

We Do Not Consent

Peaceful Revolution
and Other Provocations

DAVE BERMAN

<http://WeDoNotConsent.blogspot.com>

Foreword by Attorney Paul Lehto

For conscientious objectors everywhere.

Foreword

by Paul Lehto

*Those who are ignorant of history are condemned to repeat it,
Because those who've lost history's battles are anxious to delete it.*
— Paul R. Lehto¹

As a practicing lawyer working on election cases, reviewing the principles upon which the United States was founded helps me to fully appreciate the significance, context and relevance of Dave Berman's thinking. I find much benefit in doing this, as well as in processing the reflections of fellow writers like Dave, and I am honored to write this Foreword to his book. Americans, in fact, have always thought that remembering basic principles is important, and many state constitutions expressly state, "A frequent recurrence to fundamental principles is necessary to the preservation of liberty."

There's no time like the present for this to occur. The most important of these fundamental principles, and the one this book largely focuses on, is the consent of the governed. Based on "popular sovereignty," or the notion that legitimate power can come from the people themselves and from no other source, the Founders' perspective on the consent of the governed can be summarized as follows:

As John Locke wrote, a society of free and equal citizens can't have any superiors or rulers, except for those who rule only by virtue of actual or implied consent. Consent is critical to actual legitimacy because the application of the compulsive force of law against free, equal citizens could not be based upon the rulers' superiority; it would instead have to be based upon the consent of the people, obtained through reason. These late 1600s ideas became the spirit of 1776, as well as the phrase in the Declaration of Independence "deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed," and the Constitution's opening three word frame, "We the People."

The Founders intended that all elected representatives and government officials, as loyal trustees of the people's power, would "*incessantly* consult *their* good," since the government was a fiduciary and public servant whose only legitimate purpose was "to secure individual rights."

The consent of the governed was also *conditional* on the proper exercise of this trusteeship in power. Thus, the government is utterly devoid of power to do anything else but serve the people, for the simple reason that it is plainly absurd to imagine that the People would actually consent at any time to any form of tyranny or disloyalty to the people, when the sole purpose and intent of delegating power to the government is to create a class of public servants, loyal to the people, devoted to their general Welfare, and accountable to the people through elections and otherwise.

¹ The first line is, of course, a borrowed saying.

Based on this and other background writings on the topic of the consent of the governed, and after collegial discussions with Dave Berman and other thinkers around the country, I suggest that important corollaries are evident regarding the consent of the governed: (1) Elections are the mechanism for measuring the existence of the consent of the governed, because this consent is determined via elections. (2) Tyranny or disloyal service to the people, even if practiced for a hundred years, could not thereby act in any way to establish a general right of those in power to tyrannize or be disloyal to the people, because consent of the people is the key, and from that perspective the people certainly never agreed to tyranny or disloyalty. (3) Trustees (politicians and government workers) are necessarily and properly accountable to the people they serve both through elections and at all other times. (4) The public servants who deal with elections can not purport to tamper with the very foundations that authorize their own legitimacy: the Constitution, the People, or Elections, they can only serve and uphold the Constitution, the People, and Elections, and are obligated and sworn to do so.

I myself set out in the fall of 2004 to attempt to verify whether the consent of the governed had been or was being obtained in elections in my local county of Snohomish, Washington, without consciously thinking of it in quite this way at the time. My colleague Dr. Jeffrey Hoffman and I used science to attempt to test or verify whether democracy really existed in our local jurisdiction.

Due to a historically close 2004 governor's race, Washington conducted a statewide recount of this race. In my county, paper ballots and Sequoia paperless touch screen voting systems were set up side by side, which provided a sort of natural laboratory format. Since the paper ballots were subjected to a hand recount, most of the possible errors or fraud involving paper ballots had been eliminated as variables. The paperless voting machines, however, could not be recounted. I co-authored a report on this scientific study with Dr. Hoffman, in which we reported many remarkable findings contrasting paper and electronic ballots, among them are the following:

1. The results between the paper ballots and touch screen voting machines favored one candidate over the other so dramatically, despite the fact that both came from the same county and the same precincts, that the odds these differences were created randomly was one in many trillions. This was true even after other variables were eliminated; for example, the possibility that more voters from one party had voted with one method or the other.
2. The cumulative vote on 19 different malfunctioning machines that were removed from service (each had fewer than 30 votes recorded on it) favored the Republican candidate by a total of more than 50%. This occurred in a Democratic county in the closest gubernatorial race in US history.

3. Paper ballots and electronic ballots had statistical distributions or curves that were entirely different (paper was a single peak bell curve for both parties, while electronic ballots had twin peaks), indicating with 100% certainty that a major force acted upon electronic ballots that did not act upon paper ballots.²

These findings together showed that the type of voting technology that was used had a major impact on the results of the election, when voting technology is supposed to be neutral as a measuring device of voter intent. Even more important, however, our compelling evidence did nothing to convince Sequoia Voting Systems and Snohomish County to disclose any electronic evidence about the suspicious vote counting that took place within those machines. In fact, it became extremely clear that electronic vote counting was nothing less than secret vote counting via trade secret software. I was unable to get any electronic information about the vote counting processes either as an observer in the polling place on election night or as a member of a serious research team - the claim of trade secrecy was the same, and in fact I was told Sequoia would resist this by "all means necessary." Simply put, the government and its chosen vendors now routinely refuse to perform the simple acts of addition necessary to count votes in public, even though anything beyond simple addition would be impermissible creative accounting in our elections.

Recurring to basic principles, I've found the following about our elections: (1) Instead of attempting to prove the existence of the consent of the governed through elections, no such proof is being attempted by our public servants, who have acted to revolutionize elections by buying certain types of equipment that made checks and balances and accountability impossible; (2) The power of secret vote counting included within it the power to "elect" any candidate the secret vote counter might choose or might sell the election to, and whether or not this power would ever be unaccountably exercised, it is a corrupt act and the desire of Tyrants to accept or desire such unaccountable absolute power; (3) Hiding vote counting from the public creates a permanently disloyal election system not designed to serve the people; (4) Elections officials using electronic voting have chosen the power of the illusion of smooth elections (an interest they share with the vendors) over accountability to the people; and (5) The government, in revolutionizing voting systems in negative ways, is tampering with the very foundations that authorize their own legitimacy: the Constitution, the People, or Elections.

So, as a result of the above I did what any red-blooded American lawyer would do: I sued (see: www.votersunite.org/info/lehtolawsuit.asp). The lawsuit raises fundamental questions about the relations between the people and their government, much as Dave Berman's book does.

² This difference consisted of naturally "noisy" single peak bell curves for both parties on paper ballots, but in contrast electronic ballots featured smooth twin-peaked curves. Because naturally random systems like voting always have some "noise" or natural variation off a perfect curve, the paper curve noise for both parties was expected. However, the smoothness of the electronic curves was suggestive of computer generation with its significantly reduced noise level and more perfect curve, and a cause for further investigation. This was not allowed.

The thought provoking writings that follow raise the question: “Has the consent of the governed been withdrawn YET?” The answer to this question depends on whether the lack of consent must be a conscious decision of enough people to create an overall consent of the people. But if a government acts unjustly, though secretly, will the people’s lack of knowledge mean that the government’s authority continues to support the unjust and secret acts? For the Founders, that was an easy question to answer: If the government in fact has acted against the people themselves, the conditions to the exercise of its own power have been exceeded, and the exercise of power is illegitimate. Put another way, to ask if the consent of the people has been withdrawn may be simply to ask if the government has exceeded the powers it holds in trust for the people, in which case it would be absurd to believe the people consented in the first place.

Seen in terms of limits to government power, it is clear that the government must be acting outside its powers in its use of secret and unaccountable electronic vote counting. Secret vote counting is akin to asking all abolitionists, suffragists, and civil rights workers to turn their hard-won ballots in blank, to be both filled out and counted in secret, “according to the intent of the individual voter.” In so doing, the government is tinkering with the foundations of its own legitimacy, purporting to take a measurement via elections that determines the consent of the governed, but refusing to show anyone the ruler to be used. It performs the measurements in total darkness, and the status quo is reaffirmed as the end result.

If we all were to do as Berman does and recur to basic principles, rediscover the spirit of 1776 and the Declaration of Independence and contemplate the consent of the governed, then our country could be, as Jefferson himself hoped and intended it would be, renewed in each generation by a resurgence of revolutionary hope and spirit. We can always benefit from returning to basic principles and documents such as the Declaration of Independence for guidance, especially in complicated times. Every major successful movement in US history from abolition to women’s suffrage to civil rights has done so. And since Dave Berman has already had such good sense and insight to do so in depth regarding election integrity, we can recur also to his works that follow, pass the word on to others, and most important, apply those principles, scientifically, politically or otherwise. To borrow a phrase from Dave Berman, it’s “the least we can do.”

Paul R. Lehto, Attorney at Law
March 21, 2006

Contents ...

| | |
|--|----|
| Introduction | 1 |
| They're sending my friend to Iraq | 3 |
| 101 Ways The US "Supports Its Troops". | 4 |
| Is 1984 Taught In Schools Anymore?. | 5 |
| Is America going broke? | 6 |
| FL Debates Ban on e-Vote Recounts | 8 |
| Why Old Election Numbers No Longer Matter. | 9 |
| The Aftermath | 10 |
| Voter Confidence Resolution | 12 |
| Guide to the Voter Confidence Resolution | 15 |
| Voter Confidence Resolution ADOPTED By Arcata, CA (First in Nation)! | 16 |
| GuvWorld Joins Call For Media Coverage of Month-Old GAO Report | 17 |
| A Campaign To Unite California Election Reformers | 19 |
| Area Voting Machines Discredited By Government Reports | 22 |
| Previously Certified Diebold Machines Approved Erroneously | 25 |
| We Are Being Set Up: The Manchurian Nation | 27 |
| Hypothetical Occupation of America | 29 |
| My First Date With the Republicans | 30 |
| The Resignation Frame. | 33 |
| My Speech to the NAACP Today, MLK Day | 35 |
| A Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution. | 37 |
| Epilogue | 48 |
| Resources and References | 49 |
| Acknowledgements | 50 |
| About the Author | 51 |
| Testimonials | 52 |

Introduction

By Dave Berman

Thank you for opening my book. If you are looking at a computer, you will notice underlined phrases throughout this document. Some of these links are internal navigation for the book, and some will take you to the original source on the Internet. If you are holding a book in your hand then these underlined phrases are more like flags for things you could research further by calling up the free online version of the book (<http://tiny-url.com/rlnr2>).

Publishing this book represents a transition for me. Each of these essays originally appeared at GuvWurld, my first blog (<http://GuvWurld.blogspot.com>). When the book became available I stopped adding new content to GuvWurld and started a new blog that I could promote more readily with the book, both called We Do Not Consent. In substance and style, the two blogs are the same.

