training](#)
- [4.1.b-4 Not for Profit](#)

[4.1.c Unity of Humanity](#)

Articles [4.2](#): Dispatch

- [4.2.a Army Dispatch](#)
- [4.2.b Army Loyalty](#)
- [4.2.c Individual Right to Reject Dispatch](#)
- [4.2.d Collective Right to Reject Dispatch](#)
  - [4.2.d-1 Collective Right to Reject Dispatch, majority](#)

Articles [4.3](#): Limitations

- [4.3.a No child soldiers](#)
- 

## Chapter [5](#): Structure of Monopoly Sectors

Articles [5.1](#): Monopoly Sector

- [5.1.a Definition Monopoly Sector](#)
  - [5.1.b Service rendered](#)
  - [5.1.c Service Group](#)
    - [5.1.c-1 Service Group, Appointed Dictator](#)
    - [5.1.c-2 Service Group, Representative Democracy](#)
      - [5.1.c-2.1 Service Group, Representative Democracy semi limited](#)
      - [5.1.c-2.2 Service Group, Representative Democracy limited](#)
    - [5.1.c-3 Service Group, Public Democracy](#)
    - [5.1.c-4 Service Group, Costumer Democracy](#)
    - [5.1.c-5 Service Group, Other](#)
      - [5.1.c-5.1 Service Group, not immune](#)
    - [5.1.c-6 Service Group, privatization](#)
- 

## Chapter [6](#): Structure of Free Markets

Articles [6.1](#): Free Markets

- [6.1.a Free Market](#)

Articles [6.2](#): Initiate Businesses

- [6.2.a Establish business](#)
  - [6.2.a-1 Establish business, dictatorship](#)
  - [6.2.a-2 Establish business, rule book](#)
    - [6.2.a-2.1 Rule book, limit](#)

Articles [6.3](#): Hand over Business

- [6.3.a Reaching Democracy](#)
  - [6.3.a-1 Reaching Democracy, employee protection](#)
  - [6.3.a-2 Reaching Democracy, employer protection](#)
  - [6.3.a-3 Reaching Democracy, employer debt protection](#)
  - [6.3.a-4 Majority Business](#)
    - [6.3.a-4.1 Continuity of Democracy](#)
  - [6.3.a-5 Unity of business](#)
    - [6.3.a-5.1 Number of Companies per person](#)

- [6.3.b No International Businesses](#)

Articles [6.4](#): Minimum Working Conditions

- [6.4.a Minimum conditions](#)
  - [6.4.a-1 Minimum wage](#)
  - [6.4.a-2 Worker safety](#)
  - [6.4.a-3 Environmental safety](#)
  - [6.4.a-4 Public safety](#)

Articles [6.5](#): Anti Monopoly

- [6.5.a Anti monopoly](#)

[6.5.a-1 Nationalization](#)

[6.5.a-2 Break up](#)

Articles [6.6](#): Open markets

[6.6.a Open markets](#)

[6.6.a-1 Open markets, money](#)

---

Chapter [7](#): Structure of Special Markets

Articles [7.1](#): Special Markets

[7.1.a Definition Special Markets](#)

[7.1.a-1 Special Markets, no limit](#)

[7.1.b Special Markets Service Group](#)

---

Chapter [8](#): Structure of Finance

Articles [8.1](#): Emergency Power

[8.1.a Emergency Powers](#)

[8.1.a-1 Emergency Powers, limit](#)

[8.1.b Rotate Currency](#)

[8.1.b-1 Rotate Currency, new money](#)

[8.1.b-1.1 Taxes in money](#)

[8.1.b-2 Rotate Currency, debt](#)

[8.1.b-2.1 Rotate Currency, debt limit](#)

[8.1.b-3 Rotate Currency, credit](#)

[8.1.b-4 Rotate Currency, foreign](#)

[8.1.b-5 Rotate Currency, foreign capital](#)

[8.1.c Continuity of Existence](#)

Articles [8.2](#): Democratic Finance

[8.2.a Democratic Finance](#)

[8.2.a-1 Creation of money](#)

[8.2.a-2 Equality of happiness](#)

[8.2.a-3 Taxes](#)

[8.2.a-4 Bank service](#)

[8.2.a-4.1 Consumption credit](#)

[8.2.a-4.2 Result pay](#)

[8.2.a-4.3 Corruption](#)

[8.2.a-5 Investment service group](#)

[8.2.a-5.1 Investment service group, short](#)

[8.2.a-5.2 Investment service group, loan maximum](#)

[8.2.a-5.3 Investment service group, credit](#)

[8.2.a-6 Investment permit](#)

[8.2.a-7 Investment Monopoly](#)

[8.2.a-7.1 No debt trade](#)

[8.2.a-8 Capital Monopoly](#)

[8.2.a-8.1 Capital Monopoly, limit](#)

[8.2.a-8.2 Capital Monopoly, exclusion](#)

[8.2.a-9 Insurance permit](#)

[8.2.a-10 Company Capital Limit](#)

[8.2.a-10.1 Company Capital Limit, other](#)

[8.2.a-11 No Business Gambling](#)

[8.2.a-11.1 No Gambling, self reported](#)

[8.2.a-12 No Speculation](#)

Articles [8.3](#): General Lending Limits

[8.3.a Loan Default, no collateral](#)

---



Chapter 9: Structure of Resources  
Articles 9.1: Structure of Resources

- 9.1.a Structure of Resources
    - 9.1.a-1 Resources, limits
    - 9.1.a-2 Resources, nature
    - 9.1.a-3 Resources, public
    - 9.1.a-4 Resources, usage
    - 9.1.a-5 Resources, resource bank
    - 9.1.a-6 Resources, rent
      - 9.1.a-6.1 Continuity usage
      - 9.1.a-6.2 Continuity terms
      - 9.1.a-6.3 Continuity produce
      - 9.1.a-6.4 Continuity government
    - 9.1.a-7 Resources, home
  - 9.1.b Price Maximum
- 

Articles with variable

- 1.1.a-1.2 Changes, delay
- 1.2.a Territory
  - 1.2.a-1 New Territory
    - 1.2.a-1.1 New Territory, lost
    - 1.2.a-1.3 New Territory, more
  - 1.2.a-3 Territorial Limits
  - 3.1.b-1 Initiative Referendum
- 3.1.c Electing Government
  - 3.1.c-1.8 King Elect
    - 3.1.c-1.8.1 Duty of the King
    - 3.1.c-1.8.6 End of Reign
    - 3.1.c-1.8.8 King Income
  - 3.1.c-4.2 New Government, limit
  - 3.1.c-5 Salary
    - 3.1.c-5.1 Salary, bonus
- 3.1.d People Government
  - 3.1.d-1 Government Body, minimum size
    - 3.1.d-2.1 Council Agenda
    - 3.1.d-2.2 Council Law Making
  - 3.1.d-3 Further Government Bodies
  - 3.1.d-7 Immediate representation
    - 3.1.d-5 Country Council
  - 3.1.d-8 Discipline Day
  - 3.1.d-9 No Bribes
    - 3.1.e-3 Public Consultancy, Government Limit
    - 3.1.e-6 Public Consultancy, Demonstration
  - 3.2.a-3.3 Law Court, strength
  - 3.2.b-1.2 Demonstration, size limit
  - 3.2.b-1.3 Demonstration, frequency limit
  - 3.2.b-2.1 Company occupation, limit
  - 3.2.b-4.1 Police Privacy, oversight
- 4.3.a No Child Soldiers
- 6.3.a Reaching Democracy
  - 6.3.a-1 Reaching Democracy, employee protection
    - 6.3.a-5.1 Number of Companies per person
- 8.2.a-7 Investment Monopoly
- 8.2.a-8 Capital Monopoly
  - 8.2.a-8.1 Capital Monopoly, limit
- 8.2.a-10 Company Capital Limit
  - 8.2.a-11.1 No Gambling, self reported
- 8.2.a-12 No Speculation

- 8.3.a Loan Default, no collateral
    - 9.1.a-6.1 Continuity usage
    - 9.1.a-6.2 Continuity terms
    - 9.1.a-6.3 Continuity produce
    - 9.1.a-6.4 Continuity government
- 

## Constitution

---

### Chapter 1: Structure of Constitution

#### Articles 1.1: Power of the Constitution

##### 1.1.a Power

**The constitution has no value outside the support of the People.**

- .
- . Reasoning. Democracy.

##### 1.1.a-1 Changes

**The Constitution can only be changed by the People directly.**

- .
- . Reasoning. Since the Constitution is enacted by the People, yet laws are enacted by Government, the purpose of the Constitution is (also) to protect the People from Government law changes.
- . Therefore the Government must not be allowed to make changes to the constitution, or it could not protect the People from the Government.

##### 1.1.a-1.1 Changes, warning

**When a Referendum is to be held proposing change to the Constitution, that Referendum can not be held before time has passed of equal length to the time a Government can be in office (see Article 3.1.c, *Electing Government*), starting from the moment the Referendum is posted in the required location as to be held (see Article 3.1.b-4, *Transparency*).**

- .
- . Reasoning. If the Constitution is to protect the People, it is better if the Referendum is not held under the same mandated Government as the Referendum is proposed under.
- . The long time delay means sufficient time to alert people and form an informed opinion.

##### 1.1.a-1.2 Changes, delay

**Changes to the Constitution become law after a three month waiting period, starting from the day both the procedure for changing the constitution has been met and the result has been published widely. Before the last month of the delay starts, the ratification Referendum can be done again, the Referendum with most people casting a vote will decide.**

- .
- . Reasoning. A waiting period after fulfilling the protocol gives people the time to still organize a counter referendum or consider other options. When a dramatic change happened few people had anticipated, it can still be changed in the last

. moment before it becomes law, because that is a time when it  
. will be increasingly clear to everyone, what exactly the change  
. is going to mean. Changing a Constitution should not be taken  
. lightly, hence the long time-path. The delay is also meant  
. so that would-be law-makers will be inspired to consider the  
. seriousness of their work, knowing that the change will be  
. happening in an otherwise quiet circumstance, being visible  
. without the chaos of campaigns, voting and tallying surrounding  
. it. Also so that society has time to adjust quite leisurely to  
. changes that are by then surely coming, which will be more  
. stressful if the change happens at the moment it is known that  
. it will be happening.

. The power of representatives to fill in abstentions is retained  
. under the argument that many changes might be minor and  
. non-controversial, and that it would therefore not be worthwhile  
. to mobilize much of the country for every single change. The  
. difficulty lies only in the delays, not so much in the protocol  
. of decision making itself.

. It might happen that people don't want a change, but somehow  
. don't find out until the change becomes `widely published.'  
. If they really care to undo it, they should manage to set up  
. an undoing direct Referendum within 2 month, and undo it with  
. a larger vote. This rule should prevent unpleasant surprises  
. for people who don't want to follow things closely.

#### 1.1.b Scope

**The constitution is the supreme set of rules.**

. Reasoning. The purpose of a Constitution, is that it provides a  
. basic framework for all other laws, giving them common direction  
. and limiting them for the sake of protecting the people from  
. law makers, and volatility of Government. The Constitution stands  
. above treaties.

#### 1.1.b-1 False law

**Laws and Government decisions conflicting with the Constitution  
are void. Police is not to enforce, the Judiciary is to reject,  
and the Government is to retract such laws and decisions.**

. Reasoning. Strengthening 1.1.b, making all major parts of  
. Government individually responsible to reject conflicts with  
. the Constitution.

#### 1.1.b-2 Unity of Law

**The constitution is one and the same across the entire Nation.**

. Reasoning. Without unity of Constitution the Country is not  
. coherent, and predictable enough. If regions want different  
. supreme rules, they should instead create a new nation.

#### 1.1.c Flag

**The flag of the Constitution is divided in a top and a bottom half.  
In the middle a shape resembling an Omega letter.**

**This represents a pair of scales, symbol for democracy, it is the peace  
flag of the Constitution.**

**The peace flag of the Constitution is to be displayed alone by itself**

or in the highest position *above* an identity flag.

. Reasoning. This flag is a tool for democracy, it is used to define  
. whether the Government is at war or peace, and individuals can use it  
. to vote for peace, war, and what they think is currently true. The  
. colors in top and bottom half are important, to recognize the orientation  
. of the flag more easily. The Article leaves room for pretty and unique  
. designs.

\_1.1.c-1 Flag of war

**When a Government is at war - or orders to use weapons greater in power  
then needed to kill a lion to subdue other human beings - all the  
Constitutional flags in possession of the Government are to be turned  
upside down. This represents a bull head with horns, symbol for war, for  
when the Government is at war, it is the war flag of the Constitution.**

**The war flag of the Constitution is shown *under* a flag which  
denotes the identity at war.**

**Nobody is to accept any order from any commander to wage war without  
the official widespread display of the war flag.**

**Exception: see [Article 3.2.b-3.1](#), *Weapons Authorization*.**

. Reasoning. You can vote with this: displaying the configuration as  
. you would like it to be, war or peace. Then you can add a black  
. ribbon/flag/banner, to indicate "mourning" that it is not as you  
. want it to be, or a white banner/flag/ribbon to indicate "happiness"  
. that it is as you want it.

. This flag system means that the Government is forced by the Constitution  
. to display a war flag when going to war, and soldiers etc are forced  
. to disobey orders toward war if there is no war flag displayed. That  
. means the public will be aware that the Government goes to war,  
. and can hence mobilize in favor or against this, it works both ways.  
. It makes war more effective, and it makes a Government less likely to  
. be able to wage war without its People's agreement.

. Some identity flags can also have a lot of white, then the  
. Constitutional flag could be light blue for instance. The changing  
. position above/below is useful to make a quicker determination of  
. whether the flag is upright or reversed, the color to the side of one  
. half also make the flag position more obvious. The meaning of  
. the Constitutional flag suggests that the peace flag is the "high"  
. flag, and the war flag "low" flag, therefore the identity flag below  
. the Constitutional flag during peace if on the same mast. Another option  
. is to show both flags in top for peace on two masts, and for war put  
. them both on one mast, the identity flag above and the Constitutional  
. flag reversed below it. This would be a clear configuration, with  
. a lot of difference between the two. It does also not "demote" the  
. identity flag to a lower position (see [figure](#)).

. The Government can not practically subvert the "peace configuration  
. with black ribbon", because 1. a peace flag is the supreme order to  
. end all hostilities and reject all orders toward and continuation of  
. hostilities, and 2. the Government can not both "want peace", and  
. then say that "it is not so", because if the Government wants its  
. soldiers - which is what the flag refers to for the Government - to  
. stop fighting "but they don't", then the government is effectively  
. saying it has lost control, that they are no longer a Government.  
. That leaves the Government to display a war or peace flag, either  
. correctly or in deception, and that leaves the People free to vote  
. with the flag for or against war, while defeating a potential

. Government attempt at muddying the signals by adding a black ribbon  
. to defeat a Government that claims it is at peace while at war  
. (according to the flag-waver). When Government attempts to muddy the  
. meanings of these things, it can be a signal of a coup against the  
. flag system. The signals, meanwhile, do not by themselves do anything  
. (voting never does much by itself). The flag system is a fall back  
. democracy protocol for during war, it will probably be more effective  
. if maintained during peace. Point of the protocol is that one can  
. vote equally for and against peace/war, which should result in a more  
. accurate result. It also gives indication to what degree people care.  
. New meaning for the term 'waving the flag.' It remains to be seen  
. if people will do this, but at least it is possible. Whether they'll  
. vote or not, the Government is forced to follow the protocol, so that  
. the People know whether it is war or peace. This could cause the  
. People to use the protocol for their own purposes.

#### 1.1.c-1.1 Flag democracy

**A Constitutional peace flag signals a wish for peace and not war, referring to the the identity of the identity flag if one is shown. A Constitutional war flag - which is the Constitutional war flag below an identity flag - signals a wish for war action by that identity. A reversed Constitutional peace flag without an identity flag above it has an unidentifiable meaning, it is a display of error on the part of the display construction.**

**With the Constitutional flag display can be displayed ribbons in several colors.**

**A *black* ribbon signals there is *not* currently war or peace as it is wished by the Constitutional flag shown.**

**A *white* ribbon signals there *is* currently war or peace as is wished by the Constitutional flag shown.**

**A *blue* ribbon signals a wish for *change* of the Government identified by the identity flag.**

**A *green* ribbon signals a wish for the present Government identified by the identity flag, to *remain* in power.**

**A *golden* ribbon signals a wish for King Rule in the Country identified by the identity flag. See [Article 1.4.a](#), King Rule.**

. Reasoning. Having stated this means that the Government  
. and People can both not deny the meaning of these votes,  
. because if they do they are at least acting contrary to the  
. Constitution. This really does not mean a whole lot, but it  
. starts meaning something when there are large majorities  
. toward either end, consisting of much of the entire  
. population. The flag democracy provides a way to cast a  
. vote equally to either end, but no way to tally them or make  
. any kind of action happen on them. It can, however, be used  
. to cut the government and have new elections either by the  
. delegates, or the electoral committee. If the great majority,  
. for instance, demands peace through the flag democracy  
. protocol, this can be the explicit and somewhat verifiable  
. reason to cut the Government and have new elections. It is a  
. protocol somewhere between mass rallies and ballot casting.  
. The protocol would probably only be needed in time of war,  
. because that tends to be a time when democracy is coming  
. under attack, from outside and inside. Without war threats,  
. hopefully other protocols would be working well enough.  
. You obviously don't have to wave complete multi square meter

flags to vote, a recognizable flag could be 1 x 2 cm.

## Articles [1.2](#): Territory

### 1.2.a Territory

**The Country assembles not more than 100.000.000, one hundred million, potential voters.**

Reasoning. When countries get too large, internal democracy is eroded too much because of the size, the distances. The international balance of power is also eroded, and international objectivity suffers when there are fewer significant countries. Under this Constitution, there is no exploiting non-working ruling class, it is only that class which has an interest in as large a territory as possible. Without that interest, the larger the country also the larger the burden of Government, a larger country may have benefits and down sides, it is not only good.

#### 1.2.a-1 New Territory

**Groups of 1 million residents in a consecutive geographic area can step out of the Country if they achieve a Two Third Majority in a Referendum where abstentions count as votes against stepping out, two consecutive times with an interval of 5 years between them; without there being a Majority against leaving the Country with at least half of the local people voting in it, within 10 years after the first of the two consecutive Referendums. Then the region is independent and out of the Country, 10 years after the first Referendum. These Referendums must be widely published in the concerning area, or they will be invalid.**

**The New Country is formed by taking with it an amount of natural resources equal to the combined total of resource rights for the people who come to live in the new territory, including an equal amount of non-distributed natural resources - such as nature and public land - according to the percentage of people that will be living there.**

Reasoning. It is useful for Democracy to be able to leave the group, a kind of veto. The set-up should provide an equal economic division. If there is a valuable natural resource in the new country, making the new country smaller than desired, the new country could cut a deal that leaves part or all of the valuable resource under the control of the original country, so as to gain more territory. People who don't want to live in the new country would have to move, people who are against the new country but don't move, become part of the new country and their resources would be added to the new country. Presumably such people don't care enough to move, if their resources were subtracted they would lose value.

The anti-Referendum with normal majority is meant to give the resisting forces a chance to verify there is no support for them, even if they organize the referendum. The 10 year waiting period means 5 years after the second referendum, giving sufficient adjustment time for residents.

#### 1.2.a-1.1 New Territory, lost

**When the new country contains fewer than 1 million people before 100 years have gone by, the area falls back to the original country, unless the original country decides to reject it.**

. Reasoning. This provides some way to mop up failed attempts  
. without legal problems. If after 100 years the country still  
. contains one million people, presumably there is some viability  
. to it, at least someone to talk to and to decide whether to  
. rejoin the original country or not. If people flee from the  
. new country, they can automatically put it back with the  
. original country, even if they are no longer in that area to  
. vote about its status.

.  
\_1.2.a-1.2 New Territory, border

**The border of both Countries will not develop enclosed sovereign areas. It will be a simplified line, in such a way that both Countries will have a coherent shape necessary to easily determine in what Country a person is.**

. Reasoning. It may happen that as a result of the Referendums,  
. a computation can be made that results in a "Country" with very  
. jagged and even detached areas. This is likely: the referendums  
. will result in a patchwork of areas in which the formalities have  
. been won, either with or perhaps without a certain continuous  
. area in the middle. This article forces the new country to be a  
. self coherent area. That means certain people groups that want to  
. be in will find they are out, and others that want to be out will  
. find they are in. This requires swapping of areas, homes can  
. hopefully be sold between people who want a different position.  
. This is the kind of problem that adds greatly to the cost of  
. setting up a new country, which is why it is a good idea to make  
. it not too easy to set up a new country.

. The rule against enclosed areas means that new countries can not  
. develop in the middle of others, because that would mean the new  
. Country is not really as sovereign as it could be, being more  
. dependent on good will of just one Country. Enclosed sovereign  
. countries, to the degree that can even exist, make the original  
. country have complicated borders, which are probably not  
. beneficial to governing it; it would be somewhat counter  
. intuitive. Given this rule, people who want out of a Country  
. need to have a connection with the border of another Country or  
. international territory. That is likely to more often be the case,  
. and would protect the center of the original country by not  
. cutting out just any part. If a country feels some parts will  
. become independent, that may cause it not to invest there as  
. much as it could for fear of losing the investments (though  
. it could also invest more to keep it). In that case the wheels  
. of separation are already turning, becoming independent could  
. become the better economic choice at a certain point.

.  
\_1.2.a-1.3 New Territory, more

**An area bordering a New Territory will join that New Territory before 10 years have passed of it having become independent, if they reach a Majority in Referendum where abstentions count as votes against joining, if the New Territory accepts the application to join.**

. Reasoning. It can happen that a certain area reaches the  
. point where it can step out, but other areas are in doubt,  
. where these doubting areas will later decide they want  
. to join. For this they need a 1 million group size again,  
. which if it is not available will result in smaller border  
. communities that are in the wrong country. With this rule they  
. can still join within 10 years, which will also reduce the

. political pressure on the original Referendums, because there  
. will be second chances to join. After 10 years the one-Referendum  
. window closes, then the more difficult procedure needs  
. to be followed again, multiple Referendums and minimum  
. group-size. The rule is a normal majority, so as to find a  
. fair place of balance for the border for the two Countries,  
. not procedurally in favor of either.

. These rules where Referendum vote `abstentions' are votes  
. assumed with a certain content, are meant to refer to people  
. with voting rights, who decide not to vote.

#### 1.2.a-2 Larger Territory

**The Country Council, see Article [3.1.d-5](#), Country Council, can accept a new area into the country.**

. Reasoning. The People can always undo a Government decision  
. through Referendum, presumably most people won't care much if  
. the Country gets larger, as long as the country council thinks  
. it can handle it, since it would basically be more burden for  
. them.

#### 1.2.a-3 Territorial Limits

**The territory extends as far as the eye can see into uninhabitable territory - such as the sea - with respect to that right for other Nations.**

. Reasoning. When a nation extends its territorial claim, this can  
. be profitable for it. Then when a nation extends it more aggressively,  
. it could be rewarded for it, while a friendly Nation is punished  
. for not being so bold. This law sets a basic rule from inside the  
. country. A nation that behaves accordingly may find it is held in  
. higher regard for it by other Nations/Peoples, and hence be rewarded.

#### 1.2.a-4 International Territory

**When a petition of Nations representing more than Two Third of the world population is offered regarding an issue on International Territory, the petition will be read before the Country Council, see Article [3.1.d-5](#), Country Council. This right exists only once a year for a half hour duration.**

. Reasoning. This is presumably the weakest possible obligation  
. regarding international territory, reading a petition does not  
. involve accepting it. However, it means that it is at least  
. acknowledged that the petition exists and that the content has  
. been considered, even if it is rejected later.

.. Updated (ammended) zo feb 5 10:15:21 UTC 2012:

. The above law is threatening to be abused by an Imperial government  
. which combines two third or more of humanity under its umbrella.

. If this mechanism is not further limited they can use it to inundate  
. the national council with nonsense in an effort to gain control.

. Proposed to add:

.. "This right exists only once a year for a half hour duration."

.. End ammendment.

Articles [1.3](#): Nation of Law

#### 1.3.a Equality

**All people living in the Country are equal under the Law. None are above and none are below the Law.**



. Reasoning. Naturally all must be equal under the Law, as if there  
. could be any doubt. The article leaves some room for policy  
. because it says `living in the Country.' Normally this would include  
. everyone, except the dead. But it could for instance exclude an invading  
. army, for which it can be said it `does not live in the country,' since  
. it is `dying in the country.' Even though everyone is equal under the  
. Law, the Law could still say different things about people matching  
. different descriptions, such as it does when regulating the duties of  
. people matching the description of a delegate. This article is just  
. to close a loophole for someone who claims the law does not apply to  
. them for some reason: if they are here it does apply for that reason  
. alone.

#### 1.3.a-1 Lasting Freedom

**When no National Laws in the common interest, no decisions to favor the common interest from bodies created by the Constitution in the common interest, curtail a person its freedom, that person is assumed to have an active right to make any decision desired. A person can not lose or sell their right to make decisions: a person can not sell itself into slavery. A person cannot lose or sell their entitlements and responsibilities awarded to them by the law.**

. Reasoning. This article is meant to make sure only the Law acts  
. as the curtailer of actions, making it illegal that within the land  
. occur constrictions of freedom not based on the Constitution and  
. common interest. This law makes it easier to prosecute things like  
. slavery. It also makes it illegal to sell or lose certain personal  
. rights, such as the right to vote. If the law doesn't describe  
. it, it is assumed to be allowed by the Law, Police, Judges (as if  
. that isn't implicit). This article describes certain freedoms are  
. beyond reduction, particularly future decisions, the right to be a  
. decision-maker about your own life. This is a natural right, but law  
. could go against that in theory (and has done so in the past), so it  
. might be useful to explicitly not allow dictatorship through excessive  
. contracts made in the past. This is not intended to have consequences  
. for such contracts as marriage, which potentially are being made  
. by both parties fully equal, in the interest of possible children  
. (not slavery with one in power and the other without). The marriage  
. can probably not be kept good by law anyway, hence amending the law  
. to explicitly exclude marriage may not have useful consequences. It  
. may have negative ones, where certain marriages might degenerate  
. into legalized forms of slavery. The law also awards decision right  
. to children, which does not (is not intended to) imply parents have  
. no power over their children. This article leaves room for further  
. law to describe problems, as long as they are solved in the common  
. interest. A law that describes a certain punishment right for a parent  
. can imply that a child can not sue a parent, because the punishment  
. and therefore disallowing certain decisions of the child would have  
. been (presumably) a `law in the common interest.' It does require  
. that such a common interest law or decision will have to be made  
. somewhere flowing from Constitutional power/rights, otherwise such  
. a case could default to legal freedom as far as the Police/Judges  
. are concerned, in principle the child could sue the parent and win,  
. which is does not imply that that is therefore wrong. This problem  
. seems very sensitive and weighing different interests (in favor of  
. the child, various and varying needs for freedom and discipline).  
. One way to look at it: is a baby fully a `(legal) person' ? If  
. that personality is diminished in stature (such as it is in a child  
. compared to a parent with respect to making decisions in this world),  
. the article can also apply in a proportionally diminished fashion ...  
. When someone is half way between adult/child, the competence of a  
. certain decision can therefore decide the level of freedom to it,

. if there is no reason to deny it, then it is allowed, unless there  
. are other laws describing it in better detail.

. The requirement `common interest' means a legal protection for  
. people from erratic and self serving groups or pseudo-Government.  
. The responsibility to do punishment for a crime can not be sold.

. This article implies no law or decision has legal and Police pressure  
. behind it, unless it is in the common interest. This may protect the  
. Police from overzealous Government: the Police may sue against certain  
. decisions it feels are not common interest. That can dramatically  
. undercut the ability of a detached Government to abuse its Police  
. forces against the People, the Police is not a blind toy for the  
. Government to wield at will.

#### Articles [1.4](#): State of Chaos

##### 1.4.a King Rule

**The Electoral Committee declares a state of chaos when the Country is in Chaos, at which time the King takes over the Government and the making of non-Constitutional Law. The Electoral Committee can end the state of chaos at any time.**

**The state of chaos lasts not longer then one year and one day, after which there is one month of normal Governmental rule. One month after the end of the state of chaos, new elections for the Electoral Committee are being held, unless the condition of [Article 1.4.a-2, King Rule, Stability](#), has been met.**

**See [Article 3.1.c-1, Electoral Committee](#).**

**See [Article 3.1.c-1.8, King Elect](#).**

. Reasoning. The whole system as proposed here is highly bottom  
. up democracy. But when that fails, it has fails and results in  
. chaos. What then, since there is no top-down replacement. When there  
. is no top-down fall back, anything may happen. So in effect, this  
. system actual protects democracy in a state of chaos, by describing  
. what should happen during chaos. That in itself reduces chaos, and  
. sets the clock ticking for normalization. Since there can only be  
. a state of Chaos declared if there is actually "chaos," the Courts  
. will decide when there is doubt and a challenge raised to the Courts.  
. The Government can obviously enact common Laws that work this  
. problem out in more detail, giving Courts more structure. It may  
. be strange that there is a King who just has a tiny backing of  
. all People, King by virtue of being oldest. But since there is  
. a good chance there is but limited popularity, those Kings should be  
. less tempted to try its hand at despotism when it is not warranted.  
. `One year and one day,' why shouldn't a Constitution have some  
. poetic qualities ... puts things in perspective.

##### 1.4.a-1 King Rule, Banner

**During the state of chaos, all the flags in possession of the Government are to fly a golden banner.**

. Reasoning. Since `King Rule' changes everything, it seems  
. necessary to advertise the issue. The banner color also give  
. the People a chance to vote for `King Rule.' Naturally flying  
. the "want new Government" during `King Rule' negates `King Rule.'

##### 1.4.a-2 King Rule, Stability

**When the same King is re-elected after a period of King Rule, then**

gets another period of King Rule within one year after that election, and after that second closely following period of King Rule is again elected King, then the obligation in *Article 1.4.a, King Rule*, to elect a new Electoral Committee after a period of King Rule is suspended until the King loses its Kingship.

. Reasoning. It is not useful to re-elect the same King every  
. year. When a King has proved itself and is re-elected twice after  
. King Rule, then it must be a good King. When a King sets a country  
. in order in one year, that is good and might earn it a re-election  
. as King at the end of it. When the EC needs to declare another  
. period of King Rule within one year, that could also reflect badly  
. on the King for not having set the country back to order before,  
. and hence prevent its third election. When it reflects badly  
. on the Government, and the People - growing tired with chaotic  
. Government - elect the same King for a third time, the EC may  
. declare continual King Rule periods of one year, with one month  
. normal Government periods in between. The EC may choose to go for  
. that heightened King power or not, by declaring a new period of  
. King rule within one year or after one year. When they wait more  
. than a year, the trigger is off. Once a King does not get automatic  
. elections after King Rule, there are still possibilities to get a  
. new EC. The King can not change the Constitution by itself, and  
. therefore does not control the election process of Government  
. delegates. These delegates can organize a referendum for a  
. new EC at least in the month when there is no King Rule. Maybe  
. there are other possibilities which depend on the courts, which  
. are established in the Constitution and can not be discontinued  
. by the King.

. The police is to be loyal to the Law, and Justice decides on the  
. Law, the highest authority in these matters of Constitutional power  
. would still be the Court. The powers of King are derived from the  
. Law. On the other hand, judges are appointed by the Government,  
. which means by the King during King Rule. All power ultimately  
. derives from the Constitutional law, and the general support it  
. has. Which cuts both ways: if there is strong loyalty to a King,  
. that will have to be reflected in how the Law is interpreted,  
. because the Constitution is based directly on support of the  
. People. But even King Rule is a situation of Rule of Law in the  
. country, supported by the Constitutional law. The King would be  
. nothing without the law giving the King its powers. But when  
. things do get out of hand with the King, sooner or later the  
. King will be gone one way or the other, and sooner or later  
. the condition for electing a new EC are met, and an election  
. can be held after a year, on a date set by the Government, see  
. *Article 3.1.c-1.1, Electoral Committee, mandate*. When things  
. totally get out of hand with the King, there may need to  
. be a full scale revolution to re-establish democracy under  
. the Constitution. Since the size of a country is only so big,  
. it may be possible to flee from the situation to other Nations.  
. It seems reasonably unlikely that a King will act strongly against  
. the very laws that give it its power, but it is possible if the  
. King has a strong personal following. When the King does have  
. that kind of following, one may wonder whether this is not in  
. fact best for the Country. Democracy would already have proven to  
. be a failure for that Country at that time, though in the future it  
. might still come to work if there is more self-discipline and less  
. corruption. Both discipline and obedience to the law/Government  
. may be inspired by a period under a strong King (like a study).

