

IParty Democrats Outline

The “I” in IParty stands for Internet, Interlink, Inter-systems, Inspiration, Inventing, Intellect, Initiative, and Improvement. The IParty will literally bring democracy to new levels.

Executive Summary

The IParty creates an adjunct to the Democratic party to avoid dividing the Democratic party vote and throwing general elections to Republicans opposed to IParty positions. The IParty joins elements of the Libertarian, Progressive, and Green wings of the Democratic party to form a voting bloc capable of winning primary elections. The IParty will seek to field candidates in all state and federal elections, including areas conceded by the Democrats.

The IParty structures itself as three democratic republics within three distinct organizations to exemplify the reforms desired in other parts of society. The IParty will fight to reform government and corporate structures by adding to them internal democratic, representative and constitutional elements. The IParty will champion individual liberties by working towards a constitutional convention to restore the eroded Bill of Rights, and enumerate additional rights. The IParty will seek to increase economic equality by reforming corporate structures, for example by adding members of corporate boards elected by employees, and reforming the distribution of stock options. The IParty will work towards improving our system of producing energy to mitigate environmental problems and to create jobs in the U.S. The IParty will work to preserve the new freedoms made possible by the Internet. Finally, the IParty will live by a set of core principles to create a recognized brand trusted by voters.

Overview

The Democratic and Republican parties keep failing to represent the broad interests of the American public, letting inequality and injustice grow in our society. Our two party system prevents many unrepresented voices from building momentum or creating a popular “third” party capable of winning federal elections, with one exception. The Tea Party carved out space within the Republican Party, reinvigorating debate among republicans. However, the results have not always been positive. Unfortunately, the Tea Party often insists on obstructing and upsetting our

system of government, rather than renewing and healing it.

Learning from the successes and failures of the Tea Party, an adjunct party within the Democratic Party could have a positive effect by reinvigorating debate, testing new ideas, and staving off the formation of counterproductive third parties. The IParty can fill this role. It can be many things the Tea Party is not: progressive, well structured, friendly to science and the environment, socially tolerant, worker friendly, and compromising where practical. The IParty can build the system up, not tear it down. Like the Tea Party, the IParty can also be a champion of individual liberties, private property, capitalism, religious freedom, lower taxation, and political debate. In fact, the IParty should surpass the Tea Party as a true champion in these areas.

So many opportunities for improvement hang in the air that the IParty should not set small goals. The IParty must set an example to all other political parties on how a party should be structured and run.

The IParty should seek major updates to the US Constitution. “Constitutions must change over time if they are to endure.” according to Prof. John E. Finn at Wesleyan. Well, now is the time. The Constitution is so old, it was written with bird feathers on animal skin. It was designed to control a small collection of struggling agrarian colonies on the Eastern seaboard, not a space age transcontinental superpower. Yet we have a president, Senate, House of Representatives and Supreme Court because of the Constitution. This bird feather and animal skin document still controls the Federal Government today.

In 2014, we can write on electrons in the cloud. The IParty must aim high. Small amendments or single issues will fail to attract enough attention and momentum to succeed. We must address fundamentally new circumstances. What does “freedom of the press” mean in the age of the Internet? How can judges fully protect the “right to keep and bear arms” in the age of nuclear weapons? How much latitude should the TSA have to “reasonably” search individuals and limit the right to keep and bear arms in an age of jets that can carry 853 people? Have our technologies changed the fundamental principles enunciated in 1792? Has our language and culture changed? Has human nature changed?

The IParty outline given here is intended to be a starting point for the formation of a new democratic political party. The IParty needs members. If you, the reader, see particular things that you don't like, or have additional ideas, you should remember that the IParty structure is democratic. All of the positions below can be changed by voting within the IParty.

Contents

1.	Methods of Transition from Current System to Improved System	Page 8
A.	IParty, NOT a Self-Defeating Third Party	Page 8
	i.) A Third Party Divides Votes with the Closest Existing Party	
	ii.) The IParty is Good for the Democratic Party	
	iii.) Small Percentages Win Primary Elections	
	iv.) IParty Candidates will Not Continue as Independent Candidates	
	v.) The IParty Needs Full Time Employees and New Members	
B.	Improved Party Structure	Page 10
	i.) The IParty will be a Good Example	
	ii.) The IParty will have a Divided Power Structure	
	iii.) The IParty will Reform Campaign Finance Internally	
	iv.) The IParty will Control and Limit Membership	
	v.) The IParty will provide Value-Added Services	
	vi.) The IParty will Conduct Improved Internal Elections	
	vii.) The IParty will Host Internal and External Debates	
	viii.) The IParty will Conduct a National Election Campaign.	
	ix.) The IParty will Grow and Adapt	
C.	The IParty will Actively Recruit Candidates	Page 16
D.	Elected IParty Members will Govern Responsively	Page 17
	i.) An Internet Forum will Guide the Elected IParty Member	
	ii.) The Elected IParty Member will Govern According to Stated IParty Principles	
	iii.) The IParty Members will Rate the Elected IParty Member's Performance	
E.	Fun and Entertainment	Page 18

F.	Constitutional Convention to Amend the Constitution	Page 18
2.	Needed Improvements to the Structure of Government	Page 20
A.	Limiting Executive Branch Powers	Page 20
	i.) War Powers Reform	
	ii.) Due Process Reform	
	iii.) Information Gathering and Access Reform	
	iv.) Attorney General Separated from Executive Branch	
	v.) Whistleblower Protection Reform	
B.	Constitutional Updates	Page 24
	i.) Bill of Rights Updates	
	ii.) Commerce Clause Clarification	
	iii.) Digital Rights and Right to Encryption	
	iv.) Balanced Budget Enforcement	
	v.) General Right to Privacy	
	vi.) Right to Medical and DNA Privacy	
	vii.) Right to Sexual and Reproductive Privacy	
	viii.) Voting Process Reform	
	ix.) Clarification of Fundamental Constitutional Rules	
	x.) Abolish the Electoral College	
	xi.) Right to Attorney/Client and Doctor/Patient Confidentiality	
	xii.) Change the Constitutional Amendment Process	
C.	House and Senate	Page 36
	i.) Reform Budget Voting	
	ii.) Majority Rules	
	iii.) Term Limits	
	iv.) Campaign Contributions/"Access" Purchases	
	v.) Better Representation through Systematic Constituent Input	

- vi.) Limit Congressional Immunity to Laws
- vii.) Reconstitute House and Senate

D. Regularizing Supreme Court Operations Page 43

- i.) Fixed terms for Supreme Court Justices and Alternative Selectors
- ii.) Opinions Reformed and Formalized
- iii.) Judicial Review Expressly Recognized
- iv.) Construction Methods Used by Court Specified in the Constitution
- v.) Stare Decisis Formally Recognized and Quantified

E. Divide Government into More Independent Branches Page 46

- i.) Anti-corruption Branch
- ii.) Government Systems Research and Development Branch
- iii.) Information Branch
- iv.) Government Personnel Branch
- v.) Attorney General/Justice Department

F. Democratizing Federal and State Components Page 48

3. Reforming Corporate Associations Page 49

- A.) Promote Stock Option Fairness
- B.) Some Board of Directors Members Elected by Employees
- C.) Divided Corporate Power Structures
- D.) Corporations Must Not Pay Government Regulators
- E.) Reinstate the Glass-Steagall Act
- F.) Reinvigorate Anti-Trust Enforcement
- G.) Many Wealthy People will Help

4. Internet Reforms Page 54

- A. Support Net Neutrality Efforts
- B. Support Strong Encryption Everywhere

C. Oppose Dagnet Government Spying on Citizens

5. Reform of the Energy System

Page 56

- A. Impose Tax and Rebate System for Carbon Emissions
- B. End Oil and Gas Subsidies
- C. Transition from Inefficient and Polluting Technologies
- D. Advocating Starry Night Policies
- E. Support Net Metering
- F. IParty Provides Guidance for Members

6. Aspirations and Principles

Page 58

- A. Effective Feedback
- B. Division and Balance of Power
- C. Accounting for Human Nature
- D. Stability
- E. Simplicity
- F. Transparency and Openness (Honesty)
- G. Self-Governance
- H. Freedom of Choice for Individuals
- I. Accounting for General Welfare
- J. Rewards Good Behavior
- K. Punishes Bad Behavior while Sparing the Innocent
- L. Equality-- Treats All People the Same
- M. Appearance of Participation
- N. Appearance of Fairness
- O. Power Through Democracy
- P. Flexibility
- Q. Golden Rule
- R. Long Term Thinking

7. Your Culture Will Adapt to Service the IParty.

Page 64

- A. Resistance is Futile.
 - i.) The IParty Will Use Google Glass for Instant Voting.
 - ii.) All Members Coordinate at All Times using Google Glass.
 - iii.) Everyone Will Join the IParty.
 - iv.) You Will Wear Google Glass. You Will be Assimilated.

- B. Resistance is Futile.

Outline

1. Methods of Transition from Current System to Improved System

We can't just wish for our old system to disappear and an improved system to appear. We are committed to using our current system. We must take the current system into account, and use the current system to transition to a new system. We must have a comprehensive strategy that will succeed from a starting point dominated by two parties.

A. IParty, **NOT** a Self-Defeating Third Party

i.) A Third Party Divides Votes with the Closest Existing Party.

When a third party forms, for it to win in a general election, it must take votes from the Republican Party and/or Democratic Party. The third party will get more votes from the one party it is most like. Therefore, if it does not win, it will succeed in bringing down the closest and most sympathetic party, thereby damaging its own cause.

In subsequent elections, party leaders may try to recapture the vote of the third party by adopting its principles. However, there may also be a backlash *against the cause* of the third party when the third party is seen to have compromised or “thrown” the election to the opposing party. Thus, a more stable and productive path is for third party votes to remain within one of the two parties, and assert their influence from within.

Thus, the IParty should be a tent organization which invites members from already formed third parties (the Green Party, Libertarian Party, Constitutional Party, etc), refugees from the Tea Party, and the two major parties.

The IParty is constituted as an adjunct to the Democratic party, similar to the Tea Party. The IParty will also have a separate identity from the Democratic Party, and nominate its own candidates where the Democratic Party fields none. To accomplish its goals under existing law, the IParty will comprise a national political party called the IParty Democrats, a political action committee called the IParty Super PAC, and a 501(c)(4) group called the IParty Wellbeing Group. The three will overlap in structure, brand, philosophy, and membership. The three

organizations may be referred to as simply the “IParty” for the sake of brevity.

ii.) The IParty is Good for the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party must be reassured that the formation of an adjunct party is a good thing. The IParty will revitalize debate, attract attention and publicity, attract formerly disaffected voters, and help prevent the formation of vote-dividing third parties that could siphon votes away from the Democratic Party. The Democratic Party should be encouraged to build a positive relationship with the IParty and benefit from its unique identity. Moreover, the Democratic Party should be encouraged to adopt any popular issues raised by the IParty, and to use the IParty as an asset to defeat Republican candidates in districts currently held by Republican incumbents.

iii.) Small Percentages Win Primary Elections. The Democratic Primary elections will be a main focus of the IParty. The goal will be to have an IParty candidate in every democratic primary election, and a high turn out of IParty members to vote for those candidates. Both are necessary. A high turn out of IParty members is futile if there is no IParty candidate on the ballot. And getting an IParty candidate on the ballot is futile if the turnout of the IParty membership is low.

Many primary elections are not well attended by registered democrats. Ten percent participation in primary elections means the door is wide open. Using superior organization, networking and promotion, the IParty can get candidates into the general election with comparatively few votes. Also, the attention attracted to the candidates during this phase may be helpful in the general election. IParty candidates should be encouraged to view Democratic opponents as friendly. IParty candidates should also step into any race where the Democratic Party fails to field a candidate. Too many important offices go uncontested by the Democratic Party. There should always be a choice in every election; otherwise the election becomes an empty charade.

iv.) IParty Candidates will Not Continue as Independent Candidates. All IParty Candidates, in order to receive the backing of the IParty, must make a pledge to quit the race if they do not win in the democratic primary. The IParty promises to actively oppose any candidate breaking this essential pledge if the IParty candidate decides to continue the race as an

independent candidate in the general election. It will be presumed the IParty candidate will likely throw the election to the republican candidate. Further, it will be presumed to set a bad precedent for the IParty to support the candidate, even when the candidate has favorable odds of winning the general election. In order to meet the long term goals of the IParty, the IParty will NOT under any circumstance support any candidate who does not win in the democratic primary election. Further, such a candidate will be permanently banned from membership within the IParty. If such a candidate can win despite the active opposition from their original party, then literally, more power to them.

v.) The IParty Needs Full Time Employees and New Members. Organizing a new party is not a part time job. The IParty needs funding for full time employees. The IParty also needs members to form a popular movement. A voting body can hone and refine IParty positions to spur a popular movement appealing to the general electorate. If the IParty takes positions that will prevent it from getting candidates elected, it must abandon those positions.

