

D.A.V.I.D. Constitution Proposal ~ 239 laws

*Ratification stage: 5 (excluding the amendments **in bold**)*

D.A.V.I.D. Constitution plus Amendments

~ 240+ laws

*Ratification stage: 6 (the amendments **in bold**)*

Note the following technicalities in stage 6:

If 1.1.a-1 Changes is Ratified in stage 5, a special 1.1.a-1 Referendum is than needed for each amendment to be Ratified.

1.2.a Territory may be breached by ratification (the nation is too large).

1.2.b Proper Nation Size protocol could be activated upon Ratification.

This is the 239 law Constitution Proposal (see 'Constitution Proposal' by same author), plus a number additional amendments. Amendments added into the Constitution text are in bold, their location in the Table of Contents is marked with "240+". Only some amendments have been worked into the text: the job of making the Constitutional law passes to the reader by design, to start owning their own Constitution and bearing the responsibility for it.

D.A.V.I.D. Stands for:

Democratic:

Authorities (Government)

Ventures (Companies, Businesses)

Investments (Finance, anti-Wealth/Power concentration through hoarding of wealth)

Demarcations (Distribution of Land to all.)

Groningen (The Netherlands), 23 September 2014,

Jos Boersema

Table Of Contents:

	<i>Page in index:</i>	<i>~ in content:</i>
<i>Chapter 1: Structure of Constitution</i>	<i>[240+]</i>	..
<i>Chapter 2: Structure of Individual protection</i>		..
<i>Chapter 3: Structure of Government</i>	<i>[240+]</i>	..
<i>Chapter 4: Structure of Disaster Relief</i>	<i>[240+]</i>	..
<i>Chapter 5: Structure of Monopoly Sectors</i>		..
<i>Chapter 6: Structure of Free Markets</i>		..
<i>Chapter 7: Structure of Special Markets</i>	<i>[240+]</i>	..
<i>Chapter 8: Structure of Finance</i>		..
<i>Chapter 9: Structure of Resources</i>	<i>[240+]</i>	..
<i>Page in Constitution:</i>		
<i>Amendments List</i>		..
<i>Amendment 1</i>		..
<i>Amendment 2</i>		..
<i>Amendment 3</i>		..
<i>Amendment 4</i>		..
<i>Amendment 5</i>		..
<i>Amendment 6</i>		..
<i>Amendment 7</i>		..
<i>Amendment 8</i>		..
<i>Amendment 9</i>		..
<i>Amendment 10</i>		..
<i>Amendment 11</i>		..
<i>Amendment 12</i>		..
<i>Amendment 13</i>		..
<i>Amendment 14</i>		..
<i>Amendment 15</i>		..
<i>Amendment 16</i>		..
<i>Amendment 17</i>		..
<i>Amendment 18</i>		..
<i>Amendment 19</i>		..
<i>Amendment 20</i>		..
<i>Amendment 21</i>		..
<i>Amendment 22</i>		..
<i>Amendment 23</i>		..
<i>Amendment 24</i>		..
<i>Amendment 25</i>		..
<i>Amendment 26</i>		..

(Page numbers removed, because this document sometimes changes and it is too much work to redo all page-numbers all the time.)

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

Amendment 19 --- Nation Size Protocol ---

1.2.b Proper Nation Size

[240+]

1.2.b-1 Nation Split Protocol

[240+]

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.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 *International Justice*
 - 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-4.4 New Government, deputies

Amendment 13 --- Limit Delegate Salary ---

3.1.c-5 Delegate Compensation

- 3.1.c-5.1 Delegate Compensation, Council

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

Amendment 18 --- Country Council Restrictions ---

- 3.1.d-5.5 Country Council, Docile: no theft [240+]
- 3.1.d-5.6 Country Council, Docile: travel [240+]
- 3.1.d-5.7 Country Council, Docile: periodic removal [240+]

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

Amendment 6 --- Common Militia ---

- Articles 4.4: Self Defense [240+]
- 4.4.a An Armed People [240+]
 - 4.4.a-1 An Armed People: training [240+]
 - 4.4.a-2 An Armed People: secrecy [240+]
 - 4.4.a-3 An Armed People: defense [240+]
 - 4.4.a-4 An Armed People: limit [240+]
- Articles 4.5: Common Militia [240+]
- 4.5.a Common Militia: General [240+]
 - [rest of articles 4.5: under construction, by you ?]

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-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

6.5.a-3 Maximum company size

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.a-2 Special Markets, establishment

[240+]

7.1.a-3 Special Markets, limit

[240+]

Amendment 5 --- Chapter 7 By Law ---

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-6.5 Distance priority

[240+]

Amendment 14 --- Local land use ---

9.1.a-7 Resources, home

9.1.b Price Maximum

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.

_1.1.a-1 Changes

The Constitution can only be changed by the People directly.

_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).

_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.

_1.1.b Scope

The constitution is the supreme set of rules.

_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.

_1.1.b-2 Unity of Law

The constitution is one and the same across the entire 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.

_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.

_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.

Articles 1.2: Territory

_1.2.a Territory

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

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

Amendment 19 --- Nation Size Protocol ---

_1.2.b Proper Nation Size

The nation will split into multiple nations, when the nation has become too large. Above a certain size the split protocol must be initiated.

The size is: ..30 million people.

_1.2.b-1 Nation Split Protocol

Each phase of the split protocol takes 20 years. (Articles 1.2.a Territory are not superceded by these articles.)

1: The thinking phase.

Referendums will be held, see 3.1.b Referendum.

2: Provisional Government phase.

*Each new nation will elect a further council,
see 3.1.d-3 Further Government Body*

3: Councils harmonization phase.

*The further councils are harmonized.
The Law Court gains a seat in each new Nation,
see 3.2.a-3 Law Court.*

4: Splitting phase.

*New Currencies are initiated,
see 3.1.d-5.2 Country Council, Currency.
The split is furthered through all organizations.*

5: Establishment phase.

*The King Elect - if any - of the former Nation steps down,
see 3.1.c-1.8 King Elect.
The Supreme Law Court is established in each Nation,
see 3.2.a-3 Law Court
The split is formalized in all requirements.*

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.

_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.

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 than 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.

_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.

_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.

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 extracting information (torture), or for the purpose of punishment, or any other purpose against the will of that particular human body (person).

_2.1.a-1 Compensation

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

_2.1.a-2 Animals

Animals are not to be treated with cruelty.

_2.1.b Free speech

People have the right to express any opinion they want.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

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, in public. 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.

_2.2.a-1 Presumed innocent

People suspected of crime are presumed innocent until proven guilty.

_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.

_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.

_2.2.a-4 International Justice

People can be extradited to another Country, without the right of that country to extradite them to yet another Country, where they have committed a crime according to our system of Justice, a crime that would also be a crime in our Country.

The Country Council may prevent the extradition, in which case the convicted individual can be punished for the crime in our Country.

_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.

_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.

_2.2.b-1 Fair punishment, reading

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

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 extend parents are responsible for their children, at any time.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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%].

_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.

_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.

_3.1.b-4 Transparency

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

_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.

_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.

_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.)

_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.

_3.1.b-7.1.1 Vote Decay, speed

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

_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.

_3.1.c Electing Government

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

_3.1.c-1 Electoral Committee

Elections are ordered to occur at a date set by 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 then 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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_3.1.c-1.5 Electoral Committee, salary

Electoral Committee members receive one month median salary per year.

Exception: Article 3.1.c-1.8, King Elect.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_3.1.c-1.8.7 Start of Reign

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

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_3.1.c-4.1 New Government

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

_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.

_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.

_3.1.c-4.4 New Government, deputies

A Voter Group (see Article [3.1.d](#), People Government) may have one Deputy Delegate, who may participate in Councils on behalf of and under direction by the Delegate. Only that Deputy Delegate can be additionally elected as a Deputy Delegate to a further Council by the same voters whom elected the Delegate to that Council.

Amendment 13 --- Limit Delegate Salary ---

_3.1.c-5 Delegate Compensation

From no to reasonable Compensation for once elected Delegates is decided upon by Referendum (see Article 3.1.b, Referendum).

Further Councils may receive money for personal compensation to their elected Delegates, if described in law (see 3.1.d-3 Further Government Body).

_3.1.c-5.1 Delegate Compensation, Council

All Councils may receive money to spend on the cost of maintaining the Council itself in similar comfort as generally enjoyed, as described in law.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_3.1.d-2.1 Council Agenda

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

_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.

_3.1.d-3 Further Government Body

The delegates can assemble out of their own initiative into at least 10 blocks, each block allowed to send a representative that is already in their block,

Each delegate block elects a delegate block housekeeper, and may also elect a Deputy representative from within 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.

_3.1.d-4 Advice Council

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

_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.

_3.1.d-5.1 Country Council, Constitution

The Country council maintains and repairs the Constitution.

_3.1.d-5.2 Country Council, Currency

The Country Council maintains the currency of the country.

_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.

_3.1.d-5.4 Country Council, Local Law

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

Amendment 18 --- Country Council Restrictions ---

_3.1.d-5.5 Country Council, Docile: no theft

The Country Council is funded at leisure by further councils, see 3.1.d-3 Further Government Body

_3.1.d-5.6 Country Council, Docile: travel

The Country Council is has no home location. It will plan to be in each 1/50th area equally, after receiving permission from the delegates to be there.

_3.1.d-5.7 Country Council, Docile: periodic removal

Every so many years, the Country Council is disbanded for a time. Country Ministries - if any - are overseen by a council of appointees. One Ministerial council appointee comes from each area that elect to the Country Council and is appointed by the delegates there, or in their absence their Further Council. See 3.1.d-6 Ministries, 3.1.d-3 Further Government Body

*The Country Council is removed every: .50th year.,
for the duration of: ..One year.*

_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.

_3.1.d-6.1 Ministries, Distributed

Ministries are distributed throughout the area of Governance.

_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.

_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.

_3.1.d-9 No Bribes

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

_3.1.e Public Consultancy

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

_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.

_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.

_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]..

_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.

_3.1.e-5 Public Consultancy, Public Proxy

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

_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).*

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.

_3.2.a-1 Courts of Justice

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

_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.

_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.

_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.

_3.2.a-3 Law Court

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

_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.

_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.

_3.2.a-3.3 Law Court, strength

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

_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.

_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.

_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.

_3.2.b-1 Demonstration

The Police may not prevent peaceful mass demonstration.

_3.2.b-1.1 Demonstration, Government limit

Governments may not order the Police to prevent mass demonstration.

_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.

_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]..

_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.

_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].

_3.2.b-3 Anti Pirate force

The Police protects transportation and travel through international territories.

_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.

_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.

_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 then 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 then 3 times in the last 10 years, no Judges will have to agree to the search.

_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.

Articles 3.3: Equality of Government

_3.3.a Inclusive

The law strives to establish equality of power.

Articles 3.4: Space

_3.4.a Local Space

The local democratic Government concerns itself with local problems.

_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.

_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.

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.

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 relieve the People in times of disaster. This organization trains for disasters according to 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.

_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.

_4.1.b What war

The disaster relief organization fights invading armies.

_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.

_4.1.b-2 No Police Tasks

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

_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.

_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.

_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.

_4.1.c Unity of Humanity

The times of tribal battle and domination Empire are gone.

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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

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.

Amendment 6 --- Common Militia ---

Articles 4.4: Self Defense

_4.4.a An Armed People

People of 50 years old and older, may trade, own and possess weapons of such precision that upon normal use will kill an intended target at 100 distances, while leaving generally unharmed a person standing at 15 distances away from the target, at an angle from the weapon user that most easily affords this.

Heavier Weapons and for younger people may be subject to law.

_4.4.a-1 An Armed People: training

Practice with and temporary possession of weapons, for all ages, will not be outlawed, or unduly restricted beyond what public safety requires.

_4.4.a-2 An Armed People: secrecy

Weapons rightfully owned or in possession do not have to be shown upon request and may not be listed or tracked by the Government, except when reasonably suspected of having been used in a crime, in accordance with the law on police searches.

_4.4.a-3 An Armed People: defense

Weapons may used by anyone for reasonable self-defense against a grave and present threat of violence, not including verbal threats of violence.

_4.4.a-4 An Armed People: limit

People with certainty convicted of criminal acts such as theft and violence against innocent people, may be denied being rightful owners of weapons. The confiscated weapons will be sold back to the People in the open market.

Not more then a percentage of rightful owners of weapons may fall under this restriction. This percentage is: ..[10%].

Articles 4.5: Common Militia

4.5.a Common Militia: General

*A by internal council *) installed *) General, over a minimum size allowed to be armed *), commonly constituted *) self or otherwise assembled defense group (hereafter: Common Militia), for the purpose of freedom of speech and assembly *), who have the necessary discipline *), may order his/her units to carry and keep weapons, if necessary for their duty to the people.*

*(*) See section directly below).*

[rest of articles 4.5: under construction, by you]

Common Militia: Council

The Common Militia is ruled by an internal council elected by the membership. The council strives for order, peace and the minimum democratic rights of all people; it will not tolerate disorder within it's own organization.

Common Militia: Installed

The Common Militia council appoints it's top and second in military command, by public vote. The Common Militia has a military hierarchy

throughout its organization, with publicly acceptable rules of conduct.

Common Militia: General, Minimum armed size

A Commander over 7 000 (seven thousand) people or more.

Common Militia: Common

The Common Militia will not discriminate against membership applications other than on grounds of: military fitness, lack of reasonable discipline, or belonging to a criminal group.

A criminal group may include the Government, or parts thereof.

Common Militia: Purpose

The Common Militia protects a minimum of the political rights of freedom of speech, assembly and organization. The Common Militia protects others, any and all, from unreasonable violence, when the Police is not carrying out this duty sufficiently.

Common Militia: Discipline

The Common Militia maintains good standards of discipline, by adequate punishment, removal from the Common Militia, and surrendering to the police where necessary, of misbehaving individuals.

Common Militia: Sovereignty and Rebuilding

If the rule of law becomes the pursuit of crime, when the Government forsakes its duty to cause grave harm and death without being corrected by peaceful means, those targeted and their defenders become Sovereign for the establishment of a renewed Justice and peaceful general order, and their reasonable self defense.

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 than 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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_5.1.c-6 Service Group, privatization

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

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.

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.

_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).

_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,

_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.

Articles 6.3: Hand over Business

_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.

_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]..

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

Articles 6.4: Minimum Working Conditions

_6.4.a Minimum conditions

The Government establishes minimum working conditions.

_6.4.a-2 Worker safety

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

_6.4.a-3 Environmental safety

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

_6.4.a-4 Public safety

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

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.

_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).

_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.

_6.5.a-3 Maximum company size

A maximum company size is established by law, not larger than: ..[2 000]. (two thousand) people.

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.

_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.

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.

_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.

Amendment 5 --- Chapter 7 By Law ---

_7.1.a-2 Special Markets, establishment

Special or partially special markets are defined by the Two Thirds majority of Government. The establishment of a special market occurs by law, see Article _3.1.d-2.2 Council Law Making.

_7.1.a-3 Special Markets, limit

Special or partially special markets, including all direct Government services, may not exceed a certain amount of work hours of the total amount of work hours expended in the Nation, for longer then a certain amount of time.

The amount of work hours is: ..[20%].

The amount of time is: ..3. years

_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.

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.

_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.

_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.

_8.1.b-1 Rotate Currency, new money

The Government establishes a new currency.

_8.1.b-1.1 Taxes in money

The Government demands payments in the new currency.

_8.1.b-2 Rotate Currency, debt

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

_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.

_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.

_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 extend the Government financial monopoly is not threatened.

_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.

_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.

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.

_8.2.a-1 Creation of money

The Government creates money, the Government destroys money.

_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 than the value of a year's wages just buying luxury for a rich (wo)man."

_8.2.a-3 Taxes

The Government demands taxes.

_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.

_8.2.a-4.1 Consumption credit

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

_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 paid back.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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, one quarter].. times the average wealth.

_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.

_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.

_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].

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_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.

_8.2.a-11.1 No Gambling, self reported

If someone reports to the government authorities a business or person has engaged in 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].. .

_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.

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.

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.

_9.1.a-1 Resources, limits

The Government establishes an accurate record of the total of natural resources.

_9.1.a-2 Resources, nature

The Government establishes a percentage and/or specific parts for nature.

_9.1.a-3 Resources, public

The Government establishes a percentage and/or specific parts as public area.

_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.

_9.1.a-5 Resources, resource bank

The Government establishes an accounting system in which is recorded who uses what natural resource parts.

_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.

_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.

_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].

_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].

_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%..

Amendment 14 --- Local land use ---

_9.1.a-6.5 Distance priority

A person can register a need for land near their home, so that when land becomes available the first choice is for who lives nearest to it.

_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.

9.1.6 Price Maximum

The People or in their absence the Government set a price maximum on resource rent.

Changelog and reasoning

Added to the 239 model: laws marked by [240+] in the table of contents.

This Extended 204+ Constitution proposal may stay in this unfinished state from this end, so that if anyone wants to implement this system, they have to start working creatively to at least make it properly readable. That transfers the practice of Constitutional law making responsibility to them, in that nation, where it belongs. It is suggested that the reader gets creative. (If nobody cares for your work, no matter what you try or how smart it is what you have invented, then you know how it was and is to write this constitution.)

List of Amendments (Chronological order, oldest first)

<i>Amendment:</i>		<i>Page:</i>
1 * <i>Company size Maximum</i>	<i>(Chapter 6)</i>	..
2 * <i>Constitution Above Exception</i>	<i>(Chapter 1)</i>	..
3 * <i>No Government Debts</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
4 * <i>Limited Government Contract Liability</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
5 * <i>Chapter 7 By Law</i>	<i>(Chapter 7)</i>	..
6 * <i>Common Militia</i>	<i>(Chapter 4)</i>	..
7 * <i>Law Making limit</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
8 * <i>Country Council initiation</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
9 * <i>Delegate Age limit</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
10 * <i>Delegate Duration limit</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
11 * <i>Company seniority council</i>	<i>(Chapter 6)</i>	..
12 * <i>Sovereign Inspector limits</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
13 * <i>Limit Delegate Salary</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
14 * <i>Local land use</i>	<i>(Chapter 9)</i>	..
15 * <i>No suspension</i>	<i>(Chapter 1)</i>	..
16 * <i>Judge not Police</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
17 * <i>Allow Smaller Further Council</i>	<i>(Chapter 4)</i>	..
18 * <i>Country Council Restrictions</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
19 * <i>Nation Size Protocol</i>	<i>(Chapter 1)</i>	..
20 * <i>Taxation Maximum</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
21 * <i>No Fake Wars</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
22 * <i>Referendum Representative weighted</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
23 * <i>Removing minimum wage</i>	<i>(Chapter 6)</i>	..
24 * <i>Jury Justice</i>	<i>(Chapter 2,3)</i>	..
25 * <i>Jurisprudence</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..
26 * <i>Deputy Delegate</i>	<i>(Chapter 3)</i>	..

Amendment 1

--- *Company size Maximum* ---

- *Company size maximum, probably 2000 persons (about 10 times a large interpretation of the anonymity border), maybe larger (chapter 6)*

Reasoning. This law prevents excessive centralization of power in one company (democratic or dictatorial). It can also have the effect of calming the power hungry with the thought that their competitors can likewise not get

above this maximum. It prevents fusions of companies with too many employees. Note that within a company, there is typically not trade, but a planned economy. It is infeasible to ask payment for every little activity, such as "go get that nail, I pay you 0.001 cents." By forcing an upper size limit, complex production has to be divided between independent units that trade with each other. The total amount of traded transaction as opposed to top-down ordered actions increases if there are more companies. More companies also means more company top management people who are at that point where free contracts are closed, which means more people in the nation have that kind

of a life and experience, which is good for negotiation skills in general, and also the way Sovereign Countries in principle ought to deal with each other (as opposed to subjugating themselves under an third power.)

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Lucky you: Sun Jan 11 10:03:39 UTC 2015, undersigned is having to do it for you. The minimum-wage law was scratched by amendment, but also scratched from the other smaller versions. This brings the articles to 238 in the "239" model, which is getting messy and hence this law is put in the 239-law Constitution. A second reason is that this law should have been there from the start. This principle of limiting company size was even mentioned before the 239-law Constitution was developed. It is an important issue for the economy, similar to the wealth maximum and nation-size limitations, with similarities to soil distribution. It is no accident that this is the first amendment, and has been the reason to start the amendment series.

