

Excerpt from, *The New Enlightenment*,  
by Robert Bivona, pages 262-295

# **The Way to a Government of, for, and by the People**

*“The great object (of government) should be to combat evil by establishing a political equality among all.”*

**James Madison**, the “Father of the Constitution,” author of the Bill of Rights, the fourth President of the United States and Enlightenment political theorist.

## ***The Way to a Government of, for, and by the People***

- **Eliminate the dominating importance of money controlled by national public office candidates and their allies in elections—a necessary condition for a meaningful democracy to exist.**
- **Realize the great potential of our airwaves to serve as a public forum for candidates and others communicating on public issues.**
- **Reform other election systems to ensure more democratically determined outcomes.**
- **Institute a new democratic form to supplement our elected representative government.**
- **Create a more representative management of our “Fourth Estate” (the press).**
- **Reform lobbying and other governmental systems.**
- **Use the Internet to make policymaking processes more transparent and democratic.**

Fundamental reforms of our political system are necessary to create a true government of, for, and by the people. This goal is too important to accept constraints in our efforts to accomplish it, including the provisions of an outdated Constitution. I, therefore, ignore any Constitutional constraints in my focus on developing policies for establishing a well-functioning democracy.

Our Constitution has been inadequate as a foundation of a democracy, and its interpretation by a right-wing Supreme Court has to an important

degree turned the First Amendment to it into a kind of powerful weapon against the majority of our population through equating money with speech. Unlimited outside spending by wealthy individuals and corporations in support of the election of candidates as a result of the recent Supreme Court's *Citizens United v. FEC* and *McCutcheon v. FEC* decisions, has created a government even more extremely serving wealthy interests at the expense of the majority than it had in prior years.

We should not be surprised that a society based on our Constitution has not resulted in a well-functioning democracy. Our Constitution was not written to create a democratic society. Here is what Woodrow Wilson, the 28th President of the United States (from 1913 to 1921), wrote of its intent in "Division and Reunion" *"The Federal government was not by intention a democratic government. In plan and in structure it had been meant to check the sweep and power of popular majorities. [In 1800, only 25% of white males were eligible to vote.] The Senate, it was believed, would be a stronghold of conservatism, if not of aristocracy and wealth. The President, it was expected, would be the choice of representative men acting in the electoral college, and not of the people. The federal Judiciary was looked to, with its virtually permanent membership, to hold the entire structure of national politics in nice balance against all disturbing influences, whether of popular impulse or of official overbearance. Only in the House of Representatives were the people to be accorded an immediate audience and a direct means of making their will effective in affairs. The government had, in fact, been originated and organized upon the initiative and primarily in the interest of the mercantile and wealthy classes."*

The words "democracy" or "democratic" do not appear in the Constitution. Another important "undemocratic" aspect of the original Constitution: The tolerance of slavery.

Amendments since then have improved the Constitution, but amending it is overly burdensome, and much needs amending. Ideally, a constitution should ensure political equality among all citizens, and it should foster consensus building and promote effective problem solving. And as Thomas Paine wrote, *"When it shall be said in any country in the world, my poor are happy; neither ignorance nor distress is to be found among them; my jails are empty of prisoners, my streets of beggars; the aged are not in want, the taxes are not oppressive, ... then may that country boast of its Constitution."*<sup>1</sup> It is

past due for us to take an honest look at the deficiencies of our Constitution and do what is necessary to create a Constitution that best serves our citizenry.

When amendments improved our Constitution we had a diverse media, which allowed and helped motivate these major reforms. We now have a highly concentrated, elite-dominated media that is stifling public debate and widespread exposure to policy reforms that would greatly benefit the majority to maintain a social structure that is grotesquely benefiting elites. This is a fundamental social problem that when solved will greatly facilitate further advancement.

Thomas Jefferson would believe that we are far overdue for a Constitutional Convention to rewrite the Constitution. He wrote in 1816: *“Each generation is as independent as the one preceding, as that was of all that had gone before. It has then, like them, a right to choose for itself the form of government it believes most promotive of its own happiness,”* Jefferson recommended a Constitutional convention every *“nineteen or twenty years,”*<sup>2</sup> so that every generation would have the opportunity to create its own system of governance. Ten 20-year periods have elapsed since Jefferson wrote this, so according to him we have had at least ten too few Constitutional conventions and rewrites. Jefferson’s rewrite interval was determined based on a much shorter average lifespan in his time, but the essential point remains valid: Jefferson would believe we are far overdue for rewriting the Constitution.

Jefferson played an important role not only in the first American Revolution, but also what many consider to be the second American revolution, the period of his very contentious election to the presidency in 1800. *“The Revolution of 1800,”* as Jefferson described his party’s successful election that year was *“as real a revolution in the principles of our government as that of 1776 was in its form.”*<sup>3</sup> The defeat of the Federalists ended their attempt to lead America on a less democratic course. He may again play an important role in an American Revolution, the one now beginning in the 21st century, through his writings on the importance of rewriting the Constitution and some of his other writings.

As I argue in *Now is the Time for The New Enlightenment*, the essence of our election system problem is not the large amounts of money required in it. It is the source of, and motives behind, the dominant portion of its supply. Relative to the social value of the \$180 billion spent in the U.S. in 2014 on advertising,

the cost of “advertising” the policies and character of candidates for public office is low. \$6.7 billion was spent in the 2012 election for all national offices. Procter & Gamble alone spent \$4.6 billion on advertising, mostly for Bounty paper towels, Crest toothpaste, and Tide laundry detergent, in 2014. Devoting even more than triple the resources that Procter & Gamble does on advertising to our election process would not be unreasonable. New Enlightenment policies increase the resources used in the election process, and they change the source of and motives behind its supply.

## **Election system reform**

Policy changes that would best serve the majority require a government that is responsive to the majority; instead, corporate and other moneyed interests are dominating. Many members of Congress are among the moneyed interests—268 are millionaires, about 50%, and at least ten have wealth exceeding \$100 million.

The net worth of the members of Congress continued to rise, regardless of the economic recession. An analysis of financial disclosure forms by Roll Call magazine, using the minimum valuation of assets, revealed that members of the House and Senate in 2010 had a collective net worth of \$2.04 billion—a \$390 million increase from 2008—and an average of about \$4 million each. But their wealth is actually substantially larger than this because disclosure forms do not include non-income-producing assets.

Campaigns are getting increasingly expensive, allowing, more than ever, a tiny fraction of our most wealthy citizens to corrupt our democratic process to serve their interests through the use of large amounts of corporate and personal wealth. Despite the large amounts of average wealth of our representatives, they generally use relatively little, most comes from other moneyed interests. We now have a government “*of the 1%, by the 1%, for the 1%*,” as Nobel Prize winning economist Joseph Stiglitz has called it. Senator John McCain, the Republican presidential nominee in 2008, described our election and lobbying systems as “*nothing less than an elaborate influence-peddling scheme in which both parties conspire to stay in office by selling the country to the highest bidder.*” Conservatives,

progressives, and anyone else who knows of the torrent of cash flowing into our political system can see this obvious fact. Keith Ellison, co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus expressed it this way: “*We don’t have elections; we have auctions.*”

Many injustices and unnecessary hardships for tens of millions of Americans have resulted from a political system of a design that inherently results in public policy being determined by a small economic elite. 86% of people in a CNN poll said that “*our system of government is broken,*” implying that the best interests of the majority are poorly served or disserved, and an urgent need for fundamental political system reforms.<sup>4</sup>

We now have historic levels of political system dysfunction, with a 9% and declining approval rating for congress, and historic levels of inequality. Both our election and lobbying systems greatly advantage an elite of unprecedented economic power.

Among the policies that corporations and the wealthy have successfully influenced are those that reduced their taxes, reducing our ability to support important public needs. Their influence also has resulted in inappropriate government expenditures and regulatory changes, some of which have resulted in anticompetitive advantages for the funder, and some that have been very costly to our nation. Policies and the politicians who promote them, that maintain and increase their power and privilege are supported, as are attacks on politicians that promote policies that would empower the majority. But, attacks on candidates promoting fundamental policy changes to best serve the majority are rarely needed, because without sufficient money to be heard by the majority they have little influence.

Money has always strongly influenced election outcomes, but now its influence is greater than ever and growing rapidly.

In the 1960 highly contested Kennedy–Nixon election the candidates spent \$153 million in 2012 dollars, and in the 2012 Obama–Romney election the candidates spent \$1.12 billion for all campaign expenses, a 630% increase. Because of the 2010 Citizens United Supreme Court decision, there was historic spending of approximately \$970 million in the 2012 election by outside groups dominated by relatively few individuals and organizations making large contributions. That’s over three times the previous record of \$301 million in 2008.<sup>5</sup>

Fewer than 40 donors to Political Action Committees (PACs) that advocate for or against the election of candidates for public office gave over

\$200 million to those groups. PAC spending increased from \$15 million in 1974 to \$546.5 million in 2012, a 3,543% increase. In 1972, the total amount spent on television political advertising for all local races nationwide and national races combined was about \$200 million in 2012 dollars. In 2012, it was about \$6.7 billion—a 3,230% increase.<sup>6</sup> As I noted in *Now Is the Time for the New Enlightenment*, in 2012, over 40% of all campaign spending came from the top .01%, or Americans in the top one ten-thousandth of incomes. Corporations and wealthy individuals can now use large amounts of wealth to shape governments like never in our nation's history.

A New York Times investigation, reported on 10/10/15, found that in the first phase of the 2016 presidential campaign just 158 contributors, with companies they own or control, provided almost half of all the seed money raised to support presidential candidates, \$176 million.<sup>7</sup> They are overwhelmingly white, rich, older, and male. Those investing the most in presidential politics contributed tens of millions of dollars to support Republican candidates who have pledged to pare regulations; cut taxes on income, capital gains and inheritances; and shrink government programs that help the middle class and poor. Most made their fortunes in just two industries: finance and energy, where huge public expenditures in bailouts and subsidies play a significant role in their fortunes. But regardless of industry, the families investing the most in the early phase of presidential politics overwhelmingly lean to the right politically.