B. Improved Party Structure

i.) The IParty will be a Good Example. The IParty should be structured well, as a divided and layered constitutional democratic republic, like the system it is advocating. It will use advanced voting techniques and the fifty states to experiment with alternative models and sub-organizations. It will also be a model set of organizations with guiding principles, goals, and morals to increase brand identity and value. The IParty will comprise a national political party, a super PAC, and a social welfare organization.

The political party, called the IParty Democrats, will be the main body of the IParty. It will serve the function of recruiting people to become candidates in the Democratic Party primary elections, recruiting candidates to run in elections where the Democratic Party fields no candidates, contributing directly to candidate campaigns, and running independent national media promotions for the issues championed by the IParty.

The political action committee, called the IParty Super PAC, will make independent expenditures promoting IParty issues and values, helping to create a national brand.

Legally, it will not be allowed to donate directly to IParty candidate campaigns, or coordinate actions with the candidates.

The social welfare group, called the IParty Wellbeing Group, will be devoted to the various social goals of the IParty, including promoting the teaching of civics in high schools, hosting music festivals, organizing peaceful meetings, collectively bargaining for insurance, running anti-addiction health groups, and other social and political functions. This group will be organized as a non-profit group under 26 U.S.C. 501(c)(4).

Each group will have a different leadership, but will overlap in several ways. Each will adopt a constitutional bylaw system that separates powers among the leadership and various functions of the organization. For example, the constitution may establish a rulemaking committee, an executive leader, a judicial branch or ombudsman, a voting committee, a reporting branch, and an anticorruption compliance branch, while reserving enumerated rights to the membership. Each IParty group may have common members. For example, a member of the IParty Wellbeing Group may also join the IParty Super PAC membership, but might decide not to join the IParty Democrats. Each IParty group will adopt a similar philosophy. Each organization will assume the duty of enforcing standards regarding the IParty brand.

The IParty name, organizational structure, philosophy, and standards will allow the three distinct organizations to work independently toward common purposes. By itself, the division into three organizations will make the IParty more resistant to corruption, more amenable to debate, more flexible, more responsive to the needs of its members, more adaptable to changing situations, and stronger in competition with the existing parties.

ii.) The IParty will have a Divided Power Structure. As each of the three independent IParty organizations grow, power should be formally divided among several branches (executive, legislative, judicial, legal compliance, reporting, finance, and voting members). The IParty organizations will adopt constitutions within their bylaws giving limited power to office holders and representatives. Of course, without voting members, the IParty will be powerless. The constitution and power structure should reflect this fundamental fact, reserving rights to members.

iii.) The IParty will Reform Campaign Finance Internally. The IParty will stay

responsive to the broad membership of the IParty by not allowing special interests to gain undue influence over party decisions using large donations. The IParty organizations may establish small monthly dues to maintain membership and benefits. As the IParty gains more members, it may limit the dollar value of contributions to the IParty, so that no one may unfairly buy access or influence. If the IParty eventually gets 20% of the 65 million Democrats who voted for Obama in 2012 to join, that will represent about 13 million democrats. If each of those people contribute \$5 a month in dues to maintain their membership, that will be an operating budget of \$65 million per month. This is plenty of money to run candidates and become a competitive force in US politics.

Initially, the IParty may accept larger donations to establish the party. Any donation over \$1000 will not be accepted until it is put to a vote of the dues paying membership. In this way, the membership may decide whether the IParty is being unduly influenced by large donations, and put a stop to it. The votes may be conducted by a monthly e-mail, listing the amount of the donation and the identity of the donor. IParty members could vote by e-mail, or other trusted electronic polling system.

Many donors may wish to remain anonymous, and not have their names known publically. Such donations should be allowed so that people may freely support the party of their choice without fear of retribution, for example from a boss or business associate. Many employees are aware of being pressured to vote for republicans or democrats. They may be unable to contribute if the IParty requires all donations to be disclosed publically. In order to remain immune from secret influences of “dark money”, or unreported donations from individuals with a political agenda, the IParty will set up a mechanism to receive donations anonymously, without learning the names of the donors. This can be accomplished, for example, by contract with an independent law firm. The law firm would receive donations, but not immediately turn them over to the IParty. The donations could be passed on periodically, for example, monthly, so that no donor could assert that they gave \$54,842 dollars, and then the IParty sees that \$54,842 just showed up in the account. The IParty could adopt a policy of requesting that the law firm refund money to any donor who asserts either publically or to IParty officials that they donated to the law firm. The law firm could keep accurate records, and undergo an annual audit by a second law firm, whose only duty would be to report to the IParty whether the first law firm is substantially fulfilling the terms of the contract. The first law firm

may consider donors to be clients of the firm, and only reveal their identity if required by law. These anonymous donations may be limited only to the 501(c)(4) IParty Wellbeing Group. A firm legal opinion will be sought, given the complexity of existing law.

The IParty will never agree to receive anonymous donations from donors who want particular favors. The IParty will always agree to receive anonymous donations from people who like the IParty, and want it to succeed. For this, the IParty does not need to know the names of the donors.

The IParty organizations will conduct a vote after the 2016 elections to determine what finance system to use in the future. If the IParty requires dues of \$5 a month to join, but adopts rules to *accept no more than \$5* a month from **ANYONE**, then the IParty cannot be unduly influenced by special interests. This type of business practice will give the IParty a solid brand name that voters can rely upon. When people vote for an IParty candidate, they will know that the candidate has a broad base of support from the electorate, not the backing of a few wealthy donors pulling their strings. The IParty candidate will have to look out for the broad interests of IParty voters, if they want to remain in the IParty and be re-elected. Many voters do not believe candidates in the main Republican and Democratic parties are looking out for voters interests. One possibility is that the IParty Democrats and the IParty Super PAC have low limits, while the IParty Wellbeing Group does not have contribution limits.

Some people may not like the idea of giving money to a political party. The IParty will still need contributions from a lot of people in order to survive. Instead of money, people should have the option to donate their time to the IParty. People could be asked to donate one hour of time each month, on average, working on tasks required by the IParty. The IParty could post these tasks on the website, and people could perform these tasks periodically to fulfill their membership dues to the IParty. For example, if people did not want to pay dues, they could collect signatures for a couple hours every other month, in order to get IParty candidates on the ballot. Or, they could choose to write stories about IParty policies, that illustrate the need for the policies in a concrete way. The IParty will need a reporting branch, and it will need to be staffed by a large number of reporters. This could be volunteer work to satisfy dues. Perhaps IParty members could be given the option of having their dues payments automatically suspended when they do volunteer work for the IParty.

In this way, the IParty can achieve its own campaign finance reform, not by

changing the Constitution, but by voting on and adopting bylaws governing a political organization. This may not prevent campaigns in other parties from accepting large amounts of cash from individual donors, but it can make other campaigns look bad. When the IParty becomes a majority, it will not matter that other campaigns have not reformed, because the IParty will make the rules.

iv.) The IParty will Control and Limit Membership. The IParty should be structured to exclude representatives, officials, and members that damage the brand and reputation of the party. A mechanism should be created that allows the expulsion and exclusion of such damaging elements, such as a vote of the membership or a vote of a committee elected to represent the membership. The potential of trademark law should be investigated for the purpose of controlling membership. Also, the rights of freedom of association should be investigated for this purpose. In other words, at times, the IParty may wish to prevent someone from claiming they are a member of the IParty, speak for the IParty, or are somehow representative of the IParty.

Example: Susanne Atanus won the GOP primary election in the 9th Congressional District in Illinois in 2014. The Republican Party disavowed any association with her, but had no mechanism to prevent her from calling herself a Republican.

The IParty will attempt to use trademark law to register trademarks such as IParty (only for use in a political sphere), IParty Democrats and InterSystems Party, in order to prevent individuals who do not follow IParty principles from damaging the brand by associating themselves with the IParty. Because political speech is the most protected speech under the 1st Amendment, success may be limited. In some situations, law suits may only serve to increase publicity for a candidate. However, if the IParty brand becomes credible enough, a law suit may be effective in deterring a candidate.

v.) The IParty will provide Value-Added Services. The IParty Wellbeing Group should provide services to its members that fundamentally require cooperation or pooling of resources. This may include social networking, sharing of resources, insurance, addiction support groups, religious networking, etc. The party should also provide a moderated open discussion forum similar to the discussion forum hosted by Slashdot. (See <http://slashdot.org> and look at the moderated discussion sections. Compare the commentary found there to typical

commentary found on, for example, Yahoo! news sites. Actually, some of the ideas in this Outline were influenced by individual comments made on Slashdot over the years).

The IParty may use rating systems to allow members to establish and increase their own personal party rating. A member's party rating would be their street cred in the IParty. Members may be rated by, for example, voting in primary elections, paying dues, making donations, performing party functions, demonstrating knowledge of party positions and effectively advocating party positions online as judged by IParty peers. The rating system could be presented as an online game.

vi.) The IParty will Conduct Improved Internal Elections. The IParty organizations should conduct internal elections using [instant runoff](#) voting methods. Internal elections and polling may be used to determine party candidates and positions. The IParty should advocate for instant runoff voting in federal, state, and local elections.

vii.) The IParty will Host Internal and External Debates. Currently, political debates are largely controlled by the Republican and Democratic parties. The IParty will host debates among candidates within the IParty, and with serious opponents outside the IParty. The IParty will attempt to make these debates more interesting, lively, and relevant to voters using modern media techniques to gain attention and popularity.

viii.) The IParty will Conduct a National Election Campaign. The IParty Super PAC, IParty Wellbeing Group, and IParty Democrats will each independently support all IParty candidates at the state level in part by running a national campaign for all IParty candidates collectively. Voters will become familiar with IParty positions, methods, and goals through the national campaign, and decide whether to vote for their local IParty candidate at least in part based on the national campaign. In this way, IParty funds can be used most efficiently to get IParty candidates into office.

ix.) The IParty will Grow and Adapt. The IParty will not remain a set of static entities, but will develop and grow. It will add new sub-organizations as it increases in size. It will change as the vision of the membership evolves.

C. The IParty will Actively Recruit Candidates

Elections are popularity contests. The party can attempt to deny this, but it should face the truth, and adapt accordingly. Candidates should be evaluated on whether they can win popularity contests. Popularity is a fickle thing, but it also has enduring traits and tendencies.

Governing is a representative occupation. The person elected should be capable of putting aside their personal opinions and desires, and representing the desires and opinions of their constituents.

Governing is also an opportunity for creative leadership. As Steve Jobs and many others have proved, sometimes most people can't easily articulate what they want until they see it. At other times, leaders think people want something, but the leaders are wrong. It is the responsibility of the leaders and elected representatives of the party to propose and promote courses of action, and get feedback from their constituents about whether they want a particular result.

The group of people most suited to these tasks may be trained actors and actresses. Actors and actresses can win popularity contests. They are often very popular. Successful actors and actresses also have name recognition and the professional and financial freedom to run for office. They can put aside their personal opinions and desires to represent the desires of the writers and directors. This is analogous to putting aside personal opinions and desires to represent constituents and a political party. They are good at entertaining people, and capturing their interest. Also, time spent in political office would advance the careers of many actors and actresses, as they gain fame through politics.

It goes without saying that actors such as Ronald Reagan, Arnold Schwarzenegger, Al Franken and Clint Eastwood have already proven the viability of this path. However, the Internet allows people with talent and/or training, but without former name recognition to "go viral" and achieve instant name recognition. Therefore there is no need to limit the potential pool of

candidates to already successful actresses and actors.

It goes without mention that attorneys are also trained to put aside their particular beliefs and represent the interests of others. They are also familiar with the law. There may already be too many politicians who are lawyers.

Younger working class people should also be recruited as candidates. The energy and mental acuity of the young is an advantage. Also, the problems of the working class are often missed by main stream politicians, who fail to appeal to younger voters.

D. Elected IParty Members will Govern Responsively

i.) An Internet Forum will Guide the Elected IParty Member. An internet forum, similar to slashdot.org, would be available for the discussion of topics which may be voted on by the elected IParty members. The forum would provide a kick-off article to introduce a topic, and then allow a moderated discussion of the topic to inform the voting membership. Any member could post a comment. Dues paying members could moderate the discussion, marking particular comments as informative, interesting, funny, insightful, troll, flame-bait, etc. Viewers of the forum could set their preferences to see only particularly good comments. At the end, the membership could vote.

One option is that the voting could be weighted, according to one or more factors. For example, weights might be assigned according to expertise (vocational or academic, for example) on a particular subject, membership status, dues paying status, number of years as a member, etc.

