

A Discussion of a Plan to
Develop a Method and Curriculum
for the Implementation of
Direct Democracy in the
United States of America

ED 5990

Integrative Project

Fall 2004

Richard Bloodworth

P.O.Box 78123

Atlanta, GA 30357

admin@rbloodworth.com

<http://democracy2020.org>

Dr. Howard Jacobs

“Every nation has a right to govern itself internally under what forms it pleases, and to change these forms at its own will.” —Thomas Jefferson to Thomas Pinckney, 1792.

Abstract	4
Quotations	5
Introduction	7
Rationale	8
Discussion of Democracy	9
The Issue of Voter Competence	12
Table 1: The Voting Categories	14
Direct Legislation Issues	15
Table 2: Arguments Against and For Direct Democracy	18
Review of Direct Democracy Literature	19
Direct Democracy Survey	41
Curriculum for Implementation	44
Implementation	47
The Future of Direct Democracy	50
Conclusion	54
Appendix I: Educational Curriculum	55
Appendix II: Online Tutorials	57
Appendix III: University Courses	58
Appendix IV: Adult Reading List	59
Appendix V: Implementation in Phases	61
Appendix VI: Survey for Direct Democracy	64
Appendix VII: Open-Ended Questions	69
Appendix VIII: Bibliography	71
Appendix IX: Websites Pertaining to Direct Democracy	74
Appendix X: Confucius Quotes	76

Abstract

This paper is a discussion of the evolution of the direct democracy movement in the world and particularly in the United States of America. This paper explores future uses of the accelerating growth of technology for democratic voting purposes and the uses educational system for the implementation of direct democracy in the United States of America and in the world. With the advent of the Internet, modern technology can be utilized to allow the public to vote directly via the Internet, thus creating a government closer to the principles of a pure democracy. The implementation of this concept would unfold, develop, and occur in an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary way creating the third House of the United States Congress, the Public Assembly, a concept which could be partially accomplished by an amendment to the United States Constitution. The real possibility of a direct democracy, through direct voting, on the local, state, and national level now exists with these new technologies. This proposal includes a plan for a governmental structure supporting direct democracy. It also suggest methods for teaching procedures and concepts related to direct democracy through Social Studies and Political Science courses in educational, public, and online institutions beginning with the early years of kindergarten up through adult education with higher educational institutions supplying training for certified voters of the Public Assembly.

Related Quotations:

“All truth passes through three stages. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident.” Arthur Schopenhauer (1788-1860)

“We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable [inalienable] Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty , and the Pursuit of Happiness. That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed...” Thomas Jefferson (1743 - 1826).

“Democracy: “government by the people; especially : rule of the majority”, the first definition of “democracy” in the Merriam-Webster dictionary.

“Democracy arises out of the notion that those who are equal in any respect are equal in all respects; because men are equally free, they claim to be absolutely equal.

In a democracy the poor will have more power than the rich, because there are more of them, and the will of the majority is supreme.” Aristotle

“We are a people capable of self-government, and worthy of it.” —Thomas Jefferson to Isaac Weaver, Jr., 1807.

“No man has greater confidence than I have in the spirit of the people, to a rational extent. Whatever they can, they will.”—Thomas Jefferson to James Monroe, 1814.

“My most earnest wish is to see the republican element of popular control pushed to the maximum of its practicable exercise. I shall then believe that our government may be pure and perpetual.” — Thomas Jefferson to Isaac H. Tiffany, 1816.

“The will of the people... is the only legitimate foundation of any government, and to protect its free expression should be our first object.” —Thomas Jefferson to Benjamin Waring, 1801.

“The measures of the fair majority... ought always to be respected.” —Thomas Jefferson to George Washington, 1792.

“I subscribe to the principle, that the will of the majority honestly expressed should give law.” — Thomas Jefferson: The Anas, 1793.

“Silence is the virtue of fools” Francis Bacon

“What is now proved was once only imagined.” William Blake

“The best way to escape from a problem is to solve it.” Alan Saporta

“That’s one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind” Neil Armstrong

“In unity there is strength” from Aesop’s Fables, The Bundle of Sticks.

“I hear and I forget. I see and I remember. I do and I understand.” Confucius

“No one can make you feel inferior without your consent.” Eleanor Roosevelt

“The only thing we have to fear is fear itself.” Franklin D. Roosevelt

“Everything has been figured out, except how to live.” Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980)

“To err is human — and to blame it on a computer is even more so.” Orben’s Current Comedy

“I think there is a world market for maybe five computers.” Thomas Watson (1874-1956), Chairman of IBM, 1943

Introduction

Direct democracy is a concept which began in ancient Athens , Greece where all citizens voted directly on legislative issues. In the modern world, direct democracy was previously considered impractical or impossible to implement on a large scale but it is now possible with the advent of computer and Internet technologies. I think some version of what I am proposing will happen in the future since people should determine their own future and methods of government which is, after all, the meaning of democracy even though there is always resistance and skepticism to new ideas — though beginning 2500 years ago, democracy can hardly be considered a new idea. The same people who are concerned about Internet fraud in voting are probably unconcerned about online banking transactions, which is how practically all funds are transferred nowadays, and the same type of technology can be used in Internet voting. Also, perhaps some legislators feel that their jobs and roles are threatened but this idea involves adding direct democracy to the representative legislatures and not replacing them.

Technology and social movements are changing the world educationally, socially, politically, environmentally, economically, and culturally at a rapid pace. Now is the time to utilize modern technology to allow the public to vote directly via the Internet, thus creating a government closer to a pure democracy. This could be accomplished by an amendment to the United States Constitution, if necessary. The implementation of this plan would unfold, develop, and occur in an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary way creating the 3rd House of the United States Congress, the Public Assembly.

Rationale for the Use of Direct Democracy

When the United States Constitution was written, the forefathers wrote an all-encompassing and a sweeping document that is still relevant, has stood the test of time, and has withstood the difficulties, controversies, and amendments that have occurred during its existence. But this document was written around 1776 and the society at the time was very different from the society of today. The forefathers, even with all of their foresight and all-inclusiveness were not able to factor in dramatic future changes in technology and, resultingly, in society. They could not have foreseen a future with telephones, radios, televisions, cars, airplanes, jet engines, rockets, computers, the Internet, etc. Now that the new technologies are here and will continue to grow, advance, and be perfected, we need to examine how this affects society, the government, and the Constitution.

In its military campaigns the government of the United States says it wants to promote and protect democracy. But is the United States a democracy? The U.S. is a republic or a representative democracy. An example of a democracy within the United States federal government is the U.S. Congress where the members debate and vote usually for a simple majority to win a case or a referendum or to pass a bill. When a presidential election is held today well over 100 million people can vote. The United States Constitution created the electoral college for, I have heard, several reasons and one of them is to prevent mob rule or for a government run by the uneducated (though now, most people are receiving high levels of education in comparison with the past of the forefathers). Another possible reason that the electoral college was institutionalized was because, at the time the Constitution was written, if a national election were to be held, tallying the votes would be an almost impossible task. Then, a sack of votes, or the results of local voting, would have to be sent by a messenger riding horseback. Just carrying the votes from California (or Georgia, during the time of the 13 colonies) to Washington, D.C. could take weeks, that is, if they ever got to their destination. Today, we live in a very different world where messages are transmitted instantaneously worldwide via telephones, computers, or the Internet.

A Discussion Concerning the Concept of Democracy

Few would share Dr. Pangloss and Candide's view (in *Candide* by Voltaire) of the philosophy of optimism that this is the best of all possible worlds concerning how we are governed. But how could we improve it? What is what Aristotle refers to as the best form of democracy? This paper explores some possibilities.

It is said that the United States has a democracy in the form of a representative democracy so that the voting public can elect their political leaders. However, democratically electing political leaders does not solve all social problems: "Hitler, it will be recalled, was democratically elected." (Coe, 1985, p. 15). Joseph Schumpeter, the author of *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* stated that "democratic politics was a struggle for control of the political process in order to use the state to further one's own interest." (Coe, 1985, p. 38). "Schumpeter rejected the classical theory of democracy (which he recognized as bourgeois in origin), with its emphasis on the common good and the popular will, and proposed a theory of competition for political leadership." (Samuels, 1985, p. 105) Some may consider this view cynical and others might view it as accurate, but the fact remains that the people who are the ones that are supposed to be represented are left on the sidelines of the governmental decision making processes. John Naisbitt says in his book *Megatrends* that society is moving from representative democracy toward participatory democracy and that "the new leader is a facilitator and not an order giver." (Naisbitt, 1982, p.188). One way around, or rather to confront, the problem of having only political leaders determine governmental policy is to have the general will represented and the only way this can be determined is through more democratically direct procedures.

Concerning democratic practices, it can be said that a free market economy is a type of direct democracy where each consumer votes for particular products or services with his dollars or whatever currency is used in his country. Of course, in a capitalistic free market not everyone has an equal amount of monetary votes whereas in a democratically political election every voter is theoretically equal in voting power.

The ancient Greek word *demokratia* was ambiguous. It meant literally ‘people-power’. But who were the people to whom the power belonged? Was it all the people - all duly qualified citizens? Or only some of the people - the ‘masses’? The Greek word *demos* could mean either. There’s a theory that the word *demokratia* was coined by democracy’s enemies, members of the rich and aristocratic elite who did not like being outvoted by the common herd, their social and economic inferiors. If this theory is right, democracy must originally have meant something like ‘mob rule’ or ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’

http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/greeks/greekdemocracy_01.shtml

“Democracy arises out of the notion that those who are equal in any respect are equal in all respects; because men are equally free, they claim to be absolutely equal. In a democracy the poor will have more power than the rich, because there are more of them, and the will of the majority is supreme” (Aristotle). Karl Marx said, “democracy is the road to socialism”, a statement which could put some devotees of democracy on the offensive. However, some people could view capitalism as a form of economic democracy where each consumer “votes” with his money by purchasing what he desires and capitalism also has a democratic or socialistic slant to it when a company is owned by shareholders or people owning shares of stock in the company and this is also the case with taxation as well as insurance which is shared by all who are insured.

John Hobbes, in his book *Leviathan*, viewed society as a leviathan or whale, a giant living organism with each part having a synergistic effect in contributing to the functioning of the whole organism. Using this analogy of a giant organism as society, the intelligentsia and the educational system would represent the brain, the police and military would be the immune system, athletes could represent the muscles, artists would represent the eyes, musicians would be the ears, farmers would be suppliers of nutrients, chefs would be the sense of taste, chemists as the glands, factory workers as the digestive system, construction workers as growth mechanisms and hormones, protective agencies as the skin, and so on. Philosophers and

theologians have long debated the existence of the soul: is that the part of the giant organism of society, the leviathan, that has been missing from its body? By adding the Public Assembly would we be adding the needed, missing body component, the mind/soul, to the body politic?

The Issue of Voter Competence

Concerning direct democracy, the issue of voter competence is really what the debate all boils down to. Voter competence is what every one is concerned about in relationship to the feasibility of direct democracy. Or, in other words, do the voters really understand what they are voting on and on the consequences of that vote?

To address that issue, the idea presented in this paper involves creating a section of the voting public consisting of certified voters. These certified voters would undergo a training program in order to obtain legislative voting licenses. Concerning certified voters one question that needs to be addressed is: what should be the difficulty level of the certification requirements. Should the voting certificate be as easy to obtain as a driver's license or as difficult to obtain as a master's degree (or even a Ph.D.) — I tend to think it should involve a training program similar in depth to a master's degree, in fact, it could be offered as a master's program through schools, universities, and colleges. All qualified (meaning willing to spend the time to study for the certificate) citizens would be eligible as candidates for these certificates and scholarships, loans, or grants could be offered for those needing financial assistance in obtaining them. The certified voter would be someone who would go through a training program probably similar to a master's level graduate degree to obtain a legislative voting license — a license which can be revoked in proven cases of felony or abuse of the voting system. The certification would be periodically renewed through renewal examinations and based also on prior voting activity. So that, in this way, citizens would have a more direct say in the development of their communities and in how they are governed, which, after all, is the meaning of democracy or a government of, by, and for the people.

