

A Short Treatise on Government by Lottery

by

Vaughn Klingenberg

Dedicated to Orwell's Brotherhood and their thankless task of exposing and combating the profoundly evil, quasi-Masonic--and racial and ethnic supremacist--proponents and practitioners of oligarchic collectivism and to the tens of millions of lives members of this tribe have mercilessly slaughtered and sacrificed for their benefit and entertainment in the 20th century alone.

*** You are encouraged to reproduce, distribute, and share this treatise with whomever you like. My only condition is that you give attribution to myself, Vaughn Klingenberg, as the author. ***

A Short Treatise on Government by Lottery.

"Democracy is the worst form of government, **except for all those other forms that have been tried.**"

-- Winston Churchill, from a House of Commons speech on November 11th, 1947.

His disciples came to him and asked: "When will the Kingdom [of Heaven] appear?"

Jesus answered: "It will not come by waiting for it..."

– **The Gospel of Thomas**

LOTTERYISM AS A POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Definition

Lotteryism is a form of government in which representatives are determined by random selection from virtually the whole of the adult population. In the United States, the most convenient method for drawing the names of representatives would be to use social security numbers which are typically assigned to newly born American citizens shortly after their birth. The most striking benefit that would result from such a form of government is that since literally almost anyone could become a representative in the People's Assembly (or unicameral Congress) it is in the interest of a lotteryist government to provide the maximum educational, social welfare, health and retirement benefits to the population as a whole. However, before I expostulate on government by lottery, I should first digress into a brief propaedeutic, namely, what are the philosophical underpinnings of the nature of man and how does that inform my exposition that a government by lottery can be successfully promulgated. For those less interested in preliminary philosophical exposition, you certainly may skip ahead.

PROPAEDEUTIC ON THE NATURE OF MAN

Plato, in his *magnum opus*, **The Republic**, looks to the nature of the soul of man as a microcosm of the various types of political institutions that, on a macrocosmic level, can be erected. Socrates, the protagonist in Plato's Dialogues, argues that the

human soul is tripartite. It is composed of the intellect (which should rule the soul), the spirited component (which should be combined with the intellect to promote the welfare of the soul via honorable impulses), and the appetitive component of the soul (which concerns the physical needs and desires of the soul). Looking at the composition of raw humanity, we may say that approximately 5% of the population are intellectuals, 15% of the population are motivated by spirited impulses such as honor and noble sentiments, and 80% of the population are fundamentally concerned with satisfying their physical, bodily, needs and wants. This being the case, Socrates goes on to argue that only when we have the soul's intellect ruling both the spirited and the appetitive components is a person fulfilling his proper human nature and his soul is in its proper harmony. As Socrates would say, "Virtue is its own reward," and we should not look outside of doing what is right for a reward for our good behavior. Having a perfectly harmonized soul is reward enough for the virtuous man or woman.

Now to tie this into our discussion of political philosophy, Socrates ultimately argues that in a truly well-run Greek city-state Philosopher-Kings (intellectuals guided by right reason) should rule with the assistance of Guardians (spirited, honorable, and noble protectors of the state and its citizenry) over the economic and business-centered class that focuses primarily on its physical wellbeing. Socrates goes through how a well-run Greek city-state can devolve from rule by Philosopher-Kings, to authoritarian rule (or monarchy), to oligarchic rule (or rule by a minority group such as a military junta), to democratic rule (or rule by the fluctuating whims of the rudderless, base majority). Socrates was certainly not a proponent of democracy because it represented an elevation of the unwashed "common (i.e., undisciplined and intellectually feeble) man" and his base, appetitive nature to rule over the human soul and render it disharmonious by inversion (i.e., the worst ruling over the best), and there is certainly merit in Socrates' critique of democracy as an allegedly praiseworthy or viable political institution worth emulating.

Now, to get to the point: how does this admittedly simple summary of Plato's advocacy of rule by Philosopher-Kings bear on this treatise on government by lottery? Simple: while the vast majority of the public today would bristle at the thought of rule by an unelected elite—even a meritocratic philosophical elite--does that mean that we are condemned to be ruled by mercenary, bootlicking, and quisling electors? (Forget for the moment that the simple fact of the matter is that a clandestine plutocratic oligarchic elite actually controls and runs this country today, a crypto-elite that employs politician-marionettes as their fronts and as public waterboys and watergirls who willingly carry out their marching orders in

exchange for 30 pieces of silver and favorable Media coverage so as to enable them to be re-elected to office.) Not necessarily. Instead of rule by a minority elite of right-thinking, selfless, and altruistic Philosopher-Kings, I dare to propose that we elevate the common men and women who are selected to serve in the People's Assembly to the status of Philosopher-Kings themselves. I sincerely believe that this is something we can do!!!

With the above in mind, and looking forward, as a prerequisite to serving in the People's Assembly the representatives selected will be required to complete a 90-day course in both Logic and Ethics. The course in Logic will concentrate, equally, on both informal and formal fallacies. The course in Ethics will enable the attendees to begin to systematize their thinking about what is right and what is wrong. Of course, the attendees—once they matriculate through each of these courses--would be paid a generous stipend to ensure they take these courses seriously. They should also realize the vital importance of this coursework as prefatory for their performance as true statesmen and women. Of course, taking two courses in philosophy will not, in itself, render the attendees as full-fledged Philosopher-Kings or Queens, but it will establish a noble goal for which they should all strive as they perform their duties as disinterested, thoughtful, and altruistic representatives of the population as a whole. They are to focus on what is in the best interests of the nation as a whole and eschew partisan, parochial, agendas. One other advantage of elevating ordinary men and women to the august role of determining what is in the best interests of the nation as a whole is that, by and large, they in all likelihood do not want to serve but will be compelled to serve either out of public duty or because of penalties for not serving. **The bottom line, the so-called "Prime Directive," is that we want in office disinterested representatives who do not necessarily want to be there!!!** (Even Socrates admits that these would be the very best statesmen!) This fact alone elevates government by lottery above all other forms of governance--including democracy!

CRITICISM OF OTHER FORMS OF GOVERNANCE (ESPECIALLY DEMOCRACY AND REPUBLICANISM)

With the exception of a pure democracy in which all citizens vote on all issues, all other major forms of governance are predicated on some form of minority rule, be it republicanism, monarchy, oligarchy, plutocracy, socialism, communism...etc. Since it is considered unwieldy in the modern age to have the whole population vote on literally every single issue that needs to be decided in a state, republicanism, or voting to elect representatives who then, in turn, act on

behalf of the electorate, is widely believed to be the very best alternative to democracy. Politicians and the Media like to conflate democracy with republicanism in order to legitimize the existing the latter; this is done to suggest to the voting public the notion that they have a *direct* say in government and government policy, and not that their influence on the politicians that represent them is filtered in any meaningful way. The Media will also play word tricks such as claiming we here in the United States live in a "representative democracy," but that is an oxymoron. Either we live in a democracy, or we live in a republic. We do not live in both at the same time. The phrase "representative democracy" is self-contradictory.