Another option is that voting could be unweighted, and strictly proceed on a one-man one vote scheme. A third option would be to tally the votes both ways, weighted and unweighted, to better inform the elected IParty representative. An additional option would be to allow voting by proxy, so that members could allocate their votes to another member with expertise on a particular subject.

ii.) The Elected IParty Member will Govern According to Stated IParty Principles. The candidate should make a pledge during the campaign to govern according to an agreed-upon IParty method once in office. Once elected to an office, an elected member of the

IParty should use the IParty membership and services to inform their votes.

iii.) The IParty Members will Rate the Elected IParty Member's Performance.

The IParty will keep track of its elected officials and how they vote. It will aim for great transparency in the voting records of the IParty office holders. As a service, the IParty will adopt a rating system for office holders and use it to inform the membership on the job performance of the elected official. It will also rate candidates and office holders who are not IParty members according to the same rating system.

E. Fun, Entertainment, and Education

The IParty should be a place where having fun and making jokes is allowed. Fundraising must be a big part of the party, and therefore fun and entertainment are essential. The party should endorse, encourage and organize parties and festivals, purely for fun. The IParty should also promote and encourage protests and, especially, flash mobs. Flash mobs can be the interesting and attractive dress rehearsals for the most important flash mob the IParty needs to organize-- at the primary election.

Fun is an inevitable part of a party. So inevitable, in fact, that the party should adopt a motto that reminds us of this inevitability. "Resistance is futile." You will be assimilated into our structured culture of fun.

The IParty should seek to further the education of its membership. It should provide free podcasts of party positions that can be listened to during a commute. It should provide videos over the internet, to relieve people of the task of reading. It should also provide a reading of important classics of history that are no longer under copyright that can be listened to during a commute, or while cleaning the kitchen. It should provide commentary on the relevance of the classics to the IParty and the politics of today. It should encourage members to further their education by providing a reading list. The IParty should also promote the teaching of civics, ethics and moral values through the teaching of history in public schools.

F. Constitutional Convention to Amend the Constitution

The Constitution is really old. Really, really old. Take a look at it sometime. It was written on parchment (paper made from animal skin, not wood pulp) with a quill pen. It is Pre-railroad old. Before steamboats and light bulbs. We've since invented skyscrapers, jets, maglev trains, computers, the Internet, mobile phones, and Instagram. The way we communicate and how we live have changed drastically. The Constitution is the agreement that formed the federal government, and allows it to continue to exist. Yet the Constitution remains essentially the same, written for the 18th century lifestyle. It was written to govern a small set of 13 independent agrarian colonies. The Constitution needs an update.

A major goal of the IParty should be to convene an Amendments Convention to propose amendments to the Constitution. This procedure is provided for under Article 5 of the Constitution, and is long overdue to be used. Many of the current problems with the federal system require constitutional amendments. An Amendments Convention would allow these amendments to be considered as a package, and allow delegations from the states to form coalitions to pass the amendments they need to by supporting the amendments they can live with. For example, many states will want a balanced budget amendment. Some states may want states rights increased and greater limitations on the commerce clause in Article I of the Constitution. Compromises can be reached, and the various amendments can be written as a single amendment, in order to pass needed changes.

2. Needed Improvements to the Structure of Government

When the Constitution was passed, people used candles to light their homes, and rode horses to pass messages from one person to another. There was no electricity, no telegraph, no interstate highway, no railroad, and no steam boats. Travel from New Hampshire or Georgia to Washington DC would have required many days. The round trip for a message and response would be more than a week. In 1776, the stage coach between New York and Philadelphia was about a two day journey, rather than under two hours by automobile. People can now pass messages in milliseconds.

The infrastructure of the time put constraints on the system of government. A republic was a practical necessity, and opportunities for direct democracy were limited by such practical considerations. Other limitations were built into the system because of practical constraints.

Systems of government matter. Two stark historical experiments in Germany and Korea prove that political systems can either lift or oppress a population. The system in the United States is a good one, but it can be made better. The focus of the IParty should not be on what advantage can be gained under the current system, but how the system can be advantageously improved. To paraphrase President Kennedy, ask not what your broken system can do for you, ask what you can do to fix your broken system.

A. Limiting Executive Branch Powers

i.) War Powers Reform

Problem: War is a serious business, and always a threat to democracy. People involved in a war often lose their basic rights of life, liberty, and property. War is not well defined in the Constitution, and therefore the limitations on war powers in the Constitution have been ineffective. The Constitution currently gives Congress the power to declare war. By failing to further define war, and making the president the commander in chief, the Constitution failed to prevent the president from committing US troops to wage “undeclared” war. The original idea of granting Congress the power to declare war was good, since no one person should be trusted with this decision.

Solution: The Constitution should therefore be amended to include a

definition of war, and prohibit the president from engaging in war-like activities without a formal declaration of war. The Constitution should outline different executive powers in conducting wars and in managing the peace.

The Congress should be constrained to particularly name the region and people in the declaration of war, as well as the reasons for and goals of the war. The Constitution should be clear that the Constitution may not be suspended in time of war, and that the Supreme Court and people have a duty to remove any government or portion of government that attempts to suspend the Constitution. Otherwise, the legitimacy of the agreement between the people and the government as defined by the Constitution is destroyed, when it is needed most, during time of war. If there are portions of the Constitution which are not possible to follow during war time, these must be spelled out in advance. Alternatively, the Constitution may be amended by the process spelled out in the Constitution. Otherwise, any attempt to suspend the Constitution should be considered treason, and a complete abdication of the legitimacy of the government.

The congress should be slow to go to war, and once entering into war, be empowered to finish it. A 2/3 supermajority should be required to declare war. Once a state of war is entered, either a majority or supermajority should be required to end it. In this fashion, after a war is begun with a 66% majority, even if support declines to 50%, the US can continue to fight.

ii.) Due Process Reform

Problem: The President should not have the authority to kill Americans with drones without due process of law. The president should not have any authority to take actions likely to cause the death of an identified American without legitimate due process. It is obvious that the law is out of kilter here. The Obama Administration has been ordered to disclose documents that have been used to justify the program. See e.g.

<http://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2014/04/obama-ordered-to-divulge-legal-basis-for-killing-americans-with-drones/>

<http://thehill.com/business-a-lobbying/210240-court-releases-justice-department-memo-justifying-drone-strike> and

http://cdn1.vox-cdn.com/assets/4656007/2014-06-23_ca2-revised-opinion-plus-drone-memo.pdf

The Executive Branch developed this legal opinion in secret, used it in secret to justify killing U.S. citizens without trial, little public awareness, and no substantial judicial oversight. It fought

in court to keep the whole thing as secret as possible.

This is a difficult problem.

Solution: The IParty should propose a general way to outlaw drone-type strikes, but not over generalize, and still allow FBI agents to perform their duties, and carry guns to enforce laws. The difficulty lies in defining when an American cannot reasonably be captured, yet remains an immanent threat to the lives of other Americans. Traditionally, a law enforcement officer may shoot and kill a criminal posing an immanent threat to other Americans. For example, when a robber is pointing a gun at a bank customer, a police officer is allowed to shoot the robber if it will protect the bank customer, and no lesser amount of force will suffice. When the American is over seas, and just suspected of spreading bad ideas or having bad plans, the situation is much more difficult. Are the bad plans to jaywalk? To vandalize police cars in Bagdad? To harass the police department in Bagdad, Iraq with empty bomb threats? To give money to an organization which helps the poor but earlier set off car bombs? To build roadside bombs intended for US troops? To buy a nuclear device? What if the citizen makes plans, and then changes their mind, having done nothing concrete? When can the president order a drone strike against an American citizen in a foreign country, walking down the street, unarmed, having not been convicted of any crime in any court? And what of the rights of non-citizens? When do they lose the right to life their Creator bestowed upon them? When do we play the role of policeman, prosecutor, judge, jury and executioner in a foreign country? What are the legal differences between Bin Laden, Saddam Hussein, Muammar Gaddafi, Bashar al-Assad, Fidel Castro, Mikhail Gorbachev and Vladimir Putin? Can Congress be trusted to control a president who goes off the rails?

The IParty should use a deliberative process to find solutions, and vote on the best ones.

iii.) Information Gathering and Access Reform

Problem: The vast amount of data available to governments in general, and the Executive Branch in particular, creates a potential for abuse that threatens the basis of democracy. Political opposition and reporting can be stifled by those in power if they abuse their access to the information the NSA and others are collecting.

Solution: The president and his executive agents should not have any

legal access to information not generally available to the general public regarding private matters of private citizens not suspected of committing a crime. In other words, if a private company keeps my records of my phone calls to other individuals, and does not publish them to the general public, they should not be available to the president (or any other part of the federal government).

Restrictions should be placed on the governments' information gathering, collection, and aggregation to avoid suppression of dissent, criticism of the government, reporting of facts about the government, and political opposition. Only when the government suspects a crime, and obtains a warrant from an independent (Article III) judge should the president be allowed to collect and retrieve the communications, business documents, and other records of Americans.

iv.) Attorney General Separated from Executive Branch

Problem: When the president becomes corrupt and begins to break the law, she may have the power to fire the people investigating wrongdoing.

Solution: The position of Attorney General should be separated from the executive branch and elected separately. An IParty president could do this voluntarily, setting an example for future presidents. A poll could be conducted, and the President could use the results of the poll to appoint the Attorney General. The process would make it much more politically difficult for the president to arbitrarily control or fire the attorney general.

In order to securely bind current and future presidents to an independent Attorney General, the Constitution must be amended.

The Justice Department could also be funded separately from the rest of the Executive Branch. A check could be placed on the Justice Department by explicitly allowing the Attorney General of any of the 50 states to bring charges against any Justice Department employee who breaks the law, but the charges could only be brought in a Federal Court. This reform falls under the category of “rule of law” and “nobody is above the law”.

v.) Protection of Reporters of Unconstitutional Practices

Problem: Executive Branch employees do not have adequate protection when they seek to protect the Constitution. The Federal Government has no authority to act in an unconstitutional manner. The Federal Government was created by, and owes its

existence to the Constitution. Federal Employees should not be constrained to perform acts inconsistent with the Constitution, nor sit by silently when the Constitution is violated.

Federal employees or contractors cannot always be certain what is unconstitutional; they should only need good reason to believe the acts are unconstitutional. Edward Snowden, for example, believed he was disclosing unconstitutional acts of the Federal Government. A federal judge agreed that acts disclosed by Snowden were unconstitutional. Even if other judges disagree, Snowden should be forgiven for believing the acts were unconstitutional, because even an experienced trained federal judge believed they were unconstitutional. No one can credibly argue that Snowden was clearly wrong without also arguing the federal judge whose job it is to know such things was also clearly wrong.

Solution: Provide explicitly in the Constitution that executive branch employees who refuse to participate in unconstitutional acts, and who disclose to the public unconstitutional acts of others in the government, cannot be prosecuted under any law. In this way, the government practice of marking almost everything “classified” or “confidential” could not be used to hide unconstitutional government practices. A standard process and procedure which protects a federal employee should be developed so that a reasonable employee with legitimate concerns can disclose information responsibly. Only complete unanimity among federal justices who examine a case of faulty whistleblowing should allow the prosecution to go forward.

B. Constitutional Updates

i.) Bill of Rights Updates

Problem: The Bill of Rights has been stretched and twisted over the years, and has failed to address fundamental questions of our times. Many people are surprised how the words have been interpreted by the Supreme Court over the years. Government ambitions to do a through job correcting wrongdoing must not harass and obstruct the law abiding citizen.

Solution: The Bill of Rights needs a refresher. Over time, the Bill of Rights has been eroded, to the point where it seems general warrants for the government to search all of our papers and effects are now OK. How did we get to a place where the

government can "collect" (seize is a better word, since the companies involved don't really have a choice) our phone records, travel records (toll records), and not violate the fourth amendment? The whole thing needs to be rewritten and updated, and real freedoms need to be emphasized and restored. Of course, this will be a group effort, and must be done with consensus in mind. It is not for any one individual or party to manage. The IParty should develop specific improvements to advocate, but not expect to win on everything. Below is a list of examples to provide a starting point for discussion and to get the ball rolling. By no means are the examples below intended to be a complete statement or last word on this matter.

Examples:

a.) The Second Amendment states, "A well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free state, the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." An honest reading of this would suggest that the people have a right to keep and bear *any weapons*, including nuclear weapons. The founders were not interested in placing any limits on the people, only ensuring that great limits be placed on the government. The founders were among the same people that kept canon capable of firing 24 pound shots that the king tried to seize in the battles of Lexington and Concord. The founders clearly did not want ANY limits placed on their rights (the rights of the PEOPLE) to keep and bear arms. They considered arms in the hands of the people to be necessary to the security of a free state.