Some may say that the legislators are already serving the will of the people through their expertise. Are we all conditioned to think that legislators are experts in all legislative areas? It is important to realize that legislators are not expert in all issues either — they are just elected to represent a constituency; very often their only expertise is in being a politician and getting elected. Charisma is all well and good, but does

a politician's charisma or entertainment or speaking ability in itself solve all social ills? Of course not, but often the electorate votes only for one issue or for the most likable candidate making an election a popularity contest or, as is most often the case, the voters vote for the most famous or recognizable name thus the politician's need for keeping his or her name in the news and for the huge advertising budgets required for political campaigns.

In a general election all registered voters can vote including illiterate or uneducated voters and indeed all citizens should be represented in a democracy, however, complicated legislative issues to be voted on should be understood by the voters. My suggestion is to require legislative voters in the public voting section to have a voting certification so that complex issues can be understood. The voters would vote according to the legislation's voting category. Issues could be discussed and decided by either by public votes or by votes of the legislative voters which includes the elected legislature as well as legislative certified voters. The voting category would be determined by expert committees who are university committees appointed by Congress.

There would be no limit as to the number of certified voters so potentially all registered voters could become members of the certified voting public. At the beginning of the process the number of certified voters would not be large but conceivably the concept could evolve to the point that millions of voters could be members of the voting Public Assembly.

Bills could be written and submitted by the public to the expert committees to have them drafted into the correct form to be voted on.

As mentioned, the issues themselves would be divided into categories as determined by the expert committees which are university committees appointed by Congress. For example, if there were to be a vote on whether to make English the official language in the United States, then a bill would be written and the expert committees might decide to include that as a category 7 issue so that all registered voters would vote on that issue.

Table 1

The Voting Categories

Below is a suggested arrangement of voting categories and the chart indicates what segment of the voters would vote on each of the issues:

Category	Function and Issues	Judicial	Executive	Senate	House	Certified Voters	Registered Voters
J	Use, Application, and Interpretation Disputes	•					
1	Classified Information for Executive Branch and Corollaries		•				
2	National Defense		•	•	•		
3	Military Development		•	•	•		
4	Immigration, Emigration			•	•	•	
5	Foreign Policy and Trade, Wage war			•	•	•	
6	Economics, Taxation, Citizenship, Research and Development			•	•	•	
7	Social Issues: Population Control, Abortion, Euthanasia, etc.			•	•	•	•
8	Education, Crime and Punishment, Food Production			•	•	•	
9	Natural Resource Retrieval and Maintenance			•	•	•	
10	Health, Welfare, Health Care Insurance			•	•	•	
11	Creation of Public Institutions, Public Transit, Space Exploration			•	•	•	
12	Bonds, Infrastructure Development and Spending					•	•
13	General Elections, Recalls, Initiatives, Referendums						•
14	Election tie				•		

Concerning issues that evoke emotional responses from the public, some referendums and votes could require a second vote a few months after the initial vote in order to verify them.

Concerning the issue of the public not being able to discuss and negotiate issues in the manner of discussions between legislators, there can be more use of technological communication systems to achieve these objectives. Also, some issues can be resolved incrementally or in stages of completion.

Issues that can be Considered for Direct Legislation:

Issues that could be discussed and decided by either by public votes or by votes by legislative voters including the elected legislature and the legislative certified voters. The voting category is determined by the expert committees as described previously.

mass transit

national rail system

attracting industry, high and low technology

factories, businesses, schools

tax base and methods of acquisition and expenditure

terrorism containment

military requirements

cultural diversity

maintenance of cultural heritage and traditions

protection of minorities

welfare

taxes: sales, wage, flat, national, state, local, customs, tariffs, property, etc.

ordinances, civil laws, requirements

international relationships: travel, business, communication, citizenship, alliances, immigration

personal freedoms

governmental systems

governmental structuring

health care

forms of education: home, public, private, vouchers

treatment of minorities, non-native language speakers

treatment of mentally ill, retarded, delinquent

treatment of physically disabled

special education

developing special talents through education

space travel

medical research

educational development and spending

past, present, and future event recognition

constitutional issues and amendments

citizens' rights

law enforcement issues

definitions of libel, slander, insult, comedy, satire, art, music

definitions of eroticism, obscenity, pornography

freedoms of press, speech, expression

property rights

travel restrictions, visas, passports

safety regulations (building codes, food, drugs, manufactured goods).

license issuance (automobile, professional, trades, skills, etc.)

forms of societal punishments and rewards

establishment of a national language

ratings of manufactured and cultural products

societal word definitions

relationship definitions: family, marriage, etc.

standardized testing

certification

societal recognitions and rewards

salaries of public officials

minimum wage

insurance premiums regulation

price control

rent control

establishments of national systems

choice of national or regional symbols (song, anthem, bird, tree, flower, etc.)

awards, similar to the Nobel prize, for American Achievement in various categories (best invention, novel, citizen, etc.)

roles of federal, state, local governments

eugenics

genetic engineering, cloning

product and service safety regulations

Though there are many more possible issues that can be discussed and voted on through democratically direct procedures, this list suggests some of the possibilities.

Table 2

Some Arguments Against and For the Use of Direct Democracy

Against	For
Only advantaged people having access to the Internet.	Everyone has access to the voting centers
Not every one has a computer now.	Soon computers will be as plentiful as telephones.
Mob rule by the uneducated; tyranny of the majority	Many people now have advanced educations.
Too radical a change	The U.S. Constitution was a radical document when it was introduced.
Too complicated	Can be done with computer, Internet technology
People want to keep things the way they are.	A welcome, needed change
Illiterate, uneducated, and untrained people voting	Illiterate voters also vote in regular elections; voting certification is needed for some legislation.
People voting for issues they are not trained in	Legislators do not have expertise in all areas either.
Internet misuse and abuse	this system could be more closely regulated along the lines of online banking.
People do not want radical, revolutionary changes.	The American Revolution: radical and revolutionary.
It is revolutionary.	No, it is not; it is evolutionary.
People are conservative and do not want to change.	People want to live under a democratic system.

A Review of Literature Concerning Direct Democracy

In *The New Challenge of Direct Democracy* (1996), the author, Ian Budge, says that direct democracy involves citizens discussing and deciding how government is to govern instead of having these decisions made by legislators, bureaucrats, or parliamentarians. His book challenges the current notion that representative democracy is the correct and most feasible form of democracy and thus threatens the established existence of these current forms of governments, as any new system does when it is initially introduced. He states that with the new communication inventions, tools, and developments that direct democracy is now technically possible and desirable in the body politic. In the book, the author describes direct democracy currently in use, particularly in Switzerland, and addresses such issues as structural constraints, technological limitations, the dispensing of information to the voters, the concerns of minorities within a democratic system, and the political units (such as minorities and organizations) within a democratic system.

By far the most popular practical objection to direct democracy relates to the very feasibility of mass debate and voting. For practically the whole of the modern period, indeed, the possibility of direct democracy has been raised in theoretical discussion, usually in regard to the idealized democracy of Athens, only to have it pointed out that the size of modern states renders a face-to-face meeting of citizens impossible. This holds whether the states in question have half a million or 200 million inhabitants. In neither case could the citizens physically assemble to debate policy. Without the possibility of face-to-face discussion, debate is impossible and must be delegated to Parliament. J.S. Mill, in *Representative Government*, (1910, pp. 217-18) typifies this form of argument. The possibility of direct democracy at national level is raised and dismissed with this reasoning in three sentences.

(Technology now makes large scale communication possible and virtual face-to-face meetings are possible with telephones, computers, the Internet and even video cameras.)

Budge describes what direct democracy in ancient Athens, Greece was like as initiated by Solon and developed by Pericles:

The city-state of Athens between 450 and 350 B.C. is the best known example of direct democracy. The city and surrounding territory had an estimated 80,000 inhabitants. Only adult male Athenian citizens participated in the popular Assembly, however, excluding children, slaves, foreigners, and women. Within these severe limits the potential membership was probably of the order of 20,000-30,000, but actual attendance much less, at most 6,000 – even though citizens were paid to attend (Bonner, 1967, pp. 47, 108).

In terms of real size therefore the Athenian Assembly was probably not much larger than some constituent assemblies of our own day. Its powers however were total. Not only did it legislate on all policy, it also decided on its implementation down to the least important details. The officials who carried through its commands were chosen for limited periods and by lot, so that they lacked any authority or power base in relation to the Assembly. Individuals like Pericles who wielded great influence did so by their continuing ability to carry the Assembly with them through their eloquence – and, importantly, through building up a political organization not unlike a modern political party (Bonner, 1967, pp. 45, 61).

Debate and decision-making carried on in this manner were very time-consuming. A large part of the adult citizens' time was expected to be spent in Assembly and in political discussion. This ideal of almost total immersion in public

have reviewed on the educational effects of participation and on its moral worth were first rehearsed by Greek thinkers. (1996, Budge).

Thomas Cronin's evaluation of the achievements of direct legislation also raises the important question of outcomes rather than simply the 'process characteristics' of initiatives and popular referendums. Has direct legislation had any of the negative effects which those distrustful of populism have feared – threats to minority rights, over-weening use of majority powers, preference for left-wing over right-wing positions or vice versa, covert predominance of business interests, inconsistency and instability of policies?

Cronin's judgement on all these is basically favorable. In none of these aspects does direct legislation seem noticeably inferior or even wildly different from the measures passed by State legislatures in the same period (Cronin, 1989, pp. 196-219)

In *Swiss Democracy* W. Linder notes the similarity between Swiss and American uses of direct democracy and lists some of their characteristics as a result of using direct democracy:

1. Government responsiveness is enhanced
2. 90% of legislation is still carried out by the parliament and not contested.
3. Participation in direct democracy is spotty and favors the more educated and prosperous
4. Direct legislation does not produce unsound legislation or unwise or bad policy
5. Direct democracy can influence the agenda in favor of issues important to less well organized interests.
6. Better financed interests will usually win campaigns for referendums and initiatives. The influence of money is linked to the professionalization of campaign management as the better financed side can afford more expertise.
7. Direct democracy strengthens single-issue and interest groups rather than political parties with larger, general interest programs. (Linder, 1994, pp. 143-145).

projects has exerted a considerable attraction for theorists since, the arguments we have reviewed on the educational effects of participation and on its moral worth were first rehearsed by Greek thinkers. (1996, Budge).

Thomas Cronin's evaluation of the achievements of direct legislation also raises the important question of out comes rather than simply the 'process characteristics' of initiatives and popular referendums. Has direct legislation had any of the negative effects which those distrustful of populism have feared – threats to minority rights, over-weaning use of majority powers, preference for left-wing over right-wing positions or vice versa, covert predominance of business interests, inconsistency and instability of policies? Cronin's judgement on all these is basically favorable. In none of these aspects does direct legislation seem noticeably inferior or even wildly different from the measures passed by State legislatures in the same period (Cronin, 1989, pp. 196-219)

In Swiss Democracy W. Linder notes the similarity between Swiss and American uses of direct democracy and lists some of their characteristics as a result of using direct democracy:

1. Government responsiveness is enhanced
2. 90% of legislation is still carried out by the parliament and not contested.
3. Participation in direct democracy is spotty and favors the more educated and prosperous
4. Direct legislation does not produce unsound legislation or unwise or bad policy
5. Direct democracy can influence the agenda in favor of issues important to less well organized interests.
6. Better financed interests will usually win campaigns for referendums and

initiatives. The influence of money is linked to the professionalization of campaign management as the better financed side can afford more expertise.

7. Direct democracy strengthens single-issue and interest groups rather than political parties with larger, general interest programs. (Linder, 1994, pp. 143-145).

An important point is made by V.O. Key about public opinions and beliefs as shaped by elite cues (endorsements) as mentioned in *Citizens as Legislators*. “Studies of mass opinion change contend that the attitudes of the electorate are shaped by the political rhetoric of elites, that ‘the voice of the people is but an echo. Mass opinion is not self-generating, in the main, it is a response to cues, the proposals, and the visions propagated by the political activists.’” (Key, 1996, 2). This brought to mind hearing a voter as he was exiting the polls during the 2004 USA election and explaining why he voted the way he did and almost exactly echoing the line stated by president Bush that judges should not be activists making laws, “they should only interpret the laws”.

In *Direct Democracy: The Politics of Initiative, Referendum, & Recall* (1999), Thomas Cronin explores the workings of democracy and the variations of democracy in use today and in the past. The author analyzes the history of democracy and its possible continued evolution. He states that in early America most people were ambivalent about the concept of democracy. Most thought elections existed only to select leaders to rule them and not for the public to rule itself yet Thomas Jefferson supported the right of the people to rebel against unjust rulers and Alexander Hamilton thought the proceedings of government should be based on the consent of the people. Later on, the populists and progressives thought that more democracy was needed using the methods of initiative, referendum, and recall.