The Koch brothers are planning on spending \$889 million of their funds and a network of donors' funds on the 2016 presidential elections. This is about as much as each of the major parties will spend on their presidential nominee's campaigns.<sup>8</sup> The money will be used to make "contributions" to candidate campaigns—more accurately called "investments" that pay large returns through the resulting public policies. Unlike the parties, their network is constructed mainly of non-profit groups not required to reveal donors, and the Koches have worked to influence policy to keep a system allowing donor identity to remain secret. Their 2016 efforts will be unprecedented in scale by coordinated outside groups to shape an election that will be the most expensive in history. The \$889 million will be used not just to influence the outcome of the presidential election but also to ensure that Republicans continue to control the U.S. Senate and U.S. House, and win elections in state and local races all across the country.

Instead of making themselves available to reporters for questioning, as was once common, candidates now often just buy, mainly with the money of wealthy individuals and corporations, the communication services of consultants, then buy political ads they design. Candidates thereby avoid the risk of going off-message or exposing weaknesses. Once elected, they know they need to serve the interests of those who allowed them to win and will enable them to win office in the future.

In 2008, Barack Obama's "*Change You Can Believe In*" and "*Hope and Change*" advertising campaign won Advertising Age's "*Marketer of the Year*" award, based on the voting of members of the Association of National Advertisers. The runners up were *Nike and Coors beer*. Research has shown that most candidates have little or nothing to do with the marketing of their campaigns, including the content of their ads. Marketing consultants determine advertising content. Their job it is to win by using the most effective advertising techniques. Is this a sane way to choose the leader of the most powerful nation on Earth or any of our government office holders?

U.S. Senate candidates must raise the equivalent of \$3,300 every day for six years to have enough campaign cash to match that spent by the median Senate race winner.<sup>9</sup>

Our current system results in members of Congress spending, on average, over half their time in office raising money for their next campaigns.<sup>10</sup> Most of this money purchases influence, often to the detriment of the public interest, which then is used to purchase access to airwaves already owned by the public.

By a five to one margin, campaign cash goes to incumbents. In 2008, 80% of the \$5.3 billion spent on federal races came from 1% of the population; 60% from only 0.1%.<sup>11</sup> Knowing these facts, it is not surprising that the extensive study noted earlier found that when Americans with different income levels differ in their policy preferences, actual policy outcomes strongly reflect the preferences of the most affluent; they bear virtually no relationship to the preferences of poor or middle-income Americans. America is a society ruled by, and exclusively serves the interests of, the wealthy and corporations. The U.S. is not a true democracy or a society organized in the interests of its people.

Inevitably, a political system that creates this result has low and declining voter participation. Only 36.4% of eligible voters voted in 2014's midterm elections, down from 40.9% who voted in 2010. The last time voter



turnout was that low was 1942 when only 33.9% of voters cast ballots, according to the United States Elections Project, when a large share of the voting population was involved in World War II. Voter turnout in presidential elections is higher than in midterms—58.2% of eligible voters voted in 2012, still low and trending lower. The United States has the lowest voter participation rate in the developed world. Why bother participating in a system offering choices none of whom will serve your interests?

As Adlai Stevenson said when running for President in 1956: *“The hardest thing about any political campaign is how to win without proving you are unworthy of winning.”* Because of the many hundreds of a percent increase in the need for raising cash for campaigns, now it is not just hard, it is almost impossible.

Thomas Ferguson, University of Massachusetts political science professor and a member of the advisory board for the Institute for New Economic Thinking, described each election cycle throughout the country in this way: *“The evils of two lessers determine who’s picked as the lesser of two evils by a declining share of the electorate.”*—that’s a very clear and concise explanation why we urgently need fundamental election system reform. It’s sheer poetry, packing a lot of meaning into very few words—a short poem on our “democracy” descending into the depths of a dystopia.

Our elections system declines in quality each election cycle; it’s an international disgrace. As I noted in *Now is the Time for the New Enlightenment*, former president Jimmy Carter, the world’s most famous election observer, said, *“We have one of the worst election processes in the world right in the United States, and it’s almost entirely because of the excessive influx of money.”*

After New Enlightenment policy of making the best use of the publicly owned airways is instituted, elected officials will be free and able to spend all their time in office serving the general public. As it is now, elected officials may be free to spend all their time serving the general public, but they are not able to if they want to stay in office. And new candidates will be made viable that otherwise would not be.

Although several well-intentioned election system reform proposals to reduce large contributors’ influence on our election process have been proposed in the past, they have failed to become law because:

- Altering a system in which incumbents are reelected over 90% of the time to a more democratic one puts current policymakers’ jobs in jeopardy.

- A dysfunctional media does not give appropriate coverage to system reform proposals that would serve the majority, and to candidates that make or support these kinds of proposals.
- Some reform proposals have involved free airtime. These are especially unlikely to get the broadcast media coverage or degree or character of coverage that is necessary to develop the popular support levels to pressure policymakers to support these reforms. Although our broadcast media companies are required to serve the public interest in exchange for the free use of the publicly owned airways, they have used their influence to block free airtime proposals in the past, despite its great public service value, because free airtime policies would reduce their profits. This reduces shareholder value and management salaries and bonuses, which are priorities for air media corporate managers when making decisions on media content and on how to use their power to influence public policy.
- Corporate and economic elites, including media elites, who believe their interests are best served by avoiding true democratic governance, are dominating the legislative process through our election and lobbying systems.
- The proposals had defects that would limit their effectiveness. This is not the main cause of their failure to pass since some would have made improvements to the system somewhat, which is better than not at all.

*Past election system proposals share three important flaws, including the recently proposed “Government of the People Act” (whose other defects are described in Part 4, Note 9):*

- The influence of the mass media filter (its capacity to screen out otherwise viable candidates that it chooses to, through no coverage, an insignificant amount of coverage, or biased coverage) is ignored.
- Public funds will inevitably be used to buy 30-second broadcast media ads.
- Most proposals including the *Government of the People Act* have ignored the excessively restrictive, anti-democratic ballot access laws.

*I will detail better, more fundamental reforms.*

Past proposals including the Government of the People Act under consideration describe ways of publicly financing candidates for public

office. Who qualifies for this assistance is determined by popular support levels, but these levels are to a large degree determined by mass media coverage. These reform proposals would use public funds to multiply the power of corporate mass media coverage decisions. The mass media are poorly serving the public interest now; this will not change when their importance as a candidate filter, enormous now, increases as a result of election system reforms.

Although some prior election system reform proposals would have helped some candidates who otherwise could not compete, a disproportionate influence would have remained in the hands of the relatively small group of people managing our mass media companies. *Six large corporations control 90% of our media content.<sup>12</sup> The defect of the current system is that a tiny fraction of the country, the major campaign funders, largely determine for whom the rest of us can vote. Past election system reforms would have modified this system to one where the funders reduced influence would be largely replaced by mass media managers and major owners increased influence in determining for whom the rest of us can vote. I will describe later the general nature of these interests, how they are aligned with other corporate interests or the interests of our current major campaign funders, and how they are communicated and generally not significantly violated throughout the mass media corporate hierarchy, within The New Enlightenment media proposal.*

Also, we need substantial improvements to ballot access laws. I describe in the *National Ballot Access Standards for Elections to National Office* policy proposal the ballot access problem with The New Enlightenment solution.

Another problem with our current election system and current and prior reform proposals that we must address is that they motivate the use of 30-second ads because of the high cost and limited nature of airtime. Substantive candidate policy proposals cannot be expressed in 30-seconds, so shallow, misleading, and often negative content on other candidates is commonly used for this time. The more that ads of this type fill the airwaves, the less people respect or like any of its contestants, and even the contest itself. Thirty-second political ads disserve or poorly serve our democracy. All prior public financing proposals of which I am aware would inevitably result in mainly funding more of them.

Larger blocks of time on these most powerful media are needed to far better communicate policy proposals and the character of the candidates. Since airtime is limited and valuable, a system is required that selects a limited, yet sufficient number of candidates to provide a wide spectrum of solutions to our nation's problems. For a vibrant, well-functioning democracy, we must enable candidates with various philosophical approaches to public issues to express their views to the majority of the population. Qualifying for the free airtime must be accomplished through democratic processes free of the influence of private sources of money. The following policy proposals serve these ideals and will create a government of, for, and by the people.

## **Free Candidate Airtime**

### ***A Necessary and Just Broadcast Stations' Requirement***

The information disseminating power of the Internet notwithstanding, broadcast media remain the most effective way for candidates to reach and influence the majority of the population. This is why far more campaign dollars are spent on broadcast media than any other.

New Enlightenment policy is to institute a TV and radio broadcast license requirement to offer, free of charge, generous allotments of airtime to qualified candidates for public office. The allotments will be large enough so there would be no reasonable need for the purchase of airtime. Many hours per qualified candidate in debates, question and answer public forums, and policy speeches are necessary and provided by The New Enlightenment system. All this content will also be on YouTube, Vimeo and the FEC website.

Air media companies do not financially compensate us for using our publicly owned airwaves. We give access in exchange for public service requirements. No more important obligation exists for air media companies than to allow the airwaves to best serve our election process.

Air media companies are also obligated to serve the public because in granting broadcast rights we are also granting semi-monopoly status. A

limited number of on-air stations can exist in an air media market, so none of these markets can be fully competitive.

Also, public funds are largely responsible for broadcast companies' profits. NASA and other government research institutions' work in developing satellite delivered networks, digital electronics, robotic technology, computers and other devices has allowed commercial broadcasters to extend their programming range, automate operations and increase their profits, at taxpayers' expense.

The New Enlightenment's free airtime system will to an important degree treat the airwaves as a kind of public square for qualified candidates for national office to address the nation during campaign season. In the modern world television is a necessary tool for this purpose, and it is also justified to remedy some of the harm it has caused.