---

## Chapter 2: Structure of Individual Protections

### Articles 2.1: Individual Protections

#### 2.1.a No Harm

**The human body can not be harmed. Not for the purpose of of extracting information (torture), or for the purpose of punishment, or any other purpose against the will of that particular human body (person).**

- . Reasoning. The human justice and investigative systems are
- . not perfect because they are not all knowing. For every
- . act of aggression, justice can demand retribution and
- . compensation. If a person is physically harmed in the process
- . of creating justice, it can become impossible to rectify
- . the aggression. The threat of being subjected as an innocent
- . person to state violence is a form of mass punishment on innocent
- . people, punishment without crime. Torture is punishment before
- . conviction, therefore punishment of innocent people.
- . There can be no death penalty because it violates these
- . principles, and because too little is known about death.

#### 2.1.a-1 Compensation

**The People or in their absence the Government will set compensations in case of convicting innocent people.**

- . Reasoning. Innocent people are not to be locked up, and no
- . punishments implemented for which there exists no sufficient
- . compensation.

#### 2.1.a-2 Animals

**Animals born in captivity are not to be treated with cruelty.**

- . Reasoning. Animals who are born in the wild, face a range of
- . possibilities, some of which include death by predator or
- . disease, usually the outcome is a combination of choices made
- . and nature. Pain is to be avoided, the adventure to avoid
- . pain and win pleasure can be seen as the animal mode of existence.
- . Animals born in captivity are created by humanity, but their
- . bodies are meant for living wild in nature, and make choices.
- . One of the choices available could even include losing interest,
- . failing to find food, falling sick and dying. An animal without
- . the will to live is usually dead rather quickly. All these things
- . are broken if animals are bred in captivity. Humanity is no longer
- . part of regular animal life. Although on the one hand it can
- . be said that animals will have to adapt to the new circumstances,
- . humanity has the freedom not to force these new circumstances
- . on nature/animals. Animals under threat from humanity are both
- . the biological family of humanity, and the moral family of those
- . who have been oppressed by dictators and torturers. Needless
- . violence against animals is similar to needless violence against
- . humans. Scientists looking for animal testing should test
- . on themselves or volunteers, or do without certain knowledge,
- . even if this produces disease in humans. There usually is a
- . way forward, and if there isn't, it is better to die early
- . then die as a torturer later. In any case, this law does not
- . explicitly protect animals caught in the wild.

#### 2.1.a-2.1 Wild Animals

**An Animal caught from the wild using a higher level of technology**

**then used by any animal except humanity, is protected under Article 2.1.a-2, Animals.**

. Reasoning. Catching animals with technology is an unfair  
. advantage and alien to animal life. When animals are caught  
. with bare hands, animals have the chances they deserve to  
. escape, and only the slowest/weakest can be caught. Humans  
. in this way attempting to capture animals will also have to  
. be unarmed, and run the risk of being fair game. Catching  
. animals with technology is not meaningfully different from  
. breeding them in captivity. An interesting result of this rule:  
. people wishing to defend some animal from capture can do so  
. and engage the human hunter(s), as long as they equally do  
. not use technology.

#### 2.1.b Free speech

**People have the right to express any opinion they want.**

. Reasoning. Without being able to speak freely (speaking, writing,  
. signing, etc), development of policies and understanding is unfairly  
. restrained. The right to speak freely is augmented with the natural  
. right to not listen and ignore the speaker.

#### 2.1.b-1 No insult

**People have a right not to be repeatedly, apparently directly, apparently purposefully insulted in public areas, in a difficult way to escape.**

. Reasoning. The 'freedom of speech' can be abused beyond its use,  
. which is stimulating debate and opinion, to become 'freedom to  
. insult' and 'freedom for pestering.' This article aims to differentiate  
. between 'writing a public letter in .5 mm high font and posting it  
. on the inside of your own window facing outward', and 'playing a  
. tape with meaningless insults toward a certain population group all  
. day every day on the only road into town.' Clearly there is a  
. sliding scale between what is fruitful opinion and what is vengeful  
. insult, potentially different for speaker and listener. One may  
. also take the view that it is often better to ignore a singular insult,  
. which might even be taken as a provocation to make a legal case,  
. part of a pestering campaign, which may lead up to physical violence.  
. If an insult can be easily avoided from being received, then it  
. can be part of the duty of the receiver to try to avoid receiving it.  
. At least the limit here is set high, so that the behavior is  
. clearly "out of line" according to most people, and may be the verbal  
. provocations leading up to physical violence. Having all kinds of legal  
. cases about "insult" is too costly and has too little meaning to bother  
. with. If a person holds a long monologue about the "ills of whatever  
. group", and does not show up every day to do the exact some thing in  
. public, it is not repeatedly and possibly neither purposefully, and  
. therefore it fails to qualify. Written signs/messages that are visible  
. all the time do qualify for 'repeatedly', if they contain otherwise  
. meaningless insults it is 'apparently purposefully insulting', if in  
. a public place it is also 'apparently directly,' and if the message  
. is in 1 meter high font on a road cumbersome to avoid it is also  
. 'difficult to escape.' Then these signs should be taken down if  
. someone wins the legal case (if a government mechanism hasn't already  
. removed it). When someone goes walking through a town looking for  
. insulting messages to make a legal procedure, finding any can not  
. qualify because they aren't 'difficult to escape' if one is looking  
. for them. It only qualifies if one encounters them during regular  
. activities. Detail issues what to do with postal services and such more  
. special problems can be solved in the 'common laws' or by judges ('can

- . you escape it by not taking such a job if you are easily insulted', or
- . 'are people not to insult (the group) a post-man (might belong to)').

#### 2.1.c Freedom of Assembly

**People are free to assemble themselves in organized groups. Groups who have as their aim the changing of the Government and/or society system in whatever way, can not be disbanded because of their ideas.**

- . Reasoning. Public democracy demands complete freedom of speech on
- . political matters. Ideas can not be criminal, only actions. Political
- . parties can be a motor for change, even though their ideas at first
- . seem reprehensible or even criminal to the majority.

#### 2.1.d Property Right

**Your legal property can not be taken away from you. You can not take away the legal property of someone.**

- . Reasoning. Robbery is not allowed, when people own things legally,
- . this is essential for their life. People have to be secure in the
- . property that they earned, or why would they even bother working and
- . assembling anything. If people can't profit from their work, the
- . good who are productive are not rewarded, rather the bad that steal
- . it away without being productive are. This would be a long term threat
- . for society, causing degeneration.

#### 2.1.e Privacy

**A person has a natural right to Privacy of his personal belongings, body and home.**

**See also Article [3.2.b-4](#), *Police and Privacy*.**

- . Reasoning. It may happen that Government feels it wants to know
- . things, to be a more efficient Government or some other common interest.
- . It may then come into the temptation to demand access to private homes.
- . This article is to discourage that (making it illegal). This also
- . extends to other people: other people may not invade the privacy of
- . another's belongings and home. The word 'natural' means to hint at
- . some 'common-sense' regarding this: is the door to a home open, then
- . looking in is not illegal, but more or less 'natural.' If the person
- . wanted to claim the privacy right, it would have closed the door.
- . Does an open door does not imply the right to walk through it ? These
- . kind of things depend on the nature of the situation: a shop, yes,
- . a home, probably not; but if it was open and one wanted to warn the
- . owner, the punishment could be much smaller or non-existent, etc.

### Articles [2.2](#): Justice

#### 2.2.a Fair trial

**All people when sufficiently suspected of a crime are tried by an objective, impartial and competent judiciary. Equal cases are treated equally. In case of a public prosecutor, neither the prosecution or Judges know the defendant personally or have a direct relation with the defendant. In case of two claiming parties, the Judge knows neither personally or has a direct relation with either.**

**Justice is done according to the published Laws that held on the moment the crime occurred.**

- . Reasoning. Need objective government system. The rule for Law
- . old law ruling old cases makes it impossible to pass a law and then

. sentence people under it that could not know that what they did was  
. illegal because it was not illegal (long established principle of  
. Justice). `Equal cases ...' is copied from the current (2007) Dutch  
. Constitution.

2.2.a-1 Presumed innocent

**People suspected of crime are presumed innocent until proven guilty.**

. Reasoning. Objectivity.

2.2.a-2 Equal pleading effort

**Someone suspected of crime has the right to plead its case at least for one and a half the amount of time as its accuser(s) are pleading.**

. Reasoning. Objectivity. Trying to avoid convictions of innocent  
. people on prejudice. The additional time may wear down a prejudice,  
. provide breathing room for the opposite viewpoint.

2.2.a-3 Competent Defense

**Each person accused of a crime appearing before a Court is either represented or assisted by someone competent in the Law and evidence. This competent defense will attempt to make it appear that the accused person is not guilty. Judgement about guilt must be left completely in the hands of the Judge, to no extend is it the job of the defense. When the Judge believes the defense is significantly lacking in the quality of its defense under the Law, the Judge will resolve the matter after consultation with another Judge, until a competent defense and objective Justice is being provided.**

. It may happen that someone who is defending someone else is  
. leaving an obvious argument unused, while the Judge is well aware  
. of the superior line of Law application. In such a case the accused  
. person is being taken in by incompetent defense, and the objectivity  
. of the Judge may be compromised to some extend. To regain the needed  
. objectivity and authority, the Judge consults the issue with another  
. Judge, and then proceeds in whatever way to correct the lacking  
. defense. This can be by notifying the defense of the insufficient  
. argument or by ruling a better quality defense assistant will be present.  
. To safeguard objectivity, the Judge who is now mingling with the defense,  
. can decide that a new Judge must hear the case. The prosecution may  
. also demand this, if it can make a case of Judge and defense mingling.  
. Such a procedural case can also be held in the Judge Court (court of  
. appeal). Since no trial can happen without competent defense, it is  
. implied one will be awarded at no cost if the accused person is unable  
. to provide competent defense. All people accused will have competent  
. defense present even if they don't want that, because (often) they  
. are overestimating their own competence under the Law, which may  
. inadvertently lead them to their own conviction. They could defend  
. themselves, as long as they do it competently.

. The defense is basically allowed to go against its own sense of what  
. is true. The defense in that sense is performing a stage act. That  
. is useful because while lying in defense, the defense may well be  
. saying the actual truth, and its own idea of the truth may well be  
. wrong. It is only for the Judge to make that decision. These are all  
. common principles of Law.

2.2.a-4 Observe Trial

**Trial proceedings can always be observed by anyone willing, unless vital interests of presumed victims or accused person(s) or witnesses**



would be significantly undermined beyond the court case, not including the potential of being mistaken as being guilty by the public, in which case the doors may be closed.

Doors of a Court case can never be closed for someone who is a Law Court Judge (see *Article 3.2.a-3, Law Court*) or observers appointed directly by and reporting only to a Law Court Judge.

.  
. Public trials are usually better than closed trials, but  
. the nature of certain crimes and the security of certain witnesses  
. and such issues may cause a certain trials to fail just because of  
. their open nature. It is impossible to predict the details of  
. future cases, therefore the issue is left to the Judges. But the  
. interest is on the side of the people appearing in court, closing  
. the court is not to be done in the interest of the Judges themselves,  
. since that has some danger of creating the dreaded 'star chamber'  
. style of pseudo justice (a star chamber is a form military "justice"  
. which is known to be closed doors, and may not even allow the defendant  
. to defend itself or present evidence, the practice obviously not  
. being able to survive public scrutiny and still pass as a form of  
. Justice.) To have some oversight the Law Court Judges can observe  
. trials, both casually or extensively, to preserve the trust in  
. Justice. The doors can't be closed just because a defendant might  
. be thought of as guilty, because that would mean all cases could be  
. closed. To reconcile the innocence of an accused person and the  
. potentially erroneous ideas of a public, on the one hand the public  
. should learn, and on the other the defendant could prosecute for  
. damages through wrongful conviction. The right to observe a trial  
. does not imply the right to distribute that which has been observed.  
. This allows more common law around the issue of publication.

.  
. When it comes to doors closing, I'm thinking about cases where  
. witnesses are heavily threatened by organized crime, or certain  
. scandalous acts against victims which they do not bear to reveal  
. unless the court is closed tight. Judging Law Court Judges without  
. such privilege means they have to be discharged first.

#### 2.2.a-5 Trial not Punishment

**The proceedings of the trial may not themselves become a form of punishment, beyond a reasonable duty to work with the Judiciary as an innocent person, in the common interest. Persons who have previously been convicted and been to prison for a crime of greed, may be held in less comfortable environment during trial. A valid trial only occurs once with the same evidence.**

. Reasoning. The rule that someone charged can only be accused  
. once is also a long established rule (of common sense), technical  
. law that judges can use to deny over-zealous prosecutors. The  
. "working with judiciary" may include being locked in when  
. suspected of a serious crime, such being locked in is "in the  
. common interest," since it is understood sometimes innocent people  
. will end up being locked in, later to be released, in order to  
. make catching and holding actual criminals possible.

. This locking in is then not to be a form of punishment, which  
. implies a (reasonable) extend of comfort, "as if innocent." That  
. comfort again "in the common interest" not extreme (since it costs  
. public money), yet close enough to reasonable living conditions  
. enjoyed by most people outside of prison, however excluding  
. possible luxuries like meeting people, if that presents a direct  
. threat to either the case of other criminal enterprises (in the  
. common interest). In practice this probably means: comfortable  
. bedding, chairs, media access, food, ability to buy things, a



. certain amount of space and for instance a small kitchen area,  
. enclosed bath-room, sunlight. The kind of things an innocent  
. person would not find very punishing, more or less the norm  
. (today). People who have prior convictions should be excluded  
. from these comforts, because the abuse of the comforts by a  
. criminal could degenerate these undeserved comforts themselves,  
. make them less than what they should be. In general that probably  
. means previous criminals will be locked up as during punishment,  
. or close enough (with some additional cell comforts) to such  
. conditions, that it does not cost too much money. This will make  
. sure people aren't committing crimes to get into the more luxurious  
. presumed-innocent holding areas. In theory the holding areas (not  
. the punishment cells, that would be unfair unequal punishment)  
. could reflect less well to do conditions for less well to do  
. people. If people are committing crimes just to get these benefits,  
. then the crime could be classified as "greed crime," denying further  
. access. Previously convicted and not cleared people can hardly be  
. really presumed as innocent, so why waste the money. The part of  
. the "greed" crime, means this rule does not apply to such things  
. as breaking things, writing on walls. This is to protect political  
. action. The usual hard crime is all greed crime (for profit), these  
. people will be affected.

. Other things are also implied by this article: the trial has to  
. be reasonably quick, because too long (without reasonable cause or  
. (perhaps) additional comforts) would become punishment. The state  
. of the accused person, whether it says it is being punished,  
. should be of concern to the process, including the Judge (to  
. prevent premature punishment), wrong doings in this department  
. can then lead to claims of (reasonable) damages. It will be  
. interesting to record how the people who actually were innocent  
. have experienced being locked in, so as to provide the term  
. "reasonable" with reasonable content. Testing the facilities is  
. the "work" the innocent are performing, for which they are then  
. paid in services/goods during their stay.

#### 2.2.b Fair punishment

**People being punished to have their freedom of movement removed, have the right to ask for segregation from other such convicted people for the duration of the punishment.**

. Reasoning. If someone innocent is convicted, such a person may want  
. to avoid all possible contact with actual criminals, so as not to  
. become a victim again.

#### 2.2.b-1 Fair punishment, reading

**People convicted are never denied the right to read commonly available materials.**

. Reasoning. Reading can prevent people from going crazy in prison,  
. and it can be a great help for innocent people. People can also  
. use reading for study, so as to become better. Commonly available  
. means they may be denied the right to receive letters and  
. doctored books, which may contain criminal communications.

Articles [2.3](#): Additional rights for Children

#### 2.3.a Right to be cared for

**A child which does no longer wish to live with its parents, is cared for by the Government.**

**A child which wants to live with its parents, is released to the parents.**

**A child has the right to know who its parents are and where they are. The government can not keep parents away from a child if that child does not want its parents to be kept away.**

**The child in Government care does not pay, at any time, for the care it receives, but has the right to hold Government responsible to the same extent parents are responsible for their children, at any time.**

. Reasoning. It seems difficult to make laws that protect children.  
. Laws that make sure only people get children that know each other and  
. that can get along sufficiently - behave like adults for most of the  
. time - how do you do that. How do you demand from people who are  
. behaving like spoiled little children with a bad attitude, that  
. they behave like adults for the sake of their children. How do you  
. force incompetent people to become competent. When you force people  
. to stay together, will they not vent their aggression on the children  
. even more. If marriage is demanded to get children, there is no way  
. to enforce it, and it does not solve the problem of extra marital  
. children. The only person in all this chaos with a clear interest  
. in seeing the children being brought up adequately, is the child  
. itself. When the child can leave its parents, the parents may have  
. an interest to behave at least somewhat within acceptable levels.  
. If they don't even want the child, it is better that it leaves also.  
. This set up reduces the risk that children get in even worse  
. conditions in government care - whatever that 'government care' means,  
. it can be anything - because the children can get back. They have  
. a choice, and can therefore select the best option, that seems to be  
. in the interest of the children. The right to know who and where the  
. parents are, and disallowing the government to keep parents away  
. unless demanded by children, reduces the risk that governments  
. officials erect a barrier between child and parents, which could  
. prevent return of children to their real home. Parents could still  
. change their behavior. The government democracy should see to it that  
. the government provides adequate care.

. Some children may want to leave their parents not because their parents  
. are abusive, but for other reasons such as poverty or substance  
. abuse, chaos. In such cases an early investment in proper care for these  
. children could well prevent much larger costs for the People later  
. in life, so it is also economic sound policy to take good care of children.  
. With bad parents but proper care elsewhere, a child could change from  
. being setup to become a destroyed wreck to being a productive and happy  
. member of society.

---

## Chapter [3](#): Structure of Government

### Articles [3.1](#): Structure of Government

#### 3.1.a Government Intention

**The Government decisions are the accurate representation of the present will of the People. The task of the elected Government is to find out and carry out the will of the People. The elected delegates together attempt to steer the Government Majority into accordance with the will of the People, and avoid going against the present will of the People.**

. Reasoning. A Government which acts against the wishes of the  
. people, is apparently a limited club of no real significance, that  
. infringes on the right to self determination of the People.  
. But if all delegates attempt to speak for the majority, new  
. opinions are lost. The delegates have a level of authority

. granted to them by being elected, this should stimulate debate.  
. Such debates can function as part of augmenting public opinion  
. (see *Article 3.1.a-1, Declare opinion*), after which the opinion  
. of the People is consulted (see *Article 3.1.e, Public Consultancy*),  
. after which a decision is reached by Government Majority. This  
. decision can then be contested in Referendum by the People (see  
. *Article 3.1.b, Referendum*).  
. .  
. See here for schematics of the proposed form of representative  
. Government: [figures](#).

#### 3.1.a-1 Declare opinion

**The elected delegates express their personal opinions of the moment regarding issues the Government is concerning itself with, or the area they concern themselves with in particular.**

. Reasoning. Elected delegates are in a position to know a large  
. number of details, if for no other reason than that they create  
. these details, and work with them. The elected delegates follow the  
. will of the People, but the People need information and new ideas  
. from any and all sources, including present Government. When the  
. elected delegates communicate in this way with the People, give  
. opinion and then find out opinions to later make a decision, both  
. the will of the Government and the will of the People is absorbed  
. in the process. The People have the right and need to know what their  
. elected delegates are thinking, about any subject.

#### 3.1.a-2 Task Accountability

**If a delegate or a representative elected to Government by the delegates, does not perform a clear and specific task it claimed to carry out after being elected, then the court of Justice will appoint someone most willing and sufficiently able to carry out the task in its place, using the same authority as the replaced representative.**

. Reasoning. Representatives have a grand history of broken promises  
. to the public. That is undermining the essence of democracy. To  
. make honesty pay, dishonesty has to be punished immediately. If  
. someone says it will carry out a certain task, then this task is  
. to be carried out to the degree the representative has the power  
. to carry it out, whether that representative later changes its  
. mind or not. The representative can not be allowed to change its  
. mind on its promises because of the time and effort invested in  
. the election process. However, the carrying out of the promised  
. task should not become an procedural obligation under the law,  
. because at times situations might really have changed. Therefore  
. the task is to be taken over by someone else, which presumes  
. there is a someone else willing and able. The court will have to  
. decide when a representative has broken a promise, which presumes  
. there is a will to make something into a court case. It might  
. be more beautiful to go back to the people, but constantly going  
. back to the people is too much work. The people have already  
. spoken, so now its mandate is to be carried out to the degree  
. possible.

. When the task was merely to vote a certain way, a vote could  
. have happened before a court decision can replace a representative.  
. The vote result can be recomputed with the changed representative.  
. Any court cases should result in more detailed common laws about when  
. something is a 'clear promise', etc.

### 3.1.b Referendum

**The People make direct decisions by way of referendum, voting of all willing people individually and directly.**

The number of abstentions is divided by the number of representatives in the body concerned with the referendum, each representative is allowed to add that number of votes to the option of its choice. The abstentions-adjusted result determines fractions with which options won votes in the total of votes. Decisions are made by majority of the votes that want at least a certain minimum decision, the greatest common denominator. Representatives can continuously change how their abstentions have voted. New representatives take over the power of representatives that have left the governing body when determining what abstentions have voted.

Exception: see [Article 3.1.c-1.1.1](#), *Electoral Committee, mandate eject*.

Exception: see [Article 1.2.a-1](#), *New Territory*.

- . Reasoning. The majority of people is the moral and actual force of a country, to formalize the rule of the majority prevents unneeded armed conflict.
- . The 'abstention adding' trick diffuses the power of referendums for which few people show to vote, then power reverts proportionally to the representatives. This means that referendums are a way of inter-mixing representative and direct democracy, proportionally to the degree of abstentions. This process does not have the potential group proxy-voting of the consultation-process, it is more direct and has therefore more power. See also [Article 3.1.e-2](#), *Public Consultancy, abstentions*. The "at least a certain minimum decision" means that for instance 30% of people want 'A', 30% wants 'more A', and 40% wants B, that the decision should be 'A', since "60% wants at least A" (protection against divide-and-conquer). Such things require some fair interpretation of results, this may eventually need help from the Court of Justice.
- . For power of referendum into the future, see [Article 3.1.b-7.1](#), *Vote Decay*.

### 3.1.b-1 Initiative Referendum

**The People can take the initiative to have a referendum, by showing signatures on a Petition for a percentage of the People. A percentage of local people for a local Referendum if the issue is local, a National percentage is the issue is National.**

**The minimum percentage on a Petition to have a Referendum: ..[10%].**

- . Reasoning. If the People can't take the initiative, a referendum is a useless instrument when it is most useful: when Government tries to go against the will of the People.

### 3.1.b-2 Scope Referendum, particular

**When a referendum on a particular issue breaks laws, the scope of the result of the referendum is limited to the decision made.**

- . Reasoning. When the People decide on a particular issue that is not a law, no such law should be extrapolated from the People's decision and be assumed to have been enacted by the referendum. The People can make a particular exception to laws.

3.1.b-3 Scope Referendum, law

**When a referendum explicitly sets a new law, the new law can not be curtailed by any other non-Constitutional law or Government decisions.**

. Reasoning. The People in the present are the ultimate source  
. of Power. Artificially limiting their power can only lead to  
. confusion and breakdown/distrust of Government.

3.1.b-4 Transparency

**All referendums are to be announced clearly in the same location, in generally understandable and sufficiently short language.**

. Reasoning. When a referendum is to be held, all people must be  
. able to know about it.

3.1.b-5 Decision Repealed

**All decisions of Government can be repealed by the People at any and all times, about any and all decisions.**

. Reasoning. If Government can make decisions that the People can  
. not undo, the People are not in power. In fact, the People always  
. have the power to undo decisions, this just formalizes their  
. inherent capability and moral right.

3.1.b-6 Representatives Repealed

**All members of Government, elected delegates and employees, can be ejected from their post any moment by the People using a Referendum. The People or in their absence the majority of elected delegates appoint a replacement. When it concerns a delegate, a replacement remains in its position at the pleasure of the People or in their absence the Government, until the next elections for the Government body it concerns. Voters thus deprived of representation remain deprived until the next elections.**

. Reasoning. Government delegates and representatives have a tendency  
. to have a will of their own, contrary to either the will of the  
. People, and their earlier statements. This causes an interesting  
. situation: individuals which win the minimum number of votes to  
. become a delegate, can then be ejected nevertheless by the majority.  
. This way the People can rid themselves of certain influences,  
. without having to continuously watch every move certain delegates  
. make. With freedom of speech, the opinions of the removed delegates  
. are still available, debate is not stifled. The vote-block can not  
. rotate the replacement out of its position, this rule makes an  
. exception to such rules.

3.1.b-7 Authority

**The outcome of a referendum containing two thirds (2/3) of the People's - not abstention adjusted (see [Article 3.1.b, Referendum](#)) - vote for a particular choice, has the highest Authority, but it does not circumvent Constitutional duties required to change the Constitution (see [Article 1.1.a, Power.](#))**

. Reasoning. With two thirds, any war can be won. Prior decisions,  
. laws and otherwise, must be able to have a practical repealing  
. procedure. If a majority of 99% has been reached once, this should  
. not lock the future in place. This seems to present a conflict with  
. how the Constitution is to be changed, which requires a government  
. mandate length waiting period to protect the People from Government

. manipulations on the Constitution. Solution would be that the  
. Referendum that wants to change the constitution can not even be  
. held within 4 years of it being announced, so that it would neither  
. be able to achieve a 2/3 majority. On the one hand this curtails  
. immediate power of the people, even if 2/3. This would leave the  
. people only a vague recourse through article *Article 1.1.a, Power*,  
. which would involve suspension of the entire Constitution by  
. overwhelming (2/3?) majority revolutionary direct action. After such  
. action the entire constitution plus change could be re-enacted. It  
. is highly doubtful such activity would be merited if one only has  
. to wait a mandate period for referendum. The waiting period ensures  
. that people can rest assured that the Constitution can't be suddenly  
. changed during a holiday, not even by 2/3 majority referendum.

. It can happen in theory that a referendum being held on whatever  
. issue, unexpectedly yields an explicit change of Constitutional law  
. with a 2/3 majority, while it was not such advertised and had no  
. waiting period, hence being invalid for Constitutional change. In  
. such case it is probably smart to try to explain within reason the  
. Constitution in such a way as to come closer to the referendum  
. result, and to alter policy and execution of the law to come closer  
. to the referendum result to the extent there is no conflict with the  
. Constitution. Then the formalities for proper Constitutional change  
. can be set in motion.

#### 3.1.b-7.1 Vote Decay

**Referendums follow a rule of decay in time, so that their power eventually becomes nothing, but has a clearly defined power in the near future.**

. Reasoning. When a referendum takes place and a decision is  
. reached, what if a smaller referendum shortly after results  
. in the opposite, and what is the relation of power between  
. referendum and representatives. This appears to be a formal  
. problem: how to count multiple mandates of power. Does a shortly  
. later referendum always count, or does a (much?) larger count.  
. How long do representatives have to wait until a referendum  
. decision can be changed: never, immediately ? Because  
. representatives can continuously change how the abstentions have  
. voted and the vote is continuously decaying, power over the  
. concerning subject will slowly revert back in time to the  
. representative body completely, unless a larger referendum is  
. again held. See *Article 3.1.b, Referendum*.  
. This way the formality of where power is, is clear, it can  
. (in theory) be computed, at least gives a principle for how  
. to decide. The rule-of-decay is specified in article *Article*  
. [3.1.b-7.1.1](#), *Vote Decay, speed*.

#### 3.1.b-7.1.1 Vote Decay, speed

**Referendums lose present-day power with the same speed that people on average die.**

. Reasoning. When people die, their power is gone.  
. Decisions made in referendum will not have infinite  
. power into the future, although they would have a precisely  
. defined power in the near future, always becoming less.

#### 3.1.b-7.1.2 Vote Decay, addition

**Referendums on the same issue but different in time have their numbers not added together, but the largest decay adjusted count of people in favor of a certain choice,**



**retains the monopoly of the present-day count, the lesser absolute count majority being ignored, unless the condition of article [Article 3.1.b-7](#), Authority has been met.**

. Reasoning. If a large referendum has a certain outcome,  
. many small new referendums in obscurity are not to eventually  
. degrade it. If a referendum at some point reaches a 70%  
. majority vote on something, while shortly previous there was  
. a 100% majority vote on a related issue, then the 70% takes  
. precedence as if it were a referendum on a new subject, because  
. it has reached the 2/3rd majority. This makes sure that it is  
. still possible to make necessary changes/adjustments, even  
. if extremely large majorities have been reached. Such violent  
. changes in public opinion may be due to dramatically changed  
. circumstances, or because the subject and/or decision was not  
. contradictory with the previous decision, or on the same  
. subject, it might only appear that it was. Once a 2/3  
. majority for a certain option (not total turn-out, but total  
. for one minimum choice) has been reached, numerical comparison  
. with other referendums is not necessary anymore.

### 3.1.c Electing Government

**Delegates are elected every ..[5]. years.**

. Reasoning. If the Government can be repealed by the People, directly,  
. indirectly, or if it crosses the consultancy process too often,  
. individually or in whole, it may not be too problematic to have a  
. Government in power for some years. They will have a hard time to  
. go against the People already, every step of the way.  
. See also [Article 3.1.c-5.1](#), *Salary, bonus*.

#### 3.1.c-1 Electoral Committee

**Elections are ordered to occur at a date set by the Electoral Committee.**

. Reasoning. The Government may not wish to go, it would be better  
. if a group can order elections who are outside the Government  
. hierarchy, and can act independently. The Government can be a  
. group with a strong entrenched interests when it comes to  
. re-elections. To give the Electoral Committee a little muscle  
. flexing which it may need in time of crisis, it orders every  
. Election, whether the People or the Government ask for it.  
. The Electoral Committee is not involved in the proceedings, in  
. order to keep its task as clean and limited as possible.  
. Anyone should be able to be in the Electoral Committee.

##### 3.1.c-1.1 Electoral Committee, mandate

**The Electoral Committee is always elected in whole, unless a two third majority Referendum as defined in [Article 3.1.b-7](#), Authority overrides this rule to replace selected members.**

**Each voter votes for one person. Each person who gathers votes, but is not in the top 10, has the opportunity to award all its votes to one person in the top 10; these votes can not be sold or bought. The person who then has most votes in the Electoral Committee is allowed to award the votes that it has in excess of a majority over the person who has second most votes, to anyone, whether already standing in the Electoral Committee elections, or not; these votes can not be sold or bought. After this, the 10 persons with most votes comprise the Electoral Committee.**

The number of members is minimum 6 and normally 10. The Electoral Committee reaches its normal strength at least once every 30 years, through elections. When it has less than 6 members, there are immediate Electoral Committee elections. See [Article 3.1.c-1.1.1](#), *Electoral Committee, mandate eject*, for re-election before the mandate period is over.

Reasoning. In order for the Electoral Committee to order new elections, potentially in defiance of the elected Government, it needs its own direct mandate from the People. To relieve the burden of electing this routine body, it is only elected when needed. Officials can always be ejected through Referendum, 2/3rd in this case though, or re-election of the whole EC. The body can have a normal strength of 10. If however someone resigns, the body would suddenly become inoperable if it has to have 10 members. This can be a problem in itself, or require quick new elections. If the strength of the body can fall, electing new Committee members can take place at a later convenient time, such as during other elections (more efficient). By electing the Electoral Committee as one group, there is less chance of electing someone who is "entertaining" in stead of voting for someone who is "capable" in the position of King Elect, see [Article 3.1.c-1.8](#), *King Elect*.

The reason to only have elections to replenish the EC only after 30 years after its number drops from 10, is not to shake the EC unnecessarily. There really is no good reason to have EC elections, until the principle of the EC is starting to degrade itself.

If an older than the King person is number 8 in the EC elections, and the King has 30% votes in excess above number 2, while the persons number 8, 9 and 10 combined have total 5%, the King is in a position to choose (more than) 3 other people in the EC with its 30% excess. This also means that if there is a neck to neck race for first place, the winner may only have 1% leverage left, and is unable to change the outcome much. When 2 struggle head to head, a third may win. That is a good mechanism, reducing resentment between large sections. In the end they could be together again, in their mutual loss, good for stability. The excess-vote power of the winner is to not make a campaign needlessly complicated, with math to determine how many younger applicants you need to support without losing your top position, in order to maximize your chance of becoming King. Another interesting point with this election system is that if someone young wins the election and has more excess votes over number 2 than the person with least votes in the EC, the winner can appoint a King by awarding its excess votes to someone who would become oldest in the EC.

This complicated elect system should make the EC elections and therefore King elections an interesting business. It does reflect popularity, but it also reflects seniority. It potentially punishes a close rivalry for most popular position, reducing leverage to push out senior candidates for King, while you can also get into the EC by winning a 2/3rd referendum. But even then you still need seniority in the EC before you can be King. Since it is so subtle and dependent, it is more likely that people will say "alas, he/she won, he/she is King!, those are the rules of the game," and stop bickering over popularity contests and what might and who deceived who, etc. It could be exciting to see the election of the EC and therefore Kingship. Even the tiniest minority stands a chance with its candidate: if it has seniority, many votes are tied up in other candidates,



. and if numbers one and two are very close. Then in theory a  
. person could be King based on one vote and seniority (theoretical  
. possibility). It can also be King by being appointed in the  
. EC by the election winner, and having seniority. In any case,  
. changes can still be made through 2/3rd ejection referendum  
. later. Because the EC election may tip any way, it is hard to  
. predict. It seems likely there will be old persons in the EC,  
. because they would like to get seniority and be King, or be  
. second in line and such.