I consider my writing style to be advocacy journalism. That means I often write about the work I do for change in the world and I write in a way that promotes these efforts. To judge whether my advocacy journalism is successful, I consider only whether my intended real-world results are produced. What better way to *be the media* than to create my own account of what I'm doing?

My blogging creates the opportunity to work with framing issues ([p.33; The Resignation Frame](#)), dissecting and debunking propaganda ([p.4; 101 Ways The US "Supports Its Troops"](#)), educating the public and generating publicity ([p.17; GuvWurld Joins Call For Media Coverage of Month-Old GAO Report](#)), and organizing on multiple levels (p. all, it's the point of advocacy journalism).

The Voter Confidence Resolution (VCR) ([p.12](#)) is so far my best example of successful advocacy journalism. The Guide to the VCR ([p.15](#)) stands as a summary of the strategy and talking points, encouraging and enabling activists everywhere to lobby their City Councils. The City Council of Arcata, CA became the first to formally adopt the VCR ([p.16](#)) in July 2005. This breakthrough inspired A Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution ([p.37](#)), a detailed vision of the VCR as a "think global, act local" strategy for laying a path to a tipping point.

Ultimately, my writing relies heavily upon language and ideas rooted in history, adapted for current events, and presented as a call to action. The title of this e-book refers to the Declaration of Independence, which says the “just Power” of government is derived from the Consent of the Governed. As the VCR declares, under current election conditions the Consent of the Governed is not being sought. Such Consent must not be assumed or taken for granted.

“And so we must say, to such unacceptable election conditions: WE DO NOT CONSENT. And to the destruction of the environment: WE DO NOT CONSENT. Can I hear you say it with me now: WE DO NOT CONSENT. Spying on Americans: WE DO NOT CONSENT. War, war, and more war on phony scapegoats: WE DO NOT CONSENT. Peaceful demonstrators labeled as terrorists: WE DO NOT CONSENT. No more innocent until proven guilty: WE DO NOT CONSENT.”

Excerpt from my speech to the Humboldt County NAACP on MLK Day 2006 (p.35)

As a source for detailed reporting, both of my blogs reflect a particular depth in the area of election conditions ([p.22; Area Voting Machines Discredited By Government Reports](#)), and a breadth across the decline of our human condition ([p.27; We Are Being Set Up: The Manchurian Nation](#)). We will not break the grip of fascism running better candidates in bogus elections and we will not save the planet through impeachment. Peaceful revolution is necessary, NOW!

Dave Berman, March 2006 (Updated: September, 2006)

For Dave's latest writing see his new blog at <http://WeDoNotConsent.blogspot.com>.

They're sending my friend to Iraq

Sunday, July 18, 2004

I just found out the US Army is sending an old friend to Iraq. I am unable to attend a send off gathering but want him to know that not only will I support him, I will keep fighting for his freedom while he's gone. I know that's backwards from the propaganda, but it's the truth. There is no government but ours threatening to take more rights away with Patriot Act II. There is no al Qaeda or Iraqi resistance cell preparing to declare martial law on San Francisco. And whether our election is called off or just held for show again, my friend in Iraq won't really be in a position to deal with it.

I know when he leaves for Iraq he'll be going from bad to worse. But what about when he returns? After all, we're warned that by then we may see a terrorist atrocity lead to the cancellation of elections and martial law. He'll leave the war to come home to the war. I am not hoping for this. I hope he comes back and can resume his happy life in San Francisco. Still, I'm concerned that he could be among the 20% reportedly suffering from post traumatic stress. Worse, he might be excluded from statistics for political purposes, like the tens of thousands suffering from [DU exposure](#).

Again, that's not what I wish for him or anyone. I can't help thinking ahead to his safe return. Positive visualization is useful. Let me tell you what else I want to see:

[A small town passes a resolution](#). It says there is no BASIS for confidence in American elections. It says the Consent of the Governed is being denied.

Other communities pass similar statements and the national dialog begins to change. The Consent of the Governed is being withdrawn.

These communities begin to coordinate and build consensus. We aim to restore a genuine participatory democracy encouraging competition of ideas.

I hope I will hug my friend again some day. I hope when that happens, he has understood that the best way anybody could support the troops is to replace this government that is [addicted to war](#).

101 Ways The US “Supports Its Troops”

Tuesday, October 12, 2004

“Support the Troops” is government propaganda. The following events are inconsistent with a government supporting the troops.

Did the Pentagon support the troops when it [withheld medical data](#) from the cold war, [neglected to establish baseline medical records](#), or [hushed information](#) about [vaccines forced on troops](#)?

Are the troops [short on chemical suits](#) getting the same support as the troops [short on body armor](#)? Are these troops jealous of the other soldiers who got enough support to [buy their own gear](#)? As the world’s sole superpower, the US military has warned other countries against even considering amassing a rival force, yet we still run [short on rifles](#) and [bullets](#), and sometimes don’t know [who we are fighting](#). Unneeded [body armor delivered in Kosovo](#) embarrassed soldiers aware of the missing support it represented to the troops in Iraq.

The United States military is known for supporting its troops with the [illegal weapon](#) called [Depleted Uranium](#). The weapons of soldiers in the field have been made nuclear by [radioactive dust](#) with a half-life of [4.5 billion years](#). DU is strongly believed to be the cause of the otherwise mysterious “[Gulf War Illness](#),” which is [now affecting soldiers returning](#) from the [second Iraq war](#), as well as causing birth defects and cancers among [American and Iraqi](#) children of exposed parents. The United States can’t and won’t [clean it up](#).

All of this support comes despite fully informed warnings from military medical officers such as [Dr. Doug Rokke](#) and [Dennis Kyne](#). Not all concerns are heard. Some whistle blowers, such as William Lovett, [Robert Jones](#) and [Stephen Funk](#) have faced courts martial. For others retribution has been [denial of medical care](#) or [psych ward lockup](#). Ever supportive of efforts to improve the military, news of [faulty tanks](#), [undefended helicopters](#) and indeed even a report commissioned on [lessons learned](#) have been [suppressed](#).

All of these links direct you to the [GuvWurld News Archive](#), a vast resource of information the Bush administration would probably rather we not remember. This essay was supposed to go on until I had 101 references but I just don’t have time to complete it. At this point I invite readers to submit further examples of the [sabotage](#) wrought by the US government. This can easily be expanded from the [military](#) to the [economy](#), the [environment](#), and many other topics.

Ultimately, I hope people will use the sabotage paradigm to show others how the political establishment, from both sides of the aisle, coordinates the disassembling of our best interests. For We The People to overcome, you and your Bush-backing neighbor must determine that you are not against each other and your preferred candidate, but rather united against Bush AND Kerry and their concerted efforts to perpetuate illusions and myths such as patriotism and democracy.

Is 1984 Taught In Schools Anymore?

Monday, September 06, 2004

When I was in high school, George Orwell's 1984 was required reading. I can't help but wonder how common this is in American schools today? Wherever it is being taught, it is difficult to imagine that a class now reading 1984 could have a meaningful learning experience without discussing the eerily similar context of current events, especially since teachers have been suspended or otherwise disciplined for benign free speech about war in the past two years.

So is 1984 being taught in 2004? It is a macabre irony to say taught, yes, the hard way. Recently the Eureka Times-Standard printed an [editorial criticizing Shaye Harty](#) for wanting to remove the statue of President McKinley from the Arcata Plaza. Harty questioned the appropriateness of celebrating a man of such dubious accomplishments. In rejecting Harty's proposal, the Times-Standard editors did not challenge her facts, interpretations or judgments about McKinley.

Had the paper limited its objection to the consideration of aesthetic and tradition, I would call it a reasonable difference of opinion. I could even forgive the demeaning tone that "downsized" the idea into perspective with other current concerns. But the editorial likened Harty's campaign to the rewriting of history seen in 1984. And thus we learn our lessons the hard way: the keepers of the status quo often defend their position with accusations that more appropriately apply to themselves.

This is a peculiar flavor of Orwell's doublespeak that I call [Black Kettles](#). The greatest example may be George W. Bush saying America was attacked because terrorists hate our freedoms. This would be true if we were to properly define terrorists. After all, those who conspired to take away the rights of Americans are the Congressmembers who passed the Patriot Act; the Justice Department operating outside the parameters of an already dangerously expanded purview; the Supreme Court that has permitted wanton lawlessness in the Executive branch; and the administration that detains citizens indefinitely without charges.

It must be made plain by now that America is no longer a democratic, capitalist nation with freedoms of the press and of speech. These pretexts are maintained as a facade shielding recognition that fascism is in effect. Yes you will still find examples of capitalism or an uneroded freedom. But this is consistent with maintaining the illusion and perpetuating the myth that our country is still how we've always known it. It is not. This is not alarmist or extreme. It is sober and rational and millions of others have already realized it.

It is becoming increasingly easy to expose the charade. Mr. Bush has repeatedly said we are winning the war on terror, we will win the war on terror and that he has a strategy to win the war on terror. Last week Mr. Bush said that he doesn't think the war on terror can be won. Should such a contradiction be discussed in a class reading 1984 today?

The thinking reader has known since the beginning that a war on terror is like a war on violence and cannot possibly eradicate its supposed target. With millions awakening to the recognition of fascism, and myths being laid bare before the world, there is no reason to continue pretending that America is what it is not.

Imagine watching a magician perform. After the show you are asked to name your favorite trick. You say it was the one where he cut the lovely assistant in half. You know it was a trick and you know he didn't really saw the woman in two. In the context of recreation, entertainment and fantasy, suspension of disbelief is a prerequisite. Yet in casual conversation, your language would reflexively reinforce the illusion. This is what happens all the time from the war on terror to free speech (zones) to elections.

As headlines routinely leave reality a toss-up between the stories of two so-called national leaders, the net effect is many people now find it impossible to know what to believe. This is what the Times-Standard should be referring to when writing about 1984. Bashing Harty was, as it has come to be known, Orwellian.

Is America going broke?

Sunday, March 06, 2005

A friend sent a "must read" article – [*Is America Going Broke?*](#) – from the historic Canadian publication Macleans (which is celebrating its [100th year](#)). The rest of my friend's preamble said:

"Excellent piece on the financial crisis our country is facing from the Canadian perspective. The author and the economists he quotes paint a very scary picture that effects [sic] interest rates, unemployment, real estate markets, the value of the dollar, health care costs, education costs, etc."

This article does tie these threads together, and as my friend also noted, does not require you to be an economist to understand it. It was both powerful and easily digestible.