Television has played a major role in our citizenry's abandoning the real "town square." Beginning in the 1940s, the exceptional powers of television dispersed members of social groups by sending them home from the town square to instead be with their TV sets. In 1950, only 9% of households had a television, but by 1960 the number reached 87%, the fastest adoption of a new technology in history, with major social consequences.<sup>13</sup>

As early as the 1960s, a shocking five hours per person per day was spent on TV watching, now it is 8.5 hours.<sup>14</sup> This shifted our lives from public gatherings in the bowling alley, the park, playground, and other public places to the privacy of our own homes. Families separated from other families, and over time the TV in the living room became TVs in separate bedrooms, isolating family members from one another. The political scientist Robert Putnam found that the time spent in front of the TV is the most powerful single characteristic accounting for the decline in time devoted to civic responsibilities.

This powerful technology can have redeeming social value by using it to help us meet our civic responsibilities with this policy and The New Enlightenment media reform policy.

Both exposures to new ideas and new people are necessary for our political system. However, increasing the number of people given airtime diminishes the ability for each candidate to have sufficient time to adequately express new or important ideas. Using an equitable qualification process, the New Enlightenment's system limits the provision of most of the free airtime to four candidates per national office contest because this maximizes the

number of candidates for the desirable amount of airtime that can be practically offered per candidate. Candidates participating in our free airtime system will not use 30-second ads.

The New Enlightenment election process reforms will result in officials that truly represent the people. They will:

- Allow all qualified people, as judged by a suitable number of their potential constituency, seeking national elected office to have ballot access with an appropriate degree of effort in an equitable selection process. The ballot access selection process should require little or no candidate funds (the ballot qualification process is detailed in Policy 24).
- Extensive information on the ballot-qualified candidates and the policies they propose or would otherwise support should be widely disseminated. Reforms should create conditions where the majority of votes will be cast based on far more information given wide exposure than is currently the case.
- The wide dissemination of extensive candidate, policy, and related information should not require candidate funds. Candidate's free speech to their potential voters should in fact be "free" (unlike today when only people with large amounts of money are truly free to speak because only they are heard by the majority of voters).

Achieving these goals is necessary for a well-functioning democratic republic to exist. Evaluate the following New Enlightenment proposals based on whether they achieve these goals, not on whether the extent of the changes is too large to be practicable. A new definition of "practicable" regarding public policy is required, one that exists in a true democracy: If it benefits the majority, it should be considered practicable; only if it does not should it be considered not practicable.

A free airtime qualification process will be necessary because New Enlightenment less burdensome national ballot access rules will likely lead to over four ballot-qualified candidates in most contests for national offices. To express their policy proposals and character, the four free airtime qualified candidates will receive a large and equal amount of public exposure. This will end the dominance of our two major parties, which will be another beneficial outcome of the system.

Historically, candidates other than those of the two major parties have played critical roles in our democracy by introducing popular and

groundbreaking issues that were eventually co-opted by major parties, such as: the abolition of slavery, women's right to vote, social security, child labor laws, public schools, the direct election of senators, paid vacation, unemployment compensation, and the formation of labor unions. The excessively restrictive ballot access laws we now have exclude third-party and independent candidates who could make contributions of similar or greater importance.

The New Enlightenment election system reforms will break the long-term bipartisan lack of action or even discussion on important issues, some where it is well established that the major parties have ignored the will of most of the American people. In a Gallup poll on Oct. 11, 2013, 60% of Americans, the highest that Gallup has measured in the 10-year history of this question, said the Republican and Democratic parties “*do such a poor job that a major third-party is needed.*” A record high percentage of voters are now identifying as independent from the Democratic and Republican parties.

Four qualified candidates able to prominently and fully express their views with substantial explanatory content to the majority of voters, using a large and equal value of airtime and other media exposure, would be an advancement of great consequence over our current system. Large postal and other subsidies will also allow this. The four candidates will be democratically selected based on their ideas, not their fundraising ability.

In addition to eliminating the influence of money to the largest degree practical, this New Enlightenment reform will accomplish what no prior election reform proposal (as far as I know) would have accomplished: It will reduce the influence of mass media coverage decisions of the candidates to the largest degree practical.

It's likely that candidates made viable by this New Enlightenment policy will have fundamental philosophical differences on public policy, so the public debate on how best to solve our most important challenges will be greatly widened and stimulated.

Ballot qualified candidates can choose not to participate in the system, but would forfeit all of its advantages, including the likely preference of voters for candidates that do not use money to promote their candidacies. Participating candidates will be required to not run ads during the qualification process. This system will reduce the influence of ads by outside groups, as will a new “Fairness Doctrine.” Anyone choosing to participate would have to agree to all the system's provisions.

## ***Candidate Qualification Process for Participation in the Main Free Airtime System***

The following equitable system will be used to qualify the four candidates for the large amounts of free airtime. This system gives no advantage to any party and allows candidates to be evaluated on their merits only, as judged by voters. It requires no candidate funds. The qualifying process will be a kind of national primary.

On what we will call week one, 30 weeks before general election day, each ballot-qualified candidate puts a maximum 12,000-word summary of their platform with explanatory content on a portion of the Federal Election Commission (FEC) website created for this purpose. Each candidate will also include up to ten questions that they believe would be most important for the public to have all the candidates answer. This “primary” system allows voters to select the top ten questions from among all the candidate’s chosen questions to be used in part of the free airtime system.

The FEC website will allow links to the candidate’s website within the candidate’s summary; unlimited amounts of information on the candidates would be conveniently available. Broadcast stations will be required to air frequent public service announcements on this candidate supplied information and the civic responsibility to read at least the FEC website content. Likely, broadcast stations would devote programming to this content, and we will require public broadcasting stations to do so.

We will also offer each ballot-qualified candidate for president, the Senate, and the House space to express their views in all local daily newspapers in the nation, state or congressional district, respectively. Sufficient space would be offered for a 4,500-word description of portions of the candidate’s platform, produced by the candidate, with any explanatory content the candidate chooses. 4,500 words are slightly less than the number of words in a typical page of a broadsheet newspaper similar to the New York Times’ page size. This content also will be included in the papers’ online edition.

Newspapers would group up to ten candidate’s content into one print edition. Possibly two or as many as three editions per week with candidate supplied content may be needed in some election years, depending on the number of races, and the number of ballot-qualified candidates per race. New candidate supplied content will be offered in each of five weeks. New Enlightenment media reforms, detailed later, emphasize the support of local



media because the dangers and dysfunction of the concentrated media we have require remedy. We will subsidize only the local daily newspapers for the candidate content, both for its financial support value and to increase local medias' prominence and importance, as one part of our more extensive program for the support of local media.

The ink and paper costs for printing the 4,500 words is approximately \$.01 per newspaper copy (generally slightly less). We will provide newspapers ten times this cost, or \$.10 per candidate plus \$3 per newspaper if it is offered free on newsstands or retail outlets on the days the paper has the candidates' supplied content. For example, if the newspaper has 100,000 circulation with eight candidates who supply content, each paper printed would be subsidized with \$3.80, so the total subsidy to the newspaper would be \$380,000. This subsidy expenditure amount would typically be slightly greater than the amount for purchasing this much advertising space plus purchasing the newspaper at the newsstand price, so the subsidy will substantially benefit the newspapers that cooperate. The subsidy will be valuable not only to the candidates and our election process but also to an important part of our Fourth Estate.

The subsidy would likely be a sufficient motive for all or nearly all local newspapers to cooperate. However, to further support newspapers and encourage their participation, while serving the purpose of well-informing the electorate, we will require on-air public service announcements of all local broadcast stations to inform the public of the day that candidate newspaper content would appear and which newspapers are offering it. These announcements will be a free advertising campaign for the participating newspapers. These and the FEC website information announcements will be public service license requirements for broadcast station.

Based on the widespread and growing concern over our nation's problems, and interest in candidates offering unconventional policies to solve them, this free advertising will likely substantially increase their circulation and online readership on the day the candidate supplied content is printed, with some positive carryover impact on future circulation and online readership. (As this policy was being written the unconventional presidential candidates Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump were drawing historic numbers of people to their campaign appearances and televised debates.)<sup>15</sup>

The total circulation of all U.S. daily newspapers, about 40 million, minus the circulation of nationally distributed daily newspapers, about six

million, or approximately 36 million newspapers would be subsidized if circulation did not increase. However, I assume circulation will double on the days candidates supply content under the system, based on the promotional campaign for citizen participation, the importance of the content, and that the newspaper will be free, in budgeting for the subsidy. Assuming the standard of national elections occurring for the House, the Senate and president every two, six and four years respectively, this requires budgeting about \$1.7 billion per year for the five weeks of candidate newspaper content.

Also, we will use a broadcast series of eight and seven debates, respectively, for the candidates for president and the Senate. For the House, we will use six debates: three broadcast and three on DVDs, whose mailing and duplication costs will be subsidized. DVD recordings are substituted for some airtime because air media market areas often overlap more than one congressional district so airtime messages by congressional candidates would often be broadcast to voters not in the candidate's district, inefficiently using valuable and limited airtime.

All candidates on the ballot could participate. If a race has over ten ballot-qualified candidates, we will divide the candidates into two groups for two series of debates, to allow more substantive information on their views and policy proposals in the debates. The debates will be two hours twenty-minute variations of the three debate types used for the debates between the generally four free airtime system qualified candidates per contest that I describe later.

Unlike the debates between primary winners, we will permit limited commercial time within these debates. A ten-minute intermission will be included at the 1½ hour point for commercials. No public policy or candidate advocacy will be allowed during the intermission, and market prices could be charged to the commercial advertisers. Likely, a higher than standard rate could be charged based on audience size of recent primary debates. A recent prime time Republican primary debate had 23.1 million viewers, making it the most-watched program in CNN's history.

In each media market, the largest annual average audience size station will be required to air the debates. Also, public TV and radio will air them and any other broadcast, cable or Internet station that chooses to could also do so. Considering the recently large debate audience sizes, and that programming costs will be largely eliminated, and the time for commercials,

the provision of debate airtime will not be a significant or unreasonable burden on broadcast media companies.

We will schedule these debates for Sundays. If a race has over ten ballot-qualified candidates, and three national offices are contested, we will add Saturday debate times. As for all on-air candidate appearances, the debates will be available for viewing throughout the campaign on YouTube, Vimeo, and the FEC website.

