The Constitution of Internet-based
Non-representative (Direct) Democracy

互聯網非代議民主制度憲法及平臺（全民參政）

Development of a constitution and an online platform for direct democracy that can be readily employed in different countries and regions.

制定可在不同國家和地區輕鬆實施的憲法和直接民主的在線平臺。

Authored by Sky Darmos

10.04.2018 (first draft); 21.08.2018 (Sortition; No secret agencies; ID for participation in regional legislation; no minimal age); 24.12.2018 (voting for previous versions of a law; minimal number of votes; unterminated voting); 29.12.2018 (minimal number of votes proportional to population); 01.02.2019 (previous versions of a law must have the same number of votes); 07.02.2019 (no highest court; radius of voting area on territory issues); 09.02.2019 (legislation proof-reading; no banks; no international currency; public budget)

In the last hundred years humanity has transitioned from a monarchy to a representocracy. The basic human right of self-determination is not realized in this system. The ancient Greeks had understood that a prosperous society must treat people equally and that therefore everyone should have the right to shape and lead society. They therefore introduced the concepts of sortition and democracy. In the modern age sortition has been replaced by the election of ideology groups called political parties and their leaders. The concept of democracy has been replaced by the notion of representation. These two replacements are closely linked together: only a system based on ideologies could claim that parties can represent the "will" of different people. People who make decisions based on ideology instead of reason are called ideologues. Representocracy is based on ideology, while democracy is based on self-governance, reason and equality. The aim of this project is to provide a constitution and an administrative platform for true direct democracy.

在過去的一百年裡，人類已經從君主制轉變為代議制。雖然表面上是一個進步，但仍然沒有實現自我決定權這個基本人權。古希臘人已經明白，一個繁榮的社會必須平等對待人民，每個人都應該有權塑造和領導社會。因此，他們介紹了抽籤任職和全面參政（真正意義上的民主）的概念。在現代，抽籤制度已

經被政黨及領導的選舉所取代，而民主的概念被代議的概念所取代。這兩種替代息息相關：只有基於思想框架（意識形態）的系統才能認為只有幾種不同類型（主義）的人，然後他們可以被幾個不同的黨派所代表。基於意識形態而不是理性做出決策的人稱為空想家，他們的立場永遠是可預測的。

代議制是基於意識形態的。民主基於自治、理性和平等。該項目的目的是為真正的直接民主提供憲法和行政平臺。

Note: The principles marked as *optional* belong to a more conservative highly secure but likely less efficient version of the proposal.

1. No parties: No politician is allowed to join a party of any kind. He must stay neutral and free of any group-induced bias. That allows politicians to say their opinion without having to follow some general party agenda.

2. Pan-referendism: All political discussions are live-streamed on the internet and all issues are decided by all citizens. No politician is allowed to decide any political issue without the use of an internet referendum.

3. Pan-jurism: All court cases are live-streamed and all citizens play the role of the jury. Bribing or selecting out jury members becomes impossible.
However, local cases are judged locally. Only if a crime had a nation-wide impact, then voting has to happen nation-wide. International crimes are judged internationally.
A prisoner can be suddenly released if public opinion on his guilt changed.

4. Competence test (*optional*): Citizens have to fill out questionnaires in order to show they understand the various aspects of a problem. They have to correctly answer at least 50% of the questions in order to be permitted to vote.

5. Un-corruptible database: All changes to *Wikipedia* articles need to be approved by voting. Every change is voted upon separately and the displayed version results from all approved changes. There is no admin function. This prevents infiltration of the platform.

6. No-secrecy: Secrecy in voting is forbidden. All voting is publicly visible. That makes voting fraud impossible.

7. Notifications for experts: Approved/certified experts in relevant fields get e-mail notifications when voting on a subject within their expertise takes place.

8. <u>Subscriptions</u>: Non-experts can provide a list of subjects of interest and get notifications accordingly.

9. <u>Peer-review</u> (***optional***): Proposed laws must be made in form of peer-reviewed academic papers.