It brings confidence to the society, knowing that there is a clear upper limit so that society will not again be destroyed by the super-large companies. The measure is hardly a radical leftist idea, but puts teeth into the principle that even Adam Smith has mentioned about the dangers of cartels and monopolies. Notice how you will likely see conglomerates emerging anyway, consisting of multiple such companies working very closely together. However the Conglomerate will be broken to a degree, by the democratization law: the workers in one of the companies will eventually take control there, and when the time comes they will choose their own self interest. It is also not necessarily a problem if companies work very closely together, except when control is held by a tiny clique. Here a worst case theoretical scenario of a 2 000 person limit:

[./post/005/DV_coops/2000_size_simulation.html](#)

The following law is proposed in the Anti-monopoly article: [6.5.a-3 Maximum Company Size](#) It is a useful addition, because there can be a complicated factory production process requiring tens of thousands of workers, who could just manage it all in a setup of multiple 1000 to 2000 person businesses. There could be a single 1500 person business, who produces for international markets with heavy competition for far away, producing expensive goods for which the transport cost is small. Mining is sometimes such a type of business, which is concentrated in one place due to circumstances. Such businesses do not necessarily constitute a monopoly, even when they are the only production facility of the kind around. For such businesses this size limit can sometimes be a hindrance. Screwing it too low could at some point make it intolerable.

However there could be rural villages of merely a few thousand inhabitants, in a wider network of such villages, where if one business contained 2 000 persons it would already become a totalitarian plan economy. To have a hard limit on size gives clarity, and does not allow the politicians to ruin the system because of their "wisdom." At the same time a hard limit is not enough of a solution, hence the other two articles are necessary. Because the situation is difficult to predict, and hard to put in short Constitutional law, only a responsibility is created for the law maker, to maintain the free markets and do something against the threat of monopolies. This establishes the

markets to a degree as a field of crops that a farmer is responsible for to keep it healthy, rather than a wilderness where the biggest group is allowed to dominate all others, and seen as therefore the winner who takes all.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

Amendment 2

--- Constitution Above Exception ---

- A restriction to chap 1 art 1 ... "If this Constitution remains generally approved, there will be no deviation only for a particular case."

Reasoning. There is some risk that chapter 1, article 1, will be read in such a way that a large enough riot might have the right to do whatever they want. Note that it is to a degree also an article because this is a draft Constitution. If a Nation (National Convention) wishes to bind their own people to a Law, it is their duty to do so. It seems to me that this should emanate from them, and not from undersigned who writes a draft (essentially to prove that a DAVID economy can function). This addition closes it a little bit further, perhaps. Essentially this is a fiddle (minute update.)

Some nations have systems by which the People in Referendum or a Jury, may override the laws (but perhaps not the Constitution). Such systems are not explored in this Constitution (as of year 2014), although perhaps they should be. This Amendment goes some way in the other direction: the Constitution is supreme, can not be put down in a moment by a large group or even a majority (although the practicality of enforcing law against a majority is difficult).

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 3

--- No Government Debts ---

- Government prohibited from becoming indebted (chapter 3, near taxation law) Might even go so far as saying "Government must save for larger projects." Which is patronizing but then again, ... maybe governments have asked for that

No debts for Government

The Government will never incur debts upon itself. It will not accept a sum of valuable items of whatever nature, such as or money, upon promises to later repay more or less of what was

received in whatever way.

Reasoning. The original reason to leave this out of the Constitution, was to allow a nation the freedom to destroy themselves. Becoming excessively indebted seems to be a feasible way by which a political class can fairly easily cause major problems for their own nation, with nobody caring about it when it is being done. Then again it isn't the job of a Constitution to allow the nation to destroy itself, but rather to build it up. Particularly finances is an area in which Governments misbehave, and which is difficult to get information about and a grasp on by the people. Since there is no reason for debts in any case, it is best to outlaw it, and nullify all debts illegally incurred. Government has enough power to tax if it needs money, and if it can't then it ought not to spend or make contracts for spending.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 4

--- Limited Government Contract Liability ---

Limited contract liability

The contract liabilities to the Government, made by the Government with third parties in the free market, must be approved by the next Government after a general election. If these contracts are not approved, they become void at the leisure of the Government.

Reasoning. Notice that because of the debt prohibition, there will likely come new tricks involving contracts for repetitive spending or something else, weighing down the future Governments with the irresponsibility of those past. A law allowing the Government after a general election to void all previous business contracts can stop such trickery. That will then probably force business to demand the closure or at least payment of a contract within that Government mandate (election cycle), to avoid their contract nullification. That in turn forces the politicians to take full responsibility for their spending within their term. If they really want something that requires multiple election cycle spending, they can for example safe up the money for it, and leave the decision for a future Government. It may seem strange that the Government can misbehave, but that private business is going to be put at risk because of that. However it is devious types of privateers who use private business to tank dry the Government treasury, with their inside cronies. Private business does not have to pay the pain here, they will just have to use their intelligence and ask for speedy payment in time, or carve up their contracts in steps. There is some risk when a Government falls prematurely. The solution is for private business to demand payment ahead of time, forcing in turn the Government to save rather than be irresponsible. Is the Government a trusted business partner that can pay at the end of the services ? Perhaps not. Notice also the social logic here. One 'mad' Government may engage in wild contracts, why should after an outrage and new elections the next Government carry the burden of the absurdities of that Government ? When it's new people there.

Isn't the same true for a business and their elected management ? Not in the same drastic way, although that is also possible. In the case of gross malfeasance of a business manager who is swiftly deposed, the losses might still be recuperable by a lawsuit or some sort of contract nullification in court. Ultimately, a form of bankruptcy can

safe the situation or at least the people. A Government can not just go bankrupt, or sue in it's own courts if there isn't a clear law allowing them certain powers. This law alerts all in private business to be careful with Government contracts. It is also an additional bulwark against loan contracts. If they destroy that law, then there is still this one that voids the repay contracts at the next mandate.

The law says re-approve, the new Government must get that contract before them, and vote on it. It's not auto-approved unless cancelled, because delegates will not dare to cancel it for the sake of appearing an unfaithful contract party. But if they must approve a contract they can not live with, they are more likely to vote against it or abstain; getting rid of certain corruption games or irresponsibilities. I suppose it's always possible to pay a compensation to the losing company, although one has to be careful with that because this is how corruption puts their feeding tube on the taxation troughs, playing off of the good nature and sense of duty of others. It is supposed to be illegal that a Government makes a law that auto-approves previous contracts - use a Constitutional

change for that. What about for example the contract of the cleaning business that cleans the Government offices? Those can be hired in-house, as part of the public sector in that way (support staff). The contracts of all monopoly-sector service groups do not have to be re-approved (they are not "free market"), because this is the Government itself.

There is some reason to put support staff in this monopoly sector group, by the way, out of the argument that the Government is a unique contractor, of which there is only one, and hence this has monopolistic tendencies. Notice how there is no difference between a privateer getting such a contract from a friendly politician, and a monopoly sector manager for the same, except that the monopoly sector contractor always remains ultimately under the Government. That means that it's profits are quite obviously their wages under the taxation costs and not merely free earned in a market competition.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 5

--- Chapter 7 By Law ---

- Chapter 7 add restriction: "by law," for changing entire economic systems, so that at least all the delegates must approve of it, which is a big hurdle. Saying explicitly that all delegates must approve, for clarity. Tighten down some loopholes in chapter 7, where the risk exists that the Government re-defines the whole economy "a special market," subverting the whole system without going back to the People for a Constitutional ratification.

7.1.a-2 Special Markets, establishment

Reasoning.

The last sentence of the law above it in the hierarchy is put in this one, because it relates to how it is established rather than what it is. It is then added that a special market is established by law, which means that all the delegates must first approve of it.

7.1.a-3 Special Markets, limit

Reasoning.

This law sets a hard limit on all these non-free-market activities that the State might engage in. It is a risk to the Republic that the State absorbs too much of the activities of the People, by which it will become totalitarian, and in time this has the potential of making it abusive, because there is no sufficient counter balancing force anymore in society. This time allowance is an for emergencies, short lived imbalances, governing difficulties and uncertainties. For example if the whole country has a famine and the State has to take over, it will be a bit tiring to first have to change the Constitution. Secondly it will be awkward if through uncertainties of measurements about the amount of work hours, the Government would be breaking the Constitution essentially by accident or without knowing it. The time gives measurement some chance of precision over the average time measured. It is of course wise not to go too close to the 20%, so as not to break the law by measurement accident.

This law is quite powerful, because it limits the total size of the State by Constitutional law (which means, that the State can not alter that law). Just to make that crystal clear ;). 20% is still a fairly high number, so as not to become too suffocating. It may be wiser to keep the State at a mere 10%, or as small as it can be while still performing their duties adequately. "Direct Government services," means everything that the Government manages itself directly. However it can also include large groups that have merky or generally to the public unknown (unknowable) dealings of supposed "free trade contracts" with the Government, by way of which they would be trying to avoid this law while building their system too large. It would then be claimed that something is loose and independent, while realistically it is beholden to the Government. The Government due to the size of the operation becomes beholden to such a group. This can cause an unfresh merging of the ruling cliques from both ends. The position of businesses that primarily sell to Governments should not be counted as belonging to the Government, if the Government does not have to worry about their bankruptcy or management decisions, and these businesses lack the ability to overpower the Government. A law on a maximum size for businesses can presumably help keep this cleaner. It may in practice not be an exact science, but it is good to have a general guiding principle.

P.S. 27 Jan 2015. After forgetting that "by law" was already added in an Amendment, undersigned again came to the conclusion that chapter 7 should have added "by law." However upon more thinking it seemed that it was already implicit that a chapter 7 can only be established in the form of a law. Secondly if a chapter 7 is declared without making it law, then the next Government can easily overturn it again. Because of this it seemed then unnecessary to add "by law" (although it would not hurt either), and undersigned decided not to add it a second time. This shows that the details of these laws are becoming a little bit arbitrary. On third rethinking at the moment, there is reason enough to think that the top Government will be the primary corruption center and that therefore they have to submit explicitly on such a grave decision to all the Delegates in the nation. In the end it still seems to be the right thing to do. It is a more secure, perhaps especially needed because the economy can be ruined by the over-application of this chapter. (I would rather not work on it if it is not really necessary, which was probably the main reason of not bothering on second thought with "by law".)

{Integrated in above Constitution: done}

Amendment 6

- Chapter 4, mass self defense. Add a law that people above 50 years old, except who have committed acts of violence, may possess weapons in sufficient quantity to arm those of younger age, of such type that upon well trained use can kill one man, yet leave the one standing next to that man unharmed, from a distance of reasonable use for that weapon. Subarticle: people convicted of violent crime (check article about time limitation with respect to police searches) will be denied this right, up to a maximum of X% of the population above 50 years old. The weapons may be hidden from the government. Should there be a relation with the Phalanx of freedom, as actual organization or ideology? (Reasoning: the threat of war and tyranny is *not* over, despite appearances. Appearances like that have always existed in history, it always proved a false hope. Again and again the ruling classes seek war, and lawlessness, whatever the economic or government structure ends up being.) (Note: this right was only not put in because it seemed popularly hard to get the constitution passed with it (the hysteria surrounding this topic is high among the naive who suckle the toes of power, even when they think of themselves as rebels.) To give in to some justified fears about children and criminals having guns, the law is structured with some reasonable restrictions.

Always with these laws is the problem like here: it seems that *below 50 years old* the guns are outlawed - but that's not the way it's meant. Below 50 years it's not specifically regulated in this Constitution, is what is meant; just as with the right of 1 million to create a new country, but numbers below that can have that right too, but it's just not Constitutionally guaranteed to them, rather than Constitutionally prohibited. Maybe add "weapon possession and ownership for people below 50 years old, can be subject to law." Add "Adequately safe training in the use of these weapons for any age may not be prohibited."

Maybe add: "A Phalanx of Freedom Brigade General may arm his Brigade with people of any age, if the General is strict with discipline and safety, and if the freedom of speech or political assembly is being threatened by the use of violence." Problem: this boots 'phalanx of freedom' into the Constitution. To isolate that it is best to create a special article describing what is meant with PoF.

Normally laws are meant for the supreme court (law court), but when a Government starts to murder people for their political speech, or disbands honorable organizations, the supreme court presumably has become itself a mafia. These laws are then more or less meant for the neighbors, family and friends, the local population, who might have questions about civilian common self defense starting, and ask whether that would be Constitutional. These laws also make it harder for a corrupt Government to close off self-defense as much as possible in the judicial sphere, and you can use them trying to destroy these laws as a signal that the Government might be up to no good (although that isn't necessarily the case I suppose.) In this general DAVID/9-roads system, these laws would be a nexus to the more drastic forms of action (o-5 to o-7) inside the Constitution, while the less extreme actions (o-0 to o-3) are already shielded by the Constitution. By the way, there is a difference here with some other systems of Constitution, in that here the people themselves can create such an organization (Militia), provided it is large enough and well organized. If it starts to do criminal actions, then obviously it is organized crime and not a Militia, and will naturally be outlawed and destroyed. It also gives the nation a beginning into a generally armed population, in case foreign invasion threatens. Obviously the arms held by those over 50 years old will be the capacity to arm these Militias. People over 50 years old are assumed to have a minimum of wisdom about reality, and have lost their appetite to cut the heads off of whomever disagrees with them - which is a more youthful

reaction, however well intended it might be. This then has the same purpose as the PoF system, which is to re-dedicate self-defense to everyone, from the more habitual tendency to create a self-defense only for yourself, your own group, party, etc; which then becomes politics by other means (violence), and then civil war. Hence this Militia ideology has to be strictly in the common interest, and that can also mean that people of various camps can join into that Militia to actually prove that it is common self-defense. If that is possible, then people will have less fear from such Militias. Obviously something can still go horribly wrong, even civil war is possible, but one of the things that can go wrong and often does is that people do not defend each other enough by force, when a tyrannical regime comes to mass murder whom doesn't belong to them. It's a weighing of problems, hoping to strike the right middle ground to reduce overall casualties in the long term.

The reason to make this group so large before it gains this right, is to make it impossible for relatively small gangs of criminals do not use these laws to start to organize their gangs. Unfortunately some of that may still happen.

An Armed People

People of 50 years old and older, may trade, own and possess weapons of such precision that upon normal use will kill an intended target at 100 distances, while leaving generally unharmed a person standing at 15 distances length away from the target, at an angle from the weapon user that most easily affords this.

Heavier Weapons and for younger people may be subject to law.

Reasoning. This law more or less means (in current terms) that explosives are not covered. The logic is that the weapons allowed are limited to those that will require a conscious decision for every discharging on a target, rather than also allow weapons that allow the harming of many. It is especially the harming of many that makes people scared for weapons, and that can lead to the worst abuses, and eventually the eroding of this law. The people above 50 are awarded this right, because they see hopefully more of the subtleties of life and are less rash in their judgement than the younger. Another benefit is that people above 50 tend not to have a lot of natural appetite for war anymore, and hence they more likely will have to give their weapons to others in order to be effective. That is a certain hurdle within society, that can prevent weapons from being abused, without having to rely on a public or Government control over these weapons (which is of course the whole problem, when a Government becomes tyrannical, as they so often eventually do.) Obviously when someone who is older lets their weapons linger around, this can create a legal liability to subsequent abuse. An interesting point is perhaps also that the most violent criminals tend not to get old, hence weapons will always remain illegal for them. The law is not intended to allow people to necessarily parade their guns everywhere - this is unregulated by this law. The law is intended to give the people a self-defense against tyrannical Government or foreign invasion, that is independent of the general public sector (Government, police, etc). It is hence meant as a weapon storage system, more than it to be actually constantly being in active use. See the Common Militia article for how this use is envisioned, below. Secondly, undersigned doesn't see the problem if and when these weapons are used in a suitable manner against crime. How that is to be further done may however not be regulated in this constitution proposal here (at time of writing).

In general having an armed people reduces the need and spending on other defense systems. Secondly by the amount the people are armed and ready, the defense system has a method of assessing the threat level and how much they therefore have to train for war. If the people generally choose to be disarmed and not organized, that is

a reason for the Army to do the same. With less of an army necessary because defense is partially by the people, there is less capability of the Government to conquest other territories. The violence of these armies is usually ignored by people who favor a disarmed people, but it is an horrific amount of bloodshed done by the Government these people are represented by. Although there will be casualties from this system of an armed people, the amount will probably be less in the end than to disarm the people.

A law for younger people could be passed, for example something describing a lower age limit (like 30) for things like pistols and non automatic rifles. It could then be added that they need a minimum of training. If they served in the armed forces and behaved properly, the age might again be lowered and automatic rifles could also be included. This should be played according to the need and character of that people. Some nations having many violent criminals may need a different law (more restrictive) than generally peaceful people (more free to own weapons). Note that law making in this overall system is quite the job. A small oligarchy is not easily going to change the law anymore. Even a simple law can stop the oligarchy, it doesn't have to be in the Constitution since all the Delegates in the nation have to approve of a law in majority. (In nations where people do not get significantly older than 50, all the ages in this entire Constitutional system need to be adjusted.)

An Armed People: training

Practice with and temporary possession of weapons, for all ages, will not be outlawed, or unduly restricted beyond what public safety requires.

Reasoning. Isn't law tiring ... well, yes it is because of the 1001 tricks the mobsters who want tyranny are going to come up with. Maybe this is another one that can at least be squashed for the time being. It is also needed to add an allowance for weapons training for younger people than 50, because otherwise they can not be ready. This practice will then take place more or less, as people who may own weapon afford these weapons for the sake of training, to an adequate place and persons to train.

An Armed People: secrecy

Weapons rightfully owned or in possession do not have to be shown upon request and may not be listed or tracked by the Government, except when reasonably suspected of having been used in a crime, in accordance with the law on police searches.

Reasoning. A brewing tyranny is something violent. They think of violence all day, and hence their minds are drawn to the weapons that the people might have to defend themselves with. That means they want to track, find and destroy those weapons, and to target those who have them first. The trick to give them to the 50 year old, can also here be useful, because if they acquire and store them, at the last minute these weapons go to others, and the Government may hence lose track of them that way.

An Armed People: defense

Weapons may be used by anyone for reasonable self-defense against a grave and present threat of violence, not including verbal threats of violence.

Reasoning. It may become a trick that weapons can not be used for anything reasonable, such as against a lone violent attacker, a group or the Government itself, and that those who do use them might then fall under "crime,"

and have their weapons confiscated. More or less this is supposed to mean: if someone points a gun at you or someone else, which looks reasonably to be the pursuit of crime, you can kill them with any weapon you can get (obviously). This law also is similar to the Common Militia articles below, where this principle is worked out for an organized group. By anyone then means that younger people may temporarily possess these weapons, if the emergency requires it. When a nation descends into a state of lawlessness, naturally this right expands to cover more situations because there are more emergencies. At some point it could start to include permanent carrying of weaponry.

An Armed People, limit

People with certainty convicted of criminal acts such as theft and violence against innocent people, may be denied being rightful owners of weapons. The confiscated weapons will be sold back to the People in the open market.

Not more than a percentage of rightful owners of weapons may fall under this restriction. This percentage is: ..[10%].

Reasoning. This law is more or less common sense even if it was not there, but if it is not then the law that people above 50 may own weapons will in practice have to be breached for criminals. Note also that lending your weapons to criminals, is being involved in criminal activities also. The words "with certainty," are added, because of the fear that this will be abused by a corrupt Judiciary against honorable political enemies of the establishment. The selling weapons back is also meant to keep the people well armed even while the Government is attempting to disarm the people in the lead-up to their tyrannical overthrow of the system. The "open market" is added to make it harder for the Government to sell the weapons to their own cronies (they will probably soon enough do that anyway, but again it can delay them for a few months or years; every bit of time we can gain is valuable.). The last principle that only 10% of the people may be under this rule is probably the strongest measure against the abuse of this law, although it should not be underestimated how much damage can be done to the people within that 10% when the would be tyrants craftily build that up of the most active 10% who will oppose their tyranny. Still, with 90% or say 70% (as they start breaking this rule) armed, those 10% have a reasonable chance to re-arm themselves in time for the final revolutionary war.

The words "theft" and "violence" are added, so as to make it harder for a Government to outlaw something like insulting public figures a crime, and then confiscate weapons by those convicted of it. It must be related to violence and theft of one person unto another, including criminal destruction of property such as arson (falls under violence). Absurd acts of violence against Government property are also acts of violence. When such destruction occurs during a Revolutionary war against a tyrannical Government, then these laws may exist on paper but they are non-enforcible anyway. Obviously during a war to restore law & order against a tyrannical Government, the destruction of Government property and violence against Government officials is similar to breaking down a door of a criminal hideout, and harming Government people during combat is similar to self defense.