Today, there is discussion about using more direct democracy procedures and direct elections as well as electronic town meetings and teledemocracy. The public has become disenfranchised with the issues of taxes, regulation, inefficiency, the arms race, ecological problems, etc. since public policy is made in distant capitals by unknown agents. Direct democracy in the United States dates back to Massachusetts in 1640 with its town meetings utilizing majority rule and embodying three main principles: consent of the governed, rule by law, and representation of the people. During that period, the people were primary and governments were secondary and subservient to the people.

Citizen initiatives will promote government responsiveness and accountability. If officials ignore the voice of the people, the people will have an available means to make needed law. Initiatives are freer from special interest domination than the legislative branches of most states, and so provide a desirable safeguard that can be called into use when legislators are corrupt, irresponsible, or dominated by privileged special interests. The initiative and referendum will produce open, educational debate on critical issues that otherwise might be inadequately discussed. Referendum, initiative, and recall are nonviolent means of political participation that fulfill a citizen's right to petition the government for redress of grievances. Direct democracy increases voter interest and election-day turnout. Getting the citizens involved in the decision making process would make interested in politics and would thus alleviate apathy and alienation.

Finally (although this hardly exhausts the claims), citizen initiatives are needed because legislators often evade the tough issues. Fearing to be ahead of their time, they frequently adopt a zero-risk mentality. Concern with staying in office often makes them timid and perhaps too wedded to the status quo. One result is that controversial social issues frequently have to be resolved in the judicial branch. But who elected the judges? (Cronin, 1999, 11)

Bowler, S., Donovan, T. and Tolbert, C. (1998) in *Citizens As Legislators: Direct Democracy in the United States* contains factual information and statistics concerning direct democracy on the local, state, and national levels with listings of the results of numerous initiatives and referendums throughout the history of the United States. “This book focuses primarily on one commonly used feature arising from the Progressive Era: the citizens’ initiative.” (Bowler and Donovan 1998) “To its advocates, then, direct democracy would provide openness and end evasive partisan legislatures, mitigating the corrupting influences thought to operate within them, and would also improve the quality of public life. Voter interest would be stimulated as citizens participated directly in drafting and approving legislation. The new, open process would thus instill civic virtue by simultaneously educating and involving the mass public (Haynes 1907, Barnett 1915, Beard and Schultz 1912, and Key and Crouch 1939).” The citizens’ initiative seems to be a trend that is growing but the most of the referendums now are in the western half of the United States and in Florida:

Since South Dakota adopted the initiative in 1898, hundreds of these ‘citizen’-drafted laws have appeared on ballots in American states. David Magleby notes that from 1898 to 1992, over 1700 initiatives were placed before U.S. voters. Among states using initiatives, the most during this period, 274, appeared in Oregon, with 232 appearing in California, 160 in North Dakota, 150 in Colorado, 133 in

Arizona, and 91 in Washington (Neal 1993). Hundreds of additional referenda were placed before voters by legislatures. Most initiatives were rejected by voters, yet 38% passed from 1898 to 1992 (Magleby 1994, 231).

In *Direct Democracy in Switzerland* (2002), Gregory Fossedal explores the history of Switzerland as related to direct democracy and the development of the procedures of direct democracy in Switzerland. He mentions that:

The Swiss polity, as an historical and on-going exhibit of the exercise of a deliberative direct democracy, is a persuasive rebuttal to the stand of elites from the Greeks of yesterday to the elites of today who hold that exclusionary representative democracy, in itself, is a better form of democracy than a direct democracy in partnership with representative democracy....In a word, an effective rebuttal to the stand; you can't trust the people...Switzerland answers the potential question of the political scientist or citizen: What happens if we place so much faith in the people that we make them lawmakers? (Fossedal, 2002).

In Switzerland, many issues are settled through the use of public referendum where the majority vote determines the institutionalization of a law or social practice. Matters such as constitutional revision, immigration, joining the League of Nations or the United Nations or the European Union, establishing Romanish as a national language, military service requirements, voting rights, nuclear

weapons, rent control, legality of abortion, highway construction, social security benefits, state support for religion, among others are determined through public referendums.

Concerning educating the public about the issues and processes of direct democracy:

In the Swiss parliament, the influence of direct democracy can be seen by a whole sociology of popular orientation. Each member of the assembly thinks of himself as a teacher, and a teacher of the whole nation of citizens. No teacher who holds his pupils in contempt will succeed, or even stay long on the job; hence the pedagogical impulse, healthy and strong to begin with, is reinforced. As well, a teacher with any wisdom soon realizes he has much to learn from his pupils. The instruction is no longer one way — particularly when the classroom is an intelligent one like the Swiss people, and the teacher a humble, part-time instructor who thinks himself a citizen, not a sovereign. (Fossedal, 2002, 85).

In Part 1, the author explores the origin of the development the Swiss version of democracy and the reasons for writing this book. Fossedal, in Part 2, describes this millennium of Swiss history and how its system of self protection developed. In Part 3, the Swiss Constitution and institutions, including Swiss referendums, are examined. In Parts 4 and 5 the author gives examples of why democracy actually works when the citizens are entrusted with the power to determine the functioning of the government that governs them.

In Democracy in the Digital Age : Challenges to Political Life in Cyberspace (2000), Anthony

G. Wilhelm offers another exploration the emergence of public participation in the processes of government using the new communication technologies but he mentions that despite the superficial appearance of progress of technological advances, there is not necessarily progress in the lives in many people, especially in the undeveloped countries.

The author notes that the use of a direct democracy requires a focused policy and the cyber world of political control contains the features and advantages of access to resources, inclusion, potential for deliberation, and comprehensible design. In the future, direct democracy will be formed by shaping virtual civic spaces which will include home-based cyberdemocracy as well as public-access workstations all of which will result in community building.

In Stealing the Initiative: How State Government Responds to Direct Democracy (2000). E.

R. Gerber and other authors explore eleven California initiatives and referendums to give readers with a better understanding the political world. Topics covered in the book include taxation, transportation, legislative spending, term limits, primaries, and multilingual education. This book also includes varied conclusions about how to reform the initiative process to improve direct democracy. For citizens who want to understand and/or increase their role in government. The book also includes suggestions as to how to reform the initiative procedures to improve and positively evolve the practices of direct democracy.

Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City (2000) edited by Engin Isin is a collection of essays from several authors concerning what the functions of politics and democracy are in the postmodern world of globalization.

Like looking at the naively primitive but insightful paintings of Henri Rousseau, it is sometimes refreshing to hear the views of people outside of the mainstream (as with outsider art). Some valuable information can be found by what others might consider naïve perspectives. Though he can hardly be considered naïve, Michael Noah Mautner presents his views from a perspective outside of the traditionally trained political scientist as he was educated in the field of chemistry as a Ph.D. and is a Chemistry professor whose writings include over 140 chemistry research papers. His political interests no doubt come from the fact that he was born in Budapest in 1942 during the Holocaust and lost many of his relatives including his father during that time of world tragedy

His book, *A Constitution of Direct Democracy: Pure Democracy and the Governance of the Future ~Locally and Globally* (2000) is an interesting book for several reasons other than those already mentioned. Since he is a chemistry professor by profession, he writes about democracy from a scientist's perspective and even provides a suggested constitution for the implementation and used of a direct democracy. He first offers the possible constitution with a preamble that can be used to establish a governmental system based on direct democracy. He lists the problems associated with the representative system such as that system not really representing the will and sovereignty of the people and the associated problems of corruption, etc. One of the more interesting problems he mentions is the "illogical linkage of issues", meaning that a collection of unrelated issues are clumped together that have no relation to each other and very often they are categorized in the left or right side of the political spectrum. An example he gives is: "A voter who opposes abortion out of respect for all forms of life may have to vote for a conservative candidate and therefore also vote for and endorse the build-up of nuclear weapons with its risks to all forms of life. This is an obvious moral absurdity." (Mautner, 2000, 5).

His book continues to describe what he says are workable procedures for implementing direct democracy. Being a physical scientist, he also anticipates the future and creates futuristic scenarios in the manner of a science fiction writer and he even includes the concepts of space exploration and colonization. In the future people will need to decide on issues involving governmental systems, space exploration, robotics, cloning, economics, taxation, population growth and control, abortion, crime and punishment, religious freedom, genetic engineering, biological immortality, and many other issues. The decisions they make will affect all of humanity. People instinctively, or innately, desire to choose the best conditions for their present as well as their future. The shared knowledge, common wisdom, and the innate desire in human nature to want what is best for all, and the natural desire for survival, would result in decisions advantageous to the whole of the human condition. This collective consciousness would form a constitution of direct democracy which would implement the communal decisions of the people. In the section of the book entitled “The Constitution of Direct Democracy” he describes the structure, possible scenarios, and ethics of direct democratic systems in governments of the local, national, and world levels.

In Direct Democracy or Representative Government? Dispelling the Populist Myth (2000)

John Haskell compares and contrasts the positive and negative characteristics of populist direct democracy and representative government as described in the Federal Papers of James Madison of the founding period of the United States of America. He says that the possible realization of direct democracy has exponentially increased in recent history, primarily because of telecommunications advances such as television, computers, and the Internet and publicly determined policies in states such as California. He thinks that publicly ruled legislatures would be disorganized and incoherent since public majorities are unstable and impulsive collections of varied and contrasting philosophies (but some people would say that so are legislatures of elected representatives) whereas elected representatives tend to be more deliberative and inclined toward negotiation and discussion. Again, the importance of the Internet is mentioned as a medium for communication and a method of publicizing information and political points of view.

Haskell, who sides with the federalists who think that legislation should be formed only by the contemplative and educated elite, mentions the “paradox of voting” as having the following characteristics:

1. Whereas an individual can make a rational, logical, and coherent ordering of choices presented to him or her, it is often impossible for a group, even one made up of well-informed and rational individuals, to order their choices coherently.
2. Majorities in parties are really unstable coalitions of minorities that rarely if ever carry clear and comprehensive policy instructions.
3. Different legitimate and widely used methods of decision-making often produce different winners.
4. Decision-making processes may be manipulated by strategic voters.
5. We can never be sure that the popular will is reflected in the result of a decision-making process. (2001, Haskell from 1998, Meyer & Brown).

He maintains that the result of a collective vote can be chaotic and irrational: “The outcome of a vote may be irrational, even when all of the participants are rational and informed” (2001, Haskell) but I think this is no more true than with the results of the voting of legislators. How can the result of a vote between two choices be considered irrational, strange, or chaotic? If the result seems irrational to the voting participant then that is probably because they voted for the opposite side of the issue. If the outcome is unexpected or contrary to most polls then the voters need to accept the uncontrollable outcome in the same way that the forces of nature, such as the weather, need to be accepted as given conditions. People adjust to the results of a plebiscite: some people might not agree with the results of an election, such as the 2004 presidential election, but they eventually adjust to the outcome. The only time I would think the outcome would be chaotic is if, for example, people rioted and looted after the results of a vote were announced but that should not occur in a civilized society. Also, it is important to realize that legislators are not expert in all

issues either -- they are just elected to represent a constituency; very often their only expertise is in being a politician and getting elected.

Electronic Democracy (2002), by Graeme Browning, describes how the Internet has transformed the political atmosphere in the United States and in the world. Using Internet technology, people now have the tools to discuss issues and affect results concerning the American and world political arena. She mentions the effectiveness of online petitions and online research. Also included in the book is a history of online voting (mostly in California for the United States), online fund-raising, political polling online, and online voter registration. This book is a source of names, addresses, websites, discussion groups, and e-mail campaigns, and facts concerning how to get involved with this particular movement. There are also suggestions as to how to begin one's own political or organizational campaigns and how to organize, raise funds, develop surveys, contact people, etc. Also covered are ethical problems and abuses associated with online activism. The book covers issues such as using the World Wide Web for upstart organizations and how to create effective e-mail campaigns as well as how to write letters to Congress members that will be read and responded to and an exploration of the future of online polling and voting.

In *Electronic Democracy* Graeme Browning quotes Jane Hague who told USA Today that "The motto for the twenty-first century for government should be: 'On line, not in line'". (2002, Browning).