The article does not shy away from allowing Mr. Bush or the U.S. to appear in a bad light. That is, it does not apply what now seems like the standard [Americorporate media](#) kid glove treatment that is bastardizing the [objective recording](#) of the events of these times. There was mention that recent budgets have been put forth fallaciously, lacking estimates for war costs, but there was no mention of the Pentagon as an [inordinate suck](#) on the U.S. budget. There was no accounting for the economic fallout of the supposedly inevitable terror attack we're told to expect here in America, nor was the connection made between Pentagon behavior and incentive to attack the U.S.

There is always going to be something that is outside the scope of whatever one is writing. As I read this article, I kept hoping I'd find a section on [Peak Oil](#). The number of threads woven together was indeed comprehensive but not all inclusive. I thought of a phrase I'd recently used somewhere else: **You can tell no lies and still not tell the truth.**

This is not about nitpicking but rather further defining [ruthless honesty](#). No discussion of [global economic factors](#) is complete without [Peak Oil](#).

The current hot topic within the economic sphere is Social Security. This [manufactured crisis](#) is forcing a frame of legitimacy around forecasts 30 or more years in the future. Current uncertainties, awaiting the tipping point of chaos, make adopting such distant predictions laughable at best. How can we have a serious discussion about the world in 2040 when our willful ignorance precludes considering the end of air travel (a real potential ripple of Peak Oil)? Or the [privatization of water](#)? Or the corporate [control of crop seeds](#)? Or the [weaponization of space](#)? Or the likelihood of unabashed totalitarianism or revolution or both in one or more major industrialized nation, including the U.S.?

Is America Going Broke? is an obvious question at this point and it is not an exaggeration. By anybody's definition, trillions in the hole is broke. The more apt title would have been How Long Can America Stay Afloat? or perhaps, At the Morgue of Nations, Who Will Claim the Bloated Corpse of America? This characterization is hardly more negative or extreme than the economic experts in the article. I'm merely broadening the context to include factors I see as most likely to precipitate the collapse we're otherwise told is inevitable.

Also See: [Warren Buffett Betting Against U.S. Dollar](#)

FL Debates Ban on e-Vote Recounts

Saturday, April 03, 2004

This is the first-ever GuvWurld Blog post...

[Miami Herald Article](#) (in GuvWurld news archive, contains link to original)

Should manual recounts be allowed if the votes were cast on touch-screen machines?

By choosing to debate this question, the certainty of uncertainty is strengthened. This joins the long list of reasons to expect a lack of consensus to follow the next election. This is worse than willingly walking into a mine field. This is being “brave” enough to play Russian Roulette with a bullet in every chamber.

American democracy empowers leaders through the consent of the governed. Who is willing to consent to elections where the preparation consists of making sure the will of the people will be reasonably called into question? We can see the setup from a mile away – the so-called opponents are “debating” the rules of their contest. This is simulated competition, in the grand tradition of professional wrestling and the Harlem Globetrotters.

It is an insufficient response merely to refuse to participate in the charade - I do not advocate boycotting elections when they are held. We need the determined resolve to stop the charade itself. Politicians on the local level must be encouraged to pass resolutions (ala the 270 anti-Patriot act resolutions) that voice a “Vote of No Confidence.” The first one may be mocked or ridiculed, but by the 50th or 100th No Confidence resolution, the crux of the debate will then have become the line in the sand at which this administration loses its legitimacy (such as it never was).

Why Old Election Numbers No Longer Matter

Wednesday, August 17, 2005

This apocryphal parable contains only [true facts](#). I know because I made them up myself.

The date was Sept 33, 1965. Samdy Kouflax ate eight live pigs, a new record among those in his Pagan cult. This sign of virility and luck soon paid dividends as Kouflax threw one of golf's most memorable games. Going all nine chuckers, Kouflax completed a no-hitter to lead his Chicago Whitehawks to the Super Bowl with a victory over the Boston Celtics. Kouflax's solo grand-slam leading off the first inning was all the offense needed that season. Many also remember this game for the unusual brawl that broke out between two Celtic mid-fielders. The ensuing power play enabled the 'Hawks to expand their zone defense with 20 men on the ice. All in all, it was a [fabulous year](#) for Samdy and his wife Whora.

Can you imagine yourself getting into a debate about who won this game or what was the final score? Any such discussion would validate the legitimacy of the idea that there was an actual game with a winner, a loser, and a knowable point tally. If you were asked who won, or what was the final score, the only reasonable answer is that it cannot be known from such nonsensical reporting. There is nothing in this story to suggest that a real game of any sort was actually played.

U.S. federal elections are held under conditions that are equally farcical. At this point, any discussion of the numbers, or the outcome, is only serving to reinforce that an actual election took place. It is imperative that we make it conventional wisdom that no actual election took place, that instead we witnessed and partook in [simulated competition](#). The core argument that summarizes this frame is: there is no basis for confidence in the results reported from U.S. federal elections.

This is the nucleus of the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#), recently [adopted by Arcata, CA](#), and also the essence of LandShark's [Paul Lehto's] posts at [Democratic Underground](#). It is long past time to stop the bickering and to stop allowing ourselves to be drawn into specious debates. We say we will demand the truth yet we have a difficult enough time telling it to ourselves. The U.S. government is run by people who have perpetuated many charades against us. We are at the dawn of the new, peaceful American Revolution, or our extinction.

The Aftermath

Saturday, November 06, 2004

Since Tuesday's "election," the [Voting section](#) of the GuvWurld News Archive has continued to swell. Sort by date to get the most recent at the top. As expected, rampant fraud is being alleged, if not flat-out demonstrated.

Like many people, it has taken me a few days to collect my thoughts and process a coherent response. The first and most important thing I want to stress: WE MUST NOT SET OUT TO PROVE THAT KERRY WON.

Since inception in April, GuvWurld has strictly adhered to the position: there is no BASIS for confidence in the legitimacy of the results reported in US elections. So much uncertainty has been sown that it is impossible to positively and definitively know the outcome.

As the details of this week's fraud become increasingly revealed, some data may indicate that Kerry was indeed the victor. It may be tempting to make this argument, but it will be more effective to indict the system as a whole. People who turn defensive against a claim of a Kerry victory will continue to blind themselves to the myth of democracy.

For the few days grok I also began to see [Kerry's early concession](#) putting him in the role of [stooge](#) and [patsy](#). As a rule, I don't do name calling. I'm trying to map this onto the usual GuvWurld paradigm of [simulated competition](#). If you haven't really been onto this yet, it must now be unmistakable.

If Kerry had ever been in it to win it he should have given us a hopeful vision for a peaceful future; he could have pledged to reverse the media consolidation that has led to manipulative brainwashing; he would have feigned an interest in undoing the Patriot Act to restore civil liberties. A shrewd opponent of Bush would also support the [9/11 Truth Movement](#) and the victims' families who last week successfully submitted a [criminal complaint](#) to NY Attorney General Eliot Spitzer.

In this entire campaign, John Kerry never stood up for anything - he just stood in. He was like a sparring partner, there for a workout but not to knock you out. And wasn't he using Springsteen's [No Surrender](#) as a campaign theme? How do you ask a man to be first to concede a "contest" he may yet be "proven" to have won?

I suspect that to the powerful partisan insiders who cast Kerry in the role of candidate, he was also a hedge bet. President Kerry would keep the war machine revved and the secrets of 9/11 concealed; allow further restriction of information through anti-competitive and anti-capitalist media mergers; and perpetuate the illusion that two major corporate parties are actually fighting over how best to represent you. This campaign was not only simulated competition, John Kerry represented a false alternative. If these common GuvWurld refrains are new for you, hopefully now you'll notice the abundance of additional examples.

Also beneficial to the establishment, Kerry's early concession confined the range of possible responses to potential post-"election" chaos. For example, on "election" night, Green Party presidential candidate David Cobb was prepared to fly the following morning to Florida, Ohio, or wherever the legal flashpoint turned out to be. Instead, on Wednesday afternoon he was on the plaza in Arcata, CA speaking to at most 75 people about the same wonderful and positive messages on which he ran his campaign. In fact, he gave the stump speech I'd seen him do just two weeks ago.

I highly doubt Cobb was the first thing on most people's minds when, before the "election," they pondered what kind of leadership we'd find for a post-"election" protest against fraud. I'd like to say that Cobb could do this. He is very bright, totally charming, unassuming and approachable, and he gets the full mythology (we do not really have democracy, capitalism, free speech or a free press in America; these are myths we must debunk).

Unfortunately, as Cobb campaigned he also talked about voting for Kerry, a well-reasoned but utterly foolish and hypocritical position. Cobb himself was engaging in the simulated competition. I'd get over that in a hurry if his leadership, just on a local level, was immediately put towards exposing this week's "election" fraud; if he publicly espoused the simulated competition frame among the grounds for declaring No Confidence; and if he worked for local passage of a revised No Confidence Resolution that would, [like before](#), refer to the Consent of the Governed.

"We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness -- That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on such Principles and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness."

[US Declaration of Independence](#)

The bottom line, for now: This "election" has broken the bank on what passes for reality. If you were in the Anybody But Bush camp, you may feel like Kerry sold you out. Let it go. The entire government has been pissing in your ear while picking your pocket and mortgaging your future. Getting to the bottom of what happened this week must be connected with the long-term and systemic changes described throughout the GuvWurld blog for the past seven months.

(I'll try to synthesize a summary of the fraud charges and other resources for responding by Sunday night - for now, please visit the [GuvWurld News Archive](#).)

Voter Confidence Resolution

Saturday, April 23, 2005

BREAKING NEWS (7/21/05): Arcata, CA City Council becomes nation's first to adopt the Voter Confidence Resolution. Click [HERE](#) for the story and [HERE](#) for a scanned copy of the official resolution signed by Mayor Machi.

NOTE: The Voter Confidence Resolution is intended for City Councils across America. As unified communities make this collective declaration, they call to question: Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET? The resolution is a template that should be customized locally through bridge-building, consensus-seeking teach-ins. For a more thorough understanding, read A [Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution](#) (NEW 9/22/05). For abbreviated talking points, please see the [Guide to the Voter Confidence Resolution](#).