In addition to the debates, we will offer two 14-minute airtime blocks per candidate for speeches. The 14-minute speeches will also be given on the largest annual audience size commercial TV and radio station in each media market as a license requirement, and on public TV and radio stations. We suggest that speech times be scheduled for Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday at 9 to 9:30 PM EST with two minutes available for commercials between them. They will run from week 2 through the number of weeks necessary for all candidates to have their first 14-minute speeches in random order, and then their second speeches in random order. Since 12 weeks will be available for this content, sufficient time is available for 36 candidates before primary election day. This would likely be more than sufficient even in years when all three national offices are contested since it is unlikely more than an average of 12 ballot-qualified candidates per race will exist.

The percentage of the population not familiar with the Internet to the degree necessary to cast a fully informed vote is small and diminishing, and New Enlightenment reforms described later will create virtually universal broadband Internet access. However, judgments made just on the other media content by the candidates in this “primary” election will be better informed than most based on our current system in the general election.

We will offer online training programs for librarians, to prepare them to offer regular classes at public libraries on FEC and candidate website access and use, to ensure that everyone can fully participate. Public libraries also generally have public Internet access. If few people require instruction, individual instruction on public computers may be sufficient. Also, frequent on-air public service announcements will be made regarding the system, library assistance, and the civic responsibility of all citizens to participate.

Based on an evaluation of their website and newspaper entries, speeches and their debate performance, and any other information voters seek out elsewhere, they will vote for their top four candidates in order of preference for each national office contested. Using the results, we will use an instant

runoff voting process (IRV process detailed in policy 26) to determine the most preferred candidate. Then, using these same vote results, eliminate this candidate from the next runoff to determine the second most preferred. Then eliminate this candidate from the next runoff to determine the third most preferred and so on until the four candidates are selected. This process has important advantages to just immediately ranking the top four that are described in the New Enlightenment instant runoff voting proposal.

Voters could also select from the questions submitted by all candidates, the ten they would most want to be answered by all the candidates in order of preference. We will use the same process described above to select the ten questions most important to the public for the candidates to answer during a portion of their free airtime. The candidate and question preference votes will be cast at regular election polling centers 14 weeks before the general election day. The newspaper entries will begin 29 weeks before Election Day. The following table summarizes the scheduling for all New Enlightenment election process activities, including those after the “primary,” that I detail next.

This approximately 6½ month concentrated campaign period will result in the great majority of voters making much better-informed votes than after the seemingly interminable (especially in presidential election years) campaign period we have now.

Candidates wanting to participate in the selection process for free airtime system would be required to agree not to run ads during this process, to level the playing field for being awarded the free airtime. Even before the large amount of information widely disseminated after the qualification process, much better informed “primary” votes will be cast than is typically the case in our current general elections.

<b>Week No.</b>	<b>Characterizing Activity</b>	<b>Week No.</b>	<b>Characterizing Activity</b>
1	Newspaper/FEC Website Entries	16	Primary Election Day
2	Newspaper Entries, Speeches	17	Break
3	Newspaper Entries, Speeches	18	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Debates, Mailings
4	Newspaper Entries, Speeches	19	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Debates, Mailings
5	Newspaper Entries, Speeches	20	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
6	Primary Debates, Speeches	21	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
7	Primary Debates, Speeches	22	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
8	Primary Debates, Speeches	23	Break
9	Primary Debates, Speeches	24	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
10	Break	25	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
11	Primary Debates, Speeches	26	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
12	Primary Debates, Speeches	27	Qualified Candidate Speeches, Etc.
13	Primary Debates, Speeches	28	Break
14	Primary Debates, Speeches	29	Break
15	Break	30	Election Day

The four candidates selected for free airtime will be required to not run on-air ads after the selection process for the free airtime also. In addition to large amounts of additional free airtime exposure and primary campaign supplied information, dissemination of information on each primary winner we will further support in these ways:

- Matching with public funds the spending of the highest spending candidate in a race on print and Internet ads up to a reasonable limit.
- Providing a postal subsidy for nine free mailings per candidate, which is detailed in a separate proposal (Policy 23).

- Reinstating and improving the Fairness Doctrine, as described later in this proposal and the media reform proposal (Policy 29).

Knowing these facts, and that on-air exposure will be large, there will be little or no incentive for excessive spending by any candidate on advertising.

In 2012, a presidential election year, approximately \$120 million, and in 2010, a non-presidential election year, about \$15 million, was spent on print and Internet advertising by candidates for national office. The average is about \$67 million every two years, so budgeting \$34 million per year would likely be sufficient.

### ***Free Airtime System for Qualified Candidates***

The following free airtime policy for qualified candidates applies to elections for president and senator. House candidates will be supported with less airtime and more postage subsidy for direct mailing constituents. For campaigns for president and senator, New Enlightenment policies require all air media companies to provide candidates with airtime in these categories over nine weeks:

- Many three-minute blocks per candidate will be offered within the time allotted for commercial ads within normal programming. About 7.5 hours of airtime per candidate will be offered in three-minute blocks.
- Four half-hour blocks per candidate for the Senate for speeches.
- Four 1½ hour debates by the candidates for Senate.
- Five half-hour blocks per candidate for president for speeches.
- Seven 1½ hour debates by presidential candidates.

All the above airtimes will be uninterrupted by commercials. The debate videos and the videos of the three-minute and half-hour speeches aggregated by candidate will be available for viewing throughout the campaign on YouTube, Vimeo, and the FEC website, for easy reference by voters and the press.

### ***Three-minute Block Allotment System***

One of the reasons 30-second ads are effective is their political message is delivered “where people are.” Substantial numbers of people either cannot or do not want to devote the time to hear extended political speeches or debates. We need to reach these people “where they are” with more substantive messages than occur in 30 seconds. Three minutes is a practical amount of time within the normal commercial time of programming that

people choose to watch that can deliver reasonably substantive political messages. Viewing many of them can result in a lot of important information being communicated, alone enabling reasonably well-informed judgements.

The three-minute blocks that will replace commercial time within normal programming we will allot according to the following system:

The main operative factors in determining the value of this airtime to candidates are audience size and message time length, and I will call the product of these two factors,  $V$ , or value to the candidates of the airtime within a program. New Enlightenment systems would apportion airtime each week in this way:

Each half-hour program has about nine minutes of commercial time. This time varies by station and program and it is not uncommon for it to be eleven minutes, but is rarely less than six minutes. (Radio commercial times are slightly greater than television.) For nine weeks before an election, in each of the 336 half hours in a week, on all air media, we will require that six minutes be allotted for possible selection by candidates for their 3-minute messages. Not all 336 half-hours will have six minutes of candidate messages, just those selected by the candidates using this accounting system:

The  $V$  will be calculated for each program in a one-week period, and all these  $V$ s will be summed to determine the total  $V$  of the week's programming on a station. Specifically, the first half-hour of the week program has an audience size we'll call  $A_1$  so its  $V$ , which we'll call  $V_1$ , is  $A_1$  times six minutes or  $6A_1$  minute persons (all  $V$ s are in minute persons units so I will omit the units from now on). Similarly, the second half-hour of the week has a  $V_2$  equal to  $6A_2$  and so on. The total value to the candidates of all the available airtime in the week on any station is the sum of the value of time available in each half hour, which equals six times the sum of the audience sizes of all the station's programs.<sup>16</sup>

We will require that each station offers in total to all candidates 20% of the total  $V$  per week when a race for both president and senator exists, for the nine weeks before an election. This total will be equally divided among eight candidates, four for president and four for senator. The four maximum would likely run in each race because prospective candidates would know that the value of their ideas, not their bank account or fundraising ability, will determine their success. Specifically, each candidate will get 2.5% of total  $V$  for each station each week. In the years when only one office is contested, the candidates would get the same amount, so only 10% of total  $V$  will be needed.

Their weekly allotment could be spent only within the week. It would not be transferable to other weeks. Candidates could spend their V allocation as they wish, either for fewer 3-minute blocks on larger audience programs or more 3-minute blocks on smaller audience programs. Audience size and demographics are typically estimated for all programs.

Candidates will select the time slots they want in advance. If two or more candidates choose the same time, we will select the candidate for the time slot at random. Candidates will have available a more than sufficient amount of programming time devoted to voting age populations. If more than one candidate chooses a high voting age audience show for a message, the one that gets it would pay a disproportionately large fraction of their V allotment on it. This would disproportionately reduce their ability to have messages on other programs with a similar number of voting age viewers, so the candidate would not be advantaged. All unit V's are equal in value within the segment of programming the candidates would select.

The total amount of airtime each candidate would have would depend on the average audience size of the programming within which his ads appear. If this average is equal to the average audience size of the station, the candidate will receive about 50.4 minutes of airtime per week, or about 7.5 hours over the course of nine weeks. Since we will allot airtime in 3-minute blocks, the candidate would receive 48 minutes in 16 three-minute blocks in the week, so the candidate would likely choose programming with a different than average audience size to make full use of the candidate's airtime V.

Only the candidate could appear in the 3-minute segments, with instructional charts, graphs or pictures if needed. No one representing the candidate could be used. Some segments would likely be part of a running debate with other candidates. Candidates would be free to direct questions to, or respond to, the other candidates. But at least one-half of the candidate's V allotment per week will be devoted to answering questions from the voters that were determined to be the ten most important in the system that was part of qualifying the candidates for the free airtime described earlier. The answers would likely be part of some or all of running debates between the candidates. All candidates must answer, or elaborate on their answers to, all ten questions during one-half of their total V allotments.

For most of the several hours in 3-minute blocks, each candidate would be answering the questions voters select as their top priority questions or responding to other candidates in a kind of extended debate. These three-



minute block responses, exchanges or speeches will be easily available to voters throughout the election at any time of their choosing on websites, in addition to their original airing time.