. Rules for electing the EC and King are probably the most complicated  
. rules in this Constitution. If it is too complicated or does not  
. work well, you could switch to the most popular in the EC  
. elections, or 'the most popular aged over 30, 40, 50, ...' etc.  
. Another interesting one is a lottery between the 10 EC members,  
. however there may always be doubts as to whether such a lottery  
. was done honestly, or if it was rigged; that would be hard to  
. determine for almost everyone.

### 3.1.c-1.1.1 Electoral Committee, mandate eject

**To eject one or more members of the Electoral Committee, a Referendum to eject, replace, or re-elect has to have more votes for change which are not compensated by votes against ejection, replacement or re-election, then the time adjusted - time adjusted as defined in Article [3.1.b-7.1](#), *Vote Decay* - value of the total of votes for all currently elected members of the Electoral Committee. It also has to have more votes than a previous such Referendum (time adjusted.) When this condition is met, the entire Electoral Committee is re-elected, unless the condition of Article [3.1.b-7](#), *Authority* has also been met, in which case the outcome of the Referendum is to be carried out. The Government has no vote in the Electoral Committee re-election Referendum, it does not fill the abstentions, an exception to Article [3.1.b](#), *Referendum*. See also Article [3.1.c-1.1](#), *Electoral Committee, mandate*.**

. Reasoning. These rules are starting to get a little  
. complicated. The idea is that the Electoral Committee (EC) is  
. usually elected in whole. When there are 60% of 'A' people,  
. 20% 'B', 10% 'C' and 5% 'D', electing/replacing each member  
. individually means that the entire EC will only have 'A'  
. people, since they always have the majority. When electing  
. them all together, you have a high chance that there will be  
. 'B', 'C' and 'D' (etc) people as well, which means the EC is  
. has more connections to different parts of society. The 'A'  
. people, if they play it smart, can still get 3 members  
. elected if they spread their numbers, but sooner or later  
. their leverage runs out, giving someone else a chance to be  
. represented in the EC. Since there is no time-table for EC  
. elections, they are either spontaneous through Referendum,  
. or when someone steps down or drops out for some reason.  
. The election threshold is for similar reasons as the normal  
. Referendum threshold: to prevent small groups from making  
. trouble, prevent them the capability of forcing the majority  
. to mobilize again.

. Since re-election is always an immediate possibility, the  
. King has an interest to maintain some kind of popularity  
. all the time, and one EC member can step down to force  
. re-election of the King as well; see Article [3.1.c-1.8](#), *King Elect*. The 2/3rd majority can force election of a  
. King, by replacing someone in the EC with someone who  
. would be oldest (who is removed?). The EC members are not

necessarily called "delegate," articles about "delegates" do not necessarily hold for them, such as that "delegates" can be replaced by their "voter block."

3.1.c-1.2 Electoral Committee, vote

**The Electoral Committee decides by majority vote, always a majority of 10. At least 6 members must support the decision. When no majority can be reached, new elections are assumed to have been ordered. The vote is public.**

Reasoning. A 10 headed body should be enough. It is little use to elect people if you don't know what they are voting.

3.1.c-1.3 Electoral Committee, sovereign

**The Electoral Committee does not order new elections if neither the Government nor the People seem to want it. Its decision to order new elections can not be repealed however, neither by the Government or the People, and not by removing the Electoral Committee members from their position. When in doubt on the wishes of the People, the Electoral Committee calls for new Elections.**

Reasoning. If the Government is breaking into the means with which the People express their opinion, it may become impossible to rely on Referendum or other means to get the opinion of the People. Therefore the Electoral Committee has the right to ignore all input, and order new elections. The worst that can happen is some wasted energy and a new mandated Government, perhaps along with a new Electoral Committee. If, however, the People want a new Government but can't get one because of procedures not in their control (meaning it would need a full scale revolution), such a Government can do a lot of damage, far greater than the cost of a premature election. Premature election can't do much real damage.

3.1.c-1.4 Electoral Committee, free

**Electoral Committee members have no other obligations to the Government, are not employed by the Government.**

**Exception: [Article 3.1.c-1.8](#), *King Elect*.**

Reasoning. Electoral Committee must operate independently from Government. Therefore the members can not have jobs with the Government.

3.1.c-1.5 Electoral Committee, salary

**Electoral Committee members receive one month salary per year, as defined in [Article 3.1.c-5](#), *Salary*.**

**Exception: [Article 3.1.c-1.8](#), *King Elect*.**

Reasoning. In order to be independent from Government (see [Article 3.1.c-1.4](#), *Electoral Committee, free*), the salary has to be defined elsewhere. A salary also means the members have one more reason to be on the Committee, and hence please voters to not eject them.

3.1.c-1.6 Electoral Committee, immunity

**The members of the Electoral Committee can not be interfered with in performing their Electoral Committee duty by the Government, the Police, the Justice system, or other Government agencies, etc.**

Reasoning. Protecting the Electoral Committee from rude Government tactics. Even if Electoral Committee members are in jail for real or false reasons, they still must be able to attend meeting of the E.C., and vote freely.

### 3.1.c-1.7 Police Loyalty

**Every individual policeman is directly Loyal to the Electoral Committee when it can concern the duties for which the Electoral Committee exists: such as ordering elections, changing Government through elections.**

Reasoning. Saying the government must go is one thing, having it removed could on occasion be another. No doubt some excuse would be in play. In case such a problem comes up, it will be good if the police know where to put their loyalty, if they want to serve the People. The worst that can happen is a premature election. It doesn't begin to compare with the damage a Government is able to inflict. With strong and explicit language in place, Government is more likely not to even attempt frustrating the Electoral Committee.

### 3.1.c-1.8 King Elect

**The oldest electoral Committee member is crowned after three months the King or Queen, Head of State. The day of a new King is a National Holiday when only emergency workers work.**

**See also Article [1.4.a](#), King Rule.**

Reasoning. In the interest of practicality, it may just be too difficult to have a nation that does not have one personal focal point. Politicians may work together, but are also each others adversaries. Where does one go if a matter is not judicial, but one feels it to be of the highest importance ? Where does the nation look when things are falling apart ? If politicians are bickering between them, it can be helpful to have at least one system that all pull on but that can not be divided because it is one person, a person that has a personal stake in the functioning of the nation because of its income (level) is depending on it. If this person is already as rich as possible, it makes no point for this person to seek more wealth. It could be interested in seeking a properly functioning society so that this wealth is maintained into the future. This is how wealth based kingship works. Therefore the wealth of the King follows the average-wealth, so that how hard the nation in total is working is directly reflected in the income of the King. This means the King has an interest in that everyone work and is as productive as possible.

The King / Queen can talk to the People using its wealth, and can use its wealth to employ. The King is constraint by the possibility of losing its position to someone else, therefore it is not necessary to force the King into some kind of function by law. Since the King is the oldest of ten, there is less chance the King will be someone who the people see as entertaining rather than capable. Someone who is older is more likely to have some capabilities. The King is an emergency system, in principle it does nothing, but if it has to it does everything that the Government normally does. It has the power to do certain inspections, but it is not required to do them at all. A well functioning system of society would never need Royal Inspection, and the King may very well spend its days in quiet luxury. This is not in the

. slightest a problem for a country, because the King is but one  
. person. Wealth and 'the rich' are only a big problem, when there  
. are so many of them. When 5% of the people is seriously rich,  
. the other 95% have to support all that, and it is a large burden.  
. In the past Kings may have gathered to themselves palaces and  
. the rich, making the total burden also quite high, and unchecked.  
. This King here has a defined wealth of, taking a Capital maximum  
. per person of 30 times average, 160 (4 x 30 + 30 + 30 / 3) times  
. (see [Article 8.2.a-8, Capital Monopoly](#)), the wealth of an average  
. person. Added to that 100 persons for defense, so that would  
. make at maximum 260 times average. That is practically nothing  
. when spread out amongst the shoulders of an entire nation. In  
. a nation of 30 million people, every person supports the  
. King  $260/30 \times 10^6 = 0.00087\%$  of average wealth, and the rich  
. pay most of that because of progressive taxes [Article 8.2.a-2,](#)  
. *Equality of happiness*. On a yearly income of 15.000 units,  
. 0.00087% means 13 cents per year. If 1% of the people had 30 times  
. average wealth (more then 8 times less then this King), then the  
. total burden would be 1% = 300.000 persons times 30 times average =  
. 9 Million times average wealth. Spreading 9 Million times average  
. over 30 Million people = 30% per person. For 15.000 units, that  
. means 4500 units, more then 3 month' wages. That is a lot more  
. expensive then the 13 cents for one much richer King. In the past  
. the King might have taxed everyone, and supported a rich layer  
. with that money. This King does not have such powers, at least  
. not normally when democracy functions (see [Article 1.4.a, King](#)  
. *Rule*). Conclusion: the wealth of this King is irrelevant on  
. a National scale, as long as there is only one King, and there  
. is only one.

. It's actions and what it can do for the Nation may not be  
. irrelevant, the King may reduce corruption and safe the Nation  
. from disintegration if that threatens. The profit in that, if  
. done right, might be the total of the economy, and many lives  
. saved. Why does the King need wealth at all: to give it a strong  
. reason to keep the Country in order, when too few other people  
. are so bothered. To give it some level of independence, to make  
. it less vulnerable to being corrupted, to make it grateful for  
. the Nation so that it will be there like the Nation has been  
. there for the King.

. The King is allowed to own more then any other, and it will control  
. more immediately, then any rich person in the Country. This is  
. to humble the rich, and put the King above them all. The oldest  
. EC member is not immediately King or Queen, the People have a  
. 3 months period to elect another King or Queen. If they don't,  
. they accept the situation by default. The day of a new King is a  
. National Holiday, to make it known there is a King to everyone,  
. and to rehearse the conditions of 'King Rule,' since on the  
. National Holiday everyone is in a way falling in line for the  
. King for one time. Making it an obligation by Law to not work,  
. means everyone can safely stop and not worry the competition  
. gets ahead in the mean time. It can also be a form of discipline,  
. this time on the Country and People. Maybe the emergency people  
. can get a free dinner and an extra free days later, to thank  
. them. Becoming King is probably work for the King too, and the  
. King is an emergency worker.

. It might be feasible to have a Nation without a King or head  
. of state. This could be attempted, it would not undermine the  
. Constitution in principle. I just don't think it is feasible,  
. but maybe it is, or maybe one day it would be. One could of  
. course always add or remove the office of King.

3.1.c-1.8.1 Duty of the King

**The King or Queen will write with the hand, in the morning, one Law of the Constitution, such as this Law 'Duty of the King,' until one full copy of this Constitution is completed. Then, when the evening comes, the King or Queen will write their version of the Law of the Constitution that they wrote in the morning, at least different in words, but optionally different in meaning as well. The King may choose one day in the week for resting.**

. Reasoning. I think it is an excellent idea to have the  
. King copy the essential Law. It makes the King know the  
. law, it makes sure the Law is every so often closely  
. inspected - every time a new King is elected. With essential  
. knowledge of Law, the King or Queen can better fulfill its  
. inspection if it decides to, without being bothered too  
. much with common law. This way the King may uphold the  
. Constitution above the common law, and may alert the nation  
. about problems within the Constitution, or suggest better  
. ways of formulation. The copying of the law would certainly  
. give the King some idea what the country is about, where his  
. income and power comes from. It may give the new King something  
. to hold on to, some discipline, when all other duties suddenly  
. disappear. The people may be pleased to know that their high  
. paid King is doing something. The King would only need to  
. copy the Articles themselves, not the commentary. (This  
. idea originates from the Books of Moses: 5.17:14-20.) The  
. King or Queen is to write in the morning, before noon when  
. the mind is fresh and an entire day remains in which the  
. King may (or may not) think about the article copied. This  
. also should give the King a sense of satisfaction for the  
. rest of the day.

. The King will then write near the evening a law, regarding  
. the similar issue, but their version of it. This version  
. would be creative, and when someone is creative it can  
. become quite clear what kind of person he or she is. This  
. way nobody can hide themselves. At the same time, it gives  
. a way for the King to suggest changes to the Constitution,  
. assuming the King has already some thoughts on the subject,  
. perhaps during the day. The King could also decide certain  
. laws should be scrapped, or if entire chapters should be  
. added. All the different copies of the Constitution could be  
. interesting study material whenever disputes on the  
. Constitution arise, since when a King Elect writes a rule,  
. it has some democratic merit, whatever it is, some material  
. to discuss. The copying preserves meaning against the drift  
. in word meaning that occurs in most languages over time.

3.1.c-1.8.2 Sovereign Inspector

**The Elected King or Queen has total and immediate access to all Government and Private Company places and information, from the time the King has completed its hand written copy of the Constitution, to the time a new King or Queen has been Elected.**

**The King receives the Insignia of Sovereign Inspector after completing its Constitution copies, see [Article 3.1.c-1.8.1, Duty of the King](#).**

**The King exalts Emissaries Of The King by allowing to carry the Insignia of Emissary Of The King.**

**The Emissaries of the King exercise the access of the King on its behalf. Any economic damage that might have occurred because of an inspection by the King or its Emissaries is reimbursed by the Government.**

. Reasoning. It seems useful to allow both the nation some  
. time to adjust to a possible inspection by a new person.  
. During that time the King or Queen can prove it is worthy  
. of the privilege (whether it is being used or not) by  
. becoming knowledgeable in the Law, and it can become aware  
. of what it is to do with the privilege, if anything. The  
. people can vote a new King or Queen into power when they  
. lose confidence, before the King or Queen would have gained  
. significant privilege. The King or Queen can be the eyes of  
. the People, able to see everything, without significant danger  
. to damaging privacy or other relevant secrecy. The King or  
. Queen has no executive power, therefore it poses no threat  
. itself, in contrast to historical Kings and Queens, who  
. concentrated many kinds of power within themselves: inspection,  
. law making, law enforcement, management, etc. This King or  
. Queen is more of a safeguard against tyranny. The King  
. can inspect the Government but not private businesses or  
. individual homes. Rather than inspecting the People, he is the  
. magical commoner's friend, keeping an eye on Government  
. (if it wants to, that is, there is absolutely no obligation).  
. Since the King is one person, the People are in a position  
. to keep track of the King, so while the Government inspects  
. the People, and the Government (and economy) are inspected by  
. the King, the People see what the King or Queen does; the  
. circle is complete and should function.

. The King should have some kind of 'magic access key,' so  
. that it can open anything and can be identified, even if  
. just symbolically (see [figure](#)). As a security measure, so  
. that not just anyone can be mistaken for the rightful  
. King. Certainly anything can be copied, but that has always  
. been the case, symbols can be updated to stay ahead of the  
. counterfeits. Bracelets seem less old fashioned than crowns,  
. and are a nice depiction of access while maintaining both  
. hands ready for inspection and tossing whatever needed. The  
. King could also carry its hand-written Constitution, to prove  
. his identity further, and to be able to check the laws of the  
. Nation if there is a need for it. Presumably only the present  
. King has access to the Symbols and that Constitution copy. I  
. think it is a nice thing for a King to wear these bracelets  
. when on inspection or otherwise in function, because it  
. signals that it is not just some person who got its hand on  
. some privileges. It means it is a person in function as part  
. of the system of the Constitution and society. Problems in  
. behavior or the rules themselves aren't to be directed to this  
. person, but to its function. The bracelets are there to protect  
. the King as a person, to absorb the discontent and possible  
. jealousy or other such issues. It is the King (on inspection),  
. accept it with grace, all other issues are subordinate and  
. you can take it up with the Constitution or the People later,  
. not with the King itself. This issue is related to the dress  
. of the Judges. No dress code exists for delegates, as they  
. are subjective and personally popular, they are personally  
. responsible. I suggest to make the Symbols beautiful, with  
. lots of detail: harder to forge and nicer to wear. Not some  
. sawn of pipe of aluminum with the name of the country scratched  
. into it. It got to have a little beauty and work to it, so as  
. not to reflect badly on the office of King. Whether the King



wants to wear a Crown or sit on an actual throne instead of wearing bracelets or a necklace etc, or all at once, this can be decided per Country or per King. The King is obviously free not to wear Symbols, it is the King so it does what it wants.

The Emissaries are a necessary component to the power of the King, because it would be impossible to single handedly inspect an entire nation even if one wanted to and had swift and complete access to everything; because it is safer for the King to be able to send others, which means the inspections may be carried out with less regard for personal safety; because multiplying the King means criminals can not track and evade the King as effectively. It says that "the King exalts," which states a possible procedure. The King may use its Emissary power, for instance, in a case where corruption has come to light, or where someone is alerting the authorities or the King of corruption. The King could exalt this person as Emissary, giving it total and immediate access to obtain any and all information. Whether this turns out right in a particular case, ultimately reflects on the King. The King may also send another Emissary, and invite a whistle blower as an adviser, or do it itself.

It is relevant not to reward the King or Queen too much or at all for becoming Sovereign Inspector, because if one rewards significantly, this would be a distraction when writing the Law. It will be impossible to think clearly and freely about the law, when you know that afterwards you are rewarded with wealth or luxury privilege. The 3 month delay for becoming King is there to make sure the right person becomes King, but once the King is King, it better have all the privileges that can count as luxury. The privilege of 'Sovereign Inspector' is not a luxury privilege, using it means working and doing good. This would therefore not be a negative distraction when writing the Law, but a positive distraction.

### 3.1.c-1.8.3 Speaking to the King

**No person speaks to the King bearing Insignia, without the permission of the King. No person denies the King bearing insignia, its rightful immediate access.**

**Whomsoever insults the King in either of these two ways, has attacked the Nation. Such as who get in the way of the pleasure of the King, are thrown in jail on tasteless food and water for one month.**

Reasoning. The King is one person, the King is to be protected with all possible might. There is no reasonable way how a single person can inspect an entire nation, without there being strong laws that protect behavior toward the King. What should happen otherwise, when the King wants to inspect something for reasons only known to the King perhaps, and people dare start dragging their feet, even threatening the inspector ? It is better to have people tremble in fear of jail if they utter one wrong word, since the King has an entire nation to inspect and no time to play games. There is only one King, and hence behaving well for once should not be too hard or too much of a burden. The only reason that the punishment is not crushing the scoundrel on the spot is that this crosses other principles, and the only reason the punishment is not eternal banishment from the Country, is

. that such severe punishment could come back to threaten the  
. King again. One month on bread and water is enough to make  
. a person regret its act and be out of the way of inspection  
. for long enough, but should not be enough to build up a  
. lasting grudge or be seen as some kind of extreme punishment.

. What should the punishment be if someone burns the files  
. of all delegates of the Country Council ? A slap on the  
. wrist ? No. What is the punishment for preventing the Police  
. to catch a criminal ? Making the work of the King more  
. difficult then it should be is similar, it prevents the  
. King from inspecting as much, and therefore finding what  
. it is designed to find. Whatever it then misses, that is  
. the extend of the crime in principle. Making the King feel  
. threatened, makes the King potentially miss even more. The  
. point is not that the King would always find something,  
. the point is that it on occasion might and always could,  
. its effectiveness is also to scare would be criminals,  
. who are otherwise quite hard to control, as they are the  
. control element in society themselves. This effectiveness  
. also depends on its speed. To re-iterate though: the King  
. has no duty to inspect. But it could have been part of the  
. platform on which it is elected. If the King puts down its  
. insignia, it can get back to normal life, giving it more  
. freedom. Remember that the King is the only person in the  
. system, who represents as one person, one entire branch of  
. the system. It is like all Judges or all delegates.

. Presumably the Emissaries are similarly protected, although  
. perhaps a little less harsh and more explicitly when `access`  
. is being denied or hampered more significantly.

#### 3.1.c-1.8.4 Protect the Throne

**The present King may buy out a person standing for  
Electoral Committee membership election. Once that person  
has accepted the sale, this person will not stand in that  
election.**

. Reasoning. People who can be bought may not be good  
. anyway, so why bother. It seems useful to make the rule  
. explicit, since it otherwise is too much like a bribe,  
. and would probably be interpreted as corruption.

#### 3.1.c-1.8.5 Protect the King

**The King or Queen may choose up to 100 persons, either  
willing or from the army, that will protect the King,  
wherever it is or needs to be.**

. Reasoning. It is all well and good to have laws that  
. say the King may do this and that. But when it comes to  
. it, and the King knocks on the door, it will be more  
. efficient if there are 100 persons heavily armed and  
. trained, to effectuate whatever rules there are, immediately.  
. This may protect people who think they can defy the King,  
. since while trembling with fear they will think twice  
. before making themselves guilty of a crime. Let them  
. tremble in fear for their King, let them know that they  
. can not defy their King as far as its lawful activities  
. are concerned, that is more efficient. The inspection  
. activities of the King are particularly targeted to that  
. which can not (apparently) inspect itself, such as  
. malfunctioning government or internal-police corruption.



.  
. When the King is up against state corruption itself, it is  
. useful that it has at least some fire power at its disposal.  
. Protection of the King extends to the emissaries, since  
. the protection is meant especially for inspecting, and the  
. Emissaries are there to make that job safer for the King.  
. These 100 persons are additional to the wealth awarded to  
. the King.

3.1.c-1.8.6 End of Reign

**The King's office can be removed by a Two Third Referendum majority. If in 130 years, the King has not needed to come into action to save the Nation, the last King will complete its reign and then the office of King will become dormant.**

.  
. Reasoning. When it is not needed, why keep it. What  
. exactly 'dormant' means is unspecified, perhaps it just  
. means removal of privileges and duties, but would still  
. technically be head of state, or perhaps not even that.  
. One reason to have the country without a King, is that  
. if it works, it would give a greater sense of freedom.  
. When the King is removed, the democracy would become  
. fully bottom-up with nothing to hold on to, no stationary  
. light to coordinate and navigate by. The Nation would  
. be held up only by a network of powers invested in varies  
. people. If in 130 years the King has not needed to do  
. something significant, there is a good chance it works.  
. The People/Government could certainly invest the inspection  
. power of the King somewhere else, or re-invest it in the  
. oldest EC member, through common law.

3.1.c-1.8.7 Start of Reign

**A Referendum majority can start up the King's office.**

.  
. Reasoning. When it is needed, start it. Now the  
. Constitution can be set in either without King or with  
. King mode when it is first being used. Referendum as in  
. how it is run normally, so with abstentions filled in,  
. see *Article 3.1.b, Referendum*.

3.1.c-1.8.8 King Income

**The Head of State, King or Queen, receives a monthly income an equal amount of times the average monthly income as the amount of times for maximum wealth in *Article 8.2.a-8, Capital Monopoly*. It is also awarded the use of wealth no less then four (4) times the Constitutional maximum, payed for by the Government, which is not counted as personal wealth. The King or Queen may privately own one third more then allowed for non Royalty, until its death and regardless of Royal status.**

.  
. Reasoning. See *Article 3.1.c-1.8, King Elect*.

3.1.c-1.8.9 King Election, fraud

**From the start of the day of a new King, any procedural errors or fraud in electing the Electoral Committee are only punishable to the perpetrators, and do no longer influence in any way the authority of the result.**

**Persons who intentionally claim to have a significantly different age then their true age are retired from the Electoral Committee.**

Reasoning. Is meant to undermine attempts by (cunning) people, who intentionally commit fraud and then let this be known, in an effort to undermine the authority of the King. I suggest such people be punished severely, for instance putting them on tasteless food for one year, and taking from them all their possessions except the legal minimum everyone has, potentially banishing them from the Nation. This show of outrage would help the authority of the King despite a questionable procedure. In this case: there is no way of knowing for absolutely certain what other voters would have done, had there been no fraud; things may very well have gone different, with the same end result. The law here says: we should assume that things would have gone differently with the same result, because if not, we're undermining the King stability, which is very bad because the King is meant to provide it. It has to be taken out on the perpetrators, assuming that's not the King or EC members themselves, to compensate that it can't be taken out on the idea that another person might have been King or EC members. Severe punishment would in turn deter potential fraud. This fraud classifies as an attack on the King, and therefore on the Nation, which makes banishment a fitting kind of punishment (after the year on water and dry bread - health permitting). If the King itself or EC members themselves have committed fraud, it will be a problematic case for the supreme law court. In such a case, if proven beyond doubt, there can be no question that the King and EC members have to be removed from office, so as not to tarnish the office of King. A guilty King is even worse than a tarnished King, the office of King being above the King: because the Law creates the office, and the Constitutional Law is above the King. However, given a grand demand for King rule of that particular King, the will of the People may even go above the Law, because that is the Law per the first article: see *Article 1.1.a, Power*. This is to protect the People from a detached judiciary, conspiring against the particular King. It is this kind of potentially problematic decisions that means the supreme Law Court (see *Article 3.2.a-3.5, Supreme Law Court*) will probably assume jurisdiction in the case. Above that jurisdiction stands, predictably, the actions of the Majority of the People, which are conditions beyond any law, though legalized under this Constitution, even if it is not capable of making it illegal. ``Punishable to the perpetrators'' gives room to demote a EC member or King, as that would be a punishment. This would also conform to the rule that liars are retired from Government: see *Article 3.1.c-3, Public Government*.

### 3.1.c-2 Decisions

**The elected Government comprises delegates who decide by majority, unless the condition of *Article 1.4.a, King Rule* has been met.**

Reasoning. The Government can have all kinds of forms, but it should not be 'winner takes all' because this has proved to be a system that breeds a closed government controlled by only one centrist party, preventing new groups from entering.

### 3.1.c-3 Public Government

**All proceedings of Government are public. Elected officials who keep secrets from the Public are guilty of treason and are retired from Government.**

. Reasoning. If they are not public, the Government is not democratic,  
. but acts as a club of privileged people pretending to form a  
. government. Secret Government is hard to defeat, it should therefore  
. carry heavy penalties.

3.1.c-3.1 Public Government, finance

**All movements of money and the reasoning for that movement by financial service groups (see Article 8.2.a-5, Investment service group) are published and readily accessible to the public, including the amount, the recipient and the origin.**

. Reasoning. The public needs casual and continual updated information  
. about all financial acts of the government, unless the amount of  
. money is not significant and would therefore needlessly harm a  
. person's privacy. Seeing these financial acts and their reasoning  
. provides the public with a way to verify what the government is  
. doing. The information needs to be published continuously, so that  
. interested researchers can look into the acts of government without  
. the government knowing whether someone is investigating. The  
. "movements of money" regarding housekeeping of the service group  
. itself (coffee/tea, etc) does not need to be published. These  
. payments can be routed through the Government housekeeping system,  
. and therefore not be regarded as by the finance service group.  
. This also establishes a wall between these types of payments.

3.1.c-4 Structure

**The elected delegates elect a smaller Council from between them, if their number is impractically large. That smaller Council does not again elect a yet smaller group of leaders.**

. Reasoning. To elect many delegates means the delegates can have  
. close ties with their constituency, but means that the size of  
. the Government can become impractically large. For practical reasons  
. it will have to be trimmed. However once a group of practical size  
. has been reached, they can make decisions through debate and voting,  
. overseen by their housekeeper who maintains discipline. That is  
. enough, it should work. The person who chairs the meeting fulfills  
. the role of the single focus already, there is no need to contract  
. government into yet fewer persons for discipline and coherency.  
. The danger is that a few people may try to pull in all the power in  
. the council, by suggesting they are to become the official leaders.  
. Instead the best suggestions are to be the leaders, and if someone  
. is very capable, then its proposals would simply make it more often  
. than those of others. If delegates choose not to show up at meetings,  
. the council would become smaller. That is not the same thing as  
. electing leaders in the council, if delegates are not interested  
. then let them stay away. This way the Council would react dynamically  
. to the degree it is needed to make decisions. When there is little  
. need, though the Council may have 50 members, perhaps only 5 do the  
. day to day work when nobody else shows up. When there is a lot of  
. work and interest, most could show up. Presumably the people who  
. do not show up are ignored during votes, they could still show up  
. later and in case of disagreement with previous decisions undo them.

3.1.c-4.1 New Government

**The elected delegates can elect a new Government at any moment.**

. Reasoning. The Government has to remain in line with the  
. elected delegates. If it isn't and the time for re-election  
. hasn't come, the problem can be solved by electing a new  
. Government.

3.1.c-4.2 New Government, limit

**The elected delegates can only elect a new Government .[3].. times, if they want to elect yet another Government after said number of times, a general election electing new delegates is called for.**

Reasoning. Since the Government can fall so easily, it is more efficient if the elected delegates can re-elect a new Government quickly. The Government can fall quickly, re-electing by the delegates alone for a fixed maximum amount of times means that the Government is punished, without causing too much cost to society by forcing complete re-election. It is like a two stage break, Government can be slowed or halted. See *Article 3.1.e-3, Public Consultancy, Government limit.*

3.1.c-4.3 New Government, delegates

**Delegates that have been elected by a limited group can be replaced at any moment by this limited group through valid voting procedure.**

Reasoning. When a voting procedure is set up so that defined groups such as territories, companies, trades or self organized groups elect their delegate, such a procedure awards close contact between delegate and actual individual people. To make best use of this in enhancing democracy, the delegate is to be subjected to the pressure of casual replacement at any moment. When a delegate can only be replaced every so many years, past mistakes tend not to be punished and a delegate tends to "play nice" shortly before election. This stimulates the wrong kind of people to hold on to power. When delegates get elected into `further' bodies, they are both elected by their voters block, and a voters block of delegates. Both groups can replace their delegate at will, which means dual liability for further body representatives. More power, more liability. Should be noted that high profile politicians will tend to find a new block of voters or delegates that want to elect them, which reflects their popularity and therefore is justified. When multiple people want to be delegates, they can propose they are on a rotation list with their voters block, so that the voters elect every so many time the next on the list. This may just be done because it is fun to do, so why not, it makes the link between People and Government closer, and a solution for competition for delegate position in a voter block: time sharing.

3.1.c-5 Salary

**The elected delegates are paid: the median hourly income. On top of that the delegates get housing, transportation, food and drink for free, which is given only proportional to the amount of time they work, unless the delegate works an amount of hours equal or more the average for income earners in the country.**

Reasoning. Money buys loyalty. Because housing food and drink is free, delegates never need to worry about basic life necessities, and hence have more reason to be loyal to the People, who pay for all these expenses apparently generously, since there is no limit. They would be less interested in small corruption, since they already have that playing room. And they will deal directly with "infinity," which is what Government finance also has to deal with. This generosity hopefully affects the good side of the character of the delegates. There still is a certain limit: the amount of consumption can say something about the politician in question, and affect re-election

. and immediate rejection, so it isn't that the politicians are without  
. control.

. It is a bad idea to tie the income of elected delegates to the average  
. total income, because the average rises if exploitation increases:  
. people work harder, even if they earn less and profit goes to a  
. power elite. The wage is not tied to minimum-wage, because it is  
. hard to predict how minimum wage will develop in the public-finance  
. economy economy. It may be that there is a reasonable minimum wage,  
. but that almost nobody is at that low rate. In an economy without  
. private finance, wealth is likely to be spread more fairly, making the  
. legal minimum wage much less important than it is under capitalist  
. exploitation. It isn't that great an idea if the elected delegates  
. earn not roughly what is similar to most. They shouldn't get much less  
. which is an insult. They shouldn't get much more either which is also  
. an insult (presumed greed), and also ties them into the wrong crowd  
. (the fringe rich). Presumably the housekeeper of the council is  
. responsible for the salary bureaucracy. Delegates would pay money  
. for their food in the economy, this money is then payed for by  
. Government. A problem are delegates that rarely work, for instance  
. because they have elected a further body. These people obviously  
. should not get free food, transportation and housing. If delegates  
. have maybe one working day a year, they could get a free dinner  
. that day, and some pay for the hours and benefits, but not more.  
. That would all become much too expensive, while these delegates  
. have more than enough time to have another job in the economy.  
. Once a delegate works ``full time,' then there is no limits on  
. these free benefits. Since full time delegates are most important  
. to the Government, the money spend there buys best value. The  
. term `income earners' is to close a loophole that wants to compute  
. the average including the sick, the young and the dead.

#### 3.1.c-5.1 Salary, bonus

**For every time a delegate has worked the amount of hours an average person works in one year, that delegate gets a bonus of one median hourly wage multiplied by the amount of hours the delegate has worked on average per month over that period. This bonus is multiplied by the amount of times the delegate has worked the amount of hours an average person works in one election period as defined in [Article 3.1.c, Electing Government](#), plus one.**

. Reasoning. It seems unfair that politicians can't grow in  
. income as other sectors can, when they do their work well.  
. Second it is a good thing to strengthen the politician's goal  
. for re-election with a tangible monetary reward, that will  
. get bigger every time the politician is elected. However hanging  
. the bonus on election is a problem when politicians can be  
. rotated in and out of Government at the pleasure of the voters  
. block, therefore the bonus hangs from the worked hours of the  
. delegates. This makes the harder working delegates get more  
. money, not just because they get it sooner, but it is also  
. proportional to their amount of work per month it would be  
. higher. It is useful to have a method that makes the delegates  
. work harder, since being the Government there is not a lot  
. that can make them work. This bonus is the carrot part of  
. reward/punishment. There is a chance that a delegate will  
. share its income with its voter-block, a form of voter bribing  
. perhaps. But the bonus is not too large and it comes about  
. once a year, so the delegate will likely want to keep the  
. money while it wouldn't really be enough to bribe an entire  
. block of voters.