(v 6.1, LAST UPDATED: 5/14/05 5pm)

Whereas an election is a competition for the privilege of representing the people; and

Whereas each voter is entitled to cast a single ballot to record his or her preferences for representation; and

Whereas the records of individual votes are the basis for counting and potentially re-counting a collective total and declaring a winner; and

Whereas an election's outcome is a matter of public record, based on a finite collection of immutable smaller records; and

Whereas a properly functioning election system should produce unanimous agreement about the results indicated by a fixed set of unchanging records; and

Whereas recent U.S. federal elections have been conducted under conditions that have not produced unanimous agreement about the outcome; and

Whereas future U.S. federal elections cannot possibly produce unanimous agreement as long as any condition permits an inconclusive count or re-count of votes; and

Whereas inconclusive counts and re-counts have occurred during recent U.S. federal elections due in part to electronic voting devices that do not produce a paper record of votes to be re-counted if necessary; and

Whereas inconclusive results have also been caused by election [machines losing data](#), producing [negative vote totals](#), showing [more votes](#) than there are registered voters, and persistently and automatically [swapping a voter's vote](#) from his or her chosen candidate to an opponent; and

Whereas inconclusive results make it impossible to measure the will of the people in their preferences for representation; and

Whereas the Declaration of Independence refers to the Consent of the Governed as the self-evident truth from which Government derives “just Power”;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

Because inconclusive results, by definition, mean that the true outcome of an election cannot be known, there is no basis for confidence in the results reported from U.S. federal elections; and

Be it also resolved:

The following is a comprehensive election reform platform likely to ensure conclusive election results and create a basis for confidence in U.S. federal elections:

- 1) voting processes owned and operated entirely in the public domain, and
- 2) clean money laws to keep all corporate funds out of campaign financing, and
- 3) a voter verified paper ballot for every vote cast and additional uniform standards determined by a non-partisan nationally recognized commission, and
- 4) declaring election day a national holiday, and
- 5) counting all votes publicly and locally in the presence of citizen witnesses and credentialed members of the media, and
- 6) equal time provisions to be restored by the media along with a measurable increase in local, public control of the airwaves, and
- 7) presidential debates containing a minimum of three candidates, run by a non-partisan commission comprised of representatives of publicly owned media outlets, and
- 8) preferential voting and proportional representation to replace the winner-take-all system for federal elections;

Be it further resolved:

When elections are conducted under conditions that prevent conclusive outcomes, the Consent of the Governed is not being sought. Absent this self-evident source of legitimacy, such Consent is not to be assumed or taken for granted.

Endorsements

[Palo Alto, CA Human Relations Commission](#)

[David Cobb](#), 2004 Green Party Presidential Candidate

[Voter Confidence Committee of Humboldt County](#)

Green Party - [Eureka, CA](#), [Humboldt County, CA](#)

[Progressive Democrats of WA](#)

Veterans For Peace, [Humboldt Bay Chapter 56](#)

[Black Box Voting, Inc.](#)

[Velvet Revolution](#)

[Paul R. Lehto](#), Attorney at Law

Jane Allen, GuvWurld contributing editor

[Submit](#) your endorsement or the version of the resolution that your City Council is considering; or post your comments [HERE](#).

The permalink for the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) is:

<http://guvwurld.blogspot.com/2005/04/voter-confidence-resolution.html>

The permalink for the [Guide to the Voter Confidence Resolution](#) is:

<http://guvwurld.blogspot.com/2005/06/guide-to-voter-confidence-resolution.html>

An archive of related prior works can be found [HERE](#).

Guide to the Voter Confidence Resolution

Saturday, June 11, 2005

This is a guide to the strategy and talking points of the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#). For a more comprehensive presentation, please read [A Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution](#) (NEW 9/22/05).

Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET?

Premise:

The [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) shows us that the Consent of the Governed, referenced in the [Declaration of Independence](#) as a self-evident truth from which Government derives “just Power,” is no longer being sought through elections in America. Unverifiable votes, privatized source code, and secret vote counting ensure inconclusive outcomes. Since the results are inherently uncertain, we have no basis for confidence.

What’s Next?:

People in communities around the country are organizing and lobbying their City Councils to adopt the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#). While the resolution is a template that should be customized somewhat in each community, these three frames should remain intact to generate a cumulative impact as more and more resolutions pass.

The way it works now we’re guaranteed inconclusive outcomes and we’ll never have unanimous agreement about election results.

The [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) contains a comprehensive election reform platform designed to ensure conclusive outcomes and create a new basis for confidence in U.S. federal elections.

Since the Consent of the Governed is not being sought, we ask: Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET?

The benefit of cumulative impact means it is assumed we will eventually switch the answer to this question from no, to YES, the Consent of the Governed HAS been withdrawn. How many communities must pass this resolution for this point to be made?

The Big Picture:

By uniting citizens on the community level, bridges are built across partisan divides. This consensus-building process will make it easier for any City Council to feel free to pass the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) as a collective declaration. So begins the shift in the balance of power between We The People and the government gone awry (the very definition of revolution, according to Rebecca Solnit’s [Hope In the Dark](#)).

Summary:

Who: City Councils

What: Adopt the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#), ask: Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET?

Where: Communities all across America

Why: Election conditions ensure inconclusive outcomes and fail to seek the Consent of the Governed (and because peaceful revolution is a birthright)

When: It's already begun; On July 20, 2005 Arcata, CA became the [first to adopt the Voter Confidence Resolution](#) (scanned copy of the original resolution signed by Mayor Machi).

For further reading, review [endorsements](#) for the Voter Confidence Resoluiton.

Voter Confidence Resolution ADOPTED By Arcata, CA (First in Nation)!

Thursday, July 21, 2005

Shortly before midnight on Wednesday night the City Council of Arcata, CA became the first in the nation to adopt the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#). Illustrating that current conditions ensure inconclusive election outcomes, the resolution concludes that the Consent of the Governed is not being sought and should not be assumed or taken for granted. As other City Councils follow suit, the question asked repeatedly will be: Has the Consent of the Governed has been withdrawn, YET? This is the frame that will develop cumulative impact, taking a “not if, but when” posture so that a “last straw” will inevitably create a Tipping Point.

The [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) was adopted on a 3-2 vote with the support of Harmony Groves, Dave Meserve and Paul Pitino. Councilmembers Meserve and Groves previously served as a subcommittee tasked with revising the resolution for its eventual public hearing. Stealing one of the talking points I had planned for my public comment, Meserve noted that he and Groves had made no changes, calling the statement “perfect.”

Mayor Michael Machi and Councilmember Mark Wheatley cast dissenting votes. Wheatley acknowledged my efforts to contact him and apologized for not getting back to me. He conceded he hadn't really gotten his head around the obvious importance of

the document though he did recognize the election problems and our comprehensive election reform platform. Ultimately he wanted to see the County Supervisors weigh in (seems likely passing this resolution will get their attention). Machi was consistent with his many prior votes against using the Council to make statements or take stands. This was despite saying he personally found no fault with the resolution itself.

Passing the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) has been a goal directly targeted and pursued through the GuvWurld blog since its inception on [April 3, 2004](#). I also give a lot of credit and thanks to the Voter Confidence Committee, a group I co-founded in February 2005 with Scott Menzies and Mark Konkler.

Immediate next steps are circulating this blog entry to my e-mail lists and posting it on some message boards. In the morning I'll begin circulating a press release locally, nationally and internationally. From there, the bigger picture will be encouraging election reform advocates all over the country who will work toward passing their own version of the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) patterned after Arcata's which is held up as a template.

For now, the message Washington D.C. will ignore is: WE DO NOT CONSENT.

GuvWurld Joins Call For Media Coverage of Month-Old GAO Report

Thursday, November 17, 2005

On Oct. 20 a [report condemning the security of U.S. elections](#) was issued by the non-partisan [Government Accountability Office](#) (GAO). The report was added to the [GuvWurld News Archive](#) but I did not blog about it. It is unfortunate, but I do not have time to write about everything I see as important. Instead, GuvWurld is and always has been a vehicle for advocacy journalism where I write about the things I am DOING to bring about change, and writing in order to contribute to achieving that change. And so it is a reaffirmation of this blog's mission, today, to join the call for all media to end the blackout of the GAO report.

As is often the case lately, [BradBlog.com](#) was the first place I saw writing about the GAO report. About 10 days later, Brad lamented the [lack of coverage](#) the report had received (giving due credit to the few links to be found). Brad tagged his column with a specific appeal to Editor and Publisher, who promptly took note of the call without doing the substantive reporting suggested. I should point out that upon release of the GAO report, a bi-partisan group of six Congressmembers [issued a statement](#) in support of its findings. It is just all the more absurd that this continues to be ignored. Today the Green Party of the United States has issued a [press release](#) calling for the GAO report to be covered.

Now consider for a moment, what would be the impact of a media industry that routinely kept such important information from the public? Why, under such circumstances, we might be lead to war by a false threat; we could conceivably fail to investigate a deadly attack despite contradictory and scientifically impossible elements of the “official story”; and the possibility would have to exist that election conditions designed to produce inconclusive results would also produce something short of unanimous consensus about the outcome.

Both by what is reported and not reported, the corporate media contribute greatly to defining reality. Don't miss the pattern here. The reality being defined is quite often one of inherent uncertainty. Thus, instead of investigative reporting, often we see information surface, an attack smearing the messenger, and then a report on the he said-she said without determination of the validity of the original charge. Inherent uncertainty then remains to cause public disagreement about what constitutes reality.

In [Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution](#) I argue that this rift in the perception of reality is one example of the intentional divisiveness that has launched a Cold Civil War between the reality-based community (so-named by the administration in the [NY Times](#)) and the faith-based community (not necessarily the religious but the unquestioning citizens who accept the official line, on faith).

More recently in the GuvWurd blog I wrote [We Are Being Set Up: The Manchurian Nation](#). This commentary described some of the innocent ways that many pillars of our society are indoctrinated into believing their harmful actions actually serve the greater good. That includes local law enforcement trained to regard peaceful protest as terrorist activity; schools where it is assumed student information should be available to military recruiters; elections officials placing expediency over transparency and verifiability; and media no longer interested in being watch dogs over the powerful.

These actions reinforce the foundation of the faith-based community. To reality-based citizens it is like watching a Trojan Horse, inside duped public figures carry out their implanted missions like the movie about that Candidate. The infrastructure of the faith-based community is populated by the Manchurian Nation. No longer should we apologize for the nice folks we know who run the local paper or work at the elections office. They have to hear loud and clear: STOP SELLING US OUT. Stop right now. Today. Immediately. Cover the [GAO report](#) and stop impeding election reform.

A Campaign To Unite California Election Reformers

Monday, December 12, 2005

A recently released [report](#) by the non-partisan watchdog arm of Congress, the Government Accountability Office (GAO), has laid bare the unsecure and unreliable conditions of U.S. elections. Beyond just what could happen, the GAO has meticulously documented what has happened in the past few years, concluding:

Nevertheless, there is evidence that some of these concerns – including weak controls and inadequate testing – have caused problems with recent elections, resulting in the loss and miscount of votes. (p.38)

When votes are lost and miscounted, there is no way to be certain what the true outcome should be from an election. We can thus say that current election conditions ensure inconclusive outcomes, and provide no basis for confidence in the results reported. Among the many citations, the GAO report refers to an April 20, 2004, [Staff Report](#) from the California Secretary of State's office which reported that Diebold had admitted to violating state law in each of its 17 client counties (listed below):

[T]he VSPP [Voting Systems and Procedures Panel] initiated an audit of all 17 California counties using Diebold voting systems. The audit discovered that Diebold had, in fact, installed uncertified software in all its client counties without notifying the Secretary of State as required by law, and that the software was not federally qualified in three client counties. Diebold eventually acknowledged that it had failed to notify the Secretary of State of its proposed system modifications, and that its failure to obtain certification for those modifications violated state law. (p.3)

In response to that revelation, [GuvWurld recently pondered](#):

Who allowed Humboldt's voting machines to have uncertified software installed in them? Was someone in the Humboldt County elections department complicit in this crime or merely negligent? Is this person still employed by the elections department, and if so, why?