The important point I wish to emphasize here is that we in the United States simply do *not* live in a democracy. This fact is very important to acknowledge and is not of trivial import. There is no direct legitimization to the government that represents us were we to actually live in a true democracy—this in spite of what politicians and Media pundits want us to confusedly believe. The Establishment (and crypto-Establishment) dearly wants us to believe that our political system is legitimate in order that when "bad" legislation, legislation that is contrary to the best interests of the public at large (such as, for example, government enforced and individual taxpayer responsible privatized national health care such as the self-servingly misnamed "Affordable Health Care Act"), is enacted the confused public will swallow and resign themselves to accept that mendacious legislation since they voted for it through their "democratically elected representatives" [sic]. The self-serving misleading phrase "democratically elected representative" is yet another clever linguistic tool politicians and the Media employ to conflate democracy with republicanism. Once again, the voting electorate must believe that the government and its legislation are direct expressions of the will of the people (and certainly not the product of a plutocratic and influential oligarchic crypto-elite that hides in the shadows and yet dictates policy and legislation to quisling politicians who stand in front of the curtain) or the government might lose its legitimacy in the eyes of the public. Going forward I hope not to hear anyone in the public affirm anymore that we in the United States live in a "democracy" because we don't—we live in a republic, period, end of story! This is certainly not a distinction without a difference but an important conceptual division to keep in mind if we are truly to understand our present political footing. Even so, I would like to take a moment to critique democracy as a political philosophy to discredit once and for all that that superficially appealing political system, the system the powers-that-be so desperately want us to believe we are all a part of.

No one in their right mind would want to live in a pure democracy if he or she really thinks about it, and while it may be superficially appealing there are several theoretical and practical drawbacks to democracy which render it a very distant second when compared with lotteryism. To begin with some theoretical problems with pure democracy, many people proudly proclaim that in a democracy the majority rules and that is how it should be. No doubt they are warmed by the feeling that the constantly shifting aggregate that comprises the majority often also reflects their own attitudes. However, the statement, "In a democracy, the majority rules," contains at least some profound epistemological issues, ambiguity, and it also begs the question.

As for the epistemological issues, advocates of democracy do not take into consideration how the impressionable mass of humankind (which, as you will remember from my summary of Socrates' critique of democracy, is not led by reason but by their emotion and appetites), are very easily influenced to adopt certain beliefs, actions, or behaviors which are actually counterproductive to their best interests. For example, the Media collectively beat the drumbeat for war against Saddam Hussein's Iraq in order to punish that nation for 9/11; however, the simple fact of the matter is that Iraq had absolutely nothing to do with 9/11 but this fact was summarily ignored by our alleged "watchdog" Media. In fact, Osama bin Ladin, the unproven alleged mastermind of 9/11, even released a video right after 9/11 disavowing any responsibility for that horrific event, and the FBI never even listed bin Ladin in its Top 10 List of the Most Wanted Criminals. Nevertheless, the Establishment Media universally blamed bin Ladin for that tragedy and advocated targeting the nation of Iraq for retribution—even though Saddam Hussein and Osama bin Ladin were, in truth, enemies. The bottom line here is that democracy does not happen in a vacuum and the democratic electorate can very easily be manipulated—not just by the biased major news networks and their choices as to what to cover and how to "spin" coverage, but also by (biased and stacked) handpicked "expert" [sic] opinion-shaping tv and radio programs, by pro-Establishment, pro-*status quo*, conglomerate newspaper organizations, by ethnically influenced Hollywood movies, by social media (which often censors and deletes contrarian, anti-Establishment, opinion), by self-serving agitprop political action committees, and so on. Furthermore, these organs for the dissemination of dis-information, mis-information, and propaganda create and shape the very moral vocabulary of a nation. As Karl Marx astutely quipped, "The ruling ideas are the ideas of the ruling class," and the dominant terms of vilification and slander in the United States today are: "anti-Semite," "(neo-)Nazi," "Holocaust denier," "Hitler-lover," "White supremacist"...etc. Does a fish know that it swims in water? Does an ordinary, unself-critical, person know that he has been subtly indoctrinated into

a self-serving system of pro-Establishment--and pro-crypto-Establishment--moral values?! I doubt it.

As for ambiguity and begging the question, to say that "in a democracy the majority rules" is to espouse an empty concept. By definition whoever has the most votes is in the majority so the majority can never not rule. The word "democracy" includes within it the notion of majority rule. Moreover, pure democracy at base is guilty of a couple of informal fallacies of logic: first, it is guilty of *Argumentum ad Populum*, or appeal to the crowd, to legitimize its authority. Because everyone accepts the majority view, you should also. No distinction is made concerning whether the majority view is arrived at thoughtfully, rationally and critically or not. It is what it is, namely, the popular opinion and should be supported for that reason alone--that it is popular. In sum, legislation in a democracy is a mere popularity contest. Second, pure democracy is guilty of the informal fallacy of logic termed *Argumentum ad Baculum*, or appeal to force. The legislation approved in a democracy is buttressed by sheer force of numbers, not by critical intellectual persuasiveness. In other words, it is not right that matters but raw numerical superiority—brute force--that determines successful legislation. In a pure democracy there is no stipulation that the voters be judicious or critical thinkers. All that is required is that they cast their vote, willy-nilly whether that vote is cast by a Socrates or a cognitively challenged individual. Such distinctions would be bigoted and elitist we would be told. All opinions are equally valid so it would be wrong to discriminate. Speaking for myself, I prefer Thoreau's espoused definition of the proper form of majority rule, namely (to paraphrase), anyone more right than the majority is--by himself *and alone*--a majority of one!!! (Now that is a version of [righteous] democracy that I *could* support!!!)

As for some practical drawbacks to pure democracy, the problems are legion. To give some concrete examples: say the majority voted in favor of a bill which designated all non-Jews (or non-Islamists, or non-Christians) as sub-human and no better than animals and that they could be—nay, should be—genocided without remorse and their property confiscated; if the majority approved that bill it would then become a law of the land. Or, to take another example, say the democratic majority ruled that it was advisable for Jews (or Moslems, or Christians) to take a yearly anti-vow which enabled them to break any and all vows they might make to non-Jews (or non-Moslem, or non-Christian) in the *upcoming* year and that they should lie about this should anyone uncover this anti-vow, then that too would become a law of the land. So, you can easily see from the *reductio ad*

absurdum examples I have given the transparent foolishness of naïvely champion democracy as the best, or even the least worst, form of governance.

Of course, here in the United States we do *not* live in a democracy—we live in a republic. We vote on whom to have as our elected representatives, but this is certainly not much of an improvement over democracy. In fact, one could easily argue that republicanism as practiced in the United States is even worse than democracy and let me tell you why. Here in the United States, we have a political duo-opoly. The irrevocably entrenched Establishment political parties are the Democrats and the Republicans, and they both conspire, along with the Media, to ensure that no upstart third party gets a toehold in the political establishment. Nowhere in the US Constitution is there any mention of political parties. These are something unique and unanticipated by the Constitution, and we are all the worse for it.

The established political parties act as filters to office. A would-be officeholder must go-along to get ahead. In other words, he or she must get an endorsement from either of the two Establishment political parties if they wish to have any hope of being elected to office. But an endorsement is only given to those candidates who are willing to strictly adhere to the particular party-line of the political organization in question and those who will unashamedly advocate for the influential plutocratic oligarchic donors that grease the wheels of the respective political machine with their campaign contributions (read: legalized bribery) and pervasive influence over the Establishment Media. Since political parties can only advance their parochial agenda if they are in the majority, their primary interest is not advocating for or doing what is best for the public at large but in raw numerical power. Hence, the importance of primary fidelity to the party and not to the public interest when it comes to their ultimate goal of first securing power. The centuries-old political ethic of rewarding your friends and punishing your enemies is alive and well in our current, highly polarized, partisan legislature. Forget what is right for the nation as a whole. One's political enemies must first be humiliated and defeated. Power must be consolidated. Only *after* that can the needs of the commonwealth be addressed. This deplorable--though historically commonplace--state of affairs simply has to change and be summarily rejected once and for all!