### ***Half-hour Allotment System***

Four half-hour blocks per candidate will be allotted for the Senate, and five per candidate for president, which results in 18 hours of total program time over the nine weeks for major speeches. This assumes the four candidate maximum for free airtime per contest and an election for president and senator in the state. Stations will allot in the first week the prime time hours of 8:00 to 9:00 PM, Monday and Wednesday, the second week 8:00 to 9:00 PM Tuesday and Thursday, and so on, alternating between 8:00 to 9:00 PM on Monday and Wednesday and Tuesday and Thursday for eight weeks. The ninth week would have presidential candidate speeches on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday.

Candidates will be assigned speech times according to the schedule in the following table. It would advantage no candidate significantly. If any chance exists of a slight advantage, it would be for the “underdog” candidate because it allows him or her to speak last. The table also includes the schedule for the debates. P1 stands for the candidate for president selected in the first instant runoff vote for free airtime; P2 stands for the candidate for president selected in the second instant runoff vote, and so on, up to P4, who was selected last. Similarly, S1 stands for the candidate for Senate selected in the first instant runoff vote for free airtime; S2 stands for the candidate for Senate selected in the second instant runoff vote, and so on up to S4. VP stands for the candidate for vice president; C stands for the candidate for the House in the debate schedule. No commercial time will be allowed during any of the speeches or debates.

The FC time slots are for fact check results of all prior policy speeches, debates and ads. If few statements of fact are in dispute, some of this allotted time could be used for policy position analysis.

Both Politifact and Factcheck.org do fact-checks, as do the New York Times and Washington Post. Representatives of these organizations or members of academia, other policy experts, and journalists would point out inaccuracies or false statements made by the candidates, and do the policy analysis.

**On-Air Speech and Debate Schedule on Commercial and Public  
Media (no commercial breaks)**

Week	Day	Candidate speech times		Debate times
		8:00-8:30 PM	8:30-9:00 PM	8:00-9:30 PM
18	Monday	P1	S1	
	Wednesday	P2	S2	
	Tuesday			P1-P4
	Thursday			P1-P4
19	Tuesday	P3	S3	
	Thursday	P4	S4	
	Monday			S1-S4
	Wednesday			C1-C4
20	Monday	P1	S1	
	Wednesday	P2	S2	
	Tuesday		FC	P1-P4
	Thursday			VP1-VP4
21	Tuesday	P3	S3	
	Thursday	P4	S4	
	Monday			S1-S4
	Wednesday			P1-P4
22	Monday	P1	FC	
	Wednesday	P2	S1	
	Tuesday			C1-C4
	Thursday			P1-P4
24	Tuesday	P3	S2	
	Thursday	P4	S3	
	Monday			S1-S4
	Wednesday			VP1-VP4
25	Monday	P1	S4	
	Wednesday	P2	S1	
	Tuesday			S1-S4
	Thursday			P1-P4
26	Tuesday	P3	S2	
	Thursday	P4	S3	
	Monday			P1-P4
	Wednesday	P1	S4	
27	Monday	P2	FC	
	Tuesday	P3		
	Wednesday	P4	FC	

Stations could devote more programming time for fact checking throughout the nine weeks, but these two dedicated time slots would be a part of the official scheduling to assure on-air exposure of inaccurate, misleading or false statements. The candidate's knowledge that careful fact checking and prominent reporting of the results will be done will likely reduce the number of inaccurate, misleading and false statements compared to prior candidate debates, speeches, and ads.

The candidates for president and senator half-hour speeches and debates will be broadcast simultaneously on all radio and television stations, nationally or statewide, respectively, creating an air media programming "*roadblock*" that air media viewers and listeners could not avoid. At public office campaign time, for a significant amount of time, the airwaves should be a kind of public square of our national village. Anyone going to the public square at the specified times will serve a central responsibility of citizenship by best informing him or herself before the important vote.

The common public square character of airtime is now especially important because of the new, dangerous and growing trend of Internet ad micro-targeting. Candidates are using voters' browsing history to determine their interests, allowing candidates to target ads to voters based on those interests. Targeted ads can distort policy positions in one way for some voters and another way for other voters, and the potential exists to change positions of ads entirely based on voter profile. We would guard against this by putting all online candidate ads on a public website. The candidate's prominent public airwaves statements in the New Enlightenment systems will also minimize the potential for this deceptive practice.

## **Debate Formats**

Sometimes debates now more resemble joint campaign appearances where candidates recite talking points to predictable questions. Sometimes the questions are not substantive. But always the questions are chosen based on the biases of a non-representative media elite and their allies, or major party operatives.

The Commission on Presidential Debates has relegated our presidential debates to stage managed campaign events arranged by the two major political parties for over 20 years. The Commission, created and managed by representatives of the two major parties, is committed to preserving the

viability of the Republican and Democratic parties by minimizing the potential for the will of the people to choose a third-party candidate. Each party also works to minimize the likelihood that its candidate will be forced off rehearsed talking points.

Debates have been too far from the ideal of debates offering a concentrated period of time when diverse candidates can stimulate voters with a clash of detailed and thoughtful ideas. Voters need to learn the most significant details of what more than two candidates would do with the power of office to resolve the nation's most important problems, or create a more just and better functioning society. Debates can and should be an important part of this learning process.

In most developed nations general election debates are multi-candidate, multi-party affairs. It is not uncommon for five or six candidates to participate. Those countries have significantly better functioning democracies, with higher levels of political engagement than the United States has seen in decades. The barriers that the United States maintains to entry into debates by so-called "minor-party" candidates characterize those of authoritarian states.

New Enlightenment policy is for the following format types for presidential debates, which would create real, far more informative and lively debates: Single Moderator, Town Hall, Expert Panel. All candidates eligible for free airtime would be eligible to participate. Since senatorial and congressional candidates would have fewer debates, rather than have all these debate formats, they would choose from among them. As the scheduling table shows, candidates for the Senate have four debates, for the House two on-air debates, and for president seven debates. We motivate congressional candidates to participate in additional debates by subsidizing DVD debate recording duplication and mailing costs.

### **Single Moderator**

In watching past presidential and vice presidential debates you may have thought that if you moderated the debates, the choices of questions for the candidates would have had significant differences from those chosen. We would all have our own biases in making these selections. Since the questions selected by the moderator determined, to a large degree, the nature of the debate, undemocratically chosen individuals have had an inappropriate amount of influence on this potentially decisive kind of event in our democratic process.

The challenge is to create a system where debate topics are more democratically selected. In some cases, it may best serve the public interest for topic selection to be influenced by people extraordinarily knowledgeable in particular areas of policy. It would also serve the public interest to learn what the candidates consider most important.

Some may argue that past moderators have met the criterion of being people most knowledgeable about particular areas of policy, but this is not correct. Past moderators generally have been chosen from among members of the mass media who are not policy experts, but news announcers or “anchors,” and their priorities were determined by the same people making the poor choices regarding news report content I will describe later with The New Enlightenment media reforms.

The New Enlightenment single moderator format will maximize the freedom of the candidates to express what they consider most important, and to respond to questions and challenges from one another within an equitable structure. Getting the candidates’ views on each of the other candidates’ top priority issues and proposals would be of high value in the voter selection process—far greater value than getting candidates’ views on topics chosen based on the biases of an unrepresentative, mass-media-industry-designated moderator.

The format would be a structured conversation between the candidates of the design where the moderator has no influence on the content of the debate—enforcing time limits will be the moderator’s only responsibility. This design assumes the maximum four candidates per national contest. This maximum would almost always exist. Candidate number refers to their position in the instant runoff vote selection sequence:

Candidate 1 makes a 5-minute introductory speech, which includes two or three questions the responses to which he believes to be among the most important for the voters to know from all the candidates. Each of the other candidates is given a maximum of 3-minutes to respond in their instant runoff vote selection order. After Candidate 2’s response to Candidate 1’s questions, candidate 1 has a maximum 1½ minute rebuttal that may include a follow-up question, Candidate 2 then has one minute for response or counter rebuttal. Then candidate 3 responds to the same candidate 1 questions with a 3-minute maximum response and again Candidate 1 has a 1½ minute rebuttal and Candidate 3 has a 1-minute counter rebuttal and so on until all three candidates respond to Candidate 1. Candidate 2 then starts his sequence, and

so on until all candidates have all their question and response sequences. If the process is unclear, the following charts will clarify.

The system will allow all candidates to have equal total time and an equal or similar amount of time to address each question. The receivers of questions get four minutes, three initially then one in counter rebuttal. The questioners get 4.5 minutes to address the questions in three 1½ minute rebuttals. (This excludes any time spent addressing the questions in the opening statements).

### Single Moderator Debate Structure Charts

After Candidate 1 gives a 5-minute speech ending in two or three questions, the candidates do the following in left to right order. When the process indicated by the top two rows in the chart is completed, move to the next two row entries, and so on:

Candidate 2	Candidate 1	Candidate 2
3-min. response to questions	1.5 min. rebuttal	1 min. counter rebuttal
Candidate 3	Candidate 1	Candidate 3
3-min. response to questions	1.5 min. rebuttal	1 min. counter rebuttal
Candidate 4	Candidate 1	Candidate 4
3-min. response to questions	1.5 min. rebuttal	1 min. counter rebuttal

Then Candidate 2 gives 5-minute speech ending in two or three questions, and the candidates do the following in left to right order. When the process indicated by the top two rows is completed, move to the next two row entries, and so on:

Candidate 1	Candidate 2	Candidate 1
3-min. response to questions	1.5 min. rebuttal	1 min. counter rebuttal
Candidate 3	Candidate 2	Candidate 3
3-min. response to questions	1.5 min. rebuttal	1 min. counter rebuttal
Candidate 4	Candidate 2	Candidate 4
3-min. response to questions	1.5 min. rebuttal	1 min. counter rebuttal

Then Candidates 3 and 4 have their questions for the same response and rebuttal process.

If any candidate's top priority questions are asked by another candidate, he could ask another high priority question or, if he believes the prior discussion on the topic needs further development, he could ask the same or a variation of the same question.

