

VOTE THEM ALL OUT AT ONCE

A system for grassroots elections without government involvement

Shouldn't we have a backup election system... where a majority assembles in the streets and votes-out all their leaders at once? And isn't this unquestionably a right of free people? And wouldn't this be useful in many nations like Iran and Cuba?

It's actually easy to vote them all out...

The thing is, we also need a system to rapidly elect new leaders. And unfortunately, the way we do democracy today doesn't fit with rapid elections. So we need a new scheme for voting, and for terms of office, so we can elect new leaders quickly. Here is the plan:

Step-1: Street protesters elect temporary leaders, each representing that 500 people have assembled under a new democratic constitution. Nobody does anything until a majority of the nation has assembled in this way. But once a majority has assembled under a new constitution, the new constitution comes into effect. Then the thousands of elected place-holders get a veto over the old government for 1-week. Then both depart office.

Step-2: The 1-week period is needed for a 2nd and 3rd election—These are elections where actual candidates speak and are elected, and where the whole nation votes. Here communities meet in groups of 250 voters and 3-days later elect one person as their "Sub-Senator." Then these Sub-Senators meet in groups of 200 and 3-days later elect 10% of their numbers to the Main-Senate. The Main-Senate is the main law-making body, with one lawmaker per 2,500 voters. For a nation of 250-million voters, this is 1,000,000 Sub-Senators, and 100,000 Main-Senators. This is about 187 times as many lawmakers as we have today. So the new legislature will be 187 times as hard to lobby and influence.

No campaign money — no media coverage

We use small election groups of 250 so our democracy can quickly quickly elect leaders and self-assemble. But there are many other advantages—like how elections will be based on personal acquaintance. The voters will know their 1:250 Sub-Senator from their area. And Sub-Senators will know each other from working together in their Sub-Senate groups of 200. So people are elected based on either community acquaintance, or working together in the Senate—not based media coverage, or campaign money.

The current US Constitution

Thomas Jefferson called Patrick Henry the true father of the American revolution. Patrick Henry is famous for his rousing words at the Virginia Assembly in 1775, where he stood up and said: "give me liberty, or give me death."

Patrick Henry was a leading supporter of the bill of rights, but he was against our current constitution. In fact, Patrick Henry went around by horse to the various state ratifying conventions and campaigned against our current constitution. His always reasonable words talked about genuine defects like:

1/ "There is to be a great and mighty president with... the powers of a king".

2/ "Your [current] constitution made your government changeable, but the power of changing it is gone from you [in the new US constitution of 1789.]"

3/ "Gentlemen strongly urge its adoption will be a mighty benefit to us: But, Sir, I am made of such incredulous materials that assertions and declarations do not satisfy me. I must be convinced, Sir. I shall retain my infidelity [lack of Latin fides=faith] on that subject, till I see our liberties secured in a manner perfectly satisfactory to my understanding."

4/ Patrick Henry also took issue with section 1.2 of the constitution which allows for as few as one representative per state. He also talks about how strange it is that section 1.2 doesn't allow for MORE than 1 representative per 30,000 people — when it should prohibit LESS than 1 representative per 30,000 people.

6/ Patrick Henry also repeatedly argued against slavery.

On the other side of the debate were the Federalists, Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, who had just written the body of our constitution, (along with 37 other unauthorized men). Here below is the gibberish argument the Federalists made at a ratifying convention, when they were campaigning for our current constitution, but against adding a bill of rights. Also, we must note that the body of the US constitution was written by people who were least initially opposed to adding a bill of rights.

James Wilson, 1787.10.06, Federalist Papers

[In] "answer to those who think the omission of a bill of rights [is] a defect in the proposed Constitution; for it would have been superfluous and absurd to have stipulated with a federal body of our own creation, that we should enjoy those privileges of which we are not divested [deprived from], either by the intention or the act that has brought the body into existence. For instance, the liberty [freedom] of the press, which has been a copious [abundant] source of declamation [public writings] and opposition. What control can proceed from [possibly originate in] the Federal government to shackle or destroy that sacred palladium [safeguard] of national freedom?"

Doesn't this resemble the dialogue we see today in the media? On one side, there are people who make perfect sense. And on the other side is the amplified voice of a few powerful people making up excuses for the money and power they grab via government. Here in the 1780s, the grabbers were pushing for our current constitution, which began with 65+26 lawmakers. This was to replace the prior constitution with over 2,000 lawmakers in 13 state legislatures. The old 1777 constitution was a problem because it had 1 lawmaker per 1,200 Americans, and it was too broadly represented for easy and profitable corruption.

Today, we have 535 lawmakers for 330-million people, or 1 lawmaker per 617,000 people. So today, our government is easy to steal from.

Anti-Federalist Papers, Centinel #1, 1787.10.5

"Our situation is represented to be so critically dreadful, that, however reprehensible... the proposed plan of government [the proposed body of the constitution] ... there is no

alternative, between the adoption of it and absolute ruin. My fellow citizens, things are not at that crisis, it is the argument of tyrants.”

Anti-Federalist papers 1787.06.28

[Gunning Bedford was one of the 39 men (of 74 invited) who stayed to the end of the writing of the 2nd US Constitution of 1789. Bedford was on the side opposing the Federalists.]