The words "innocent people" are added, to prevent this law from being abused when people defend themselves from criminals or badly behaving Government officials. For example, Government officials may seek to harass political enemies of the establishment, coax them into whatever act of supposed violence to then deny them their weapons. That could then pave the way for a midnight death squad, to do their crimes and surviving them (which

they should not.) This added can delay the abuse of this law for a while perhaps, and also prevents misinterpretation of it by squeemish judges with Imperial lordship tendencies, who might fail to appreciate the right to self defense, who might fail to comprehend that he is a servant to a free people rather than a whimsical ruler of idiotic and misbehaving children for a lawless oligarchy (a monkey judge).

The word "rightful owners of weapons" is added, because of the verbal trickery of having for example only 8% of the entire population be older than 50, and then denying them all their right if the text read "percentage of the people" instead. It being "rightful owners," implies those with the right whether they exercise that right or not. In this case when it is about people above 50, that implies a 10% of those people older than 50 years can not be denied their right under any circumstances. This should obviously be calibrated in such a way as to allow the criminal element to all fall within the percentage. A percentage above 30% seems to become excessive however, in any case. With that many violent criminals, this model of a Republic will probably not last a day in any case. There is still some room for play with this perhaps, for example if the percentage were made wide in law (the law mentioned for people younger than 50), then you could enlarge that percentage and take weapons away from more people. However as you do that, you also enlarge the amount of people who have the right to own weapons. Example: if you allowed anything to be owned for people from the age of 25, then 10% of rightful owners is a much larger group than the group older than 50 years old. The tyrants however cut themselves with that, as more people may become weapon owners.

There is still a game that can be played with this, and that is to for example define small caliber pistols or even kitchen knives as "weapons," enlarge the total group that way, and then under that pretext get all the weapons out. This can be combatted by having the 10% rule apply to the same types of weapons that are being confiscated. Example: Kitchen knives become "weapons" and since that makes everyone a "weapon right owner," 10% of the entire population falls under the 10% denial rule potentially - and if only 10% of the population is above 50 for which you can own heavier weapons, they could target them only for confiscation, and then allow disarmament. This is somewhat resolved by using the same terminology in the first and second half of this law, to suggest that this must be the same right. Although it is possible to write the law even stricter than this, this is a Constitution and therefore requires a minimum of elegance. It is reaching the limit of tediousness that a Constitution should have.

Notice how this system reduces the chances that weapons will be abused. Once someone threatens an innocent person with a weapon, they could lose their right to keep arms, for decades, or even life. That makes people careful with their weapons. Secondly once you have a criminal convicted and they lose their weapons right, once you see them owning a weapon, or even touching one (depending on the added laws and verdict), that is enough to give them another punishment. The Constitution as it is written does not include the right to wear arms (in public), although it also does not exclude that right necessarily (it is open for general law making). The main aim of an armed public is to make the Government understand who is the real power in the nation, and that if they go too far with repression they may face a civil war that they will lose. There is no denying that in a system where you try to spread the power to all, this has to include the right to weaponry. It is still quite regulated in this system, which is more or less a gift to the people who don't like weapons being everywhere. They then have a more controlled situation already, so that they will not start degrading the given system. Then it might last longer, remaining effective against tyrannical treason from the Government at the point of the breaking out of hostilities. With a fair amount of weapons owned by the public, it will hopefully be possible to obtain heavier equipment once it becomes necessary (explosives, vehicles, etc). It is furthermore noteworthy that once the People are well armed, reasonably trained, disciplined and organized, ready to retake their Justice, that this is impressive

to the existing police and army. They are then more likely to place their future with the side of Justice. That has the potential to de-escalate the situation before it becomes a civil war. It might then hopefully only be a relatively peaceful Revolution. Perhaps that is also something to think about for the Imperial serfs, if they wish to deny adults their natural right to self defense in the name of peace. There is no meaningful peace without Justice, there is no Justice without the victims of injustice having the capability to undo the injustices. Unfortunately for those too scared to live in reality: that quite often includes revolutions and - sadly - sometimes an unavoidable civil war. If the Imperial serfs wish to avoid such a conflagration, they should do something they are not used to doing, which is be politically and economically active to create Justice by peaceful means. It is by the slow deterioration of the system thanks to those who do not dare to face reality, that eventually a civil war may have to break out.

The system still allows for laws in the theme of: you can have your weapons at home, including the company you (partially) own, even when you can not walk on the public roads with loaded weapons in your hand aiming at people. That still allows people to defend their business and their homes from invaders. It can also allow an employee, who does neither own the business or the weapon, to use a weapon that is located in a shop.

*

It remains to be seen how this will all play out with the next great generation of weapons, which could for example be computer guided laser or plasma type weaponry. The target rules here suggested could still function, but it is not easy to predict what will be build.

Common Militia: General

A by internal council *) installed *) General, over a minimum size allowed to be armed *), commonly constituted *) self or otherwise assembled defense group (hereafter: Common Militia), for the purpose of freedom of speech and assembly *), who have the necessary discipline *), may order his/her units to carry and keep weapons, if necessary for their duty to the people.

(*) See section directly below).

Reasoning. If at some point, it becomes necessary to defend the people from tyrants (or foreign invasion), this should both be done in an efficient way (resisting infiltration of the Militias), with the least of friction against pre-existing laws and costume. This law more or less says: if there is a properly organized Common Militia, it may take the weapons and get armed (people of more usual fighting ages) under certain conditions (lawless and tyrannical Government). If it is not armed, then it is merely a citizens club of little consequence; hence it starts here with the right to get armed. The fear is naturally that this right will be abused, hence the laws around it. This system in general is something in between a disarmed people and a fully armed people; however if you look at the capabilities this should allow then you could say that the weaponry is secretly available when needed, and the Militias can get to these weapons where necessary and train adequately, hence the capability isn't necessarily cut in half. Once the weapons are somewhere out of Government reach in sufficient quantities, it becomes possible to defend a Revolution by arms, etc. For some nations this system might be a step back though, in capability against tyranny, probably they should stick to that while they have it.

Common Militia: council

The Common Militia is ruled by an internal council elected by the membership. The council strives for order, peace and the minimum democratic rights of all people; it will not tolerate disorder within it's own organization.

Reasoning. It improves morale probably, when there is a leverage over who is in command; it also prevents abuse of power, infiltration of the top, rotating of failing commanders out of office by those most intimately concerned, etc. It also makes the whole responsible to the whole, and the elected top council personally responsible for the actions of the top commanders. There can be no State or Public responsibility at the time of crisis, because presumably the State has gone rogue and lawless. Hence the second best thing is to be responsible to a fairly large group of people.

Common Militia: duly installed

The Common Militia council appoints it's top and second in military command, by public vote. The Common Militia has a military hierarchy throughout it's organization, with publicly acceptable rules of conduct.

Reasoning. The second in command also have the mandate, so that the top person does not have only foot washers around him, but people who know they are somebody with the electing council and can give the necessary feedback even when top command doesn't like to hear it.

Common Militia: General, Minimum armed size

A Commander over 7 000 (seven thousand) people or more.

Smaller units are denied this right. Is that smart, or should the units be even larger ? Larger units tend to be more responsible, lay more heavy on the public debate, are more serious, and if they emerge are also more ominous to the tyrants, more potent when necessary. Making the units smaller has a danger of easier to organize false flag vilification by the Government, and even by misbehavior of general people abusing this right, thus eroding the concept for when it becomes necessary. Just because this is a right in this system from a Brigade and larger, doesn't mean you should accept being assassinated by the Government when they see fit even if you are not organized or at smaller sizes (obviously). By putting this right at this level, invites various defense groups to actually reach this level. By virtue of that they become a more solemn force (with the drawback of enemy list making by the Government ... but if you are that far down the line of tyranny, perhaps it is time for a cell resistance instead of openly defending your law and country.)

Common Militia: common

The Common Militia will not discriminate against membership applications other than on grounds of: military fitness, lack of reasonable discipline, or belonging to a criminal group.

A criminal group may include the Government, or parts thereof.

Reasoning. The ideal is to have this Common Militia be comprised of various members of all the warring factions, and of those who are more or less neutral. That will create more likely the kind of group willing to do whatever is necessary to prevent escalation into violence, and protect all sides in the conflict from all other sides. The grouping

of the various persuasions also makes this Common Militia a potential breeding grounds of the necessary creative compromises that can bring a peaceful settlement closer. If they are comprised of all, they will more likely listen to the problems of all. In the ultimate case they may need to recreate a democratic Government, for which case it is also important that they are a representative sample. This does create some problem with infiltrators and undisciplined people, who may cry that they are discriminated against if they are rejected. It will therefore be wise for such a Common Militia to already sample from all walks and opinions, at least who wish to defend freedom of speech and assembly for all, so that they become immune from such accusations but retain the ability to reject the undisciplined and enemy agents. It being a Common Militia, will also reduce the fear in the general population from this Militia. Because they will know that some are of their kind, and that creates calm for them. These things then become the political foundations for a success.

Common Militia: Purpose

The Common Militia protects a minimum of the political rights of freedom of speech, assembly and organization. The Common Militia protects others, any and all, from unreasonable violence, when the Police is not carrying out this duty sufficiently.

Reasoning. This is essentially an army, it's ultimate task is to meet criminal force with righteous force, and destroy the enemy if necessary. In practice this may be low intensity like doing guard duties. In extreme conditions the task could be to win a civil war, or a war against well organized armies under command of tyrannical forces of domestic subversion or foreign invasion. It is essential that everyone understands what the goal is: to protect the freedom of speech and assembly, especially for those that the Militia people themselves do not agree with. The word 'outright' is added to put the bar a bit high for what is criminal and not to be defended, because people who severely disagree with something can probably always find some reason to call something criminal or violating some law or principle. An actual criminal is something else then a citizen who has an opinion that is offensive to someone. If this ideology is put out strongly enough, which goes a way to discipline, then this becomes a system that is not unlike the public police in the type of position that it has (a sort of a police against criminals that have taken over Government; police in that it is there for all and is not supposed to first ask for party affiliations, etc.) Notably this ideology ought to attract the most enlightened people (hopefully), another good thing.

Common Militia: discipline

The Common Militia maintains good standards of discipline, by adequate punishment, removal from the Common Militia, and surrendering to the police where necessary, of misbehaving individuals.

Reasoning. The first thing enemy tyrants are going to do, is get some criminals to get into the Common Militia, and start committing crimes. Then they can claim the Militia is undisciplined, and then take their right to be armed below the age of 50 away by lawsuit. For that reason, discipline is defined as punishing those who misbehave. It is then possible to remove these infiltrator agents from the Common Militia, according to this law they then have done their duty and actually even proof that they are as disciplined as necessary. If however they do not remove abusers and trouble makers, then they rightly do not deserve to be a Common Militia, and probably ought to be disbanded by force of law and police.

Common Militia: Sovereignty and Rebuilding

If the rule of law becomes the pursuit of crime, when the Government forsakes its duty to cause grave harm and death without being corrected by peaceful means, those targeted and their defenders become Sovereign for the establishment of a renewed Justice and peaceful general order, and their reasonable self defense.

Reasoning. So that there is no doubt that when targeted by the Government, or parts thereof, that a Government loses its rights. These rights will then transfer to those targeted, which means they become Sovereign. Sovereign (at least as a concept or law) means that they can do whatever they want. Since that includes abuses also, this is then restricted again to be for the purpose of their defense and the establishment of a new peaceful democratic order with rights for all. This also jingles with article 1 chapter 1, where you can say that the law is so deeply subverted by the ruling classes (if any), that their claim to legitimacy through the Constitution becomes void. The Constitution might still be supported, but the Government does no longer reflect that Constitution, or the Constitution has been subverted in text to be unrecognizable to that which is supported. Without a mandated Government in a ratified system, there is then also a condition of lawlessness, which automatically means personal Sovereignty increases.

- Anker right to self defense clearer in the law, so that for example a burglar may be killed (to get rid of the absurdity that you can't even defend yourself in your own home), check if this wasn't already in there DON(E: see common militia (?))

{Integrated in above Constitution: mostly done}

Amendment 7

--- Law Making limit ---

- A limit on size & amount of laws passed per day.

"There can only be one law passed in one week."

"The length of one law may not exceed 3000 commonly understandable words."

This length is taken from the Dutch 1798 Bataafse Constitution, which seems to be about 7 pages of A4 format, and already a pretty serious amount of text to take in at once. Keep in mind that this is not only about law. It is also about democratic ratification of law. Far too lengthy laws are a method by which the higher bureaucracy attempts to divorce themselves from the general public, pretending to gain an aura of expertise by the length of their work, and to evade decent public scrutiny. This trick of excessively lengthy rules is well known from the private sector and particularly the banking industry (proverbial small print.) If long laws are needed, they can be passed in parts. And there we have another possible trick coming up: passing excessively long laws in sections of 3 000 words, while the whole is unreadable without referring to the rest. To close that hole: "Every law passed is understandable by itself." and/or "Longer legislation must be passed in the form of a General law outlaying the principles, and then detail laws each describing a logical section of details."

This is not only good for ratification, but also for the overall legal quality because then you have general laws like ... "hospitals shall be safe, clean, etc" or "people shall not be allowed to starve on the streets," and then in details you get "each hospital shall cleanse their operating theatre using chemicals X, Y, Z, after every procedure, and and and and," so that when the details need changing you have an easier time and you aren't going to cause fear in the population because you're going to touch important principled legislation. It is further perhaps noteworthy that in this system, all the delegates (tens of thousands) must vote on the law, and if the law is long they are less likely to be able to vote, whereas if the law is concise this process is more functional. People are more likely to vote yes on a short law they can oversee, then long laws that will cause them fear and doubt for unforeseeable consequences because of the overall complexity just being too hard to completely envelop in the mind. Phone book thick laws are a sign of a falling Republic, should be feared and cause the people grave concern about who is running their State. The law is not a toy of the bureaucracy, it is something that is owned by all the people.

The bureaucracy should respect the special need that requires, and also let the representative responsibility take its own place when making the laws, so that the laws don't become too long. Does this principle belong in the Constitution: yes it does, because it is the law that it pushed unto the Government, to keep it in line and under control. It can not be left to keep itself under control.

The part "commonly understandable words" is used to foil another plot, namely to create new words and then add lengthy appendixes where these are then explained, which has the effect of creating much longer laws also. An interesting aspect of this: how is this Constitution itself ratified. A solution can be, after the 50 laws version, the system is then ratified 1/50th part a week, to respect this principle of law making from the start, and thus respect the People.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 8

--- Country Council initiation ---

Added on Sun Aug 10 06:13:09 UTC 2014:

This below picture is to show how these laws were created first (then altered a little again when putting in computer writing), to show that you can do this too - and probably even better.

[sketched_law.png]

- A law that describes how the country council is established, including an oath of office, so that this is conducted in a disciplined way which is good for its standing (to be regarded as a serious council.)

** Chapter 3, somewhere at the Country Council:*

Country Council, initiation

The 7 oldest Judges from the Law Court, see 3.2.a-3 Law Court, will come to the first meeting after the elections, with the Scepter of the King. They will give the Scepter to every candidate, if their election was reliable. The elected delegate will perform an oath of truth, to be regulated by law.

Reasoning. The idea to add an oath of truth came from someone in America, who said in public that it was a good idea because their representatives are lying so much. It is noteworthy that lying is necessary in war, and an oath of truth may have to reflect that need. On the other hand to conduct a war is not the task of the representative but of the army and/or the common militia. This oath will then have the consequence that if a Delegate is caught lying, they will be punishable by the Judges for a crime (in general it is a breach of contract you could say.) This may be a useful addition, because otherwise it could be said perhaps easily that lying is part of freedom of speech.

The idea with the Scepter is to try to get through to the Delegates that they are the final responsibility. The Nation in a sense rests in their hand: they should take and exercise that duty, shoulder that burden, and not seek to delegate this Responsibility to Imperial commanders who wish to snap up the entire Nation as a subservient Province. The nation is Sovereign ! Who can not understand that, should perhaps leave the Country Council. A typical task of people in a governing role is to delegate tasks away, until they have nothing to do anymore. It may seem enticing to subvert the nation to foreign cliques for the lazy, while the ambitious see a path to greater power within the new and larger Empire for themselves. These tendencies must be resisted, unless they truly represent the initiative and Will of the People. Each Country Council member must know and feel that eventually it all comes down to an individual doing what is right, by bold initiative, standing alone for the truth if necessary. For who is hopeless but keeps fighting, who stands alone against hordes of evil, idiocy and darkness ... that is the pillar upon which the Nation is build. They must be those pillars, so should everyone be. Yes friend you are it !. Do your job, reap honor not riches, wisdom rather than the praise of empty flatterers. Satisfy your conscience, make your memory a treasure of pleasure for in your old age; who can steal it from you ? Perhaps not even death can take it away. The one who lost an impossible battle is still credited with the ferociousness of his fight, sometimes victoriously. Stand high, not to look haughty over the planes you think you rule, but to kneel down to the most hurt, the lowest, the poorest, the forgotten ... then raise them.

*Country Council, doubted election
Candidates whose election is in doubt by the Law Court will step away from the country council. They will remain informed and follow the debates from nearby, until their status is resolved by the Law Court.*

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 9

--- Delegate Age limit ---

- Adding age requirements to the Representative, because children have less experience in reality and can cause great harm to their nation while fighting for some ideological aim without deep thinking nor regards to reality.

* Chapter 3, somewhere at the 'structure' part:

Delegates, age limits

All Delegates in the nation are 35 years or older.

Delegates in further councils are 40 years or older.

Delegates elected to the Country Council are 50 years or older.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 10

--- Delegate Duration limit ---

- Adding term limits after all ... to break up people who are overpowering others by their experience in Government. This can force people who do not even want to get into Government, to try it anyway, because there are too few and the usual suspects are forced out by term limits. This does have a risk that an entrenched bureaucracy will undermine the influence of the Delegates. To limit that problem while still breathing some fresh air in the Delegates, they are only out for a while every 20 years. That time for them could be useful to become acquainted again with a more regular existence, perhaps ideally used to not work for the Government or public sector (if possible).

Delegates, duration limit

A Delegate will not serve more than 15 years out of every 20 years.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 11

--- Company seniority council ---

- An advice council for companies larger than 100 employees, where the 10 employees with the most experience in the work field of that company (excluding management of the company, unless it is a management advice company) have a special role. This is a soft measure, but it elevates some people who otherwise may never get near any management or power. They may be the most competent of all, and further pull the power away from the career bosses. It gives the employees a second group to listen to, so that the chartered management has a meaningful counter balance (less de-facto totalitarian). It is also proper that the oldest people start to get into management, and this is a way to get them into it. They may think the idea is horrible, unless they start doing it;

from one thing may come the next and who knows soon they are even in the elected Government doing good work for their nation.

** Chapter 6:*

Company Seniority Advice Council

Every company larger than a given size, will have an Advice council comprised of it's 5 or more oldest employees, together with 5 or more of those who have for longest been producing the marketable product of the company.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 12

--- Sovereign Inspector limits ---

- A law limiting some of the Sovereign Inspector' power. For example what would happen if the Sovereign Inspector assigned 100 000 Emissaries, to shut down the Government by causing everyone to have to be silent ?

** Chapter 3, somewhere at the King:*

Emissaries, amount limit

The King may appoint no more than a given number of Emissaries.

The maximum is: ..[10].

King, silence limit

Judges in session are not silenced by the Sovereign Inspector presence, see 3.1.c-1.8.3 Speaking to the King.

The Country Council in session can only be silenced by the King during a State of Chaos, see 1.4: State of Chaos.

Emissaries of the King do not silence any Council of Delegates in session.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job ?}

Amendment 13

--- *Limit Delegate Salary* ---

The law 3.1.c-5 Salary was created to put a limit on the salary of delegates. It however still leaves an opening for theft: they could pretend to work many hours, which might either be unnecessary although it still could be productive (unnecessary projects to keep busy and earn income), or they might languish silently or play checkers still hoping to get the hourly income. There are various methods to counteract this.

