

Michael

page 9 Be WORD MISSING. A young child can be taught many things, but until he has reached an age of mental maturity, it may be difficult for him to understand theoretical concepts about policies of government. Similarly, in much the same way, a child needs its parents in order to survive, learn, and grow to a certain age when it is ready to move out into this world on its \_\_\_\_\_. Think of it in these terms: if one were to remove a six-year-old from his or her home--its nest, so to speak, known from its earliest childhood, then the child most assuredly would not survive on his own.

mmmmmmmmmm

BE> I think these "rules" impossible to define and those "judging" could eliminate minorities or people they for some reason want to eliminate. Not good. I think it is unnecessary to closely monitor the voter. If sane people are outnumbered, we are in more trouble than DD can fix. Than too, one truly addicted would be drunk or high, not likely to vote where they could or would be apprehended.

M>

In practical application terms, we can say that a person has reached this stage of development at the point of gaining full-time employment, attending college, or moving out of the parental nest. We can say this because each one of these achievements in its own way promotes responsibility, courage, and self-reliance long-term and in a real way. Of course, we know that there are exceptions to every rule. We understand that there are people that may leave the nest of their childhood, but still be unable to fly on their own.

BE Not necessarily because of addictions to drugs. Many are lazy or get a stipend from parents.

M>

People with drug and other addictions or certain abnormal mental conditions (depending on their severity), may definitely need help from their society, and should not necessarily become part of the decision-making process because their ability to do higher-level thinking has been compromised. Of course, the hope is that with time and the right treatment they will one day be able to leave the prison cell of dependency and become a fully functioning, contributing member of society. However, there are shades of gray even in this area.

BE> Yes, many present politicians are "alcoholic" and with no means of intervention, will remain alcoholic.

M>

Those in society that are willing to honestly and sincerely look at themselves in mirror and realize that they are struggling with dependences should not be penalized for seeking help.

BE> It is impossible to intervene and identify all addicted. Nor can one assess "recovery" for years. And then like all illness there could be a relapse. I think best to leave out this whole area from your book. Would wind up eliminating everyone except the liars.

M>

Therefore we are drawing a distinction between those in society that have been forced to deal with their dependency issues through government law enforcement, such as, drinking and driving apart from those people who voluntarily, courageously seek self-help.

BE>Why? The question is not how they came to terms with their illness. The outcome RECOVERY is the telling issue.

page 11 M>

Therefore, for the purposes of this discussion, because of their deeds, they have been removed from the decision-making process. Once again we are determining a person's place in society based on his or her actions, and once again we must account for exceptions to every rule. On the other hand, people can be--and sometimes are--imprisoned for intentionally violating laws they see as unjust. About this, Martin Luther King, Jr., said:

"I submit that an individual who breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, and who willingly accepts the penalty of imprisonment in order to arouse the conscience of the community over its injustice, is in reality expressing the highest respect for the law."

BE> Many of us believe those who have served their sentence should be able to "vote". Many were wrongly accused and prosecuted. But than how about those many UN-Prosecuted. (Bush and a few other politicians and corporate CEO's)

I think society may choose not allow someone who is serving a sentence be allowed to vote, but those who have completed their debt to society must be allowed to vote. They could well be rehabilitated. Who is to judge that?

-----  
Page 15 Democracy / Republics

M>

The issue with direct democracy from the republicans (i.e., those who favor instead the republic form of government), is the notion that direct democracy means rule by the mob.

BE> I think this idea is not confronting the problem. 1. Example would be the old lynch mobs where one or two stirred up the community until all agreed to hang the accused. Of course many who were not guilty were hung. This is democracy at it's worst and there need to be safe guards built into a WRITTEN Constitution. These same "leader type" could talk the community into anything. Present day the same. Evidence our MEDIA and the PARTY's selling their propaganda. We need to confront these dangers of representative democracy.

Than there is the term Republic. This is simply a method of defining jurisdiction. The Nation, State, County, Town or City etc. Federalists use this terminology also. We must break down community's and define what is their jurisdiction and responsibility. Their could be a purely DD Republic. It is how these jurisdictions are run that you are addressing with your book on DD. (Much needed)

The difficulty with the US and other country's is the REPRESENTATIVE form of government. You have the same problem in a REPRESENTATIVE PARLIAMENT AND PRIME MINISTER as a REPUBLICAN CONGRESS AND PRESIDENT.

So go after the Representative but not the country's rightful divisions.

Direct Democracy is the people (in an Assembly of People) making the decisions for their community --- including the world community. The government they "authorize" must be totally subservient to the people.

This is to bottom of page 15 ---- This book is really needed Michael. I applaud your witting it. I simply have a different view of the terms so far.

All the best, Bruce