These questions have been referred to the Humboldt County District Attorney and Grand Jury. These same questions are valid in each of the 16 other California counties using Diebold touch screens and/or scanners. GuvWurld hereby calls for a coordinated effort among election reformers to make this an issue throughout the state. Why? Look what appeared on page four of the same CA SoS report:

Diebold's conduct has created an untenable situation for both county and state elections officials. Some county officials have felt compelled to defend untested, unqualified and uncertified Diebold voting systems, having authorized large capital outlays only to find out on the eve of or during an election that the systems do not function as promised. Before the March [2004] Primary, county officials repeatedly warned that, without certification of particular voting system components, the election could not be conducted because it was too late to devise and implement back-up plans.

If elections officials were or are in an “untenable situation,” then voters are in an even worse position. We are trying to draw a line in the sand demonstrating our refusal to accept election conditions that will continue to guarantee inconclusive outcomes. Necessary to this goal is a similar line in the sand laid down by elections officials. After all, if they say elections “could not be conducted” under certain circumstances, why have we not seen a cancelled election? Where will elections officials draw their line in the sand?

Many elections officials will never do that. Such people do not warrant the trust of the public and must be the first to resign or be removed from office. Try this line: “If you are resigned to the status quo, you must resign your office and make way for someone determined to improve election conditions.” Anyone who continues defending, excusing or apologizing for current election conditions has no business in election administration or in any other public office.

Action Steps:

Forward this message to District Attorneys, Grand Juries, County Supervisors, City Councilmembers, and local media in each of Diebold’s 17 CA client Counties (listed below), requesting investigation of Diebold’s crimes and any possible involvement of local elections officials.

Follow up with phone calls requesting:

- 1) Election department officials be asked to acknowledge and affirm their understanding of the GAO’s findings, or submit their resignation;
- 2) Diebold be declared an unfit business partner, ruling out any further use of Diebold voting equipment, any future contracts with Diebold, and all privately owned, proprietary voting systems;
- 3) City Councils and County Boards of Supervisors adopt the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) outlining conditions necessary to ensure conclusive election outcomes and create a basis for confidence in the results reported.
- 4) Turn to those around you and discuss how else to draw a line in the sand. In particular, we greatly need the leadership of California’s many established election reform groups acting in solidarity with this call to action.

CA Counties Using Diebold:

AlamedaFresno

Humboldt

Kern

Lassen

Marin

Mendocino

Modoc

Placer

Plumas

San Diego

San Joaquin

San Luis Obispo

Santa Barbara

Siskiyou

Trinity

Tulare

Click [HERE](#) to see which CA counties use which voting systems.

Resources:

[CA election code](http://tinyurl.com/8ggts) (http://tinyurl.com/8ggts)

[CA voter complaint form](http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/elections_fraud.htm) (http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/elections_fraud.htm)

[CA newspaper contacts](http://newsdirectory.com/news.php?co=USA&p=ca) (http://newsdirectory.com/news.php?co=USA&p=ca)

[CA Grand Jurors Association](http://www.nvo.com/cgja) (http://www.nvo.com/cgja)

[CA District Attorneys](http://doju.tripod.com/california.html) (http://doju.tripod.com/california.html)

[CA Boards of Supervisors](http://www.cicg.org/search/roster.php) (http://www.cicg.org/search/roster.php)

Area Voting Machines Discredited By Government Reports

Friday, December 23, 2005

I like that title. In a letter to the editor of the Eureka Reporter, [shown below](#), I suggested using it for their next article on election integrity.

I haven't used the term "election integrity" much until recently but I think it has a good ring. It clearly delineates from the likes of Diebold, voting machine maker cum snake oil salesman. As Brad Blog has reported, on Thursday [Diebold pulled out of North Carolina](#), and [endured rejection](#) by St. Louis.

Another Diebold note, omitted from my last post – [Diebold Denied California Once Again](#) – debunks the claims made by Dave Byrd, vice president of business operations for Diebold. An [AP article](#) I cited quoted Byrd saying:

"So far, we have complied with every certification test the Secretary's office has requested of us," Byrd said. "We have always complied with what the state has requested of us, and will treat this new request in the same spirit of cooperation."

This is strongly in contrast with the April 2004 CA Secretary of State [Staff Report](#) I've referenced heavily in recent weeks:

At the same time this office was seeking to ensure compliance with state certification requirements for the March Primary, the Secretary of State's office was also working to verify the vendor's [Diebold's] previous record of compliance with state law. The result of that investigation showed the record to be very poor.

Another point left over from Wednesday comes from the Eureka Times-Standard article, "[County to miss federal election deadline](#)." Though I have [recently been critical](#) of Humboldt Clerk-Recorder Carolyn Crnich for defending current election conditions and seemingly remaining in denial about their problems, on Wednesday the T-S made clear that Crnich has heard at least some of the community's concerns:

...many of the concerns people currently have with the Diebold system would still apply to almost any other system. They all have proprietary software, Crnich said.

A good portion of the rest of the article is concerned with the January 1 deadline for compliance with the Help America Vote Act of 2002 (HAVA), which Crnich says no CA county is likely to meet due to the handicapped accessibility requirements and the lack of available certified equipment. As pointed out in the letter below, [previously](#) at GuvWurld, in [Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution](#), and in a recent meeting I had with Crnich, the artificial and arbitrary deadline decreed by HAVA works directly counter to the People's concern for creating improved election conditions. We need local leaders who will resist being used by federal mandates against the interests of the local community. As inspiration, consider the [good example](#) set by Utah in resisting the No Child Left Behind Act:

New York Times

Utah Vote Rejects Parts of Education Law

By SAM DILLON

Published: April 20, 2005

SALT LAKE CITY, April 19 - In a stinging rebuke of President Bush's signature education law, the Republican-dominated Utah Legislature on Tuesday passed a bill that orders state officials to ignore provisions of the federal law that conflict with Utah's education goals or that require state financing.

Finally, the Times-Standard article from Wednesday closes with an announcement for the long awaited inaugural meeting of Humboldt's election advisory task force, first proposed by [Voter Confidence Committee](#) member Mark Konkler in [April](#):

To discuss these issues, a task force on elections and voting will have its first meeting on Jan. 5, Crnich said. The public is invited to help decide who should be on the committee, and what it will discuss. She said it will center on the voting system, rather than on political issues.

It will be held at 6:30 p.m. in Conference Room A in the Humboldt County Courthouse.

[Report on voting machines worthy of some follow-ups](#)

12/23/2005

Dear Editor,

Thanks for tackling the crucial topic of election integrity ("Area voting machines could have flaws," Dec. 16). We simply must come to terms with the subversion of our democracy. As you investigate this subject further, please consider a follow-up called "area voting machines discredited by government reports." Some suggested sources:

1. The official nonpartisan watchdog arm of Congress, the Government Accountability Office, in October released a 107-page report condemning the security and reliability of U.S. elections. See: <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05956.pdf>
2. An April 2004 California Secretary of State staff report revealed Diebold had illegally installed uncertified software in voting machines in Humboldt and 16 other California counties. See: http://www.ss.ca.gov/elections/ks_dre_papers/diebold_report_april20_final.pdf
3. A report prepared for the Maryland General Assembly explains how GEMS, Humboldt County's vote-counting software ("central tabulator"), can be compromised. See: <http://tinyurl.com/h7gzl>
4. The Department of Homeland Security's cyber-threat division, U.S. Computer Emergency Readiness Team, included GEMS in this Sept. 2004 bulletin: <http://www.us-cert.gov/cas/bulletins/SB04-252.html>

While not a government report like the others, visit <http://www.tinyurl.com/g7hon> for the free download of “Votergate,” the movie. Watch footage originally aired on CNBC featuring Bev Harris demonstrating for Howard Dean how to hack GEMS and alter vote totals without a trace in under two minutes.

Some hack demonstrations may test the access from an outsider’s reach. Others, such as the one you reported on in Leon County, Fla., grant the hacker the same access as an election official or machine vendor. Mr. McWilliams’ dumbfoundedness at this procedure notwithstanding, the software has proven unsecure.

In light of the fine example set by both Leon and Volusia Counties in Florida, it is time that the Humboldt County Board of Supervisors declare its intention to do no further business with Diebold, a company now facing multiple class action lawsuits from its shareholders.

The looming deadline of the Help America Vote Act is inconsequential compared to the restoration of voter confidence and a basis for such.

The Supes should also start considering how else to have us vote in June, because no way should they expect us to use area voting machines discredited by government reports.

Dave Berman

Eureka

Previously Certified Diebold Machines Approved Erroneously

Thursday, December 29, 2005

While Diebold is engaged in a controversial and protracted effort to regain certification for its voting systems in California, it now appears to some in the election integrity community that previously certified Diebold machines were approved erroneously.

Diebold elections machines employ something called interpreter code which is expressly forbidden in the specs for federal qualification and CA state certification. This needs to become another angle worked in the [campaign to unite California election reformers](#). I'm in the midst of gathering some legal opinions so this piece will have to get held over before I can issue a specific call to action.

However, I will share my thinking which is that people in each of the 17 Diebold client counties should be attempting to get an injunction or restraining order against any further use of the clearly out of compliance yet previously certified Diebold machines. To make it easier to discuss this possibility and feel out your own legal possibilities, the rest of this post covers related background.

As reported [last week](#), the office of CA Secretary of State Bruce McPherson sent a [letter to Diebold](#) explaining that their voting systems could not be certified without further federal review of the source code.

It is the Secretary of State's position that the source code for the AccuBasic code on these cards, as well as for the AccuBasic interpreter that interprets this code, should have been federally reviewed.

Actually, even if you don't know what AccuBasic is or what AccuBasic interpreter does (I'll tell you later), it is simple to understand that interpreters are expressly forbidden by the [2002 Voting System Standards/Guidelines](#), which are required for federal qualification and California certification.

Volume 1, Section 4

4.2.2 Software Integrity

Self-modifying, dynamically loaded, or interpreted code is prohibited, except under the security provisions outlined in section 6.4.e.

Volume 1, Section 6

6.4.1 Software and Firmware Installation

The system shall meet the following requirements for installation of software, including hardware with embedded firmware:

- e. After initiation of election day testing, no source code or compilers or assemblers shall be resident or accessible.

So it makes no sense for McPherson to demand “more” federal testing since the system will fail on its face and could only have “passed” previously in error.