One interesting problem that plays into this is that there may be local Governments that are under the same taxation authority (which is how this system is envisioned to operate, by having a 1/50th sector of the Nation have a Provincial Council, which is also the taxation authority; they then fund the system both toward National and more local.) Isn't it an unfairness if one direct council is prudent, while the next from the same taxation intake in the general area spends much more on their delegates? That means that the delegates in one area are funding those in another, but see no benefits. It may seem a solution to make this taxation very local, but then we get into the issue of neighbors sniffing around in each others wallets - and that is something we can not like to see happening (hence the fairly high and thus official and abstract/anonymous/general position of the taxation authority).

Having defined the problem, a solution seems to more or less rise up out of it: the Taxation Authority or even the National Council, will give each local council a salary budget. When they do not spend it, they can give that money back to the citizenry (or even save the money for future special projects that benefit the people in that area). This puts a second maximum on the delegates salary (by grand total), and that limits how many hours they can work (for the regular pay), and how much time they will either have to work voluntarily or not at all. It is much easier to give people their money back, then to try to take it from them for funding these delegates (like a scheme where every voter-group funds their own delegate - which will mean there is a cost involved in having a delegate, which will mean that nobody will want to be a voter.)

3.1.c-5.2 Salary, budget

The further Council responsible for taking taxation, or in its absence the Country Council, will give every council in its area of Jurisdiction a budget for the salary of the Delegates.

*What is not spend on salary, is at the leisure of that council.
Exceeding the allowance by working more hours then it affords,
means working without financial compensation.*

The law is written in such a way that councils that are prudent are rewarded (they do not have to give the money back; and this also can give councils some financial independence as some may save it.) The law also allows the council giving the budget to come in with more money if some council asks for it (special circumstances?). The council with too little money can not call to the article about work-hours to then demand having them payed. They should themselves work within the budget, then they are payed what they are entitled to by the Constitution per work hour. The rest of their work is a gift. I imagine that much of their work will end up voluntarily, especially in the direct councils. Such things as inspecting things in the surroundings, doing minor tasks, and so on. Being in

these direct councils is in part also a hobby, something to do, interesting, a basic effort for the common good that all might engage in - and besides that: it is an honor. It can lead to new and interesting contacts, and that way it can lead to trade and jobs as well (if it has to be re-converted to profit.)

Notice how it is not allowed to spend any budget saved on salaries, on salaries (on their persons), like divide the saved sum between themselves at the end of the year without actually doing the work. Then they are then overstepping the bound of the article on work hour pay. The salary budget can only become their private money when they work for it. If they don't work for it, that is perhaps fine (maybe there is nothing to do).

*

A note on the two laws: 3.1.c-5 Salary and 3.1.c-5.1 Salary, bonus It seems that these laws are a bit too creative, sorry about that. It is probably best to remove everything from 3.1.c-5 Salary except that the delegates earn the median income, and that transportation at reasonable cost is free (?). The part about food & housing being free is also vague as to what this should mean in practice.

The bonus law 3.1.c-5.1 Salary, bonus is also over complicated, it is impractical to count all these hours and so on. On the other hand there is one benefit, and that is an interest in the system to count all these hours, so that they can claim their bonuses ;). What to make of this, I'll leave for you to decide. It is not all that extremely important, perhaps. Keep in mind that this Constitution is meant to show that a D.A.V.I.D. system can work in principle as a system of law. To finetune secondary details like this is not the purpose of it.

(Mon Oct 31 09:33:47 UTC 2016) This system above mentioned is too complex, and needs to be corrected. It is disfunctional bad law, especially bad in a Constitution.

It seems good to make it law that the once elected direct councils all work voluntarily. This is a way for people to show that they care (which is also something middle American Injuns know as a method of finding an honest person to serve in a position in the Government.) The delegates who are twice elected would likely be engaged in a heavier amount of work, making it less easy to do everything voluntarily. A problem with councils and meetings in general is that once it becomes payed work, many people merely come to collect the money and attempt to slow the council down. Doing almost nothing then results in more pay. The problem is hopefully less severe for twice elected delegates, because there are the delegates that elected those delegates who are also keeping an eye on them.

It seems best not to regulate it in the Constitution entirely, other then reducing the ability of the Delegates to reward themselves money, because there are so many practical details with it (compare also the housing and things like tea or coffee on the table). This can be achieved by making a law that the pay of the Delegates must be regulated in a law, by Referendum, or other such method. Although having salaries defined "by law" does not remove influence of the Delegates, it does give most of that power to the once elected Delegates (of whom there will likely be most). Unfortunately that doesn't solve it entirely, because those unpaid Delegates may be looking to become payed delegates later, thus having an interest in making the delegates pay too high. The strongest method is a Referendum without abstentions filled in by the Delegates. Then again this might be a bit too much, for something that is relatively trivial (compared to going to war, or Ratifying a Constitution.) The people do have some control over their Delegates (or should have).

- *Directly elected Delegates are volunteers who receive no compensation.*
- *Twice elected Further Council Delegates could be given compensation, if it is described in law.*
- *The idea that Councils receive funding for their own expenses (see above) seems good, to equalize the cost of the Councils.*
- *One could then have all councils (both "direct" (once elected) and "further" (twice elected) receive a budget to run the Council itself, with the Further Councils (twice elected) also receiving a budget for individual compensation of those Delegates (if described in law). The budget system for a Council prevents that Delegates will declare their hours independently, to vague entities elsewhere. If their compensation comes from the budget of their own Council, they can all directly talk and decide about it there, about every Delegate individually and the whole. This way they keep each other under some control, and then the control is where the knowledge is. As a Council they are under the control of the Provincial Council and its general budget decision for the Councils. It follows then that this Council must make that budget decision as described in law (meaning, it is no longer a decision, but an administrative obligation of following the law.) The Country Council sets limits on local law, which implies that it could be so that in one Province the law is different from another. Since the taxation would be taken by Province, this is then not a problem.*

3.1.c-5 Salary

All Councils may receive money to spend on the cost of maintaining the Council itself in similar comfort as generally enjoyed, as described in law. Once elected Delegates do their work voluntarily. Further Councils may receive money for personal compensation to their elected Delegates, if described in law (see [3.1.d-3 Further Government Body](#)).

3.1.c-5.1 Salary, bonus [cut]

3.1.c-5.2 Salary, budget [cut]

The first sentence is about such obvious costs as: a building, the chairs, the paper, heating or cooling, a reasonable amount of food and drink. This then obviously extends to: cleaning services, assistants for paperwork, and so on. Needless to say the whole bureaucracy will also have to be funded, however that isn't personal pleasures derived by the Delegates from the taxation money, and hence shouldn't have to be limited in a Constitution. The second sentence refers to Delegates taking value with them to their private lives, which is then not allowed. There is a grey area here in the sense of Delegates organizing banquets for themselves every night at the Council building, pretending to hold meetings. This is then caught by the first sentence "as generally enjoyed." If people generally do not enjoy banquets every night, then neither can the Council. The last sentence forces the compensation of the Further Delegates to be described in law, which implies general ratification and approval. Without such a law in existence, the further delegates also work voluntarily. It is conceivable that a law will be passed to the effect of the further Delegates also working voluntarily.

The articles 'bonus' and 'budget' are cut because they are too complex. The article 'budget' is overly controlling for a Constitution. The new article does not define the source of funding, implying it could also come from the people directly (donations), although that is not how it is anticipated to function (which is through the taxation and budgeting of the Provincial Council).

These are the new articles:

3.1.c-5 Delegate Compensation

3.1.c-5.1 Delegate Compensation, Council

The reference to article 3.1.c-5 in article 3.1.c-1.5 Electoral Committee, salary, will now also have to be changed, into the broadly similar:

3.1.c-1.5 Electoral Committee, salary

Electoral Committee members receive one month median salary per year.

Exception: Article 3.1.c-1.8, King Elect.

Update: Sat Mar 4 05:39:47 UTC 2017

On rethinking it seems that the above idea to make the once elected Delegates work voluntarily is not practical, because it cannot be foreseen if they indeed will work more or less casually. By determining in such a strict law as a Constitution that they must work voluntarily, they are also forced to work casually while maintaining other income, but that cannot be the purpose of that law, or the Constitution in general. The overall salary law now concerns itself only with who determines how the income is to be regulated, while only maintaining a vague maximum of it having to be "reasonable." The Constitution should be a guiding force against foreseeable excesses, not become a stumbling block to reasonable activities.

P.S. This going back & forth on what it should be is an example of how all these laws are made up, although usually the various options don't leave such a paper trail.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes}

Amendment 14

--- Local land use ---

A problem can occur when people can not easily get land near their homes. One way to make this easier is to have enough of a buffer, from which to declare land for new use. Then when someone expires and there is nobody available to take that land, it returns to the unused buffer. Some nations (such as the Netherlands in 2014) have destroyed virtually all their wild nature, leaving only production land. This can squeeze a system of land

distribution because once a parcel would come available for someone young in that city or village nearby, someone far away may have been waiting longer and could snap up that land (under a system where who waited longest has precedence).

Maybe a law that gives precedence to those living nearest to a parcel that becomes available is useful. Then people could simply wait until land near them becomes available, and switch to that land. That opens up their previous land, and that can then be taken by someone who lives near that, and so on. For example someone gets land far away, because it was the only land available. Then land nearer becomes available, but it is snapped up by someone who lived even nearer than him. However by taking other land, that person vacates a parcel that was closer than the far away parcel, and if nobody else takes that, then he can take that. This then vacates his original parcel, and someone living close there who might be looking for land by then, could take that.

9.1.a-6.5 Distance priority

"A person can register a need for land near their home, so that when land becomes available the first choice is for who lives nearest to it."

Many people may want to register for this, so that they get first choice on nearby land, even if they do not have a real need but just in case. This might be an opportunity to ask for some administrative fees in maintaining their registration, so that fewer will register (but more people with a real need), and by that the administrative burden of the land distribution system could be partially funded (although probably marginally.) It is noteworthy that the word "nearest" has issues in practice. For example is this computed over the roads or a direct line? What if the center of the land is closer to one house, but the edge of it closer to another, and they both want it? It seems to be an opportunity to make some (non Constitutional) laws.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

Amendment 15

--- No Suspension ---

A law to be added in the 1st chapter, that says clearly that: Suspension of the Constitution is absolutely illegal, for the nation as a whole or parts thereof. No emergency shall suspend the Constitution; including by declaring emergencies of whatever nature, including natural disasters, including terrorism and war, including industrial disasters.

This has not been added in the Constitution originally, because it seemed apparent by saying this is the supreme Law of the land and not allowing for such a suspension for a state of emergency in any article, that it therefore can not be suspended. However it seems to be a grave threat that corrupt politicians are going to go around and outside the Constitution to games that have been often played by criminal ruling classes: creating an emergency themselves (often it is war or terrorism), and then declaring a state of emergency and become military dictators. They then simply say: the Constitution is suspended, as if that is their right. Unfortunately in many Constitutions

such a right is included. It seems necessary to make it clear that this does not exist in this system. By doing so, specious language later added to this Constitution by people scheming to overthrow it, will have a clear obstacle.

Note that in this system there is a different kind of emergency provided for: the State of Chaos, and there is also a state of economic emergency of sorts in chapter 8.

{Integrated in above Constitution: no }

Amendment 16

--- Judge not Police ---

This amendment also illustrates how to make amendments: watch what the tyrants are doing, how they break the system down, and create new laws for after the next Revolution. What happened in America is that they violated people their right not to be unreasonably searched, by having a Judge on hand while they blockaded the road and apprehended everyone who passed through. The Judge could then ratify whatever the police wanted. In effect they have merged the role of the Judge with that of the Police. This is a fundamental possibility to break the system of separation between the Police and Judiciary down. In the same vein one could have Police agents become Judges. There needs to be an institutionalized difference between these roles, because the Judiciary needs to be capable of an objective review of the activities of the Police. The police is merely one side in a Judicial case against someone. The same problem would occur if the Judges became one with the defense lawyers - however that is far less likely to occur because the defense lawyers are a less large part of the public sector, or not part of the public sector at all. Corrupt Government officials have a keen interest in controlling and corrupting the police, so that their corruption will not be investigated. Similarly they have an interest in corrupting the Judiciary, and in conflating these two entities to deny the People their rights.

Separate Judges from the practice of arrests & general police activities. There needs to be a separation (of powers) there. People are social creatures. It means everything if you are standing around the same coffee pot during the breaks. Police and Judges must be separate, just like lower and higher court Judges have to be separated. They have to be in different buildings, with a different entrance, and probably even work in different cities if that is possible. This reported American problem is hardly the only issue, in the Netherlands they have dared put the public prosecutor (who in a sense is virtually a part of the Police as he represents their researched case against someone) on the same table as the Judges, with the defending party as a sole group before them all ! It is amazing what happens when there are no laws against it. The Governments prove time and again that they can not be trusted, but need to be watched like hawks and be corrected like children. The wise among them, will understand and welcome it.

How to write that law I gladly leave to you. Be bold, keep it short and to the point, don't let a lawyer write Constitutional laws because you don't need longwinded Jargon, and don't let civil servants do it either since they might write it with the holes they want to exploit later. Write in simple every day style. Just let a few commoners to do it, a few parents perhaps. It is not complicated, and it don't have to be perfect.

The Constitutional law is not written for the high court, or the civil servants. They will have to make due with what is given them. It is written for the People: the law to which they will bend those with power. It is the law the People decided to remember and do. Those in power will read the Constitution, and upon realizing for whom and by whom it is written, they will be humbled and be the better for it. Do not allow convoluted laws to be written in the Constitution, in haughty jargon for and by men who lost their direction, who are making a pretence with their empty words, because it will be the beginning of the oligarchical rot in the backbone of the Nation. Those in power will have to be bend by the commonly understood Constitutional law; first by wish and argument, if need by by force or even bloodshed when they have become hostile to the People.

{Integrated in above Constitution: no }

Amendment 17

--- Allow Smaller Further Council ---

Further Council maximum size not 50 but 10

The below is perhaps a bit longwinded with unnecessary personal remarks, however it seems good that it is quite clear how this Constitution comes about, of which the below is a good illustration because the problem was discovered by writing the below message. Everyone is invited to think about this Constitution and try to find problems and solutions in the same way. It is all merely a matter of thinking and re-thinking, making something up and tweaking it later. The most important part of that will be if it is attempted in practice.

Newsgroups: alt.politics.socialism

From: Jos Boersema

Subject: Detailed structure for a Council Government

Organization: <http://www.law4.org> D.A.V.I.D. Constitution & Revolution

A Council Government is one in which citizens themselves form Parliaments, and send representatives from their parliaments to those of others, to integrate the common decision process over any amount of people.

However this is not so simple, because modern society is vast. The current parliament resolves this by having enormous voting assemblies cast their vote for a shortlist of people they will almost all never talk to in their life. Hence the voting in the current parliamentary system is mostly a blind vote, a situation that is exploited by liars who go undetected so much easier, and at the same time remain out of control because these enormous voting assemblies cannot easily change their vote. They have to wait for another chance in years, when the damage has already been done.

To resolve this problem the Council Government can work, however the size problem of the vastness of society is then shifted from the population itself forming extremely sized voting assemblies, to there being much fewer than that but still very large amounts of delegates from the public's own parliaments. I think this can be resolved by those delegates forming Councils of any size, however when that becomes too large they can then create a 2nd election step from between themselves. That step is similar to a current Parliament electing a Government, although in this case it is on a somewhat different scale. The delegates of the public's own parliaments then get together in Councils, and where these become very large they go out into 50 sections (or blocks) to each elect a thusly twice elected delegate from between them, to collapse that large and impractical Council into one that can work.

With all that envisioned, I propose the following additional stabilizing elements:

- Every public's own Parliament - that is citizen directly - henceforth called a voter-group, is minimum size 50 and elects:

- One delegate (representative, politician, etc, however one would like to call it).

- One internal administrator or (say) housekeeper, to maintain the internalities of that voter-group, to organize elections, to rally the group and to be the point of contact for the members.

- One optional Deputy Delegate.

- Every Council must be a minimum of 50 delegates before it is recognized as a public Government with the Constitutional mandate to make decisions.

- Every council selects one chair person, which is similar to a housekeeper / administrator. The chair person relinquishes the vote, but can - like everyone in this system - be re-elected any moment.

- For Councils that are too large to be practical, they go out into 50 sectors.

... And now - I'll admit - I discover a possible mistake. To form blocks of delegates in a sort of meaningful way, they would need to be a minimum size of 3 delegates. It can still be done with 2, but that gets weird. That in turn dictates that to have a twice elected Council only works from 150 delegates onward, and even that is very small for the delegate sections, whereas 150 delegates is comparable to a modern parliament and although therefore it is possible I think it is very large. It is also very large for something like city Governments.

Hence it seems I should change this and make the amount of such sections also a variable, which seems to be a great idea because then you can vary the size of the twice elected council to something that works well for that situation, and also you could make a territorial jurisdiction that fits that area because you can vary more easily (more to smaller numbers that is) the amount of territories that elect one delegate for a twice elected council (if there is territoriality to that, which it will more likely have for the larger areas). Meanwhile this territoriality is also something that can be a problem in this system, and that needs to be carefully considered.

This setup gives the system 2 modes of broad freedom to adjust sizes on the 2nd elected Government level: the size of the amount of delegates per block or section within that Council where the large population size is absorbed, and then as a modifier upon that the size of that Council itself.

Continuing ...

- For Councils that are too large to be practical, they go out into a minimum of 10 blocks (or sectors, etc).
- Each block elects one Delegate from between them.
- Each such block elects a block housekeeper.
- Each block can elect one Deputy Delegate.

(That was a change I was working on right now, to make that section or block housekeeper mandatory, for stability reasons.)

Now one can say that I am stupid for not seeing this before. I guess that is one side of it. Thusfar I had just thought this would work, and you could have very small sections, but I think I never really realized that it would put a size pressure on the smaller Governments until they reach that level of about 100 to 150 delegates. It's not that such cannot absolutely not work, but it does seem strenuous in some cases. Then again the idea with this kind of Government is also that the Councils are quite large at the very top, or say medium-large, so that it is avoided that a tiny clique needs to be put again on top of that as we see with modern Parliaments who then go on to elect a so-called Executive. The idea is to have a medium to large top Council, and that will be it, no tiny clique above that.

I guess on the plus side, this is how it goes when you think long about how such a system might work, rather than let it to chance as was done in 1917. Thinking things through helps make it go right quicker, as a number of likely failure points have hopefully already been caught in advance.

Another issue that I think is always a problem, is the territoriality of both voter groups and councils in this system, giving the potential for confusion. If people mainly organize locally, it should work, but if they form groups from very disparate people all over the map, the focus in local Governments becomes less natural. However this will hopefully work itself out as people realize they would better form more local groups and get to know their neighbors if they didn't yet. The idea of forming groups of 10 first and then network those, is also something that can help bring local people together who are separate friends circles. I don't think this is a bad idea socially either, since modern society is so fragmented and individualized.

3.1.d-3 Further Government Body

The delegates can assemble out of their own initiative into at least 10 blocks, each block allowed to send a representative that is already in their block

Each delegate block elects a delegate block housekeeper, and may also elect a Deputy representative from within 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.

It is also interesting how this reflects on the largest size level, being the National Government and the division into Provinces (which are those delegate blocks at the highest level). I chose 10 as the minimum in order to afford a good freedom to fill it in as seems to be good, but still a minimum to avoid a too narrow top Government. This is

still quite small and clique like to have only 10 persons. Still it is perhaps wise to make this bridge to what is more or less current in terms of Executive Governments. Since that works now for some Nations, it might make that this new system at least doesn't fail there, and the size of the further Council can also always be enlarged to make it more democratic.

A downside of such a small top Government is that it is harder to control, especially by a very large parliament that is in total about 1% of all people. As it is with these things: one benefit on one side can become a downside somewhere else, and hence Constitution making sometimes seems to resemble cooking. A bit of that, and a bit of such, for hopefully a balanced and interesting flavor that pleases the population, and that they (we that is) can stomach.

Or shall I propose a minimum of 20 ? Perhaps 30 ? ... When does the risk of failure (that is, a fall into dictatorship and increased corruption) warrant to make a more strict proposal, and when should a proposal be more loose so that there is easier room to experiment with how things are organized ? Where exactly does that balance shift ? What is the difference between proposing 10 here, rather than 15, or 25, or 11 ? Why not 1 after all, go radical ? It's all a bit a matter of guessing and trying to envision it ... and so I will stick with ...

