

3.2.2.3.2.68 Structured representation instead of democracy

It is an illusion that when people are given the option to elect their national leaders directly, they would elect who is best for them. Instead, they will elect whom they believe to be worst for their enemies, or those they envy.

Furthermore, it is an illusion that when people are given the option to elect their national leaders directly, they would elect who stands for personal freedom. Instead, they will elect those of whom they believe that they will, to the highest degree, curtail the personal freedom of those they hate, and of those they feel envy for.

It is a fatal misconception to equate democracy with freedom. In the contrary, democracy tends to lead to social systems that are highly regulated and restrictive down to every-day details. This is the case because everybody who gets elected usually is so because he promises to regulate something that currently causes some people to have an advantage that is considered undue by those who cannot participate in the same advantage.

Sensible democracy must be multi-tiered. A village or a neighborhood elects a representative. In one city or county, the village and neighborhood representatives elect among themselves a representative who will then participate in an election on the next higher level.

I assume that a realistic model would be: 500 to 1000 people at the base of society elect a lowest level representative. Approximately 200 of these representatives then elect representative among themselves. This person would then represent something between 100,000 and 200,000 people.

On the next level, 50 representatives would elect one representative, who would thus stand for 5 to 10 million people.

The rationale of such a system is to eliminate politicians who want to

get elected on a populist platform. Populists thrive on opposing people, not on constructive ideas. They play on the emotion of people who, first of all, want that their enemies are worse off than they are themselves. Which is why populists never have a constructive agenda.