

## **Technologies for the implementation of direct democracy**

Democracy is usually thought as an allocation of control, sometimes at the global level, and often also at more local implementations. It may also be thought of as a system of thinking in which majority opinion, although not often the best, is the most likely to succeed in general in its objectives.

As we have already mentioned, the BC is not in its intent a control structure, but an ethical system based on the allocation of need. I believe that if it is well designed, it will operate as such in practice. There is the question of the stability of this structure, both internally by the introduction on nonethical procedures, leading to power control structures based on explicit human command, which is a subversion of its ethical idea, and this indeed could become general and endemic, and by external subversion, where say a competitive entity tried to gain control of this ethical system. The latter is partially addressed in section 10.

We think it is legitimate that opinion should be polled whether the ethical system has become corrupt, and the project abandoned. We think this would be a tragedy for the ethical idea, because it would be likely that the consensus would be that we return to a system based on control and, we would think, the capitalist and monetary idea. Nevertheless, we have to face realities that such a circumstance could become real if internal subversion of ethics became widespread, and the general majority opinion was that its many disfigurements meant that this programme, or at minimum this implementation of it, had to be abandoned. Widespread global change is, or ought to be, embedded within our model, so a transfer within it to new principles which were still ethical is presumably one and the same as the structure itself. In the tragedy of a return to capitalism, if that were the genuine reasoned idea and it was the consensus, then like death we would have to accept it.

It is not our intention in this iteration to consider this matter directly any further, but in the first instance to consider something else which mirrors it. This is the allocation not of control, but of need.

A slogan of our civilisation is “I do not want to know”. We will go into a completely different issue, the embedding of innovative ways of thinking so that, for instance, TV programmes become not instruments for the passive acceptance of systems of control, but active instruments for the direction of activity arising from the wish of the community to express themselves and be helped to do it, to know correctly their environment so that they are better enabled to form their own plans as a consequence of this, to enable debate on issues which encourage dissent from established thinking, assertion of their own validity as human beings, of expression of their own inner selves, and as individuals and groups being able to connect with and be involved in organising the world around them.

What follows is the transmission of ideas on creating a TV station and its programmes. An assessment of need it addresses is the idea I frequently have that nobody is allowed to think. Planning involves communication, which is a two way process. A fundamental aspect of the following text is that it must be augmented by the reception of views back. Several iterations of this idea should be made before any proper proposal can be developed.

In this second iteration we propose tentative programmes for inclusion in a TV service. Whereas we recognise that TV is a communication medium most often used by the old, it is not to be ignored for all that. The titles of these programmes may be thought challenging and

unacceptable to the status quo, and often completely unacceptable as TV programmes, sometimes of any sort. We note in the first place that it is often remarked that although in comparison with other countries BBC programmes are in better shape than average, their content is unadventurous, and for those that like adventure, boring. In a society which seeks to introduce innovation and new ideas, a strong and almost exclusive interest in the conventional is unlikely to further the progress of that society in its aims. This is the denial of a society which asserts its fundamental right not to think. It may be claimed that the BBC will always be there, so an additional comment might be made that the audience which it serves if it likes that sort of content, is precisely the sort of audience which is served. We think therefore a specific requirement of an innovative society is that it should enable the active participation of its citizenry in the accumulation of knowledge which the media as presently constituted thinks is beyond the reach of its audience, and there is information of this sort which can never be transmitted because of its technical nature.

So to be a bit in-your-face about it, we think that prime time TV, which we designate as 8.30 to 9.30 pm should be committed to precisely this sort of programme, and continuously. An important requirement is that the information provided should be very carefully designed to avoid jargon, and should be presented in the simplest language possible consistent with the preservation of technical meanings. It should be necessary to state that equations are not here off-bound in TV programmes. We admit that TV is visual and does not often employ readable script. Nevertheless, we think that where text is presented normally in TV, algebra should also be allowed as an accompaniment in a scientific culture. These technical discussions must be followed by alternative points of view. This will immerse the audience in challenging debate and logical reasoning. I do not think it matters whether this is understood. A baby does not understand its parent's language, but by constant immersion picks up the command of language which is quite sophisticated, despite unnecessary worry that people can't spell, can't express themselves and don't know how to use standard English.

I have thought that a period of the week, amounting to one day, should have no programmes whatever allocated to it, and should have a blank screen with no music. This would mean people would be able to plan the week in the expectation that they would be unable to watch TV, and would either have to sit on the couch all that time, or find something else to do. There can be too much education, even when it is moronic.

The time we allocated to no programmes is Saturday. This might accommodate religious services for some religions, but not quite. The prime-time TV which declares the cultural edifice of the BC is

Monday	General Relativity.
Tuesday	Quantum Mechanics.
Wednesday	Molecular Biology.
Thursday	How the Brain Works.
Friday	Building Construction.
Sunday	Communism.

There are additional programmes to be designed actively by their participants, to encourage similar activity by others and immersion in challenging and sometimes off-bound discussions.

They are

Ancient Civilisations.

Can we Avert Climate Catastrophe?

Control and Capitalism Today.

Cuban Permaculture.

Drab is OK, Sexy is Nice.

Ecological Transport.

Energy Propulsion.

Genocide News.

How to be an Author.

How to be a Composer.

How to be a Film Maker.

How to be a Lesbian

How to be a News Presenter.

How to be a Sex Worker.

Improve your Vietnamese.

Inventing Reason.

Is Ethics Possible?

Liberation of the Soul.

Medicine and the Body.

Our Family.

Outer Space.

Paranoia and Conspiracy.

Providing for Need and Replacing Money.

Sexy Sportspeople.

The Banana Custard and Macrobiotic Prune Programme.

The Underclass Directs.

What is Beauty?

Youth Directs.

I am reminded that a wonderful colleague who I use to deconstruct my work and who once, whose discovery is described in the physics section as a Garcion propagator and is present elsewhere in my investigations into mathematics, claimed that my entire output from beginning to end is incorrect. A further colleague, of not inconsiderable acquaintance with the literature, refuses to read anything I write unless it is approved by her. In putting forward proposals that Galois theory is incorrect to a number of mathematicians of world repute, I received no reply, no doubt in consideration that I had not properly declared myself, except from someone I know at the University of Sussex who teaches Galois theory and who replied with the uttermost brevity that he was not an expert in the subject. In a desire to communicate directly to undergraduates at the University of Sussex the results of intensive research covering eleven years recently, and a consequence of investigations over a lifetime into the fundamentals of physics, and more recently mathematics, a successful decision was taken to prevent my communication of these results at the Meeting House of the University of Sussex, and not soon later to deny me access to the department of Mathematics and Physical Sciences there, where previously no doubt in acknowledgement that I might have something to say, albeit in an unconventional way, I was allowed access freely to lectures despite having no suitable qualifications. For reasons of time they were not taken up. This is not at all unusual and exhibits itself in many ways, major, minor and trivial covering many subjects where an approach involving thinking can resolve issues. For instance, just now in presenting a very concrete idea of to me no discernible complexity to a very ordinary person, I was asked whether I had too much coffee to drink. Events like that are the reason for writing this ending. In putting forward these proposals I assert my love and attachment to those around me who deny my fundamental right to think.