10, since that's also the size of a so-called sub-council, and when you want blocks / sections that are 3 persons or or larger to elect that twice elected delegate you easily get to a minimum of $3 * 10$ equals 30 Delegates total before you can do that.

50 in a council, times 3 per section = 150 as a minimum size before a council can collapse itself into a twice elected Council of smaller practical size.

30 in a council, times 3 per section = 90 as a minimum. That is still a lot of people, isn't it.

10 in a council, times 3 per section = 30 as a minimum. That is at the lower end of a nice sized Council, but 30 is still a nice size for a good serious Council. You could then say: as they are 30, they gain the right as it where to collapse themselves into a twice elected Council. However that isn't even possible, because at 30 Delegates they aren't even a Council yet, as that was only allowed at 50. So then this border of collapsing into sections is no longer an issue that prevents a Council from becoming a twice elected council. The practical limit to do that - which is minimum 3 per block (section) - has already been reached at 30. If a Council of 50 persons wants to collapse themselves into a twice elected Council, and they would choose the minimum Constitutionally allowed if that was set at 10, there would be 10 sections obviously, of each 5 members (5 delegates). 5 members is fairly nice as a starting under level for these sections. They can of course also decide to have not 10 delegates in the twice elected council, but for example 20. That then yields an average of 2.5 delegates.

Notice that this issue is only at play for local Governments that are just in the 'pain zone' between 50 and 150 delegates, which is the case for cities of certain sizes under certain voter turnout conditions.

I'll have to give it all some thought now, and I hope you will too. What will it overall mean in such a system, if ...

- Voter groups are minimum 50.
- Governments are minimum 50 delegates.

- Twice elected Governments are minimum 10 delegates (rather than also 50).

I'd have to say it gives me a good feeling, having given it some thought on the details but more is necessary. How about you ? Funny isn't it that people think we make this society together, and when you try to do something serious, there is nobody to do it with; yet the whole world is crying about Government corruption and lying out of control politicians ... You'd think someone would care to think about how to fix all that ? Or two ?

Take your chance then and write a useful reply, thanks. Anything that has constructive intent I will enjoy, even if it's not very well thought through perhaps. Don't hold back if you want to help, because it's not like there is a lot of debate on this at the moment.

--

End of message.

This change has been put in all Constitutions and not just the 240+ model (with amendments), because it should be ratified as this right away. It is still put as an amendment here because it is a later change requiring updating previous material, and if that gets overlooked it is clear that this amendment overrules such oversight.

{Integrated in all Constitutions: yes }

Amendment 18

--- Country Council Restrictions ---

In general it will be necessary to humble and de-power the national Government, in favor of the constituting federated Governments and people, so that the national Government does not become exuberant and then destructive of the Nation by attempting to foment an Empire either by conquest or consent. Leave it to the ambitious to find a way to cause their nation to fall, by trying to reach for higher power.

The following we could do:

- The National Government may not levy any taxation whatsoever. They can only be funded by the federated Governments. In a stronger version of this: the funding for the national Government is at the leisure of the constituting Governments. The National Government misbehaves: they get nothing.

- The National Government is forced by Constitutional law to travel around in the nation (as previously argued in this system.) A stronger version of this: The National Government must ask permission of the federated Government to enter on its territory. It must also plan to be in every province roughly the same amount of time. The phrase "plan to be" allows for the Government to fall prematurely, or have a plan that stretches further than 5 years to see all provinces. You might notice that at a 5 year usual election cycle, and 12 months per year, there is a fairly easy solution to be in every province for one month, with 2 months spare (vacation or to be in troubled areas.) To allow for extended presence in troubled areas, the phrase "plan to be" can cover for that also.

- This is a fun and radical one: the National Government will stop existing every so many years (for example every 50th year, or every 25th year), for the duration of so many months or years (for example: one year). The departments of the national Government may be overseen by an appointee from each of the federated Governments, at their leisure (they can appoint someone, or leave it as is).. This is meant to disrupt clique formation in the top level.

It also disrupts the psychology of the Imperial serf. Suddenly they are confronted with a reality that the entity they worship stopped existing, and that power is held so locally that he can run into the top powerful in the streets. This gives the Imperial serf the realization that he lives not in an Empire, but that he is free and responsible. He realizes that power is not something divine or magical, but that it is mundane as any other thing. This will gladden him, and it will embolden him.

It practically strengthens the power of the federative Governments over the National departments. Their appointees are likely to linger in the departments afterwards. A law could be made like so:

_National Council: Docile

The National Council will serve to repair, not exalt itself for conquest.

Reasoning. If it needs a stub to hang the following subarticles under. With conquest here is meant power grabbing of all kinds. Some functionaries of powerful organs have a tendency to do so, if not for themselves then for their cronies, friends and family.

_National Council: no theft

The National Council is funded at leisure by further councils.

_National Council: travel

The National Council is has no home location. It will plan to be in each 1/50th area equally, after receiving permission from the delegates to be there.

_National Council: periodic removal

Every so many years, the National Council is disbanded for a time.

National Ministries - if any - are overseen by appointees from the federated councils.

The National Council is removed every: .50th year..

for the duration of: ..One year.

Reasoning. Those who crept to high places may be the most honorable men, but these places also tend to attract those who wish to grab power and hold on to it, and build it up ever more. This measure is a form of periodic weeding. Their cunning work is receiving a blow, while the federated Governments are strengthened both practically (as they gain influence over the National Departments), but also psychologically (as the delegates realize they do have the power, that they are more than merely the spokespersons for the National Council who are

there to hand the High Edicts down to the streets.) As mentioned (above), it also has an effect on the population itself. They (the devious elements) are day & night on their quest for power, so then the Constitution will strike them down periodically to compensate for their destructive work. If the National Council still becomes exuberant, perhaps they should be removed every 25 years, or even 10, or perhaps entirely (!). These effects will give them (the National Council) something to think about, so that they realize that the Nation may not need them as much as they might think it does. That in the end they too are mere mortals.

The National Council as a "repair man," is then obviously not always needed. Why repair something that works? If this repair man is not available, then another can be. That is the logic of it. The power builds to the Provincial Government, where it peaks, and it then depletes to the National Council and then to foreign relations. If the power becomes exalted in the National Council, you have a risk that it will network internationally - as at least it is doing in this timeframe (2014), which leads to the destruction of the Democracy / Republic. If you then devolve the power already to the National Council, they have less ability to network the nation into Empires. The problem is that, by nature, the National Council will have a lot of power: it has the largest amount of people in it, it operates such things as the Constitution and high courts, it can wage wars, it can dominate domestic propaganda, and so on. Hence measures are necessary to put this great power in it's place. What is more beautiful, then to periodically remove it entirely.

An even harsher method is to also remove the national Departments. However you then get issues with national systems such as the currency, perhaps some aspects of infrastructure. To avoid that part of the problem, the national Department heads could all be removed periodically, perhaps two levels down from top management - where you will usually find the most powerful people in the system (!). This is a possibility for the federative Governments, but left unspecified in this law.

Why 50 years: at first it is a copy of the famous Jewish law of Jubilee, the return of the land. On second thought, when one does 30 years, then it may become a bit burdensome. Secondly those who grasp for power will learn tricks on how to avoid their devices to be devolved by this mechanism; and they may successfully clamor for the measure to be abolished or done less effectively under the argument of it being too burdensome. If it only happens once every 50 years, it remains something quite unusual, that most people will not live to see happening more than twice. That makes it unique and more enjoyable. One could go to longer periods like 80 years, but the risk at long intervals is that it becomes archaic and that people will be so not used to it, that they might fear it and therefore abolish it. Every 40 years should be good as well I suppose (this Constitution is only a draft proposal.)

Update: Sun Sep 7 10:28:23 UTC 2014

With "federated councils" is meant what is called the Provincial Councils (in each 1/50th of the nation). These councils are not mentioned in the Constitution however, and might not exist (in small nations). The term "further councils" could mean that many hundreds or thousands of such councils could all appoint someone over the national ministries. This could be overkill, and lead to a measure of chaos (although it is something that could work; a meaningful solution will need to be created if this results in too many people being appointed to be in the ministerial ruling councils). Perhaps it is better to use a phrase like "delegates in each area that elect to the Country Council" instead of creating a new term "federated councils." When looking deeper the term "federated councils" is incorrect: the council is not federated, but the delegates in that 1/50th region are, because they elect to the Country Council, not the council that exists in that 1/50th (which called Provincial Council in this model elsewhere). This election by the Provincial Council to the Country Council is even illegal in the Constitution (because it is a 3rd election step, see chapter 3.)

1st version:

_National Council: removal

*Every so many years, the National Council is disbanded for a time.
National Ministries - if any - are overseen by appointees from the
federated councils.*

*The National Council is removed every: .50th year.,
for the duration of: ..One year.*

2nd version:

_3.1.d-5.7 Country Council, Docile: periodic removal

*Every so many years, the Country Council is disbanded for a time.
Country Ministries - if any - are overseen by appointees from the
Further councils. See 3.1.d-6 Ministries, 3.1.d-3 Further Government
Body*

*The Country Council is removed every: .50th year.,
for the duration of: ..One year.*

3rd version:

_3.1.d-5.7 Country Council, Docile: periodic removal

*Every so many years, the Country Council is disbanded for a time.
Country Ministries - if any - are overseen by appointees from the
delegates in each area that elect to the Country Council, or in
their absence their Further Council. See 3.1.d-6 Ministries, 3.1.d-3
Further Government Body*

*The Country Council is removed every: .50th year.,
for the duration of: ..One year.*

Here is also added that the (what probably will be the Provincial Council) can act themselves. If then the mass of Delegates there wishes to appoint someone else, they can and it will then replace the appointee from the Provincial Government. This system should limit the appointees to oversee a Ministry to 50 (which is the general model proposed here: not a single minister person at the top but a council of 50, who appoints single heads for specified jobs below it. The single-head feature is there but it is lower down in the structure. Why this is proposed here, has been argued elsewhere, see 'Constitution Proposal'.) In the 4th version, "appointees" is set from plural to singular and the sentence is made a bit easier to read although sadly it is longer (the version progression is left in this document to illustrate how these laws are cobbled together over some time.)

3.1.d-5.7 Country Council, Docile: periodic removal [240+]

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

Amendment 19

--- Nation Size Protocol ---

Then the nation as a whole: it must not become too large. Splitting up is not so easy. It may be useful to have a Constitutional protocol for it. For example:

- When the nation has reached 50 million inhabitants, the splitting protocol must be started. Why 50 million: this is already very large, and if it is cut in half still two quite large nations will result. A split far sooner, or even already when at 25 million, might be wise. However this would be a Constitutional force, and therefore it is better not to restrict things too much by force, but leave room for decisions first (force in this case is rather relative, because the decision to split is far heavier and involves much more work than the decision to change the Constitution to remove this force - but this law could still have a cultural impact.).

- The first phase could be the thinking phase of where to put the new borders. One could make this phase in the order of 10 years. One could have one or several Referendums on what the borders should be. It could be one Referendum on the general principle of the new division(s), and then later a Referendum that explores details of the choice that won the first Referendum. Under Constitutional change Referendum rules, you are then already at least 10 years further in time. This may be a good principle: the national split is something that is organized for the next generation, whereas the current generation will live mainly under the existing nation. Add 5 years to spare, for a third Referendum, and this phase takes 15 years. Then add another 5 years spare and it takes 20 years. This seems to be a good amount of time for the thinking phase.

- The next phase could be to jostle around certain internal Government election borders, or quite simply have each to form new nation elect a provisional Government. This puts eyes on the new Nation from internally. In the election system, these new Governments would be elected by 50 geographic sectors by the delegates. It is merely another 'further council'. It already will have it's regular Constitutional role over the area it is elected for, but remains operating under the existing National Government. This is not unusual in this system, it is how it already works. An interesting side effect is that it automatically creates a new overlay over the nation of multiple times 50 provinces. Since the first phase took 20 years, it makes sense to make this phase also last 20 years. That allows for a slow build up and searching for whether this is the right path for the nation.

- Then one could go to the next phase, where the new nations are reconstituting themselves into each 50 Provinces properly, with their Provincial Governments. You could say that the split first starts at the People level with the Referendums (phase 1), then when it is agreed on how to do it, the Nations will be parted in multiple from the head down: National level is parted to a degree (but not formally) in phase 2 (National Governments are created, but have the role of very large further councils and are not National Councils yet - they do not run the currency and elect the high court, and so on). Then the split is furthered down in the system to the provincial councils. One could again take 20 years for this. We are then 60 years into the split. The nation still is one nation, with one currency, one Constitution, one head of State, one Army, one High Court (Law Court). All that has happened by the end of phase 3, is that it's further councils have been re-organized as by their election and responsibility areas.

- Then in phase 4, you could say that the new to form Nations are prepared to such an extent that one could fairly easily part the different areas. Perhaps it is wise to first re-create the unique national responsibilities in a subservient form:

- Each new to form nation will create a subservient Law Court (High court). This is not as hard as it looks because the high court is comprised of chambers of 7 judges, and then there is the supreme high court. This can be as easy as creating multiple locations where the 7 Judge chambers are holding their cases, and maintaining the old location for the Supreme Law Court (the combination of them all.)

- Each Nation creates a new currency. This is probably one of the more difficult operations. It might work to first create independent regional currencies. The nation then has temporarily three or more currencies. It should be noted that this is not nice to foreign trade, and that the new currencies will probably be worth less in foreign trade than the old larger one (?). Hence there may be an economic cost to pay, in exchange for which you gain a more stable and democratic nation (fewer corruption costs). Short term wealth isn't everything, and an Imperial collapse for later generations can be a deadly affair. One could at first allow taxation in both the pre-existing currency, and the new currency. After some time one could stop spending the old national currency back into circulation, and only print the new currency. Now the split will become exceedingly obvious to the general Population. Some will probably not like it. People typically do not have an eye out for the long term, but they think of their own wallet and special circumstances (as is their right).

- It may be smart to wait with the election of new Heads of State (King Elect) as the last activity, because the King Elect has the role of taking over when the councils are in chaos (State of Chaos). This may still be needed up until the last moment. Perhaps it is wise to let all things settle slowly, and that phase 5 will be this formal splitting into two Sovereign Nations with all that it will mean (such as the prohibition against international businesses).

Phase 4 then also lasts 20 years, because there is a lot to do, and to keep it simple. We are now 80 years into the split.

- Phase 5 then begins with the new lands electing their own heads of State - or perhaps they do not, because they want an entirely different Constitution for themselves. Perhaps they want a monarchy, or a more advanced Democracy than was promulgated in the old larger nation or in this Constitution. Since this plan here proposed, assumes this plan, it is assumed then that there was a Head of State and a new one will be elected. Hopefully future nations will be so little corrupt that no head of State will be needed. Then there is nothing to be done on this aspect. The former head of State will then have to step down.

In phase 5 which is the last 20 years in the protocol from 80 to 100 years after the start, the split is completed on all levels, formally. Each will then have its own flag, Constitution and so on. You could say that the last two phases are more or less one phase, with in the first 20 years everything that can be organizationally split is being split, and then in the last 20 years the Head of State is also split (if any), and all remaining unity links are being cut formally. The last 20 years is then more or less the first 20 years of being split nations. Somewhat of a test phase, where you could still negotiate certain things or have some things be left over from the past. After the 100 years have passed, then all must be cut that has to be Constitutionally cut.

An example of a law:

Proper nation size

The nation will split into multiple nations, when the nation has become too large. Above 50 million people the split protocol must be initiated.

Reasoning. (See above, and ...) Here is first said that "too large" is wrong, implying the nation can split before the 50 million limit is reached also. You merely need a decision "it is too large."

_Split Protocol

Each phase of the split protocol takes 20 years.

Phase One: The thinking phase. Referendums will be held.

Phase Two: Each new nation will elect a further council.

Phase Three: The further and local councils are harmonized.

Phase Four: The Law Court gains a seat in each new Nation.

New Currencies are initiated.

The split is furthered through all organizations.

Phase Five: The Head of State - if any - of the former Nation steps down.

The Supreme Law Court is established in each Nation.

The split is formalized in all requirements.

Reasoning. (See above, and ...) The provincial councils are not mentioned in Phase Two, because they might not exist. The words "in all requirements" in Phase Five is there, to subtly point out that there will not be weird treaties between the nations, such as "You may have that port, if you pay us a billion currency units a year." They are split, and they are well and truly split, including the prohibition against supra-national control organs. The mentioned treaty example may still be legal, but as a Government decision that can (and should) be overturned. It is not a condition of the separation, which is perhaps how it will be positioned at first. It is an unconstitutional contract, it will have to be destroyed by the Law Court. "In all requirements," allows the Constitutional elements that outlaw international businesses and supra-national control organs to be modified (if so desired, not recommended by undersigned), without also having to change this law. "In all requirements" could then come to mean that the Law Court will destroy any illegal agreements.

It should be noted that dividing a nation will probably always mean that some resources go to this and other to that side. It will be wise to try to follow old borders, cultural, ethnic, religious, language and strong geographic features.

There are then more or less two forms of a split: the one that is forced by the Constitution and can only be stopped by altering the Constitution, and the one that is sought by more or less simple decision. All these splits can still be halted by the People at any time. Furthermore, both nations could re-unite by Government decision.

The article about how people can remove themselves from the Nation using a 2/3rd Referendum victory, remains active (of course it is active if it is not expressly said that it is not active, but to be sure it has been added that it is

active). This can be used (still) to speed up the process (if a people is so inclined). It can also be used as a self defense: consider a scenario where a group lives within a larger nation, and that nation decides to split. This group is for example a minority. The larger nation decides that they will want a border that runs right through this group. They can manage to push that through, because they are the majority. This group can then do the 2/3rd Referendums, and if they win they can separate themselves out as a new Nation. If enough people are then out of the former nation, it might also gain a better size. Since the splitting protocol is much slower than this 2/3rd Referendum Protocol (article New Territory), the power is with this 2/3rd Referendum system. Smaller groups are in also quicker than larger groups. They can wait as long as Phase 5, if they don't like what is going on. If they are cut in two and then get below the one million threshold in both new nations, they might have a procedural difficulty. If not then they could still split away after the split has been established.

Update 20 Mar 2017: changed 50 million to 30 million, because - basically by gut feeling - I think that 30 million is the maximum that can be sustained under this model; or is already destabilizing.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

Amendment 20

--- Taxation maximum ---

A final trick to push people into slavery, is crushing taxation. Since the Government officials often tends to have a selfish and corrupt interest in taxation, it is a danger if they have the free reign of this decision. It has to be forced upon them what the limits are. Because their greed is ferocious and their deceptions to get it ratified are endless and tiring to combat continuously, it is best that it is fixed in the Constitution.

In this system it should be put after article [8.2.a-3 Taxes](#), as a subarticle reading something like the taxes may not take below what a person needs reasonably to survive (to put an absolute minimum there, to protect the poor even if some of them might decide to be poor for their own reasons), and something like an upper limit of say 30% of their earnings. This however creates the problem that the Government bureaucracy has to find out what everyone is earning ~ which is a danger in its own right because it puts the Government control-obsessed fingers into everything. This problem already exists because of the wealth maximum. However that is supposed to be an extreme case (to have that much wealth), and can therefore hopefully be enforced by reasonable suspicion being raised against an exceedingly rich individual for evading the law on the maximum. Hence it is hopefully possible to enforce that law case by case, rather than that the Government needs to know what everyone is earning.

In the same manner a law that only protects the poor from Government theft, could be enforced against the Government as case by case when people feel oppressed and make a court case of it against the Government. Since in this system the Government is suggested to let people work who can not pay their taxes - thus recuperating the losses in direct labor - the Government could have an interest in raising taxes for crushing the poor, so that they have to directly work for the Government more. This reduces overall taxation burden in principle (as the work is done free already), and then a situation could emerge that the majority of the people starts to abuse the poor by leaning on them exceedingly, forcing them to work excessively for the public good, so that they are monetarily better off from it all. The problem with this danger is that it is a majority who can use the vote, and that they can

put in the type of Government officials who will effectuate this abuse for them by unfairly treating the so captured working poor in the public sector. One of the tricks for example is to value the so done work in the public sector below what it is worth, to squeeze more out of the poor than is fair.

The Amendment that limits the total size of the Government and all its departments & dependent monopoly service groups (chapter 5) and the like, is also a form of protection against over taxation because a Government of defined maximum size would have to create more difficult to get away with corruption schemes to still ask more money without also growing its own overall size. Presumably at some point the corruption potential of the overall Government system that they can get away with without the People understanding it and doing something about it, will then be reached sooner. That then also limits the total amount of taxation that the Government can effectually take in, which in turn protects the people from Government overreach and theft.