For more context here, AccuBasic is Diebold’s proprietary code. On December 23, the [Electronic Frontier Foundation announced](#) that Diebold had demonstrated its commitment to keeping the code a secret by taking its machines out of consideration in North Carolina’s certification process. Diebold could only be considered for certification if they revealed the code and they chose to walk away. McPherson has created a juicy new pickle for Diebold in California.

As far as what the interpreter code actually does, it is about translating data between programming languages in the counting/tabulation process. Imagine trying to convert currency but without a published exchange rate. Here is a more technical explanation provided by Harri Hursti in his 7/4/05 [report filed for BlackBoxVoting.org](#) based on Hursti’s May 2005 hack testing in Leon County, FL:

*Accu-Basic programming is a two phase process. First the Accu-Basic program source code needs to be pre-compiled with a compiler, converting it from a human readable source code form into token based pseudo-code. The pseudo-code is still a non-binary, ascii file. This first phase programming is normally done on a standard PC running Windows or *ix-variant operating system. The author used the FreeBSD platform. Then this pseudo-code is transferred to the final execution environment (that is, to the voting machine), where the pseudo-code is executed by an interpreter.*

Note: The interpreter, built into the optical scan firmware, will execute the code following the instructions on the memory card. No information has been provided about the interpreter.

Hursti’s words are clearer in the context of his more recent hack test in Leon County. That demonstration was very [widely reported](#) and resulted in Elections Supervisor Ion Soncho resolving not to use Diebold for future elections. The following day [Volusia County, FL](#) followed suit.

So to review, some old information has come to be viewed in a new light. Diebold machines currently certified for use in CA contain illegal programming that should have precluded their certification in the first place. The suggestion is exploring legal means to prevent their future use and the promise is to come back with specifics on this in a near future posting. In addition, it may be useful to throw this line to elections officials and County Supervisors who should be looking for a way to abandon the [sinking Diebold ship](#).

We Are Being Set Up: The Manchurian Nation

Monday, October 31, 2005

I recently read Michel Chossudovsky's 6/7/05 article for the Center For Research on Globalization called "[Orwellian "Scenarios": Emergency Preparedness against the "Universal Adversary"](#)". This is an analysis of a [leaked report](#) by the Homeland Security Council:

A recent Report of the Homeland Security Council entitled Planning Scenarios describes in minute detail, the Bush administration's preparations in the case of a terrorist attack by an outside enemy called the Universal Adversary (UA).

The Universal Adversary, is identified in the scenarios as an abstract entity used for the purposes of simulation. Yet upon more careful examination, this Universal Adversary is by no means illusory. It includes the following categories of potential "conspirators":

- "foreign [Islamic] terrorists",
- "domestic radical groups", [antiwar and civil rights groups]
- "state sponsored adversaries" ["rogue states", "unstable nations"]
- "disgruntled employees" [labor and union activists].

According to the Planning Scenarios Report:

"Because the attacks could be caused by foreign terrorists; domestic radical groups; state sponsored adversaries; or in some cases, disgruntled employees, the perpetrator has been named, the Universal Adversary (UA). The focus of the scenarios is on response capabilities and needs, not threat-based prevention activities." (See [Planning Scenarios](#))

The domestic radical groups and labor activists, which visibly constitute a threat to the established political order, are now conveniently lumped together with foreign Islamic terrorists, suggesting that the PATRIOT anti-terror laws together with the Big Brother law enforcement apparatus are eventually intended to be used against potential domestic "adversaries".

While the Universal Adversary is "make-believe", the simulations constitute a dress rehearsal of a real life emergency situation:

"The scenarios have been developed in a way that allows them to be adapted to local conditions throughout the country."

Chossudovsky describes who is involved in the conduct of these exercises and what are some of the implications:

These fabricated realities penetrate the inner-consciousness of key decision makers. The reality model script molds the behavior of public officials, it builds a "knowledge" and "understanding", namely a shared ignorance regarding the war on terrorism and the "adversaries" who oppose the administration's war and homeland security agendas.

[snip]

The “Scenarios” were developed for “Use in National, Federal, State and Local Homeland Security Preparedness”. They instill in public and private sector officials and participants a sense of responsibility, duty and awareness in relation to something which is ultimately fictitious.

The “scenarios” and anti-terrorist exercises develop observance and compliance by public officials, law enforcement, intelligence, military and civilian federal and State employees, etc.

Moreover, the scenarios also envisage the circumstances under which Martial Law could be triggered in the case of a threat by the Universal Adversary. In other words, fake intelligence could indeed be used to trigger a martial law situation in America, much in the same way as (deja vu) fake intelligence was used “to fit the policy” of invading Iraq, as revealed in the controversial [Downing Street Secret Memo](#).

Last month, just prior to attending the [National Summit to Save Our Elections](#), I posted a white paper called [Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution](#). The paper describes many ways that inherent uncertainty is created, resulting in a rift in the perception of reality. The government intentionally creates this divide to facilitate consolidation of power and control - as long as We The People fight amongst ourselves, we won't unite in non-violent revolution.

Rather than a culture war, or red states and blue states, I see a Cold Civil War occurring between the reality-based community and the faith-based community (where faith-based has no religious connotation, instead referring to those who accept the official line unquestioningly, on faith). Chossudovsky's analysis strongly supports this paradigm by exposing the “reality models” actually used to condition and indoctrinate many establishment members into the faith-based community.

So two powerful realizations overtook me as I read this article. The first is what I've been describing: my own analysis has even more supporting evidence than I realized. The other thought referred me back to the [first-ever post](#) in the GuvWurld Blog:

American democracy empowers leaders through the consent of the governed. Who is willing to consent to elections where the preparation consists of making sure the will of the people will be reasonably called into question? We can see the setup from a mile away - the so-called opponents are “debating” the rules of their contest. This is simulated competition, in the grand tradition of professional wrestling and the Harlem Globetrotters.

I added the emphasis because Chossudovsky's article again gave me the inescapable sense that we are being set up. It goes far beyond the dangerous and violent corruption of any powerful individuals, and even surpasses the recklessness of rogue factions such as the [PNAC](#). As Chossudovsky describes labeling peaceful protesters as terrorists, initiating actions based on fake intelligence, and the overall brainwashing needed for mass buy-in, the wholly manufactured existence of the faith-based community reveals we have become the Manchurian Nation.

Hypothetical Occupation of America

Wednesday, November 09, 2005

Lots of new readers have been finding GuvWurld since I wrote [We Are Being Set Up: The Manchurian Nation](#). This is a commentary on [Michel Chossudovsky's analysis](#) of a [leaked report](#) from the Homeland Security Council.

The report lends weight to [the idea](#) that the government is intentionally dividing Americans, largely by creating a rift in the common perception of reality. Much of this revolves around creating fear, and planning to evade or overcome something traumatic. With such great influence over corporate owned media, the government's propaganda reinforces scenarios and paradigms presented for the purposes of disaster training and emergency preparedness.

The "scenarios" and anti-terrorist exercises develop observance and compliance by public officials, law enforcement, intelligence, military and civilian federal and State employees, etc.

This is the breeding ground of the Manchurian Nation, inhabited by many people superficially appearing as upstanding members of the establishment while simultaneously oppressing the ideals and values for which the establishment supposedly stands.

In trying to think like it seems the Homeland Security Council does, I found myself wondering what a sustained foreign attack on America might do. Not listed in the leaked report is a hypothetical occupation of America by a liberating force that comes to defeat fascism and free the American people. Well of course Homeland Security won't plan, or at least not publicly plan, a response to that. But what about us? Aiding and abetting the enemy is a serious thing. Many people, and I think I'd be one of them, would consider this hypothetical to contain two sets of enemies of America, each at war with the other and both likely looking to use as pawns.

Perhaps, just maybe, this might be a place from which we could possibly come close to beginning to imagine the plight of Iraqis today. I don't suggest we ask John Kerry for his help but we might think about what it will take to develop a "[smarter, tougher, more effective](#)" [insurgency](#) to drive out the invaders and take control over our own affairs.

"We're not waiting for another attack. We can't wait for another attack to employ the full power of America in this cause. We're acting now to protect the American people and to shape a future of peace."

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/01/20030103.html>

My First Date With the Republicans

Friday, September 09, 2005

Earlier tonight I had the privilege of being the guest speaker at the monthly meeting of the [Humboldt County Republican Party](#). Their meetings are held in a private room at OH's Town House in Eureka. People gathered gradually between 6-7pm, during which time salad and then a main course were served. I got the impression it was \$20 per head but I'm not sure, partly because Chairwoman Lori Metheny had made a point of inviting me to join them for dinner. She specifically said that their speakers get to eat for free. Choices for entree included several kinds of steak, chicken cordon bleu, and a (chicken?) ceaser salad.

I arrived promptly at 6pm, mindful of the cliché about no such thing as a free meal, totally ready for my full-on Republican experience. Many people told me I was being brave. Pity I didn't experience it that way. Now I don't exactly light up a room and there was some time when I was poring over their agenda and a news article that had been left at my seat. But it wasn't awkward and I remember being conscious of smiling and making eye contact. There was some small talk, none of which was contentious in the least. Prior to being there I had given thought to what this would be like. In my idealized notion I managed to warm it up a bit. I didn't achieve that but I certainly wasn't failing.

During the latter part of the dinner hour Kay Backer gave a PowerPoint presentation about HELP, Humboldt Economic and Land Plan group. The Eureka Reporter quoted Kay in [this article](#) from last week. Coincidentally, Kay referenced Reagan's quote "Trust, but verify." I have been using that a lot lately in introducing the lack of verifiable voting.

After Kay's talk, Lori called the meeting to order. After an invocation and "The Pledge," there was a roll call, previous minutes were amended and adopted, and other routine things occurred. Before I knew it Lori was calling me to the podium.

I thanked them for having me and told them it was an honor. I mentioned that lots of people have reacted with shock and awe that I might actually do this. But it is important that it be done, I said, in light of the events of the last two weeks, I want more than ever to know that I can work with others in my community. I told them I wanted to have a dialog with them and work on building a bridge together.

As an example, I spoke about how doing follow up phone calls after the town hall forum on preferential voting led me to connect with Kevin Matlock, a man they all know as a former Executive Director of their group (he was current ED when we met). I repeated a challenge I had made to Kevin: the Republican Party of Humboldt County could widen its appeal if it would commit to the same principal as the [Voter Confidence Committee](#), namely, systemic election reforms that benefit all voters equally.

At this point I called back to the Reagan quote and asked how "verify" should be defined in the context of elections. Several people commented about absentee ballots,

particularly in Arcata and in houses where multiple students live. There was also support for requiring ID to vote. It is interesting to notice the common perspective focuses on who gets to vote as opposed to making sure votes are counted and counted accurately.