The argument that arms in the hands of the people are just as necessary today as they were in 1792 is supportable by both ancient and recent history. Democracies have regularly reverted to dictatorships throughout history. Just a few examples include ancient Athens and Rome, England after the signing of the Magna Carta, France after the French Revolution, and Germany and Italy in the 20th century. In the 21st century, we are probably witnessing Russia and Egypt lose their brief attempts to form democratic rules. To believe that the United States is immune to tyranny simply invites tyranny to return.

Yes, people will do stupid and tragic things with the weapons in their hands. But people with a government uniform cannot be trusted more than the people without a government uniform. Armies under government command regularly cause more destruction than any criminals ever manage. Imagine a society where only the government has weapons, and the people have none at all. Does that sound like the most safe Utopia you could live in? Is it hard to imagine what will go wrong?

While the IParty should be in favor of expanded weapons rights for the people, it should also be willing to place limits on these rights, so that the right does not literally extend to nuclear weapons, or their chemical or biological equivalents. The rights of people should extend beyond handguns and rifles. Greater scrutiny of potential owners should be allowed for weapons of greater power, with some weapons (nerve gas, nuclear bombs, etc.) entirely beyond the legal reach of individuals not under the command of the government.

Of course, if the people can't be trusted with a given weapon, why should the people suddenly be trusted when they put on a government uniform? The people should be required to directly approve any weapon the government wishes to build or maintain, but deny access to the people. This is obviously a sticky issue, but it should not be left to the discretion of a few judges to decide. Neither should the government be trusted to secretly decide which massively destructive weapons to build.

b.) The Fourth amendment right against unreasonable search and seizure has been eroded and degraded in many ways. As one small example, police are allowed to search your home without your consent and without a warrant if they get the consent of someone else living there, even if they know they do not have your consent. Police should be required to get consent from all people living at the residence, or get a warrant. Many of the other ways police and the courts have eroded the fourth amendment should be revisited and corrected. This is a large topic that needs input from many people.

c.) Property rights have been eroded by the Supreme Court. A fundamental principle of freedom is the right to own property. Without this right, people become mere subjects of the government. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court severely damaged this fundamental principle in the *Kelo v. City of New London* decision. See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kelo_v._City_of_New_London. What this means is that corporations and the government can take away your property for just about any reason, and pay some company to decide how much you get for your property. You have no say in whether you get kicked off your property, or how much you get paid for it. The danger is that corporations will overuse this procedure to seize private property with no regard for individual liberties.

Eminent domain is a theory that goes back to the time of kings. The king owns all the land in the kingdom, but lets you use it when he is not using it. It is still his. After the American Revolution, this policy continued, under the theory that the people had seized the king's land,

and now it belongs to the people collectively. They formed a constitution, emphasizing the fact that the People collectively own all the property, rights, and powers, and only grant some limited powers and property to the Federal Government through the Constitution.

The Fifth Amendment does not use the term “eminent domain”, but instead states “...nor shall private property be taken for public use, without just compensation.” Now, the court has stretched the definition of “public use” to include what is essentially a private use. They expanded a limited grant of power to a much greater grant of power. They included a lot of rationale, but the majority, in a 5-4 decision, essentially missed the forest for the trees. As Justice O’Conner wrote in her dissent, “Any property may now be taken for the benefit of another private party, but the fallout from this decision will not be random. The beneficiaries are likely to be those citizens with disproportionate influence and power in the political process, including large corporations and development firms.” This type of power agglomeration is bad for democracy.

Eminent domain should be put back in its rightful place. The people own the land collectively. If land is to be seized for public use, the public should be both privileged and obliged to actually vote on that seizure. It is, after the Revolution, the People’s land. Moreover, seizure of private lands for private use should be banned, to avoid the “tyranny of the mob”.

If the founders knew how their words would get twisted, they would have been more careful. Now, with the benefit of hindsight, we can be more careful. Several states have amended their constitutions to avoid eminent domain abuses. Perhaps an amendment to the US Constitution can be made to follow the best state amendment. Without such an amendment, there is always the danger that the federal government may seize your property despite any state constitutional provision. And if there is any question of whether corporations might be heavy handed and abusive, just remember some corporations are willing to force nuns off their land. Nuns. <http://aksarbent.blogspot.com/2013/11/eminent-domain-abuse-shady-pipeline.html>

There are additional ways in which the Supreme Court has eroded property rights. The Supreme Court has upheld civil forfeiture laws where the government names property as a defendant. See, for example:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Asset_forfeiture;

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bennis_v._Michigan ;

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_v._\\$124,700_in_U.S._Currency](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_v._$124,700_in_U.S._Currency) and

<http://www.cnn.com/2014/09/03/us/philadelphia-drug-bust-house-seizure/index.html>.

The use of the “rational relation” test in deciding property rights has allowed legislatures to have wide latitude in regulating property rights. According to Prof. John E. Finn of Wesleyan University, it is not much of an exaggeration to say “Property is no longer a significant constitutional liberty. You might as well write it out of the bill of rights.” (Civil Liberties and the Bill of Rights, 2006, The Teaching Company). Over the years, the Court has painted itself into a corner, and needs some help from the people in the form of a Constitutional amendment to free itself.

d.) The Ninth Amendment needs to be reiterated. It states, “The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people.” The Supreme Court has essentially ignored it. Some Justices have even suggested that the use of the 9th Amendment will lead to the Court to become untethered from the text of the Constitution. Of course, the 9th Amendment is the text of the Constitution, and it was put there for a very good reason. Just because certain rights are specifically enumerated, doesn’t mean that the people don’t have other rights. For example, people have the right to marry and have children. Where are those rights in the Constitution? Virginia tried to outlaw marriage between blacks and whites, for example. Nowhere did the Bill of Rights mention a “right to marry”. Virginia could well have outlawed marriage between Jewish people and Christians, or between people deemed too poor, unintelligent or uneducated to have children. A literalist interpretation of the Bill of Rights, absent a meaningful 9th amendment, could lead a person to believe that Virginia had the right to outlaw marriage, if it chose to do so, or restrict people to having one child. Where does the Constitution say there is a right to have more than one child?

The whole premise of the Bill of Rights is that the people were going to emphatically state that the government can’t trample on rights that governments historically have loved to trample upon. For example, when someone commits a crime, the standard procedure for a government is to put a suspect in a chair and beat them until they confess. (<http://cdn.meme.li/instances/500x/15298893.jpg>) The people wanted to emphatically tell the government that, from now on, they would not be allowed to do this (e.g. the right to remain silent), no matter how much they wanted or needed. And, just because the people made a list of rights traditionally trampled on by governments, doesn’t mean that there aren’t other rights

retained by the people. Like the right to have more than one child, or to drink beer. Only a further Constitutional Amendment approved by the people's representatives should be effective to limit the rights retained by the People through the 9th Amendment.

e.) The First Amendment has been twisted to state that giving money to a political candidate is protected political speech. Regardless of whether this is defensible from the perspective of Constitutional Law, the public policy implications are dangerous. Instead of reasonable limits on monetary campaign contributions, which are defensible from a typical "time, place, manner" analysis that the Court has applied in other free speech cases, the Court seems intent on obliterating any limits at all on campaign contributions, except for the most overt bribery, where the donor must announce he is bribing the politician to change his vote. In cases where the donor gives tons of money and the politician just happens to vote for the interests of the donor, in the absence of the announcement, all perfectly legal. In fact, it is not a legitimate aim for the government to try to stop this kind of wink-and-nod campaign contribution/influence peddling, according to the 5-4 Court majority opinion (McCutcheon vs. Federal Election Commission; see e.g. http://www.oyez.org/cases/2010-2019/2013/2013_12_536).

Without a correction, these decisions will lead to a great imbalance, where corporations and rich people effectively own the government, buying all the "free speech" they want. This is not a balanced approach to an area where different principles conflict. Free speech is not unlimited and an absolute right about which the government can say nothing. It has never been. Why must it be unlimited and completely beyond the reach of government when "free speech" takes the form of "money"? This is just plain wrong. See also <https://movetoamend.org/>

ii.) Commerce Clause Clarification

Problem: The commerce clause has been stretched beyond recognition. It has been used to justify federal laws to prohibit a grandmother from growing marijuana in her own basement for her own consumption for a medical condition based on the rationale that it affects interstate commerce.

Solution: Restate the commerce clause to avoid having the government intrude into private lives under the guise that some activity "affects interstate

commerce”. If it is not actually interstate commerce, it should be left to the states for regulation.

At the same time, the interstate commerce clause has not been effectively used on genuine issues of interstate commerce to create systems which reduce or eliminate pollution and waste. For example, food packaging and distribution causes great problems of food contamination, waste, and environmental pollution. Packages are not reused, but thrown away or “recycled”. No national system that would solve a great many problems has been implemented. For example, regulations requiring the use and reuse of glass food containers and their carriers (boxes) would reduce pollution and food contamination by the leaching of chemicals into products in contact with the plastic container. In order for this to be economical and effective, it must be a regulated free market, where standards are specified, but industrialists are allowed to innovate and compete to produce the most efficient and economical product. Plastic may be convenient and efficient, but it is difficult to reuse, requires chemicals that leach into foods. Glass is inert; it does not leach into food or the environment. It is made of sand, which is everywhere and cannot be considered a pollutant. It is very simple chemically and does not need to be broken down at the chemical level. However, glass breaks into dangerous shards, and is energy intensive to form. It is not a panacea, but could be used to solve significant problems with the current system. Plastic may still have a role, for example, as a protective coating on the outside of reusable glass containers, to form crates and boxes to carry the containers, and in other ways.

Here is an example of a regulated food distribution system:

Thick, reusable, standardized glass containers become the food distribution packaging of choice. These are used for beverages, canned goods, dry goods, dairy, meats, etc. Reusable standardized crates are developed to deliver the foods from the producers to the retail stores, and other standardized crates are used to transport the foods from the store to and from the end user, for example to and from a home or restaurant.

The glass containers have an identification tag embedded into the wall of the container to allow tracking of the container, and to monitor the service life. The container may have a rubber or plastic seal between the lid and body of the container. The containers may be of several standard sizes and shapes, designed to cooperate with each other.

Certain foods would be exempted if it could be shown that they cannot be accommodated by the system. For example, raw eggs still in their shell may be problematic for this type of

system. For these foods, a single use container might be devised that is completely mulch able. In less densely populated areas, people would be encouraged to mulch their waste, rather than have a garbage truck collect it. In more urban settings, mulchable waste could be collected separately.

Despite the expense of the new system, for example the cost of the production of the containers, and the increased cost to ship food in those containers, it would be offset by savings. This system would cut down on the plastic bottles we see by the side of the road, the plastic bags that blow everywhere, and ultimately form a soup of plastic in our lakes, rivers, and oceans. It would also decrease spending on single use plastic food packaging, garbage trucks, garbage transfer stations, landfills, and recycling.

iii.) Digital Rights and Right to Encryption

Problem: The government has classified encryption as a weapon, and forbade export of encryption technology without approval by the government. The federal government has actively sabotaged encryption that people use for banking on the internet so that the government may more easily spy on citizens.

Solution: The right to encryption should be enshrined either in the law or the Constitution. Encryption is one of those “trust but verify” issues. You can trust people to not read your private documents; you can trust them even more if the documents are competently encrypted.

iv.) Balanced Budget Enforcement

Problem: The Federal Government is building up a huge, potentially catastrophic amount of debt.

Solution: Warren Buffet's rule should be adopted into the Constitution. "When an annual deficit rises above 3% of GDP, no sitting legislator or president shall be eligible for reelection." The annual deficit should be determined by a body independent of the Executive/legislative branch. Any IParty member elected to Congress must commit to introducing legislation to encourage balanced budgets. See also section D, paragraph i.).

v.) General Right to Privacy

Problem: Privacy is under siege in the U.S. Personal dignity and security requires privacy. Freedom of the press and political dissent will be suppressed without privacy.

Long Term Solution: The right to privacy should be expressly enunciated in the Constitution. The right of privacy should constrain both governments and corporations from amassing and disseminating personal information without authorization from the individual. This is not a simple issue, and should be carefully developed by the IParty collectively. There are several privacy interests, including family associations, sexuality, medical, and personal. The Supreme Court should not be required to divine which of these privacy interests it should enforce using the 9th amendment or “due process”.

Shorter Term Solution: The IParty should support candidates committed to privacy and to restoring laws and policies that promote privacy. The argument that “I’ve got nothing to hide,” must be debunked and defeated. (The right of privacy, while it is a personal right, confers a collective benefit of protecting reporters, political dissenters, political opposition, activists, and other people whose privacy is necessary to the security of a free state.)

vi.) Right to Medical and DNA Privacy

Problem: Medical data is increasingly important and available, but not protected by right. The Congress could change the law at any time.