Perhaps there do not need to be an amendment added to the Constitution then, because it was already done in [8.2.a-2 Equality of happiness](#), which certainly has this precise problem at the target. However it remains to be a worrying problem; how exactly it is to be solved more decisively I do not know at the moment. You probably have an idea ! Taxation may not exceed a third or fifth or tenth of average monthly income as a direct levy on a person ? Since a Constitution is a heavy handed mechanism, it should leave a measure of freedom and therefore uses a higher cut off point for taxation than you would like to see the actual taxation to be, and therefore it could even put this on half of the average monthly income ~ with the risk of a heavy debt burden of who earns the average, almost crushing for who earns much less, before Constitutional protections are activated ?

{Integrated in above Constitution: no }

Amendment 21

--- No Fake Wars ---

It has become costum in society, that politicians send others to fight in the senseless wars for Empire that are designed to make certain elements of the domestic Oligarchy rich, for which these politicians will then later become well payed members. A law that forces these politicians themselves to become the first casualties in the wars they have created, could make those that are corrupt think twice. Those who are not corrupt, yet do want a certain war, better belief in it so much as the soldiers who will have to do the fighting and dying will have to belief in it. The way to do that is to force these politicians who voted for a war, to be put on the front line themselves. It is up to the nation to keep an eye on the overall casualty rates of these politicians and the soldiers, to see whether or not there is a deception at work. A reasonable rate of casualties should be similar, between the soldiers and these politicians who are forced to go to the front line by law.

The first trick we can expect, is that these politicians will assume high ranks, for example Generals or even Staff Generals, so that they can claim to have to be far away from where the danger is. Hence a law may need to specify that they will become of a lower rank, "... will fight among the soldier ranks ..." (in the system of Army ranks proposed here, the soldier ranks go up to Sergeant, which is a commander over 12 soldiers, two of which are Corporals.) They would not even be Lieutenants then. Lieutenant is an officer corps rank, and for which there are

special educations. It can not be expected that these politicians are capable of finishing the officer corps school. They only need to do some manual tasks, as long as it is at the furthest front line directly facing the enemy, there where the dying occurs.

That is the second trick we can expect: the politicians will hide deep in the army, at the rear (except those who are brave and true, who will be on the tip of the spear assaulting the enemy, dying for the true cause ~ which may be a true cause, sometimes wars are just because the enemy is a tyrannical bloody scourge that has to be defeated.) Somehow the law has to put them at the front line, however we can not be certain of the nature of future wars. What if in the future the "front line" is difficult to define, or even a place of relative safety? On the other hand "front line" means that place where the contact with the enemy is made. Even in a civil war, there are such places, who then become "the front line." Another method that can be used it to say "where the danger is greatest," or "where the dying occurs." A phrase like "at the most dangerous front line" might suffice.

Then there is another trick we can expect: the warmongering politician who is looking to get rich out of spilling the blood of his own people, is going to switch seats at the last moments. He'll put a stooge on his place to take the vote for war, and then the stooge goes off to die and he swaps back on the seat. The law should at least make an attempt to catch this kind of callous behavior, for example by casting a net that will catch not only those who took the final vote to go to war, but also those who argued for the case of war and are in this pro war coalition. If they are in the pro war coalition, then why don't they fight and die themselves? There is no special reason to merely take the one who took the final vote that made the decision official. It does get a little bit merky however, if the language of the law means that anyone who was for the war will then have to be sent to the front. At some point, it seems doubtful that the law can prevent that people act as stooges for others. At some point there is also the humanity of the stooge itself. Notice that a Country Council delegate can not so easily put a stooge on his seat. He is elected by the delegates of a Province, only they can put another individual there. Hence these are already politicians with a fair amount of power, and much to loose.

Another interesting method is that all delegates within the province of the politician in the Country Council who voted for a war, will all be sent to that war. If they do not want to be sent to that war, they will have to change their delegate. This risks that these politicians who are not for war, will retire from the Government at the point of the vote. This turns the whole Government potentially in a more radical group that wants war, because those who don't are lost. It also seems unfair that delegates who do not want war, are forced to go to the war they don't want if they fail to control their Country Council delegate. It may be an option then to force all delegates in the entire nation, who are for the war, to also go to the front. Old, or women, it does not matter: you vote for war, then you are ready to die for it, and if not you might be better off retiring your position or voting for peace.

The mechanism where all delegates in the nation are forced to go to the most dangerous front as soldiers, gives delegates the opportunity to force a vote within their council (wherever it is), to get these people on the record as voting for the war. If they then refuse to vote, their cowardice becomes known. It is another interesting effect that as these delegates are forced to go to the front themselves, thousands of delegates all over the nation if the vote is pro-war, are then lost to the Government. That is not a big problem for the war itself, because that is run by trained Generals, and not by politicians who in many cases know nothing about war. It should however not be thought that therefore the Government becomes pro-peace, because the voting groups that support the war, could send in a new delegate that is even more aggressive in wanting war (although it might be a good war, however these seem to be rare and hence the prejudice is against war.)

The above could result in this, to be added somewhere around the law of the War Flag. It could also be added somewhere in Chapter 4, but Chapter 1 is the most fundamental Chapter. If it is put in Chapter 4 there could be a risk that politicians attempt to minimize this article as only referring to actions done by the Disaster Relief organization (Army). What if they create mercenary systems outside of Chapter 4, even when it is illegal, or pretend (again) that their war is a "police action" ? Using the War Flag system, also gives the Judges an opportunity to look at what flags are flown throughout the Nation. If many for example fly a flag that indicates the Government is at war or should be at war (for example the Constitutional Peace flag with a black ribbon), they may conclude that it is war, and hence that the pro-war Delegates are to be sent to the front by law.

_1.1.c-1.2 True War

Delegates that want to take the nation to war, will serve in the war they want at the dangerous parts of the front line. They lose their position as Delegates. They will continue to serve for the duration of the war, the state of their health allowing.

They will not have a higher rank than to command twenty soldiers, they will be as soldiers among soldiers in everything.

4.2.c Individual Right to Reject Dispatch, and all other law, remains applicable even to them.

The above law means that they can vote for the war, and they have to go to the front. But then again they don't, as they can reject the Dispatch, which is a right in this system. Does that not mean that it all means nothing ? Perhaps, however: rights are rights and they have to be maintained for all. Politicians may change their mind at the eve of war, or when they see the terrible events. Should they then be forced ? Perhaps so, as they asked for the war in the first place. However there is also a political effect if those who voted for the war, then use the Right to Reject Dispatch: it brings everything they said in doubt, and brings the morale of the Army down to the point that they too might decide, if our Delegates are such cowards as to dishonor themselves by rejecting the Dispatch (to war) they themselves put on us, then we will likewise Reject their Dispatch. It could then perhaps de-escalate. It seems better to allow people to seek peace whenever they can, whenever they may have learned that war is terrible, even if previously they desired the war. Notice that they are still retired from being Delegates.

In some cases when politicians are really old, or for women or disabled persons, and for example the war is Just, then they can also pull out of the war using the right to Reject Dispatch. In their case it is reasonable because they lack the health, and then this is not a dishonor but easily understood ~ and then in a Just war you do not have old men and handicapped people at the front line, who have done no wrong but to call for a war when it was needed.

*

The next day ...On second thought the right to reject dispatch should not apply to them. They vote for the war, they are going to the front line as soldiers themselves, all the Delegates in the Nation who wanted the war (that is in the order of 1% of the entire nation, in this model; it is a large amount of people. If Texas was Sovereign under this model, it would by itself be one Army (about 200 000 troops)). The sentence "They lose their position as Delegates." should be sharpened with "... Delegates, for the duration of the war."

It could be sharpened further: if the Country Council wants a war, that has to mean that all Delegates in the Nation are in majority in agreement with this, otherwise such a decision can not stand in this system. That means that you can make that a requirement: the majority of Delegates in the nation, will go to the war, otherwise there is no war.

The risk with allowing the Right to Reject Dispatch, is that the politicians will tiptoe around the issue with their lying mouths, saying things like "I send the Army to this great battle, but as for myself, I will wage this war from the halls of Government to make sure we win this war, and therefore I will Reject Dispatch because not being a trained soldier I would only get in the way of our brave warriors." That would probably work, and they get away with murdering their own people for profit, the people never even knowing that they are being murdered by the person they look up to as their savior (in the case of an unjust war, which is the usual wars, except when there actually is an invading army).

The issue that old people or women can not fight (some women can fight), is already handled by the mentioning of their health allowing.

The article could then come to read like this:

_1.1.c-1.2 True War

The Majority of Delegates in the entire nation that want to take the nation to war, will serve in the war they want at the dangerous parts of the front line. They loose their position as Delegates, for the duration of the war. They will continue to serve for the duration of the war, the state of their health allowing.

They will not have a higher rank then to command twenty soldiers, they will be as soldiers among soldiers in everything, bearing the same cost in death and pain.

The last addition is an interesting one as well: they bear the same cost. That means that if after a year of war for example, it turns out that the death rate of soldiers is 1 death for every 5 soldiers, and 1 in 20 is captured a prisoner of war, but the ex-delegates die only at a rate of 1 death for every 1000 ex-delegates (because they are trying to let others die for them), then the ex-Delegate forces will be put at a more dangerous position. If on the other hand the ex-Delegates, being probably mostly badly trained forces, die at a much higher rate then real soldiers, then they will be put in less dangerous positions.

Doesn't this negatively impact the freedom of the Staff Generals to create the necessary strategy? Perhaps to a small degree, however think of the benefit to all if the Delegates do not dare to wage a war to begin with because they know that the Staff Generals will make sure they are going to die like everyone else, and that they have no hope of curbing that as they are only soldiers at the receiving end of the orders. The Staff Generals must comply with this law, because it is part of higher strategies then any strategic issues of combat at play within that single war. The Staff Generals must make sure that it will be burned into the memory of the Nation that this law is respected, and that those who wanted the war actually did die for it, as did the soldiers whom they send. There is another effect that can make the Delegates who want war afraid: they could be put into units that are only

comprised of ex-Delegates. They would be sitting next to each other in the council, but later they would be lying on the ground under enemy fire together as well. Since they are presumably mostly untrained, their forces will be weak, their forces could be pathetic even, virtually incapable of resisting the enemy at all who would massacre them at will. This realization might make the delegates who want war also a little more scared of what exactly they are doing. A brave Delegate who fights a just war however, will not be so afraid, because he lusts to die for the honorary death for Justice, to die bravely and show the others how to be brave and not fear death.

What is the penalty for if this law is not respected? Can any single ex-Delegate be faulted for not dying? Of course no single ex-Delegate can be faulted for not dying, that would be absurd. Usually in this Constitution there are no punishments described, the issue of creating punishment until the law is complied with is left to the Courts. One might assume they will levy a punishment that will increase until there is compliance. In this case this is not so easy to do. Three groups come to mind for punishment: the Country Council (who is the highest authority), the highest Generals of the Army (who have the command to put the ex-Delegates at the places where they die in sufficient numbers in compliance with the law), and the ex-Delegates (which is a large group). Perhaps a sort of a trick is to in a way never end the war, or never end it with regards to the ex-Delegates, then until the ex-Delegates have died sufficiently, meaning they can never be part of the Government again. They can never be elected again. However the problem with this, is that it interferes with the right of the people to elect whom they want. The Courts would get in between that in some cases, and this is not generally a good thing. The vote must be free; it is already bad enough that during the war these delegates are to be at the front and can not be elected (which means that the ex-Delegates, if they form new voter-groups, have to elect someone who was not a delegate at the time of creating the war decision.)

Since it is the high Generals who know how many have died, which may be secret knowledge, and they know where it is most dangerous at the front line, and where the dying will occur, and they have the responsibility to make sure these ex-Delegates die sufficiently in according to the law (although naturally they have a duty to keep the overall death rate as close to zero as possible), it seems logical to put the punishment there where the responsibility occurs. There is still a line of influence between the Country Council and the high Generals however, so that the Country Council might interfere with the high Generals. The high Generals have a higher responsibility to the Constitution than to the Country Council however, and are in a good position to know deception (as it is an essential part of war). A way to deal with the issue could hence be that the high Generals are demoted to the rank of soldiers themselves if the death rates are too much uneven. For example, more than a 100% difference, more than twice or less than half, because these things are not an exact science; perhaps it should even be more than three times or less than a third before there is some reason to suspect of doing this on purpose. It depends on how the war goes, and how long it lasts. In a long war, that allows for easy manouvering of units, it is easier to play with the death rates. Once the ex-Delegates do not die sufficiently, they are repositioned where the dying is worst. However if the war is short, and does not allow for repositioning, and the enemy is attacking certain armies but not others, then the death rate could be very uneven, without anyone having a blame in having set it up that way. Furthermore, although it is easy to get a weak army to get killed, it is not fair to make an army that fights extraordinarily well, to put them into positions where they are certainly going to die, just to get their kill ratio the same. Perhaps a solution to all this, is that the ex-Delegates units or even individuals, are interspersed with the other forces. However being untrained, they could prove to be a serious problem for the efficiency of the war, and this is therefore probably not a wise choice. You don't want to loose a just war, because there are incompetents all over the Army.

It is therefore all in all not an easy problem to apply a Court case to. If foul play is proven, the high Generals could be demoted and send to the front themselves, for example as part of the ex-Delegates army which in many cases will probably be a weak army. Another issue is that the Judges will not be experts of war either, and also if the war is lost the Nation might take their rage out at the high Generals by an unfair court case. If the rate of casualties of the ex-Delegates is high, they have the political connections to make the high Generals hurt, get them to loose their jobs or something. On the other hand, since all Delegates are being replaced, those new Delegates will have job security if the previous ex-Delegates die, so that is an effect that works the other way, perhaps counterbalancing both. (Sorry if that sounds rough, but the premise in this entire system is that nobody can be trusted. Even when many people are good and trustworthy, the system assumes the worst so that the law is as strong as it could be. If people are trustworthy, that is a bonus and never a problem, but if not the system still should work. The idea is to play self-interests against each other, so that they cancel each other out, this is an example.)

All in all it is a difficult Court case, which is probably in the Jurisdiction of the Law Court because with an appeal to the Supreme Law Court, because it involves the high players of power (to which the high Generals of the Army could also be reckoned, certainly in case of war.) It will be important to find proof of foul play. Also account has to be made that war can bring miracles sometimes, it is an unpredictable thing; the logical mind of those not in the war may not necessarily apply. Perhaps a good way then to get a sensible input in all of it, is to also put the question to the real Army, and whether they feel that everyone has taken the burden of the war fairly. They lived through it day by day. If outrage lives in the Army (which is not all that likely, as being fighters they will probably want to defend the ex-Delegates more than to have them be killed at their rates), that is a sign something may be wrong ~ however not necessarily because the Army could just be angry to have lost the war; and if it's won the war then they might just be happy and forget all the suffering one way or the other. It seems then that the issue is difficult, the high Generals will have to be trusted to make some effort to respect this law, and only in grave cases of proven deception in this case may it be proper to give a punishment. Another problem is that some of the high Generals may not wish to prevent war, but rather stimulate it, and thereby shield the ex-Delegates. Similar to that would be the instinct to protect the untrained non-fighters from combat, and put them rather in the supply lines or even manufacturing, where they are more useful. That might be legal, if these factories come under bombardment as well, so that it becomes part of the front line. Otherwise it wouldn't be legal.

There are many issues at play that can not be foreseen. In the end the point is that at least the ex-Delegates suffer the war and not sit in their sofas slurping coffee while watching others do the dying. Court cases will probably have to be postponed then until after the war, because you don't want to pull the high Generals off that war unless they are incompetent. That is also a problem of secrecy of war, and could even be done by enemy infiltrated agents.

Another problem is that the high Generals must still always try to supply also the ex-Delegates army to win the war without taking a single casualty; as they would with all other armies. If they take away equipment from the ex-Delegates to get their death rates up to the same as the actual soldiers, then they become guilty of those deaths morally. This must never occur. However they can give the ex-Delegates all they need and even more, at least similar to the rest of the army, and if they then still die it is not the fault of the high Generals but of the failure of these ex-Delegates to properly train for the war they wanted themselves. To prevent such moral guilt, it might be good to equip the weak ex-Delegates a little better than the other armies, but not much because it takes away from the most competent forces. I also think that the ex-Delegates Army will always have to be positioned such, that at least they have a chance to win the fight, taking into account their likely weakness; but in the same way this

would be done for all Armies. A noteworthy solution to letting the Delegates suffer without killing them on purpose, is when they surrender to the enemy and become prisoners of war. Since they are likely so weak, they are also likely to surrender. As prisoners of war, they will probably suffer for their own decisions, but not be killed. Enough has been said to make the high Generals understand perfectly. The matter is in their hand.

To put it shortly: don't make them suffer on purpose, but don't shield them by preference either. Use them to try to win the war, for what they are worth. If they suffered an extend, even if it is merely from hard work or by walking long watches, getting little sleep, sleeping in the cold and so on, experiencing the dangers close by, then I think they have done what can reasonably be expected. It's better to save the ex-Delegates and err on that side, so that fewer died than regular army, than to on purpose get them killed, because that would be a grave offense. Let them taste the war close up and suffer it, but don't kill them just to get in compliance with this law. Don't send them as weak infantry against enemy tank battallions just to get their death rate up I mean; but they could be put against enemy infantry, where they should have a chance if they had trained properly ~ and that is their own responsibility. To surrender in time if they are slaughtered, is also their responsibility. Court cases seem to be unlikely because the issues are too complex, unless all the ex-Delegates are put in a hidden bunker far away from the fight. Don't worry about court cases if you used the ex-Delegates in the fight in some way.

Do what you feel is right, what that is can not be foreseen from this place. The people have to trust the high Generals that they gave their positions for that reason.

Perhaps the main way this is enforced, is not as a grand court case after the fact (unless there where grave abuses in general somehow, with intent), when the grand percentages can be computed and compared, but as small individual cases in the lower courts, against individual Delegates who are trying to evade being sent to the front by the high Generals. It becomes a tool in the hands of the high Generals, to get theres recruits by force of law. Notice how it is not merely about the Delegates who voted, it is about everyone who has been a Delegate during the period that the issue came under debate, and who has played a role in furthering the cause of war. This is a way to catch Delegates who snap out of their seat for a few days or even months, to put a stooge in who will go to war for them (which is probably going to be a way these people are going to still try to send people to die for their wars, while they sit back and enjoy the reigns of dictatorship that war tends to foster.) They better realize that the high Generals can get them all and send them to the front, with a rifle pointing at their backs if need be. The high Generals will then be assisted in this effort by you, because someone will need to bring these court cases to the courts and point out these Delegates who are skirting their duties.

Perhaps the law should be more precise, saying that anyone who has been a delegate in the last year or even 5 years and has furthered the cause of war, is liable to be sent to the front.

1.1.c-1.2 True War

The Majority of Delegates (see [3.1.c Electing Government](#)) in the entire nation that want to take the nation to war, and all those that have furthered the cause of war by their public activity and where Delegates in the preceding 5 years , will serve in the war they want at the dangerous parts of the front line. They loose their position as Delegates, for the duration of the war. They will continue to serve for the duration of the war, the state of their health allowing.

***They will not have a higher rank than to command twenty privates.
They will be as privates, bearing the same cost in pain and death.***

A protection is added in the form of "their public activity," because they still have the right to free speech. They still need the right to speak to people however they want, without any grave repercussions. However if they are going to try to reach the general public, or are being interviewed and they know it is going out to the general public, then they are part of the generalized war effort. It can reasonably be called their public activity, even if they are interviewed by others. It would be protected however if they talk to individuals, without obvious intent that it becomes knowledge of the General Public. Then it can not reasonably be called their public activity. There are some problems here, with people who are routinely in the news. However they are free from the measure, if they have not been delegates in the last 5 years, so it is not that grave a burden in general. Once someone is a Delegate, that is a special responsibility, and this measure is part of the problems that the good must suffer, to catch the bad in the net of the law. If honorable people want a war, they should fight it, and therefore this is not a problem for them ~ they may see it as an opportunity to get to the front line unhindered. Isn't it interesting how lighthearted even commoners today, send others to the front without hardly a second thought for those they send for the vaguest of excuses ? The belief in State propaganda by most commoners is also a shocking affair and a testament to their lack of intelligence. Let them go themselves from now on. These empty headed folks who send others to their deaths without a second thought ! This measure in that sense is already light, because one would really want to send everyone to the front who wanted the war ~ let them do it themselves safe for small children, the sick & elderly who can not walk anymore (but maybe they can still lay in ambush or on the lookout). War will hopefully die out quickly, when people the people who send others learn what it really is.