In *E-topia* (2000), William J. Mitchell refers to the future online meeting places where friends, co-workers, colleagues, and students will meet:

"What sorts of meeting places, forums, and markets will emerge in the electronically mediated world? What will be the twenty-first century equivalents of the gathering at the well, the water cooler, the Greek agora, the Roman forum, the village green, the town square, Main Street, and the mall?" Many of the meeting places will be located in the virtual world of cyberspace and he adds that "they will make growing use of electronic mail systems, mailing lists, newsgroups, chat

rooms, Web pages, directories and search engines, audio conferencing, video conferencing, increasingly elaborate, avatar-populated, online virtual worlds, and software-mediated environments that we cannot even imagine yet. Some of these virtual meeting places will be the private domains of well-defined special groups, some will be discreetly out of the public eye, and some will even be determinedly clandestine; others will be true public space open to all.” (Mitchell, 2000, 85).

“Traditionally, political power has been exerted, made visible, and architecturally celebrated through physical assemblies of kings and courtiers, senates, parliaments, cabinets, councils, and so on. Conversely, if you wanted to overthrow established political power, you assembled ‘the people’ in an urban public place, set up barricades, authorities had the wit and the will, they would try to take the usual countermeasures - dispersion of crowds, prohibition of assemblies, and exile of agitators.” and “Tocqueville’s famous insistence on the importance of free political associations, and on the ‘power of meeting’ in forming and sustaining such associations, takes on new meaning. Now, the necessary venues can be found not only in physical space but also in cyberspace, and this opens up fresh, highly effective avenues for political organization and action.” (Mitchell, 2000, 96).

In the section, “Reinventing Public Space” he says that:

The twenty-first century will still need agoras - maybe more than ever. But these will not always be physical places. They will operate at an extraordinary range of scales, from the intimately local to the global. And even where they *look* familiar, they will no longer function in the same sorts of ways as the great public places of the past. Under these new conditions, though, the simple, ancient principles of public space remain crucial. If public life is not to disintegrate, communities must still find

ways to provide, pay for, and maintain places of assembly and interactions for their members - whether these places are virtual, physical, or some new and complex combination of the two. And if these places are to serve their purposes effectively, they must allow both freedom of access and freedom of expression. (p. 97).

He includes a quote from the American philosopher and educational theorist John Dewey who observed that:

“It seemed almost self-evident to Plato - as to Rousseau later - that a genuine state could hardly be larger than the number of persons capable of personal acquaintance with one another. Our modern state-utility is due to the consequences of technology employed so as to facilitate the rapid and easy circulation of opinions and information, and so as to generate constant and intricate interactions far beyond the limits of face-to-face communities...The elimination of distance, at the base of which are physical agencies, has called into being the new form of political association. “ (p. 133).

In *Adult Education for Social Change: From Center Stage to the Wings and Back Again*, Thomas Heaney views adult education as participatory and as a tool for social change, where educational progressivism is the contemporary approach to educating the public. “ ‘Adult education turns out to be the most reliable instrument for social actionists’ since it assures that any action undertaken would be authentically democratic” (Brookfield, 1984). Eduard Lindeman, as influenced by John Dewey, considers adult education to be intertwined with democracy, social action, and control by people over their daily lives. To Lindeman, adult education equals social change, a method to create good and productive citizens. Even if education is viewed as a “great selector” rather than a “great equalizer”, each person can, as a result of

education, find their niche, based on their abilities and merits, within a democratic society. The concept of using the educational system to implement a direct democracy is closely connected with the ideas expressed by Heaney, Miles Horton, Paulo Freire, and Jack Mezirow since their approach is to empower the populace through education in order to create a democratic society. Since it is necessary to have an educated public in order to have democracy function efficiently, democracy is dependent on the educational system to survive and prosper.

In “Developing e-Citizens and e-Consumers, an Irish e-Commerce Case Study” (2001), John MacNamara and David O’Donnell offer a comprehensive study of the effects the new cyber culture of the computer and the Internet and their effects on society, culture, and education. and the necessity for society and the educational system to produce “e-literate” citizens for the resulting new society. As they state it in their abstracted introduction: “We present a very simple argument: e-business needs e-consumers and e-literate workers; e-government needs e-citizens”. The authors give many examples from Ireland, where they are based, and other nations and institutions using online voting. The authors present an in-depth description and qualitative analysis of the trends toward e-government, e-commerce, e-education, and e-culture in general backed by knowledge, examples, and statistics.

One of the concerns many people have about online voting revolves around the security and privacy issues and these are well-explored by Dr. Russell Smith in *Electronic Voting: Benefits and Risks* (2002). Dr. Smith, who is deputy director of research at the Australian Institute of Criminology, thinks national electronic voting will be prevalent in the near future, but some people are hesitant because of security and secrecy issues and some people now attach a certain ritual to voting and some would therefore want to resist online voting in order to hold on to past traditions. He even includes a history of the changing methods of voting procedures. He mentions that there would have to be sophisticated servers for many people voting at the same time but the pluses of speed and accuracy, ease of use, lower costs compared to paper ballots, the fact that online voting is already successfully being used in many countries, etc., outweigh the minuses.

Dr. Smith mentions in an interview (2003) with Rachel Lebihan that, in his opinion, security is not an insurmountable problem, since the solutions that are used in financial transactions can be incorporated into methods for e-voting. His expertise and knowledge is evident in his writing and his use of examples and I think with many other technical experts on the project that the security and efficiency issues can be solved.

In the book *Democracy, Real and Ideal* (1999), a critique and analysis of the philosophy of the German philosopher Jurgen Habermas, the book's author Ricardo Blaug examines Habermas' philosophy in relation to the theory and practical aspects of democracy. Habermas' work includes a theory of democracy and his exploration of the realistic practicality of democracy and an in depth analysis of his normative theory of democracy and his theory of judgement. "Only where democracy is conceived as an everyday and real interactive process can we understand what it might mean to truly rule ourselves" (Blaug, 1999, xv). In the study of Habermas' discourse of ethics, references are made to Hobbes's *Leviathan* and Locke's concept of protective rights (Blaug, 1999, 12).

Democracy is discussed in relation to the rationalism of Plato and the empiricism of Aristotle. The essay mentions that Locke's theory starts with the natural human rights, Hobbes' begins with rational death avoidance (or survival instinct), and Kant begins his premise with the idea of pure practical reason Kant says: "a person is subject to no law other than those he (either alone or at least jointly with others) gives to himself" (Blaug, 1999, 6), a thought which is greatly influenced by Jean Jacques Rousseau and Kant also refers to a social contract like Rousseau's. Kant's support of the moral law assumes that mankind is essentially good and moral by nature, a concept which figures heavily in democratic theory (but Hegel criticizes Kant's philosophy as being overly abstracted and not applicable to reality). Also explored are Aristotle's episteme (objective knowledge), techne (technical knowledge), and phronesis (practical reason) in relation to democratic theory (Blaug, 1999, 23,24).

The what, who, how and where of political theory including the location of the democratic process, as well as Rousseau's concept of popular sovereignty, are discussed. "The normative theory requires that

the maximum number of people be involved and that the procedure they use be as fair as possible” (p. 50). According to J.F. Bohman: “more democracy ... is possible ... so long as citizens find the public sphere a discursive space for criticism, learning, and new forms of associations” (p. 54). R. Bernstein says: “If we don’t strive to realize the conditions required for practical discourse then we will surely become less than fully human” (p. 54). And from K. Baynes: we need a “robust and multifaceted model of the public sphere in which individuals can deliberate about the collective terms and conditions of the common lives” (p. 54). Blaug concludes his introduction with: “If we forget what he (Habermas) has taught us we will achieve nothing, for the world is full of theories of deliberative democracy that, lacking normative sophistication, amount to little more than heart-warming remonstrances, fantasies of positivistic control, or mere semantic incantation.” (p. 127). Concerning the actual functioning of the democratic fora, Blaug mentions that the application of democratic theory in reality “has always had a profound distrust of the people” (p. 133) as evidenced by the American Constitution.

Habermas states that:

What we need is a hegemony of democratic values, and this requires a multiplication of democratic practices, institutionalizing them into ever more diverse social relations, so that a multiplicity of subject-positions can be formed through a democratic matrix. It is in this way - and not by trying to provide it with a rational foundation - that we will be able not only to defend democracy but also to deepen it ... a project of radical and plural democracy requires the existence of multiplicity, of plurality, and of conflict, and sees in them the *raison d’etre* of politics” (p. 134)

In the section “Democracy from the Participant’s Perspective” (Blaug, 1999, 136), a discussion ensues concerning a “breakout of democracy”, which has definitive characteristics and its own life cycle. When this breakout occurs, and as public interest increases, the people will, in Rousseau’s words “fly to the assemblies”. “With a breakout of democracy we have Sartre’s ‘group in fusion’, Pizzorno’s ‘mobilization’ type of political participation, Mansbridge’s ‘fragile bubbles’ of ‘unitary democracy’, Phillip’s ‘internal democracy’, Moscovici’s ‘consensual’ participation, Arendt’s ‘oasis in the desert’ or ‘elementary republics’, the Czech Republic’s Charter 77’s ‘parallel poleis’, and the opening of a Habermasian ‘public sphere’.” (p. 138).

Blaug mentions the democratic decision making process as having five elements: 1. problem recognition 2. deliberation 3. decision making 4. implementation 5. evaluation (p. 141). L. Goodwyn (1981, p. 146) mentions that democratic institutions build slowly so, in their development, patience is required. And Blaug says: “While mistrust of the political consciousness of the populace has served to ground the need for elitism in democracy, participation itself is just as frequently appealed to as the supreme educator. If practiced regularly, perhaps at first on tasks appropriate to the level of learning, participants can make significant gains in proficiency.” (p. 146). K. Elder refers to the three levels of society as micro, meso, and macro (p. 149).

Concerning the democratic participatory process, Blaug states (p. 151):

When we begin to consider the a movement seriously challenging the power of the state, we reveal the extraordinary lack of knowledge we have accumulated over our history regarding what it actually means to rule ourselves. the flight into liberal democracy evinced by those countries who have recently joined the “democratic” club shows both the collective paucity of our understanding of such a process and also the dangers in imagining that one “revolutionary” push, one legitimating social contract, one constitutional founding, can relieve us of the need to preserve

genuine democracy. Where we conceive of a social contract as an ongoing procedure requiring constant work and attention, so do we understand that deliberative capacities must be learned, practiced, preserved, and patiently extended. (p. 151).

Blaug also discusses the issue of emotions in the democratic process (p. 153) but mentions that, according to Rousseau, “once you have citizens, you have all you need” (p. 155). S. Behabib is quoted as saying: “the question is not whether discursive democracy can become the practice of complex societies but whether complex societies are still capable of democratic rule” (p. 156).

The following quotations are some thoughts (translated by Christopher Betts) of the great French philosopher of democratic principles, Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-78) — whose political philosophy influenced Thomas Jefferson as well as the other American forefathers and formed the basis of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States of America — from *The Social Contract* (1994):

The first and most important maxim of a lawful or popular government, that is to say a government which has as its object the good of the people, is therefore to follow the general will in everything; but in order to be followed, it must be known, and above all it must be clearly distinguished from the particular will, beginning with that of the individual self. (p. 9).

Public education, following rules prescribed by government, and controlled by officers established by the sovereign, is therefore one of the fundamental principles of the popular or legitimate form of government. (p.23)

Each of us puts his person and all his power in common under the supreme directions of the general will; and we as a body receive each member as an indivisible part of the whole. (p. 55).

By the social pact we have given existence and life to the body politic; we must by

the social pact we have given existence and life to the body politic; we must now, by legislation, give it the ability to will and move. For the act by which this body is originally formed and unified does nothing to determine what it must do so as to preserve itself. (p.73).

Laws, properly speaking, are no more than a society's conditions of association. The people, being subject to the laws, must create them; it is the associates who have the right to determine the conditions of society. But how are they to determine them? By sudden inspiration bringing common agreement? Has the body politic some organ by which to articulate its wishes? Who will give it the foresight it needs to produce acts of will and publicize them in advance, or how, in time of need, will it make them known? (p. 75).

What then is a government? It is an intermediate body set up between subjects and sovereign to ensure their mutual correspondence, and is entrusted with the execution of laws and with the maintenance of liberty, both social and political. (p. 92).

The sovereign can entrust the responsibility of government to all the people or to the greater part of the people, so that more citizens will be members of the government than are simply individual citizens. The name given to this form of government is democracy. (p. 99).