From a public relations point of view, republicanism is a Godsend for the ruling plutocratic oligarchic elite. Behind the public facade of a form of governance in which, purportedly, "anyone can be elected to the Presidency let alone lower office," the actual oligarchic powerbrokers can go about their job of deciding who from the two major political parties will be put forth as the only viable, serious,

candidates from which the public has to choose. The public is indoctrinated into believing that it is their civic duty to vote to determine who their representatives will be. If they do not vote, then they are responsible for the flawed politicians who assume office. However, the real reason the Establishment is eager to have the public vote in republican elections is that by doing so they thereby validate the thoroughly corrupt and compromised political system now in place. The domestic voting-eligible population is told that the system is legitimate because, even if someone is not interested in holding office, they can at least influence the composition of the legislature by casting their vote as to whom is to represent them. And if it turns out that that representative is no good, then he or she can be voted out of office at the next election or impeached. The public is told that there are "checks and balances" built into the current republican system of governance to prevent it from being abused, forget the fact that the pre-determined, Establishment-vetted and oligarchic-approved bootlicking quisling candidates are presented to the voting public as the only serious options the voters have to choose between so in actuality the electorate is really only given the option of rubber-stamping, *pro forma*, which of two insignificantly different candidates they wish to have to nominally represent them. In fact, given these truths, I would argue that it is immoral—yes, immoral—to vote in contemporary American republican elections because you are really only validating the kakistocracy that results. Doesn't anyone find it odd that political candidates will spend millions upon millions of dollars for an office that only pays a few hundred thousand dollars a year?! But even here this is deliberate. Elections are deliberately prohibitively expensive so as to allow well-funded monied interests to determine who the candidates will be. Best of all for the oligarchic ruling class is to have Establishment political candidates who have "skeletons in their closet"; this way, via blackmail or the threat of blackmail, the candidates are coerced into championing the agenda of the ruling oligarchic elite; if they don't do what they are told, a politician's "dirty laundry" can coyly and calculatedly be leaked to a readily compliant and subservient Media in order to destroy that politician's political career or even land him or her in jail, and all the politicians know this.

In schools and in the Media the electorate is indoctrinated into believing that the government does *their* will (and not the will of the actual ruling oligarchic elite). The public is told that "anyone can be elected President" and that "bad" representatives can be voted out of office or impeached so there are checks on political power. And even if one is not interested in seeking office, they are led to believe that they can at least influence the political make-up of government by voting in (rubber-stamp) elections...etc. Voting is promoted to the public as a civic duty, but the fact of the matter is that that is only really promoted in order to have

the public legitimize the corrupt political system that is in place and in order to be able to have the voters blame themselves—not the oligarchic crypto-Establishment—for the deplorable, anti-commonwealth, legislation often passed by the republican congress. Republicanism in the United States encourages the electorate to internalize blame for the corruption and short-comings of the established political order—after all, they voted for the politicians now in office. The public is directed to look only at the formal structure of representative governance; they are discouraged to look deeper into the more important material sub-structure of the persons and entities who *really* rule, who *really* "call the shots," in the U.S. (all the while hiding behind the convenient republican facade of popular governance).

And just when you thought it could not be worse, it is! The oligarchic persons and entities who are in absolute control here in the United States have established a "vicious circle" of financing to reinforce and guarantee their continued hold onto power in perpetuity. What I mean by that is the apolitical oligarchic establishment via legalized bribery (i.e., generous campaign contributions) creates a beholden obligation on the part to the recipient politician, in return, the beholden politician rewards the oligarchs with favorable financial legislation; in turn, the oligarchic establishment uses some of the favorable financial benefits so accrued to reward the beholden politician with even greater campaign contributions...and so on and so on and the vicious cycle is reinforced and continues. The most obvious example of this has to do with the Jewish lobby and their monothematic and rabid support of the Jewish state of Israel. The American Israel Public Affairs Committee (and other pro-Zionist organizations AIPAC coordinates their lobbying with) lavishes generous election and reelection campaign support to compliant politicians; in turn, these bought and paid for compromised politicians vote massive economic and military foreign aid grants (i.e., many billions of dollars per year) to Jewish Israel. In turn, some of this money is recycled back to the U.S, as campaign contributions to the very same quisling politicians who authorized the *carte blanche* grant subsidies to Jewish Israel in the first place. Ultimately, American and Israeli Jews are using American taxpayer money to bribe our own politicians to bankroll foreign aid grants to Israel to the tune of billions and billions of dollars each year. It's completely dishonest, of course, but brilliant!!! No wonder it is very rare indeed for a President or congressperson to buck the system and actually stand up to Israel. Our politicians, desperate to stay in office and always deliberately kept financially insecure when it comes to financing their re-election campaigns, are actually "politiciantitutes"—political whores at the service of their paymasters. Since it cost (in 2018 dollars) candidates for the Senate \$15,700,000.00 to win their seats and Representatives \$2,000,000.00 to win their

seats; no wonder we have the worst government money can buy—and 2018 was an off-year election; the cost would certainly be higher in years when it is a Presidential election year!

Of course, I can hear someone object that there are rules and limitations on PAC donations, and in one sense that is true. But AIPAC is *not* a "Political Action Committee" which does have numerous rules and regulations regarding how they are to collect, distribute, and report campaign contributions. AIPAC is a "**Public Affairs** Committee," and this designation allows them to collect money from abroad (e.g., Israel) and they do **not** have to disclose who their contributors are!!! AIPAC, through slight-of-hand with their initials, wants you to believe that they are regulated and overseen just as Political Action Committees are, but that is simply not true, and of course our alleged "watchdog" Media, which is largely Jewish owned and controlled, is not about to inform the public of this subterfuge.

Finally, the most important criticism of American republicanism is that the government and legislature are not demographically representative of the population of the United States. For example, the persons sent to Congress are not, as a group, typically American. Over 80% of congresspersons are white, middle- and senior aged males, and while many certainly were wealthy before assuming office, they make, **as an individual**, a salary around 2.3 times the earnings of your typical American **family**. Senators and Representatives earn a base salary of \$174,000 per year. On top of that, 72% of their health care premiums are covered by a federal subsidy and, when they retire, they can qualify for lifetime health insurance covered by the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. Last of all, after 5 years of service and upon reaching the age of 62, they can receive a pension up to 80% of their salary as a working congressperson. Compare this with the average annual **family** (not individual) income in 2023 of \$75,000.

Moreover, the term "representative" in the current political system is deliberately ambiguous. Is it the job of "representatives" to function as mere conduits who promote the programs and goals of the constituencies that elected them, or is their function to decide, independently, what is best for the nation as a whole—regardless of their constituencies--because of their perspicacious intellect, independence of mind, and leisure time to investigate all sides of an issue before rendering their well-considered, well-reasoned, vote in congress? On important issues, the former function, unfortunately, is classically exercised. Only on those rare issues in which special interests have little interest do "representatives" have the opportunity to exercise their decision-making intellect.

Not surprisingly, it is very difficult to uncover the average wealth of sitting congresspersons. The most recent, admittedly low-ball, estimate of the average wealth of Senators and Representatives in 2011 (the most recent data on this I could find on this on the internet) was a whopping \$7,900,000.00, and this does not include the value of their residences which they do not have to declare. No, our plutocratic congress is not at all representative—especially financially—when compared with the 2011 median net worth of the average American, a paltry \$69,000.00, and this is, I believe, the most serious shortcoming of American republican government. How sympathetic is a multi-millionaire Senator or Representative going to be to someone classified as poor and who only makes, at most, \$28,000 per year in income! Income and wealth often determine ideology and worldview and that is so much the worse for the economically disenfranchised who currently have no seat at the table of American government. The Congress is certainly **NOT** demographically representative of the population of the United States as a whole, especially when it comes to wealth and income. The word "representative," when speaking of our congresspeople, in the current political context is both deliberately ambiguous and painfully ironic.

AN OUTLINE OF A VIABLE AND TRULY BENEFICIAL AND BENEVOLENT GOVERNMENTAL INSTITUTION: GOVERNMENT BY LOTTERY.