If all candidates take their maximum time for their questions and statements and all their responses, rebuttals or follow-up questions, which is unlikely, completing this process would take 86 minutes. The process would probably take less than 82 minutes which would allow two minutes or more equal time in closing statements by each candidate. One debate in this format will be devoted to domestic policy questions, one for foreign policy, and a third open to any subject for the presidential debates. Senatorial or congressional candidates can choose from among any of these three or the following debate format types (adapted for the geographic area of their constituencies) for their on-air debates.

## **Town Hall Formats**

### ***Young Adult Questioning***

A debate forum controlled by young adults could inspire millions of them to tune in to the presidential debates and raise atypical subject matters for national discourse. It will also stimulate the interest of, and educate, almost everyone.

The burdens of those in this age group are unusually serious, and they are voting in historically low percentages, indicating a profound disaffection with the country's political system. This is an ominous sign for the future of the country.

It is likely this will be the first generation in American history whose average economic wellbeing over their lifetimes will be lower than that of the prior generation. For March 2013, the unemployment rate was 16.2% of workers under age 25, over twice as high as the national average. These are people not in school or at work, and are often not doing something positive.

For young people entering the workforce, wages and benefits are declining significantly. As noted previously, students have over \$1.2 trillion in student loan debt, more than the total national credit card debt. More than half of America's recent college graduates are either unemployed or working in a job that doesn't require a bachelor's degree. Historic levels of inequality are growing. Potentially devastating environmental developments may have a major disruptive impact on their lives, which may not significantly affect

the lives of older Americans. And young people are the future of the country. This demographic deserves special attention.

One way to select young adult participants is:

College student government presidents are elected representatives of a segment of this demographic. We will make use of the value of this representation by asking all student government presidents from colleges in the top 100 highest enrollment colleges (colleges with an enrollment over about 29,000) to attend a town hall debate with a prepared public policy related question for the candidates. (We will ask airlines to donate the trip as a public service and for the public relations value. If none will, the federal government will pay for their flights to the town hall.) Ideally, the presidents would get opinions from fellow students and select what they consider to be the most important policy question for the candidates to answer. They would be obligated to keep the question they chose confidential.

If this format is used for debates in contests for the Senate, the student government presidents in the number of colleges existing in the state would participate. If used for congressional races, student government presidents and all other student elected officials of the colleges in the district would participate. However, for both congressional and senatorial debates, in some cases, this would not result in a sufficient number of participants. We will then include political science, sociology, economics or government studies majors, starting from students with the highest grade point average percentile in each school, and working down until the total of 100 students is reached.

We will randomly select student government representatives at the debate hall for a maximum 30-second question and preface, and they will be allowed a short follow-up question. Each candidate will be given a maximum of 3-minutes to respond to each question and a 2-minute maximum response to each follow-up question, in each case, with the possibility of a 1-minute time extension at the discretion of the moderator.

The random order of questioners would be determined immediately prior to the debate, and a volunteer panel of seven peers will decide if any in the order have a question sufficiently similar to a prior one to be excluded, or if any other overriding concern exists that would cause the question to be excluded. They will also help the questioners edit their questions for conciseness. We will randomly select these seven peers from volunteers among all the participating student representatives sufficiently far down the selection order for questioning the candidates that they would not be a



questioner. A question will be rejected only if, after discussion among the panel members, five or more panel members reject it.

Another option for a debate forum controlled by young adults is to choose participants at random from citizens between the ages of 18 and 30. Anyone randomly selected to participate of course can choose not to, in which case another person will be randomly selected until the 100 total is reached. Random selection will likely result in a group that is representative of the general population, or nearly so. Even if a person selected knows little about public policy almost everyone has more knowledgeable family, friends or acquaintances that would likely make suggestions for questions.

### ***Undecided Voter Questioning***

Cities with especially severe problems should get more national attention. We will locate one of the town hall debates in the city with a population over 100,000 whose median income is the lowest in the U.S. We will contract the Gallup organization to find undecided voters in this city and randomly select 100 who choose to play a role in a town hall debate. These voters will select what they consider to be the most important policy question for the candidates to answer and would be obligated to keep the question they chose confidential.

We will randomly selected questioners at the debate hall for a maximum 30-second question, and preface if necessary, and will allow a short follow-up question. Each candidate will be given a maximum of 3-minutes to respond to each question and 2-minutes to respond to each follow-up question, in each case with the possibility of a 1-minute time extension at the discretion of the moderator.

As in the young adult format, the random order of questioners would be determined immediately prior to the debate. A volunteer panel of fellow participants will decide if any in the order have a question sufficiently similar to a prior one to be excluded, or if any other overriding concern exists that would cause the question to be excluded. They will also help the questioners make their questions concise. We will randomly select the seven peers from volunteers among the 100 participants sufficiently far down the selection order for questioning the candidates that they would not be a questioner. A question will be rejected only if, after discussion among the panel members, five or more members reject it.

We will also locate another identically formatted debate in the city with the largest population whose population has a median income within three percent of the U.S. median income.

### ***Expert Panel Questioning***

Many people have devoted almost all their adult lives to the detailed study of topics relevant to public policy. This is the case for professors of political science, economics, government studies, and sociology. To select our panel, we will request that each university with departments in any of these subject areas collect secret ballots of all professors in these four subjects with their ranked top five votes for panel members of these qualifications:

The panel candidates are members of their discipline or any of the other three related disciplines, who have won an award for their professional work from any relevant professional association or reputable award-granting agency. (For example, a sociology professor could have among his five choices one or more winners of the American Economic Association's annually awarded John Bates Clark Medal, or an economics professor could have among his five choices one or more winners of the American Sociological Association's annually awarded W.E.B. DuBois Career of Distinguished Scholarship Award).

These ballots will then be mailed to the Federal Election Commission, where the votes would be tallied. We will select five panel members using the instant runoff vote process. If someone selected chose not to participate, we will offer the opportunity to the next highest vote getter.

Panelists will each choose four questions they determine to be the most important for voters to know the response to of each candidate. Internet voting, with a system that will authenticate registered voter's votes or representative sample polling will then be used to select the most preferred questions. Each voter will rank up to seven questions from among the total of 20 questions of the five-panel members.

Using the results of this vote or poll, we will use an instant runoff voting process (IRV process detailed in policy 26) to determine the most preferred question. Then, using these same vote results, eliminate this question from the next runoff to determine the second most preferred. Then eliminate this question from the next runoff to determine the third most preferred and so on until at least seven questions are selected. It is unlikely more than seven questions could be asked in the allotted time.

The voter selected questions will then be asked in ranked order by the panelist who suggested the question, and this panelist will be allowed a short follow-up question. Each candidate will be given a maximum of 3-minutes to respond to each question and 2-minutes to respond to each follow-up question, in each case with the possibility of a 1-minute time extension at the discretion of the moderator.

## **Elections for the House**

We will provide congressional candidates airtime for two debates to minimize the inefficient use of valuable and limited airtime due to air media market areas often overlapping more than one congressional district, while still offering an important amount of on-air exposure. We will use the single moderator format unless the candidates agree on a local adaptation of the other debate types described above. TV and radio stations with the largest audience in the district will be required to carry the debates of the district's congressional candidates. Also, public television and radio stations will carry the debates. We will be use Sunday evening time slots since they are not used for the other candidate debates.

We will provide large subsidies for postage for all candidates for national office, and larger for congressional candidates, because of the more restricted airtime. Their mailings will include two DVDs for two debate recordings and additional policy speeches, as a substitution for on-air debates and policy speeches.

As for the debates and speeches of the candidates for president and the Senate, candidates for the House debates and speeches would also be put on a portion of the Federal Election Commission website, YouTube, and Vimeo.

### ***Additional Free Airtime on Public Media***

1½ hour debate times will also be provided exclusively on public media on Friday evenings during all nine weeks of debates on all air media. Two Fridays will have a debate between the candidates for president, three Fridays a debate between the candidates for the Senate, and four Fridays a debate between the candidates for the House. The debates will be of the single moderator type unless a majority of the candidates choose otherwise.

### ***Free Airtime for the Other Ballot-Qualified Candidates***

In addition to the above main free airtime system for the qualified candidates (which is combined with internet, print, and postal subsidies) we will provide the opportunity for the other ballot-qualified candidates to have free airtime on public media. On Saturdays, for all nine weeks of the main free airtime system, we will schedule two-hour debates for each national office contest, on public media. (So in some states in presidential election years as much as six hours on Saturdays will be devoted to debates) Any candidate that did not qualify for the main free airtime system will qualify for the Saturday debates. The debates will be of the single moderator type unless a majority of the candidates chooses otherwise.

If only one candidate in a contest did not qualify for the main free airtime system, any of the four main system candidates could participate in the Saturday debates. If none chooses to, the one candidate in a contest that did not qualify for the main free airtime system will receive one-half hour of speech time in each of the nine weeks.

---

New Enlightenment candidate free airtime will overcome, to a large degree, the impact of corporate and wealthy donor supported super PAC advertisements. Candidates would not only be free to fully express their policy positions, they would also be free to respond to super PAC ads created by opposing interests in the prominent public settings provided by these media. This could include making a wide audience aware of the super PAC's major funding sources, possibly further discrediting any inaccurate ad claims, and potentially the super PAC. However, The New Enlightenment Fairness Doctrine will also result in substantially reducing the number and influence of super PAC ads.

In summary, New Enlightenment election system reforms uniquely beneficial impacts include:

The importance of mass media coverage judgments is minimized. Past election system reform proposals, including the Government of the People Act, would use public funds essentially to multiply the power of corporate mass media coverage decisions.

30-second ads are eliminated and replaced by a minimum of 3-minute blocks of time for communication directly from the candidates. Past election system reform proposals would substantially increase the number of 30-

second ads. Half-hour candidate speeches and one-and-a-half-hour debates are also major components of The New Enlightenment system.

New Enlightenment free airtime allotments are sufficiently generous to eliminate the need for raising large amounts of national public office campaign money because candidates' airtime demands the most money, and airtime is the highest power tool for reaching the majority of the population. Also, we will provide large postage subsidies and match the spending of the highest spending candidate in a race on print and Internet ads with public funds, up to a reasonable limit.