10. <u>Blind-peer-review</u>: Peer-reviewers should not be told the identity of authors they are peer-reviewing.

11. <u>AI-check</u>: New laws must be in accordance with the constitution and other existing laws. That has to be checked by an AI system.

12. <u>Sortition</u>: although proposals for laws can be made by everyone, there is still a group of people paid to discuss laws and propose laws to the public. These are the members of government. They are selected out of a group of candidates by random choice (using a RNG).[1]

13. <u>Reward for successful legislation</u>: People who have suggested laws that get implemented receive a monetary reward.[2]

14. <u>AI-execution</u> (***optional***): All laws are implemented by an AI system and thus the legal system becomes something like a computer program. This further prevents abuse of power and inefficiency due to too much human bureaucracy.

15. <u>No-secret agencies</u>: Secret agencies and secret societies are recognized as illegal and manipulative.

16. <u>Levels of legislation</u>: Regional laws, national laws and international laws are decided separately on different online platforms.

17. <u>Identification</u>: Participation in the creation of national laws requires an ID which proves that one has the nationality in question. Regional laws require a residential registration certificate of a place in the region in question.

18. <u>No minimal age</u> (***optional***): There is no minimal age for participation as long as the questionnaire (see point (4)) can be answered satisfyingly. If no questionnaire is used, then the minimal age is 10.

19. <u>Voting on former versions</u>: When a particular law is changed there is a legislation history that can be viewed by all citizens online. Citizens are allowed to vote for former versions of a law at any time. However, they can vote for only one version of a law. If a citizen votes for another version of the same law at a later time, the original vote is cancelled.

20. <u>Minimal number of votes</u>: For a law to become effective the number of approval votes for it must be a power of 10 and it needs to be in the same order of magnitude as 1% of the population. Germany for example has currently 82,365,528 citizens (as of 29.12.2018; 10:26), and 1% of this is 823,655. From this follows a necessary number of votes of 100,000. Hong Kong has a smaller population than Germany, so there 10,000 votes are sufficient.

21. <u>Unterminated voting</u>: a vote for a certain legislation can be turned into a vote against it at any time. Voting goes on forever. The version of a law with the highest approval rate is the legally effective one. When all versions of a certain law drop below an approval rate of 50% then the law becomes ineffective.

22. <u>Parallel voting</u>: When one votes against a present law then one is asked if one supports any of its previous versions. If no previous law is selected, then veto votes are placed on all previous versions of this law by default.
This ensures that when a law reached the critical amount of votes and its approval rate is below 50%, then previous versions of the law will also all be above the critical amount of votes, so that the present version of a law can be replaced by a previous version.

23. <u>Location bound voting on territory questions</u>: A certain geographical region can become independent only if a majority of the citizens in this region and the region surrounding it vote for it. The radius of the region that has to vote in favor of the independence needs to be double the radius of the region that seeks independence. If the circular voting area includes parts which lie in the ocean, then the radius has to be extended in order to account for the area loss.

24. <u>Only provinces or states can become countries</u>: Every province or state of a country has its own regional laws alongside with national laws and international laws. All those are decided on different internet platforms. For a region to become a country it has to be a province or state first.[3]

25. Legislation proof-reading: Laws that are proof-read by lawyers are marked as proof-read. A lawyer is allowed to edit posted law proposals. However, the edited version is not displayed until the author of the law proposal approved the edit. The lawyer is then automatically paid for his work according to the word count by his client, the author.

26. No banks: Money is stored digitally and without charge. No entity is allowed to earn money out of storing other people's money. The amount of money inside a country is adjusted according to the population of a country and exists only in the digital accounts of people. However, people are still born without money and have to earn it (see "The Human Standard").

27. No international currency: Every country has its own currency. International trade is conducted using currency swap by default.

28. Public budget (*optional*): There is a common public digital budget which is filled by tax money. Any concrete plan on what to spend it has to be voted upon.