Now that we have dispensed with democracy and republicanism as satisfactory systems of governance, we can now turn to what form of governance should replace them, namely, government by lottery. Employing a lottery as a method for selecting representatives is as old as democracy itself. In ancient Greece, qualified lotteries were sometimes used to select governmental committees as well as juries, so the idea of lotteryism as a form of governance is as old as civilization itself.

Selecting Lotteryist Representatives

I have already proposed that in the United States we could use Social Security Numbers as the pool from which to select representatives to the Lotteryist People's Assembly (or Congress). However, not everyone with a Social Security Number would be eligible to assume office in a lotteryist government. Only full-fledged United States citizens, not provisional or, of course, non-citizens, would be eligible to serve. As for who would be considered a full-fledged United States citizen, he or she would have to have been born into a family in which at least one of the

parents is a full citizen. The current criterion for United States citizenship, namely, anyone who happens to have been born in the territory of the United States is thereby officially granted U.S. citizen, will have to be replaced. The current criterion is grossly abused today with pregnant illegal aliens crossing the border into the United States in order to have their newborn granted full American citizenship at birth; the illegal alien parents then use the newborn (who now has full American citizenship) as an "anchor" to dishonestly facilitate their own candidacy for American citizenship. This "loophole" certainly needs to be closed, and it needs to be made illegal to "game the system" in this fashion.

As for other exclusions to serving in a lotteryist government, the representatives should be over the legally defined age of adulthood. (I myself would like to see legal adulthood defined as all those who have reached the age of 21.) The representatives should not be currently incarcerated, nor should they be deemed violently disruptive or physically endangering to the other representatives. Furthermore, anyone with dual citizenship—be it *de facto* or *de jure*—should be excluded from office in a lotteryist government. All of the representatives should be concerned solely with what is in the best interests of the nation itself; there should not be any hint of potential divided loyalty among the representatives. Finally, each and every member of secret societies--the Freemasons, B'nai B'rith...etc.--should be identified, these societies closed, and its members prohibited from serving in any government position. Everyone else, including the mentally or physically challenged, should be subject to serve in the national assembly.

Geographical or Open Lottery.

Members to the People's Assembly could be selected according to a regional or open basis. According to a regional based lottery, members to the national assembly would be selected from various geographical areas. This would ensure that there would be a degree of geographical distribution to the assembly representatives. On the other hand, according to an open lottery, the representatives would be selected from the nation at large, regardless of geographical distribution. I strongly favor an open lottery as a means of guarding against parochialism, in this case geographical parochialism. The members of the People's Assembly should have the best interests of the nation as a whole in front of their minds when they decide on legislation. They should not feel obligated to advance or protect any particular region of the country. The ultimate goal with

respect to the lotteryist representative's worldview is that they be stripped of *any* parochial interests *whatsoever*.

The Legislative Pillar of Government and the Supplemental Judicial and Executive Departments.

The unicameral People's (legislative) Assembly is the primary governmental institution, and the Judicial and Executive Departments are supportive, but equally secondary, institutions. As for the total number of Representatives in the Assembly, I believe a workable number would be 300, with 100 veteran Representatives being retired and exchanged with 100 new Representatives each year. The term of public service for a Representative would therefore be three years.

The Assembly could be organized in a variety of ways, but one viable option might be to divide the representatives into a set number of committees. Some committees might include Education, Health & Welfare, Trade, Foreign Affairs, the Military, Banking/Finance/and the Economy...etc. If the national assembly was comprised of 300 members and there were 10 committees, then each committee would have of course 30 members. A Chairperson and two Assistant Chairpersons would be drawn by lot from veteran third-year Representatives to run a committee administratively. A new Chairperson and Assistant Chairpersons would be selected on a trimester basis each year in order to avoid Chairpersons becoming unduly entrenched.

Given the potential heavy volume of work placed on the members of the Assembly, it seems to me advisable to have the Committees function as loose filters to minimally vet legislation. With that in mind, I see the legislative process in a lotteryist assembly as follows: one, any Representative may introduce legislation; two, the relevant committee will hold hearings on the merits and demerits of the proposed legislation. Part of this process will include having carefully vetted "experts" testify before the relevant committee. (More about this in due course.) Once the testimony and information-gathering are complete, the committee will vote on whether or not to advance the legislation to the full Assembly for a final vote. It will take a vote of at least 51% of the committee members to advance the legislation to the full assembly. Then, three, for that legislation to become law, 2/3's of the full assembly will have to approve the legislation. Once a piece of legislation is approved, it will then be enforced, say, 90 or 180 days after it passes in the full assembly. Fulsome debate will be

encouraged in the assembly—both in the committees and in the full assembly itself—but filibustering will not be permitted. As for a declaration of war (or any other military operation foreign or domestic), only the unicameral Assembly can authorize such, but it would also require a 2/3's majority of the full assembly for full, legal, authorization.

Budgeting, Finance, and Auditing.

Funding for the government and its programs would be collected by non-income taxes. This would include taxes on businesses, tariffs, user taxes, property taxes, and possibly sales taxes (in which food and clothing would be exempted). The People's Assembly will determine the budget for each of the individual committees which initially adjudicate the proposed distribution of funds. After the relevant committee settles on proposed funding for various projects, the People's Assembly will still have to approve the proposed funding with a 2/3s majority vote. To prevent wide and erratic fluctuations in spending and to ensure the relatively seamless continuity of budgeting, the proposed transfer of funds between committees will be capped at 10% of the previous year's budget. Finally, the complete budget and financing of the government will be audited in full every three years; this will be mandatory.

Mandatory Cap on Income/Wealth and a Cap on Earned Income.

In the lotteryist commonwealth great disparities of wealth and income should be prohibited. Therefore, I strongly recommend that income and wealth be capped at 10 million dollars per individual, 20 million dollars per married couple, with an additional \$100,000 additional per child. No one needs more than this. So, for example, a married couple with three children would have their income and wealth capped at \$20,300,000. Since I also insist that the currency be *fully* backed either by gold, silver, precious metals, or commodities (or a combination of these), inflation should be a thing of the past. Finally, once again to prohibit great disparities of income, the very highest income that an executive in a company or corporation may earn should be capped at 20x the income of the very lowest paid employee of that business. So, for example, if the lowest paid employee earns \$10.00 an hour, then the highest paid employee can earn no more than \$200.00 per hour. No longer will executives be allowed to issue "golden parachutes" to dismissed or downsized CEOs and no longer will they be able to reciprocally reward fellow executives with discretionary unilateral high pay or stock

options. Any income or wealth over the cap may be distributed to shareholders, employed to raise the wages of employees, reduce the cost of the product or service offered to the public, or turned over to support the financing of government programs.

Limitations to Debate and the Vetting of "Experts."

Absolute free speech will not only be permitted but encouraged and guaranteed in the People's Assembly. No speech will be forbidden, regardless of even if some in the Assembly find the speech offensive. No one in the Assembly can be censured, impeached, fined, or jailed for *anything* they say in the Assembly.

When it comes to soliciting "experts" to testify for or against a particular piece of legislation, anyone who testifies before the Assembly *must, beforehand, have a* complete dossier composed on him or her. This dossier will include their education, personal data (family history, ethnic and religious background, membership in *any* societies—especially exclusive esoteric secret societies such as the Freemasons or B'nai B'rith--published works, political orientation, any personal, group, professional, or financial interest they might have in the pending legislation, their relationship to the representative who invited him or her to speak before the Assembly...etc.), and any other pertinent and salient factors pertaining to their reputed expertise. This dossier will be published on the Assembly webpage *before* the "expert" testifies so the Assemblypersons, and the public, can also evaluate his or her credentials. Moreover, an "expert" may only appear before the Assembly—be it before a committee or before the full Assembly--once a year. This is to ensure a wide variety of expert opinion is available to the Assembly. Finally, it should be noted that *absolutely all* People's Assembly sessions—whether committee sessions or the meeting of the full assembly—will be fully televised and recorded. Any unofficial or clandestine meetings between Representatives to discuss pending legislation will be subject to severe penalties such as a public reprimand and a financial penalty for the first offense. A second offense should result in their removal from office and criminal prosecution.