By new forms of association let us, if we can, correct the faults in the general form of association. (p. 175).

Legislative power belongs to the people, and can belong to it alone. (p. 91).

A Survey Concerning the Use of Direct Democracy and its Implementation through Educational Institutions

Concerning the research topic of direct democracy and its present use and the methods of its implementation and ways of introducing and educating the public about the concept, the methods of collecting data would involve research in the history of these ideas by reviewing past research, experiments, and uses of direct democracy through a search of literature, studies, and experiments done on the topic. Also, another method would involve the collecting of information from interviews, surveys, and questionnaires conducted with the general public, focus groups, and politicians as well as social studies and political science teachers. The information gathering instruments used would involve closed form and open form questions and the use of quantitative (in determining numbers, statistics, percentages, etc.) and qualitative (such as in eliciting opinions from the respondents for open form questions) forms of collecting and analyzing the data. The data could be collected and tabulated via Internet connections and the open-ended questions could be analyzed by readers, the number depending upon the scale of each survey or questionnaire.

This project also involves a survey (Appendix VI) concerning the procedures for developing direct democracy in the United States of America utilizing computer and Internet technology as well as the existing educational system. The first step is the development — through research and proposed methods of implementation, study of precedents, and historical and literary references — of the procedures and then the implementation (which would run concurrently with educating the public about the concept beginning with the K-12 levels up through post-secondary and adult levels) of the procedures involved in direct democracy.

The basic research questions are: What are your opinions concerning direct democracy? How has direct democracy, utilizing computer and Internet technology, been implemented and used in various countries and institutions and what has been and could be the role of educational systems in the implementation and continuing use of direct democracy?

The purpose of the survey is to determine the level of interest of the public, the politicians and professionals involved, teachers, and students in the concept and practice of direct democracy. Another purpose is to determine the practicality and suggestions for methods in implementing a direct democracy in the United States of America and the methods of training all voting citizens for using it on a continuing basis.

While contacting the public, legislators, politicians, professionals, focus groups as well as teachers of Social Studies, Political Science, History, Civics and Government, the methods most used to get responses would be questionnaires with briefly descriptive cover letters, surveys (and pilot surveys), and interviews all using mostly closed ended, and some open ended, questions. Pilot surveys could be used utilizing university students and some questionnaires could be sent to politicians and random selections of respondents.

Questionnaires are documents that ask the same questions of all individuals in a sample. The two main types of questions are open-ended and closed-ended questions, both of which can be asked in a formal or an informal tone, and can be used in an appropriate mix in both qualitative and quantitative research.

Below are some examples of multiple choice closed form items in *Direct Democracy: the Politics of Initiative, Referendum, and Recall* (1999) by Thomas Cronin:

1. To be realistic about it, our elected officials:

- know more about an issue and should be trusted to make the right decisions
- should be carefully watched in case they misuse their power going against the will of the people
- undecided

2. When making laws, government should pay attention to:

- mostly to experts
- opinions of ordinary people
- undecided

3. In government, should people with more intelligence and character have greater influence than other people
- Yes, they have more to offer
 - No, because all the citizens should decide on an issue
 - undecided

(questions from McClosky, 1978). Civil Liberties Survey. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

The below sample questions are in the form of open-ended questions and can be answered with essay type answers:

How has direct democracy been practiced in other countries and institutions and how effective has it been?

How can the educational system participate in the implementation of a direct democracy utilizing Internet and computer technology?

How can direct democracy be introduced and taught in Social Studies and Political Science courses?

Do you think the United States is a democracy now?

Do you think Direct Democracy or people voting directly on legislative issues is a good idea?

Do you think adequate technology exists today for direct democracy?

A Curriculum for the Implementation of Direct Democracy

This project also includes a plan for direct democracy to be introduced and taught in Social Studies and Political Science courses in educational, public, and online institutions and possible curriculum (Appendix I) that could be utilized to implement it. The initial introduction to the concept would begin in kindergarten and the early grades of elementary school and then incrementally more information would gradually be added to the knowledge base progressing through to high school, and in post-secondary and adult learning environments, to prepare the learners to be educated voters in a continuing and growing direct democracy.

One problem with the educational system, and society in general, involves political philosophy. If most societies are called democratic then many people hold the opinion that the people should be allowed to govern by voting directly and democratically (as is done in Switzerland) on issues rather than voting only for representatives. When educating post-secondary or adult students (or even students beginning with the early years of kindergarten and then through high school, in preparation for their becoming adults), how can the concepts of democracy be conveyed and transferred to the learners and how can they become directly involved in the implementation of democratically determined plans? The proposed project involves exploring what methods have been used previously to establish direct democracies (which are defined as the public voting directly on issues rather than through elected representatives who can, after being elected, vote any way they choose.) and to establish a curriculum to teach the principles and techniques of direct democracy in schools, primarily through social studies and political science classes. The process can involve obtaining ideas from social studies and political science teacher in developing a curriculum. One approach could be to send an e-mailed questionnaire to Social Studies and Political Science teachers in public and private schools who teach from kindergarten to the twelfth grade levels and to those who teach in the post-secondary and adult education learning

suggestion space at the end of the questionnaire where the instructors can add any thoughts that they may have on the subject.

The social studies and political science classes could introduce, early in the development of the curriculum - such as during the elementary school years, the first concepts of democracy as government based on the will of and for the good of the people or society. The curriculum would eventually include the history of democracy beginning with ancient Athens, Greece (and perhaps even before that) and its present forms of use today in various countries and institutions and studies of its various methods of execution. Also included in the course curriculum would be computer skills courses since thorough knowledge of computer and Internet usage would be needed to implement and sustain the continuing use of a direct democracy. Once the system is established and the procedures for its execution are in place and all of the necessary legislation is passed to secure its governmental structure, procedural content, and continuing existence, the voters, or potential voters (who would require secured registration, training, and perhaps certification to qualify to vote), would learn how to research and read about issues to be voted on at the local, state, and national levels. Computer tutorials could also be developed to teach the learners how this is done and even provide some practice voting sessions and hypothetical situations to which they can respond.

The social studies and political science classes would introduce, early in the development of the curriculum — during the elementary school years — the first concepts of democracy as government based on the will of and for the good of the people or society. The curriculum would eventually include the history of democracy beginning with ancient Athens, Greece (and before) and its present forms of use today in various countries and institutions and studies of its various methods of execution. Also included in the course curriculum would be computer skills courses since thorough knowledge of computer and Internet usage would be needed to implement and sustain the continuing use of a direct democracy. Once the system is established and the procedures for its execution are in place and all of the necessary legislation is passed to

secure its structure, procedural content, and continuing existence, the voters, or potential voters (who perhaps would require secured registration, training, and perhaps certification to qualify to vote), would learn how to research and read about issues to be voted on at the local, state, and national levels. Computer tutorials could also be developed to teach the learners how this is done and even provide some practice voting sessions and hypothetical situations to which they can respond.

After, and even before and during the discussion and implementation of a direct democracy system, the most important aspect of creating a system whereby the information and training necessary to maintain a direct democracy is to establish a curriculum, including the methods, institutions, and locations to dispense that information. The information could be dispensed in schools, both public and private, in home schooling situations, on the Internet, in books and magazines, and through commercial, governmental, and community organizations. The most wide-ranging method of disseminating this information would be through the public school system and colleges and universities.

The information could begin at home with the parents reading to their children with early learner books. The curriculum could begin with the pre-kindergarten students by having the students vote for what they like by placing balls into baskets and by showing flash cards showing the most basic ideas involved about the concept of democracy. The curriculum could progress up through the school system through the school system: through kindergarten, elementary, junior high school, high school, then through colleges and universities as well as specialized schools, post-secondary institutions, and other forms of adult education.

Implementation

The implementation in phases of the direct democracy system is described in Appendix V. Many people could potentially vote, after being educated in the procedures involved in online voting, during popular and controversial issues but the obscure, unpopular, or specialized issues would have fewer voters. But even if the voter response was only one percent of the United States registered voters that still would be over a million votes and this could reflect the views of the majority in the same way as an opinion poll (such as the Gallop Poll) which uses randomly selected participants to determine the general public opinion or stance on an issue with usually + or - 3% margin of error.

Concerning ethical issues, there could be the possibility, as in all areas of life and business, of the unethical use of funds along the way while creating this system as well as propagandistic advertising but this would be much less than that now utilized in the election of political candidates. Also the bribing of millions of voters would be next to impossible though, in the other view, finding a few swing voting legislators to slip tempting enticements under the table to would be comparatively simpler to do.

One concern of the direct voting concept is the security issue. The Internet or computerized direct voting procedure is a decentralized structure and therefore not susceptible to the sort of attack that a congregated collection of legislators would have to guard against should another September 11, 2001 type attack be attempted. But the Internet can be vulnerable to computer vandals. The motivation of such vandals, except for the thrill or mischief in committing such an act or the desire to create an anarchic situation, would be slight since they are usually interested in debilitating monopolies and big businesses and are generally on the side of the common people who would benefit from a participatory democracy. But to subvert any attempts at espionage, system manipulation, or system destruction, strict felony laws with severe penalties and punishments could be passed to discourage and prevent any of those sorts of attempts. In the same way that computer security is accomplished with regards to credit card use, online courses, privacy issues, etc., technology experts could devise impenetrable systems as is done now using a system involving

computer intelligence utilizing a matrix of security solutions involving cross referencing, passwords, statistical probability, etc., all of which could be utilized, developed and perfected for online voting processes.

Below is a report titled: a Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project entitled Voting: What is, What could be which estimates that there probably was from 4 to 6 million lost votes in the 2000 U.S. presidential election:

In part one of the 92 page report the authors say that:

“We estimate that between four and six million presidential votes were lost in the 2000 election. These are qualified voters who wanted to vote but could not or were not counted. (Losses occur for two reasons: first, some voters do not, or cannot, participate due to problems with voter registration or polling place practices; second, some votes that are cast are not counted due to problems with ballots.)

Two million ballots, two percent of the 100 million ballots cast for president in 2000, were not counted because they were unmarked, damaged, or ambiguous.

Of this two percent it is estimated that 0.5 percent did not intend to vote for president, so 1.5 percent (or 1.5 million people) thought they voted for president but their votes were not counted”. (Caltech/MIT, 2001, 8).

The most difficult part of implementing this plan would be to get a constitutional amendment unless the 3rd House remained to function only as an opinion poll collection system. Constitutional amendments are permanent additions to the Constitution, though they can be counter amended as was the case with the Prohibition Amendment, that require a 2/3 vote from both houses of the Congress and therefore very difficult to obtain. There have been twenty seven Constitutional Amendments with the most recent being in 1992 which involved no Congressional self salary increases while the legislators are in their terms. The twelfth Amendment concerning changing the method of electing the president of the United States using the Electoral College was added in 1803 after the first ten Amendments, the Bill of Rights, were added in 1791.

Since the Congress is now divided half and half between the two major parties, the Republicans and the Democrats, passing such an amendment, or any amendment, at this time would probably not be possible since most Republicans would not vote on any changes to the Constitution and only some of the more progressive Democrats would support the idea. Also, since the Democratic candidate received 530,000 more votes in the 2000 election than his opponent but was defeated by the Electoral College system, it is not likely that the Republicans would vote against a system that allows them to get elected, though, conceivably, the Electoral College could remain intact and the 3rd House system could still be implemented. However, if this idea, the 3rd House — the Public Assembly, were to be introduced and publicly debated using the available media (television, radio, newspapers, magazines, scholarly journals, the Internet, etc.) over a period of several years with a trial period of several years people would eventually adjust to and then accept the idea and then the possibility of passing a Constitutional Amendment would increase. After all, the Constitution began with an idea and a blank piece of paper. Then the United States of America can, utilizing the techniques of participatory action research, move toward the direction of being an even more participatory democracy.

A Discussion of the Future of Democracy

Though some authors such as Carl Cohen in *Democracy* do not believe in a bright future for democracy, many of the writers of pessimism presented their views before the advent of computer and Internet technology. I believe with the correct use of new technology democracy can indeed have a bright future. Technology and social movements are changing the world educationally, socially, politically, environmentally, economically, and culturally at a rapid pace. Other events or ideas that affect the future are: social movements, religion, attitudes, wars, the economy, health or disease, environmental conditions, and natural and man-made conditions and catastrophes.