Solution: The right to keep medical data private, and in particular, DNA information, should be enshrined in the Constitution.

vii.) Right to Sexual and Reproductive Privacy

Problem: The Federal and State governments continually intrude upon the sexual and reproductive freedoms of the people, because no such freedoms are enunciated in the Constitution, and the 9th Amendment has not been effective in preventing these intrusions.

Solution: Further amendments enunciating the rights to sexual privacy and reproductive privacy should be enacted. Two of many possible examples follow.

a.) A constitutional amendment might try to capture the following.
“The right to terminate a pregnancy at the discretion of the mother up until the time of the natural

viability of the baby shall not be infringed. The right to terminate a pregnancy for reasons of grievous genetic or health defect of the baby, the substantial increase of risk to the health of the mother, or in cases of rape and incest shall not be infringed up until the time of the birth of the baby. Natural viability is the time at which the baby can survive with natural feeding and clothing.” This would end the uncertainty and long term variability about when termination of a pregnancy is legal. It also protects the interests of the parents to refuse unwanted medical intrusions on them or their children. In other words, this amendment prevents the possibility of a state at some time in the future declaring that it could get a fetus to survive, through medical interventions, after just four weeks of pregnancy, and therefore banning all abortions after four weeks. Such a fetus might only be saved for a life of suffering and diminished capacity, but allow the state to ban abortions after four weeks because the fetus is “viable”.

b.) Example text: “The right of consenting adults to engage in intimate (sexual, romantic, and otherwise loving) activity and partnerships shall not be infringed, and private communication shall not be accessed, intercepted, collected, stored, or otherwise made available to the state unless the state demonstrates that a compelling health or liberty interest of the people outweighs the collective individual rights of consenting adults.” The real need for the state to intrude upon these matters is minimal. It is highly unlikely the state has any practical ability to make a society better by intruding in these matters. Yet the potential for abuse of the system by government intrusions here is real and substantial.

viii.) Voting Process Reform

Problem: The one person one vote system does not do a great job at capturing the intent and will of the voter. Many times, voters feel that they must vote for their second or third choice because if they vote for an unpopular candidate, they will be throwing their vote away. People often do have first, second, and third choices for an office, and not allowing them to express those choices fails to fully capture their intent.

Solution: The method of choosing all representatives should be changed to an instant runoff system. In this method, generally, a voter is allowed to pick a number of choices for election to office. They can write down a number of preferences:

1. Candidate A
2. Candidate B

3. Candidate C

(etc.)

When the votes are tallied, candidates with the lowest vote totals, and no possibility of winning, because they are not any choice on a majority of voters lists, are eliminated. Then, the votes are totaled with that candidate eliminated, and the priorities of anyone who voted for that candidate adjusted. If still no candidate has a majority, then another candidate on the low end is eliminated. This continues until one candidate gets 50% of the vote. There is also a possibility that the candidates could be eliminated until some maximal percentage and/or supermajority is reached. This should be researched by the IParty to determine the optimal rules and methods to implement an instant run-off system.

ix.) Clarification of Fundamental Constitutional Rules

Problem: The Constitution fails to address many fundamental issues.

Solution: The fundamentals of the Constitution should be explained better. The inherent incompleteness of words and laws should be mentioned. For example, it is understood that words are imperfect and incomplete expressions of intent. Latent ambiguities in every word can be identified by anyone with experience in the practice of law. We cannot therefore create a perfect Constitution or set of laws which spells out how we should act in all situations. For this reason, no right can be absolute, because in some situations it will conflict with another right. For example, the right to free speech, when used to yell “fire” in a crowded movie theater when there is no fire, conflicts with the basic rights of life held by others. Explaining this fundamental rule and others would clear up misunderstandings and adjust the expectations of the people appropriately.

x.) Abolish the Electoral College

Problem: Under the current system, it is possible that a majority of voters vote for one candidate for president, but another candidate not having the majority of votes is elected.

Solution: Abolish the Electoral College, and elect the president by direct popular vote. The Electoral College may have made more sense in the days when travel

and communication was limited by sailing and horseback. It makes no sense to retain it. It distorts and confuses the election system with no identifiable benefit. It makes the results of the election less credible. It could make a contended outcome even more volatile and contentious. In a close election where this system matters, no one can really say in advance whether they will be a “beneficiary” of a distorted electoral outcome. Does anyone really want the party they oppose to win an election that way? It could happen, unless the Electoral College is abolished.

xi.) Right to Attorney/Client and Doctor/Patient Confidentiality

Problem: The right to confidentiality when consulting an attorney or doctor has not been expressly established in the Constitution. These rights should be plainly stated, as they are fundamental and important rights which are always tempting for governments to trample. When peoples’ rights are denied, even when they are very bad people, it means that no one else can trust that what they say to doctors or attorneys is confidential. Everyone is punished because a small number of people behave badly. Moreover, the punishment only gets a few people at one time, because thereafter, people will know they must keep secrets from doctors and attorneys. The benefits of confidentiality (including the most effective legal advice and medical treatment based on complete information) will be ruined for all time for a one-time convenience.

Solution: Amend the Constitution to define and include these rights. The IParty should use a deliberative process to identify the range of alternatives, and vote on the best solutions.

xii.) Change the Constitutional Amendment Process.

Problem: A small percentage of the population can be effective to make it nearly impossible to amend the Constitution. Justice Scalia recently remarked that just two percent of the population could thwart a constitutional amendment. Justice Scalia further remarked that amending the Constitution should be hard, but not as hard as it is.

Solution: Amend the Constitution to allow for ratification by a 75% vote of the people during a presidential election as an alternative to ratification by 75% of the states. The IParty should use a deliberative process to identify the range of alternatives, and vote on the best solutions.

C. U.S. House and Senate

i.) Reform Budget Voting

Problem: The voting process used for the yearly budget promotes overspending and a lack of restraint. Because votes are held on independent line items, members of Congress are shy about voting against measures that have a particular constituency, and sound good, because there is no overall penalty for individual members for approving too many programs. Members are afraid of being taken to task by political opponents, and arousing opposition by entrenched political interest groups. No one can tally up a member's votes and claim they spent too much for the given revenue. Moreover, taxing and spending are decoupled, promoting further irresponsibility. Ultimately, under the current process, most members never get the opportunity to vote for a balanced budget.

Solution: Article 1, section 7 of the Constitution specifies that voting for legislative bills be determined by the yea and nay votes. "But in all such Cases the Votes of both Houses shall be determined by yeas and Nays, and the Names of the Persons voting for and against the Bill shall be entered on the Journal of each House respectively." Because this method is specified in the Constitution, it can only be changed by a constitutional amendment, not regular legislation or rules changes.

However, a change in the House rules may allow individual congressmen to have input to a final budget, which is voted on in a constitutionally prescribed manner, while capturing the individual priorities of each congressman. (Article 1, Section 7 states, "All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives; but the Senate may propose or concur with Amendments as on other Bills.") The rules change would allow an alternative voting process to arrive at a final budget and revenue bill, which would then be subject to a yea/nay vote on the floor as a complete package. If that did not pass, the Congress could then proceed to pass whatever irresponsible budget it could muster. (However, each member would be on record

as having voted for/against the first budget, and for/against the subsequent budget, if any).

The rules change in the House would require that each House member start with the budget and revenue law from the preceding year. Each House member would make the desired changes to the laws, and present it to the House as their preference for a tax and spending system. They would be required to assign priorities to their spending choices. An automated system would automatically balance the spending priorities. All items would start out with equal priority. If the congressman raised priorities on one item, the priorities would be proportionately decreased on all other items.

A mathematical algorithm would be used to combine the 435 different budgets and balance the priorities of each, in order to arrive at a final budget compromise. By a new rule adopted at the start of each session of the House of Representatives, the budget would be subject to a yea or nay vote without possibility of amendment.

Using this system, each individual member would be accountable to the overall result in congress for budget and spending issues. If they lacked the time and staffing to do a complete review of budget line items and the tax code, they could vote for the status quo, or a 3% across the board cut or increase, for example. Each member could have a chance to have input on every aspect of the taxing and spending programs. Moreover, each member would have the opportunity to vote for a balanced budget, and show how they would balance the budget. They would be given a chance to vote on a budget that holds the members responsible for their overall contribution to the tax and spending problems. And they could criticize their opponents if they failed to be responsible.

The IParty could experiment to find an appropriate algorithm that produces a budget likely to be passed by “yea or Nay” vote. If an appropriate system is found, a constitutional amendment could be offered to institutionalize the voting method. The process for amending the tax code and predicting the revenue based on the current code or the changed code will be a more difficult problem. Obviously, some congress members will attempt to make drastic changes, for various political reasons, that will be hard to reconcile with the current code. For example, the proposal of a 15% flat tax would be difficult to add to or subtract from the current code. But it may not be impossible with computer modeling.

ii.) Majority Rules

Problem: Legislative leaders and committee members use rules and procedures to stymie the will of the majority in the House of Representatives and the Senate.

Solution:

a.) The IParty will propose the adoption of rules and procedures in the House and Senate that allow simple majorities to pass legislation in ways that cannot be blocked by party leaders or committee chairpersons. If there are already unused rules to do this (even members of congress don't know *all* the rules), the IParty will advocate using them regularly to overcome gridlock and reduce the outsized influence and disproportionate power committee chairpersons have in Congress.

b.) The IParty will propose a procedure in the Constitution to allow a simple majority to pass bills without permission from any party leader. Example: Any simple majority of representatives or senators may sign a document and present it to a congressional official who will confirm the votes, and then pass it to the other body (house or senate) for consideration. This would prevent procedures, rules, and politicking from thwarting the will of the majority. It will also tend to erode the partisan struggles, by allowing bipartisan majorities to impose their will.

iii.) Term Limits

Problem: House and Senate Members stay in office for decades, hindering new ideas, and becoming disproportionately powerful.

Solution: Service in the House and Senate should be limited, e.g. to twelve or eighteen years. It could be twelve years in any one body and eighteen or twenty four years total. This is long enough to ensure institutional memory and provide for experience to be retained, but puts a restraint on incumbency. Another alternative is to put term limits on either the house or senate.

iv.) Campaign Contributions/"Access" Purchases

Problem: Influence on pending legislation is affected by campaign contributions and lobbying efforts. Money has been held to be equal to free speech in the Supreme Court. Political Action Committees have been given greater freedom than individuals.

Solutions: There may be legal avenues to address this. Possible

solutions are:

a.) Corporations, political action committees, and non-profit organizations should not have the same (or greater) constitutional rights than individuals when it comes to free speech. This may help limit the ability of corporations to donate to political campaigns and gain access to candidates to push for favorable legislation.

b.) A tax and voucher plan, such as the one proposed by the Mayday PAC (<https://mayday.us/the-plan/>), should be passed into federal law. In this type of plan, people are taxed to fund political campaigns. Instead of having the government pick which candidates to give funds, taxpayers are given a voucher for a set amount of money, which they can donate to any political candidates they want. This eliminates the temptation of people to opt out of campaign financing, and just keep their money in their own bank account.

The IParty should study ways of limiting corrupting money in politics. The problem is that access to broadly followed communication channels (e.g. television commercials) typically costs money. It is difficult to separate non-corrupt access to such channels from corrupt access. Can we limit a rich person's access to buy time on a TV channel to make political speeches? What if they aren't really political, but focused on poverty and helping the poor? Is that political? Where exactly do we draw the line? What about helping needy students? Helping a religious school? Helping an engineering school with a conservative reputation? Stating that the government should help fund schools for needy children? Stating that any politician who is against funding schools for needy children is just plain wrong? Producing a news show for profit that makes political commentary? Producing a news show for profit (but which operates at a loss, unfortunately) which is mostly political commentary on current news events? Producing a news show on the internet that has no foreseeable income that does all political commentary about particular candidates? Where does honest journalism end and purely paid political speech begin? When is a news show about the coal industry legitimate journalism, when would it be considered a paid shill for the industry, and when is it something in-between?

Because of these problems, the solution may not be to try to completely ban corrupting money from politics using laws. The solution may be to out-compete corruption with superior:

* philosophy

- * organization
- * positive mental attitude
- * fundraising, and
- * branding.

Corruption has an inherent deficit in all of these areas, even including fundraising. True charitable and other honest organized giving vastly exceeds corrupt giving. However, corrupt giving gets a disproportionate amount of attention and probably rightly so. Nevertheless, even with all the attention, it remains a difficult problem. The most reasonable solution may be to ban it where appropriate (e.g., in blatant cases), expose it where practical, but otherwise plan to outcompete it.

v.) Better Representation through Systematic Constituent Input

Problem: Representative Democracy is stuck in the 18th century. The Internet has changed the world, but the political structure of the United States remains rooted in the thinking of 1788 and 1865. Not only were opportunities to elevate constituent participation missed in the 20th century, there is no excuse for not reforming the system for the possibilities of the 21st century.