I don't recall exactly what caused the topic to really open up but there seemed to be consensus that I should read the eight reforms in the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#). I did not discuss the Consent of the Governed aspect of the VCR, instead conveying the idea that these are systemic reforms that will benefit all voters equally, and that together, these changes are designed to ensure conclusive election results that will make sure we have unanimous agreement about who won. I mentioned that we are promoting the resolution to other communities with the idea that they should determine their own list of reforms capable of generating conclusive results and a basis for confidence. I didn't mention framing but clearly I was consciously promoting our frame by talking about promoting our frame.

The focus stayed primarily on preferential voting and proportional representation after that. One woman spoke of the Federalist Papers and the origins of the electoral college. She credited America's Founders with being far more steeped in and knowledgeable about history. Their wisdom was greater than us, she seemed to say, and we should leave it alone. In explaining how the electoral college is supposed to work, I pointed out, she had explained that the intention was to have proportional representation. Yet it is precisely because of this antiquated vestige of government that we do not have proportional representation. She disagreed, alleging that the Electoral College is working as intended.

An Arcata resident expressed her frustration at not having any hope of seeing a Republican on the City Council. This person would benefit most from proportional representation. I quickly pointed out that with five seats she would have to help a Republican candidate get just 20% to win a seat and get the representation she lacks. She waved me off and mumbled something about still not being able to win.

I don't remember exactly where some of these next things fit in but I recall mentioning the Utah Republican Party for its use of ranked choice voting. I also referred to Cambridge, MA where a Republican minority has long favored choice voting and its resultant proportional representation. I picked up on a comment about majority rule to connect to Eureka Mayor LaVallee being elected with 38%, an impossibility with the majority mandate of instant runoff voting.

There was also a gentleman who spoke about how Eureka's voting has changed in the past. He said we should go back to primaries and runoffs and that plurality is not good. Well if we don't have plurality we have to have majority and why should we pay extra money for a second election with historically lower turnout when we can get to the same place in a single ranked choice ballot? The response was a sincere but misguided pitch for the merits of the two party system. Another time and place and I would have demonstrated how the two party system perpetuates the myth of democracy.

I really could have done this for as long as they liked but I could see Lori indicating my time was nearly up. To bring it all together I mentioned that the VCC has been work-

ing with Registrar of Voting Carolyn Crnich on creating an Election Advisory Committee. I reminded them that I came to start building a bridge and this Advisory Committee is going to be a chance for us to continue working together. I announced that I had a sign up list for anyone interested in updates from the VCC. Nobody took me up on that. However, several people asked for copies of the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#). I also presented Lori with one copy of [Mythbreakers](#) and one of the [Conyers report](#) on Ohio last November in hopes she'll let them be resources in their headquarters (I hope it isn't a tragic waste of paper).

Before I left, Lori thanked me for coming and praised my bravery. She sort of apologized if it felt rough at all but I sort of didn't let her apologize since I hadn't been ruffled at all. She then said (something like) "the 20 bucks to get you here was so worth it to see some of those guys have their thoughts challenged." There may be more than one way to read that but I heard it in a way that was a great compliment.

It is really unfortunate that there is no video of this event. Other than that, I can't really think of other negatives about this experience. I didn't get any of the tangible things I might have known better than to dream of, but I did raise awareness and get respect and hopefully set a good example. It is not a cliché or a talking point. We have to do this bridge building like society depends on it.

We must unite our communities if we are to protect ourselves from a federal government that provides no assistance to its people other than to aid and abet the deaths of thousands of poor people in a disaster area. Katrina changed everything. It wasn't just lack of assistance, it was denial of help and resources. The media is now being prevented from showing dead bodies. There are evacuee camps where media are forbidden and conditions resemble martial law. The [Denver Post](#) called one such location a concentration camp. If it seems like I've gone astray from my topic, remember that I'm trying to build a bridge and show you how important it is that you do the same.

The Resignation Frame

Monday, August 08, 2005

Here's the thing I don't get about George Lakoff, called "the father of framing" by the [New York Times](#). Lakoff understands the severity of the current American condition yet he continues to offer his services to the Democratic party. I do not see him as a shill. He is genuinely progressive and sincere in his passions. I am simply dumbfounded that he looks out at the world and thinks his best chance to improve it is by working with people who are resigned to many aspects of the status quo.

- This party has accepted voting conditions that ensure inconclusive outcomes;
- This party continues to participate in a legislative charade where they are not allowed to introduce bills, convene or even attend hearings;
- This party makes no effort to enforce existing laws against war crimes and war profiteering;

This last bit is what got me thinking about this. Yesterday I attended my first [Communities for Peace](#) meeting in a while and I heard the report back from Humboldt's two latest Peace Ambassadors. Thanks to Carol Brannan and John Shaefer for representing our community in the name of peace. In their report they mentioned meeting with Congressman Mike Thompson. Carol described asking Thompson about what could be done to curtail war profiteering, adding that the war would be over right quick like if nobody was making any money off of it. She said he looked at her like she had six heads. He has resigned himself to accepting war and war profiteering.

My instinctive reaction was to shout out that he should resign if he is resigned. Aside from the momentary outburst, I now see this as a new kind of [Tilt Strategy](#). Another example quickly followed. peterph54 posted this to the [J30 listserv](#) today:

"I spoke with BOE directors Charles Miller, Tuscarawas County [OH]. The Board there chose Diebold, he didn't seem to be in agreement but didn't openly state that. I don't want to crucify this guy, but he said that ES+S (their vendor for the past several years) "could be throwing out every third vote, and he wouldn't know the difference".

From this account it appears Charles Miller is complicit in the dismantling of democracy. I don't want to crucify the guy either – I just want him to take his resignation toward his hopeless job and resign.

There are others also in this indefensible position. This is the hallmark of the tilt target, the person who can maintain his untenable spot only because nobody has challenged him for it. When we seek out these targets it must be to bring the novel challenge that causes one either to bear the continued shame of such exposure, or be "tilted" into taking a stance more closely aligned with specific preferred remedies being suggested, in this case resignation.

I first wrote about the [Tilt Strategy](#) three years ago while working on a now-defunct

project called [Reinventing Activism](#). During that time I was referred to the book “Moral Politics” by fatherly framer Lakoff. He is a linguistics professor at UC Berkeley and this is a text book. It was a valuable read in that it helped me understand how and why people hold the mosaic of political views that they do. I doubt if Lakoff would remember the few e-mails and phone calls we exchanged but I was glad to find him so accessible after finding his book to be so important.

Three years later Lakoff’s star has risen considerably. As the [Times story](#) notes, an excerpt of “Moral Politics” has sold over 200,000 copies as a paperback called “Don’t Think of an Elephant!” Lakoff has also set up his own consulting firm, he is in high demand as a speaker, and he has been a highly regarded strategist for the Democratic party.

Except for that last item, it is an impressive pedigree worthy of a progressive leader in the peaceful revolution. But Lakoff must first resign himself to the fact that the Democrats are part of the problem, not the solution; and that they are cooperating, not competing with the Republicans. On accepting the [ruthlessly honest](#) truth about [simulated competition](#), Lakoff can resign from the Dems and join We The People.

We have always had the winning frame like Dorothy who could have clicked her heels to go home again. The government has no “[just Power](#)” without our bestowing it upon them. So We The People must withdraw the Consent of the Governed. The [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) gives us the frame to call the government’s legitimacy into question, town by town, until the inevitable time when it is no longer a question - the emperor has no clothes, the government has no legitimacy, and the Consent of the Governed has been withdrawn.

It has been 16 months since the [GuvWurld Blog](#) was [launched](#) on this premise. Never before has there been this much momentum (scroll through some other recent entries) for this frame. The resignation frame is a totally consistent secondary tack that we should now pursue simultaneously. Even if we do not get a single resignation this is still a valuable frame because it will contribute to undermining the general sense that the status quo is acceptable.

I wonder what Lakoff has to say about all this; I’d also like an opinion from Dr. Jeffrey Feldman whose [Frameshop blog](#) is all about dissecting language for the frames.

My Speech to the NAACP Today, MLK Day

Monday, January 16, 2006

There were probably about 200-300 people at Eureka's Adorni Center today for the NAACP's annual remembrance of Martin Luther King, Jr. I was asked to speak about voting but felt that I didn't know enough about the audience, other speakers, or the event in general to prepare a fully written presentation. I went in with a few notes and improvised something along the following lines...

When the Voting Rights Act was passed in 1965 I was not yet born. I do remember last August when the NAACP put on a big event in Atlanta to commemorate the 40th anniversary of this landmark legislation. I remember Barbara Lee, Cynthia McKinney and John Conyers. They all spoke about stolen elections. The Black Caucus has shown the country's greatest leadership since our constitutional crisis began during the 2000 election.

I remember a year ago last week when the Congresswoman from Ohio, Stephanie Tubbs Jones, along with California's own Barbara Boxer, stood up and made the unprecedented challenge to the 2004 election.

When we hear about the problems with our elections, we learn that 30% of the votes cast around the country in November 2004 were cast on paperless electronic machines. Those votes are unverifiable. They cannot be recounted. No matter what, we can't really know how those votes were truly cast, or what the election's outcome rightfully ought to be.

We hear about private corporations that make these election machines. The machines run on software considered "proprietary," and it is kept secret from the public. Not even our local elections officials know how it works.

Of course we hear a lot about disenfranchisement too. But that's not just for the poor, or African Americans. It isn't even limited to Democratic strongholds. Let me tell you something. Disenfranchisement is universal. And it is guaranteed. If we can't recount the votes, nobody's vote counts and we are all disenfranchised. When we hold elections under these conditions, the Consent of the Governed is not being sought.

Where does this phrase come from, Consent of the Governed? I see a lot of children here today and I know that the Declaration of Independence is still taught in school. Parents, is it enough for your kids to hear the words, or do you think the spirit of Dr. King says they must grasp the meaning too? For some context, the Declaration says:

Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these Ends--the self-evident truths that we are created equal with unalienable Rights to Life, Liberty and Pursuit of Happiness--it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on

such principles and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness

And so we must say, to such unacceptable election conditions: WE DO NOT CONSENT. And to the destruction of the environment: WE DO NOT CONSENT. Can I hear you say it with me now: WE DO NOT CONSENT. Spying on Americans: WE DO NOT CONSENT. War, war, and more war on phony scapegoats: WE DO NOT CONSENT. Peaceful demonstrators labeled as terrorists: WE DO NOT CONSENT. No more innocent until proven guilty: WE DO NOT CONSENT.

How long are we going to continue to allow our citizens to be jailed without charges, detained indefinitely without access to an attorney? We must understand, in the greatest spirit of Dr. King, that non-violent revolution has become necessary, NOW!