### 3.1.d People Government

**One group of adults assemble out of their own initiative.**

**Once they have chosen from between them a vote block housekeeper that is responsible for correct voter registration and verification, they are allowed to have one representative, which can be anyone in or out of that block, except their vote block housekeeper. The People or in their absence the Country Council decide on the minimum size of a voter group.**

**The minimum size for a voter group is: ..50 persons.**

. Reasoning. This system of Government is meant to put Government and the People so close together that they become indistinguishable.  
. When voters vote per quite small block, everyone, however humble of nature, has a real chance to be selected for representative.  
. This would be completely out of the question in case of a national ballot and career politicians. The main problem with government is corruption and it becoming a separate class, the problem is not that making decisions is in any way difficult or unattainable with sufficient advice. Making decisions is a prerequisite for learning, therefore making decisions should be given to the people, particularly the ones having a tendency to make mistakes. Such mistakes will not happen easily anyway, because of the systems that glue popular opinion to what the Government can do. A mistake will be carried by the majority.

. This set-up may seem difficult at first, where as a simple human being does one gather up another 99 to vote someone in power ? In practice there are already numerous kinds of organizations in society, if for no other reason then that we'd all starve to dead if we didn't cooperate. These organizations easily assemble several tens of people with similar interests, who can then join up with other such people to elect someone to look out for their interests and stability of society in general. From the political side, a political will is not expressed only as a political party, but it can also be expressed as joining together as many groups of 100 people as possible, so as to improve political power for that group. When things go wrong, people start being interested in solving a problem, they start organizing voter groups. Also, when an individual wants power, he may lobby people to form a group, and others to follow its lead to form yet more groups to vote for representatives that agree with this person. Political power would depend on the ability to bring people together (for good or bad, though), which does sound rather nice doesn't it. Since bringing together people would be based on affinity since these would vote for a certain representative or common interest, it is likely the political system would bring the same kind of people, who might then share between them more then just voting.

. During an enactment of the Constitution: when it is enacted by a formed Country Council, it can be said that the People are at first absent, or that their support is not specific yet to every detail. This should leave some room to play with the group size until it works during the beginning time. Later, and if support remains, or if there is a formal ratification vote from the People, then the number here probably represents the People. Alternatively: if it is felt better to have this or any other variables under the power of the Government, the Constitution can be enacted without these numbers. These numbers can then be filled back in by Government decision, and changed at any moment. The number could then say: `to be determined, see there/there for current value.'

. Updated (ammended) wo jan 25 12:09:54 UTC 2012:  
. Housekeeper and delegate of a voter-group: same person or not



. It is probably in general better that the housekeeper of a  
. voter-block, and its delegate are not the same person. That way  
. power in the voter-block is spread around more, the housekeeper acts  
. as an anker inside the voter-block away from the political issues,  
. as a bulwark against the possible rethoric (demagoguery) from the  
. delegate when in debate with its own voter-block. Another problem is  
. that a delegate who is also the housekeeper of its voter-block can  
. become intoxicated with its own power, and therefore may develop a  
. tendency to behave less decently in the councils, causing unnecessary  
. frictions. The voters in that block may on the other hand cower from  
. the delegate, turning the power relations between the voter block  
. and delegate upside down (the voter-block should rule the delegate.)  
. The proposed law however says: (see above).

.  
. They can elect "anyone in or out of that block," hence this also  
. includes the housekeeper. This problem is probably an oversight, I  
. did mean it as two different persons. On the other hand one may ask:  
. what right does any law have to minutely detail what a relatively  
. small group of only 50 persons do, how they want to organize  
. themselves ? Perhaps this should stay a recommendation in that case.

.  
. Propose to add to this law 3.1.d: "The housekeeper and the delegate  
. of the voter-block are not the same person." To prevent people first  
. selecting a house-keeper and then electing that houskeeper also as  
. delegate, arguing that from that point on it has lost its housekeeper  
. role - which seems a reasonable interpretation of the law in that case,  
. it is changed by adding: ", except their vote block housekeeper."  
. That should add a neutrality to the housekeeper during the voting  
. procedure, it secures it more firmly into its role as servicing the  
. voter block, and in its role as a contra-balance to the chosen delegate.  
. End ammendment.

#### 3.1.d-1 Government Body, minimum size

**The minimum size for a Government body is 50 delegates. 49 Delegates  
or more, and 1 delegate elected council housekeeper by the council.**

. Reasoning. It is important that representative bodies maintain  
. an element of mass, so to ensure a reasonable copy of the make  
. up of the people and their will. Larger size makes it more  
. difficult to make secret policy.

#### 3.1.d-2 Closest Government Body

**The delegates assemble into groups determined by their own majority.  
They are to mutually accept a joining with delegates who are unable to  
form a legal council because of lack of delegates, see [Article  
3.1.d-1](#), *Government Body, minimum size*.**

**They choose from between them a council housekeeper that is chairing  
meetings, is responsible for information distribution, overseeing  
the vote block housekeepers that elect delegates, but has no vote right  
in the council. They then takes a vote on whether the Council is with  
too many, and if so how to deal with it.**

**After the size problem - if any - is resolved, and the Council has  
determined a name for itself by agreeing that a majority has been  
reached for a certain name, it can make decisions in that name, by  
majority, within the context of the Constitution. Then the agenda is  
set, conforming to [Article 3.1.d-2.1](#), *Council Agenda*.**

. Reasoning. The housekeeper is necessary to maintain stability,  
. and it must not itself become all powerful therefore it loses  
. its vote right. The geographical nature is practical, otherwise

. chaos would result quickly from impossibility to determine  
. jurisdiction, and cooperation tends to be simpler when people are  
. close enough to see each other regularly. The `context of the  
. Constitution' part, is to point at certain rules that limit the  
. power of Government and that places certain demands on Government.  
. Such as that it can not change the Constitution by vote, that it  
. must consult the People, respect referendums, comply with certain  
. war/peace protocols, etc.

. In case interest in partaking in Government is very low, the Government  
. would be sparse in its number of delegates, with few and far between  
. councils. In principle this is not a problem. The minimum of 50  
. council members would make every council stretch its influence over  
. a larger and larger area. It is not the case that the councils are  
. based on clumps of houses such as villages or cities, they're based  
. primarily on assembling 50 delegates or more. If in a city there  
. are only 30 delegates because only 3000 people united for voting,  
. they'd not have a 30 delegate Government body, but would need to  
. join up with neighboring towns until reaching 50 delegates, and rule  
. over the combined geographic area. If a rural area feels oppressed by  
. cities, they could form groups until reaching 50 delegates, and have  
. their completely rural councils. In case this isolates a group with  
. too few voters to form a council, the council would be forced into  
. other councils, where it presumably could form a minority, hence the  
. accepting councils should not be bothered extremely. This will make it  
. not unlikely that the existence of councils and Government would change  
. in time dynamically, as it is depending on how many people partake  
. in voting, and also on how the delegates assemble themselves in  
. groups. This certainly ensures there is always some Government,  
. unless in the entire country there are less than 5000 voters, in which  
. case there is no legal Government under this Constitution. Presumably  
. by the time there are that few voters, there is no clear need for  
. a Government, and having none is what the people want. At any moment  
. a working Government could come into being, though, to determine an  
. issue, since voting and support for the Constitution are different  
. issues.

. The reasons for demanding a name for the Council itself is besides  
. practical, to give the Council a sense of responsibility for keeping  
. this name in good standing. The council determined its own name,  
. hence the existence of this council is their mutual work, for which  
. performance (in the public eye) they become personally responsible.  
. Making a name for themselves is also the first test of procedure  
. in the Council. Since the first issue is more or less procedural,  
. any delegate partaking would lose its natural right to step out of  
. the Council during subsequent debates/votes and blame it on the  
. organization of the Council itself. The naming issue establishes  
. the housekeeper as in control, giving it precedent and experience  
. to handle more sensitive problems. The fact that there must be  
. agreement that a majority had been reached, and not just to declare  
. a name after the first majority ignoring the minority, means that  
. everyone is ending the naming procedure positively, minorities may  
. lose a game but are not ignored in the mutual effort that is the body.  
. People who disagree with the establishment of the majority itself, are  
. in contradiction with the obvious procedures of the council itself.  
. There would be a vote on the name, and perhaps 60% votes for a name  
. and 40% for another name. When the 40% acknowledges the 60% majority,  
. the name is accepted by accepting majority rule procedure rules over  
. the minority, setting precedent for proper procedure. If they do not  
. want to acknowledge the 60% majority, perhaps they have a valid reason  
. to doubt the count and have a right to demand a better procedure  
. for voting. If not, they may want to consider stepping out of the  
. Council before they implicate themselves in it, because it would be  
. their last opportunity not to assume responsibility for it. If they



. do not step out after disagreeing with the majority rule procedure,  
. they have apparently accepted it.  
.

. After these things are done, the council is operable: it has an  
. experienced housekeeper, majority rule has precedence and acceptance,  
. it can sign its decisions with its name and be referred to by the  
. public, it has a place where it has convened. It became a council  
. when the delegates were capable of electing a housekeeper without  
. breaking up, this council past its exam to make decisions by making  
. a name for itself. When multiple councils pass their exam in one area,  
. all of which claim to speak over that same area, the councils either  
. merge, or retract themselves to different areas. That means there  
. needs to be no holding back when making councils, there is no  
. central coordination needed. Just make the councils and when someone  
. else also does so, there really is no conflict, but an opportunity  
. to work together. It is great if people take the responsibility to  
. create councils through proper procedure, standing fully in their  
. Constitutional rights. Councils can also be created when there is  
. already another Council known in the area, because once there is  
. valid voting procedure and enough delegates, they automatically have  
. the right to establish themselves over their area. The whole  
. council governance is dynamic, the governing bodies can really  
. change from hour to hour, and it would all be legal as long as  
. the votes were valid. To the degree this produces problems, the  
. courts settle legal disputes, and the country council settles  
. inter council problems, which by definition are not local problems  
. since they involve multiple local councils. They would then have  
. a certain right to say something about it, which can be enforced  
. through the courts who must uphold the Constitution, in which it  
. says the country council decides in country-wide problems.  
.

. See also: *Article 3.4.a, Local Space, Article 3.4.b, National*  
. *Space and Article 3.1.d-6, Ministries.*  
.

. Dealing with over-crowding: split up into multiple area Councils,  
. the closest body elects a further body, a further body (see *Article*  
. *3.1.d-3, Further Government Body*), requests larger vote blocks of  
. delegates in the closest body on which it is based.  
.

#### 3.1.d-2.1 Council Agenda

**Unless emergency, issues are set on the agenda at least 7 days prior.**

. Reasoning. For this bottom-up democracy to work, transparency  
. and predictability are essential. Some delegates may only be  
. part-time delegates, having a week's notice means they don't  
. need to be in the council every day to keep an eye on things,  
. so that not suddenly something is discussed they would want to  
. be part of. The same is true for the public. With ample warning,  
. the quality of discussion could also improve, and people who  
. feel a need have time to give advice and prepare. If the  
. councils are run from moment to moment, pretty soon nobody  
. except a few professionals know what is really going on. That  
. would erode the standing of Government, and its mandate. Making  
. it Constitutional Law means people can rest assured that if  
. they look once a week on the Agenda, they know what is going  
. on, and can undo decisions that do not conform. Brings air and  
. relaxation.  
.

#### 3.1.d-2.2 Council Law Making

**Debates and decisions on new Law are set on the agenda at least two months prior. A new Law comes into force not sooner than two**

months after it has been both voted into the Law, and the result has been published widely.

**Every law made by a further council, including the Country Council, must be explicitly approved by a majority of the delegates which are represented in that council by a public vote.**

Reasoning. Changing the Law is an extremely serious business, it is as if one were to make an infinite decisions all with one decision. Secondly, changing the Law changes everything, so everyone will have to know what laws are going to be discussed and have a realistic chance to find out in time, and everyone will need to have plenty of warning before a new law becomes effective. There must also be a time frame large enough to nullify the decision, through one of the control powers of the People. With adequate delay, there is also time for court cases prior to something becoming law, and there is time for people to flee. The issue of whether to discuss an issue of Law, new law, how the agenda itself should be set, can obviously not be part of the obligation, since that would mean no Law could ever be discussed and voted upon. The issue of setting the agenda will potentially involve some rudimentary discussion on the subject, to establish whether there is use for a debate. This would have to be tolerated only to the degree it does not deprive the people of their warning-time, to be present, and only to the degree necessary to prove there is a need for a point on the agenda.

Updated (ammended) Mon Oct 8 12:19:03 UTC 2012

#### Separation of power: law maker

In this system as proposed the Country Council can make laws under the Constitution, but can not change the Constitution without having a public Referendum. There is a longer waiting period for a law to come into effect, which is hoped to mean that the system will have time to block bad laws.

It is easy however to separate the law making power from the budgetting and ministerial powers of the Government ('executive power') by simply adding a Constitutional law saying:

Every law made by a further council, including the Country Council, must be explicitly approved by a majority of the delegates which are represented in that council by a public vote.

The benefit of this is that it becomes harder for the councils to push through laws while 'the people' in general are lazy or not interested. It forces the directly elected delegates to lend their name to the law, to come out of any sleep they are in and vote. Historically it has seemed to be a good idea to separate the law maker from the executive branch, which is something that is usually not contested. Because of the proximity to the people of the directly elected delegates in this system, and the seperation they therefore have from the Country Council, such a Constitutional law which demands the directly elected delegates to vote on each proposal of law by the further councils (Country, Provincial and other twice elected councils) would probably mean that the law making power and the executive

. power are more separated then they have usually been under  
. the parliamentary systems which have so far attempted to  
. separate the executive and law making powers. If there  
. is any good to expect from this separation of powers,  
. which there probably is despite earlier arguments here  
. to the contrary (claiming that a law is merely a more  
. powerful general decision and hence law making and general  
. budget and ministerial directives could be made by the  
. same group to be more in harmony that way), then they  
. may come out better under this model of Government then  
. those of previous decades & centuries.

. Since caution is the greatest concern in relation to  
. Constitutions and their job of enslaving the Government  
. and constraining their members from abusing their power, I  
. would personally think (on second thought) that separating  
. these powers this way is probably a safer way to do it.  
. (It seems reasonable to simply add these new lines to the  
. above law.) The nation and supreme Judges will have to watch  
. out for games by a corrupting Government to the effect of  
. re-labeling what effectively is 'law' to avoid this duty.

### 3.1.d-3 Further Government Body

**The delegates can assemble out of their own initiative into at least 50 blocks, each block allowed to send a representative that is already in their block.**

**The Further Government Body, a policy decision council, is organized in the same way as the Closest Government Body, see [Article 3.1.d-2](#), *Closest Government Body*.**

. Reasoning. Closest bodies based on 1% of the people can get large  
. quickly, therefore it is practical that they elect a further body  
. and leave day-to-day matters to that body. The closest delegates  
. can then go back to other activities and only use their power in  
. a verification function, incidentally when things are going wrong.  
. The closest body has the true power, it gives it by proxy to a  
. group of more practical size. Council is an other word for Government  
. decision making body.

. The set up proposed here only has a local Government and a national  
. Government, no explicit intermediate layers. The delegates can  
. however decide to assemble over an area of any size larger then  
. minimum amount of delegates, they would simply elect a Further Body  
. if the size of the delegates group becomes too large. Hence the  
. local Government may rule local power over an area of a large  
. size. Then as a power of the local Government, it can establish  
. Ministries [Article 3.1.d-6](#), *Ministries*, which can for instance  
. be given the task of local Government in some smaller area. These  
. Ministries can have a locally elected Management again, turning them  
. into a local representative Government which does not have to conform  
. to the rules of Councils. This would be a top-down approach to  
. area Government.

. A bottom-up approach is for delegates not to join other delegates,  
. but to elect together with neighboring delegates an area advice  
. council. This area advice council would then give all the actual  
. Governments advice from the perspective of the larger area, without  
. it having any power of its own.

. These two forms can be mixed in the same area and dynamically  
. adapted. Delegates are certainly always free to leave and start

. their own council, provided they are from a consecutive area,  
. have at least 50 delegates and don't go against the will of the  
. local people. If other delegates in the area don't do this,  
. the area that does maintain a local Government could still take  
. the decisions of the neighboring larger local Government as  
. an interesting point of study, as if it were an advice council  
. for them.

. The reason not to demand mid-level management is because it  
. seems to get too confusing for bottom-up democracy. If there are  
. all kinds of layers, it gets confusing very quickly. Now there  
. are only two layers: local and national, but it is flexible enough  
. to create various kinds of mid-level management dynamically, so  
. that when there is an actually good reason it can be created  
. dynamically.

. Further body delegates can be ejected by their vote-block, but  
. can stand in another vote-block, which can then swap their  
. representative. When the again elected delegate finds a vote  
. block of closest council delegates that wishes to put that delegate  
. in the further body from which it was just removed, it would  
. again become a delegate in that further body. This means widely  
. popular delegates will have a significant chance to maintain  
. their position, independent of their original voter block. They  
. could boot-strap themselves to the same position, using a different  
. ladder. A delegate may decide it is under inappropriate pressure  
. from its vote-block, which is the good part of this. A delegate  
. may also be able to fool the general public but not its own  
. block for long, which can be the problem part.

#### 3.1.d-4 Advice Council

**Council delegates can elect Advice Councils given specified issues to advise on. The Advice Council issues the same advice to Government and the People. Anyone can be elected into an Advice Council.**

. Reasoning. This is a way to get expert advice into Government,  
. without giving these experts any executive power. They can only  
. advise and hope for the best. They are forced to give Government  
. the same information and the People. When Government is overrun  
. by people with best intentions but lack of understanding, the  
. advice council is a great way to get some rationality into  
. government decisions without that threatening the balance of  
. power. In theory an advice council could become powerful  
. if all its advice is followed, yet the moment it goes wrong it  
. only hangs on the string of good will and belief of the People's  
. Government. This precarious position would stimulate the advice  
. council to stay on course, and it would not be much of an  
. attractive place for corrupt people - there is no real power in it.  
. This set up can make it easier for the real experts to have the  
. influence (platform, funding) they deserve.

#### 3.1.d-5 Country Council

**All closest representative bodies divide into 50 geographic blocks of equal numbers of voters, each block sends one delegate to form the Country Council.**

**The Country Council is organized in the same way as the Closest Government Body, see [Article 3.1.d-2](#), Closest Government Body.**

. Reasoning. An efficient way. But one geography can not vote,  
. as it would give the housekeeper, without which there is no

. country council. This should inspire the country council to  
. look beyond the needs of their region and to the needs of  
. the whole country. That is why they are there, to provide for  
. an overall view, not only to lobby just for their region. The  
. housekeeper position can be made to rotate if that seems useful.  
. It will be a good idea that one region is responsible for the  
. integrity of the country council itself, in a way the hand that  
. lifts the country council high enough so it can do its work.  
. A well functioning country council then reflects positively on  
. the area giving the housekeeper, the interest of that area  
. becoming the well functioning of the council itself. An  
. interesting twist is to let the country council meet by  
. rotation in the different regions. It could for instance go  
. to the next region every year or 4 years, lottery deciding where  
. to go next, thus giving more informed and equitable coverage to  
. the whole country.

.  
. The Country Council is the body which oversees the entire country,  
. territorially it is oversees the largest area. When the Country  
. Council wants a mid-level government layer, it can create  
. Ministries that focus on a specific area, just as the local  
. Government can also do. That would provide for a mid-level  
. Government flowing from the Country Council, applied where  
. needed. Such mid-level Government would have its authority  
. flowing from the Country Council, and hence have a legal  
. status accordingly, see *Article 3.1.d-2, Closest Government Body,*  
. *Article 3.1.d-6, Ministries, Article 3.4.a, Local Space and*  
. *Article 3.4.b, National Space.*

#### 3.1.d-5.1 Country Council, Constitution

##### **The Country council maintains and repairs the Constitution.**

. Reasoning. The coherency of a country relies on its law. If  
. local Governments wish to implement novel contra-Constitution  
. laws, they may wish to consider breaking away and forming  
. their own sovereignty. When local Governments want to go their  
. own way, then do it for real and not create some kind of  
. chaotic and diffuse law situation; do it, or don't. This way  
. the People know what they have.

#### 3.1.d-5.2 Country Council, Currency

##### **The Country Council maintains the currency of the country.**

. Reasoning. The currency is a constant throughout the area  
. assembled in the Country Council. The maintenance of the  
. currency is a major power point in a country, its potential  
. influence internal in the country is great. Making currency  
. policy is what gives the Country Council a source of real power,  
. lifting it above a mere area advice council. In practical terms  
. a currency defines a country. The article leaves open the  
. possibility of currency union with other nations, but fixes  
. the responsibility of such a union and the continuation of  
. it in the Country Council. The Country Council can at any  
. time step out of such a union.

. Updated (ammended) wo jan 25 11:54:05 UTC 2012:

. The above commentary on this law is incorrect: the article  
. does not allow a currency union because in a currency  
. union the Country Council is no longer maintaining the  
. currency. An international currency union also breaks other  
. laws of national Sovereignty in this system. Currency union  
. was never envisioned in this system, but the idea left

. open to make this Constitution less defined and appealing  
. to people who want currency unions (in particular between  
. extremely small nations.) See also the sheet 1 "A better  
. Future ?" quote '(not global) currency,' which was  
. inspired on this thought also. No currency unions are  
. envisioned to work or exist in this system.

. To future Imperialists:

. Where greater union is desired: unite the nations outright  
. - but why; Imperial lusts getting the better of the people again ?  
. Give up the lust for domination and menacing other nations,  
. so that you won't be pressed with your face in the dirt.  
. Empires (+- 60 million persons and more ?) seem doomed; perhaps  
. even nations, but to a lesser extend. When a Kingdom (+- 5 to 27  
. million persons?) falls, it falls with less dire consequences  
. than an Empire, getting to their legs again easier. Trade over  
. the border fairly, and give up the domination obsession, which  
. is an obsession that leads to nothing. Isn't that why nations  
. unite: to menace, destroy and loot a third, and then a fourth ?  
.. End ammendment.

### 3.1.d-5.3 Country Council, Core

**The Country Council is the core Government of a country. It does not submit itself to the rule of other bodies, neither internal in the country, neither external from other countries, and neither external rising from a coalition of some or all other countries. The Country Council denies its own resources to come under direction of management bodies in whole or partially external to the Country. It retains direct executive control over its own resources, which do not include independent companies, within the context of the Constitution.**

. Reasoning. This is already implicit in that the assembly  
. can not exceed a set number of people, see *Article 1.2.a,*  
. *Territory*, and in that the country is and remains sovereign.  
. However it seems useful to spell it out in bold detail, so as  
. to deny international scheming, plotting by politicians seeking  
. to attain new levels of power. The government can neither submit  
. itself, nor parts of the country, to international management  
. bodies. If there are international cooperative efforts, the  
. Government has to maintain a direct line of command to its own  
. resources. Independent companies are excluded from the rule, the  
. point is not to put everything under Government direction, but to  
. maintain the Government as sovereign in its territory.

### 3.1.d-5.4 Country Council, Local Law

**The Country Council determines by Law the bounds for creating Local Law by Local Authorities.**

. Reasoning. The Country Council is responsible for the  
. coherency of the Country. If it can decide by executive order  
. which law is or is not - at its pleasure - permissible locally,  
. it would practically take over local Governments. If it has  
. to create Laws, which afford some additional time constraints,  
. there exist a pressure to be (more) equitable about these bounds.  
. If the Country Council does not set any bounds at all, then  
. the Local Government may explore how far it can go, which is  
. presumably up to the limits of the Constitutional obligations.  
. This may produce high differences in Law between regions. That  
. is in itself not necessarily a problem, however it could make  
. the country incoherent and unworkable. The Country Council is  
. responsible for the nation-level problems, however local law

. is in principle a local issue. This article gives the CC the  
. leverage to maintain a coherent Country. It could say that Local  
. Governments have zero room to make Local Law, or that it could  
. make any Law compatible with the Constitution.

#### 3.1.d-6 Ministries

**Policy decision Councils form Ministries - subordinate organizations that handle Government tasks - when needed. The ministries can be organized along the lines of a Monopoly Sector Service Group, see subarticles under [Article 5.1.c](#), *Service Group*.**

. Reasoning. Point being the Council makes the ministries and  
. administers them, the Council does not first elect a yet further  
. and minute top body or top Leader, who then appoints ministers  
. to oversee ministries subordinate first to the Leader and then  
. controlled by the Council. In such a set up the executive power  
. would be concentrated yet one step further, above the Council.  
. The set up here proposed keeps the Council in the highest position  
. above the ministries, it handles executive power directly. The  
. control function that a Council that first elects a leader has,  
. is in this proposal fulfilled by the closest Government body and/or  
. the People. The Council is the executive. When there is disagreement  
. between Council members, majority rules, if there are continued  
. disagreement that somehow can't be solved: go to Justice. Ministries  
. do not only exist on the National level, local Governments would  
. create local Ministries to handle their tasks.

#### 3.1.d-6.1 Ministries, Distributed

**Ministries are distributed throughout the area of Governance.**

. Reasoning. The Government concentrates income from taxes  
. from the entire are of Governance, it is only fair that the  
. additional employment this brings is distributed back into all  
. communities. Distribution of Ministries would also mean  
. distribution of Power to different areas, so they can all get  
. hold of a part of Government. The distance between councils  
. and Ministries should make Government a more formal business,  
. more transparent for the Public, more structured by rules and  
. less `smoky back room' policy making. When there is a  
. distance between varies important Ministries, Communications  
. should be more formal, this could reduce corruption.

#### 3.1.d-7 Immediate representation

**Whenever a representation becomes legal at the moment of assembly of voters in a new block electing a delegate, or whenever a representation becomes illegal at the disintegration of an assembly of voters, the legal status of affected body and representative is changed before the next day.**

**When a delegate is not informed by its voter block or someone else of changes about the legal status of the delegate, the delegate retains voting rights in the council(s) it is in, provided it does not actively evade such information.**

**When a voter block housekeeper steps down, the voter block retains all rights to representation for the duration of one month, after which it disintegrates if it does not elect a new housekeeper.**

. Reasoning. When a lot of people don't care about government because  
. all is going fine, but suddenly the Government acts up strangely,  
. the People must be able to immediately group into otherwise redundant



. voter blocks, send their delegates in, and have them vote for changes  
. that will make Government conform to the will of the People. There  
. can not be any doubt that delegates can be moved in or out in one  
. day notice or sooner, so that Government can not claim a imaginary  
. loophole that says it remains static up to the next elections, claim  
. bureaucratic time delays, or some other flight of fancy to retain  
. power as before and force its decisions. Since the Government is in a  
. position to force its opinion using arms and police, it is important  
. to leave no room for doubt. The reason for the change to be effective  
. before the next day and not at the instance of change, is so  
. that delegates can at least be sure of their power until the next  
. day or until they actually hear about a status change, and their  
. work is not retroactively powerless. Having to constantly wonder  
. whether one still has had power the last few hours and whether one  
. actually was allowed to work does not produce good work on the part  
. of the delegates. If they are not evasive to their voter block, their  
. work is legal regardless of what happens with the voter block. Because  
. the voter blocks are a loose and low intensity kind of organization,  
. the vote blocks have a lapse of one month to refill their housekeeper  
. obligation, assuming that the work of the house keeper remains valid  
. throughout the coming month which is probably reasonable, even on the  
. short side. There is no such delay for council housekeepers: if they  
. are gone the council stops existing and re-emerges when it re-elects  
. a new housekeeper. Since the work of the vote block housekeepers is  
. overseen by the council housekeepers, the vote blocks are usually never  
. without some housekeeping oversight.

#### 3.1.d-8 Discipline Day

**Every year the delegates present themselves in total to the general public in the area they are elected to govern.**

. Reasoning. A common problem with bottom-up Democracy is a certain  
. amount of confusion of who is who, the discipline day is to take  
. away such confusion. It is to show the delegates who really is  
. boss, and who really needs to be disciplined. By making this a  
. constitutional obligation, it is not a toy for the Governments,  
. the obligation goes over their heads, just as the power of the  
. people goes over their heads. Whether the King or electoral Committee  
. count as delegates is undefined here, it may be useful to have  
. the King or Queen and the electoral committee present themselves  
. at least once a year as well, to prevent any possible confusion,  
. and to confirm them in their role.

#### 3.1.d-9 No Bribes

**Government delegates are prohibited from accepting gifts of a value greater then one day work against average salary. Delegates keep a public record of the gifts which have a value larger then the average income for one hour of work.**

. Reasoning. Obviously rich people must always be prevented to simply  
. buy up the Government, or parts. At the same time the rule shouldn't  
. be so strict as to prohibit delegates to accept a bouquet of flowers,  
. a book. Since the delegates keep a public list, they can wash their  
. hands clean when accepting gifts, even if such gifts seem questionable  
. at the moment of them being received. The issue can later be dealt  
. with. Since it is arbitrary to set a boundary for gifts, the  
. constitution sets an arbitrary boundary for the sake of clarity.  
. if the delegate receives a cookie or a flower, the delegate shouldn't  
. have to take out a notebook in order to conform with the Constitution.  
. such extreme demands would only erode the law, since nobody would  
. keep them.



### 3.1.e Public Consultancy

**The Government routinely consults on all decisions all people who wish to be consulted.**

. Reasoning. the government must have a formal way to know what the  
. People want, even though not all people may want to be bothered about  
. everything and/or all the time. In the absence of complete involvement  
. of all people, routinely involving all interested people is the next  
. best solution. The People can explicitly take the initiative, because  
. Government should not pretend a limited or non existent consultation  
. to have fulfilled its obligations. People and/or organizations of  
. people can register themselves for the Consultation process, and  
. start voting on issues they want to vote on. The Government is in  
. the position to verify the validity of subscriptions of people to  
. the Consultation process, since a group claiming to speak for many  
. people or an individual claiming not to have registered already, can  
. be asked to surrender proof of their assertions before being taken  
. serious. Hence the Government would only need to verify what is already  
. present, which is primarily that there are no false voters paraded  
. into the process. Since consultation is a Government obligation,  
. the infrastructure and bureaucracy to count votes and verify claims  
. would fall to the Government, but the Government does not need to  
. do everything, such as go by people's doors to ask whether they want  
. to participate. The public initiates, the Government facilitates and  
. verifies, this should keep cost down on the Government, and make sure  
. the process isn't overused by people not that interested anyway.

. One interesting aspect of Consultation is that it brings a level of  
. formality to every Government decision, since even if it is just a  
. formality - which it not necessarily is, since there are potential  
. consequences - it is still something that needs to be done. The  
. decision has to be presented, it has to be voted on by outside parties,  
. so the reading material has to be prepared with some quality and  
. understandability in mind. The publication means transparency as well,  
. since people can not vote if they do not know. On the other hand,  
. the Public assumes responsibility for the decision, and delegates with  
. ulterior motives could win a case by citing different arguments that  
. the public agrees with anyway, more or less clearing such a delegate  
. of possible guilt of deception.

. A reasonable set-up is to debate an issue in delegate council  
. until it has a majority, and then present a more abstract decision  
. for ratification procedure, involving the Consultancy. During the  
. Consultancy some ideas might come up, which can be added without  
. altering the Consultancy success vote, if that success vote did not  
. involve a decision with too much detail. Doing it this way would  
. really involve the Consulting public, but not bog down Government  
. too extremely in procedures. It will always be the case that there  
. are main issues and detail issues, you can not ask every single  
. detail issue. One can ask if somewhere a building should be build,  
. one should not ask what the color of the coffee cups is going to be  
. in that building. The public will be able to steer the process in  
. great detail by electing certain delegates and ultimately use the  
. Referendum. Because the public has other means to force a decision,  
. policy making routines should assume a level of breathing room when  
. dealing with details, which is warranted. If walking a dog without  
. a leash, one might need to grab it in the neck. But when it is on a  
. leash, it can and should decide where it wants to walk, both dog and  
. walker would feel fine as the leash is there to set the boundary when  
. necessary. The word 'decision' hence does not involve every minute  
. detail, which is how the word is usually used as well.