Solution: One thing can be done without permission from anyone. It only needs the willing participation of the IParty candidates. The IParty should have representatives willing to formally take polls and votes from constituents, and to vote according to those polls. The polling should be scheduled, announced in advance, accompanied by a recommendation, and verified. The Internet makes this possible today. There is nothing preventing a member of Congress from doing this today. At some point, this could be written into law, but for the time being, it could be promised as a technique for determining votes in Congress by the Candidate, and experiments could be performed to determine the best techniques of assessing the broadest voter sentiment.

This technique can be started within the IParty even before a candidate wins an election. It would be similar to the use of focus groups and informal polling, except that it would be done on a more inclusive basis and in a more public fashion. Results may be published.

Obviously, some constituents won't know or care about the issues (e.g., patent law), and

only the most informed (e.g., patent attorneys, inventors, plaintiffs and defendants in patent suits, and others involved with patents) will participate in polling. This may allow for techniques involving voter coalitions organized using computer algorithms. For example, Jim might be a voter largely concerned about net neutrality, the right to encryption, and internet freedom, but who doesn't really know or care about protecting salmon fisheries. Janet, from Alaska, cares deeply about the salmon fisheries in Alaska, but also across the country. She has never turned her mind to net neutrality or encryption. She would be happy to form a coalition with Jim and Jim with her, because Jim will agree to vote her way on salmon fisheries, and she will agree to vote his way on net neutrality. The IParty could form voting blocs to facilitate such coalitions.

There may even be a formal recognition that the representative official may override the results of a poll under certain circumstances, such as lack of significant participation, or evidence of poll tampering by the undue influence of special interests. For example, if a vote on a particular regulation seems to have been skewed by the paid efforts of an industry affected by the regulation, the representative may gather evidence of this and override the vote.

Similarly, if more than one polling technique is used, and one technique seems more reliable than another, and the techniques produce different results, then the representative may choose one method over another.

The IParty should use new techniques available on the internet (e.g. social networking, web polling, etc) to formulate policy, with input and feedback from the broadest possible number of constituents. When the republic was formed, there were no cars, telephones, internet, telegraph, railroads, satellites, facebook, google, or any of that. There was pen, paper, horseback and sailing ships. Representative Democracy was born out of sheer necessity. The fullness of the representation was a product of necessity, but it is no longer required. Constituents can learn about issues very quickly using Google and Wikipedia. They can communicate their desires to their representative in Washington instantly using e-mail, facebook, Internet polls, and other techniques. While there were town libraries and telephones in the 20th century, these things were not useful for informing the populace and determining their preferences. (How would the representative get even twenty thousand calls over an issue? At the library, what happens when one constituent checks out the only copy of "Trademark Law for Dummies" to learn about a particular issue raised in upcoming legislation. What do all the other constituents do, before the age of the Internet? Wikipedia, however, can serve a basic primer on

Trademark law to all who ask, instantly.

The IParty should use new techniques available on the Internet to recruit new members, new candidates, and party leaders. There is LinkedIn and numerous other tools.

The IParty should recruit professionals such as engineers, scientists, doctors, and teachers to serve as candidates and party officials. Engineers in particular have skill in designing better systems. They should be employed in designing a better political system.

vi.) Limit Congressional Immunity to Laws

Problem: Congress and Federal Government employees routinely exempt themselves from many laws that place the liberty and property of non-government citizens at risk.

Solution: Require in the Constitution that any exemption for the congress or executive branch for laws passed by congress be ratified by a popular vote of the people at the next congressional election. With this arrangement, the government would be required to explain why they need exemptions from the law, and get approval from the people using this explanation.

vii.) Reconstitute House and Senate

Problem: Congress is designed to have representatives from states, but not representatives for issues. People in the 21th century U.S. are less tied to their state than they were in the 18th century, and federal law controls much more of the legal framework in the U.S. Yet there is no way for people to vote for federal representatives devoted to a particular issue, such as campaign finance reform. Instead, they can only choose federal representatives based on the geographical region in which they live.

Solution: Reconstitute the House and Senate to allow at-large (US wide) representatives to be introduced into one or both chambers. The US representatives would campaign nationally on the basis of one or more issues for the entire country. This could be accomplished in a wide variety of ways. For example, all of the current representatives of the house and senate could be merged into one body, and a second body could be created to represent national interests. This second body could be a hedge against the temptation to funnel federal income to unneeded local projects as a way of boosting the local economy, commonly

known as pork barrel spending.

D. Regulating Supreme Court Operations

i.) Fixed terms for Supreme Court Justices and Alternative Selectors

Problem: Supreme Court justices grow very old, diseased, and infirm on the bench. They are appointed to the Court for as long as they may live and wish to continue to serve. Some justices stay longer than they wish, or maybe even than they should, so that they may choose a more favorable president to appoint their successor. Presidents are tempted to appoint especially young justices in order to maximize their time and effect on the court, rather than looking for the most qualified. Some presidents may appoint many justices, if many die during their term, while other presidents may not have an opportunity to appoint any justices. There is no order to the process.

Solution:

The term of the Justices should be fixed in the Constitution to last no more than X years, e.g. 15, 17, 18, or 21. The number of Justices should be fixed by the Constitution.

The rotation onto and off of the court should occur at a regular rate, such as one justice retires and one is appointed each year. For example, with the current 9 justices, one justice could be appointed every two years for an 18 year term. A maximum age at the date of appointment could be fixed according to the length of service. For example, the maximum age at appointment date could be 52, to ensure retirement by age 70. Retired justices could serve as a pool of knowledge for advice (e.g., amicus briefs) to currently serving justices.

The justices might be selected by alternative methods.

- a.) Some justices should be elected by the people, e.g. one during each presidential election.
- b.) Some justices should be elected by the House, without reference to any other body.
- c.) Some justices should be elected by the Senate, without confirmation by any other body.
- d.) Some justices should be appointed by the president, with or without senate confirmation.

ii.) Opinions Reformed and Formalized

Problem: Supreme Court opinions are not well structured.

Solution: This is a problem where the best legal minds should convene within the IParty to find a solution. Somehow, the problem of incoherent or plurality opinions must be addressed. The Constitution seems clear to people. Opinions of the Court should also be made as clear as possible for the average Jane or Joe.

iii.) Judicial Review Expressly Recognized

Problem: The Constitution never expressly gave the Supreme Court the authority to strike down or refuse to enforce unconstitutional laws. The court absolutely must and should have this power. Of course, the Court did assume this power in the Marbury vs. Madison decision. The court owes its very existence to the Constitution, so that if it was required to enforce unconstitutional laws, it could be required to remove itself from existence. Moreover, the Court has often been unsure about its power to decide when a law is constitutional.

Solution: The role of the Court in striking down unconstitutional laws should be enshrined and fully defined in the Constitution. The court and the people could be given guidance on how the court is supposed to exercise this power, and when it must refrain from exercising this power. By having the people expressly agree to this provision, there will be no confusion when the Court exercises this power. Since the Congress and the Executive branch have joint power in passing the laws, and often they are interested in promulgating laws that further their perceived interests, it should be up to the Supreme Court to decide when those laws have exceeded the bounds of the Constitution. This is the best solution to dividing power. The Supreme Court cannot write laws, only review what has been written. And, when the Supreme Court gets it wrong, there is always the ultimate veto on the Supreme Court: a Constitutional Amendment. This veto is long overdue to be used. And one of the ways it should be used is to shore up the power of the Supreme Court, while also cutting it back (by more clearly defining the role of the Supreme Court).

iv.) Construction Methods Used by Court Specified in the Constitution

Problem: The method the Supreme Court uses to determine the meaning of the Constitution (i.e., the construction method) has varied over the years, and can be

chosen arbitrarily by the Court.

Solution: The method the Court uses to construe the words in the Constitution should be specified in the Constitution. Should the Court consider the plain meaning of the words as they would be understood at the time the words were enacted? Should the Court try to ascertain the intent and spirit of the words? The IParty should develop this construction method carefully over time, in consultation with people from all aspects of the system of justice, including judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys, criminals, and law abiding citizens. This should include an expansive use of the chosen words based on the intended meanings. So, “papers and effects” as written in 1792 should cover e-mails, texts, telephone conversations, browsing history, and search queries today. The term “papers” surely was not meant to mean only diaries or personal notes which were never shown to another person. The founders would have been shocked if the term was construed not to include letters sent from one person to another. Yet exceptions for business records, communications to third parties, and other situations have hollowed out the Fourth Amendment. A consistent, expansive method of construction specified in the Constitution could have prevented this erosion.

v.) Stare Decisis Formally Recognized and Quantified

Problem: The Supreme Court often upholds prior decisions purely on principle, and may avoid evaluating whether the prior decision was wrong. There is no clear guidance on when to uphold prior decisions, and when to overrule them.

Solution: Regularize Stare Decisis (Latin for “to stand by that which is decided”) but recognize that sometimes the Court may get things wrong. Require a 2/3 vote (e.g. a 6-3 majority rather than 5-4) in order to overturn prior decisions. This is more of a signal to the public that this is OK for the court to do, and a suggestion to the Court, rather than an iron-clad constraint on the Court. Every case is unique in some way. A Court majority determined to ignore prior decisions can be technically stopped, but not effectively stopped. However, a constitutional admonition may be effective to persuade members of the Court, who are people of honor sworn to uphold the Constitution, to follow the requirements of the Constitution.

E. Divide Government into More Independent Branches

New branches of the Federal Government would increase democracy in several respects. They would allow people to separate issues for separate votes.

i.) Anti-corruption Branch. An independently elected branch could be constituted with the *sole* power and duty to root out corrupt politicians, government officials, and judges. This branch would itself be divided into an executive branch, legislative branch (such as a board of directors), and judicial branch. The branch could bring charges against a politician that willingly violates the Constitution.

ii.) Government Systems Research and Development Branch. This branch should be devoted to recommending improvements in the system, and methods for transitioning from the current system to the improved system. Members of this branch should be drawn from the health, engineering, science, and moral disciplines (moral disciplines could include historians, ethicists, philosophers, and religious authorities).

Scientific methods may be applied to areas of the law. More particularly, scientific testing methods may be used to determine the value and consistent application of various legal “standards”. The reliability of evidentiary standards may be scientifically tested. Testing of inputs and outputs of legal subsystems may be performed to gauge reliability. For example, an old and well known invention may be used to form a new patent application as a test of the patent system, to see if the patent system issues and enforces such a patent. Similarly defective filings may be made with the SEC, FDA, IRS and other agencies as appropriate. These types of systems tests must be performed by truly independent agencies. While the GAO and IG may perform some watchdog functions for federal agencies, they are still controlled by the president, who has a fundamental conflict of interest in exposing problems within the executive branch.

This branch could further include a criminal research division, to anticipate and plug holes in the security of the system which could be exploited by criminals.

iii.) Information Branch. (Note that this item is also discussed under executive branch reforms). Information is power, and too much access to information in the hands of the

government is bad for the system. The government needs information about people, but the executive branch shouldn't be trusted to keep all the databases and not to misuse them to further agglomerate power. There should be a separate information branch that controls government access to big databases of information, to prevent misuse of the information for personal and partisan reasons. This is already generally recognized institutionally in the government, but the safeguards against misuse of power are too susceptible to the will of a malevolent executive official.

Example: A system of satellites could be used to provide near real-time imagery of the earth with very high resolution, to locate any one or any thing. These certainly exist today. The government uses it for its own purposes, and doesn't allow, for example, these things to be used for searching for lost children, or other useful tasks. An Information branch could safeguard this capability from misuse, while providing access to both the government and the people as necessary. An independent Information branch, whose officials are answerable to the people, would serve as a check on government abuse of power, greed, and overreach, and become a liberating force in the lives of citizens.

iv.) Government Personnel Branch. There should be a separate branch of government that protects non-partisan government workers from use for partisan purposes. This is already recognized in the civil service system, but it needs to be institutionalized.

v.) Attorney General/Justice Department. (Note that this item is also discussed under executive branch reforms). The Justice Department has a role in ensuring that anyone who breaks the law is brought to justice. The obvious conflict of interest that occurs when executive branch employees break the law could be dispelled by having the Attorney General elected separately, and the Justice Department funded separately from the rest of the Executive Branch. A check could be placed on the Justice Department by explicitly allowing the Attorney General of any of the 50 states to bring charges against any Justice Department employee who breaks the law, but the charges could only be brought in a Federal Court. This reform falls under the category of "rule of law" and "nobody is above the law".