Policy debates will be significantly widened because some candidates will be able to fully express to a wide audience important views and policies that would not have otherwise been considered by a large number of voters.

The critically important problems of the corrupting influence of large amounts of money and the dominating influence of mass media coverage decisions is solved by this system. If any additional funds are needed, it would put the candidates on a far more equal footing to raise them.

This New Enlightenment free airtime policy will be transformative, and it should be widely supported because it is based on an obvious truth: Since we all own the airwaves, we should use them to optimize democratic functioning (instead of destructively distort it, which their use does now).

As described within New Enlightenment media reform policies, we will reinstitute the Fairness Doctrine and strengthen it to further level the playing field between candidates. We will require on-air media to provide free equal time immediately following a purchased public policy related ad for an opposing view. If the ad advocates for the election of a particular candidate, all other candidates will be given equal time. This sacrifice would be part of air media's public service responsibility for the use of our airwaves. The value to the public of these ads far exceeds the value of commercial ads, so we need to use the publicly owned airwaves to provide this value.

The commercial airtime sacrifice will be greatly moderated by the foreknowledge of wealthy funders wanting to support the candidacy of an individual that the funds they supply to do so will assist their preferred candidates' opponents to the same degree as their preferred candidate—likely few ads will be funded.

Broadcast stations will object to all New Enlightenment free airtime requirements, but their objections will not be based on losing a substantial fraction of their revenues. And New Enlightenment comprehensive media

reforms subsidize, and transform the character of, our media.

Any broadcast stations' sacrifice required by this policy will be small relative to the advantages we confer to them. Broadcasters' exclusive rights to use our public airwaves for free commonly result in over 30% profits. Television stations regard 30% profit as "low." Media executive Barry Diller said of TV stations: "*This is a business where if you are a birdbrain you have a 35 percent margin. Many good broadcasters have 45 to 60 percent margin.*" The publicly owned television and radio spectrum is estimated to be worth hundreds of billions of dollars.

Broadcasters in the past acted on their requirement to serve the public interest in exchange for free use of our airwaves by providing free candidate airtime, but they progressively lost sight of this obligation as political advertising increased. The average number of free messages fifteen minutes or longer that broadcasters gave to presidential candidates fell from sixty in 1952 (15 hours total), to twenty in 1972, to five in 1988, to zero thereafter.<sup>6</sup>

Not only do air media companies not give free air time, ad rates substantially increase during campaign season.<sup>17</sup> The law of supply and demand rules, rather than the mandated obligation to the public whose airwaves they are using. During times of peak demand, stations sell political ads at rates many times higher than other ads. Political advertising is now about 12% of average revenue and its growing fast.<sup>18</sup> Political advertising is up 122% from January through May 2016 over that spent over the same period in 2012—about \$408 million on television advertising in the presidential race.<sup>19</sup> To summarize in three words modern air media's response to our expressed requirement that they meet public service responsibilities: shirk, then gouge.

Our corporate media are especially powerful barriers to the media reforms needed for improving an election system that is producing a government increasingly unable or unwilling to serve the majority. They control the most influential coverage of the public debate, and to a large degree its content, and their interests are commonly far removed from majority interests, as we will see in more detail within The New Enlightenment media reform policy proposal. A system that uses candidates as conduits of vast amounts of campaign cash into corporate media coffers, though serving their financial interests well, is resulting in progressively more severe societal dysfunction, and common and widespread injustices.

For the four qualified candidates for the large amounts of free airtime, in election years when there is an election for president, the Senate, and the House (when there are the most contested national offices) about 2.75% of the total annual available time for advertisements on air media would be taken so we can have fair elections and good governance. This excludes the time taken to provide equal time to candidates under the Fairness Doctrine. This time is not likely to be substantial for the reason previously mentioned.

In years when there is just a congressional race, about .05% of the total annual available time for advertisements on air media would be taken for this purpose of essential importance to our democracy.<sup>20</sup> In odd-numbered years, there are no national elections, so no candidate airtime would be needed. On average, over all years, about .8% of all time currently devoted to commercials would instead be given free for use by qualified candidates. Although commercial time will be eliminated during candidate speeches and debates, so will station programming costs to a large degree.

Since annual ad time would be reduced, rates for the remaining time available could be slightly higher to compensate for any lost revenue. However, a .8% average commercial time loss is a small price to pay for air media company use of our airwaves that is needed for this policy.

The commercial time allowed within the airtime provided in the qualification process for the large amounts of airtime for four candidates is sufficient broadcast station compensation for this time since program creation costs are eliminated.

Also, New Enlightenment policies include air media subsidies that compensate for some of the loss of ad revenue from this policy. The New Enlightenment comprehensive media policy will reform the essential character of much of the media to align them to a far greater degree with their important public service role.

In the past, proposals for generous allotments of free airtime for qualified candidates have failed because congresspersons serving media companies, other moneyed interests, and their own self-interest have chosen to maintain a system that results in the probability of their reelection being over 90%. Incumbency provides enormous advantages in raising campaign cash. Only a mass movement can result in the major change that is now needed.

This policy is an important part of more comprehensive New Enlightenment media (and other) policies requiring clear majority support to be instituted. Organizing large numbers of people to support media reforms

with little or no mass media cooperation, at least initially, is necessary and is possible, through alternative media and other grassroots routes. If the policy reforms are part of a more comprehensive reform movement, the mass media will be compelled to provide significant coverage. The New Enlightenment is designed to be the foundation of such a movement.

As in all the great societal advancements throughout history a mass movement is necessary. Some recent examples include mass movements in the middle of the 20th century without which little or no progress would have been made in advancing the civil rights of women and blacks. Another example of a mass movement resulting in major public policy reforms was the environmental movement of the late 1960s and 1970s when a broad segment of the middle class participated.

On Earth Day in 1970, in the largest one-day grassroots demonstration this country has ever seen, twenty million Americans marched and held rallies and teach-ins to demonstrate their outrage over the industrial poisoning of our environment. They were appalled by incidents such as the Santa Barbara oil spill in 1969, acid rain in the Midwest, the choking smog over Los Angeles, toxic waste in the rivers, to the point where some were catching on fire, and lead paint or asbestos in their own homes.

Governmental response was swift. During his first year in office, President Nixon set up a White House Council on Environmental Quality, naming environmentalist Russell Train as its chairman. Bipartisan majorities in Congress rushed through a flow of environmental legislation: the Clean Air Act; the Clean Water Act; a bill establishing the Environmental Protection Agency; the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act; the Noise Pollution and Abatement Act; the Coastal Zone Management Act; the Marine Mammal Protection Act; the Endangered Species Act; and the Safe Drinking Water Act.

If we join together, we can move the country in a positive direction again—this time in more fundamental ways into a New Enlightenment.

*The New Enlightenment: Ideals of Democracy,  
Human Rights, Reason, and Progress \* Policy 22*



## Support Free Candidate Mailings

New Enlightenment policies will subsidize the full cost of one mailing of an eight-page standard newsletter-sized document per week for all the candidates who qualify for free airtime, for all the weeks of free airtime. The mailings will be to each household of the potential constituency of the candidates. For congressional candidates, included in these nine mailings we will additionally subsidize the cost of two of the mailings to include DVDs (including DVD replication costs) with recordings of their speeches and debates not given airtime similar to that offered candidates for the Senate.

Also, for the House “*primary*” contests DVD recordings are substituted for some airtime. Three debates on DVDs will have mailing and duplication costs subsidized.

The Internet and air media have reduced, but not eliminated, the value of printed material to voters. Many of the poor do not have Internet access, except in public libraries, and many people with Internet access at home also consider printed material a more convenient way to read and share information on a candidate. Unlike air media, print media offer a permanent and easily accessible record of candidate information. Also, receiving candidate material in the mail will be a useful reminder to some people that time needs to be devoted to the important responsibility of deciding whom they want in public office.

An annual budgeted amount of \$2.3 billion, of which \$1.1 billion is Post Office costs and \$1.3 billion in packaging and duplication costs would support the postal subsidy policy. This is based on the mailings going to the addresses of all households within the relevant district or state, or the entire nation in the case of presidential candidates, using the Post Office’s EDDM service.

In addition to this policy being important to the process of creating a *government of, for, and by the people*, it will be important to an institution that deserves more public support because it is serving the public well, despite being under attack in an apparent attempt to discredit it, to try to privatize it: the Postal Service. (For some information on why the Post Office deserves this support, see Part 4, note 8.)

*The New Enlightenment: Ideals of Democracy,  
Human Rights, Reason, and Progress \* Policy 23*

## National Ballot Access Standards

U.S. voting rates decline year after year as our government becomes increasingly unresponsive to the interests of the majority. In 2012, although it was a presidential election year, only 58.2% of eligible voters participated, the lowest voter turnout rate of any advanced country. As I noted previously, in the U.S., in the late 1800's, often over 80% of eligible voters participated; generally, about 75% did. In Denmark and Sweden in recent elections it was about 82%.

Our electoral system and government need the new people and new ideas resulting from improving our ballot access laws. Extensive media exposure to the policy proposals of several ballot-qualified candidates of diverse philosophies and priorities will stimulate the voter interest and participation needed for a true *government of, for, and by the people*.

The United States has the most severe ballot access laws of any democracy in the world; it's been criticized by the Organization for Security and Co-operation for them. These laws are designed to minimize the potential for the will of the people to choose a third-party candidate.

The great political theorist C.B. Macpherson said, "*When there are so few sellers (two parties) they need not and do not respond to buyers' demands as they must do in a fully competitive system.*" More competition is needed, yet the Supreme Court has ruled that state ballot access laws can require independent presidential candidates and third-party nominees to obtain the signatures of 5% of the number of registered voters. 5% of the number of registered voters in the U.S. is over 7,600,000.

Since petition gathering costs about \$1 per signature, the Court's ruling means that it is constitutionally permissible for states to erect ballot access barriers of over \$7,600,000 for candidates. Each state selects its own ballot access requirements for presidential and other national office candidates, and ballot access laws invariably greatly advantage major party candidates, mostly with discriminatory rules, but even in states with the same rules for all, the rules greatly advantage the larger financial and organizational resources of major party candidates.