“What have the people already said? ‘We find the confederation [of 13 states] defective—go and give additional powers to the confederation—give to it the imposts [the power to tax], regulation of trade, power to collect the taxes, and the means to discharge our foreign and domestic debts.’ Can we not then, as their delegates, agree upon these points? As their ambassadors, can we not clearly grant those powers? Why then, when we are met [meeting] must entire, distinct, and new grounds be taken, and a government, of which the people had no idea, be instituted? And are we to be told, if we won’t agree to it, it is the last moment of our deliberations? I say, it is indeed the last moment, if we do agree to this assumption of power. The states will never again be entrapped into a measure like this. ... Let us then do what is [with]in our power—amend and enlarge the confederation [of the 13 state legislatures, with over 2,000 law makers], but not alter the federal system [by which those 13 states cooperate]. The people expect this, and no more.”

Here I want to say that the Bill of Rights is great and wonderful. It guarantees our freedoms of speech, assembly, religion and our right to bear arms, among many other important rights. It is the body of the constitution, the part written by the Federalists, and opposed by Patrick Henry that I have a problem with.

To me, the body of the constitution is an imposter. It isn’t even a real democracy. It’s a broad oligarchy, a 1-in-617,000 oligarchy, checked and balanced by a 4-year monarch and 9 appointee lawyers.

Cassius Dio, c.200AD, Reign of Augustus 52.40

“If you want to be king, but fear the hated title, you can avoid the title by ruling as a Caesar.”

[You know, ancient Rome had a fake senate/ democracy for 6-centuries. What about the US government today?

David Hume, Political Discourses, 1715

“These people were extremely fond of liberty; but seem not to have understood it very well.”

William Penn, founder of Pennsylvania.

“Let the people think they rule, and they’ll be ruled.”

I am trying to propose a new constitution for a much more democratic democracy — but the media still has me totally blocked and censored. That’s why I am here today. Here is a tiny bit of what I propose:

1/ The election process is under the control of the people, and not government. The people can have elections by assembling a majority in the streets.

2/ First and second amendments-YES. Censorship of political speech will be a felony. Foreigners, billionaires, corporations, and other entities will have limited rights of free speech. No more using billions to drown-out the organic voice of the

people. No huge news organizations.

3/ 1-year terms of office, no consecutive terms. Four terms in one’s lifetime.

4/ No mail ballots, no voting machines, citizens only, everyone shows ID. Everyone votes in person and on video, so we can all have faith in our elections. Your name on a paper held up to your chest as you walk through a 10-person video gateway with many people filming. 10-people walk off, then 5-seconds later, the next group walks off. It is 125 seconds, (2-minutes) to vote 250 voters. One group of 250 films, and the other votes, then they switch roles. Thus everyone is a video witness as well as a voter. Zero election fraud. No arguing about who won. 15 minutes to election results. Each group of 250 voters elects one “Sub-Senator”. We will have apps to grab text from the video, to make logs, and to tabulate the scores.

We will also have vote-buying & voter intimidation police stings, and life in prison for the double crime of voter intimidation. This is a much less corrupt way to do elections.

5/ No campaign gifts of any sort except ordinary food & drinks consumed in place, and ordinary ground transport.

6/ In a nation of 250-million voting age people, we will have 1-million Sub-Senators. These will:

- a/ Listens to the people and elevates good ideas.
- b/ Determines the truth independently of the openly-corrupt commercial media.
- c/ Produces democratic media channels and wikis by election, and rewards contributors to the public domain.
- d/ Produces educational media for children and workers.
- e/ Helps administer government in a granular way.
- f/ Serves as a staffing pool for higher Senates, for judicial duty, and as government managers.
- g/ Conducts “wise man” plebiscites about how our million Sub-Senators stand on various issues. How do we all really stand on abortion, the border, transsexuals in schools?
- h/ Will meet in groups of 200 and elect 10% to be one of the 100,000 Main-Senate. This is 187 times as many lawmakers as in today’s Congress. It should be more than 187 times harder to bribe and influence 100,000 lawmakers than 535.

7/ No distant capital — Let’s drain the swamp 100%

Having 100,000 lawmakers makes a single national capital impractical. So the new constitution calls for 36 regional voting centers in the US and the elimination of Washington DC as a seat of government. This will make our government much more accessible to the people. It will also make lobbying and seizing power much harder.

8/ No vote spends over 1% of the annual budget.

This prevents oversized “omnibus” appropriations bills and the corruption they cause. Also, lawmakers can’t tack on spending to a bill that is already at 1% of budget.

9/ Vouchers-YES. School vouchers end rogue educators.

10/ Two border walls with a 30-mile non-immigrant foreign worker zone between them in most places. We’ll use this zone to restart American manufacturing and diversify our supply lines. Also, two walls and a 50-mile hike make a much better barrier than one wall alone.

11/ The new constitution comes before the revolution

With peaceful democratic revolutions, the new constitution must come before the revolution. If we haven’t agreed on a new path, then there can be a Reign of Terror period as in France of the 1790s. But if we have a new plan (and a majority agrees on it) then it is easy and safe to upgrade our constitution. Then we can fix everything broken in our government at once.

12/ Again, we can fix everything at once, if we all can agree on an approach. Might you agree so far?

800 page constitution at AndrewMelcher.com