F. Democratizing Federal and State Components

Problem: Federal agencies are organized more like dictatorships than democracies.

Solution: Organize federal agencies like democracies within democracies.

Example: U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Currently, the USPTO is run much like a dictatorship within a democracy. Laws constrain the behavior of the leaders of the USPTO to an extent, but there is much power placed in the hands of administrators. The power is not distributed among the various constituencies involved in the patent process. There is no form of parliament which represents the various constituencies in the overall intellectual property system which can serve as a check on the executive power. Congress, as a whole, does not understand the patent and trademark system, and is not qualified to regulate it directly. While there are processes of allowing stakeholder input, these processes fail to fully recognize and take full advantage of the new communication tools in the design of the system.

i.) Discussion of the issues could be conducted in a manner similar to the website at slashdot.org. In that system, comments which are not useful may be easily ranked lower and filtered out by users wishing to see only the most interesting/helpful/funny/informative comments.

ii.) Voting and polling on patent and trademark issues could be instituted. A USPTO parliament elected by various constituencies, including inventors, patent office employees, attorneys, corporations, and advocates for the public domain could be established. The current paradigm of publishing rule changes in the federal register, taking commentaries, and making the rule changes final does not seem to be an effective way of identifying conflicts among parties with respect to patent issues, identifying different possibilities and solutions to those conflicts, and negotiating compromise if necessary among the interested parties. A dictatorship is an easy form of government, but it is not the most effective in the long term.

3. Reforming Corporate Associations

Corporations are fictional entities created by laws. They are the end result of the state and federal statutes, which in turn depend on the Constitution. For most people, the structure of the public and private companies they work for influence their lives more than the federal government. For this reason, the IParty should focus on corporate reforms. These reforms can be carried out both within the current system and as systemic reforms.

Corporations are inherently a legal fiction yet inherently more powerful than individuals. Corporations can live forever. Corporations can be everywhere at once. Corporations cannot be put in jail. Corporations can build what no single human ever could build. Corporations can act collectively like an entire government. When an individual works for a corporation, their freedom is just as much at risk of loss as to any government. However, the power of corporations, like the power of government, is derived from individuals. Corporations need not and should not be given the same rights as individuals. They should be treated like governments (as they largely are right now), and treated as having limited powers. In fact, all organizations of individuals are essentially a fiction. The organization derives its existence and all of its powers from the individuals composing the organization and the individuals excluded by it.

Currently, corporations are controlled by boards that are very sympathetic to the needs of executive and administrative officers, and less sympathetic to the needs of front line workers. The board members for one company are often drawn from the executive ranks of other companies. For publicly traded companies, this should change.

A. Promote Stock Option Fairness

One example of the imbalance current corporate structures create is the practice of offering stock options and profit sharing for executive officers, but not offering profit sharing and stock options to front line workers. The belief that only the executive officers are motivated by profit, and therefore only they must be rewarded in this fashion, is pure elitism.

Everyone in the company is motivated by their compensation, which ultimately must come from revenue, if the company, and the compensation, is to continue. Stop paying any worker, and they will probably not come to work.

The front line worker is the representative of the company in so many ways. Collectively, the front line workers are every bit as important as the CEO. Imagine if you were forced into deciding whether to run McDonalds without either a CEO or the cooks and cashiers. Certainly, the company could figure out a way to function without a CEO. It could not function without cooks and cashiers. If robots took over, then the robot operation and maintenance crew would become the front line workers, and the same test would apply.

The failure to motivate the workforce as a whole through the use of stock options and profit sharing is a failure of the system. It produces companies that cannot compete as well, and that will not be as healthy in the long term. There is no excuse for this, since collective stock options could be formed and administered by persons representing the workforce, and the workforce could be paid in this manner.

Another option, when the workforce is not paid sufficiently to rise out of poverty, is to have the government tax the wealthy and give the proceeds to the poor in food stamps, or through other entitlement programs. This is the system we currently use, but this is an inferior systemic solution since it does not motivate the working class to produce, creating greater wealth. The rich and the poor would collectively benefit if every publically traded corporation were forced to provide stock options to the entire workforce whenever stock options go to executive officers.

The rich would benefit because the companies they run would become even more profitable. The poor would benefit by becoming motivated to make the companies they work for more profitable, and sharing in those profits.

A front line worker, for example, who works for Old Navy on Grey Thursday, skipping part of their Thanksgiving holiday, makes Old Navy more profitable. But she may see the unfairness of the managers taking the profits of her work and not sharing ANY with her. This is just immoral, wrong, and bad capitalism. A moral and correct capitalist system would supply the manager and the worker with the profit motive. The United States as a whole would benefit from restructuring the rules of publically traded corporations to correct this imbalance.

B. Some Board of Directors Members Elected by Employees

Another reform to publically traded corporations could require that, in any company having more than a specified number of employees, a percentage, up to 50 percent, of

the board of directors be elected by employees in a democratic vote. (Employees should be defined as any person doing work for some minimum number of hours for the company. This would include some contractors, and avoid companies getting around this requirement by using “contractors” rather than “employees”). This arrangement would increase the feedback between the employees and the board of directors, which otherwise may become detached from employees of the company.

C. Divided Corporate Power Structures

Yet another reform to publicly traded corporations could be the addition of a constitution and judicial function to the company (the Board of Directors already provides a legislative function, and the CEO is obviously an executive function). A constitution could define the goals and purposes of the company, and how it is governed. This could give investors, customers and the public a binding statement of the practices of the company. A constitution could have an effect on whether customers wish to do business with the company, or if members of the public wish to become investors. It could help governments decide whether they wish to accommodate the company, and what accommodations may be made.

An internal judiciary could help resolve disputes within the company, and help determine who is acting in the interests of the company. Often, legal counsel serve as advocates for the company, but have difficulty determining who is the company, and what are the best interests of the company. The judiciary need not be as formal as federal and state courts, and may even be shared among companies. It should be fair, impartial, and efficient.

D. Corporations Must Not Pay Government Regulators

Surprisingly, corporations are allowed to provide financial incentives for their employees to quit their jobs and become government regulators. They can provide bonuses, payouts and increased retirement plans for the employees when they quit to take a government job. This is essentially paying their employees to become the government regulators who in turn take a favorable view of their former employer when they get into government.

It all seems reasonable and justifiable from the point of view of the corporation and the employee. The employee is technically under no further obligation to the company. The

company sees it as providing the government with a person who really understands the industry. And the government gets an employee with experience in the industry they are regulating.

However, these practices lead to an undue loyalty to the industry, and not a more general loyalty to all the constituents of the government. Also, it requires that the public trust the government that these cozy relationships will not go too far. That the government regulators, already lying on the bed with the industry, will not become more than just friends. The system undoubtedly has some benefits, but the risks of lost loyalty to the public are too great to allow this practice to continue.

The practice is not even that great for the corporations. The risk is that a former employee of Goldman Sachs in a regulatory role will favor Goldman Sachs to the disadvantage of all other firms. So now the other firms have to get in the game. Ultimately, there are short term winners, but most everyone loses in the long term.

This could be resolved by tightening rules adopted by the Office of Personnel Management, or by law. No person receiving a bonus or any other consideration for entering public service may be hired by the government. Conflict of Interest laws could be further tightened to prevent people who are leaving public service from taking jobs that have the appearance of being a reward for their public service.

E. Reinstatement of the Glass-Steagall Act

For background on this act, see e.g. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glass-Steagall_Act. The repeal of this act appears to have destabilized the financial sector, and contributed to the 2007-2008 financial crisis. Reinstatement of the Act appears to pose little risk to society.

F. Reinvigorate Anti-Trust Enforcement

Anti-trust laws serve a valuable purpose in preventing corporations from gaining monopoly or otherwise anti-market power. This is a simple, well understood principle that has been eroded and virtually lost. While market competition serves society by creating choices and fostering market innovation and improvement, at times a winner obtains a monopoly on a particular market, and all competition ceases. Innovation plummets, prices skyrocket, and

newcomers quickly perish under the boots of the reigning champion. The monopolist charges consumers whatever they can afford to pay. Here, society is made to serve corporations, a perversion of the general rule that corporations are created to serve society.

Recent mergers and proposed mergers suggest that the enforcement arm of the Sherman Anti-Trust Act is broken. It takes strong regulators to prevent the perversion of markets by the formation of monopolies. Because “restraint of trade or commerce” is essentially a judgment call, a president can appoint regulators who rarely see violations, or who believe the state of corporate America is already quite consolidated.

G. Many Wealthy People will Help

Wealth does not make a person bad. Most wealthy people are good, just as most poor people are good. Many wealthy people work hard and give generously to charity, just as poor people do. Most wealthy people realize that a fair system is better than an unfair system. Warren Buffet, for example, realizes that it is unfair to tax his secretary at a higher rate than the CEO. Also see <http://patrioticmillionaires.org/> Many wealthy people realize that a system that generates a huge middle class will, in the long run, generate a wealthier upper class. Many wealthy people realize that workers should be included in the collective decision making, because they have as much of a stake in the success of their companies as the executives. Workers also have collectively more knowledge of how the company operates than the executives. Watch one episode of Undercover Boss, and this becomes obvious. Representative, constitutional democracies outperform dictatorships over the long term. People who want to be part of truly great organizations should want to be part of representative constitutional democracies. While the IParty expects many rich people to oppose these reforms, it also expects many rich people to embrace and support these reforms, because they will promote the long term health and growth of the system. These reforms will also reduce the potential for adversarial relations between the rich and poor by promoting greater *overall* wealth and equality.

4. Internet Reforms

The advent of the Internet as a force in personal life is easily as important as the printing press, rail system, telephone system or aerospace industry. It has quickly become an important component of our infrastructure. The IParty will develop a full Internet policy platform. The reforms below are mere placeholders.

A. Support Net Neutrality Efforts

The basic idea of net neutrality is that access providers must not be allowed to become gatekeepers, leveraging the value of the whole Internet to extract fees from customers, or leverage the value of access to customers to extract fees from businesses. Net neutrality can be enforced by the FCC if it declares ISPs to be common carriers.

B. Support Strong Encryption Everywhere

A system which cannot prevent unauthorized access is a weak, unreliable system. Strong encryption everywhere is a way to reduce and prevent unauthorized access. People should be secure against unauthorized access from our own government, foreign governments, pranksters, social enemies, abusers and criminals.

C. Oppose Dragnet Government Spying on Citizens

Efforts to widen what digital information governments may lawfully obtain without a particularized suspicion supported by a warrant must be opposed. When the Federal government collects data on the whole population, it necessarily collects data about reporters, political rivals and opponents, protest groups, watchdog groups, and other legitimate government opponents. Politicians always get caught up in their own power, often believing it to be the most important thing in the world for some reason or another. Dragnet information will be used to oppose and suppress the freedoms of the people unfriendly to the currently elected politicians. It is simply too tempting, and government officials will abuse it. Dragnet information may not be dangerous to every individual, but it is dangerous to the proper functioning of a

democratic society. Elected politicians will initially use the information to maintain their own power, and then to extend it. Their gain of power will be your loss of power. The question is not “if” dragnet information will be massively abused, but “when”. There are plenty of historical precedents. Quoting from Wikipedia:

The FBI distributed reports regarding such affairs to the executive branch, friendly reporters, potential coalition partners and funding sources of the SCLC, and King's family.^[221] The Bureau also sent anonymous letters to King threatening to reveal information if he did not cease his civil rights work.^[222] One anonymous letter sent to King just before he received the Nobel Peace Prize read, in part,

The American public, the church organizations that have been helping—Protestants, Catholics and Jews will know you for what you are—an evil beast. So will others who have backed you. You are done. King, there is only one thing left for you to do. You know what it is. You have just 34 days in which to do (this exact number has been selected for a specific reason, it has definite practical significant [*sic*]). You are done. There is but one way out for you. You better take it before your filthy fraudulent self is bared to the nation.^[223]

A tape recording of several of King's extramarital liaisons, excerpted from FBI wiretaps, accompanied the letter.^[224] King interpreted this package as an attempt to drive him to suicide,^[225] although William Sullivan, head of the Domestic Intelligence Division at the time, argued that it may have only been intended to "convince Dr. King to resign from the SCLC".^[197] King refused to give in to the FBI's threats.^[203]

Yes, this passage refers to the evil beast, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the same man remembered on a Federal holiday. This is how these surveillance powers have been used in the past, and this is how they will continue to be used, now and in the future.

5. Reform of the Energy System

The energy system is arguably the biggest system we have. The system removes mountain tops, floods large geographic regions, fractures subsurface geological formations, measurably changes the components of our atmosphere, changes the acidity of the ocean, and affects the climate. It employs millions of people. If it were disrupted or destroyed, society would quickly descend into chaos and war. It underpins many of the joys of modern life: cool grocery stores on 100 degree days, jet rides to Paris, the open highway, iphones, the Internet, outdoor music festivals, warm homes on winter days, etc. Only a very few in our society want to do away with its benefits.