*

A benefit of the system where Delegates can Reject Dispatch, is that it greases the skids for everyone else to likewise Reject Dispatch. However it is likely that this effect gets snowed under by other effects, such as the war propaganda and the tricks and excuses that the pro-war Delegate majority will be well positioned to use against that effect. They could generate a propaganda situation where they are excused from going, but those in the Army will be harassed socially for Rejecting Dispatch anyway. This is not difficult to do, because it goes over lines like "we are untrained" and "you have been given the training from the public treasury to do this job, not doing it is not doing what you were payed for" and so on. The effect of forcing the Delegates to go to their war themselves is in the end probably going to have a more solemn effect on the whole situation in the end. It even has an effect on the Reject Dispatch law, because if Delegates are going to try to evade the law on being forced to go to the front themselves, then they become less credible with their methods of trying to prevent soldiers to use their right to Reject Dispatch. They start breaking the law (perhaps, especially if it is an unjust war for profit), then who are they to force soldiers to go to their war when the law allows the Soldiers to likewise not go !

Caution: don't expect too much from all these laws. They may sound great, but they are nothing then until the masses enforce these laws upon those who do not comply, if need be with force. Don't sit around waiting on the System of Government and the Courts to enforce this for you, as these Delegates are send to their own war. You need to make sure, with a large percentage of the people, to make sure the law is actually done. Get off your butt and let the system know that the Delegates will go to their war, whether you want that war or don't want that war is irrelevant. Force them to go; and notice that during war the entire System and the Constitution are trembling on their foundations (which on many occasions, is exactly why the corrupt are waging the wars ... it

allows them to destabilize the Nation, to undermine the Constitution and the law.) Search out for who is profiting from the war. If it is not Justice then you should be starting to think of Revolution.

*

Some issues of clarification on how this is intended to work,

- The Electoral Committee are not Delegates by virtue of being the EC.

- The King/Queen Elect is not a Delegate either. There arises a problem when the State of Chaos is in effect, and the King Elect declares war. Now he/she is the one making the war, should then not he also go to the front as a private, according to the principle of this law ? I suppose he/she should. Once the King Elect is at the front as a private, then the next in line in the E.C. could become King Elect instead. The beauty of that is that it gives the Nation a second chance to pull out of the war again. If that occurs, the previous King Elect would perhaps be King Elect again. A problem with all of this is that it breaks into the laws that describe who is King Elect. Does he/she lose that position when declaring war ? Perhaps that is not a bad idea. Should the Delegates go to war, if the King declares it and not they, during the State of Chaos ? Probably not, since they didn't make that decision. This however gives warmongering Delegates the chance to first go to the State of Chaos (by making chaos?), then have the King Elect declare the war. This is the dream of all those who want tyranny. The effect that the King Elect will then go to the front, and lose the Kingship, is an effect that counterbalances this problem.

1.1.c-1.2.1 King declaring War

If the King Elect rules during the State of Chaos (see [1.4.a King Rule](#)) it will go with him as it would have the Delegates described in True War. The Kingship will pass to the next in line in the Electoral Committee for the duration of the war (see [3.1.c-1.8 King Elect](#)).

Although the law gets a bit nitty-gritty here (what is the chance on State of Chaos, and then also declaring war maybe it is not so small, because State of Chaos and war are related to each other; and this whole model is also designed to cope with a Nation that is not fully capable of democracy but that relapses at times into a dictatorship.)

- The Sovereign Inspector, may inspect everything of the Government, which includes the Disaster Relief Organization, and which therefore includes the Army, and it includes the high Generals and their plans. What if the King Elect has decided the war is evil ? What if the King Elect has decided to expose the plans of the high Generals, even to the enemy ? That is his right ! He should do that, it is his duty. He is elected for this ~ for better or worse. Will the high Generals hide their plans, or even assassinate the King Elect at the brink of war, if the King Elect is trying to stop the war ? That would obviously be murder, and not part of the war. High Generals do obviously not have the right to kill the King Elect, or stop the Sovereign Inspector. But what about the law that installs a death penalty, as part of the overall laws describing the Common Militia ? What if they create a law, that the Sovereign Inspector then breaches as part of what he perceives is his duty. They can not make a law that breaches the Constitution, hence if they make a law that all those shall be executed who publish the plans of the high Generals, this does not touch the Sovereign Inspector, who has his powers out of the Constitution.

You could then argue that the death penalty law was also created out of a power from the Constitution. That is true, but that law can not breach the Constitution. The Government can make the law, as is their Constitutional responsibility, but they can not make law that breaks the Constitution. The Sovereign Inspector has its powers, and if the powers of the war system are supposed to be supreme over the responsibility of the Sovereign Inspector, then the Constitution would have specified that (but on purpose, it does not; at least not the version proposed here.) There is an obvious margin of activity between the Constitutional responsibility to make law, and usurping the power to break a Constitutional article. It is that margin of activity that is intended by the Constitution as to be used. If someone writes a law "those who expose the plans of the high Generals shall be executed," there is a certain limited scope to that law defined by the Constitution, which is an intrinsic part of that law. For example under conditions that such a law can not be made at all, see the Constitution (240+ version), such a law can be written, but is void. This is all the result of article [1.1.b.Scope](#), but perhaps it is good to repeat it again here, in case these things came under review at a time of war stress.

- The Courts on any level, are not Delegates. Everyone who is not delegates, or was shortly ago, can further the war without being forced to sent to the front. Major public propagandists who are known to have caused the war, but are not Delegates and where not shortly ago according to the period mentioned in the law, are not forced by Constitutional law to go to the front either. This is part of freedom of speech. They are probably morally loathsome if they do not go to the war, but the idea is to make those who make the decision go suffer the consequences themselves for an issue as grave as war. Propagandists don't make the decision, they try to influence it (sadly they often succeed to the point that they seem to virtually make the decisions, but that is by choice of the people who pretend not to notice reality because it scares them).

*

The first article True War, is left somewhat vague as to what it should mean when the conditions of the subarticle King declares war are met. It still seems to be a good idea to send the delegates to the war they wanted as well with the King, just not merely out of them being forced to carry out that decision because they have to do what the King tells them.

{Integrated in above Constitution: no }

Amendment 22

--- Referendum Representative weighted ---

There exists a second problem with a Referendum, besides the problem that is solved by giving the Representatives the power to vote the abstentions: the possibility that the Representatives themselves have an unusually small mandate. What right does a Representative Government that merely combines 1% of the voters have, to dramatically modify a Referendum result that has been achieved by for example 30% of the public direct voting ? 30% in direct voting is a 30 times larger mandate to the Referendum then the 1% turnout for the politicians, yet it leaves the politicians with 70% of the abstentions to control the result almost as if there had been no Referendum.

The solution seems to be obvious and simple: the percentage of the turnout for the elections (the amount of citizens that is represented in the Government, this is a fraction between 0 and 1) is multiplied by the number of abstentions. That means the Representatives can only vote that part of the abstentions, that is the same size of these abstentions as is their amount of voters that elected them is of the whole population. If 10% of the people voted in the elections (are represented in the Government), then the Representatives (the Delegates) can only vote 10% of the abstentions. If 90% of the people is represented in the Government, then the Government may vote 90% of the abstentions. An added benefit is that this gives the Representatives an incentive to attempt to bring in as many people to vote, so that they have a larger control over the Referendums (assuming that politicians mainly are seeking their own power, which may not be the case although it has historically been the case.)

This modification will probably have to be added inside article 3.1.b, because the phrase "The number of abstentions ..." there is fairly unambiguous and means all abstentions, without this modification. A phrase "The number of abstentions, multiplied by the mandate of the Representatives, ..." might work. The word 'multiplied' here is meant mathematically, but since it is counter-intuitive perhaps 'reduced' is better. Here another attempt:

The number of abstentions left, after taken the fraction thereof equal to the fraction of the people Represented in that Government, 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.

It might also be useful to add that this vote of the abstentions by the Government is a public vote. It is not part of their private citizens vote. The last part of the above sentence might be better:

...
is divided by the number of representatives in the body concerned with the referendum; each representative is allowed to publicly vote its assigned abstentions.

The next sentence might also be dropped, as the article is already a bit long. It should be implicit that this is how it is to work.

The abstentions-adjusted result determines fractions with which options won votes in the total of votes. ... The phrase "that Government" is to mean the same Government as is the one concerned with the Referendum.

Sidenote: this principle allows a solution to exist to the problem of multiple competing Governments in the same area, who might both have their own election systems (dual Government claims during Revolutions.) It might not be practical as one or both sides may be lying about how many people they represent, it is at least a theoretical solution. Both Government representatives could then add the fraction that is the abstentions to the result equal to their mandate. It leads to the problem that the addition of both mandates could be larger than 1. Probably a reasonable solution to that is to then normalize both fractions back their addition not be larger than 1, so as not to unreasonably infringe on the direct election result. Each abstention is then only voted once. If it was to be voted more than once, you could say the right of one man having one vote has been violated, as it downgrades the direct votes to less than one vote.

Amendment 23

--- Removing minimum wage ---

As had been noted already, the minimum wage law does not belong in this Constitution: /post/005/DV_coops/minimum_wage

Quote: "Perhaps this law does not belong in this Constitution, and was added as a knee-jerk reaction to the dangers of historical *laissez faire* capitalism ('capitalism')."

After hearing more arguments about it, such as that minimum-wage endangers entry level jobs that do not earn the company almost anything (or could even cause losses), it seems that it is best after all not just scrap this law. It is a tenuous law in this power distribution system, which causes the State to have another difficult to do job, putting their fingers into private contracts where they do not belong. It cuts against the freedom of the market, not just for employers but also for employees. Even if there might be a reason to have a minimum-wage law, it is not strictly necessary in a DAVID system (contrary to a Capitalistsystem), and thus does not belong in a Constitution. It is already heavy handed to put the economic system into the Constitution. A regular law, if necessary, would have to do. Secondly there is a whole new problem created with this law, in the area of volunteer work, services between friends for no payment, work done in such low quality that it merits virtually no payment or even repayment of damages, and so on. These troubles are already solved by distributing power, rather than Wealth. Indeed on third thought it seems that this article distributes *wealth* (or tries to), which is contrary to the philosophy of this system, which is to distribute *power*.

The other labor protections do seem worthwhile, for example if conditions for a certain work are unsafe, then the company or employer has an interest in deceiving a new employee about these dangers. Then when the employee becomes sick or permanently damaged, the costs will have to be shouldered by the public, while the deceiver walks away with the profit. It is not easy for a random employee to judge the dangers in some kind of specialist job, or the exact circumstances that exist in a new company. Furthermore this is probably not so difficult to police, because when there are accidents the one hurt has a reason to complain (alert the police), and the situation can be addressed. If the standards are not overly shocking but more in line with common sense and what is reasonable, then there should not be a problem. It could however be argued that these laws are also better off as regular laws. Then again to establish the absolute minimum of worker safety law, such as establishing a reasonable responsibility for those who know for those who do not yet know the dangers, would already satisfy this Constitutional requirement. After all, we all know what has happened in the past with abusing the labor force, which is an ongoing problem in the world. Similar arguments are the case for the other safety articles.

Personal note: I consider having added the minimum wage as a mistake, already before mentioned as such. The way of re-interpreting minimum wage law as a way of hurting dictatorial businesses, is also tenuous, and is a bit mean spirited toward such businesses. It is also a little bit of an unfair reading of the literal wording of the law, which is not a good thing to start from when proposing a Constitution.

This law read originally as follows:

~~6.4.a-1 Minimum wage~~

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

There is still a minor issue that could be resolved for people who do not own land in the nation: underaged, children and immigrants. The technical protection by which a minimum wage is not necessary, is after all their share of resources. What if they do not have it, does the system revert to wild capitalism again in which protections are needed? You could argue however that immigrants will have to prove themselves working, while children are protected by their land owning parents and also have to prove themselves working. If the bulk of the economy is free and people in general have options, wages in general will have to be higher, and this positively affects the labor market for people without land as well.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

Amendment 24

--- Jury Justice ---

Adding the principles of English Justice, such as a guilty verdict by a Jury of peers. Various other or all provisions of Jury Justice could be directly added to this Constitution.

Since Jury Justice is well known, there is no reason to re-invent it in this document. The purpose of this document is to prove that this power distributive economic system proposed here can function, and achieve the necessary detail to be functional in practice as a Constitution, in case of an emergency implementation becomes a Revolutionary necessity, and as a means to deepen the debate. The issue of human rights or Justice are added only to codify a Constitution that might function (as previously noted), rather than attempt to reach a perfect state on those issues by creative law making. This Constitution goes already well beyond the average discussion of economics, and perhaps in some cases too far.

Every attempt possible has been made here to create a better form of representative Democracy, as a requirement of a form of limited public investment into the economy, or more precisely: the removal of the financial Oligarchy, and its mechanisms for power concentration. With that we are back where this effort began: the problem of the removal of the Oligarchy, ending the damage they do to life and happiness. A durable Representative for the Public sphere fills a vacuum, that can therefore no longer as easily be filled by an Oligarchy, which is essential for a functioning economy, the reduction of poverty, the frequency of war and tyranny. It certainly is true that the mechanisms of Justice are no less important, but it seems that this is not where the major problems of today are. Dare one say it: those problems of Justice are more or less solved, in terms of law. The problems of economics and Oligarchy are not currently solved in the public mind, hence this work.

Besides Jury Justice, there are scores of most interesting legal accomplishments in the world. Provisions of which could be added to this Constitution, and which fit perfectly into the idea of the distribution of power. One such

related idea is to add the election of a Sheriff. The Swiss have most interesting principles at work, worth studying and copying, in the area of democracy and their military Defense. A property that these mechanisms have over many of the laws here proposed, is that they have proven to be functional. Although it is possible to find and list all these useful traditions and documents here, given time and opportunity to do so, it seems proper to stop adding to a project that has seemed to achieve its aim long since, and leave the rest of the work for others to accomplish. May you feel invited to continue on such work for your Nation, to find and create law.

P.S. It is remembered at time of this writing, that in some parts of the reasoning for the Constitution there is arguments against adding more forms of election to the People, so that their effort would be focussed. However, if people can handle it, it is more power-distributive to have more to elect. There may also be some downsides of Jury Justice which may have been mentioned, however it is more power-distributive then justice by Judge alone. Hence such principles do belong in a system that strives for the efficient distribution of power. The arguments made here are not necessarily flawless, of course ...

An interesting effect of allowing the People more votes for different powers, such as Police, Judicial, Jury involvement, and so on, is that it lessens the tasks that voter groups can arrive at an internal discord about. Thus, by lessening the pressure on voter-groups, which are the most involved aspect of this democratic system, the overall workload of people in this system could end up being less, even while they vote more often. It is also useful that those not organized in voter-groups can have more points that they can vote on (besides Referendums). It goes without saying that those organizations established upon a direct vote, distribute power and balance the system like no other public organization can.

P.P.S. Amendment 25 had to be renamed because it turns out that the "Magna Carta" is not strictly about Jury Justice. The intention of this amendment is simply to spread the power of Justice to the People, and since this is well developed in England, it is logical to point to those nations for how it can work, without endlessly trying to develop the same kind of system again from scratch. This is after all about economics, and the fact that it contains an entire Constitution is already going well beyond that target. The goal is not to develop a new system from scratch in its entirety, on the contrary. Whether or not and to what extend the power to judge the law itself should be part of such a system, I gladly leave that to someone else to decide. It can help in extreme cases where law clearly produces injustices, on the other hand the law in this system is already made by the approval of a vast amount of delegates throughout the nation, which means that there is less of a condition where a small inner central clique makes the law against which the common man needs a street level direct defense. Even so, laws can be written in bad ways or have unexpected consequences, which only become apparent during a trial.

{Integrated in above Constitution: your job? }

Amendment 25

--- Jurisprudence ---

It is mentioned somewhere, perhaps not in law but accompanying documentation, that Jurisprudence is not binding on the law court (the highest court). Perhaps that was going a little too far, and Jurisprudence should be assumed binding in some ways, because then the practice of law becomes clear(er) to all. The Law Court should not go off on a whim every day something else, and especially not degrade the law. On the other hand, it seems logical that if a previous ruling was unjust, that it must be repaired somehow.

Perhaps one could think of an additional rule, that is whenever a ruling breaks the previous Jurisprudence on an equal case, that because there are then 2 different rulings, that the case must then be referred for further review to the Supreme Law Court for a final decision. Such a court case could then take into account not just the immediately brought case but also all the previous cases on the same matter (or a key selection from them). If it is determined that the Jurisprudence is going to be changed by the Supreme Law Court, then one could make a rule that the verdict is publicised, pending approval by the next Supreme Law Court. The next Supreme Law Court is the one after the next general elections, when new Law Court Judges can be approved to their position within the Law Court. They then again review the matter, add their verdicts to the cases at hand, and then the new ruling on the matter is determined.

Since now the law could be said to have been changed by the Law Court, which is admitted, you could now argue that the law as it previously was interpreted still has to be valid for events that occurred during that time. That means that the case brought before the courts are not altered by the new interpretation. One could perhaps compensate for this, by using the available room to the Judges to determine how to rule a case - if any - to give a verdict as much into the direction of the new ruling as the old law would allow. Example: if a new interpretation stipulates a high fine for something, whereas the old rulings usually ended up with a low fine, that the court cases on this matter until the new interpretation is fixed by the new Supreme Law Court are skewed to the highest fines that occurred under the old regime. In cases where there is no such room, the old law would then apply.

This system does allow different readings of the law in principle by the Supreme Law Court, while giving the People a chance to impact on such an occurrence if it should be about to occur beforehand. The law would always be fixed and known by its Jurisprudence (if any), and a serious event is created out of altering the Jurisprudence on new cases that seems to fit such a serious event. Since the whole Law Court is involved, this limits the amount of such cases that the Supreme Law Court can handle. That practical limit means that the law changes quite slowly, and that the People can hold the entire Supreme Law Court responsible, rather than a number of individuals in a single chamber.

Whether the above rules are congruent with the thusfar created Constitutional Proposal is undetermined. The Supreme Law Court has jurisdiction in "sensitive cases," and you could argue that changing the Jurisprudence, is changing the Law as it existed before, and that could therefore be claimed to be a sensitive case. One could also modify the above rules for changing Jurisprudence, to only apply when it involves Constitutional law, since that is also mentioned as the Supreme Law Court jurisdiction; especially if there are too many cases for the Law Court to function otherwise. Secondly it is the Constitution which is the backbone of the whole system, and quite hard to change for anyone. Therefore changing its interpretation is a most serious matter. Contrary to that is when a regular law is changed in its interpretation, because the legislature would only have to change the wording of that law to influence the Judiciary to create a ruling as desired. Although under this Constitution that is also by no means an easy matter, it is far easier than altering the Constitutional law. The other option to influence the interpretation of the law is by altering the composition of the Supreme Law Court, which is easier than altering

the Constitution. In the above suggested rules that has already been possible then, before the new interpretation might be effectuated, thus preventing a whiggling back and forth of the interpretation of the Law.

{Integrated in above Constitution: no }

Amendment 26

--- Deputy Delegate ---

The loss of local representation by further council election

When a delegate gets elected from local to a neighborhood further council, a delegate may in practice still be able to service his own local most direct council as well (or perhaps not). When a delegate gets elected nationally, it is increasingly unlikely that such a delegate will have the time or energy to service his local council. That means that a voter-group is without meaningful local representation, despite their delegate being a popular one (with the other voter groups / delegates).

In terms of rights one can view the problem as that a voter-group has a right to be represented by one delegate, but upon election of their delegate into a further council, that delegate then also starts to represent other delegates and other voter-groups. Since one person can only do so much, one could reasonably say that while on the one hand the originating voter-group of that further elected delegate now has an opportunity to have greater influence over a wider area, on the other hand they are loosing the ear and a measure of control over their delegate as well. In practice this problem is worsened from the perspective of the delegate, because by being apparently popular enough to be elected into a further council by other delegate (which implies the approval of other voter-groups), upon a discord with his own voter- group he is likely to find another voter-group to become his / her initial step back into the delegate role. The further council delegates start to free float to a degree, upon a greater amount and potential of voter-groups as such.