Our Founders opposed the kind of political party system we now have. No mention exists of political parties anywhere in the Constitution, and James Madison warned against partisan "factions" in Federalist No. 10. "*By a faction, I understand a number of citizens, whether amounting to a majority*

*or a minority of the whole, are united and actuated by some common impulse of passion, or of interest, adversed to the rights of other citizens, or to the permanent and aggregate interest of the community” [He warned against] an attachment to different leaders ambitiously contending for preeminence and power ...[who] have, in turn, divided mankind into parties, inflamed them with mutual animosity, and rendered them much more disposed to vex and oppress each other than to cooperate for their common good.”*

John Adams wrote, *“There is nothing which I dread so much as a division of the republic into two great parties, each arranged under its leader, and concerting measures in opposition to each other. This, in my humble apprehension, is to be dreaded as the greatest political evil.”*<sup>21</sup>

In President George Washington’s Farewell Address in 1796, he said, *“Let me now ... warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party.... It serves always to distract the public councils and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill-founded jealousies and false alarms, kindles the animosity of one part against another ...”*

And here is Thomas Jefferson’s opinion of the value of political parties: *“If I could not go to heaven but with a [political] party, I would not go there at all.”*<sup>22</sup>

The New Enlightenment Party will not be a party of the kind that our Founders warned against. We will be a group of people united to support instituting, maintaining and improving programs designed to create a government of, for, and by the people, and prosperity for all. Neither the Democratic nor Republican Party is a group of people devoted exclusively to serving these purposes.

Ideally, voters would vote for candidates whose proposed policies, or policies they support or would promote, would in their judgment, based on sufficient and accurate information, best serve their interests in consideration of the interests of the majority. This judgment should be made independent of any group to which the candidate belongs, including party. The New Enlightenment’s ballot access policy proposal is designed to not significantly advantage any party or group of any kind.

Ballot access is the first step to real viability, which results from the other necessary condition of media exposure. Our candidate free airtime and postal, newspaper, and other media subsidies give real viability to candidates through

the widespread provision of extensive information on those meeting the following ballot access requirements:

### ***Candidates for Congress Ballot Access***

We will institute a petition signature system that includes minimum standards. Candidates will provide printed information to anyone choosing to sign a petition in support of their candidacies. This information will generally include references to other information sources. The signer would then be free to spend the time to determine the value of any information provided and referred to. If the candidate receives enough petition signatures that 150 of the signers, after considering the printed and other information, are sufficiently motivated to appear at the local election office to show identification and sign the following statement, the candidate will be ballot-qualified:

*I (voter), after carefully considering information on the policies that (candidate) has developed, or would otherwise support and promote to serve the public interest if elected, believe it would be in the best interest of the citizens of the (district number) Congressional District and the United States if (candidate) was on the ballot for the (year) election for Congressperson representing the (district number) Congressional District.*

Candidates would need substantially more than 150 petition signers before 150 signers, after more careful and thorough consideration than they made at the initial signing, are sufficiently motivated to go the local election office to sign such a statement. The 150 petition signers standard could be adjusted based on public input, and experience, as could the following recommended number of signers standards for candidates for the Senate and president.

Statement signers will be required to sign an oath that they were not paid or offered any form of compensation to sign their candidate statement. Also, the candidates would be required to sign an oath that they did not pay or offer any kind of compensation, including employment, to anyone to sign their support statement. In both cases, falsely signing their oath will be a felony. The statements in support of candidates of other national office will also require this oath, with the same penalty if false.

This is an appropriate and far lower barrier than current ballot access barriers. It likely would not lead to an excessive number of candidates on the ballot.

This type of requirement is similar to that in some other countries. In Canadian elections to the House of Commons, either 50 or 100 petition signatures are required depending on the electoral district. In the Republic of Ireland, candidates may be nominated to the European Parliament by 60 members of the electorate.

### ***Candidates for Senate Ballot Access***

Candidates or their supporters will provide printed information to anyone choosing to sign a petition in support of their ballot access. The information will generally include references to other information sources. The signer would then be free to spend the time to determine the value of any information provided and referenced. If the candidate receives a sufficient number of petition signatures such that 700 signers, after considering the printed and other information, are sufficiently motivated to appear at the local election office to show identification and sign the following statement, the candidate will be ballot-qualified:

*I (voter), after carefully considering information on the policies that (candidate) has developed or would otherwise support and promote to serve the public interest if elected, believe it would be in the best interest of the citizens of the (state) and the United States if (candidate) was on the ballot for the (year) election for senator representing the (state).*

Candidates would need substantially more than 700 petition signers before 700 signers, after more careful and thorough consideration than they made at the initial signing, are sufficiently motivated to go the local election office to sign such a statement.

### ***Elections for President***

As for the candidates for the House and Senate, candidates for president petition signers will be given printed information and references to other information sources at the signing. After considering this and other information, the required number detailed below would need to appear at the local election office to show identification and sign the following statement:

*I (voter), after carefully considering information on the policies that (candidate) has developed or would otherwise support and promote to serve the public interest if elected, believe it would be in the best interest of the citizens of the United States if (candidate) was on the ballot for the (year) election for President of the United States.*

The more extensive Presidential candidate ballot access requirements:

- One state: 1000 election center statements confirming support and prior petition signing.
- Five additional states: 700 election center statements confirming support and prior petition signing.
- Twenty additional states: 150 election center statements confirming support and prior petition signing.

Presidential candidates so qualified will be on ballots nationwide.

Ballot-qualified candidates will be eligible to put a maximum 12,000-word platform summary on the FEC website, and for the other parts of the voter selection process for the main free airtime system, and postage and other subsidies.

The New Enlightenment reforms will result in a greatly widened diversity of candidates and public policy proposals for solving our most important challenges. Issues of concern to the average American and our least powerful citizens will no longer be ignored. We will have a more just and prosperous nation, one where prosperity will be far more equitably shared.

*The New Enlightenment: Ideals of Democracy,  
Human Rights, Reason, and Progress \* Policy 24*

---

<sup>1</sup> Rights of Man, Thomas Paine

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Jefferson letter to Samuel Kercheval, 1816, ME 15:42

<sup>3</sup> Thomas Jefferson to Spencer Roane 6 Sept. 1819, [http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/a1\\_8\\_18s16.html](http://press-pubs.uchicago.edu/founders/documents/a1_8_18s16.html)

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.cnn.com/2010/POLITICS/02/21/poll.broken.govt/>

<sup>5</sup> Los Angeles Times, 2012 campaign set to cost a record \$6 billion, 10/31/12 By Matea Gold

<sup>6</sup> Dollarocracy, John Nichols and Robert McChesney, 2013 pgs. 104,153

<sup>7</sup> The families funding the 2016 presidential election, New York Times, Nicholas Confessore, Sarah Cohen and Karen Yourish, 10/10/15

<sup>8</sup> New York Times, Koch Brothers' Budget of \$889 Million for 2016 Is on Par with Both Parties' Spending, Nicholas Confessore, 1/ 26/15

<sup>9</sup> Demos Report, The Money Chase: Moving from Big Money Dominance in The 2014 Midterms to a Small Donor Democracy, 1/14/15 Adam Lioz, Karen Shanton

<sup>10</sup> Call Time for Congress Shows How Fundraising Dominates Bleak Work Life [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/08/call-time-congressional-fundraising\\_n\\_2427291.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2013/01/08/call-time-congressional-fundraising_n_2427291.html)

---

<sup>11</sup> America the Possible, James Justave Speth, pg. 172

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.businessinsider.com/these-6-corporations-control-90-of-the-media-in-america-2012-6>

<sup>13</sup> Media and polarization Evidence from the introduction of broadcast TV in the United States Filipe R. Campante, Daniel A. Hojman. Journal of Public Economics 100 (2013) 79–92

<sup>14</sup> TV Basics, [http://www.tvb.org/media/file/TV\\_Basics.pdf](http://www.tvb.org/media/file/TV_Basics.pdf)

<sup>15</sup> This is not to imply any other similarity between these two very different candidates. The mythology exists that Trump, like Sanders, is a populist candidate. However, one important indication otherwise is his income tax proposal. According to an analysis by the Tax Policy Center, although the proposal would cut taxes at every income level, high-income taxpayers like himself would receive the biggest cuts, both in dollar terms and as a percentage of income. The highest-income 0.1 percent of taxpayers (those with incomes over \$3.7 million in 2015 dollars) would experience an average tax cut of more than \$1.3 million in 2017, nearly 19 percent of after-tax income. Middle-income households would receive an average tax cut of \$2,700, or 4.9 percent of after-tax income. The proposal would reduce federal revenue by \$9.5 trillion over its first decade and an additional \$15.0 trillion over the subsequent 10 years, before accounting for added interest costs.

<sup>16</sup> The simple algebra showing this is below:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Total } V &= V1 + V2 + V3 \dots + V336 \\ &= 6A1 + 6A2 + 6A3 \dots + 6A336 \\ &= 6(A1 + A2 + A3 \dots + A336) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>17</sup> National Journal, Ad Rates Spiking as Candidates, Groups Scurry to Get On Air By Reid Wilson July 26, 2012

<sup>18</sup> [thestreet.com](https://www.thestreet.com), TV Political Ad Spending Will Break Records in 2016, and These Broadcasters Will Cash In, Chris Nolter, 6/8/16 <https://www.thestreet.com/story/13594342/1/tv-political-ad-spending-will-break-records-in-2016-and-these-broadcasters-will-cash-in.html>

<sup>19</sup> Wesleyan Media Project, Advertising Volume Up 122% Over 2012 Levels; Spending in Presidential Race Over \$400 million, 5/12/16

<sup>20</sup> This assumes on average candidates would choose audiences of about average size in their three minute time slot selections. Another perspective on this is ad revenues would be reduced by these percentages if ad rates were proportional to audience size, as is candidate V.

<sup>21</sup> Letter from John Adams to Jonathan Jackson, 2 October 1780

<sup>22</sup> Letter From Thomas Jefferson to Francis Hopkinson, 13 March 1789