. Example: some talk about a building and how and what in the council,

. a plan results; the Consultancy is asked 'do you want a building,  
. for instance such as this plan suggests'; then the Consultancy comes  
. up with some votes and comments, which either move against the whole  
. plan, or result that it shouldn't be a building but a bridge meaning  
. a new plan and new Consultancy are needed, or it results in minor  
. modifications such as 3 stories instead of 4, which means the plan  
. could be modified if delegates wish to go along, without having  
. to again issue a Consultation, or the delegates go forward with 4  
. stories anyway without having another Consultation, since the question  
. 'building yes/no' was confirmed, in this 3 or 4 stories are not  
. significant. If the Consultancy results 'no building if it is 4  
. stories,' then going forward with 4 stories is going against the  
. Consultancy. Hence it matters a lot what exactly is asked and what  
. exactly comes out of the Consultancy, which presumably is not just a  
. multiple-choice procedure rigged by delegates. Being confused about the  
. limits is not a problem, the public has its means to get its way, and  
. a major issue has been achieved: the Government has taken in the will  
. of the interested public. That is relevant, since the Government has  
. the obligation to do the will of the Public - it is just a matter of  
. determining it which can be a point of contention (is it the delegates,  
. is it the Consultation, is it the referendum, ...).

#### 3.1.e-1 Public Consultancy, Practicality

**The Government condenses and formulates decisions in such a way that the practical application of [Article 3.1.e, Public Consultancy](#), is helped as much as possible, from the perspective of Government but especially from the perspective of the People.**

. Reasoning. The Government could discourage the involvement  
. of the People by issuing consultation about masses of details,  
. obtuse wording and other tactics. This must be made illegal  
. in order to prevent the Government the ability to practically  
. severe communications with the People.

#### 3.1.e-2 Public Consultancy, abstentions

**The number of abstentions is divided by the number of representatives in the body concerned with the consultancy, each representative is allowed to add that number of votes to the option of its choice. The abstentions-adjusted result determines fractions with which options won votes in the total of votes.**

. Reasoning. This provides a convenient way to deal with the meaning  
. of high and low numbers of voters. The fewer voters means more  
. conceding power to any mandate already in force, more voters  
. means more wish to force a decision despite what representatives  
. want. People who do not vote are diverting power to representatives.  
. The votes/abstentions fraction in the people is not to be changed  
. by this procedure. This abstention-adjusting means that the  
. consultation process can be turned into an empty shell by the  
. people if they in majority don't register (or register explicitly  
. as abstentions). Such abstentions give up some potential  
. influence and detract from the power of what they could have  
. influence with, which is fair. See also [Article 3.1.b, Referendum](#).

#### 3.1.e-3 Public Consultancy, Government Limit

**The People or in their absence the Government set a maximum number of times that the elected Government can move ahead with their own decision and disregard the Consultation result, as defined in [Article 3.1.e-2, Public Consultancy, abstentions](#). If the number is exceeded, new elections are held for that Government body by the**

persons that directly elected it: A Further Government body is to be re-elected by the elected delegates who elect it (see *Article 3.1.d-3, Further Government Body*), a Closest Government body is to be re-elected by its voters (see *Article 3.1.d-2, Closest Government Body*.)

**Maximum number of times different Consultation result can be ignored without forced re-election: .[12]..**

. Reasoning. `Consultation' isn't a continues form of referendum  
. Government, because this could become distracting, people  
. having to watch Government's every move, while there is always  
. the referendum to force it to adhere. Allowing Government not  
. to contradict endlessly the consultancy process means it does  
. not become a futile process. See also *Article 3.1.c-4.2, New*  
. *Government, limit*. The idea is that the Consultation would  
. sometimes result in an answer after abstention-adjustment that  
. is different from what the delegates voting alone results in,  
. that this should have some defined impact. It already has a vaguely  
. defined impact, see *Article 3.1.a, Government Intention*, which  
. leaves doubt as to whether the People's opinion is reflected  
. in either the choosing of the present delegates, or through the  
. consultation. The delegates are pushed a little by this article,  
. not to ignore the consultation discrepancy outright, not too  
. often. The People can proceed with a Referendum: as long as enough  
. people show up to vote, the Referendum abstention votes amount to an  
. insignificant force for the delegates, and therefore would override  
. the Government. The People can also choose to elect different  
. delegates.

. The re-election is by the people directly electing the body, is to  
. not have everyone bothered by people who are highly interested in  
. politics and with the Consultation process.

#### 3.1.e-4 Public Consultancy, Registration

**People can forward their personal act of consultant to someone else, who will service their consultations for them.**

. Reasoning. To prevent the consultation process to become  
. monopolized by obscure groups or professionals, people who  
. have no time to continuously watch government must be able  
. to forward their voice to a proxy.

#### 3.1.e-5 Public Consultancy, Public Proxy

**People who are proxies for more then one other person, vote publicly, by hand-raising or similar.**

. Reasoning. The danger exists that consultancy becomes a  
. strange bureaucratic process, where large block votes  
. from mysterious sources decide everything.

#### 3.1.e-6 Public Consultancy, Demonstration

**People who demonstrate (march while carrying clear messages) have their number counted to the consultation process, as long as their number is above a minimum limit.**

**Minimum for demonstration to be a factor: .[1%]..  
or: .[10.000].. (whichever is less).**

. Reasoning. People who demonstrate show strong will toward  
. a certain goal, which suggests a larger force. If they

. participate in both consultation and demonstration, this  
. force is reflected. A clear and non bureaucratic alternative  
. to a consultation process, open and free for all.

## Articles [3.2](#): Law enforcement

### 3.2.a System of Justice

**The people or in its absence the Government set up a system of Justice, which only adheres to the abstract laws set for it, to uphold the law of the nation. The system of Justice decides based on argument, in fairness and transparency. The Judges behave honorably and exemplary under the law at all time.**

. Reasoning. The laws set by the People or their proxy Government  
. have to be enforced, or there would be no structure at all in  
. society. When there is no structure at all and too many individuals  
. act too much in their short-term self interest, the resulting  
. chaos can be worse to bear for most, then a structure of laws.  
. judges must behave exemplary, or else they neither have the moral  
. authority, nor the belief in the law, nor the apparent fortitude  
. to speak Justice. This means that Judges risk losing their job over  
. the smallest of infractions of Law, which in turn would give Judges  
. an intimate idea about the severity of the total Law pressure in  
. the country, which could have a positive effect on how they judge  
. others.

#### 3.2.a-1 Courts of Justice

**The Country establishes courts to the amount necessary, which handle legal disputes.**

. Reasoning. It is useful to have legal disputes be solved,  
. solving the problem of merit in practical cases. If there is  
. no such body, disputes would presumably have to be settled  
. through violence. The legal disputes can be between individuals,  
. companies and individuals, companies and companies, the government  
. and non-government parties, parts of government and other parts  
. of government, even governments and other governments, etc.

##### 3.2.a-1.1 Courts of Justice, Judges

**The People or in their absence the majority of delegates in the area install Judges for the local Court of Justice.**

. Reasoning. It seems useful to derive the power of  
. a judge from the delegates (since the People would probably  
. be absent most of the time), as a judge can have a strong  
. influence. Basing it more closely on democratic power, means  
. its judgements are likely supported by a great many people  
. in the area. This should give the judge more authority.

#### 3.2.a-2 Judge Court

**The Country establishes local appeal courts to the amount necessary, which handle complaints about cases held in the courts of Justice in their area.**

. Reasoning. It could happen that justice is not done in the  
. normal courts, an appeal Court reduces some of the power of the  
. normal courts.

##### 3.2.a-2.1 Judge Court, Judges

**The People or in their absence the majority of delegates in the area of Jurisdiction of the Judge Court install the Judges for the Judge Court in that area.**

**Judge Court Judges are older then 40 years, each has served as a Judge in other courts a minimum of 15 years.**

. Reasoning. The election system is the same as for the  
. normal courts, but these judges must have significant  
. experience.

### 3.2.a-3 Law Court

**The Country has one Court deciding over disputes of law itself.**

. Reasoning. There can be contradictions or seeming contradictions  
. in law, it can not be the task of the Government to hear such cases  
. and determine what should be done, since that would be too much of  
. a burden for a Government body.

#### 3.2.a-3.1 Law Court, Judges

**Law Court Judges are approved by the People or in their absence the Country Council, see [Article 3.1.d-5](#), *Country Council*.**

**Law Court Judges are older then 40 years, each has served as a Judge in other courts a minimum of 20 years.**

**The by the Country Council once approved Law Court Judge(s) only become Law Court Judges when there has been one general election of delegates in the nation, and the approval is upheld by that new Country Council.**

. Reasoning. Naturally the people have the right to select their  
. Law Court Judges, but nevertheless they need to be older then 40  
. years with 20 years experience. Since the people don't need to  
. be involved with details like this, it will typically be the  
. country council that accepts judges into the Law Court. With  
. 'The People' is meant the People's referendum, adjusted for  
. abstentions by the country council in this case, see [Article 3.1.b](#), *Referendum*.

. Updated (ammended) wo jan 25 11:30:25 UTC 2012:

. The problem with this is that the Country Council might  
. want to install judges to the law court, and that way  
. influence cases that are between the law court and the CC,  
. which is what many cases may be about because they involve  
. legislation from the councils.

. It may be better to add a qualification that a judge its  
. approval only becomes effective after the next general  
. election of delegates. The court is then shielded from  
. the influence of the current delegates, who may be the  
. ones in court contesting a case.

. One could say "but the People are not absent" when there  
. is already judges, but that is too vague, especially  
. because the judges are likely already routinely installed  
. by the CC. Added: The by the Country (...) is upheld by  
. that new Country Council.

. This ratifies the addition to the Law Court through  
. the general elections back to the People, causing it

. to have a better mandate. The demand to have it twice  
. approved by the CC is then only in case when 'the People  
. in their absence' do not do it. How do the People install  
. a Judge: for example by Referendum. Since Referendum  
. is not mentioned, and the People is contrasted with the  
. CC here, and the CC can be an indicted party, it seems  
. that the more reasonable mechanism would be that it is  
. a Referendum without the CC filling in the abstentions,  
. but where a large majority of the people wants to install  
. the new judge. However now we get into the usual problems  
. with Referendums again: 'what is a functional majority' and  
. 'what about is an amount of voters that is enough' ? Then  
. we would be back with the 3.1.b Referendum, which the  
. People can also use. One could say: the 3.1.b Referendum is  
. still good as a way of representing the will of the people,  
. because in the time when the Referendum is coming about  
. the People have the chance to change their delegates.

.  
. The above addition at least prevents a CC to add new  
. judges to the law court. I'd say this is a mistake in the  
. Constitution as presented before, this way the problem  
. might be corrected.

.  
. Another solution for a 3.1.b nation wide Referendum where  
. the People want to install a law court judge, is that not  
. the CC fills the abstentions, but all the delegates in  
. the nation.  
. End ammendment.

### 3.2.a-3.2 Law Court, Discipline

**The Law Court Judges will wear the same dress, selected by  
the majority of all Law Court Judges. All Judges under the  
Constitution follow the dress of the Law Court of the Nation.**

. Reasoning. I think it is important that the Law Judges  
. present themselves in an objective way since they are not  
. a political/subjective body. This deflects the idea of  
. personality and personal political ideas. It shows a level  
. of self discipline and order which should count as credit for  
. a body which is to enforce discipline under the law from others.  
. Having a bunch of different looking people may quickly give  
. rise to the idea: why is anyone listening to these people,  
. how are they like as individuals, whom does claimants like  
. most and who decided what, to whom should claimants feel  
. a personal grudge (friend/foe), etc. By removing subjective  
. appearance, the Court would be an objective unity, shoulder  
. to shoulder against chaos. What it is does not matter, and  
. neither would matter things like earrings or bracelets,  
. within reason. Since they have to wear it, they can choose  
. and update it. Their choice will propagate to all other  
. judges, which reflects that their choice of Law interpretation  
. propagates to all other judges as well. The Law Court Judges  
. may also feel responsible (which they are to some degree) for  
. those that they allow to wear their dress, which is a good thing.  
. In order to keep the standing of all Judges high, all Judges need  
. to be OK since they can't be distinguished easily. Judges can't  
. work that easily for their own individual credibility if they  
. are not easily distinguishable in dress in the public eye. If  
. they can't work individually, presumably they must act for the  
. collective credibility harder, and bring misbehaving Judges to  
. trial to clean their collective image. Such a trial against  
. another Judge would then again reflect on all Judges as positive,  
. while if one Judge acted against another and the trial failed

. to produce for that Judge, it would be negative for that individual  
. Judge. If it fails for an anonymous Judge, it would still count  
. as credit for all Judges, because they apparently zealously attack  
. their own to maintain obedience to the Law. The dress is probably  
. nowhere as important as for the Judiciary. The Judiciary may want  
. to select their dress wisely, so as not to reflect a bias toward  
. whatever group in society, since dress often portrays social  
. allegiance. The public on the other hand could gain some insight  
. in the Judiciary from its dress, and complain/applaud accordingly,  
. so the responsibility lies ultimately with the People in reaction  
. to all Judges.

. Talking so much about the dress of Judges may seem over the  
. top, however without Judges all Law is useless, there would be  
. no recognizable society and probably total chaos and famine. The  
. authority and qualities of Judges is essential, even details can  
. matter a lot. If there is no reason to regulate the Judiciary in  
. detail, then presumably there is no reason for Law in the first  
. place. These things have always remained important, while dress  
. for other groups has faded in relevance, for good reason. As  
. a matter of fact this system is quite liberal, allowing Judges  
. to change their dress code. Different dresses in different  
. nations may be useful, it denotes the legal system the Judge is  
. working under, establishes the Judicial territory of the Nation.

### 3.2.a-3.3 Law Court, strength

**A regular Law Court case is heard by 7 Judges, who decide by majority.**

. Reasoning. A reasonable size, not extremely large or small.  
. Decision could have far reaching consequences and lead to new  
. law making, so it is useful to have it not depend on a couple  
. of people. At the same time making the Court as large as 12  
. for example, might give it an independent group dynamic with  
. leaders and followers, leading to a loss of individual opinion.  
. 7 Judges means every single Judge will be heard, even if it  
. is silent. It is in theory conceivable that different Law Court  
. chambers rule seemingly contradictory on the same issue, there  
. is no solution for such cases and it should not even be a problem.  
. If it is a problem according to the other courts, new cases  
. would filter through to the law court, or the law court judges  
. may feel compelled to suggest the Government repairs the law  
. to make it less ambiguous.

### 3.2.a-3.4 Law Court, removal

**Only the People through a Two Third majority Referendum in the area of Jurisdiction, or a Law Court Decision, can relieve a Judge from the Court of Justice, the Judge Court or the Law Court. A Law court Decision to remove another Law Court Judge requires the case to be brought before the Supreme Law Court, see Article [3.2.a-3.5](#), Supreme Law Court.**

. Reasoning. Once the judges are installed by the People or  
. Delegates, which is not a difficult procedure, they will speak  
. Justice and may in this cross the will of the present Government  
. or large parts of the People. Therefore their position has to  
. be independent enough, which is achieved by making removal hard.  
. Because Judges can only be relieved by the central Law Court -  
. there is only one Law Court but with any number of judges to the  
. degree necessary - the Court of Law will be able to maintain a  
. certain objectivity and similarity throughout the Country, and  
. Judges know what they are dealing with wherever they speak



. Justice in the Country. This set up will reduce the differences  
. between Justice in different areas. The Two Third majority of  
. Referendum will always have to be supported though, since that  
. is the executive power of the People. Having it in would mean  
. the local majority, while leaving it out might give room to  
. the interpretation it has to be national or is not a valid  
. procedure. By making removal hard, people may think harder about  
. who to appoint, to get it right the first time. There is some  
. credit to the idea that deciding over Law and Judges is the same  
. level of issue, therefore belonging to the same Court. The  
. 'behave honorably and exemplary' in 3.2.a, is also to  
. give the Law Court the leverage needed in this matter.

. The removal of the Law Court Judge involves all Law Court  
. Judges, because: this way all Law Court Judges will gain  
. intimate knowledge about what they should not do in case  
. there is a relieving of duty. This is necessary to maintain  
. the credibility of the Law Court. The proceeding itself is  
. high profile, which means the Law Court Judges will not risk  
. lightly to be indicted, and hence behave themselves more  
. admirably. Because there is always the Referendum option for  
. the People, which does not require any additional legal  
. justification for removal, the Law Court is not fixed in  
. its power, which might lead to corruption. Corruption in the  
. Law Court seems unlikely though, it is all rather abstract  
. and high profile, while bribery is more likely to happen in  
. the Court of Justice, because cases involve weighing truth  
. as well as Justice which makes them more complicated giving  
. room for Judge freedom, there is a higher volume of cases  
. meaning less scrutiny per case, and it is the natural first  
. contact between people who would bribe Judges and the Judicial  
. system. The Law Court is unlikely to become a problem.

#### 3.2.a-3.5 Supreme Law Court

**The Supreme Law Court is the assembly of all Law Court Judges, who rule by their own majority. It has jurisdiction over sensitive cases concerning Constitutional Law, such as - but not limited to - cases involving the Electoral Committee, the King, and the Country Council.**

. Reasoning. When the Court has to decide on issues that are  
. of far reaching consequence, such as whether or not to annul the  
. declaration of a state of chaos by the Electoral Committee, it  
. is important that such decisions are widely supported by all  
. judges, and that the decision is not in fact decided by the  
. mechanism that appoints certain judges to certain cases. This  
. chamber gives Law Court judges a way out if they feel the issue  
. is over their heads. The Supreme Law Court may refer cases back  
. to the normal sized chambers of the Law Court, giving the Law  
. court judges the necessary confidence, if they were in doubt as  
. to their jurisdiction. There is no obligation in the Constitution  
. for the Law Court to follow its own previous interpretations,  
. although all other courts are required to follow them, and the  
. Law Court could dismiss a case if it had already ruled on the  
. issue and feels it will not change its position.

#### 3.2.b System of Police

**The People or in its absence the Government set up a Police force subservient only to the Law, which investigates crimes already committed, verifies that the Laws of the Country are being followed, and brings people who have broken the law before the Court of Justice, while providing all gathered evidence to the Court of Justice.**



## **The Police is present in all areas requiring Law Enforcement.**

. Reasoning. See [3.2.a](#). The law is nothing without Judges, but  
. criminals won't normally go freely to the Judge to ask permission  
. to be punished. It usually takes someone to force them. The police  
. handles the entire task of Law enforcement, which means there is no  
. dependency on for instance the King and its privilege to knowledge  
. see [Article 3.1.c-1.8](#), *King Elect*. If the Police is present in every area  
. of Law Enforcement, they will be primarily responsible for every  
. area and can not assume someone is taking over some area, even though  
. others may be working there as well. The Police could quickly adapt to  
. shifting crime, it gives the Police a better idea of the total of crime  
. they are up against, it gives the Police more knowledge and resources  
. to fight complex forms of crime. It also means people can demand the  
. Police to look into any breach of the Law, whether it is accounting,  
. violent crime or littering the streets, if that is against a law. The  
. Police could never say 'we do not do that type of crime,' if they  
. did they'd be liable for trial, and/or the delegates responsible.

. The decisions of Councils are enforced or not like this: the Police  
. is obliged to uphold the Law. It is the Law that gives Councils a  
. defined Authority. When someone crosses the will of a Council, and  
. the Council stands in its right according the Law, the Police will  
. have to see this as crossing the Law. The Police will have to  
. oblige by the Law which ultimately means obliging to the requests of  
. Justice (Judges), defined in the Law, and the Law directly - the  
. Police can also read the Law, as anyone can. It will then have to work  
. to repair this breach of crossing the Council for the sake of the  
. Law. This is different from a Law enforced because the Council/Leaders  
. order it, even though it is in practice usually the Councils that  
. make the Laws. The Law forms everything, even itself. That is what a  
. Law state is, law is not a toy of the executive, but the executive is  
. a toy created and operated by the Law, who through it updates itself.  
. It is the subtle difference between absolute dictatorship and the rule  
. of Law. The Police would therefore always have to think when getting  
. requests from the Councils - can not call them orders - whether  
. the requests flow from the Law through the Council to the Police,  
. or whether they just originate in the Council. The Councils would  
. hence always have to have a legal argument accompanying their  
. request, or supply one when asked on what Authority their request  
. is based. Ultimately a Judge would make a decision on the basis of  
. existing Law. The Police is neither a toy of the Council, it is a toy  
. created and operated by the Law, which ultimately answers to and is  
. created/supported by the People, and itself (coherency).

. This means that a Council could order the Police to do its bidding  
. when there are Laws that make it so, though. On the other hand, the  
. Laws are designed to invalidate certain laws that go toward tyranny.  
. When there is a Council that passes a law that says the Police must  
. do anything for the Council, this Law or actions under it should not  
. hold up in Court because of (many) conflicting laws, that prohibit  
. all kinds of behavior. However eventually these safeguarding laws  
. could be eroded, since the Law can be changed. It is therefore very  
. important to maintain the Constitution in a self-coherent state,  
. maintain it as the supreme Law (as if that is not self-evident).  
. It should be noted that the Constitution does not allow for a state  
. of emergency suspension of the Constitution. Even so it would be  
. important to make sure what exactly the Laws are concerning the Police  
. and the Power of the Councils, so as not to get unpleasant surprises.  
. An attempt at tyranny will likely cross the border of making the  
. Police a toy of some (pretense) executive force, by passing a rule  
. that makes it so, or by claiming some kind of suspension condition  
. war, calamity, or ... "public majority support". Since this

. constitution is based on the support of the Majority, the Majority  
. would need to be careful in what it is exactly supporting in Majority,  
. as it may invalidate and put out of power the entire Constitution !  
. On the other hand, Majority power also validates the Constitution,  
. and invalidates changes that are not supported by the Majority.  
. This could be useful when prosecuting people afterwards.

\_3.2.b-1 Demonstration

**The Police may not prevent peaceful mass demonstration.**

. Reasoning. A mass demonstration is a way for the People to express  
. their opinion, no crime has been committed. If a Demonstration  
. comprises a majority, it also comprises a valid Referendum and  
. is therefore a sovereign force, able to lawfully depose government  
. and assume its authority. `Prevent' is a word wide enough so that  
. a demonstration could be steered so as not to be needlessly  
. disruptive.

\_3.2.b-1.1 Demonstration, Government limit

**Governments may not order the Police to prevent mass demonstration.**

. Reasoning. Making it illegal for Government to give out certain  
. orders, making it easier to win legal cases since Police could  
. usually claim it had to follow its orders, no such obligation for  
. Government.

\_3.2.b-1.2 Demonstration, size limit

**The People or in its absence Government set a numerical  
limit to when a demonstration is a "mass" demonstration (see  
Article [3.2.b-1](#), *Demonstration*).**

**Size Limit: ..[50.000]. or ..[10%]., whichever is less.**

. Reasoning. Not every group of 2 or 3 people should be able  
. to disrupt society and claim to be a "mass demonstration".  
. A percentage is also needed, because in small communities a  
. large number makes no sense.

\_3.2.b-1.3 Demonstration, frequency limit

**The People or in its absence Government set a numerical  
limit to how often a demonstration by the same people is allowed  
to march under "mass" demonstration protection (see Article [3.2.b-1](#),  
*Demonstration*).**

**Time Limit: .[1 year]..**

. Reasoning. It will be tiring to watch the exact same group  
. marching again and again, just trying to disrupt life in general.

\_3.2.b-2 Company occupation

**Governments may not order the Police to repel or prevent occupation  
of companies by a two thirds majority of its working people.**

. Reasoning. When the majority of workers move against  
. a minority of the company, the group dynamic of the  
. company is acting. It is not for the Police to use  
. external weapons to force the will of a minority on  
. a majority, because moral and physical power lies  
. inherently with any majority. All involved can be

. presumed to have an interest in keeping the output of  
. the company adequate, therefore this is not inherently  
. a state matter, much less a Police matter.

3.2.b-2.1 Company occupation, limit

**The People or in its absence the Government set a numerical limit above which a company is large enough be protected under Article 3.2.b-2, Company Occupation.**

**Limit: ..[30].**

. Reasoning. Some companies are small, tiny groups of  
. 2 or 3 employees do not appear to be able to form a viable  
. democratic company, against an entrepreneur who also has merit.

3.2.b-3 Anti Pirate force

**The Police protects transportation and travel through international territories.**

. Reasoning. The army shouldn't, because it is too aggressive and  
. essentially aimed at other Nations.

3.2.b-3.1 Weapons Authorization

**When the Police maintains public, accurate and timely records, also for other Nations of the World, of how its weapons are being used, then the Police is exempted from being restricted to bring weapons across the border, but only to the extend of: international territories, territories of other Nations that are explicitly agreeing to allow it.**

**When entering the territory of another Nation, the Police will submit to the law and Government of that Nation, and be liable under its law.**

. Reasoning. It may erode the Law or the flag protocol, if the  
. Government has to declare a state of War if it is going to sink  
. a pirate boat with heavy weapons. Then, when that happens often,  
. the People will stop seeing the war flag as being associated  
. with war, and secret Government may attempt to sneak in illicit  
. activity when the People assume a pirate is being attacked.  
. On the other hand, if the Police is allowed to without flying the  
. war flag, then the law is being eroded. Eroding the law may also  
. end with secret illicit actions, grouping them under the actions  
. supposedly allowed without the war flag.

. The Police must obey the law of the other Nation, to respect that  
. Nation its sovereignty, such as this nation would like it as well.  
. Then things will be simply a matter of where you are, then that  
. law holds. Don't like the foreign law, then don't go there.  
. This does imply that if police enters a foreign territory, and  
. that Government orders our police to surrender its craft, then  
. the Police must obey: it would be our law to obey that. If the  
. Police rejects the foreign order, the foreign power could sue  
. in our courts. If it wins the case, foreign law and foreign  
. Government would hold over the Police officers and the vessel.  
. Presumably all would be extradited, to correct the situation.  
. This could be useful for international peaceful relations.

3.2.b-4 Police and Privacy

**The police is allowed to suspend temporarily and in individual**

cases the right to Privacy, see [Article 2.1.e, Privacy](#), if doing so is vital to solving a crime.

Reasoning. The right to privacy conflicts with the necessity to solve crimes, to deny criminals the ability to make their home into a legal fortress against the Police. Both interests have to be weighed.

#### 3.2.b-4.1 Police Privacy, oversight

**The right of the Police to search evidence and criminals by invading Privacy, is overseen case by case by Judges.**

**For persons not having committed a crime of greed in the last 10 years, two Judges will have to agree to the search. During the search a witness of the Court of Justice will be present, from start to end.**

**For persons having had committed a crime of greed not more than 10 years ago, one Judge will have to agree to the search.**

**For persons having been convicted to prison for a crime of greed more than 3 times in the last 10 years, no Judges will have to agree to the search.**

Reasoning. This progressive system for people having had more contact with Justice and been convicted, is to make criminals carry more of the burden they create. The 10 year limitation, which is presumably a long time for many criminals not to carry out any crimes, is to prevent wrongful convictions having legal consequences for an entire lifespan, and to make sure that at some point the negative legal consequences end (end of punishment). People who have changed their behavior, will have a chance to be as good as new.

The witness of the Court, is to provide the potentially innocent person with someone who can look out for its interest, re-assure that person that the search is not happening in a legal vacuum. Incidentally, the witness may be useful during a trial as a witness, either for the defendant against overzealous prosecutors and police-men (who did the search, and build the case), or against the defendant who could otherwise perhaps argue his record as upstanding citizen and attack the credibility of the searching Police more successfully but still deceptively. By doing a well done search, the damage from the crime is not made more worse than need be for finding the criminal.

#### 3.2.b-4.2 Police Privacy, Compensation

**The duration of Privacy invading activity, even if it - the subject - is not hindered in any way, is reimbursed at the average wage for one person, plus unreasonable damages.**

Reasoning. This acts like a punishment on the Government, the more persons privacy is being invaded, the more it costs, the less money remains for other policy making, likely to upset more Government politicians (who want money for their activities). The 'unreasonable damages' should be good enough to pay for common breakages, but should exclude extreme damages from unusual situations, or if the owner is standing by without trying to prevent damage knowing it will occur and be unexpected for the Police. It will be a good idea to recover the funds if the party is actually guilty. It may be interesting to recover all search money from the guilty party, if it is eventually found,

. as this law-enforcement cost is additional damage flowing from the  
. original crime. This would make hiding for longer potentially more  
. costly for the criminal, it will make police less unwilling to give  
. the money if it can be recovered in total, and perhaps more  
. motivated to find a guilty party, and to weigh the cost of  
. searching against its use and chance of eventual recovery.

### Articles [3.3](#): Equality of Government

#### 3.3.a Inclusive

**The law strives to establish equality of power.**

. Reasoning. The government and society are not to be the rule of  
. a limited club, because this breeds injustice and corruption.  
. "Equality of initial chance" can deteriorate into the "freedom to  
. deny freedom", where "chance" is often neither a fair game of  
. productivity, and neither proportional to the extent it is a  
. game of productivity. The end result being inequality in practice  
. both with respect to the law, and elsewhere, particularly economic.

### Articles [3.4](#): Space

#### 3.4.a Local Space

**The local democratic Government concerns itself with local problems.**

. Reasoning. Obviously a government dealing with larger spaces has no  
. time to handle sufficiently small scale problems, and similarly a  
. government dealing with small spaces does not necessarily have the  
. need to handle large scale problems objectively.

##### 3.4.a-1 Space protection

**The local democratic government is not evicted with force by a democratic government having authority over a larger area that includes the concerned local democratic government.**

. Reasoning. When there is a conflict between smaller and larger  
. space government, the local government is to have some level of  
. protection, or else it really is just an office of the larger  
. government. If a place decides it is going to go against a larger  
. area government, then this will have to be solved diplomatically.  
. Ultimately the larger government might eject a place from its  
. authority and work around the (for them) problem area. Even though  
. the National Government can't eject a local Government, the Courts  
. still could if the local Government violated the Law and the  
. National Government won a case in Court. Difference is that it  
. wouldn't be an executive Government decision. In other words,  
. the local Government could fight eviction in Court, and win that  
. case. The National Government could not proceed, or risk being  
. prosecuted and even thrown in jail by the Courts and Police for  
. behaving criminally.

#### 3.4.b National Space

**The National democratic Government concerns itself with National problems and inter local Government problems. When an inter local Government problem can not be reduced to two problems solved differently, the National democratic Government will decide how the issue will be decided.**

. Reasoning. When there are disputes between local Governments,  
. both have equal authority, so the issue can presumably not be  
. resolved. There might be a taxation problem for instance, where people

. in one area decide to have fewer taxes, yet they go to a hospital  
. in another area funded by local taxes. The Council in the area with  
. hospital do not like to pay an unequal share, and the people in the  
. other area claim that they should then also reduce their taxes and  
. reduce service at the hospital. They continue to claim access into  
. the hospital for paying some, and the hospital refuses to refuse  
. people from a neighboring area. Hence the problem just sits there,  
. so now what. This would be a good issue to either try to resolve  
. through the courts if there are national laws about this, but if  
. there are no laws it could be referred to the country council to  
. make an executive decision. Since it is inter-council and not local,  
. the national Government certainly has executive jurisdiction. It can  
. then determine the issue, and the decision can be enforced through the  
. courts under the rule that the National Government had precedence. Then  
. the police could force the issue if it isn't complied with. If the  
. decision was that the low-tax area has to pay its full sum, the police  
. could seize the necessary funds and procedure the offending delegates.

.  
. On the other hand: if there is a area of nature apparently both in the  
. area of two local councils, and they disagree on its management, it may  
. well be possible to have different management in both areas, assuming  
. the nature area is compatible with that. If it isn't, it would again  
. be a National Government problem to determine. The Article says `how  
. it is solved,' which suggests the National Government could decide  
. the matter by for instance setting up a poll over the entire region.  
. If that seems to be `the will of the People,' there is some legal  
. pressure to go with that, see *Article 3.1.a, Government Intention*.  
. But the National Government could also determine the issue on its  
. own terms, determining that will be the method.

#### Articles [3.5](#): Money oversight

##### 3.5.a Money oversight

**The elected delegates elect a body of oversight and/or management with complete authority to know everything pertaining to the money system. The elected Money oversight committee handles the task in the area of authority of the electing delegates.**

. Reasoning. Only the majority has a common interest at odds with  
. money manipulations behind the scenes. The fiat (non-commodity) money  
. system seems to be completely open-ended from the side of the banks,  
. what is stopping a bank or government employee from adding money or  
. taking money away from the "back" side of accounts: rules and oversight  
. flowing from the people. Changing to a commodity money such as gold  
. is another option, but a fiat system could work provided it is run  
. honestly. Money would be more of a "right to have a number of credit  
. points", instead of "owning a commodity which is widely used in swap  
. trade." If a commodity money such as gold is in practice also reduced  
. to abstract money (valueless coins, notes and bank-accounts), the practical  
. difference between a gold standard and a "judicial" standard could be  
. small. Whether a fiat-judicial standard works may depend on the honesty  
. of the people, since making gold from lead is more difficult then punching  
. numbers in a keyboard. In a system where money is controlled by  
. wealthy people, the system could be kept in check because the richest  
. people can only be rich if others are poor, and hence they'd attempt to  
. stop the making of money by employees if it is not for themselves. How  
. much money can be extracted from the back-end-open banking system, may  
. just depend on the social struggle for better living conditions by the  
. People at large. Whether or not this is the situation in a not  
. democratically controlled fiat money, something has to replace that will  
. to reduce corrupt money creation by employees. Naturally the people  
. again, through voting procedure.