Term of Service

As previously noted, service in the People's Assembly would be for a three-year term with a third of the assembly members being exchanged, new members for old, each year.

The Salary for Lotteryist Public Servants.

The salary for service in the People's Assembly would equal the average annual national income for an average family. If a person selected to be a Representative earns more than the average annual national income for a family, he or she will still only earn the annual national income for an average family but the lotteryist government will guarantee that once his or her time in office is complete that he or she will not lose their pre-Representative economic level or status; in other words, their income and wealth will be guaranteed to be on par with what they would have had if they had not served in the Assembly. As for housing and transportation costs, these will be provided by the state to the Representative and his or her family, especially since the location of the People's Assembly office building should rotate among cities every 10 years or so.

The Penalty for Refusing to Serve as a Lotteryist Representative.

There would be a penalty of 10% of a person's yearly income and/or wealth for three years (the period of time they would have served in office) should someone refuse to serve in the People's Assembly.

The Criterion for Rendering a Lotteryist Drawing Invalid.

The only criterion for rendering a lotteryist drawing of People's Assembly Representatives would be economic. If the selection of the members of the People's Assembly are not demographically *economically* representative of the population as a whole, +/- 5%, the drawing would be invalid and a new drawing would have to take place until this criterion is met.

It is inevitable that some groups that feel that because they have experienced a history of mistreatment and discrimination would want special classes created to guarantee their voice in the legislature. Some of the groups that may want special, guaranteed, precise set-aside demographic quotas could include minorities, religious groups, gender, ethnic or racial groups, the disabled, members of a particular sexual orientation...etc. Be that as it may, I strongly urge that *solely* an economic criterion be used as the only principle for invalidating a lottery selection drawing. Stipulating that special groups or classes of people be guaranteed a

minimum number of seats in the Assembly will only serve to sow divisions both within and outside of the legislature. Once again, the **prime directive** of the representatives selected for office in a lotteryist government is that they are **completely** (as much as is feasibly possible) disinterested in the legislation they are adjudicating and that they have **absolutely** no partisan, parochial, interests. Lotteryist representatives must be **relentlessly reminded** not to succumb to partisanship or being an apologist for special interests, and this includes favoring persons based on race, religion, ethnicity, creed, sexual orientation...etc. Instead, not what divides us but what **unites** us—namely, our bedrock common humanity—needs to be repeatedly emphasized to both the representatives as well as the general public. Dividing the Assembly into pockets of self-seeking partisan advocates each with their own parochial agendas would be completely counter-productive to the spirit of the People's Assembly. Instead, **the communality of what unites us all as human beings should be emphasized**. As Shakespeare aptly puts it, "One touch of nature makes the whole world kin!" Our common humanity needs to be tirelessly promoted to both legislators as well as to the general public itself and there should be frequent public service announcements—on tv, radio, newspapers, billboards, social media...etc.--championing this noble and praiseworthy attitude for the public to emulate.

A Bill of Rights.

There should also be enshrined in this lotteryist constitution a guaranteed set of inalienable rights to protect the public from any potential over-reach on the part of the lotteryist assembly. Some of these rights should include the following (not in any particular order):

One, freedom of speech and the right to dissent. So-called "hate crime" laws or laws to protect special groups or special interests are prohibited. Only calls advocating actual **physical** violence should be prohibited.

Two, the right of **habeas corpus**, including the right to a speedy and fair public trial in which the accused can face **every one** of his accusers in open court; there is to be absolutely no private or clandestine prosecutions, especially ones which employ secret testimony or evidence, and this includes claims of so-called "national security" exemptions--that will not be allowed and all of these rights should be guaranteed.

Three, the right to protection from excessive bail or cruel and unusual punishment, This includes prohibiting "double jeopardy," namely, being charged and prosecuted more than once for the same crime, and the absolute guarantee that all citizens are absolutely equal before the law.

Four, the right to privacy. The government, as well as non-governmental entities, are prohibited from gathering, collecting, and storing information on individuals without good reason *and* due process (i.e., vetted by at least *two* judges). This prohibition would include patenting personal collected medical data and the collection of information for marketing purposes on behalf of businesses...etc. Citizens would have the right to petition the government to learn what information on them has been collected and stored. Only current criminal investigations would be exempt, and once the criminal investigation is complete the person, group, or entity that had been investigated has the right to know the reason for the investigation and what specific information had been gathered on them regarding this. The requested information should be provided to the interested party/parties within 90 days of the submission for the request for information.

Five, the powers not explicitly granted to the federal lotteryist assembly are reserved for the states or the people.

Six, the government itself will regulate and print money; it is not to be delegated to a non-government institution (such as is currently the case with the Federal Reserve). Furthermore, the currency issued by the government is to be backed 100% by collateral be it gold, silver, precious metals, commodities....etc. or a combination of collateral. Fractional reserve or fiat currency is to be prohibited.

Seven, all citizens will be guaranteed national health care, and this will include provision for food and shelter for the destitute, abandoned, mentally or physically ill, and homeless. Citizens may also purchase supplemental private health care policies if they so wish.

Eight, once an individual reaches the stipulated legal Age of Retirement, they will be eligible to receive social security benefits that is equal to, say, 75% of the average earned income of the average existing current wage-earner. The point is to have retired seniors able to survive, moderately comfortably, on social security retirement benefits alone.

Nine with respect to education, students will be placed in the grade appropriate to their academic and scholastic abilities, not according to their age. This will be determined by standardized tests. Students will not be required to be in school, and if they do drop out, they can always apply for re-admission. Moreover, all students—regardless of income—who are in the top 25% of their graduating class will be guaranteed admission and full financial support to cover the cost of their higher, post-high school, education. This benefit will apply to both university, college, and trade school admission.

Other rights may be added to this proposed list of guaranteed rights as the Lotteryist People's Assembly so decides.

The Ombudsman Unit.

In order to ensure corruption, bribery, parochialism...etc. does not corrupt the lotteryist government, a special Ombudsman Unit will be established for this end. The Ombudsman Unit will regularly set up sting operations in order to keep government officials honest. This unit will see if government officials can be entrapped. All government officials (especially police officers) will be made aware of the Ombudsman Unit so they cannot claim ignorance if entrapped. Government officials should report all attempts at influencing them to the Ombudsman Unit. The Ombudsman Unit will set up sting operations for the Assembly as well as for the executive and judicial departments of government. All sting operations will be videotaped and recorded. Officials, after a trial and if found guilty of corruption in a sting operation, will be expelled from their government position and criminally prosecuted. Members of the Ombudsman Unit will only serve a one-year term in order to prevent institutional bias.

Mandatory Service to the State.

Going forward, all citizens, once they reach the age of 18, will be required to serve at least one year in service to the commonwealth. These citizens will have the choice to serve in police units, as social workers, as medical assistants, as public works employees...etc. All those choosing to do their mandatory service in the military will be required to serve a minimum of two years; in exchange for serving more than one year they will be granted a bonus of, say, \$10,000 upon completing their two-year term of service. The pay for mandatory service to the state will be 50% of the average annual income of the average employed person.

Some of the Legislative Changes I would expect to see once a Lotteryist Government is in Place.

I would expect to see some of the following legislative changes once a lotteryist government is established:

One, national health care, robustly funded, for every citizen regardless of income.