In the educational field, one example of a new use of technology is the use of distance learning using online instruction via the Internet using the World Wide Web, invention of the Millennium Technology Prize recipient, Tim Berners-Lee. In addition to technology, issues that impact the living and professional environments are the decentralization of all processes, globalization, and the democratization of society. An example of a new use of technology is online and distance learning which are the wave of the future in this global village in which we all reside. In addition to technology, issues that impact the living and professional environments are the decentralization of all processes, globalization, and the democratization of society.

By utilizing the educational system, a system of direct democracy which is essentially having citizens vote directly on legislative issues rather than only electing representatives who can, after elected, vote any way they choose. The implementation of a direct democracy was previously considered impractical, or not possible, on a large scale, but now with the advent of computer and Internet it is. Though the process can begin in part before that time, the proposed plan could take a generation of time to fully implement — and then it would continue to grow and evolve beyond that — which may sound like a long time compared to a human life span but is in fact a short time in historical perspective. The term and concept of evolution, rather than revolution, can be used when changes are involved, especially social changes such as changes in the educational system. When change is to occur, a slow and natural growth is always the preferred method

rather than a sudden, radical change of events and values, which usually only creates more problems of a different sort. As previously mentioned, technology and social movements are rapidly changing the world in many areas including educationally, socially, politically, environmentally, economically, and culturally. In the educational field, one example of the new uses of technology is the use of distance learning using online instruction via the Internet. In addition to technology, issues that impact the living and professional environments are the decentralization of all processes, globalization, and the democratization of society. In my idea of teaching and implementing the processes of direct democracy in the United States (as is practiced now in Switzerland, for example), the citizens would have a more direct affect on the legislative and governmental policies under which they must live and these changes would occur and progress at a natural pace.

In exploring future possibilities some methods that can be used are trend extrapolation, the delphi technique, scenario planning, and futuring trees.

Trend extrapolation is the “identification, collection, and analysis of past and present trend patterns and their probable impact on the future of an organization” (1999, Alexander, W. & Serfass, R.). Concerning Trend Extrapolation, several trends that affect society and educational systems come to mind. Some of these trends are: new technology, population growth , decentralization, globalization, diversification of interests and populations, and standardization of services

The Delphi Technique is “a multi-step systematic process for extracting expert intuitive expectations of alternative futures” (1999, Alexander, W. & Serfass, R.) through the use of a series of expert panels. The Delphi Technique alludes somewhat to the issue of fortune telling referred to previously but in this case the fortune telling, or guessing, is done by panels of experts. The knowledge of the experts in addition to the contributions of visionaries, artists, writers, and the like, come into play as they can submit ideas for the experts’ scrutiny for plans for the best possible future for the most people. This process also demonstrates the value of democracy, the Internet, and other new technologies. If two heads are better than one then how

much better are 6 billion heads (or selecting from 6 billion heads)? A good future might include some factor of luck, or being in the right place at the right time, but more often than not, it is the result of careful planning and the systematic execution of those plans. So experts and scientists, in concert with other sources, can play a vital role in guiding — if not predicting — the present towards a desirable future. Developing a direct democracy system would involve continuous panels of experts and this could be considered a type of a Delphi method. The previously mentioned extrapolated trends (new technology, population growth, decentralization, globalization, diversification of interests and populations, and standardization of services) would be incorporated into the future plan development process. After, and even before and during the discussion and implementation of a direct democracy system, the most important aspect of creating a system whereby the information and training necessary to maintain a direct democracy is realized, is to establish a curriculum — including the methods, institutions, and locations — to dispense that information. As the concept of direct democracy develops, and as it comes into daily use, there would constantly be the need for the advice of expert opinion. In areas of specialized knowledge, in medicine for example, governmental policies would need to be derived from experts within those areas and those ideas could be exchanged through the procedures of the Delphi Technique.

A futuring tree provides “a process for connecting an organization’s future state with its present state through a network of pathways working from the future to the present. (1999, Alexander, W. & Serfass, R.). A futuring tree is defined as a diagramming of network pathways moving from the desired future goal to the present conditions. The purpose of constructing a futuring tree is to identify a future goal and then determine what pathways would have been necessary to achieve that desired goal by reasoning backward towards the present. The operational characteristics of a futuring tree are that the process begins with the desired future state, that vision and strategic methods to achieve a goal are required, that the analysis proceeds in reverse from the future to the present and presents a network of possibilities that occur through phases of development. The structure of a futuring tree is analogous to the branching of a tree with the trunk

being the future and the branches moving toward the present.

In the desired future scenario society evolves toward the practice of the democracy that almost everyone says they believe in (yet which exists only on a small and local scale such as within a legislature or a small organization), a world exempt from the petty, and potentially deadly — for the ruled populace — conflicts between politicians. To trace the development from the future of direct democracy back to the present, we would first need to conduct the journey from one situation or location and I would choose the United States of America for the purposes of this futuring tree. Today the United States has a complicated system of local, state, and federal legislatures and a government roughly divided into an executive, a legislative, and a judicial branch. The purpose, it is said, of a democracy is govern according to the will of the people, a concept developed around 500 BC in Athens, Greece. This is now accomplished by electing people who try to think like the majority of the people who elected them on every issue, which is in actuality, an impossible task. Also, it is done by conducting random opinion polls such as the Gallup or Harris polls to get a general idea of what the public is thinking. Only recently has technology offered the possibility of rendering the public's desires directly, however, this idea is too new to be absorbed into and accepted by the collective consciousness at the present time and needs time to be explored and then accepted. As every individual's strongest drive is the drive for survival, so too the strongest drive of the collective consciousness of society is the drive for survival of human society and it is therefore logical to assume that the majority of a society will elect to choose those behaviors and conditions that are the most beneficial to the sustenance of the human race. For these reasons, a government of, by, and for the people is the preferred method of governance. Using the seven futuring tools — Trend Extrapolation, the Delphi Technique, Morphological Analysis, the Crawford Slip Method, Scenario Planning, Cross-Impact Analysis, and Futuring Trees, we can develop future strategies for the implementation of truly democratic procedures. The future will always be a mystery and unknowable but we can use futuring methods to plan for and affect a future partly of our own making.

Conclusion

The concept of democracy was discussed by Socrates and written about by Plato in *Republic*, Aristotle in *The Politics*, Machiavelli in *The Prince*, Locke in *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* and *Two Treatises of Government*, Montesquieu in *The Spirit of Laws*, Hobbes in *Leviathan*, Rousseau in *The Social Contract*, and Thomas Jefferson in his writings. Democracy was first used in Athens, Greece before 500 B.C., where each citizen voted directly on all legislative issues, thereby being a true democracy. Direct participatory democracy was considered impractical before now, primarily because there was no technology to supply it. Now, with computer and Internet technology, there is.

Computer and Internet technology can supply the forum for the voting of citizens to occur and schools and community and governmental organizations can supply the knowledge, information, and training for the implementation and continuing use of a direct democracy.

Appendix I

A Curriculum for the Implementation of Direct Democracy

Following is a possible curriculum that could be revised, amended, and expanded to accommodate changing instructional requirements and changing new technology as well as changing and evolving informational content:

Pre-kindergarten: Flash cards with pictures depicting basic concepts and people and places associated with democracy. Voting by raising hands, clapping, shouting, or placing balls in a basket to show what they like as shown from pictures of the objects (such as apples, cake, hamburgers, lemons, music, etc.)

Kindergarten: Vote by placing softball size balls in a container. Flash cards with pictures and words of basic concepts of democracy.

First grade: Vote by placing ping pong balls in a container. Vote by writing letters. Flash cards with words of leaders of history, places and events associated with democracy. Elect students for class duties for each student such as erasing the board, closing the windows, turning off lights, sweeping, etc. These duties can be rotated monthly.

Second grade: Vote by writing letters, numbers, and then names.

Third grade: Vote by writing names of the students and of objects voted on. For instance, for the question: “What do you like?”, the students write what they like such as “ice cream”, etc. Eventually, sentences are used.

Fourth grade: Vote for class officers and class duties. Students write sentences on what they want to vote for and why. Read political news for children in Weekly Reader, Yahoo Kids’ page, etc. Draw pictures and write paragraphs about democracy in the U.S.

Fifth grade: Vote for class officers and class duties. Voting by printed forms or writing names of people or objects voted on. Introduction of the early history of democracy, around 500 B.C. in Athens, Greece. Draw pictures about fora in ancient Greece. Read Political news in Weekly Reader, Yahoo Kids’ news, some newspapers and read about the history and practices of democracy in the students’ social studies text books.

Sixth grade: Vote for class officers with ballots. Introduction to computers, software, using the Internet for searching and researching information, introduction to Internet for voting. Write essays and draw pictures about democracy, history related to democracy, and political topics in the U.S. and the world.

Seventh grade: Vote for class officers and duties with computer and Internet technology. Study issues to be voted on. Vote for issues of the past. Vote for some current issues. Write essays on democracy, history, political topics, current events, and new ideas of how society should be constructed. Read the Declaration of Independence and a summarized version of the United States Constitution. Memorize some quotations associated with democracy.

Ninth grade: High school clubs established: Democracy Club; Political Science Club; Political Philosophy; clubs for Democrats, Republicans, Green Party, Independents, etc. Develop Internet surveys to find public opinion on various topics. Find books and articles about direct democracy and write reports on them.

Tenth grade: Civics discussion of the responsibilities of the voting citizens. U. S. History and democracy. U.S. Constitution, Declaration of Independence. Terminology relevant to democracy explored, direct democracy explained, duties and responsibilities of the voters. Computer voting Tutorial I.

Eleventh grade: Learn to vote via the computer and Internet. World History of Democracy. Discussion and essays about forms of government throughout history. Continue corresponding with your international pen pal and ask your pen pal to find an additional join your correspondence group to have three way discussions. Find one additional pen pal to correspond with via the Internet and discuss all current event topics including direct democracy. Summarized readings of Plato's Republic and the Politics by Aristotle. Read and write essays on Democracy and Education by John Dewey and the Social Contract by Jean Jacques Rousseau. Computer voting Tutorial II.

Twelfth grade: Vote via the Internet. Vote on current and historical national and international issues. Direct democracy procedures examined, explained, discussed. Political Philosophy and duties of and preparation for the voting public. Discussions comparing representative and direct democracy, totalitarianism, Marxism, capitalism, and socialism. Read and write essays on: Direct Democracy: The Politics of Initiative, Referendum, and Recall by Thomas Cronin; Direct Democracy in Switzerland by Gregory Fossedal; Elections in Cyberspace by Anthony Corrado and Charles Firestone and more essays on Democracy and Education by John Dewey. Computer Voting Tutorial III.

Appendix II

Online tutorials

The history of democracy

The philosophy of democracy

Glossary of terminology related to democracy and government

Navigating the computer and Internet for online voting

Computer Voting Tutorial I, II, III

Voting on Referendums, Initiatives, Elections for representatives, and Recalls

Preparation for certificate for a voting member of the Public Assembly

Writing and submitting legislation

Links, resources, publications, and organizations concerning direct democracy

Appendix III

Technical Skills for the Use of the Computer and the Internet Related to Direct Democracy

Below are listed university, post-secondary, adult, online courses, some of which are required, in addition to taking the certificate exams, to become a voting member of the (newly created) public legislature or Public Assembly. One certificate is for the local level, one for the state level, and one for the national level (laws and an amendment would need to be enacted to create such a voting body). The certificate would require at least a high school education or a recognized equivalent and for the certification candidate to be a registered voter. All registered voters are able to vote in initiatives, referendums, general elections, and recalls but the Public Legislature would require a licensed certificate, similar to obtaining a driver's license or a specialist's license, renewable periodically with renewal examinations, to become a nonelected member of the Third House of Congress, which will count for 1/3 of the votes of the United States Congress.

University, college, online, and adult courses -- with majors in political science with an emphasis on direct democracy and related subjects, some required for a voting certificate:

- The growth and development of direct democracy
- Writing and submitting legislative bills for a direct democracy
- Topics covered in the voting certificate exams
- Designing instructional material for direct democracy
- The procedures for voting in a direct democracy
- Political philosophy and direct democracy
- The use of direct democracy in Switzerland
- Procedures and precedents for amending the U.S. Constitution
- The world history and use of direct democracy
- The use of direct democracy in governments and organizations worldwide
- Referendum, Initiative, Election, and Recall
- Methods of informing the public on legislative and di d issues
- Security issues of online voting
- The governmental structure for direct democracy
- Theories and use of democracy

Appendix IV

University, advanced and adult learner reading list for courses in direct democracy

Adult Education for Social Change: From Center Stage to the Wings and Back Again (1996) by Thomas Heaney.