- . A fiat money works because:
  - . 1. The government forces you to pay taxes in money, so that somewhere in the economic chain people (even a lot of people) have a need for money to pay taxes to stay out of jail. Once something has value for someone in the economy, it can be used as a medium for exchange (money), because even if it has no value for someone, it can be exchanged for goods/services with someone who is 'looking to stay out of jail with that money.' Once you know that 'Jimmy' wants 'a bag of leaves', you can use 'a bag of leaves' as a medium of exchange with everyone who knows Jimmy, and knows that Jimmy will do something for that bag. Transition of value, almost a form of speculation.
  - . 2. Shops are forced by law to accept money, and if shops are forced to accept it, money automatically has value. On force of prison.
- . You would need a complete government system to back a pure fiat money up, and maintain it into the economy. But how do you justify asking taxes, it can't just be the stick, that's not "nice" ... The taxes pay for that government system, and in return the government has to do useful things, that can not be done by the free markets themselves, completing the circle. Such as provide Justice, Police, and maintain money, work for the common good. If you want a pure fiat money, you apparently need a government.
- . If you want to have money without government, you are stuck with commodity money, such as gold, rice or "promise for an hour of work" (which is too uncertain and would probably not work in larger groups either). A fiat money is flexible for policy-making, but equally flexible for the corrupt.
- . When needed, money-oversight committees on the local level are elected to deal with local corruption, elected locally to prevent top level corruption. The local committees will be a useful stomping ground for potential future national oversight committee members.

---

## Chapter 4: Structure of Disaster Relief

### Articles 4.1: Purpose

#### 4.1.a Purpose

**The purpose of the disaster relief organization under Government control is to to relief the People in times of disaster. This organization trains for disasters according their likelihood of occurring. Foreign invasion is only one type of such disaster, which is trained for according to its likelihood by people also trained for other disaster relief roles.**

- . Reasoning. War has no future because if it has, humanity has none.
- . The purpose of the armed forces is to retire. In the past combat may have had a purpose, but that time is gone and will only come back if the army destroys humanity first, which with todays and especially future technology is more then a theoretical possibility. In effect, the armed forces and potential for all out conflict are the only true enemy of humanity.

#### 4.1.a-1 Separation of Task

**The disaster relief organization strictly separates all tasks involving weapons from all other disaster relief tasks which do not involve weapons. Separated at least in conduct, in dress, in tools, in finance.**

. Reasoning. For the army, the tasks that involve weapons should be  
. a specialist task, so that there is potential that this task  
. eventually becomes obsolete and forgotten throughout the world.  
. An army that has other means of making a living and doing work,  
. will not have to make a war out of necessity to keep alive.  
. Armies that train exclusively for war would eventually become  
. bored with peace: why train people for war when there never comes  
. a war. Exclusive war training means a political pressure to  
. eventually either make war, or fire people. When the army is  
. wearing a different outfit during non-weapons tasks, such as  
. help during earth-quakes, floods, famines, storms, disease  
. outbreaks etc, the people in the army will come to realize that  
. these task stand on their own and do in no way flow from their  
. weapons capability, suggesting that they could do away with their  
. weapons capability without losing the real work.

#### 4.1.b What war

**The disaster relief organization fights invading armies.**

. Reasoning. There has not been all out war since the second world  
. war by any country which has the highest technological capabilities.  
. In that sense war has already ended, even though the limited actions  
. that did take place were often more destructive then the all out wars  
. that preceded it. This has apparently made many people unaware of  
. the destructive capabilities of todays armies. A Government which  
. is faced with an invasion force may attempt to use the armed forces  
. to protect itself, rather than act in the best interest of the People,  
. even if that means losing power.

#### 4.1.b-1 local Battle

**The only battle the disaster relief organization is to fight, is  
the war against local dictatorship, either foisted by a local minority,  
or foreign aggressors. The disaster relief organization does not attack  
other nations.**

. Reasoning. There is no more tribe warfare, therefore other  
. countries can never be a military enemy. In case of an invasion,  
. it is not the other country, but the institution of local  
. dictatorship by the invasion army which is the enemy. The enemy  
. is therefore limited to occupation forces, who act as local  
. criminals against the local law and the local People. Fighting  
. this occupation force has the potential to kill occupation  
. soldiers. Invasion has little use without subsequent occupation,  
. during occupation the invading criminals are most vulnerable.

#### 4.1.b-2 No Police Tasks

**The disaster relief organization does never engage in policing the  
local population majority.**

. Reasoning. Long established army exclusion. The army is trained  
. to kill people, in this they perpetrate the death penalty, without  
. trial. They are therefore never to engage the local population.  
. Armies tend to be the force with which local dictatorships are  
. established.

#### 4.1.b-3 Inside the Land

**The disaster relief organization is only permitted to bring weapons  
and fighters - people in a fighting role - beyond the border of the  
country during war, war as defined in [Article 1.1.c-1](#), *Flag of war*.**



No on duty war personnel or any of its weapons under direction by the army or the Government will appear beyond the border of the country, when no war has been declared.

Exception: see *Article 3.2.b-3.1, Weapons Authorization.*

. Reasoning. Though it in general seems a mistake to ever allow  
. fighters beyond the border even during war, there could be a  
. justified use during defense. A law against it might be exploited  
. by a hostile enemy as a tactical advantage. The army is neither  
. allowed to carry weapons into international territory, no surface  
. ships with weapons or submarines with weapons. The task of destroying  
. pirates on the open seas falls to the Police, the pirate is a robber  
. and a criminal, not the army of a foreign nation. The police is  
. well suited for this task, because the police has the necessary  
. skills to fight crime, and to form friendly relationships with  
. all other police forces out on the open seas to destroy pirates.  
. There need be no tension between varies police forces of varies  
. countries, therefore international cooperation in this area should  
. be easy and natural. No such ease exists between armies of different  
. nations, as they view each other as potential criminals and hostile  
. invaders, which reduces the effectiveness of the police work.  
. Pirate activity can be used as an excuse by politicians to keep  
. an aggressive army on foot.

. Using the words `fighters' and `war personnel' leaves some room  
. for interpretation regarding people also trained to handle other  
. disasters, for them to go toward another nation in a non-military  
. aid capacity (volcano eruption, earthquake, etc), obviously  
. without arms or battle dress. The phrase `under direction of army  
. or Government' leaves yet more room, to send out personnel under  
. direction of independent groups or foreign Governments, etc. The  
. article says the same thing twice, to remove all doubt. To get  
. around the prohibition: raise the war flag.

#### 4.1.b-3.1 Training

**The disaster relief organization to the degree it trains for use of weapons and fighting, occupies itself with learning the terrain of the home country. How to inflict maximum casualties on any invading army. How to defeat a hostile army long term, once it has changed its role from offensive to oppression and occupation, and how to deny an invading army economic gains for itself and for its home country. Training with other nation's disaster relief organizations is only permitted for non-violent disaster relief roles.**

. Reasoning. The purpose of the army is to defend the sovereignty  
. of its Government, to the degree that sovereignty is democratic  
. and not itself an oppressive occupation. To effect this, it is  
. useful to kill as many invaders as possible, and to deny economic  
. gains from entering the country, since that would prevent an  
. invader from reaching its invasion goals, which are either  
. strategic power, ideological goals or economic benefit. Such  
. invader benefits are only reached once a country is safely under  
. control under a newly fomented Government. To deny an invader  
. from reaching these goals, even if the sovereignty and order in  
. the country can not be protected for some time because a hostile  
. army is expressing its power in the country, means that an invasion  
. will be less likely, and that there is hope it is being expelled.  
. Most countries do not like drawn out battles over territory that  
. gives them no profit, because war is expensive, it cuts into the  
. luxury of the people in the invading country and can destabilize  
. it over time. An invading army can be confronted head on, but

. when the clash fails the country lies open. This is a short term  
. gamble some politicians might be willing to make. When an invading  
. army faces an endless professional insurgency aimed at killing  
. the invaders personally and denying economic benefit, the cost  
. is always going to be quite high, the duration potentially long,  
. and the backlash / profit balance on the invading country would  
. seem more difficult to estimate. Training for an insurgency could  
. therefore prevent the war from happening. The aim of killing the  
. invading soldiers personally in the greatest possible number,  
. might be scary for invading soldiers, since they would be walking  
. into a prepared trap.

. The army can also engage in terrorist activities within the  
. attacking nation, so as to reduce the economic gain that country  
. is reaping from the invasion - in so doing the army should take  
. care not to attack (dissenting), people and to focus on economic  
. destruction of all kinds, not necessarily linked to the invasion.  
. An invading country is to pay deeply for its crime, whatever  
. else happens.

#### 4.1.b-4 Not for Profit

**When the disaster relief organization wages a war - which can only be a defensive war - and comes to occupy new territory, the resources of the occupied territory are not taken home as spoils of war. The resources can be used only for waging the war itself.**

. Reasoning. Many wars would be waged out of profit lust, the army  
. should not risk its blood for greedy people. Just as the army  
. would deny an invading country to take spoils, so it should resist  
. taking such spoils. However using resources can be important  
. for an ongoing (defensive) battle, the army should therefore not  
. be disallowed to use such tactical advantages. A reasonable way  
. to delineate either is when people get richer because of the use  
. of such resources. That is crossing the line.

#### 4.1.c Unity of Humanity

**The times of tribal battle and domination Empire are gone.**

. Reasoning. There can be no place for territorial divisions between  
. parts of humanity to the extent this produces armed struggle, much  
. less war. This article is to set the disaster relief organization with  
. a certain mind-set, so that this group does not assume itself to be  
. part of some kind imaginary tribal defense unit, becoming a policy  
. making force rather than just an executive force.

### Articles [4.2](#): Dispatch

#### 4.2.a Army Dispatch

**Armed forces - disaster relief organization bearing arms - are not allowed to engage any enemy without explicit Two Thirds approval from the People.**

. Reasoning. The lives of soldiers have often been the toys of confused  
. or megalomaniac politicians, either incapable or unwilling to find  
. alternative solutions, which often tend to be in the area of alternative  
. politics rather than destructive armed struggle. To murder people in  
. other parts of the world, or in the local part of the world, and to  
. cause catastrophic damage, is a decision which if it is to ever be  
. taken at all, it should be taken directly by the highest authority  
. possible: the Two Third majority of the People, directly in Referendum,  
. not by proxy. This is to protect the world from turning its high

- . technological power unto itself, to protect the soldiers, and protect
- . the People from being guilty in the unspeakable crimes of war.

#### 4.2.b Army Loyalty

**Soldiers, officers and other disaster relief organization personnel in a war time role individually and in groups, are without fail Loyal to the People and their Referendum above the Government or army officers.**

- . Reasoning. The power of the army tends to be directed at killing
- . people. This devastating weapon must never be a toy in the hands of
- . a group as small as a Government, regardless of how it was elected.

#### 4.2.c Individual Right to Reject Dispatch

**Every soldier has the right to declare himself as no longer a part of the disaster relief organization, and face no penalties for this action.**

- . Reasoning. Soldiers may end up killing people when engaged. Many
- . causes, if not all causes, do not warrant this killing. This
- . understanding may come to a particular soldier at any time, and
- . may be the result of fighting a war which should never have been
- . ordered, and serves no common purpose.

#### 4.2.d Collective Right to Reject Dispatch

**Soldiers and officers have the right to initiate or participate in a referendum regarding the question whether they will reject an order to fight.**

- . Reasoning. It is the soldiers who are going to do the fighting,
- . killing and dying. Nobody has the right to ask such from anyone,
- . not even the People, without asking for consent and agreement.
- . Under conditions, the People may be confused and/or in hysteria,
- . when the soldiers are not. In most cases it is better not to
- . fight.

##### 4.2.d-1 Collective Right to Reject Dispatch, majority

**If a Two Thirds majority is against fighting, the order to fight is nullified as if it had never existed. Soldiers who retired because of the order (see [Article 4.2.c, Individual Right to Reject Dispatch](#)) are counted in the said Referendum.**

- . Reasoning. If there is true cause for war, people who wanted to
- . be in the army are probably going to fight it. But if the cause
- . is speculative or wrong, the army as a whole has to have the legal
- . power to say no.

### Articles [4.3](#): Limitations

#### 4.3.a No Child Soldiers

**People with lowered capacity to understand the world and its complexities are excluded from serving in the armed forces.**

**The disaster relief organization does not train or have working in any type of work whatsoever people below the age of 25 years.**

- . Reasoning. It is important that soldiers are able to understand what
- . they are doing, and when they are being used as toys. Small children
- . have been used time and again by dangerous regimes, because small
- . children have no psychological defense. Small children won't know
- . when an army is being used to destroy a country and oppress its

. people, and when it is being used to help a country. When the army  
. can only hire people from the age of 25, they will tend to have had  
. a few years of economic independence and probably have had another  
. job. This should broaden their horizon if they later came to work  
. in the army. Since training can only begin at 25, battle ready  
. forces would still be older than that. The last thing anyone should  
. want is a group of children aged around 18-20, in control of absolute  
. fire power and naturally unable to have the slightest clue for what  
. ends they are really being used if these ends were not justifiable.  
. In any battle there are two major legs of power: direct force and  
. strategy/tactic. The strategy/tactic involves deception, and therefore  
. the army leaders are well versed in how to deceive people (ideally  
. the enemy). Psychological warfare has been around since billions of  
. years. It should come natural to them, to deceive their fellow soldiers,  
. were they inclined to do so. Handing the army child-soldiers is asking  
. for such problems, because child-soldiers don't expect to be so abused  
. by the adults of their own country. Children tend to believe more  
. easily that the world could be a primitive war of tribe against  
. tribe, and children have a natural tendency to copy behavior from  
. adults and believe what they say good/bad true/false.

---

## Chapter 5: Structure of Monopoly Sectors

### Articles 5.1: Monopoly Sector

#### 5.1.a Definition Monopoly Sector

**A Monopoly Sector is a sector of industry where having a multitude of offerings to costumers results in a multitude of concurrent infrastructures, each or most of which could carry with comparatively marginal extra cost the entire volume of trade, but each of which has to charge a much higher price to costumers then a single all carrying infrastructure would be able to, because of the cost of maintaining their complete infrastructure on the basis of their limited share of trade.**

. Reasoning. Having concurrent infrastructures means total volume of  
. trade divides between the infrastructures. This is not a problem  
. if the infrastructure size is directly proportional to the volume  
. of trade going over it. It is possible to have several concurrent  
. taxi companies, because the "infrastructure" of all taxi businesses  
. adapts directly and proportional to their share of trade, the  
. fixed additional cost of the "infrastructure" is low. Concurrent  
. infrastructures are a problem if the size of the infrastructure is  
. mostly fixed regardless of the volume of trade going over it. When  
. there are several concurrent tap water systems, even systems that  
. have barely any or no trade going over them, need still a complete  
. functioning system, almost as if all trade was going over them.  
. The cost of maintaining the infrastructure while only carrying a  
. (small) share of total possible trade, means the cost of the  
. infrastructure per consumed amount is high. The needs of meaningful  
. competition demand there are "many and freely changing" competitors,  
. which is "many and freely changing" infrastructures. This makes the  
. price even higher compared to one fixed infrastructure.

#### 5.1.b Service rendered

**The People, or in their absence a Two Third majority of Government, decide whether a Monopoly Sector service will be rendered for any particular sector.**

. Reasoning. It is possible to create and remove monopoly sectors, depending on how a service is to be rendered. By dismantling the tap water system infrastructure as a way water is delivered, water trade can fall exclusively to business competition that sells bottled water, since such sales have no fixed costly infrastructure. By building an automated system where food is delivered to each home daily, a new type of infrastructure is created where meaningful competition could be impractical (depending on the technical details).

5.1.c Service Group

**The People or in their absence the Government decide who governs every monopoly sector service group. Changes to the setup are made by the People or a Two Third majority of Government.**

. Reasoning. There are many possible models for organization, some may work better for this, others for that. But can't have the setup change all the time, so need Two Third majority.

5.1.c-1 Service Group, Appointed Dictator

**The People or in their absence the Government can decide to appoint a dictator over a monopoly service group. The dictator is a subordinate employee of the Government.**

. Reasoning. This method has a high level of discipline, work don't talk.

5.1.c-2 Service Group, Representative Democracy

**The People or in their absence the Government can decide to declare a monopoly service group a representative democracy of employees.**

. Reasoning. This method is nicer to employees, who will have to have discipline in themselves to make it work.

5.1.c-2.1 Service Group, Representative Democracy semi limited

**The People or in their absence the Government can decide to declare a monopoly service group a representative democracy of employees, where the Two Third majority of Government has the right to force or change any decision.**

. Reasoning. In a way this is already implied because the Government could change the form of Governance. The article makes it possible for Government to change decisions without having to change the governance system. Perhaps this article is a bit superfluous.

5.1.c-2.2 Service Group, Representative Democracy limited

**The People or in their absence the Government can decide to declare a monopoly service group a representative democracy of employees, where the Government has the right to force or change any decision.**

. Reasoning. This method gives Government easy access to change decisions more extensive than implied in the Government's mandate to change the form of governance.

5.1.c-3 Service Group, Public Democracy

**The People or in their absence the Government can decide to declare a monopoly service group a representative democracy directly elected**

by the general public.

Reasoning. Stand alone democracy.

5.1.c-4 Service Group, Costumer Democracy

**The People or in their absence the Government can decide to declare a monopoly service group a representative democracy, elected by the costumers and employees. Costumers and employees are both represented in management.**

Reasoning. Stand alone democracy, which gives workers more power.

5.1.c-5 Service Group, Other

**The People or in their absence the Government, with or without collaboration with employees, can establish forms of organization not listed here.**

Reasoning. Should not make the impression this is an exclusive list. All kinds of possibilities and permutations are potentially useful.

5.1.c-5.1 Service Group, not immune

**The People or in their absence the Government always reserve the right to terminate or alter the form of such organizations as established under [Article 5.1.c-5, Service Group, other](#).**

Reasoning. No "cut forever loose from Government" forms, which may lead to private dictatorships over monopoly sectors, and the price/quality problems associated with private monopolies, and dictatorships in general.

5.1.c-6 Service Group, privatization

**A Service Group or parts of it can be privatized by the Two Third majority of Government.**

Reasoning. Sometimes technical situations may change, or a service group might have developed activities which are not really part of the a natural monopoly, and which are in practice better left to competitive markets (political choice). Service Group organization is also mentioned in [Article 7.1.b, Special Markets Service Group](#).

---

## Chapter [6](#): Structure of Free Markets

### Articles [6.1](#): Free Markets

6.1.a Free Market

**Everyone has the freedom to trade - negotiate an exchange until agreed by both sides; the freedom to start and stop a business at their leisure, and to engage in contracts that do not violate the law.**

**Trade across the national border can be subject to special laws, policies and duties by the Government.**

Reasoning. Free market activities can overlap with activities also serviced by the monopoly sector or other sectors, where they can temporarily or permanently fill voids in availability, diversity.

.  
. The idea of this system centers around a freely negotiated trade society,  
. because that causes power to be dispersed throughout the society, and if  
. it can be guaranteed that there is no (or little) theft and power abuses,  
. then in the main the producers negotiate mutually. They can shut out power  
. abusers and criminals, as well as give to those who work with bad quality  
. only as much as their work is worth in their eyes. Because the markets are  
. wide and varied, and people may choose to buy and sell for many reasons  
. - they could choose the price/quality relationship, but they do not have  
. to - if something is worth something eventually one might find a buyer.  
. The market also prevents the Government to know everything, and therefore  
. to adopt its non-totalitarian role. With this great power of trade, which  
. is also a natural given, the people can both heal and destroy their nation.

.  
. The trade across the border is restricted, because foreign trading  
. partners may not meet our standards of Justice and other standards. Trading  
. openly with them can destroy the domestic markets. Foreign entities can  
. use trade as a means to wage a nefarious campaigns against our nation.  
. The domestic market is something that the people through their Government  
. must be able to protect if that is necessary.

## Articles [6.2](#): Initiate Businesses

### 6.2.a Establish business

**Every person and groups of persons has the right to quickly establish a business recognized by the law, if the activities of said business do not conflict with the law.**

.  
. Reasoning. Creating a new business should be a trivial administrative  
. procedure, open to everyone. Larger businesses can start with only  
. one employee/owner.

#### 6.2.a-1 Establish business, dictatorship

**A business can be established as a dictatorship, lawful decisions being made by the person or persons having established the business (see [Article 6.2.a](#), *Establish business*).**

.  
. Reasoning. Very small businesses usually are dictatorships, and  
. can only be dictatorships for practical reasons. The employees  
. of the dictatorship often just include the dictator himself,  
. sometimes with a few helpers. Such business can be unstable, it  
. could break under the stresses of complicated democratic rules,  
. where the dictator knows what is to happen anyway. The leadership  
. can also be a limited club.

#### 6.2.a-2 Establish business, rule book

**A business can be established under a rule book, lawful decisions being made by the mechanism of the rule book.**

.  
. Reasoning. Businesses can be established by groups or individuals  
. on the basis of a personal set of rules rather than a dictator.

##### 6.2.a-2.1 Rule book, limit

**The rule book in [Article 6.2.a-2](#), *Establish business, rule book*, loses its power when the conditions of [Article 6.3.a](#), *Reaching Democracy* have been met.**

.  
. Reasoning. The rule book can not prevent the law which makes a  
. business a democracy.



6.3.a Reaching Democracy

**When the person or persons which has originally started a business (see [Article 6.2.a](#), *Establish business*) ends regularly working for the business, and the business has more employees then a number to be determined by the People or in their absence the Two Third majority of Government, control and ownership of the business is transferred to the employees, in good faith, fairness, transparency and equality. The starter is compensated fairly out of the value of the company, and/or the private value of employees, and/or the value of future profits generated by the company.**

**When there are: ..[10]. or more employees, the employees gain control as described.**

. Reasoning. The owner/director has done his work, other have had to obey his orders, good and bad. The employees have earned the moral right to own be business, and are the only group with a vested interest in the continued success of business. Giving the business to someone else means creating a top-class of people, who wield power they have not build up themselves, and who will continue dictatorial relations between management and employees with all the problems that brings, such as income differences based upon power differences, rather than on productivity. This eventually produces a class of rich parasites, without much ability, but with inherited power (much like a monarchy, but then in dictatorial business instead of dictatorial country rule). Putting the employees in charge, is like a democratic revolution after the King (Queen) is out.

. It should be noted that if a number is given in this Constitution, then "the people" are not absent. So the two/third of Government can not change it, the constitution must be changed instead. Removing the number means it becomes common law, which the Government can alter in this case only with a two/third majority.

6.3.a-1 Reaching Democracy, employee protection

**When a business has more or equal number of employees then a number to be determined by the People or in their absence the Two Third majority of Government, the employees have the right to veto the sale of parts of the business, the right to veto buying new parts for the business, the right to veto the firing of employees in an effort to get below this limit, and in general the right to veto self destructive business practice.**

**The minimum number of employees for this protection is .[7]..**

. Reasoning. In order for the employees to have a realistic chance of running the business later, the employees have to be able to resist last minute destructive selling and last minute destructive buying. For this to be meaningful, the employer must not be able to use back doors like firing away employees.

6.3.a-2 Reaching Democracy, employer protection

**When a business owner loses control of a business as described in [Article 6.3.a](#), *Reaching Democracy*, the employer negotiates a pension out of future profits from this business with the employees. The People or in their absence the Government decides a minimum duration of this pension, and a minimum height of this pension.**

. Reasoning. The employer has build the business, and has  
. moral right to a share of future profits. The employer knows  
. much about the business, if it is payed out of future  
. profits it has one more interest in seeing the business do well.

6.3.a-3 Reaching Democracy, employer debt protection

**A business newly owned by employees assumes responsibility for necessary debts made by the previous employer in the clear interest of the business.**

. Reasoning. The employer should not be left with (large) personal  
. debts made in the interest of the business, while the employees  
. live it up in the newly won business. The amount of profit the  
. employer has taken out of the business can be weighed against  
. the amount of personal debts. If much profit was sucked out,  
. leaving (some) debts is fairer then if this was not the case.  
. This might be a reflection of the character of the employer, and  
. therefore give an indication of the necessity of the debts.  
. An employer which has poured personal money into a business  
. can be seen as a business which has a lend money from an employer.  
. Such things would have to be negotiated. One mid way solution  
. is to factor these things into the pension from future profits,  
. rather then new possibly crushing debt on a business going  
. through a difficult transition.

6.3.a-4 Majority Business

**The Majority of employees become recognized as legal owners when they have surrendered to the Court of Justice a description of the decision making rules for their company, which enacts these rules the Law of the Country.**

Decision making rules is one of either:

**B company: Boss elect. The boss elect decides all, but can be replaced at any moment by new elections in the company.**

**C company: Cooperation management-worker. The management and workers have regular meetings, the management will surrender all information, the management can be replaced at any moment by new elections in the company.**

**D1 company: Dialogue meetings 1. The people working in the company will discuss the proceedings of the company regularly, and decide per majority vote, one vote one person.**

**D2 company: Dialogue meetings 2. The people working in the company will discuss the proceedings of the company regularly, and decide per majority vote, one vote per worked hour counting from one year ago to the present.**

**E company: Erupting majorities. The people working in the company meet when a problem arises, and there decide by majority vote of those present, one person one vote.**

**O company: Other, to be described.**

. Reasoning. Self evident. The employees do not become per person  
. owner of a part of the company, which they then might take out and  
. sell. They are owners as a group, if they want to disintegrate and  
. sell, they would first need to agree to that in majority. If there  
. is no such majority, individuals who want out while taking a share  
. will have to get approval of the majority.

. The description of the rules for the company can be a simple ``We  
. are a B company,'' or ``We are a D2 Company,'' once surrendered to

. the Court and the transfer having gone according to other legal  
. requirements which are probably going to be described in common law,  
. it is obvious to anyone what the status of the company is. When  
. a company wants to change some rules they should register under O,  
. and describe it in detail, and await a Court approval, which can  
. then be appealed. The descriptions of B, C, D1, D2, and E company  
. types is primarily meant to give new employees-owners some structure  
. to work with, and to make sure order is maintained within these  
. companies with the force of the Court and Police behind it. When  
. a company has registered as a certain type, it becomes law for that  
. company, the law of the Country and not just the private rules of  
. a group of people, left to enforce these themselves. That is probably  
. necessary because debates about money and work are very important to  
. people, which could cause emotions to flare up. With this being the  
. law of the Country, it becomes possible to make court cases about  
. company-internal decision-making and related details. Such court  
. cases carry the risk of being convicted to pay for the court case  
. out of the company profit, reducing pressure on the Courts from this  
. kind of cases.

.  
. An `A' company is an entrepreneurial company.

#### 6.3.a-4.1 Continuity of Democracy

**If the majority mentioned in Article [6.3.a-4](#), *Majority Business* decides on a rule book for future decisions, the authority resulting from the rule book and the rule book itself remain subordinate to the Two Third majority of the employees of the moment.**

. Reasoning. The employees can not lock themselves out of their  
. own democracy, as this is likely to result in regrets, and would  
. likely be a decision forced on them, while it serves no useful  
. purpose. However, a Two Third majority is needed to change a  
. rule book if any is explicitly established to prevent constant  
. instability in the business organization when something hangs  
. around 50% votes.

#### 6.3.a-5 Unity of business

**All persons who in practice do more or less the work of employees, but are administratively registered as businesses owners or otherwise put into a different category, have all the rights of employees.**

. Reasoning. Businesses may attempt to evade rules by attempting  
. to plug their employees differently into the law. A business  
. could pretend to accept the services of a lot of independent  
. service providers, evading the rights these "service providing  
. businesses owners/employees" would have if they were known as  
. employees. When the "service providing businesses" want to exercise  
. a certain right, they need to be able to be re-registered as  
. employees. This may result in the business having to deal with  
. employees having a certain amount of power (see Article [6.3.a-1](#),  
. *Reaching Democracy, employee protection*, or becoming owners (see  
. Article [6.3.a](#), *Reaching Democracy*, etc.

#### 6.3.a-5.1 Number of Companies per person

**One person can in total own not more than a number of Companies.**

**The limit is: ..[4]. companies per person at a time.**

. Reasoning. In entrepreneurial business, it is only useful to ever  
. own one company, and do that well. When it comes to combining

. effort of different companies, these companies can work together  
. cooperatively, rather than submit to one point of power.  
. Grouping multiple businesses under one person seems only important  
. for people who want to evade laws, such as the maximum on  
. ownership for (pretense) businesses without employees, and  
. preventing companies becoming democracies for companies above  
. the numerical employee limits, etc. Legitimate and productive  
. businesses tend to be owned by one deeply involved entrepreneur,  
. there seems no reason why that single company could not become  
. bigger to envelop the tasks the owner wishes it to perform when  
. the efforts lie on the same terrain.  
. .

. When the wealth of a company is counted to its owners, companies  
. can not be used to store personal value. But when that is done,  
. fractional ownership results in each employee holding a percentage  
. of ownership for democratic companies. When the limit is one  
. company, then if someone only holds a part in another company, for  
. example one tenth because it is a democracy or some related  
. scheme, that would mean that person can not start a business next  
. to its other job, even though it is hardly "owning a company." That  
. other business could be a hobby or something to the side, maybe  
. a car driving around selling ice-creams on sunny summer days. It  
. seems unjust and unfair to reduce the chances of such a person,  
. who is not dedicated to one company, just to prevent certain legal  
. loopholes. That company to the side could one day become a bigger  
. company. In this case it is fine if one person has 1.1 companies.  
. Then there may be people who have multiple talents or maybe they  
. want not to bet all on one horse, or start multiple things to see  
. what works. If someone has a lot of part time jobs, the limit of  
. two could be overstepped if these businesses are small, but  
. this problem would probably be rare enough. It would take more than  
. 8 jobs in 8 companies of on average 4 people total ( $8 \times .25\% =$   
.  $200\%$ ). To set a limit to the number of companies keeps the system  
. from being flooded by empty companies, and it forces entrepreneurs  
. to cut what is useless. Empty company shells are a way often used  
. to commit financial crimes. Every company would result in some  
. bureaucracy at the state level, the state has an interest not  
. to see the amount of companies approach infinity. Who can  
. seriously manage 10 companies concurrently? Does that not reduce  
. the freedom of other people to start their businesses? At what  
. point does an owner become a rarely seen adviser, in which case  
. one might as well (from a common-interest productivity standpoint  
. at least, the view of society) set up one management advice bureau.  
. .

#### 6.3.b No International Businesses

**Productive activities which help to create the marketable product of a business, taking place on the territory of the country, are organized in a business incorporated within the Nation. The business acts independently in its own best interest with respect to businesses in other countries, with which it can interface at its own pleasure through free trade, within the context of the Law.**

. Reasoning. What this does, effectively, is cut all businesses  
. organizations off at the border, parts - if any - are independent  
. businesses in their own right. This does not have to hamper business  
. operations at all, as the relation with the rest of the company  
. shifts from a potentially dictatorial management relation to a trade  
. relation which should distribute profit accordingly. It is important  
. to deny infusion with other businesses, so as to avoid the losing  
. of profit from work done within the country (international  
. financial/managerial parasitism). Work done here but profits moving  
. to elsewhere is not in the interest of the country, and it reduces  
. the exposure of the management reducing its democratic and natural

. responsibility. It is important to make sure workers have all the  
. rights to which they are entitled, such as becoming a democracy,  
. which could be confusing for businesses straddling borders. Allowing  
. multinational businesses breeds all kinds legal confusions.

. This set up demands a trade interface, which is a soft concept  
. that it can mean a lot of things. You could "buy/rent" a business  
. concept from another country, thus making it possible for a  
. franchise to span countries, as long as the interface is trade  
. and not managerial force. This means for a franchise that a  
. franchise chain owner in another country has no management power  
. within this country. When the law of this country disallows for  
. instance the use of names or franchise concepts from other countries  
. to be used without a direct contract from a foreign franchise giver,  
. the foreign franchise holder may sue in local Court and for the  
. sake of local law.

. The transportation business seems to be an obvious problem: its  
. product/service is created on the territory of `this' country,  
. yet its management and organization often would not be here, while  
. it is impractical and costly to change everything at the border just  
. for the sake of protecting local law coherency. Transportation  
. businesses do not tend to suck profits out of a country: there  
. is enough room for competition, transportation businesses go  
. both ways, etc. A view which could work, is to regard each person  
. or groups of persons, who enters over the border while transporting  
. as an employee to another country, comes to comprise an individual  
. consumer, private person, or person in the capacity of an implicit  
. independent local business. Then they are subject to all rules  
. that hold for businesses and private persons transporting things  
. locally.

. The term `marketable products' would exclude advertisements or  
. coming in to discuss business proposals, which would be a secondary  
. activity not directly producing the products / services. Though it  
. are activities of a business, they do not require local incorporation,  
. unless marketing is (among) the core product(s) marketed. The `context  
. of the Law' is added so the article can not be read as to nullify  
. common law in favor of `free foreign trade.' The purpose of the  
. article is not to deny the Government the power to make law and  
. regulate trade, international or otherwise.