Two, social security retirement benefits on which seniors may live moderately comfortably so they don't necessarily have to save for their old age. As suggested, this benefit might be 75% of the average income of the average working individual. Of course, people may certainly establish retirement accounts so as to have additional money for their retirement.

Three, wealth will be capped at 10 million dollars per individual and 15 million dollars per family. The purpose behind this of course is to prevent the consolidation of wealth in a class of the uber-wealthy.

Four, corporate and company income for the top CEOs and Board of Directors will be capped at 20 times the pay of the lowest wage of the lowest level employee of that business. So, for example, if the lowest paid employee in a corporation earns \$10.00 per hour, then the top wage/salary for the Chief Executive would be capped at \$200.00 per hour. "Golden parachutes" for executives and stock options would be prohibited unless they are also provided to all of the employees of that business.

Five, the virtues of education for all will be promoted, especially since anyone above the age of majority could theoretically serve in government. However, education will not be mandatory—only students who want to be in school should be in school--and grade level will be determined by academic ability and not by age. Consequently, primary and secondary students will take annual tests at the end of each academic year to determine which grade level they will be placed in the following year. Drop-outs will be permitted to be re-admitted to primary or secondary school, but they must petition a school to be re-admitted. Critical thinking will be promoted and emphasized and not mere rote memorization. Consequently, courses in logic and ethics will be made mandatory for all secondary students (ideally beginning in their freshman year in high school).

Prohibitions on the "Fourth Estate."

Since the Media certainly can unduly frame issues—e.g., by limiting the parameters to "legitimate" debate--as well as promote parochial, self-serving, special interests, it needs to be tightly regulated to prevent this from happening. For this reason, only public networks should broadcast news and opinion programs, not private corporations or companies. To ensure a very broad and all-encompassing range of opinion, I would strongly recommend that *all* news and opinion programs also be very closely monitored by a *truly* independent watchdog agency of government. This agency will regularly publish, every three months, an analysis of the coverage of news and opinion in the public broadcast media and of course this should be made readily and easily available to the public. Broadcast news must cover *truly* important national issues, such as important legislation, and not, for example, "fluff pieces" such as covering a house burning or the antics of a celebrity. Opinion programs must present the most diverse range of ideas possible, and no opinion should be shown any favoritism, for example, less popular or unfamiliar opinions should also be aired in prime time. There simply must be true balance to the programing of opinion shows, and there must be balanced rotation to the scheduling of such programming. For example, Holocaust revisionism should get equal time along with orthodox Holocaust advocacy. Absolutely nothing should be off-limits or sacrosanct, nothing should be immune from criticism. Furthermore, the persons who appear on opinion programs should be limited to one appearance per year and their biography, and potential biases, should be published and accessible to all. Finally, there should be public service declarations or announcements before all news and opinion broadcasts alerting the viewing public that *all* such programs are inherently biased to at least some degree and that the viewers or listeners need to take that into account.

Social media (such as Google, YouTube, or Facebook...etc.) must not be owned or run as private businesses and they should be prohibited from censoring allegedly "harmful" content. Nor should such media show favoritism by, for example, promoting some internet listings over others. Social media must be truly open and democratic.

As for Hollywood and the entertainment industry, these institutions must also not be owned or run as private businesses. Currently there is a pronounced ethnic and racial bias to the ownership, management, and control of Hollywood and the entertainment industry (not to mention the news and opinion industry), something which—along with the parochial control of news and opinion programming—I

consider the most salient and dangerous threat to contemporary national security. The public needs to be made aware of this historical bias and the absolute need to rectify this pronounced historical demographic bias. Instead, video, film, and entertainment need to be regulated by a rotating board of media overseers in order to prevent these mediums from being used for parochial, self-serving, propagandistic purposes, be this done overtly or—especially--covertly.

The Judicial Department of Government

Once again, the Judicial Department is secondary and subservient to the unicameral People's Assembly. Ideally, the judicial practice of *stare decisis* would be replaced by complete codification of the law so legal decisions would be based on statute, as promulgated by the People's Assembly, and not according to the vicissitudes of who is named to a higher court. While a *writ of certiorari* would be allowed and an appeal for judicial review by a higher court would be permitted, there would not be a Supreme Court filled with political appointees to be the final arbiter of judicial decisions.

As for judgeships, one will have to have served as a lawyer for five years as a prerequisite, and then from the pool of said lawyers a lottery would be done to determine lower-level judges. These lower-level judges would serve for a period of three years and then from that pool appellate judges, in turn, would be selected by lottery and serve as appellate judges for a period of two years after which they would be retired from being judges and may return to the practice of being lawyers. Of course, even though these judges are selected by lottery, still their detailed biography should be published and available to the general public. Judges who demonstrate a pattern of not complying with the statutes as promulgated by the People's Assembly may for that reason be impeached and removed from office.

The Executive Department of Government

The Executive Department that enforces the law is also secondary and subservient to the unicameral People's Assembly. The Office of President would be disbanded if for no other reason than because it places too much power and influence in the hands of a single individual.

The objective of members of the Executive Department is to fully and unreservedly enforce the laws as promulgated by the Assembly. They may not

pick and choose which laws to enforce and which laws to soft-pedal when it comes to enforcement. Both the letter and the spirit of the laws are to be enforced.

Since authoritarian personality types are drawn to police work, the Executive Department must be on guard against this. With that in mind, it may be a good idea to have frontline police officers drawn, by lottery, from the pool of candidates subject to mandatory service to the state. These frontline police officers would serve for one year. As for the upper ranks of police administration, psychologically vetted candidates from the original pool of those serving in the police force for one year as a part of their mandatory service to the state would be eligible. These individuals can thereby form the lower and middle ranks of police officers and detectives. Nevertheless, the very top administrative positions should be held by qualified, non-rank-and-file police, civilians. These civilian heads of the Executive Department may be drawn from the pool of lawyers who have a minimum of five years of criminal trial experience and their term should be limited to three years. As already noted, since there will be regular "sting" operations done to test the honesty and professionalism of members of the police units, that should go a long way towards weeding out unprofessional or corrupt police officers.

As for so-called "national security agencies" such as the NSA, that should be completely disbanded. Their actual function has been to illegally spy on ordinary American citizens without due process or a legitimate warrant. The loaded phrase "national security" is in fact dishonestly used to disguise the fact that so-called "intelligence agencies" are actually primarily employed to protect, buttress, and defend the ruling oligarchic elite and crypto-elite. They are not interested in protecting ordinary Americans from harm unless they can spin that canard as public relations propaganda to be used as a cover for their main task of serving the anti-democratic, anti-commonwealth, partisan and parochial goals of the political, financial, and Media Establishment. As for the CIA, while there may be some usefulness to that agency with respect to foreign intelligence gathering, no longer will they be employed to overthrow or illegally influence foreign governments. No doubt the upper ranks of the CIA will have to be purged and replaced with law-abiding, honest, non-partisan professionals (probably selected from the lower ranks via a random lottery as well and have a term of service limited to 3 years as well). The CIA and the FBI should both be diligently, regularly, and routinely very closely scrutinized by the lotteryist assembly and the Ombudsman Office for misbehavior and those found guilty of said misbehavior should be *very severely* punished with dismissals, a fine, and a prison sentence of *no less than 3* years without the possibility of early release.

Protections Against Undue Bureaucratic or Administrative Influence over a Lotteryist Government

Since members of the bureaucratic and administrative support system for the People's Assembly can, intentionally or unintentionally, offer up biased information or biased experts to the lotteryist government, special attention must be paid to their formal (the administrative structure) and material (the individuals who comprise the administrative organization) composition as well. Since the bureaucracy that supports the Assembly can subtly and decisively influence the information and advice offered to that institution, special care must be given to prevent this.