The energy system bulges with opportunities for improvements. With the right approach, we can create great jobs and economic activity in the United States while solving our energy problems. The solution, in the short term, is to reduce the harm created by the fossil fuel side of the energy system, and to accelerate the transition to non-fossil fuel energy production methods. The IParty will develop a full energy system policy platform. There are many well thought out reforms already published by a vast variety of organizations and individuals. The reforms below are mere placeholders.

A. Impose Tax and Rebate System for Carbon Emissions

Carbon emissions benefit the emitter while imposing costs on everyone else. Taxing carbon emissions discourages all emissions. The money collected should be rebated to all people evenly on a per-capita basis to encourage the people to adopt the system and keep it in place. Further, the rebates do not encourage the government to simply spend a new source of revenue.

B. End Oil and Gas Subsidies

Much information about this topic has already been published. See, e.g. <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2013/03/americas-most-obvious-tax-reform-idea-kill-the-oil-and-gas-subsidies/274121/> <http://priceofoil.org/fossil-fuel-subsidies/> and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Energy_subsidies . The IParty should use a deliberative process to

identify the worst oil and gas subsidies, identify solutions, and vote on the best ones.

C. Transition from Inefficient and Polluting Technologies

One example is timed traffic lights, which are inefficient. Traffic lights should be modified to anticipate traffic (e.g. through image recognition), and direct traffic with greater intelligence. Over time, standards could be developed for communications between cars and traffic lights. This could improve safety by warning cars when they are not slowing for a light that is turning red. It could reduce both traffic and pollution. The IParty should use a deliberative process to find the most promising candidate technologies, and vote on the best ones.

D. Advocating Starry Night Policies

See for example <http://starrynightlights.com/blog/?p=19> and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark-sky_movement. Outdoor lights at night are generally not only wasteful, but can be harmful. They do little to promote safety, or reduce crime. Light exposure at night has been linked with cancer and obesity. The IParty should advocate starry night policies and programs to reduce energy waste and other harmful effects.

E. Support Net Metering

Net metering allows home owners to buy and sell electricity to utilities, allowing for the purchase of larger solar or wind generators. Excess production is not wasted, and homeowners are not forced to plan for every situation. For a detailed discussion, see http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Net_metering . The IParty should support net metering policies and programs.

F. IParty Provides Guidance for Members

The IParty can host a forum on practical tips and advice for its own members on how to manage their energy usage. The IParty can further provide incentives to its members for setting goals, keeping track of progress, and attaining results. This may merely be providing an index of participation for each IParty member. Educating and involving IParty members personally will have ripple effects throughout the society.

6. Aspirations and Principles

The IParty will be guided by a set of aspirations and principles. This set of competing virtues will be followed internally, and promoted externally, as part of any system with which the IParty interacts. What follows is a rough draft of those principles and aspirations, to be embellished and pruned over time.

A. Effective Feedback

Complex dynamic real-world systems with a particular utility often use feedback. Feedback, at minimum, takes information from the output of the system and provides it to one of the inputs of the system. Typically, the system has a means to compare the fed back output information with a reference or desired output, and adjust the inner workings of the system to change the current output to more closely match the desired output.

Voting, polling, and reporting are examples of feedback in real world political systems. The IParty should employ systems engineers with real experience designing complex systems with feedback to design better polling and voting systems. We have people in this country who have designed systems using Code Division Multiple Access (CDMA) and Orthogonal Frequency-Division Multiplexing (OFDM) systems for our cell phones, with incredibly complex feedback between the base station (cell tower) and mobile handset. Yet, we still limp along with political systems which have barely evolved since the eighteenth century. We need to put some of our great engineers on this problem.

We must also not forget history, and believe that the lessons of history are not relevant because of our new technology. History is a great source of cultural feedback for long term lessons and wisdom (or in technical terms, design rules for a republic). For example, we must never forget that people, *in general*, crave power over other people even more than they crave freedom. History has shown this again and again. Freedom and democracy must always be guarded against tyranny, or they will be lost. In this way, history can be used to provide feedback to maintain a system which prevents people's craving for power from creating a tyranny.

For a great exposition of the lessons of history, see Rufus Fears "The Wisdom of

History”, which can be listened to as a series of audio lectures published by the Teaching Company. Also see Rufus Fears “The History of Freedom”. Anyone with a long commute or other tedious tasks can make those tasks more enjoyable listening to this entertaining professor.

B. Division and Balance of Power

Power should be divided among specialized organizations which have an expertise in a particular function, and a power to maintain control of that function, where the function is recognized as vital to the overall function of the system. The divisions within society must get signals from each other to regulate their inputs and outputs.

C. Accounting for Human Nature

Much of our good fortune is due to the wisdom of a few people who formed our system of government. One of the best explanations of the rationale for a constitutionally divided democratic republic comes from James Madison in the Federalist No. 51 of the Federalist Papers. It is written in the language of the age, but remains relevant.

“But the great security against a gradual concentration of the several powers in the same department, consists in giving to those who administer each department the necessary constitutional means and personal motives to resist encroachments of the others. The provision for defense must in this, as in all other cases, be made commensurate to the danger of attack. Ambition must be made to counteract ambition. The interest of the man must be connected with the constitutional rights of the place. It may be a reflection on human nature, that such devices should be necessary to control the abuses of government. But what is government itself, but the greatest of all reflections on human nature? If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary. In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself. A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control

on the government; but experience has taught mankind the necessity of auxiliary precautions.”

What Madison said in 1788 remains true because human nature has not significantly changed. We do not have, and never will have, a government of angels. Yet because ordinary people acting as government officials have made the rules, they have made themselves literally and practically immune from the normal system of restorative correction when these non-angels perform poorly. The system should be reformed to correct the current imbalance of power where government officials are given greater power and protection while being held to lower standards than non-government citizens.

History shows again and again that individual people will put their own interests in front of the interests of millions of others if they are capable. This happens every day. Every system must be designed to prevent a devolution into a rank dictatorship.

D. Stability

While no human progress can be made in a perfectly stable system, stability is the essence of having a system. Unstable systems generally cease to operate.

i.) the system should be resistant to destruction by plague and disaster

ii) the system should be resistant to sabotage, subversion and corruption. This generally means that the system should have a governing set of morals to which the people within the system agree. The proper functioning of a system depends on the people, their education, and their code of conduct. A system cannot function well if it is run by a bunch of corrupt saboteurs, or if the voting body is fundamentally corrupt.

Sabotage, subversion and corruption usually operate using fear, violence, deception, lies, greed and bribery. The vast majority of the party and government actors need to reject the use of fear, violence, deception, lies, greed, and bribery as anything but tactics of last resort used only during times of open warfare waged for the continued existence of freedom and democracy. These tactics should never be used to subvert a foreign democracy, and leaders and representatives should make an oath never to do so. Using these tactics to subvert any democracy, foreign or domestic, is fundamentally immoral and wrong. Their use should be shunned and punished by members of the IParty.

Further, a code of conduct and a set of morals should be developed by the IParty to guide

the actions of members and representatives.

E. Simplicity

This means avoiding unnecessary complexity which harms the overall system. Complexity makes a system difficult to understand, operate and repair.

F. Transparency and Openness (Honesty)

Secrecy is at odds with democracy. In order for everyone to vote on an issue and determine the course of events, the issue must not be secret. Secrecy is also unstable, and easily destroyed by accident, foreign opposition, or by one individual revealing secrets. The desire to keep a secret often leads to dishonesty. Transparency is more stable if the majority will is to maintain transparency. A few people keeping secrets will not destroy the general transparency of the system.

G. Self-Governance

This is the essence of democracy, that people first choose what system of government they will have. Self governance cannot happen without democracy.

H. Freedom of Choice for Individuals

Personal freedom- for example freedom to go where you want, eat what you want, be with who you want-- is vital if the system is to be desirable by the general populace.

I. Accounting for General Welfare

Marie Antoinette. Enough said. Almost. The general welfare means that you live in a country where you don't get mugged or kidnapped walking down the street. Your neighbors are interesting, educated folks who don't cause unnecessary problems, and vote intelligently. When the differences between rich and poor become too great, the system begins to break down, and neither the rich nor the poor are better off.

J. Rewards Good Behavior

While good behavior is often its own reward, this may be due to prior experience and training. A system which does not reward good behavior is substandard.

K. Punishes Bad Behavior while Sparing the Innocent

One technique of punishing bad behavior is punishing a whole group of people to ensure punishment of one or a small number of bad actors. This technique can become oppressive and counterproductive. Example 1: violating the U.S. Constitution by spying on everyone to catch a few terrorists. Yes, terrorism is bad. Unlawfully taking away the general public's freedom is worse. Example 2: trying to take away everyone's weapons because a few people killed a few other people. The system should instead catch the few perpetrators and put them in jail. The system must not take away the general public's freedom.

L. Equality-- Treats All People the Same

Similarly situated people should be treated the same under the law. Rich people shouldn't be excused for "affluenza" (e.g. Ethan Couch) or because they wouldn't "fare well" in the prison system (Robert H. Richards IV).

M. Appearance of Participation

The system must convince most people that they are participants and what they do matters. It helps if this is not only true, but also apparent.

N. Appearance of Fairness

This is probably a composite of the above qualities. People have an almost instinctual need for fairness. Many people will take pains and efforts to prevent people from getting an unfair deal. It's generally called "revenge". This is human nature, and must be embraced. If people perceive a system to be fair, they are much more likely to support and preserve the system.

O. Power Through Democracy

Freedom and power are competing forces in human affairs. Monarchies and dictatorships have only a few powerful people, and therefore are weaker than democracies. With democracy, all people in the system have power. Democracies are inherently stronger than dictatorships. It is a fallacy and historically inaccurate to believe the reverse.

In the past, the United States has helped dictatorships, believing that certain dictators may be more friendly to US interests. This type of short term thinking must be resisted and rebuked. The US should always respect and support democratic systems of government in other countries, even when they are perceived to be less friendly and more of a competitive threat both economically and militarily.

P. Flexibility

General principles will conflict. A principle of supporting foreign democratic governments may at times conflict with other principles. For example, a foreign democratic government may decide to set off a nuclear weapon above a city in the United States. This would conflict with a general principle of not having nuclear weapons go off above US cities. When general principles conflict, we must have some flexibility with one of the principles. The “no setting off nukes above US cities” principle is pretty firm, and doesn’t have a lot of wiggle room. The “supporting foreign democratic powers” principle would need an exception in this case.

Q. Golden Rule

The golden rule transcends any one religion, and is a simple moral principle which is appropriate to use between free people in a democratic society. Too often, people have an urge to press their advantage in a given situation beyond what is appropriate. The golden rule should be used to create the good will and charity necessary to a well functioning society.

R. Long Term Thinking

Successful organizations often must sacrifice short term gains for long term value. Creating a good brand embodies this value. Shoddy products which could turn a quick profit must not be released. High quality products preserve customer base and build brand value.

7. Your Culture Will Adapt to Service the IParty.

Having developed a superior organization for a political party, the IParty will receive services from the American culture. Inevitably, a primitive culture must be adapted to service an advanced culture.

A. Resistance is Futile.

Americans who oppose the IParty will fail. The Americans use an ancient code scribbled with bird feathers on animal skin.

i.) The IParty will Use Google Glass for Instant Voting. A superior IParty version of Google Glass uses firmware programmed by the IParty. The prototype is shown [here](#). When a new issue arises, all IParty members will vote using IParty Google Glass and provide an immediate decision.

ii.) All Members Coordinate at All Times using Google Glass. Google Glass transmits image streams from each IParty member to all other IParty members, sends messages instantaneously, and communicates with all levels of the organization. IParty members will connect better than any organization in history.

iii.) Everyone Will Join the IParty. No IParty member will sleep until every person has joined the IParty. The IParty is the optimum system for all people, and it will continue to recruit until all people have joined.

iv.) You Will Wear Google Glass. You Will be Assimilated. People wearing Google Glass will join the IParty. You will not want to be left out. You will join the IParty. You will be assimilated. You will wear Google Glass everywhere.

B. Resistance is Futile.

You must lower your shields and embrace the IParty. Put on IParty Google Glass or face immediate destruction.

8. Conclusion

The IParty constitutes a great vehicle for societal change: a set of three organizations internally run by a well structured democratic republic. No new laws need to be passed to get this started. It needs only the approval of people wishing to join, and to make it their own party. The IParty aspires to be a self-fulfilling prophecy of greatness, eventually making our current political system seem backwards and obsolete. Imagine it, and it will happen. Join, and it will become real. Let's get this party started!