Notes:
1. This was a suggestion from Alexandros Pagidas (HK Polyu), a contemporary Greek philosopher, after seeing my first draft.
2. It is not yet clear what the size of the reward should depend on.
3. A special administrative region can be regard as a special type of state or province.

實施計劃

第一階段：建立網站。
第二階段：上載所有現有的法律。
第三階段：上載所有曾有的法律並把每個法律的不同版本對應和連接起來。
第三階段：開始讓人投票。
第四階段：50% 的法律達到足以有法律效果的投票數量就可以開始向政府申請讓平臺有法律效果。
第五階段：平臺開始有法律效果。
第六階段：申請讓政府在網站上直播所有的討論。
第七階段：向政府要求只有得到足夠投票量的新法律可以開始生效。只有舊法律可以沒有足夠的投票數量。
第八階段：開始讓律師和法律專業的人提出新法律。
第九階段：開始讓所有人有權利提出法律。提出被接受的法律的人收到報酬。
第十階段：取消黨派制並且開始抽籤任職制度。

The human standard
Proposal for a new monetary system

We all know that FIAT currencies make the rich richer and the poor poorer. They allow a few people to print money for themselves. Those are banks, secret agencies and the government. Printing money simply when we (or better they) think we need more is not reliable and reasonable. Yet many would argue that going back to the gold standard isn't reasonable either, since not every country has rich gold resources and then also, why gold? Is the amount of gold in any way related to the amount of resources a country needs?

On the other hand, if all coins and paper money are just representations of something that exists only digitally, then why would we need banks? Originally banks had the job to store our gold and give us representations of this gold in form of coins and bills (currency).

If we all used mobile apps to pay, there would be no necessity for banks anymore; at least that would be the case if all existing money would already be circulating on those apps. Still it would be an institution like the Federal Reserve determining how much money should be circulating. According to what? Usually the US government can ask the FED to print more money when they need it for war. The wars themselves are needed for resources and for forcing everybody to accept the money printed or digitally created by the FED.

If FIAT currencies are tyrannical and unreasonable, and if the gold standard is arbitrary and unfair, then what can we use then?

I suggest the use of a "human standard". Money should not be created according to the will of some powerful institutions who can use it for their own purpose, but according to the number of people that are living in a country. That doesn't mean every person needs to have the same amount of money to its disposal, but it means the amount of money circulating is proportional to the population.

For creating such a standard we would have to set how much money a person needs in his lifetime on average and then put this much of money into circulation for each person that is born. For each person that dies this same amount of money has to go out of circulation. The amount of money in circulation would rise and fall with the population.

Prices for goods would depend on the life expectancy of people and on how often something is needed in a lifetime. Food would be cheap, while things like cars and houses would still be expensive, but stable in their price. No inflation, no economic crisis, the only possible crisis would be bad crops, poor harvest or pollution.

<div align="right">

29.10.2018

Sky Darmos

</div>

<u>Discussion of the first draft from the 10.04.2018</u>

Alexandros Pagidas: "Democracy was not defined by majority-voting but by the use of *sortition* (https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sortition). I didn't see it featuring in your proposal.".

Response: "The idea here is that politicians have only the right to ask the questions the people are supposed to vote upon. They don't do much beyond that. With that being said, having the right to ask the questions is already a lot of power, so yes, *sortition* could allow us to focus on the policy making without having to deal with whom to put in place in the government. That would be a good alternative to Duncan's 'Big Brother'-like system. Thanks for your suggestion."

Ioan Catalin Chiriac: "Votes based systems makes me think about the *arrow theorem*: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q60ZXoXP6Hg".

Response: "In the above introduced system only one alternative can be voted for, so the problems the arrow theorem is concerned with do not arise.".

Yike Ni: What if the AI is hacked, controlled or particularly designed for someone?

Response: **"**The AI has nothing but the law in its program. A country doesn't have only one single law book. Information about laws is always stored in multiple places. If it is an open source project, then everybody would see it if laws have been deleted."

Runcel D. Arcaya: "What if the AI or the internet becomes conscious and acts against us?"

Response: "It is not quantum random and can therefore not become conscious."