For example, let us say that someone wants there to be a national holiday to commemorate Jews who died in the Holocaust, but he doesn't know who to summon as experts to advise the Assembly on this legislation. In this case, he may defer to the administrative bureaucracy to provide a range of experts on the topic in question. With this in mind, in order for a committee or the People's Assembly to properly adjudicate and authorize such a holiday at least four experts of differing opinions should brief the Assembly. For example, one expert could be an orthodox (Jewish) Holocaust apologist; another expert could be a Holocaust Revisionist Truther; a third expert could be someone who argues that since the term "the Holocaust" only refers to Jews who died at the hands of German Gentiles, there should be an additional holiday for Gentiles who died at that hands of the largely Jewish police state administration under Stalin (where more Christians died than Jews died in the Holocaust); finally, a fourth expert should be summoned to testify that since the Holocaust was a European event and that since hardly any American citizens died in the Holocaust that the Assembly should instead forgo commemorating the Jewish Holocaust and commemorate with a holiday a more relevant domestic event, namely, the genocide of native Americans here in North America. This is an example of the range of expert opinion that should be made available to the Assembly. Besides merely debating the pro and con of a particular issue, there should also be experts summoned who question the very framing of the issue itself.

As for the persons who comprise the bureaucracy that supports the Assembly, their term in office should be limited to two years. Furthermore, a biographical dossier should be composed on each of these bureaucrats as well as a list of whom they promoted as "experts" to testify before the Assembly. (As already noted, the

"experts" themselves will also already have a dossier composed on them.) All of this biographical information as well as which bureaucrat(s) promoted which expert should be reviewed and vetted for bias by a team of rotating, non-bureaucrat, independent evaluators whose goal is to uncover and identify bias (intentional or not). The independent evaluators will check to see if there is a pattern of bias concerning the bureaucrat's nominations of candidates to appear before the Assembly. While these independent evaluators may not bar an expert from testifying, at a minimum they can alert the Assembly to selection bias. Since an "expert" may only testify once a year before the Assembly this, alone, should go a long way towards facilitating a broad and diverse pool of experts from which to draw. Finally, all this information should be easily accessible to the public (e.g., by being posted on the government website). While it may be impossible to eliminate absolutely all bias steps should be taken to set this as the goal; moreover, the members of the government themselves should be reminded to be watchful and careful of bias regardless of who appears as an expert before them.

As for what constitutes someone being designated an "expert," that would include anyone who has published something relevant to the topic at hand and it is not to be limited to (partisan) members of think tanks or academics. Ordinary untutored citizens who have published papers, essays, editorials, missives, or Letters-to-the-Editor may be considered "experts" as well.

Some Possible Criticisms of Government by Lottery and their Rebuttals

1. **Illegitimacy and Misrepresentation.** People want to choose their representatives and elections serve to validate the political system. Furthermore, some are concerned, for example, that less populated rural areas will be under-represented; consequently, they may wish to have geography be a necessary component of lotteryist selection. To tackle the question of illegitimacy first, the current political establishment itself is illegitimate! Nowhere does the US Constitution support or even mention having political parties act as sieves through which political candidates are winnowed and vetted before they are then offered up to the public for a vote of benediction. In the US the two Establishment political parties, the Democrats and the Republicans—along with Media complicity--act as gatekeepers to political power and actively discourage—nay, prohibit--upstart or alternative political parties from having a seat at the political table. What we have in the US is not a political monopoly but an entrenched

political duo-opoly that gives the appearance to the naive public that there is an authentic, but limited, range of disagreement between the two Establishment parties when, for all practical purposes, that is actually not the case. In fact, I would argue that this duo-opoly is worse than a political monopoly because the public is misled into believing they have an authentic choice in elections when they simply do not, and this is exactly how the ruling oligarchic elite want it to be. As the old saying goes, "If elections actually influenced and impacted government policy, if they actually meant anything, then they would be made illegal!" How true. The financial and Media-controlling plutocratic oligarchic elite that actually decisively controls each of the two Establishment parties wants the public to **believe** that they have a choice in who governs them when the simple fact of the matter is that the voting public merely functions as an after-the-fact, *pro forma*, rubber-stamp when they ignorantly believe that the only viable candidates for office are the two Establishment-vetted candidates presented to them at the ballot box.

Furthermore, in our digital age with paperless ballots it is extremely easy to rig an election. Since in most states there are no paper ballots that can be used anymore to independently corroborate an election tally the field is rife for electronic election tampering and fraud. No longer do corrupt political machines have to physically stuff illicit paper ballots into election boxes later to be physically counted. Now all someone needs are access to the software algorithm, and they can easily, cleverly, and covertly rig an election to their liking. Of course, the Establishment Media and politicians who benefit from this corrupt practice poo-poo anyone who raises legitimate issues such as this. The skeptics are self-servingly pejoratively labeled "conspiracy theorists" and are alleged to be suffering from 'sour grapes' concerning an unfavorable election outcome, but this is dishonest. Election tally software is very simple, and very simple to rewrite. As Stalin reportedly remarked, "It's not who casts their votes that determines an election; instead, it is who *counts* the votes that matters!!!" Welcome to Stalinist America!

As I have already mentioned, in a very real sense voting in American elections today **IS** immoral. By casting your vote, you are legitimizing the

thoroughly corrupt political system under which we all live in thrall. You are validating the two-party duo-opoly and insodoing you are agreeing to the marginalization, the dismissal, and the silencing of other political voices that should be heard, that should have a seat at the table of government. Is a political system legitimate if self-seeking political parties, of which there is no mention in the US Constitution, act as gatekeepers to power and actively discourage alternative political voices from having a seat at the table of government? Is a political system legitimate if after getting rubber-stamp benediction from the voting public that congressperson spends literally half of their time in office kowtowing to big doners and special interests in order to get the funding (i.e., campaign contributions or, more accurately, legalized bribery) needed to get re-elected to office? Is a political system legitimate if the composition of the elected body does not accurately reflect the demographics of a nation? No, no, and no!!!

As for misrepresentation because of a fear that some geographical areas will be marginalized in a lotteryist system because of a dearth of population, I have two answers to this criticism. First of all, if geographic distribution was employed as a criterion for a legitimate lotteryist draw, then these representatives would have a constituency--an interest--for which to advocate, and the whole point of the lotteryist system I am advocating is that all representatives disavow **ANY** constituency that they feel they may have to answer to or placate. I want statesmen and stateswomen, not politicians who are beholden to a constituency. True, rural areas will have less—but proportional—representation in the People's Assembly, but that is only because of the nature of the demographics of the United States as a whole. Since representatives from large urban areas, similarly, would not be beholden to a local constituency, they should be voting for what is in the best interests of the nation as a whole as well, and that is what they will be strongly encouraged to do. After all, they will not be running for re-election, so they do not have to placate, or curry favor with, an activist and influential political base in a home district. They only have to decide what is right—period, exclamation point!

As for the fear that a particular lotteryist selection will not have *exactly* 50% women or *exactly* 15% African-Americans...etc., such is the nature of a

lottery. Absolutely precise percentages of particular groupings within the population will not always be *exactly* reflected in the body of the representatives selected for the People's Assembly, and this goes back to the Prime Directive of the lotteryist assembly, namely, the representatives are simply not to have, or feel beholden to, constituencies, be they racial, religious, ethnic, sexual, geographic...etc. constituencies. The **ONLY** criterion that would legitimately invalidate a lottery draw would be if the body of representatives did not accurately reflect, plus or minus 5%, the financial (i.e., income and wealth) distribution of the population as a whole. The poor have been systematically disenfranchised and marginalized in the current political system. By having, *solely*, a financial trigger to invalidate a lotteryist selection of representatives ensures that the pernicious corrupting influence of wealth does not enable a new plutocratic oligarchic financial elite from being resurrected from the ashes of the old moribund political crypto-Establishment and, once again, unduly influence the People's Assembly. As Thoreau says in **On the Duty of Civil Disobedience**, you should not despair of the government we have as a result of people believing they **only** can choose between the two pro-offered Establishment candidates; instead, the nation should despair of having gullible and spineless voters who, in their culpable and lazy ignorance, blindly legitimize an illegitimate system by accepting the framing of the election as *only* a choice between the two Establishment candidates. Thoreau then goes on to rhetorically ask, "How many *real* men do we have in 100 square miles of this country?" He then gives us the answer: "Hardly one!" Would that Thoreau were wrong!