The Americans: The Democratic Experience (1974) by Boorstin, Daniel J. Boorstin.

America's Crisis: The Direct Democracy and Direct Education Solution (2000) by D. B. Jeffs and V. Hugo.

Aristotle and Xenophon on Democracy and Oligarchy (1975) by J. M. Moore.

Caltech/MIT Voting Technology Project (2001) by the California Institute of Technology and The Massachusetts Institute of Technology Corporation.

Citizens As Legislators: Direct Democracy in the United States (1998) by Bowler, S., Donovan, T. & Tolbert, C.

Civic Participation and Community Action Sourcebook: A Resource for Adult Educators by A. Nash.

Collected Writings of Thomas Jefferson.

A Constitution of Direct Democracy : Pure Democracy and the Governance of the Future ~ Locally and Globally (2000) by Michael Noah Mautner.

The Cultural Creatives: How 50 Million People are Changing the World (2000) by S.R. Anderson & P. Ray.

The Communicative Ethics Controversy (1990) by S. Benhabib and F. Dallmayr.

Democracy: Real and Ideal, Discourse Ethics and Radical Politics (1999) by Ricardo Blaug.

Demanding Choices: Opinion, Voting, and Direct Democracy (2001) by Bowler, S, & Donovan, T.

Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education (1997) by John Dewey.

Democracy and Education and Prospects for Democracy (1994) by N. Chomsky.

Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City (2000) by E. F. Isin.

Democracy in America (2000) by Alexis de Tocqueville.

Democracy in the Digital Age : Challenges to Political Life in Cyberspace (2000) by Anthony G. Wilhelm.

Developing e-Citizens and e-Consumers, an Irish e-Commerce Case Study (2001) by John MacNamara.

Direct Democracy: The Politics of Initiative, Referendum & Recall (1999) by Thomas E. Cronin.

Direct Democracy in Switzerland (2002) by Gregory A. Fossedal.

Direct Democracy or Representative Government?: Dispelling the Populist Myth (2000) by John Haskell.

The Economist: A better way to vote: Why letting the people themselves take the decisions is the logical next step for the West (1993) by Brian Needham.

Electronic Democracy: Using the Internet to Transform American Politics (2002) by Browning, G. & Powell, A.C.

- Electronic Media and Technoculture* (2000) by John Thornton Caldwell.
- E-Democracy, E-Governance, and Public Net-Work* (2003) by Steven Clift.
- Elections in Cyberspace: Toward a New Era in American Politics* (1997) A. Corrado & C.M. Firestone.
- E-democracy in Practice: Swedish Experiences of a New Political Tool* (2001) by T. Rosen.
- Electronic Voting: Benefits and Risks* (2002) by Russell Smith.
- Electronic Voting — Evaluating the Threat* (1993) by M. I. Shamos.
- Essay Concerning Human Understanding and Two Treatises of Government* by John Locke.
- E-topia* (2000) by William J. Mitchell.
- The Examined Life* (2000) by Stanley Rosen.
- The Future of Teledemocracy* (2000) by T. Becker & C.D. Slaton.
- The Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2000) by J. Frow & M. Morris, M. (2000).
- Leviathan* (1998) by Thomas Hobbes.
- Megatrends 2000* (1996) by J. Naisbitt and Aburdene P.
- The New Challenge of Direct Democracy* (1997) by Ian Budge.
- New Schools for a New Century* (1997) by Diane Ravitch and Joseph P. Viteritti.
- Political Parties and Constitutional Government: Remaking American Democracy* (1999) by S. M. Milkis.
- The Prince* by Niccolo Machiavelli.
- Republic* (1998) by Plato.
- Rethinking Democracy and Education: Towards an Education of Deliberative Citizens* (2000) by T. Englund.
- The Social Contract* by Jean-Jacques Rousseau.
- The Spirit of Laws* by Montesquieu.
- Stealing the Initiative: How State Government Responds to Direct Democracy* (2000) by E. R. Gerber, A. Lupia, M. D. McCubbins & D. R. Kiewiet.
- Technoscience and Cyberculture* (1996) by S. Aronowitz, B. Martinsons, M. Menser, and J. Rich.
- The Third Wave* (1984) by Alvin Toffler.
- United States Constitution, the Declaration of Independence, the Federalist Papers.*
- Virtual Environmental Citizenship: Web-Based Public Participation in Rulemaking in the U.S.* (2003);Schlosberg, D.
- The World in 2020: Power, Culture, and Prosperity* (1994) by Hamish McRae.

Appendix V

A Proposal for Creating the Third House of Congress: the Public Assembly
for the Creation of a National Democracy in the United States of America

Phase 1 (3 to 10 years):

Debate about and Introduction to the Concept

Discussions and committees formed

Brain storming and think tank groups developed

Petitions and letters, e-mail, talk shows, TV, radio campaigns

Public education of the concept

Readings and discussions in schools and universities about democracy

Concepts related to direct democracy discussed and read about in schools

Writers and artists commissioned

Software conceptualizing

Books and magazine articles are printed on the subject

Funding and economic issues are discussed

Funds raised

A suggestion hotline is established

An Official website is established

Phase 2 (2 years):

Organizing and structuring of the voting methods and procedures

Curriculum developed for public schools and universities

Development of the Government Structure

Legal Documents developed

Constitutional amendment first draft written

Various committees appointed

Local referendums held

Phase 3 (3 years):

All of the above activities continue (website, etc.)

Trial period when the procedures are developed, refined and the first results used as an opinion polling collection method.

Educating the public on the procedures involved

Curriculum about direct democracy initiated for public schools and universities

First trials are done locally, first city, then county, then state, then national levels

During this period suggestions and changes are made

Software is developed

Security issues addressed

Computer and software bugs are worked out

Initial voting centers are established, these can be adjacent to post offices

Participants (initial voters) are assigned temporary voter registration numbers; passwords chosen.

The voter registration numbers are assigned through the voting centers.

Phase 4 (3 years):

Voting Centers are established nationwide

Voter registration numbers are established partly containing a social security number.

Voting Centers have the bills and plans to be voted on in booklet form and posted on the walls and these bills and plans are also available online for perusal and study.

The voter registration numbers, including a social security number, are assigned through the voting centers in a way similar to registering to vote and passwords are chosen. (Voters are given up to 3 days to edit or change their submissions when voting)

The opinion poll collection system continues using the online voting system

Strict felony laws against Internet abuse or direct voting fraud with severe penalties and punishments are passed by the legislature.

Phase 5 (Continuing):

Voters are able to connect to the voting system via the Internet with their own computers, or continue to vote through the Voting Centers, and become voting members of the 3rd House of Congress, the Public Assembly according to U.S. federal law and also of state, county, and city governments as laws of each state allow.

In the future, computers will be as standard as telephones and everyone with a telephone will have a computer with which they can cast their votes and then the United States government will become a truly participatory government of democracy.

Appendix VI

Direct Democracy Survey

Definitions:

Direct democracy: people voting directly on issues rather than through representatives.

Initiative: a legislative measure proposed by the citizens

Referendum: a vote for the public to approve or reject a law voted on by the legislature.

Recall: a vote to remove or retain an elected official after a filing a petition.

Petition: A collection of a designated percentage of signatures of voters to begin the process for an initiative, a referendum, or a recall.

Your name (optional): _____

Your institution or company (optional): _____

Your position (optional): _____

Contact information (optional): _____

SURVEY

Respond to the following items by marking the items below according to your opinion or answer:

1. I get most of my political information from:

(a) newspapers__ (b) other people__ (c) radio__ (d) television__ (e) Internet__ (f) books

2. Direct democracy been practiced in other countries and institutions and has been effective.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

3. The educational system should participate in the implementation of a direct democracy utilizing Internet and computer technology.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

4. Direct democracy should be introduced and taught in Social Studies and Political Science courses.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

5. The Constitution should be amended creating a direct democracy system in the United States .

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

6. The Internet is a reliable method of voting.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

7. The voters have complete privacy and security when voting by the Internet.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

8. The public can be adequately informed of issues to be voted on.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

9. The voters could easily register their votes via the Internet or computer.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

10. The public should be made aware of the security issues for using the Internet for voting in a direct democracy.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

11. The public should be made aware of the limitations of direct democracy.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

12. The public should be made aware of the roles and duties of citizens in a democracy.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

13. The public should be made aware of the philosophy and history of democracy.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

14. We don't need to change anything, the United States is a democracy now.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

15. Direct Democracy or people voting directly on legislative issues is a good idea.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

16. Adequate technology exists today for direct democracy.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

17. Education, information, and training can be given to citizens for them to vote as Legislators.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

18. After its inception, interest in direct democracy would be maintained by the public.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

19. Eventually a new branch of Congress could be formed by the voting citizens.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

20. The people's voting branch of Congress could be used first as a method for public opinion collection.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

21. Citizens and students should study for and take examinations in order to receive certification in order to

qualify as a voting member of a legislative branch in a direct democracy.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

22. Public schools provide education and training for citizens to function as voting members of a direct

democracy system of government.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

23. Voters are generally well informed about issues.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

24. Initiative and referendum items on a ballot are sometimes so complicated that the average voter can not

understand them.

25. Voters should have a direct say in how they are governed.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

26. The public should trust public officials to make laws.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

27. The voters' pamphlets are helpful in informing the public about issues.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

28. The majority of voters would vote for minorities' rights.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

29. The U.S. Constitution should allow the recall of federal officials.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

30. U.S. citizens should be allowed, on the national level, to gather petitions to place an initiative on a ballot and if the measure passes it should become law.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

31. I would favor placing an item on the ballot if a petition is gathered of 3% of the voters of the most recent presidential election.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

32. The U.S. should have a national advisory referendum which would allow the voters to vote on proposed laws every two years and the results of the vote would be non-binding.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

33. Citizens should be able to vote directly on issues.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

34. If people could vote on issues then they would become interested in politics and would participate in government.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

35. In a direct democracy many people would not be able to cast an informed ballot.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

36. In a direct democracy special interests would gain power by spending money to promote their cause.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

37. There should be a limit to the number of initiatives on a ballot.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

38. Public officials know more about an issue and should be trusted to make the right decisions.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

39. Politicians should be carefully watched in case they misuse their power and go against the will of the
people.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

40. When making laws, government should pay attention to mostly experts.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

41. When making laws, government should pay attention to mostly opinions of ordinary people.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

42. In government people with more intelligence and character should have greater influence than other
people.

(a) agree_ (b) somewhat agree_ (c) middle range_ (d) somewhat disagree_ (e) disagree_ (f) don't know

Appendix VII

Open-ended questions:

The below core questions are in the form of open-ended questions and can be answered with essay type answers -- you can answer as many as you would like:

43. How has direct democracy been practiced in other countries and institutions and how effective has it been?
44. How can the educational system participate in the implementation of a direct democracy utilizing Internet and computer technology?
45. How can direct democracy be introduced and taught in Social Studies and Political Science courses?
46. How can a constitutional amendment be proposed?
47. How can the reliability of Internet voting be assessed?
48. How can the privacy and security of Internet voters be assured?
49. How can the public be informed of issues to be voted on?
50. How can the voters register their votes via the Internet or computer?
51. How can the public be made aware of the safety and limitations of direct democracy?
52. How can the public be made aware of the roles and duties of citizens in a democracy?
53. How can the public be made aware of the philosophy and history of democracy?
54. How can the concept of direct democracy be introduced and the procedures for its implementation and utilization be taught in Social Studies and Political Science courses?
55. Do you think the United States is a democracy now?
56. Do you think Direct Democracy or people voting directly on legislative issues is a good idea?
57. Do you think adequate technology exists today for direct democracy?
58. Do you think adequate education, information, and training can be given to citizens for them to vote as legislators?
59. Do you think interest for direct democracy would be maintained by the public?

60. Do you think that eventually a new branch of Congress could be formed by the voting citizens?
61. Do you think the people's voting branch of Congress could be used first as an opinion collection device?
63. Do you think citizens and students should study for and take examinations in order to receive certification in order to qualify as a voting member of a legislature in a direct democracy?
64. Should the public schools provide education and training for citizens to function as voting members of a direct democracy system of government?
65. What other comments would you like to make about the concept of direct democracy?

Sample response: How can a Constitutional amendment be proposed?