.. Updated (ammended) wo jan 25 11:16:11 UTC 2012:  
. Tue Sep 8 19:29:29 UTC 2009 foreign transportation instead chapter 7  
. Significant: relatively irrelevant detail  
. Certainty: reasonable

. Special rules can then be made, whatever they need to be for the  
. crossborder transportation business, if it can not be solved within the  
. confines of the rules in chapter 6. This is hardly a serious issue.  
. But if it is going to be solved in a way that bends and oddly interprets  
. laws or makes laws that are hard to follow so that the situation will be  
. resolved - even if properly - outside of the law, then the respect for  
. the law will deteriorate. That could be the beginning of the collapse of  
. the lawful order, which is a more serious problem.  
.. End ammendment.

## Articles [6.4](#): Minimum Working Conditions

### 6.4.a Minimum conditions

**The Government establishes minimum working conditions.**

. Reasoning. Working against bad conditions can make prices

. low, and therefore a business successful. On the one hand this  
. can be resisted by a consumer boycott, but not all consumers have an  
. interest in good working conditions, especially business owners.  
. Secondly, not everything can always be known by consumers, or  
. consumers may have no practical choice. Businesses with bad working  
. conditions cause society hidden (future) costs. Workers on a low  
. wage have to seek cheap products, spreading the disease of bad conditions  
. when they have to buy with and therefore stimulate businesses with  
. low prices and therefore also likely to have bad working conditions.

6.4.a-1 Minimum wage

**The Government establishes a minimum wage, expressed relative to the average income.**

. Reasoning. Expressing it relative to the average is a more stable  
. way to express it. If the total income increases because of more  
. inequality and more exploitation of low wage earners, the minimum  
. wage has to automatically rise with the total and average income,  
. providing a break on the exploitation, perhaps preventing it.  
. Another reason is that if expressed relative to the average, the  
. politics has to say clearer what they stand for. Minimum expressed  
. as absolute number has a tendency to be measured against subsistence  
. level, while often the low wage workers provide much/most of the  
. value in the society. \*)

6.4.a-2 Worker safety

**The People or in their absence the Government establish minimum safety conditions to work in.**

. Reasoning. See *Article 6.4.a, Minimum conditions.*

6.4.a-3 Environmental safety

**The People or in their absence the Government establish rules to protect the natural environment.**

. Reasoning. Self evident, but probably deserves to be mentioned  
. explicitly.

6.4.a-4 Public safety

**The People or in their absence the Government establish rules to protect the Public from safety risks.**

. Reasoning. Self evident, but probably deserves to be mentioned  
. explicitly.

Articles [6.5](#): Anti Monopoly

6.5.a Anti monopoly

**The Government ensures large businesses do not acquire a market share so great that any or all individual costumers are losing the ability to choose between many different suppliers and producers.**

. Reasoning. The whole point of markets is choice for consumers, and  
. also choice for employees. When there is no choice, the market is  
. stagnated and effectively a monopoly service group under private  
. dictatorial control without Government oversight. This breeds bad  
. quality and profiteering.

6.5.a-1 Nationalization

**The Government has the right to declare any company which has become large enough to fall under *Article 6.5.a*, *Anti monopoly* exclusion from free markets, to become a monopoly sector service group (see *Article 5.1.c Service Group*).**

- .
- . Reasoning. Some businesses may have created or become active in an
- . area where competition is not possible or costly, it would be
- . no solution to break them up or create more businesses.

6.5.a-2 Break up

**The Government passes laws which determine when a company is to be broken up in order to re-establish a condition of choice and competition.**

- .
- . Reasoning. When a business is to be broken up or not is better not
- . left to the whims of Governments, because this may produce corruption,
- . unequal justice, and additional insecurity for businesses.

Articles 6.6: Open markets

6.6.a Open markets

**Trading partners, whether businesses or individual costumers, have the right to know with whom and what they are trading.**

- .
- . Reasoning. Market preferences of consumers based on the social-economic
- . make-up of companies is a major element to keep the economy in
- . line with social expectations of the people. For this to work, it
- . is essential that consumers get accurate information, and for this
- . information to be provided accurately on penalty of legal punishment.
- . The information needs to be published, probably at the point of
- . selling, so that there is no additional business expenses/work involved
- . and people may casually observe the status of a company. The important
- . information is primarily working conditions, which includes where the
- . money is going and probably what the organization type of a company
- . is. In the interest of privacy individual wages/conditions do not
- . need to be specified, unless they concern some special circumstance
- . (high/low).

- .
- . Publishing of conditions may develop automatically in an economy,
- . especially in businesses that expect to benefit from consumer
- . favoritism. However, other businesses are likely to come up with
- . schemes of deceit. For every honest "seal of approval", there could
- . be invented false seals, marginally different. To prevent such an
- . arms-race, all companies are expected to yield the information in
- . the same format. To this information can always be attached creative
- . seals/labels. The government may also device seals/labels to indicate
- . the social conditions. Businesses who cheat would obviously be fined
- . (or worse), providing additional business set-back for such badly
- . behaving companies.

6.6.a-1 Open markets, money

**Information as specified in *Article 6.6.a*, *Open markets* includes a telling indication, in a form explicitly defined by the People or in their absence the Government, of how the total business revenue from whatever sources is distributed among all that are productive for a company, be they individuals or other businesses.**

- .
- . Reasoning. Consumers must know how money is distributed in the
- . companies that they promote the existence off because they buy its
- . services/products. These businesses are their and their children's



. future employers. An obvious choice here is providing highest and  
. lowest salary, and/or a wage distribution index. The information  
. would have to include parties who lend money to a business, because  
. otherwise a high income might be hidden as payments on a loan. Some  
. people might come to support businesses with high wage disparities, but  
. this would hopefully be a minority. More likely people who don't care  
. for social conditions of workers will not care, not change their buying  
. behavior either way. If almost nobody cares or if conditions are fine  
. everywhere, the system would be a useless economic burden. Therefore  
. the cost of the system should probably be low from the start, and the  
. method of computing/publishing simple and obvious, so as not to hurt  
. the economy more than it is worth.

---

## Chapter [7](#): Structure of Special Markets

### Articles [7.1](#): Special Markets

#### 7.1.a Definition Special Markets

**A special market is a market in which free competition for consumers and/or labor can have advantages, but needs a specialized solution to be adequate. Special or partially special markets are defined by the Two Thirds majority of Government.**

. Reasoning. Special markets may need to be special for a wide  
. variety including unforeseeable reasons, it is therefore impractical  
. and impossible to define them beforehand. It is therefore also  
. impossible to define what kind of rules may need to govern any such  
. a special market, what would be the best way to oversee them,  
. to lead them, etc. Rules may need to change when either conditions  
. or people change. The Two Third rule is to ensure that complete  
. sectors don't change erratically with flickering 50% majorities.  
. A example is health-care: certainly patient-preference can help  
. a hospital to seek improvement to make patients happy, basic  
. market operations have advantages. But a patient can not be bartered  
. with for highest price while nearly dying, a hospital is a high  
. cost facility and therefore there might only be one in a wide  
. area, therefore a completely free market has disadvantages that  
. need as tailored solution for this kind of activity. Consumer  
. pressure is beneficial, but seeking maximum profit from helpless  
. costumers probably is not.

#### 7.1.a-1 Special Markets, no limit

**For Special Markets defined in Article [7.1.a](#), Definition Special Markets, the Articles in Chapter [5](#), Structure of Monopoly Sectors and the Articles in Chapter [6](#), Structure of Free Markets can be relieved.**

. Reasoning. Making a market special is a concept which can conflict  
. with mentioned chapters.

#### 7.1.b Special Markets Service Group

**The Two Third Government can establish a Special Markets Service Group, organized similarly to a Monopoly Sector Service Group (see Article [5.1.c](#), Service Group).**

. Reasoning. It can happen that an area of activity does not fall under  
. the Monopoly Sector (see Chapter [5](#), Structure of Monopoly Sectors),

. but for some reason a Government controlled or established business  
. is needed. This can be to force a standard on an industry, by engaging  
. a market in competition with the business delivering the desired qualities.  
. A certain (sub) market would then be declared a partially special market,  
. because of sub-standard production. The special thing about it being,  
. for instance, that a service group would be created for it. The service  
. group would automatically be restricted to only that market. Other  
. reasons can be poor quality of treatment of workers, or some kind of  
. economic emergency requiring (temporary) direct commandeering of  
. businesses, to provide a certain service to the public.

---

## Chapter 8: Structure of Finance

### Articles 8.1: Emergency Power

#### 8.1.a Emergency Powers

**When financial and/or managerial power is severely out of balance in the economy, clearly undermining the financial monopoly of the People, the two third majority of Government supported by the People, have the right to seize the minimum amount of money, businesses and property to establish again the Financial monopoly of the Government in High Finance, and to establish power balance in the economy between the various market actors.**

. Reasoning. The Democracy of the People is expressed through the financial  
. monopoly of the Government. The freedom to organize businesses in different  
. ways in general and in democratic ways in particular, depends on free  
. political will to direct investment, rather than the need for profit  
. on capital alone, which will eventually have to seek low wages bad working  
. conditions and dictatorial relations between work and management, whether  
. that is what most people support or not. The need for unfettered pressures  
. of consumer choice on businesses requires an absence of financial inspired  
. warfare between companies, which often cuts against the will of the  
. consumer, especially by eliminating business models which are not  
. profitable for capital investors, company profit sharing schemes in  
. particular. To establish and guard the financial monopoly of the  
. Government and therefore the will of the People, private financial  
. powers need to be disarmed. Not unlike the monopoly on violence needed  
. by the police, for it to do its work of enforcing the law effectively.

#### 8.1.a-1 Emergency Powers, limit

**Businesses, property and/or money only seized to protect the stability of the economic correction process itself, is either returned to its previous owners, or returned to owners described in this Constitution.**

. Reasoning. The process of correcting imbalance is itself a form  
. of extreme imbalance. This will likely need a temporary unnatural  
. overreach of the power of government in some, most or all businesses,  
. just to make sure the beneficiaries of the imbalance do not cause  
. additional problems in an effort to protect the imbalanced economy,  
. frustrate the correction process, or attempt to profiteer personally  
. to the detriment of others and therefore the progress of the  
. correction process. Such beneficiaries of the imbalanced economy  
. may have practical power over some, most or all businesses. When  
. the process is completed, many such businesses will no longer be  
. able to pose a threat, and can therefore be cut free again.

8.1.b Rotate Currency

**For decisive application of Article 8.1.a, Emergency Powers, the Government may decide, suddenly if the situation requires it, to declare all money as being without value.**

. Reasoning. Seizing money is just not good enough a measure. Money  
. is like water, and as long as the currency is expected to have  
. value in the future, the financial power not under Government  
. control could be hidden locally or elsewhere, only later to pose  
. the same problems again. For hidden money to be eliminated, the  
. only viable solution is to declare the entire currency as to be  
. void of value. This will affect all money, hidden or not.

8.1.b-1 Rotate Currency, new money

**The Government establishes a new currency.**

. Reasoning. Money is a valuable tool for markets and businesses.

8.1.b-1.1 Taxes in money

**The Government demands payments in the new currency.**

. Reasoning. For money to have a defined value, there has to be  
. a real reason to have a certain amount of it. Just floating  
. currency into the economy, what will its value be, and why ?  
. When money enters the economy through lending and inflationary  
. spending, and leaves it through taxation and spending toward  
. the Government, money can exist with a defined and definable  
. value. Be an instrument of politics and a tool for trade.  
. Inflation can

8.1.b-2 Rotate Currency, debt

**The Government maps the debt obligations of each person unto the new currency.**

. Reasoning. The economy should be cured, not spoiled. That means  
. running businesses need their income, consumers have to fulfill  
. their previous obligations.

8.1.b-2.1 Rotate Currency, debt limit

**The Government can lift application of Article 8.1.b-2, Rotate Currency, debt, when said debt is a threat to the financial monopoly of the Government.**

. Reasoning. There may be schemes, especially involving debt  
. with the Government because it can pay any debt, to hide  
. money in the form of debt. The Governments hand should not  
. be tied in such cases.

8.1.b-3 Rotate Currency, credit

**The Government maps money owned by persons and companies unto the new currency, to a maximum such as to establish with confidence the financial monopoly of the Government and the People.**

. Reasoning. The economy has to be cured, not the people be robbed  
. of their fair money, savings, etc. The people need money to trade,  
. pay taxes, rents, etc.

8.1.b-4 Rotate Currency, foreign

**The Government ensures continuity of foreign trade, in an effort to protect the export and import industry, to the extent the Government financial monopoly is not threatened.**

. Reasoning. Foreign traders can be a group which is unfairly set  
. back by local financial politics. On the other hand, ensuring  
. continuity of foreign trade can be a loophole for money to attempt  
. to be converted into the new currency when it would otherwise be  
. collapsed. It would not be a good thing if foreign product/services  
. traders lose trust because they lost money unfairly, as this  
. may hamper future foreign trade.

8.1.b-5 Rotate Currency, foreign capital

**The Government does not allow large quantities of foreign capital which threaten the Government financial monopoly to persist.**

. Reasoning. Protecting the People from Government corruption. People  
. elsewhere who hang on to large quantities of currency are no  
. different from local financial threats, and in some cases worse  
. because details may be harder to uncover. This also limits  
. *Article [8.1.b-4](#), Rotate Currency, foreign* further.

8.1.c Continuity of Existence

**The Government and the People ensure the existence and availability of emergency services for all people when *Article [8.1.a](#), Emergency Powers*, is being applied.**

. Reasoning. The emergency Government (People) take over of the economy,  
. implies the responsibility for at least its minimum services. This can  
. be done by commandeering resources, or dispensation of money. When  
. there is an acute economic crisis which requires financial emergency  
. powers, which may at first cause even more problems, it helps if people  
. can be sure of their own survival and health. This rule should not be  
. taken as exclusive, such that if the emergency powers are not invoked,  
. that the Government should then also not ensure these services. This  
. is left open here.

Articles [8.2](#): Democratic Finance

8.2.a Democratic Finance

**The Government maintains a monopoly of high finance, under democratic control by the People or in their absence the Government.**

. Reasoning. Private investors (capitalism) have a devastating influence  
. on the type of businesses that make up the economy, and can even  
. have this same influence on entire countries. In the main, causing  
. them to be dictatorships, rather than react fluently to pressures  
. from the consumer and labor markets, and the unimpeded flow of  
. fresh initiative and consumer pressure. The basic problem is that  
. in order to achieve high profitability, and therefore high return on  
. invested capital, the difference between company profit and total costs  
. (including wages on all levels), should be as high as possible. This  
. means wages should be as low as possible, even though capital itself  
. goes against the trend it forces on the economy, and extracts the  
. profits for itself, without actually doing productive work (in a  
. narrow sense of the word). It is not possible to extract profits  
. from business models which are highly efficient flat organizations,  
. which share profits equally. Such businesses do not pool their profit,  
. they can only be invested in through loans. To contrast, dictatorial  
. businesses are run by people who have no problem ordering other people  
. and firing them when they don't respond to their whim, they can keep

. wages low, while pooling profits. Such businesses are well suited for  
. investment of the "share of power" type. It can not be a surprise  
. that business managers in such businesses will award themselves or  
. will be awarded by the investors huge wages, because these managers  
. effectively are the center of power the investors need in order to  
. extract profits. Private capitalism then causes an economy crisis,  
. as wages are dropping or kept low, employees have to buy their goods  
. with companies who sell cheap products, firing on the machine driving  
. wages down, stimulating more abusive business organizations. If this  
. crisis was not constantly battled by trade unions and the like, the  
. situation could collapse in a situation of outright slavery. To a  
. degree this already is the case, although it takes the form of wage  
. slavery. The situation causes employees to have no or little power  
. over their work, which is frustrating and drives down the motivation  
. of workers, causing a less effective economy as a whole. Secondly,  
. only business leaders with sufficient moral deficit will want to be  
. guilty of the abuses, which excludes many people from the area of  
. business planning, organization, product development, etc.

.  
. ``Democratic Finance'' is not another form of "Capitalism": Private  
. Capitalism can be seen as a seething mass of maggots eating away  
. at the economic production, while in State Capitalism these maggots  
. have been transformed into a single dragon doing the same. Common  
. to both private and state capitalism (as its called), is the lack  
. of control by those being productive of where the investments are  
. made and where the profits are going. For this reason the term  
. `Finance' is probably better then `Capitalism', since `Capital'  
. to a degree supposes a finite sum, while no such limits exist  
. for the point of money creation. The term `Democracy' is more  
. crucial, it reflects the critical point in the whole system which  
. makes it different from state capitalism. State capitalism is the  
. same as corrupted `democratic finance' at the Government level,  
. while private capitalism is the same as as corrupted `democratic  
. finance' at the population level. What is in many cases called  
. "corruption" under `democratic finance', is called `capital profit'  
. under state/private capitalism. Democratic finance does therefore not  
. hold a mid position between state/private capitalism. The difference  
. between state and private capitalism is not great comparatively,  
. they are just different exploitation models, who do things only somewhat  
. different. Private capitalism seems more toward (criminal) anarchy,  
. State capitalism seems more toward feudalism.

.  
. The economy is meant to be consumption and trade driven, where democratic  
. finance provides a means of changing things smoothly. Markets under  
. both state and private capitalism tend to be finance driven or  
. bureaucracy driven, both not too different, they prevent a market  
. pressures driven market. Under democratic finance these things are  
. also possible, it is up to the People. But even a finance driven  
. `democratic finance' economy is better then state/private Capitalism,  
. because at least the finance is used in the interest of the People.  
. In theory the economy could also operate with zero additional finance.  
. The amount of finance seems to be a throttle for the speed of economic  
. change. The more finance, the less correction from consumption and  
. market pressures; fewer finance can mean things can grow into undesired  
. directions. One danger might be to misinterpret `democratic finance' to  
. mean a finance driven economy. Heavy finance also means heavy taxation.

.  
. `Democratic finance' does not mean bureaucratization, because finance  
. can (even should) be limited in volume, and because the bureaucratization  
. already exists under private/state Capitalism. When the Government takes  
. this job over, it is like the Police and Justice are government jobs.  
. It is a matter of structuring this properly, making workers there have  
. useful interests/responsibilities, that make it work properly.

## 8.2.a-1 Creation of money

### **The Government creates money, the Government destroys money.**

. Reasoning. In order to maintain the monopoly of finance, the  
. Government has to have the sovereign right to create money,  
. causing inflation, and the right to destroy money, causing  
. deflation. Money for the Government is therefore something entirely  
. different than it would be for anyone else. Businesses and  
. individuals have to get a specific amount of money from a source,  
. and can spend that amount to a recipient. To the Government  
. this logic does not apply, it is an illusion to pretend  
. that the government has to spend the money it has won from  
. taxation. To organize the Government that way means that the  
. Government is a business or an individual, where someone else  
. seems to actually do the job of creating and destroying money,  
. be "the Government" in that area. Under private capitalism the  
. central banks have that power, they lend money at low interest  
. rates to investment banks, creating money. These banks lend out or  
. gamble in the economy with the money, and demand higher interest  
. rates from costumers, the difference they are allowed to keep.  
. Money can be created in the economy when loans default with the  
. Central Bank and are not re-paid, yet the money is already spend  
. into the economy, or - probably more importantly - when the Government  
. engages in inflationary spending. The Government lends money  
. with the Central bank, which of course is nonsense. The Government  
. then has a phantom loan, but it is really inflationary spending of  
. which a record has been kept. Unfortunately the setup gives power  
. to the Central bank, not only to limit lending by Government but  
. also to lend money at low rates to private investors. It is  
. effectively, a form of institutionalized Government corruption,  
. disguised as a "common interest" effort to reduce inflation and  
. promote "investment, renewal in the economy". Reducing inflation  
. is however an interest of private capital itself, because the higher  
. general inflation, the less valuable the private fortunes become.

. "Repaying" this phantom debt can only be part of a policy which  
. seeks to destroy taxation money in an effort to increase the value  
. of money. Such a policy does not require the phantom debt to exist,  
. it is a policy which stands on its own. (Government debt with private  
. individuals is something else.) By handing out newly created public  
. money at throw away rates to private investment banks, the money  
. creation is being used to cover the risks of investors, increase  
. their financial power and temporary liquidity (which can be used  
. for short term financial assaults on industries).

. This is an unacceptable situation, especially because the "work" of  
. investors is hardly if ever productive/necessary, and causes systematic  
. diseases in the economy (see [Article 8.2.a, Democratic Finance](#)),  
. which directly translate into human suffering. It is however  
. doubtful how many investors do even realize what they, as a group,  
. are doing (investors for profit). The fact that the situation does  
. not cause a public outrage is probably because the system is overly  
. diffuse and complex (alternatively because this analysis is flawed).

. The central banks make their interest rate higher when they  
. want banks to be less risk taking in their loans. When the profit  
. margin for banks goes down because the central bank heightens their  
. interest rate, they will need to be more secure about the investments  
. they make. This causes fewer investment and fewer defaults, the  
. inflation rises less quickly. In short: the creation/destruction  
. of money is used fully in the interest of private investors, and  
. Government has to "lend" its own money, might even pay it back with  
. future taxation income. This will cause deflation, which means the

. Central bank can lower the interest rate: there is more room in the  
. economy for easy money. Easy profit for the private investors  
. that benefit from the low rate. In effect it is a scheme of private  
. counter fitting and then white washing and profit enhancing through  
. investment processes administered by dusty old men, which is hidden  
. in the unnecessary complexities of financial rules, mostly pretending  
. to govern a phantom process. Hidden well enough to elude public  
. outrage, apparently (I must admit it has taken me long enough to  
. come up with this). The Central bank investor lending, combined  
. with investor gambling producing more dictatorial companies and low  
. priced products, is a perfect profiteering machine. This is the true  
. reason why certain politicians want Government to pay down "public"  
. (really: phantom) debt. Politics does the hard work of causing  
. deflation, private investors pick up the slack and get even more  
. wealthy.

. If Government were spending freshly created money without a way for  
. money to be destroyed, the amount of money would grow rapidly, and  
. the value of money would be falling rapidly, which is impractical. The  
. way to destroy money is through taxation. Nevertheless it can be  
. computationally practical to keep score on the amount of taxes coming  
. in and the amount of money spend, because the difference yields  
. information about how much the total amount of money is changing by  
. Government taxation/spending alone. For instance, if someone burned  
. a house full of cash, that money is not lost at all. The money  
. supply shrunk, and therefore the Government is able to spend more  
. money before the money supply is growing too rapidly. Burning money  
. means income for the entity creating more money. It is therefore both  
. true that the Government can only spend what it has taxed, and that  
. the Government can spend to any degree it desires, taxes or not.  
. The success or failure of Government spending/taxation levels, is  
. measured by inflation/deflation levels and the political goals that  
. inflation/deflation is supposed to serve. Causing massive inflation  
. can for instance be a government policy to remove the fortunes of  
. private investors, to restore its financial monopoly.

. When at the point of money creation and administration for masses  
. of people, money takes on a different quality. Imagine a Government  
. bank which has an account for everyone, the Government bank is  
. allowed to create and destroy money at will - somebody has to have  
. this power. Now this bank makes a loan to someone, which is not  
. paid back (defaults). Does the Government lose money ? Does the  
. Prime Minister has to pay for the difference from his income ?  
. Of course not, though since the money is now in the hands of other  
. people it can't be destroyed, therefore inflation has risen and  
. Government has less room to spend inflationary money. The money  
. most likely went to other accounts, also held by the same bank.  
. It does not affect the total of money it has stored, though it  
. did affect the more direct control over it. These issues exist  
. in the present economy, it is just a matter of recognizing them.

. The Central Bank acts like this hypothetical Government bank,  
. but not entirely. The "normal" banks are allowed to lend out  
. more money then they "have" with the Central bank, about 10 times  
. as much. That sounds strange, but it is not strange because money  
. behaves differently near/at the point of creation/administration.  
. What stops a bank from creating an account with infinite profit ?  
. Accounting with the Central Bank, it can only create money up to  
. about 10 times more then it has with the Central Bank (fractional  
. reserve banking). And another is the inflation this infinite profit  
. causes, which collapses the value of fortunes, much of which are  
. naturally owned by bankers themselves. The banks are conservative  
. with inflation, because it threatens the value of their fortunes.  
. Fractional Reserve banking works because while a bank may lose



. money from one individual, it gains new money from another when  
. it deposits money on an account. Thus the flow of in and out  
. balance, and the bank generally can pay for what goes out with  
. what comes in. The 10% reserve is to deal with imbalances. If  
. more then 10% of the money in a bank was moved to outside the  
. bank, the bank is in trouble because when moving money out and  
. in the accounting is done in the Central Banks reserve money.  
. What often happens is that a bank closes its doors and attempts  
. to ride out the panic before going bankrupt. The bank would of course  
. attempt to get a new loan from the Central Bank, or it could be  
. helped out by Government intervention. These two things, Government  
. intervention or Central Bank loan really are effectively the same  
. thing. The difference is perhaps that politicians may think they  
. need to take the difference out of their running budget, turning  
. the cost directly on the People, rather than make it inflationary  
. spending.

. What a Government should really do, is nationalize a bank once it  
. is bankrupted. Why bail out a bank without getting something back.  
. A law could be passed that states the Central Bank is only allowed  
. to create money unto Government accounts, and when the Government  
. asks for it. Private banks can get no Central Bank loans anymore,  
. and their fractional reserve is pushed up to a 100% Central Bank  
. coverage. If that hasn't bankrupted them yet, their account with  
. the Central Bank is converted into a regular account with the  
. Government bank. Then they will be barred from having the right to  
. demand pay back for loans they make, every loan they make will be a  
. gift. This either reduces the banks to simple accounting service  
. providers, who even might have to charge - like a real company - for  
. their services. Or it bankrupts them. No doubt many will bankrupt,  
. as management attempts to take money first for themselves. Fortunately,  
. there are solutions for this ...

#### 8.2.a-2 Equality of happiness

**''The value with respect to Government income of a day's wages buying dinner for a poor (wo)man, is more then the value of a years wages just buying luxury for a rich (wo)man.''**

. Reasoning. The value of an amount of money decreases, the more  
. a person has of it. A small amount N in the hand of a poor person,  
. may mean living to the end of the week, while the same amount N  
. above a fortune already in hand, is hardly any impact on the  
. conditions of life. Yet, the amount N, when spend, require the  
. same amount of productive capacity from society. Hence, the amount  
. N can be spend in return for a high change in happiness in the  
. poor man, or the amount can be spend - with equal effort from  
. society - to produce marginal change for the rich man. The amount  
. can be used in return for producing food/water to the tune of,  
. say, 10 man hours. The amount can be used for producing an  
. expensive bouquet of flowers to the tune of, say, 10 man hours.  
. This article states that the happiness of one person is equal  
. to that of another. The smile on the face of the rich man when  
. seeing the flowers is far less total happiness then the survival  
. and health of the poor man.

#### 8.2.a-3 Taxes

**The Government demands taxes.**

. Reasoning. The Government requires a means of destroying money,  
. in order to be able to create money for spending above what can  
. be acceptable inflation spending. The Government could alternatively  
. demand payment for all services it provides. But this is often much

. too costly and impractical. For instance how does one demand payment  
. for general services such as road building or the police, the  
. justice system, etc. The Government is to a large degree a company  
. delivering services and products which simply have to be carried  
. out and benefit almost everyone, whether they pay or not, and which  
. can not be provided for by free market competition. Just picture  
. several militia forces competing with each other, demanding payment  
. from victims to prosecute, judge and sentence a criminal. That is  
. not likely to result in justice. It is absurd to demand criminals who  
. "use" the justice system, to pay for it its services, and the cost of  
. imprisonment criminals will usually be beyond the means of individual  
. victims, if these victims survive the crime in the first place.  
. It is also costly and error prone to demand people walking on  
. the street to pay for the amount of road usage. Taxes are like  
. giving to charity (the common good), which in turn forces the  
. obligation unto the government that it behave like a charity, and  
. that it responds to the requests of the tax payers (public). The  
. government is effectively a monopoly service group, governed by  
. an elected management, elected by its costumers and workers.  
. Because there are few market pressures on government, it can not  
. be a free floating for profit business: it has to be a non-profit  
. organization. People who want to get rich honestly can try to do so  
. in the open markets.

#### 8.2.a-4 Bank service

**The Government establishes a bank, where people and businesses can have a bank account on which money can be stored, moved to other bank accounts, taken out in cash, and put into the account in cash.**

. Reasoning. To reduce private capitalism, great pools of money  
. should not be under control of private individuals and businesses.  
. When people/businesses put money in a private bank, this allows  
. the private bank to start gambling with other people's businesses  
. and loans using that money. When the money is stored in a Government  
. bank, no private hands can use it for their own self gain. It is  
. true that the Government might be able to use "it", even for  
. profit. However, the money stored with the Government disappears  
. from regular existence. The Government can spend any amount of  
. money it wants, it does not need to use the money stored on its  
. retail bank. Even if the Government were to write down some  
. administrative statements that make it appear as if the retail  
. bank money "had been used" (which would really be nonsense  
. statements), the Government is supposed to have that investment  
. power. The Government does not need profit (unless it is corrupt),  
. it therefore directs investment on the basis of democratic  
. politics, not the forced need for investment profits.

. Several people might pool money in a single account (or in cash),  
. thus establishing new potential for private investments. However,  
. having a nationalized retail bank means people can make a political  
. choice whether they want to support private for profit capital  
. gambling, or not.

#### 8.2.a-4.1 Consumption credit

**The Government establishes a mechanism for people to get budget neutral consumption credit.**

. Reasoning. People sometimes need to buy a product which can  
. be produced it high cost relatively quickly, but the  
. buyer can not pay the needed amount immediately. Such as  
. a home. If consumers have no ability to get consumption  
. credit or mortgage, the producers of the product may need

. to establish a long lasting administration to get their  
. monthly payments. This job may then be serviced by specialized  
. businesses, but where does this business get the investment  
. fund to start their business. In the end it may be better  
. to prevent such troubles and potential to build up such  
. financial loan businesses, which effectively are private  
. investors, and have a "service group" do it. Budget neutral  
. means that no money should leak out to bad loans, which can  
. be a dangerous source of low level corruption.

8.2.a-4.2 Result pay

**Government employees who decide on loans to be given or not, have a portion of their wage and job security tied to whether loans are being payed back.**

. Reasoning. To promote an atmosphere of integrity.

8.2.a-4.3 Corruption

**Government employees who decide on loans, can not give loans to their family, friends, people they previously worked for or whom worked for them.**

. Reasoning. To promote an atmosphere of integrity. It will be  
. the general level of inflation, that is a tax on the entire  
. economy, which pays for bad loans and corruption. Practical  
. experience should provide ways to reduce corruption sufficiently.

8.2.a-5 Investment service group

**The Two Third majority of Government can define finance service groups, with a specific mandate to invest money in businesses, business initiatives, and other activities. Finance Service Groups are organized like Monopoly Service Groups, see *Article 5.1.c, Service Group*.**

. Reasoning. Just providing low risk consumption credit can be a basis  
. for a slowly developing economy. However this does not provide  
. politics with a strong means of expressing political will, either  
. in the sense of slowly steering the economy into a certain direction,  
. or to engage in financially high risk project, or to engage in  
. investments which are never to be payed back. The Two Third is  
. needed to prevent constant creation/destruction. The Government  
. would want in general to establish its policies through the finance  
. groups or directly itself, rather than constantly re-organizing them.

8.2.a-5.1 Investment service group, short

**The Government can establish an Investment Service Group with the obligation to ask permission for a budget neutral loan or credit with the Government regarding every individual transfer of money into the economy.**

. Reasoning. To have a severely restricted investment service  
. group, it needs to ask for money every time it wants to make  
. an investment, and then has to pay this money back. This is  
. then inflation neutral spending. Naturally there can be  
. shortcomings in payment of debt, which can always be collapsed  
. as the cost of making investment, or provide fuel for a decision  
. to dissolve that investment service group as incompetent,  
. distrusted, etc.

8.2.a-5.2 Investment service group, loan maximum

**The Government can supply the Investment Service Group(s) it establishes, with a maximum amount of money it is allowed to lend out in the economy.**

. Reasoning. This kind of investment service group has more freedom,  
. but still has to ensure being payed back or risk bankruptcy.  
. Types of capabilities can of course be mixed in several ways.

8.2.a-5.3 Investment service group, credit

**The Government can supply the Investment Service Group(s) it establishes, with a certain amount of credit which it is allowed to spend.**

. Reasoning. This kind is allowed to make continual losses, it is  
. spending tax money (inflation money). However the amount of  
. spending is bound to a maximum, giving Government an easy way  
. to control their activities. In the most extreme cases it could  
. make credit unlimited (which is kind of dangerous, because it  
. can devalue the currency quickly), or zero.