4. **Incompetence.** Supposedly some of the representatives selected by lottery will be incompetent and therefore render the People's Assembly ineffectual. Instead, it is argued that under the current political system executive and judicial appointments are vetted by congress and only well qualified persons pass the test of congressional interrogation and are approved for office. Of course this is ridiculous. First of all, the current republican system of government is littered with incompetent legislators who rarely even read, let alone analyze, the bills they vote on; they are too busy spending half their time soliciting money for their next re-election. Also, politics trumps qualifications when it comes to executive or judicial appointments. It is not the very best people who are nominated for

an appointment but instead people who will favor the particular party in power that nominated them. This is no better demonstrated than by the almost universal party line votes on judicial nominations. If the very best disinterested, thoughtful, and unbiased candidates for appointment were put forward for vetting by congress then we should not expect strict party line votes by those adjudicating the nominee but just the opposite; we should expect a heterodoxy of opinion, but this very rarely happens. To take yet another example, ambassadorships. It is well known that ambassadorships are frequently awarded to generous campaign donors and not to people with the necessary language or in-country knowledge skills needed to perform their job well in the particular foreign country in question. Furthermore, our alleged "competent" congresspersons acquiesced to the illegal, immoral, unjustified, and pointless invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, invasions which cost the US thousands of military lives lost as well as trillions of dollars, dollars which could have been better spent elsewhere, such as in providing all Americans with national health care and retirees with a truly livable monthly social security check. (Forget, for the moment, about the millions of Afghanis and Iraqi we killed or displaced as a result of these foolish campaigns!) Calling these representatives "incompetent" would be doing them a favor; instead, they should be tried for knowledgeable and culpable treason against the American public and, when convicted, serve a long prison sentence indeed. But to which court does one bring the charge of treason against the whole of the governing political ruling class? Please let me know. Yes, some representatives in the People's Assembly will be more competent than others, but I will accept this possible minority of incompetents to the so-called "competent" [sic] spendthrift, genocidal warmongers now sitting in office!!!

6. **Enthusiasm.** Some would argue that representatives who are not enthusiastic about being in office would not make good advocates for a constituency. Supposedly having enthusiasm for the job of representative is a good thing. As some would argue, those who are *not* enthusiastic about being in office would not make good advocates for a constituency. Of course I have already addressed this criticism. In a word, we do NOT want constituency politics to play any part in the Lotteryist Assembly. We do NOT want our lotteryist representatives beholden to any special interest group whatsoever! We do NOT want representatives who see themselves as special and who take pleasure in ruling over their fellow citizens. We do

NOT want our lotteryist representatives to play to a constituency--period!-- and since they are not up for re-election, they do not have to do that. In fact, they should be roundly discouraged from playing favorites. Our representatives can concentrate solely on what is truly in the best interests of the commonwealth as a whole. They certainly are not to play to an audience and take pleasure in promoting a parochial agenda.

7. **Unaccountability.** Here critics argue that if lotteryist representatives
8. advocate or take unpopular positions that they should be able to be impeached. This is absurd for it would put a chill on fulsome debate and encourage self-censorship, a bane of the current political system. *Au contraire*, obviously we want lotteryist representatives to have *complete and absolutely protected free speech*, without the threat of punishment or loss of representative status should they go afoul of popular opinion. Minority voices, especially, need to be protected because it is often a budding minority opinion that, ultimately, is the best opinion. Once again, since lotteryist representatives are not up for re-election they should be free to voice, publicly, their opinions—even opinions others would find offensive--and let the chips fall where they may. This should be encouraged, not discouraged! I agree with Socrates, "The stronger argument will always defeat the weaker argument," so we need to enable the stronger argument to be tested and validated through critical debate. Censuring speech or thought must be *absolutely forbidden* in the lotteryist assembly because it would prohibit free, open, and wide-ranging debate and insodoing likely subvert the stronger argument from ever being put forward to be considered, tested, and voted on.

Now that we have dispensed with the supposed disadvantages of selecting representatives by lottery, let us now turn to the profound advantages of employing a lottery to select who will represent us. Below are a list of merely some of the virtues of government by lottery.

1. **The demographics of the population would be accurately reflected in a lotteryist government.** This is arguably the main advantage of using a random lottery to select government representatives. As I have already noted, in a government by lottery, for example, approximately 50% of the representatives would be women, 13% would be Blacks, 19% would be Hispanics, 35% would have a bachelor's degree, approximately 10% would be non-heterosexual, and, most important, 12.4% would be people who are officially classified as living in poverty,..etc. The fact that the demographics of the nation would be accurately represented in a lotteryist government that alone elevates government by lottery as superior to all other forms of representation.
2. **Egalitarian.** Since *all* citizens have an equal chance of serving in a lotteryist government such as system would be inherently fair and just. No one—except dual citizens and persons currently in prison—would be excluded from office.
3. **Ordinary people will be empowered.** An inherent problem with electoral politics is that politically active groups and people who join political parties are grossly over-represented. As I have argued earlier, political parties are a cancer on the body politic; they are more interested in securing power than they are in doing what is right for the nation as a whole; therefore, political parties need to be prohibited. In place of this we will have ordinary, politically-unconnected, people as our representatives, people not beholden to any constituency.
4. **Loyalty will be to conscience and not to political party.** As an old entry on government by lottery (or sortition) from Wikipedia has it: Elected representatives typically rely on political parties [and uber-wealthy and influential oligarchic donors] in order to gain and retain office. This means they often feel a primary loyalty to the party and will vote contrary to conscience to support a party position. Representatives appointed by [a lottery] do not owe anything to anyone for their position." And this relates to the next virtue of lotteryism.
5. **Anti-corruption.** Since lotteryist representatives are not beholden to anyone--be it a political party, financial donors, special interests, lobbyists, constituencies...etc.--corruption would be virtually eliminated. And to ensure lotteryist representatives would stay honest, regular "sting" operations would be conducted to test the honesty and law-abidingness of **all** those in power; lotteryist representatives and officials will be made aware of this beforehand of course. All attempts to influence a member of the lotteryist government will have to be reported, and the punishment for corruption should be very severe indeed!!! (Expulsion from office, a fine,

and a set prison term--say a **minimum** of 3 years or more **without parole or the possibility of early release**--should all be a part of the penalty for corruption.)

6. **Cognitive diversity.** Since representatives will not be beholden to **any** constituency and doesn't have to curry favor with special interests or the public, there should be a much broader, more open, and diverse set of alternative solutions to issues brought before the lotteryist assembly for adjudication. New ways of thinking will be encouraged with an onus on thinking "outside the box," so to speak. This is yet another reason for prohibiting political parties because they put limits on and constrain legislative diversity.

In conclusion, to quote two apt, pertinent, dictums: As one wag is reported to have astutely suggested, "Some see things as they are and ask, 'Why'? Others see things as they could be and ask, "**Why not!**", for "**We have nothing to lose and a world to gain!**" **Please join me in inaugurating this new world.**

Vaughn Klingenberg
975 County Road C2 West
Roseville, MN USA 55113
Email: vaughn_kl@msn.com