Constitutional amendments are permanent additions to the Constitution, though they can be counter amended as was the case with the Prohibition amendment, that require a $2/3$ vote from both houses of the Congress and therefore very difficult to obtain. There have been twenty seven Constitutional Amendments with the most recent being in 1992 which involved no Congressional self salary increases while the legislators are in their terms. The twelfth Amendment concerning changing the method of electing the president of the United States using the Electoral College was added in 1803 after the first ten Amendments, the Bill of Rights, were added in 1791.

Appendix VIII: Bibliography

- Alexander, W. & Serfass, R. (1999). *Futuring Tools for Strategic Quality Planning in Education*. Milwaukee, Wisconsin: Quality Press.
- Aronowitz, S., Martinsons, B., Menser, M., and Rich, J. (1996). *Technoscience and Cyberculture*. New York and London : Routledge.
- Becker, T. & Slaton, C.D. (2000). *The Future of Teledemocracy*. Praeger Publishers.
- Benhabib, S., and Dallmayr, F. (1990). *The Communicative Ethics Controversy*. London : The MIT Press.
- Blaug, Ricardo (1999). *Democracy: Real and Ideal, Discourse Ethics and Radical Politics*. Albany New York : State University of New York Press.
- Bonner, R.J. (1967). *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*. New York : Russell and Russell.
- Bowler, S., Donovan, T. & Tolbert, C. (1998). *Citizens As Legislators: Direct Democracy in the United States*. Columbus , OH : Ohio State University Press.
- Bowler, S, & Donovan, T. (2001). *Demanding Choices: Opinion, Voting, and Direct Democracy*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Brock, William. (1970). *The Evolution of American Democracy*. New York : The Dial Press.
- Browning, G. & Powell, A.C. (2002). *Electronic Democracy: Using the Internet to Transform American Politics*. Cyberage Books.
- Budge, Ian. (1997). *The New Challenge of Direct Democracy*. Polity Press.
- Burns, J., Peltason, J., & Cronin, T. (1990). *Government by the People: Bill of Rights Edition*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bushell, Sue. (2003). *Where to Now for E-Voting?* Retrieved November 25, 2004 from: <http://www.cio.com.au/index.php?id=405941257&eid=-601>
- Caldwell, John Thornton. (2000). *Electronic Media and Technoculture*. New Brunswick , NJ : Rutgers University Press.
- Chomsky, N. (1994). *Democracy and Education*. Retrieved November 24, 2004 from <http://www.zmag.org/chomsky/talks/9410-education.html>
- Coe, R. *Capitalism and Democracy: Schumpeter Revisited*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame Press.

- Corrado, A. & Firestone, C.M. (1997). *Elections in Cyberspace: Toward a New Era in American Politics*. Aspen, CO : Aspen Institute Publications Office.
- Cohen, C. (1971). *Democracy*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Cronin, Thomas E. (1999). *Direct Democracy: The Politics of Initiative, Referendum & Recall*. Cambridge, MA and London : Harvard University Press.
- Dafermos, G. (2001). *Management and Virtual Decentralized Networks: The Linus Project* . Retrieved on November 25, 2004 from http://firstmonday.org/issues/issue6_11/dafermos
- Dewey, John. (1997). *Democracy and Education: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Education* New York : Free Press, Simon & Schuster.
- Dillman, Don. (2000). *Mail and Internet Surveys: The Tailored Designed Method* . New York : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Fossedal, Gregory A. (2002). *Direct Democracy in Switzerland* . New Brunswick, NJ : Transaction Publications.
- Gerber, E. R., Lupia, A., McCubbins, M.D. & Kiewiet, D.R. (2000). *Stealing the Initiative: How State Government Responds to Direct Democracy* . Prentice Hall.
- Gates, Jeff. (2000). *Democracy at Risk*. Cambridge, Massachusetts : Perseus Publishing.
- Haskell, John. (2000). *Direct Democracy or Representative Government?: Dispelling the Populist Myth*. Boulder, CO : Westview Press.
- Heaney, Thomas. *Adult Education for Social Change: From Center Stage to the Wings and Back Again*. (1996). Retrieved on November 25, 2004 from http://www3.nl.edu/academics/cas/ace/resources/TomHeaney_Insight.cfm
- Isin, Engin F. (2000). *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City* . New York and London : Routledge.
- Lebihan, Rachel. (2003). *Arm Twisting to Hinder Home Electronic Voting* . Retrieved on November 24, 2003 from <http://www.zdnet.com.au/news/communications/0%2C2000061791%2C20265293%2C00.htm>
- Linder, W. (1994). *Swiss Democracy*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

- MacNamara, O'Donnell. *Developing e-Citizens and e-Consumers, an Irish e-Commerce Case Study*. Retrieved on November 25, 2004 from <http://www.efmd.be/learninggroups/chapter/eisb2001proceedings/pdfs/MacNamara%20%20O%27Donnell%20.pdf>
- Mautner, Michael Noah. (2000). *A Constitution of Direct Democracy : Pure Democracy and the Governance of the Future ~ Locally and Globally* . Legacy Books.
- McRae, Hamish. (1994). *The World in 2020: Power, Culture, and Prosperity* . Boston : Harvard Business School Press.
- Mitchell, William J. (2000). *E-topia* . London : The MIT Press.
- Naisbitt, John. (1982). *Megatrends*. New York: Warner Books, Inc.
- Naisbitt, John. (1997). *Megatrends Asia* . New York : Touchstone.
- Patrick. (2003). *Recent Email from a Swiss Citizen* . Retrieved on November 25, 2004 from <http://www.vote.org/swiss.htm>
- Plato. (1998). *Republic* . New York : Oxford University Press.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. (1999). *The Social Contract* . New York : Oxford University Press.
- Salant, P. & Dillman, D. (1994). *How to Conduct Your Own Survey* . New York : John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Samuels, W. (1985). A Critique of Schumpeter. In Coe, R. *Capitalism and Democracy: Schumpeter Revisited*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Shamos, M.I. (1993). *Electronic Voting — Evaluating the Threat* . Retrieved November 25, 2004 from <http://www.cpsr.org/conferences/cfp93/shamos.html>
- Smith, Russell. *Electronic Voting: Benefits and Risks* . (2002). Retrieved November 24, 2003 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi/ti224.pdf>
- Schumpeter, Joseph A. (1947). *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Toffler, Alvin. (1980). *The Third Wave* . New York : Bantam Books.
- Vago, Steven. (1999). *Strategies of Change* . Chapter 9: Social Change. Pearson Educational, Inc.
- Wilhelm, Anthony G. (2000). *Democracy in the Digital Age: Challenges to Political Life in Cyberspace* . New York and London : Routledge.

Appendix IX: Some websites pertaining to direct democracy

http://topics.developmentgateway.org/e-government_worldwide e-government

<http://thomas.loc.gov> - the proceedings of the U.S. Congress and e-government development

<http://egov.mit.gov.in> _e-government in India

<http://www.abc.net.au/ola/citizen/interdemoc/republic.htm>

http://www.veritasdigital.com/ad_online/participatory.html

<http://www.cpsu.org.uk/downloads/Modernising%20Background.pdf>

<http://www.publicus.net/ebook>

<http://www.mail-archive.com/do-wire@tc.umn.edu/msg00045.html>

<http://policy.womenspace.ca>

<http://www.analysphere.com/21Oct00/democracy.htm>

<http://www.statskontoret.se>

<http://www.itac.ca>

<http://www.one2one.co.nz/edemocracy.html>

<http://www.politics.tcd.ie/courses/undergrad/bcc/portal/egovernance.html>

<http://www.internetnz.net.nz/members/lists/isocnz-council-tidbits/2000-August/000012.html>

<http://www.flaxroots.net.nz/2000/papers/2000-PaulHughes.html>

[http://www.context.co.nz:8080/newsItems/viewDepartment\\$Participatory+Democracy](http://www.context.co.nz:8080/newsItems/viewDepartment$Participatory+Democracy)

http://www.diverdiver.com/2003_03_07_diverdiver_archive.html

<http://www.washingtonpost.com/ac2/wp-dyn/A8287-2003Feb26>

<http://lists.essential.org/1995/info-policy-notes/msg00137.html>

http://mondediplo.com/1998/12/03bensaid_ThirdWaygovernment

http://www.jhu.edu/news_info/news/topic/politics.html _online voting

<http://lone-eagles.com/democracy.htm> _list of related links and sources

http://www.bbc.co.uk/history/ancient/greeks/greekdemocracy_01.shtml

<http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/Philosophy/UG/ugunits0102/rousseau.html>

<http://www.wabash.edu/Rousseau/WorksonWeb.html>

<http://www.sosig.ac.uk/roads/subject-listing/World-cat/philpol.html>

<http://www.sosig.ac.uk/roads/subject-listing/World-cat/demgovt.html>

<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Poli/PoliFeld.htm>

<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/MainPoli.htm>

<http://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Poli/PoliBuch.htm>

<http://oregonstate.edu/instruct/phl302/texts/locke/locke2/2nd-contents.html>

<http://www.ancientworlds.net/aw/Post/32871>

<http://teachers.ausd.net/antilla/philolinks.html>

<http://plato.stanford.edu>

<http://www.rep.routledge.com/index.html>

<http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/Philosophy/Dept/journals.html>

<http://www.bris.ac.uk/Depts/Philosophy/VL/index.html>

<http://web.mit.edu>

<http://etext.virginia.edu/jefferson/quotations/jeff0600.htm>

<http://www.anova.org/>

<http://www.pdemokracie.ecn.cz/cs/doc/Statut-ang.doc>

<http://edemocracy.meetup.com/members/878>

http://dmoz.org/Society/Politics/Democracy/Direct_Democracy

<http://www.free-project.org/connect/links>

<http://www.election.com>

<http://www.votehere.net>

<http://www.lib.ied.edu.hk/edarticle/civic.htm>

<http://edu.uwe.ac.uk/cred/bibliographic/papers.asp>

<http://www.egov.vic.gov.au/Research/ElectronicDemocracy/voting.htm>

<http://www.vote.org>

From: Chenglie, L. (1989). *A Collection of Confucius's Sayings*. Ji Nan, China: Qi Lu Press.

“When the Master went to Wei, Ran You drove the cart for him. ‘What a large population!’ the Master said, ‘Since the people are already numerous, what more would you do next?’ Ran You asked. ‘Enrich them,’ was the reply. ‘And what comes after they have become rich?’ The Master said, ‘Educate them.’ (p.12)

“Zi Xia, having become the governor of Jufu, asked for advice on governing. The Master said, ‘Do not try to do things in a hurry. Be intent with small gains. What is done quickly is not done thoroughly; and if small gains are considered, great things remain unaccomplished.’ “ (p.13)

“The Master said, “The real fault is to have faults and not try to amend them.” (p. 63).

“The Master said, “It may be possible to study with someone without being able to join progress with him. It may be possible to join progress with someone without being able to join in council with him. It may be possible to join in council with someone without being able to exercise power with him.” (p.72).

“Standing by a stream the Master said, “Time goes on and on like the flowing water in the river, never ceasing day or night!” (p. 86).

“Someone said to Confucius, ‘Why don’t you engage yourself in government?’ The Master said, “The Book of History says, ‘Be filial, only be filial and friendly towards your brothers, and you will spread these qualities to government. This too is to engage in government. Why does one have to hold office so that he could be said to engage in government?’” (p. 97).

“The Master said, ‘A gentleman who is widely versed in letters and at the same time knows how to behave courteously, is likely to go the correct way.’ “ (p. 102).

“The Master said, ‘Instruction recognizes no castes.’ “ (p. 111).

“The Master said, ‘Acquire new knowledge while thinking over the old and you may become a teacher of others.’ “ (p.116).

“The Master said, ‘One who will study for three years without thinking of a post in government would be hard indeed to find.’ “ (p. 120).

“The Master said, ‘Pursue study as though you could never reach your goal and were afraid of losing the ground already gained.’ “ (p. 121).

“The Master said, “I was not born with innate knowledge. By learning from the ancients, I sought it through diligence.” (p. 123).

“Zi Zhang asked about the way to knowledge. The Master said, ‘He who does not tread the steps of others can not expect to learn true knowledge and virtue.’ “ (p.125).

“The Master said, ‘If I have to take up a single phrase to sum up the Three Hundred Songs, I would say, ‘Let there be no evil in your thoughts.’ “ (p. 130).