8.2.a-6 Investment permit

**In the interest of the productive economy, The Two Third of Government can give individuals and businesses by temporary permit the right to lend money - or otherwise invest - while demanding being payed back the full sum plus interest; the permit holder being backed up by Justice and Police against a failing recipient of the investment, notwithstanding a sum being higher then the maximum established for loans - or similar investment mechanisms - for which being payed back can be demanded in this Constitution, as in *Article 8.2.a-7, Investment Monopoly*, and lifting business organization repercussions for loans to businesses, as in *Article 8.2.a-11, No Business Gambling*, or establish rules for handing out such permits.**

. Reasoning. It can happen that people wish to pool their money, to  
. make investments in the economy for some political purpose, to  
. make their money available to someone else while they take a risk  
. of losing it. These things should not be happening for profit,  
. because of the negative results for the economy (seeking high  
. profit margins and setting back opportunities for profit sharing  
. businesses). But they can happen for political purposes. Under such  
. circumstances, it would be a good thing if lend out money can be  
. protected from fraud, meaning if money is lend and then stolen,  
. the loan can be enforced and re-payment demanded.

8.2.a-7 Investment Monopoly

**The People or in their absence the Two Third majority of Government establishes a maximum amount of money, expressed as a multiple of the average wealth, above which contracts involving payment of money for receiving money, such as loans, between non Government market actors are void; the received money having the status of a gift.**

**The limit is  $.[0.25, \text{one quarter}]..$  times the average wealth.**

. Reasoning. While small loans are not a great problem because many  
. people have the power to grant them, large loans are effectively  
. a monopoly sector business. The reason why large sums of money  
. have exceptional value/power, is because they are scarce, monopolized  
. to a degree. Secondly, private abuses of capital have to be prevented  
. in the economy, because they eventually throw the economy in crisis.  
. Thirdly making money deals is as such not a productive job, it is  
. gambling with other people's lives. It is to be done for political

. purposes only, where the common interest aspect is present, the  
. goal is productive. The Government has to protect its financial  
. monopoly. It would still be possible to raise large sums by pooling  
. many small sums, which is however less dangerous than large sums  
. under private control. But larger sums pooled by many people are also  
. to be cut off by this rule, if it exceeds the limit it is a gift  
. at the point of reception.

#### 8.2.a-7.1 No debt trade

**A loan or other money trade, granted between two actors, can only be legal between these two actors.**

. Reasoning. It is important for the transparency of  
. the system, that the money trade is cut back wherever  
. possible. When trade in debt is possible, this can grow  
. into a black shadow "industry", which does nothing  
. productive whatsoever, is not trading in products of  
. effort. The money involved far outstrips the value of  
. effort being put in. This trade also has the potential of  
. creating pools of private capital, with people who specialize  
. in taking over loans.

. Furthermore it is an important violation of the right  
. of knowing with whom one has a loan, which can lead to  
. criminal and unfair activity on unsuspecting people.

. When the Government wants to take out additional money  
. through loans from private people (essentially borrowing  
. money from future Governments bringing them in trouble),  
. when people who invested in those loans die, the loan  
. defaults. This is good for the whole economy, because  
. it produces deflation, which the Government can then  
. spend. It is also good on the people who take part in such  
. Government loans, because if they live at pay back date,  
. they get a profit; if they are dead already then they  
. probably won't care. It would be far worse if the debt would  
. remain in circulation between different people until it  
. was payed back. When loans default because of death, for  
. instance a mortgage not yet payed back, the loan can default  
. but ownership of the home would compensate for the loss.  
. Debt trade does not affect such problems, and can therefore  
. safely be removed.

. Reason to have this rule in the Constitution rather than have  
. it depend on whatever Government is in power, is stronger  
. protection of individuals and protecting transparency. Protecting  
. the Government finance monopoly is a Constitutional problem.

#### 8.2.a-8 Capital Monopoly

**The People or in their absence the Two Third majority of Government establishes a maximum amount of wealth, expressed as a multiple of the average wealth, above which no person is allowed to own.**

**The limit is .[30].. times average wealth.**

. Reasoning. The Government needs to protect both its financial monopoly,  
. and a reasonable minimum distribution of wealth between all people.  
. This is a hard limit, it will therefore affect everyone, including  
. artists who sell millions of records, and gambling games. Because  
. the larger businesses will tend to become democratic (businesses  
. tend to take time to grow), and because there are no private investors  
. anymore, the danger of extreme wealth has already been significantly

. reduced. Top managers of democratic businesses will need to please  
. their employees, be elected (depending), controlling their income.  
. This hard limit is therefore not a stop all dike, but more like a  
. last resort, cutting off the few that make it through all other  
. more natural barriers. It is therefore not necessary to set this  
. barrier low, or to imagine that all wealthy people will in  
. mass pool behind the maximum. Some people near the maximum will  
. attempt to start hiding their wealth, therefore the maximum should  
. be high enough to reduce their number to make enforcement effective.  
. There are still more measures which can be taken, for instance  
. progressive income taxes, etc. If things get out of control, the  
. financial emergency powers can be invoked to restore balance (see  
. *Article 8.1.a, Emergency Powers*).

8.2.a-8.1 Capital Monopoly, limit

**The wealth of persons below a certain age is added to the total wealth of their parents.**

**This age is: ..[18].**

. Reasoning. Preventing hoarding schemes through child birth.

8.2.a-8.2 Capital Monopoly, exclusion

**The wealth owned by businesses or entities having an investment permit, can exceed the limit in *Article 8.2.a-8, Capital Monopoly*, only for wealth reserved for the purpose of investment in the common interest, as detailed by the investment permit, see *Article 8.2.a-6, Investment Service Group, permit*.**

. Reasoning. In order to by proxy execute the Government's financial  
. monopoly, one would naturally need to share in some of the  
. exceptional power of the Government in financial matters, such  
. as owning dangerous amounts of wealth and enforcing loans.  
. The wealth needs to be owned in the common interest, the permit  
. can not permit building (excessive) personal palaces.

8.2.a-9 Insurance permit

**The Two Third of Government can give individuals and businesses by permit the right to pool money for the purpose of distributing between members the unexpected or exceptional costs of the few, or establish rules for handing out such permits. The pooled money can not be used for other purposes except the direct business operations.**

. Reasoning. Insurance business is useful. However, it also  
. pools large amounts of money, which could in turn be used as  
. investment capital. Seeking profit on Capital investments is a  
. poison to the economy, but not all insurance businesses may even  
. realize this and act out in good faith for the interest of their  
. clients. It is therefore necessary that it is allowed to pool  
. large amounts of reserve value, while it has to be prevented from  
. becoming a toy. Insurance business can simply demand to be payed  
. for their services, and compete with each other on the productive  
. side of their business. They should not be able to compete with  
. each other in a game of investor capitalism. The bank-account  
. involved will therefore have practical limits, money can not be  
. spend for any and all purposes. If it is, Government ought to take  
. corrective action to prevent Capital abuses. Naturally the Government  
. can itself establish an insurance group(s) if it (that is, the  
. People) wants to, in case of excessive and continuing malpractice.  
. This can give individual clients a choice between different kinds  
. of setups they might want to support.

8.2.a-10 Company Capital Limit

**The Two Third majority of Government establishes a maximum amount of wealth, expressed as a multiple of the average wealth times the number of employees in the company, above which no company is allowed to own. Value is based on realistic production cost for goods, the fair price rather than the actual price - ignored is unusual or speculative value in the actual markets significantly above total production costs, such as may result from works of art.**

**Company can own ..[5]. times average wealth per full time employee.**

. Reasoning. Companies create profit, this they can use the way they  
. want, either for private consumption or investment in their own  
. company. Companies may however also hoard money for however how  
. long. This may in the end pose risks. It is not unlike the Government  
. monopoly on violence, with the understanding that the Government  
. only uses violence to correct crime. When certain groups are  
. allowed to hoard significant stocks of dangerous weapons, this  
. threatens the Government violence monopoly, and what is the purpose  
. anyway (unless for overthrow of dictatorial government, in which  
. case the Government won't like it for different reasons regardless  
. of any Constitution). Hence, this article is to establish at least  
. some maximum, lest people be tempted unnecessarily. Money is for  
. trading and a little security, but not hoarding without end.  
. The way the maximum is expressed, means that companies that want  
. to have more money, also need to hire more people. There is a  
. danger that a company will invest in capital goods, in order to  
. evade the capital limit. Therefore all capital goods are included  
. within the count, the limit should therefore not be too low  
. (increase when needed), companies will come to own potentially  
. significant amounts of total value.

8.2.a-10.1 Company Capital Limit, other

**The Two Third majority of Government can define sectors of the economy that work with their unique maximum on maximum Company ownership, different from the default maximum set in [Article 8.2.a-10](#), *Company Capital Limit*.**

. Reasoning. It is certain that different economic sectors will  
. end up having vastly different amounts of wealth stored in the  
. company assets, even when turning out the same profits per employee.  
. One sort of company might not have assets above a good chair and  
. a coffee machine, another might possess ocean cargo ships, yet  
. the hourly return for working on either could be similar. The  
. Capital limit could for the 'good chair' company be low,  
. and for the cargo-ships business high, while achieving the  
. goal of preventing excessive build-up of wealth inside companies.  
. This maximum is also to have a tool to prevent money laundering  
. and storage in fake companies.

8.2.a-11 No Business Gambling

**A business, the physical and economic substance thereof, becomes immediately a democracy of workers without compensation for the leader/owner, if this owner/leader has used speculative money lending (investing), not received directly and explicitly from the Government finance monopoly.**

. Reasoning. One of the major problems with money gambling in the  
. economy, is that it stimulates abusive companies. Turning companies  
. into democracies reduces this problem directly, but leaves democratic



. companies free to borrow minor sums of money against rent, since they  
. are already democratic and therefore presumably less internally abusive.  
. This set-up means the economy will be less speculative, businesses go  
. bankrupt quicker because they can not postpone it without government  
. loans, and when they go bankrupt they will likely collapse with less  
. financial drama since there will be fewer of defaulting loans with  
. private parties, fewer attachments a failing business will get.

8.2.a-11.1 No Gambling, self reported

**If someone reports to the government authorities a business or person has engaged in an an illegal money trade as described in Article 8.2.a-11, No Business Gambling, or other illegal money trade, a percentage of the money becomes a gift to the reporting party.**

**The percentage the reporting party can keep is: [50%, half].. .**

. Reasoning. This means that democratic businesses can legally  
. extort money gamblers, as long as they report the illegal  
. activity. Dictatorial companies can do the same, but if they  
. are found out they run the risk of becoming democracies. The  
. goal is to hurt those that cause most trouble, and that are  
. the money gamblers. The Constitution takes the side of the  
. businesses against the gambler, this reporting reward  
. makes lending a highly dangerous practice, it makes enforcing  
. the anti-capitalist rules easier.

8.2.a-12 No Speculation

**No person is allowed to make a living income entering a risk-taking state by lending or otherwise investing not directly physically useful instruments of economic value - such as money - in businesses. All income in one month above a certain limit made from such not itself as an activity productive speculation is to be surrendered to the Government immediately.**

**The limit is .[5%, one twentieth].. of average monthly income.**

. Reasoning. A fast and hard rule against money speculation, but  
. trying to exclude businesses that rent out things such as vehicles.  
. Vehicles are "physically useful", and therefore are excluded from  
. the rule. They should be because it is a productive business which  
. repairs/maintains the vehicles. The "only a risk-taking state" is  
. meant to further divide productive rent-businesses from the money  
. gamblers. Money-gamblers tend to only enter a risk-taking state,  
. and are not otherwise productive. It is true that vehicle-lenders  
. enter a risk-taking state also, but they are assumed to be payed  
. for the availability and maintenance on the vehicles, for the  
. repair of the vehicles if the vehicle is damaged (an insurance  
. would probably pay for stolen vehicles, so the insurance is taking  
. the risk part). The money-gamblers are however only payed for  
. risk-taking, they repair and do nothing, at best offer some advice.  
. This "advice" could be charged for directly, a fee for an advice,  
. then it would not be speculation because then they would not first  
. put money in to hope to take more out later.

. The Government monopoly on finance has to be protected. The rule  
. could also be "no income at all", but how is one going to enforce  
. something like that. It would mean preventing even the smallest  
. of lending. If the rule is 5% of monthly income, that means almost  
. nobody would be bothered by the rule because almost nobody tends  
. to make serious money from lending, except the professional money  
. gamblers (who can make billions). It is more practical to exclude

. the extremely small gambles, so as to enforce against larger  
. gambling with more authority.

### Articles [8.3](#): General Lending Limits

#### 8.3.a Loan Default, no collateral

**All loans - or outstanding parts thereof - within the Country, for which there is no immediately available collateral, are terminated after a maximum number of years after they were agreed.**

**The maximum number of years running for a non-collateral loan is:  
..[7]. years.**

. Reasoning. It is a sad thing to be under the burden of a loan.  
. When there is no collateral, there is potentially no way to get out  
. from under the loan. If the lending party practices the trick of  
. suspending payment whenever the loan taker can't pay, the loan is an  
. eternal drain. But where is the responsibility for the loan giver  
. for making a loan that can be payed back within a reasonable time,  
. and where is the need for this loan giver to even get back the money  
. when it can apparently be loaned out and therefore being lost for  
. immediate consumption ? When in a state of crisis, someone may be  
. forced to take a loan, people with excess money should not prey on  
. such helpless victims. Instead, with some leverage for loan giving  
. removed, solutions will have to be found somewhere else, such as  
. a Government intervention of some kind. Compare: student loans for  
. study or Government payed common interest education. Both systems  
. cost money, the first may produce speculative loans, the second won't.  
. [This law is inspired on an anti-capitalist law of Moses.]

---

## Chapter [9](#): Structure of Resources

### Articles [9.1](#): Structure of Resources

#### 9.1.a Structure of Resources

**Every person has the natural and practical right to use its equal share of the available natural resources.**

. Reasoning. Makes sense. Resources tends to go askew over time, creating  
. ever worsening imbalances. When everyone has a right to use a share of  
. resources, everyone has something to bargain with. How else to distribute  
. economic wealth. Distributing resources challenges the user to use them,  
. distributing money does the reverse. When awarded resources, a person  
. can never "lose everything", can always start again, always has a  
. `fighting chance.' People who wish to live differently from the  
. domination of general society, face fewer obstacles. People who for  
. some reason are less able or unable to work, have something to trade  
. with. Distribution of use is a basis for maintaining distribution  
. of power, founding democracy in a firm basis in the economy. Distributed  
. resource suggests cooperative type business, rather than dictatorial.  
. Note that this is not distribution of ownership, which includes right  
. to do whatever within lawful minimums, and the right to sell. It is  
. the right to use. When sale is allowed, a person becomes a lame duck  
. after sale, and imbalances enter the system again.

. One of the purposes of resources is to check them out, either in  
. specified or unspecified amount form, and then rent the right to  
. use the land to someone else, or even the Government. This money  
. can be a basic income, or whatever. The logic not being that a

. basic income would be a natural right, but that use of resource is a  
. right, which happens to be convertible into money. Indirectly: the  
. resource can be rented to a company which specializes in renting out  
. resources to other businesses/individuals.

.  
. Detail laws such as how to exactly organize awarding of resource,  
. how to do justice, when a use right can be revoked and when not,  
. is to be defined by the Government, or by whomever adjusts the  
. constitution to local circumstance, which can of course be  
. different between regions. Wouldn't want to make it too convoluted  
. with (even more?) arbitrary details.

9.1.a-1 Resources, limits

**The Government establishes an accurate record of the total of natural resources.**

.  
. Reasoning. Have to know what to distribute before you can distribute.

9.1.a-2 Resources, nature

**The Government establishes a percentage and/or specific parts for nature.**

.  
. Reasoning. Need nature.

9.1.a-3 Resources, public

**The Government establishes a percentage and/or specific parts as public area.**

.  
. Reasoning. Need public area, roads, public buildings, etc.

9.1.a-4 Resources, usage

**The Government can establish a percentage and/or specific parts as resource which can only be handled, or left untouched, in a way determined by the government.**

.  
. Reasoning. When lands are effective to be used for farming, it can  
. cause long lasting problems when someone suddenly decides to build  
. a home on it. Equally, if someone has secured the right to fish  
. somewhere, that doesn't necessarily give this person the right to  
. bomb the lake for easy fishing, etc etc. Someone living on a dike,  
. does not have the right to make a hole in it (!).

9.1.a-5 Resources, resource bank

**The Government establishes an accounting system in which is recorded who uses what natural resource parts.**

.  
. Reasoning. Need to know what is happening.

9.1.a-6 Resources, rent

**Natural resources up to the total a person has a natural right to, is awarded for free. Whatever the persons wants to have that is still available in the resource bank, is awarded.**

.  
. Reasoning. Choice.

9.1.a-6.1 Continuity usage

**When a resource amount becomes available for handing out by the**

resource bank, the continuing user of the resource has an amount of time to propose someone to the resource bank that is to be awarded the right to the resource.

The waiting period is: ...[one month].

If the continuing user is trying to obstruct the resource allocation process as opposed to finding an enduring and suitable resource right holder, the Government or the resource bank can award the resource right without this protection for the continuing user.

. Reasoning. It matters in principle nothing to the resource-bank  
. who checks out which resources, however it may matter everything  
. to the current user. One of the problems that may occur is  
. hostile politically or privately motivated checkouts. For  
. instance someone has an estate, for which amounts of land are  
. rented to this person, say this person is owner of a successful  
. business. The land is for instance classified as "managed nature"  
. by the Government. Now someone renting their right to the  
. estate dies, the land reappears in the bank for hand-out. Someone  
. spots the opportunity, checks their land back in and quickly  
. checks the portion of the estate. Now all kinds of problems that  
. are not productive may occur, ranging from trying to be a pain  
. for the estate owner to extorting the estate owner for an  
. extremely high rent price, just because the right-holder knows  
. the estate-owner will suffer a lot by not renting some portion.  
. Because of this rule the estate owner has a chance to play  
. several would-be renters against one another, so as to attain  
. a fair(er) price. This rule can also keep land within the same  
. family. If a family uses a portion of land, that means the land  
. can be awarded to someone proposed by the current user.

. Protecting a continuing renting party against abuses from  
. a right holder, opens a hole that can be abused by the renting  
. party: the resource users can collectively hire someone who has  
. no resources checked out. This person takes the contract, then  
. voids it after one minute and checks its rights back in, then  
. the waiting period starts again. This way many resources can be  
. kept in a state of waiting without there having to be rent-payments.  
. This method can also be used as a protocol obstruction.

#### 9.1.a-6.2 Continuity terms

**When the terms for renting a resource right are proposed to be changed by the resource right holder, the renting entity has the right, after giving the resource right holder notice that it is not accepting the proposal and after the resource right holder has given notice it is not accepting that rejection, to propose a new willing resource right holder to the resource bank within a certain time limit, which is to be accepted by the resource bank. If no new right holder is found, the new terms apply.**

The time limit is: ...[one month].

. Reasoning. This protects, the renting party against the right  
. holding party, so that the right-holding party can not abuse  
. its leverage and demand unusually high rent. If someone starts  
. asking a higher rent because it knows the renting user can not  
. do without some resource, that is destructive leverage: 'if  
. the user does not comply, he will suffer dis-proportionally.'  
. This rule also means that if someone has a lucky year in  
. crops, rent-prices can not suddenly skyrocket without the resource  
. right holder running the chance of losing the particular resource  
. to someone else. The resource user can hold this power also as

a punishment, even if it can't find another cheaper rent.

#### 9.1.a-6.3 Continuity produce

**When a resource is used to create a product which can not be separated from the resource without significant economic damage and this condition could reasonably be assumed to have been known to the resource right holder, the renting entity retains the ownership of the produce and access to the resource as before, until the produce can be collected as it would normally be collected, regardless of legal disputes concerning the resource.**

**If the legal dispute allows finding a new resource right holder, see [Article 9.1.a-6.1](#), *Continuity usage*, and [Article 9.1.a-6.2](#), *Continuity terms*, the period for finding a new resource holder is extended for as long as the produce is attached to the resource, up to a certain maximum.**

**This maximum is: ...[one year and three month's].**

Reasoning. This is to protect farmers, who are not to be disturbed with legalistic tricks while the crops are growing, they are to be certain that the crops are theirs whatever else happens. The produce growing from multi-year trees can be a problem, because it can be unclear whether the produce is attached to the land is the trees or the fruit. The rent-contract may indicate this: one could either rent a fully grown set of trees or a barren piece of land unto which the renting party plants trees. The right to the trees would naturally fall to the entity having planted or bought them. However this would mean one only had to plant trees to use a resource forever under unchanging conditions, since "the produce is attached." For such problems the maximum time is 15 month, which should leave enough time for the natural cycle toward fruit, and then the possibility of either moving the trees or finding a new right holder.

The article says "dispute", once a Judge has determined what the status is there is no longer a "dispute," hence if the Judge says the produce is to be destroyed (for instance) then that is to be done. As long as there is uncertainty (or appeals possible), the produce should be protected if it is impossible to restore to normal once "moved." If a legal dispute ends with the determination that "the produce is in the wrong location, not rented by producer to begin with", then that should obviously mean the produce is lost to the producer, since it wasn't properly owned by producer to begin with. This article meant to protect the produce during legal status changes, where it is first rented properly by producer, but this status is claimed to have been changed later by resource right holder.

#### 9.1.a-6.4 Continuity government

**When the Government wants to change the status of a resource, it has to compensate the current user at least for economic losses, plus the reasonable costs of resettling into an equally economic profitable position, plus a reasonable average wage payment for the additional work done because of the Government request, plus the value of one day average wage, plus a percentage of this sum in damages.**

**The percentage is: ..10%..**

Reasoning. The Government is expected to behave well, but it may be useful to set a rule so that everyone knows what "well

. behaving" means for the Government. If the Government wants to  
. change something, for instance a crop land should become an  
. harbor, the farmer has to be compensated. It makes sense that  
. the cost is simply the cost of setting up somewhere else, or  
. setting up something equal. It makes sense that there will be  
. additional work involved for the resettling party, so that has  
. to be payed for even if it is private work, because it is  
. involuntarily. And then some damages because it was involuntarily.  
. These things should also prevent the Government (system)  
. becoming less popular when it behaves rudely to people with less  
. power on the one hand, and it prevents individuals demanding  
. extortion prices from the Government. The "one day average wage"  
. is the only fixed quantity (times 1.1), all others might be zero,  
. therefore it is there as a payment-minimum, so that the right  
. holder always gets something regardless of all else.

#### 9.1.a-7 Structure of Resources, home

**Every person can claim and is awarded the natural resources it uses for a home it lives in, removing prior claims on the same resource, up to the maximum it has a natural right to use.**

. Reasoning. Prevent parasitic land-claim rent schemes by private  
. individuals.

#### 9.1.b Price Maximum

**The People or in their absence the Government set a price maximum on resource rent.**

. Reasoning. The dynamic of trying to get highest resource rent from  
. companies leads to the same pressure on social working conditions  
. as private investing. The companies that abuse workers most, are  
. able to make best profits to pay highest recourse rents. The companies  
. that focus power and money are more easily persuaded, promoting  
. business dictatorships over democracies. But it is not as bad as  
. private investments with money, because the resource-rent is distributing  
. money to many people, and most will not have an interest in the  
. worsening business conditions. This may persuade not to seek highest  
. rent. Those not interested in the common good or long term personal  
. good, could be stopped by a rent maximum. One solution would be  
. to make the resource rent maximum zero, making renting out resources  
. a useless exercise. Companies could then "check resources out of  
. the resources bank" without any economic burden. Playing with the  
. height of the rent may be a useful political tool to influence the  
. economy. If rent is zero one might want to do away with the rent  
. bureaucracy. However if many people suddenly wanted to use their own  
. resources personally, it would be easier if it was known where their  
. resources are if the supply of "not explicitly checked out of the  
. resources bank" resources has been depleted, and resources have to be  
. taken away from active companies. Removing a personalized rent  
. bureaucracy means the government becomes the lending agency, and  
. the rent income would count as government income for the common  
. good. This gives the government more power over to individuals,  
. how and where they are awarded their resources. Individuals may not be  
. able in practice, to use their resources the way they want because  
. of government obstruction (corruption). If individuals own resources,  
. it is more likely that a body of fair law is created to solve  
. differences. If the government can pick and choose who gets which  
. what and why, this is more likely to breed abuse of that power.  
. When there is a rent price maximum, people who have reached the  
. maximum stop being interested (legally) in bargaining for more.



© Written and (C)opyright by [Jos Boersema](#). This constitution text is released into the 'public domain', do what you want with it.

Latest change (Hebrew):

27 Tevet 5767, [8.2.a-7.1](#), [8.2.a-4.3](#), [8.2.a-9](#), [8.2.a](#), [8.2.a-10](#)  
28 Tevet 5767, [3.2.b-1.3](#), [variables](#), [8.2.a-7](#)  
1 Sh'vat 5767, [3.2.b-1.3](#)  
2 Nisan 5767, [9.1.b](#)  
9 Iyyar 5767, [3.1.c-3.1](#) [8.2.a-5.1](#)  
23 Iyyar 5767, [3.1.c-4.3](#)  
24 Iyyar 5767, [3.1.a-2](#), [3.1.b-4.2](#), [3.1.b](#)  
25 Iyyar 5767, [3.3.a](#), [2.2.a](#), [2.2.a-1](#), [2.2.a-2](#), [2.2.b](#), [2.2.b-1](#), [3.4.a](#), [3.4.a-1](#), [3.3.a-1.1](#)  
6 Sivan 5767, [\[moved \(2.1\)\]](#), [2.1.b-1](#)  
11 Sivan 5767, [3.5.a](#)  
15 Sivan 5767, [6.6](#)  
16 Sivan 5767, [3.1.b](#), [3.1.b-7](#), [3.1.b-7.1](#), [3.1.b-7.1.2](#), [1.1.a-1.2](#)  
17 Sivan 5767, [4.3.a](#)  
18 Sivan 5767, [8.2.a-7](#), [8.2.a-11](#), [8.2.a-11.1](#), [8.2.a-12](#)  
22 Sivan 5767, [9.1.a-4](#), [9.1.a-6.1](#), [9.1.a-6.2](#), [9.1.a-6.3](#), [9.1.a-6.4](#)  
25 Sivan 5767, [1.1.c](#), [1.1.c-1](#), [1.1.c-1.1](#)  
18 Tamuz 5767, [8.2.a-10.1](#)  
20 Tamuz 5767, [8.1.a](#)  
21 Tamuz 5767, [8.1.b-3.1](#), [8.2.a-4.2](#), [8.2.a-4.3](#), [8.2.a-6](#), [8.2.a-9](#) [8.2.a-10](#), [8.2.a-11.1](#), [8.2.a-12](#)  
22 Tamuz 5767, [3.1.c-5](#), [3.1.c-5.1](#)  
24 Tamuz 5767, [3.1.c-5.1](#)  
25 Tamuz 5767, [6.3.a-5.1](#)  
27 Tamuz 5767, [6.3.a-5.1](#), [6.3.a](#)  
28 Tamuz 5767, [7.1.a](#), [7.3.a-1](#), [7.3.a-1 \[moved\]](#), [3.1.c-1.8](#), [8.2.a-8](#)  
3 Av 5767, [3.1.d](#), [3.1.d-1](#), [3.1.d-2](#), [3.1.d-3](#), [3.1.d-3.1](#), [3.1.d-3.2](#)  
5 Av 5767, [6.3.a-5.1](#)  
6 Av 5767, [2.1.c](#)  
8 Av 5767, [2.3.a](#),  
15 Av 5767, [3.1.d-4](#)  
16 Av 5767, [3.1.d-3.2.1](#), [3.1.d-3.2.2](#), [3.1.d-3.2.3](#), [3.1.d-3.2.4](#), [3.5.a](#), [3.1.d-5](#), [3.1.d-6](#)  
17 Av 5767, [4.1.a](#), [4.1.b-1](#), [4.1.b-3](#), [4.1.b-3.1](#), [4.1.b-4](#), [4.1.c](#), [4.1.b-2](#), [4.1.b](#), [6.3.b](#)  
18 Av 5767, [3.1.c-1.8](#), [3.1.c-1.8.1](#), [3.1.c-1.8.2](#)  
19 Av 5767, [3.1.c-1.1](#), [3.1.c-1.1.1](#), [3.1.c-1.4](#), [3.1.c-1.5](#), [3.1.c-1.7](#) [3.1.b-6](#)  
20 Av 5767, [3.1.c-5](#) [3.1.c-5.1](#)  
21 Av 5767, [4.1.a](#), [4.1.a-1](#), [4.1.b](#), [4.1.b-1](#), [4.1.b-2](#), [4.1.b-3](#), [4.1.b-3.1](#), [4.1.b-4](#), [4.1.c](#), [4.2.a](#), [4.2.b](#), [4.2.c](#),  
[4.2.d](#), [4.2.d-1](#), [4.3.a](#), [3.2.a](#), [3.2.a-1](#), [3.2.a-1.1](#), [3.2.a-2](#), [3.2.a-2.1](#), [3.2.a-3](#), [3.2.a-3.1](#), [3.2.a-3.2](#), [3.2.a-3.3](#),  
[3.1.d-3.2.4](#), [3.1.d-1](#),  
22 Av 5767, [3.2.a-3.4](#), [3.1.c-1.8.3](#)  
23 Av 5767, [3.1.d-6](#), [3.1.d-6.1](#), [\[moved 3.1.d-\\*](#)], [1.2.a](#), [1.2.a-1](#), [1.2.a-1.1](#), [1.2.a-2](#), [3.2.b-1](#), [3.2.b-1.2](#)  
24 Av 5767, [3.1.c-1.8.2](#), [3.1.c-1.8.3](#), [3.2.b](#)  
25 Av 5767, [3.1.c-4](#), [3.1.d-2](#), [3.4.a](#), [3.4.b](#), [3.2.b](#), [1.3.a](#), [8.3.a](#), [2.1.d](#), [3.1.d-2.1](#)  
27 Av 5767, [3.1.d-2.2](#), [1.1.b-2](#), [3.1.d-5.4](#)  
28 Av 5767, [3.1.e-6](#)  
29 Av 5767, [1.4.a](#), [1.4.a-1](#), [1.1.c-1.1](#), [3.1.c-1](#), [1.1.c](#)  
2 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.8](#), [3.1.c-1.8.2](#), [3.1.c-1.8.4](#)  
4 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.1](#)



6 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.8](#), [1.2.a-3](#), [1.2.a-4](#)  
8 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.8.5](#)  
9 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.8](#), [1.4.a](#), [1.4.a-2](#), [3.2.a-3.4](#), [3.2.a-3.5](#), [3.1.c-2](#), [3.1.c-1.1](#), [3.1.c-1.8](#)  
10 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.1](#), [3.1.c-1.1.1](#), [4.2.d-1](#), [3.1.c-1.8.2](#)  
12 Elul 5767, [3.1.c-1.8.6](#), [3.1.c-1.8.7](#)  
14 Elul 5767, [3.2.b-3](#), [3.2.b-3.1](#), [1.1.c-1](#), [4.1.b-3](#)  
20 Tishrei 5768, [3.2.b-2](#)  
22 Tishrei 5768, [2.2.a](#), [1.1.a-1.2](#), [3.1.d-2.2](#), [3.1.c-4.3](#), 3.1.b-5.1 + 3.1.b-6.1 (solved in 3.1.b), [3.1.b-6](#)  
2 Cheshvan, 5768, [3.1.c-1.8.1](#)  
3 Cheshvan, 5768, [2.2.a](#), [2.2.a-3](#), [2.2.a-4](#)  
5 Cheshvan, 5768, 7.2.a, 7.3.a, 7.3.a-1, 7.3.a-2  
9 Cheshvan, 5768, [6.3.a](#), [6.3.a-1](#), [6.3.a-4](#), [1.2.a-1](#)  
10 Cheshvan, 5768, [1.2.a-1.2](#), [1.2.a-1.3](#)  
11 Cheshvan, 5768, [1.2.a-1.2](#)  
12 Cheshvan, 5768, [3.1.c-1.8.8](#), [3.1.c-1.8.9](#)  
16 Cheshvan, 5768, 3.3.a-1, 3.3.a-1.1, 3.3.a-1.2 [counter productive]  
19 Cheshvan, 5768, [3.1.e-3](#), [2.2.a-5](#), [2.2.a](#)  
22 Cheshvan, 5768, [1.3.a-1](#), [2.1.e](#), [3.2.b](#), [3.2.b-4](#), [3.2.b-4.1](#), [3.2.b-4.2](#)  
28 Cheshvan, 5768, [3.1.d](#)  
10 Kislev 5768, [3.1.b-1](#)  
16 Kislev 5768, [3.1.d-9](#)  
feb 2009, [3.1.d](#) 100 changed to 50, delegates can work part-time as delegate and the rest of the time be like everyone else, naturally being accessible for the people. 100 is also possible, but 50 seems like a tighter and faster control. It makes the 1st delegates layer bigger and thus harder, but it is a specialist layer that is more efficient and organized, hence should be capable of bearing more social load. It is harder for a voter-group to be involved.  
1 Sh'vat 5772 / jan 25 2012, [3.1.d](#), [3.1.d-5.2](#), [3.2.a-3.1](#), [6.3.b](#) (updated from earlier changes.)