One can therefore reasonably say that the original voter group is starting to be deprived of representation, especially on the most local level. One can also wonder quite rightly if a delegate who is concerning himself with the national budget, should spend time on the issue of a rotten tree on a street corner in his home street.

One solution is to push a second delegate into the local council, for this voter group (as has been suggested elsewhere). However that creates the problem of there being more official delegates, with all the usual rights, including to vote on law. It seems to me that this is going to cause confusion, and formally speaking the voter-group in question is now gaining more official rights then they are entitled to (they are only entitled to one delegate). The obvious solution is to have a place-holder or assistent, that functions for the original delegate and under his authority, merely to expand the amount of time that the original (proper) delegate can dedicate to the

(more) local issues. This place-holder or assistant then does not have any personal rights, does not vote on law, and cannot have a conflicting opinion to the original delegate.

At the extreme there seems to be some risk that one voter-group, would put into operation a whole string of such assistants, on every level of Government. Example: One proper delegate at the National Council. One assistant/place-holder for him/her at the Provincial council. One assistant /place-holder at the city council. One assistant/place-holder at the neighborhood council, and one assistest/place-holder at the most local direct council. One may ask; is this even a problem ? On the other hand one could question: does this voter-group now shine unfairly much brighter then most others ? To which one could respond: yes they do, but as they are so elected, it is their right to be more prominent, and in so doing the represent all those others that elected them.

Just because a Province elected someone a delegate to the National Council, that does not mean that this Delegate is also elected by the city in which he could be represented to sit in the city council. When someone is already elected into the National Council, it is unlikely that he / she would stand candidate or be elected in a Provincial, City or neighborhood Council as well, for the obvious reason that this person is unlikely to have the time to do that job as well. Than the problem reduces itself to choice and known consequences: if a city elects someone who is also elected at a larger area level (or keeps them elected once a delegates gets to a larger area level, does not replace them), then it is their own choice if they end up with an place-holder/assistant delegate; and it being their choice it is also their problem, and not a problem of the system itself. If they like it that way, it's their choice, if they don't like it, they can replace that delegate and thus no longer have a place-holder/assistant there (but a proper delegate of another voter-group). Hence the string-of-assistents problem is possibly a non-issue, which could mean that it is unnecessary to limit the amounts of place-holder/assistents a voter-group may have.

This leaves the issue of what the relationship should be between the delegate, the place-holder/assistant delegate, and the voter group. If formally speaking the place-holder / assistant delegate as it where does not legally exist because he is merely a ghost presence of the proper delegate, then one could make the argument that the delegate should simply appoint his / her place-holder-assistent delegate. However one could argue that this tips the balance of power for the delegate against his / her own voter group. The other extreme is to have the place-holder/ assistant delegate be elected again, by the original voter group, to put the power where it belongs in maximum: the voter-group (of which the delegate is merely a spokesperson). One could argue that if the proper delegate appoints his / her own place-holder / assistant delegate, this is not a problem because the delegate is under control of the voter-group, who can replace that delegate at will. However in practice one will likely see that an established functioning delegate will have a measure of momentum, and the voter-group will unlikely be willing or able to easily put another person into that delegation job, and thus they will end up compromising to the will of the proper delegate his / her wishes, even when they ultimately don't agree to the appointment, or if they have not yet formed their opinion but would have chosen differently if they had. The danger with such a system of free appointment by the proper delegate, is that he / she will start to put in his own cronies into power, his friends and family - or be succesfully so pressured by those around him; even if he wanted to resist such pressure. Social peer pressure of friends and family is something that should not be underestimated.

Hence I would propose to resolve this issue in a balanced way:

- The voter-group can have any number of place-holder Delegates.

- *The place-holder Delegates derive all their legal standing from the (proper) Delegate they represent in the councils.*
- *The place-holder Delegate forms one vote with the (proper) Delegate.*
- *The place-holder Delegate can be removed from his / her place in any Council, on any moment and for any and no reason, by the (proper) Delegate.*
- *The place-holder Delegate functions at the leisure and appointment of the (proper) Delegate, however the appointment is not free.*
- *The voter-group will supply the (proper) Delegate with one or more candidates to choose from, for appointment into the function of place-holder Delegate to a specifically mentioned Council. Example: Name1, Name2, Name3 stand candidate to be place-holder Delegate for the direct local Council (optionally: for period X).*

Example: Name4 stands candidate to be place-holder Delegate for the City Government. The (proper) Delegate can also refuse to appoint anyone, and either leave the specific chair vacant or do it himself. The power over the delegate still resides with the voter-group, who can of course always decide to elect a Delegate who is listening more closely to them. It seems unfair to have a (proper) Delegate his vote be exercised on his / her behalf in lower councils, by someone he / she cannot even approve off ((note: something like that was suggested earlier and elsewhere on this website.))

- *Implied by the above is that if the voter-group provides no candidates for place-holder / assistant, or if the proper Delegate does not select one of the candidates, then there is no place-holder / assistant. The proper Delegate may not put someone in on his own accord, and any Council may (or perhaps should) reject from a seat someone who has not been properly elected under these rules to be a place-holder / assistant delegate. This would be the only way to have a place-holder / assistant for a Delegate who is absent from the Council.*
- *Implied by the above is that the voter-group can remove from office the place-holder / assistant delegate by revoking its candidacy for that job, but they cannot independently from their Delegate install a new place-holder / assistant delegate. To do that on their own, they have to replace their proper Delegate as well, and have him / her appoint (or say elect) the new place-holder / assistant delegate, for which they supply the candidates by election.*

One could wonder of whether a place-holder / assistant delegate has the right to participate in a debate, if he is only an assistant. This issue seems to be solved in the most local council by the fact that the voter-group did elect that person as a candidate, and also because the voter-group is close to that council anyway; which implies the place-holder / assistant can function otherwise fully as a delegate, and participate in debating and voting. The opinions formed by the place-holder / assistant delegate can be viewed as being the freedom afforded to him in confidence by the proper Delegate to do that as would be desired. This would be strengthened by the effect that the proper Delegate always has the right to remove the place-holder / assistant, or thus force the place-holder / assistant (using that threat) to comply with the will of the (proper) Delegate. The capability of the voter-group to do away with the proper Delegate and elect the place-holder / assistant to the role in earnest, also strengthens the idea that the place-holder / assistant delegate should participate in debating and other issues as a regular delegate. The place-holder / assistant delegate is controlled from both ends (by the Delegate and the Voter-group), and

therefore as long as he / she remains in place one has to assume the operation is within the will of the voter-group and their right to their one vote (represented in their proper delegate).

The argument in favor of the right to speak could be expanded by saying: this voter-group already has a popular Delegate, and that could say something about the quality they represent, which could also be represented in their place-holder / assistant delegate; the place-holder / assistant delegate today could well be the next proper Delegate for this voter-group, and by extension of confidence of the previously further elected Delegate also move up and soon speak for many more Delegates. The point of this argument is to treat the place-holder / assistant Delegate as an equal, even when formally he is not equal under the law. It is unpleasant to treat someone who already is allowed to sit in a council, not as an equal. The person is either in, or out. It is however true that one could contact the proper Delegate about the behavior of the place-holder / assistant delegate, something which is not possible for the proper Delegate himself. Let that then be the extend of the second rate position the place-holder / assistant has in the council, which is an activity that goes around the direct operation of that council (unless it is so serious an issue that it would be discussed in the council).

From the Council that the place-holder / assistant delegate is in, the place-holder / assistant can be taken as his own person with his own mandate. As seen from the voter-group the job is to keep both place-holder / assistant delegate and proper Delegate in line with the group opinions, and if need be switch them for each other or do other things. As seen from the proper Delegate the place-holder / assistant delegate should be kept in line with either the precise opinions of the proper Delegate himself (as literally a place-holder and spokesperson), or the place-holder can be given an amount of freedom to make his / her own opinions based on confidence that a good job will be the result, or the proper Delegate can even decide that it is good (as indeed it should be) that the place-holder follows securely the opinions of the voter-group; ideally these three views are in alignment. From the perspective of the place-holder he has a triple duty of satisfying his own conscience, his voter-group, and the proper Delegate he is a place-holder for; and of course the general wellbeing of all. From the perspective of the legislative function of all proper Delegates together in the Nation (or a region for local law), the view on the place-holder / assistant Delegates is that they do not exist (this concerning the one vote that each voter-group has on a new law, which otherwise would bizarrely become two votes.) From the perspective of a Referendum on an issue that is balanced with the Representative (3.1.b), the perspective would logically be that each voter-group has one vote through its Delegate, be that either in practice cast by the proper Delegate, or the place-holder / assistant delegate on its behalf (directly ordered, or implied by confidence and left to its own decision).

To put it in another way, the hierarchy of power is: voter-group above Delegate, Delegate above place-holder / assistant delegate, and voter-group also (of course) above place-holder / assistant delegate.

The whole system as it could then be with this place-holder / assistant role Delegate secured in it, has an additional benefit in that you have as it were junior-Delegates who more or less have a chance to experience the Council operations, without having all the rights and duties of a proper Delegate. One could use this effect as a form of traineeship for future proper Delegates, and that gives those voter-groups who apparently have a more popular Delegate already a chance to bring to the table yet another Delegate who over time will be adequately skilled.

Additional benefits:

Such a system could be made into a law (regular law), or it could be part of the Constitution (where it perhaps belongs). It would likely be needed to put it into law or the Constitution, because of the problem that the Council is only open to Delegates and not necessarily to any mandated replacements by them. It seems it would require an act of lawmaking, to prevent Councils from rejecting the seating of a place-holder / assistant Delegate (which they otherwise would perhaps even be required to do, in which case - if that is the opinion of the Supreme Law Court - it would require a Constitutional change).

Another question is if the only reason to allow a place-holder / assistant delegate to be on a Council should be that the proper Delegate is away on duty in a larger area Council. It seems to me that if a voter-group goes through the trouble of getting a place-holder / assistant delegate elected, that it should be of general use. This can also provide some air in the Council that the place-holder would go to, a different voice of that voter-group sometimes, an opportunity to test how it will go for someone who might think of doing it as a real Delegate, or even to put a specialist on a particular topic directly into a Council (probably usually the direct local Council, where there are no secondary election mandate problems) for a debate, without going through the trouble of electing a new Delegate and then re-electing the old one. It might be as simple as that the proper Delegate needs a day off, is sick or anything else.

Further council Mandate confusion.

A problem that arises with further Councils that might see an attempt by a voter-group or proper Delegate to put a place-holder / assistant delegate into that seat (for a moment or longer), is that this proper Delegate has a mandate both from the voter-group but also from other proper Delegates in that sector of the Council. The question can then be raised: can this place-holder suddenly take that place, without personally having been elected ?

Naturally speaking one could say: it is perhaps possible to do that, if the place-holder does no more than read statements prepared word for word by the proper Delegate who has the proper Mandate. Then again such statements could be read by the chair person, it wouldn't require such a special presence. It might be perfectly acceptable for the absent proper Delegate to cast his vote by some other form of communication. It seems to me that it will not be acceptable for a place-holder / assistant to assume a seat, and participate into debating and voting, without having the same mandate as he is replacing. That would mean that the place-holder / assistant on all further council levels must directly and personally be accepted as representing that sector in the further council as a place-holder / assistant of the proper Delegate that he is acting on behalf off (or with more freedom: instead off). If such an election has proceeded, which could be a yes/no vote by that sector, then perhaps there is no problem

It seems likely that most Councils will dispense with the representation of that voter-group in that further Council, and elect another proper Delegate candidate; however there could be situations where this is an expedient option. Notice how some larger council sectors (large councils that go out into sectors, forming a 50 person further council), are quite small. They could be as few as even 3 persons or less. To accept someone as a place-holder / assistant delegate for a sector to such a council could be a trivial matter. For much larger councils such as the Provincial or the National Council, it seems that this proces would be quite heavy handed as it involves many votes. It would then likely be easier to elect a proper Delegate who can be present at the job. Even in such cases

however, it might be something that people want to do, even for the National Council. You would then end up with 2 person Delegate teams, one being the real one and the other as it were the shadow one. This might be a good thing in terms of workload and overall control, and make the job of being a Delegate more pleasant because there is someone on the same seat (somewhat) to talk with.

- Place-holder / assistant delegates do not take a seat in a further council, without being accepted as a place-holder / assistant delegate by the sector in that council that elected the proper Delegate to his / her position for which he would be a place-holder / assistant delegate (and having been vetted as such, naturally).

For the smaller large-area-councils (that go out in sectors to form a further council,) it is potentially just as trivial to put another proper Delegate candidate in for their sector, instead of formally accepting a place-holder / assistant delegate for the one already elected. However with both options available, perhaps things would be even easier. Naturally the verification of the claimants to any offices would go through from the Council Chair to the voter-group administrator, and then to the evidence; potentially involving the police if vote fraud is suspected.)

It is imaginable that for the largest Councils such as the National Council, a candidate will propose himself with a place-holder / assistant delegate immediately, so that both functions are ratified at the same time. It seems that this system will likely go into a run-off election system, until a majority candidate support has been found; and this is potentially also true for the place-holder / assistant delegate role, which could even be conducted on a separate ballot. If it is all rolled into one, that reduces the amount of effort needed to elect someone. The place-holder / assistant delegate then provides some backup for the coherency of the Council to be fully staffed at all times when necessary (or at least closer to a Quorum). Keeping in mind that only the proper Delegates vote in these National Elections (the voter-groups elect the Delegates, and control them, also in this vote), it should not be that much of a burden on society in general to have a run-off election of Delegate + place-holder / assistant delegate teams, or even have a Delegate offering on a ballot several place-holder / assistant delegates for the proper Delegates in that Province (1/50th election region) to choose from (which are provided as candidates for him, by his voter-group).

As Constitutional law

Following the argument that: the post of place-holder / assistant delegate - henceforth: Deputy Delegate - is a balance of power issue between the voter-group and the Delegate and the Deputy Delegate; the need to have a singular widely used system in an overall system that puts power so closely in peoples hands that a measure of confusion and even chaos cannot be ruled out at times/places; and considering that the Deputy Delegate function may end up quite important in an informal way for the confidence of the Delegate itself to the degree that it might be an overall stabilization factor in the system (its practical operation in terms of Council meetings, etc.) ... it seems wise to secure this position in the Constitution, and not leave it as a second rate position only determined in regular law.

Since the Constitution otherwise states that Delegates form Councils and not Deputy Delegates, it seems necessary to put this in the Constitution to stand on its own as a supreme law. The interpretation thereby forced to be that the Deputy Delegate and the Delegate function (legally) as one vote or one person (as it were). It is an arm that could be afforded its own brain (as it were), but within limits set by the Delegate.

On second thought about the amount of Delegates (see above) there may be some risk and unforeseen consequences if the amount of Deputy Delegates is not limited, such as that the entire voter group appoints themselves as Deputy Delegates and walks into Council Meetings at will, thus possibly degrading the process if everyone starts to do that as a response (although there is a recourse to reject a Delegate). If there are whole crews of Deputy Delegates, this might cause social destabilization to a degree of the Council process, by making it fade out larger amounts of vague people that remain unknown to each other. Traditionally functions seem to have only one Deputy. Hence it is written to only afford one Deputy Delegate.

An attempt to write a short and clear law:

Deputy Delegate

A Voter Group (see Article 3.1.d, People Government) may have one Deputy Delegate, who may participate in Councils on behalf of and under direction by the Delegate.

Deputy Delegate, election

The Voter Group supplies willing Deputy Delegate candidates to the Delegate. The Delegate selects one of the candidates.

The Deputy Delegate can be removed any moment by both the Voter Group, or by the Delegate acting on his own, or by his/her own will.

Deputy Delegate, Further Government Body

The Deputy Delegate may not be participate in a Council for which the Delegate was additionally elected (see Article 3.1.d-3, Further Government Body), unless having been approved by those electing the Delegate to that position.

Since the Delegates make decisions by majority, that is also what "approved" means in the last sentence: a majority rule vote by that sector in the larger area Council (whose sectors elect Further Government Bodies or with another name: the Further Councils.) It seems to me that it can be relevant to add "or by his/her own will." because if not then there might be levied pressure on a Deputy Delegate to participate and vote as the Delegate requires, while the vote is going against the conscience of the Deputy Delegate. It is left unsaid as to whether the Deputy Delegate should belong to that Voter Group, however since that already was not the case for the Delegate either then it follows it is also not the case for the Deputy Delegate; and it not being forced it is left free.

(Fri Oct 28 06:42:05 UTC 2016) It seems that the above proposed law is making things too complicated. It is simpler and more in line with how the Delegate is elected, to have the Deputy be elected in the same way and they will just have to try to work together.

Deputy Delegate

A Voter Group (see Article 3.1.d, People Government) may have one Deputy Delegate, who may participate in Councils on behalf of and under direction by the Delegate. Only that Deputy Delegate can be additionally

elected as a Deputy Delegate to a further Council by the same voters whom elected the Delegate to that Council.

The second sentence then covers the further councils, and makes it clear that there can only be one Deputy for every Delegate in the whole system, and not every Council can elect another Deputy for a Delegate. This gives the system more simplicity and prevents wild growth of all kinds of people who hang around in the Councils. The Deputy position should probably be unpaid labor.

It should be obvious that once a Voter Group elects a Deputy Delegate, that this does not imply that the Deputy Delegate can act as a Deputy in any other but the Closest Council (the most local form of Government). The Deputy Delegate is an ordinary citizen without a seat in all further Councils, until elected as a Deputy Delegate there by the section that voted for the associated Delegate already. Naturally these elections can occur together: Delegate and Deputy Delegate can be elected during the same event.

The phrase elect "as a Deputy Delegate" is meant to signify that the Deputy Delegate is not treated as a normal Delegate, but that the other Delegates can refer to it as a Deputy, and might question what the actual Delegate its position is of a certain matter. When then the harmony between Deputy and Delegate is clear to the Council if need be, then the Deputy can proceed to wield the vote of the Delegate in the Council. (This is of course nothing unusual, but merely the nature of a junior or representative or spokesperson position.)

Another benefit of the Deputy system is that as a way for people to enter the Council system for the first time, they will do so in a service oriented role to their Delegate. This might impact their psychology to retain the service oriented approach once they become a proper Delegate.

{Integrated in above Constitution: yes }

Last changes:

wo okt 12 09:02:14 UTC 2016

Amendment 10 term limit has been changed from 10 out of 20 to 15 out of 20 years.

Tue April 26 15:53 CEST 2016

Amendment 26 added in the PDF/.odt

Mon Dec 14 10:09:01 UTC 2015

Amendment 25 had to be renamed because it turns out that the "Magna Carta" is not strictly about Jury Justice. (As usual things go wrong whenever you start sourcing it from anywhere.)

Mon Dec 7 07:15:35 CET 2015

Amendment 25 Jurisprudence added

Wed May 27 08:13:37 UTC 2015

Amendment 25 Magna Carta added

As you can see, it starts here to look to other documents and historical useful practices, rather than make new law. The end of this project has been reached (I hope!).

Fri Jan 9 10:20:21 UTC 2015

Amendment 23 Minimum Wage Removed

Wed Dec 10 10:09:15 UTC 2014

Amendment 17 ~~RETRACTED AMENDMENT~~

Fri Oct 31 10:13:30 UTC 2014

Amendment 22, Referendum Representative weighted

Fri Oct 10 13:20:26 UTC 2014

Amendment 21, no fake wars

Sun Sep 28 14:02:36 UTC 2014

(non-?)Amendment 20, Maximum taxation

Wed Sep 3 15:25:04 UTC 2014

Amendment 18, Country Council Restrictions

Amendment 19, Nation Size Protocol

Sun Aug 31 12:08:56 UTC 2014

*Amendment 17, Death Penalty (Note: **retracted on Dec 10 2014**)*

Fri Aug 29 21:12:37 UTC 2014

Amendment 16, separate police and judges

Fri Aug 29 02:46:24 UTC 2014

Amendment 15, no suspension

Tue Aug 12 18:07:18 UTC 2014

*13 * Limit Delegate Salary (Chapter 3)*

Mon Aug 11 10:07:51 UTC 2014

Amendments table of contents.

Thu Aug 7 05:11:35 UTC 2014, Added:

[7.1.a-2 Special Markets, establishment](#)

[7.1.a-3 Special Markets, limit](#)