I want to invite you all to attend a community forum on Saturday, February 11, starting at 2pm at the Vets Hall. We will be working on what each of us can do, and what we can all do together to take responsibility for turning our words into deeds and truly beginning the peaceful revolution.

Dr. King spoke of Freedom, of being In the Light, and of Every Person Counting. Of this responsibility we each have to the Dream. That Each of us can stand up in a NON-violent way, Oppose the wrongness in our ill society. That only by each of us standing up, being responsible, and demanding that responsibility from our leaders, will we be a Free People. Without a vote, we have no voice, and without a voice, how can we demand this responsibility? Without a voice, we are not a Free People.

WE DO NOT CONSENT.

Thank you.

Special thanks to [Ian Blei](#).

A Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution

Thursday, September 22, 2005

This paper is archived online at GuvWurld.org.

When in the Course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another...they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

– *United States Declaration of Independence*

Executive Summary

We The People have been divided into a Cold Civil War¹. This divide was intentionally created by a government that does not seek the Consent of the Governed. Unverifiable “elections” leave no basis for confidence in the results reported, and make this government’s power illegitimate. This government benefits from being divisive, and from the inherent uncertainty it creates with Orwellian paradoxes. This paper describes consensus-building measures to heal the divide. It is recommended that communities across the U.S. support a Voter Confidence Resolution² (VCR), modeled after the template language already adopted in Arcata, CA. Part of this campaign involves contrasting proposed election reforms with current conditions to expose the myth of democracy. Other such myths are discussed in this paper and ideas for debunking them are presented as part of the process of consensus building and divide healing. Peaceful revolution is defined as a shift in the balance of power between the government and We The People. Therefore, going from having no say in elections, to having any say at all, is necessarily revolutionary. The essentials of the VCR lay out the parameters for defining success: we must ensure conclusive election outcomes, create a basis for confidence in the results reported, and establish an accountable government genuinely representing us with our Consent. No one single reform can achieve all this and so we must embrace both the notion of an election reform platform, and the broader paradigm of peaceful revolution.

Context: The Cold Civil War

America is in the midst of a Cold Civil War, more commonly described as a culture war or the red state/blue state phenomenon. These oversimplifications perpetuate a set of myths, explored throughout this paper, which collectively represent what has been called The Big Lie³. Sides are chosen in this Cold Civil War based largely upon whether one continues to

1 A Google search of “cold civil war” returns over 1000 hits. It is not clear who first used the phrase or when, though a German newspaper is cited from 1949 and Ayn Rand used it in the LA Times in 1962. References have been more frequent since the November 2000 U.S. presidential election and generally bear a surface level resemblance to the use in this paper.

2 Voter Confidence Resolution, as adopted by Arcata, CA on 7/20/05: <http://tinyurl.com/cr2va>

3 A Google search of “big lie” returns over 1.7 million hits. The origin of the phrase is generally attributed to Adolf Hitler’s 1925 autobiography “Mein Kampf” in which he writes: “. . .in the big lie there is always a certain force of credibility; because the broad masses of a nation are always more easily corrupted in the deeper strata of their emotional nature than consciously or voluntarily; and thus in the primitive simplicity of their minds they more readily fall victims to the big lie than the small lie, since they themselves often tell small lies in little matters but would be ashamed to resort to large-scale falsehoods. It would never come into their heads to fabricate colossal untruths, and they would not believe that others could have the impudence to distort the truth so infamously.” (Translation credit: James Murphy, p. 134, courtesy of http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_Lie)

believe The Big Lie. Many of us may not even be sure which side we're on, a particularly insidious aspect of this Cold Civil War. Inherent uncertainty will be a common theme throughout this paper.

Millions of Americans currently suffer from cognitive dissonance as a result of The Big Lie. Cognitive dissonance is the confusing mental trap created by Orwellian contradictions, such as claims that "they" (terrorists) hate our freedoms when in fact those making such claims are the ones to formally enact legislation abridging our rights. These paradoxes inflict upon society a rift in the perception of reality. The intentional creation of such a rift is a hallmark of The Big Lie. This is how America's Cold Civil War was created and continues to be fueled. Cognitive dissonance keeps many people in denial of The Big Lie.

The Cold Civil War has been created and fueled by those currently claiming to be the legitimate U.S. government. This regime ascended to office through "elections" whose results could not be verified and are thus illegitimate. Power and control have been consolidated using divisive issues⁴, policies⁵ and rhetoric⁶, revisionist history⁷, and shameless self-contradictory statements⁸. The purveyors of The Big Lie mockingly deride "the reality-based community," claiming "We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors...and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do."⁹

Some readers will have no trouble accepting that quote as validation of The Big Lie's existence. Let this be a clue about which side you are on in the Cold Civil War. Across the divide from the reality-based community is the faith-based community. In this context, faith-based does not refer to religion but rather to citizens who unquestioningly accept The Big Lie, on faith.

The aftermath of Hurricane Katrina raises serious doubt about the stability of U.S. domestic tranquility. Though I personally have devoted myself to a peaceful resolution, there can be no certainty that the Cold Civil War will remain cold (non-violent) for the duration. However, for the Cold Civil War to have an end, we can say for sure that intensely divided Americans will have to unite against those who have intentionally created and fueled the division. The Cold Civil War will cease to be civil as it becomes a nascent Revolutionary War that can only be concluded when We The People sufficiently unify, organize and shift the balance of power to the point where a representative government sits with the Consent of the Governed.

4 "House OKs Gay Marriage Jurisdiction Bill," AP, 7/23/04. See: <http://tinyurl.com/bad9b>

5 "Large Volume of F.B.I. Files Alarms U.S. Activist Groups," New York Times, 7/18/04. See: <http://tinyurl.com/bey17>

6 "Administration Rejects Ruling On PR Videos," Washington Post, 3/15/05. See: <http://tinyurl.com/ajfdt>

7 "New textbooks rewrite history in Iraq through omission," Seattle Times, 11/10/03. See: <http://tinyurl.com/atvfy>

8 "The Revision Thing," Harpers, Oct. 2003. See: <http://www.harpers.org/RevisionThing.html?pg=1>

9 "Without a Doubt," New York Times, 11/17/04. See: <http://tinyurl.com/8ey3s> 11

Consenting Citizen or Faithful Subject?

According to the Declaration of Independence, the government derives “just Power” from the Consent of the Governed. Let’s take a candid look at that Consent.

- Changes to the U.S. Constitution require a two thirds vote in both houses of Congress and ratification by three quarters of the state legislatures. Yet without going through this process, the current U.S. federal government has seen fit to eliminate habeas corpus, jailing citizens without charging them with a crime and without providing a trial¹⁰. The fundamental notion of innocent until proven guilty has been removed and the Consent of the Governed is not being sought.
- Environmental legislation such as the Clear Skies Act and the Healthy Forest Act foist upon us decisions to put pollution for profit ahead of a sustainable atmosphere, and destruction of our natural Commons before conservation and stewardship of vital natural habitats. As bad or worse, the laws do the opposite of what their names suggest, creating some of the contradictions that cause cognitive dissonance. The Consent of the Governed is not being sought.
- The introduction of paperless electronic voting machines has resulted in “elections” whose unverifiable results are inherently inconclusive. In November 2004, roughly 30% of the votes cast could not be recounted using physical ballots touched by voters¹¹. This is blatantly illegal in the many jurisdictions where a close race automatically triggers a recount. It also means we cannot possibly reconcile the results of so-called “glitches” such as machines losing data¹², counting backwards¹³, or reporting more votes than registered voters¹⁴. These conditions ensure inconclusive outcomes that will never receive unanimous acceptance (more inherent uncertainty). As the City Council of Arcata, CA attested in adopting the Voter Confidence Resolution, “When elections are conducted under conditions that prevent conclusive outcomes, the Consent of the Governed is not being sought.”

Failing to seek the Consent of the Governed has created a situation where such Consent is assumed. Allowing this assumption to stand is the great collective sabotage¹⁵ of We The People. The very legitimacy of the U.S. government must be questioned and challenged for it is based not on democratic principles or even laws, but rather the textbook aspects of fascism. Within the reality-based community, these 14 characteristics of fascism¹⁶ are familiar thanks to Laurence W. Britt’s widely circulated essay describing commonalities among seven different fascist regimes throughout history.

¹⁰ <http://www.sfbayview.com/091405/josepadilla091405.shtml>, <http://independent.org/newsroom/article.asp?id=1570>

¹¹ <http://tinyurl.com/75r1w>

¹² <http://tinyurl.com/7wc8r>

¹³ <http://tinyurl.com/8kbb4>

¹⁴ <http://tinyurl.com/78luk>

¹⁵ Sabotage is the human nature tendency to make trouble for ourselves. Sabotage is yin to the yang of Progress – the result that occurs when we stop making trouble for ourselves.

¹⁶ http://www.secularhumanism.org/index.php?section=library&page=britt_23_2

This should be an intellectual flashpoint between the faith-based and reality-based communities. The reality-based community must aggressively portray the definition of democracy, juxtaposed with the conditions of America today. Debunking of The Big Lie's many myths will bring increasing majorities of the population to the reality-based community and foster a unity that will favorably shift the balance of power between the government and We The People. It is this shift that is cited as the definition of revolution in Rebecca Solnit's "Hope In The Dark."¹⁷ This definition will factor in again later when discussing selection of goals.

The Mythology

The Big Lie is a patchwork of myths. These myths are illusions that our norms and ideals exist in society today, and that we are actively upholding them. Some examples:

- Free Speech: An ideal enshrined in the first Amendment; "free speech zones" concocted during the 2004 campaign season kept citizens from being close enough to petition their leaders for redress of grievances.
- Free Market: Unfettered access to the opportunity to compete; the myth of the free market is exposed by Halliburton's no-bid contracts, Enron's gamed energy prices, free trade that is by no means fair trade, and ever consolidating industries "regulated" by their former executives.
- Free Press: Another first amendment guarantee; this myth is exemplified by the flag-draped coffins of U.S. soldiers that can't be filmed, the glaring contradictions left uninvestigated in the official story of 9/11, the ads and programs critical of government that networks have refused to air, and even the admissions of self-censorship by top media professionals¹⁸.
- Capitalism: In theory, a Darwinian system of "survival of the fittest" businesses competing for market share. In reality, privatization and industry consolidation often strangle any true semblance of competition. Further, corrupt and unaccountable corporations bypass conflict of interest and other laws to wield power far beyond the mandate of their charters.
- Democracy: As explained above, unverifiable votes leave no basis for confidence in the results reported from U.S. federal elections. The Consent of the Governed is not even sought. Comparing current conditions to any definition of democracy reveals this myth.

It is understandable that much of society buys into these myths. As a collection, these myths depict the way things are supposed to be. In the midst of the Cold Civil War, however, things are clearly not the way they're supposed to be. The readiness to acknowledge this is another clue about which side you are on in the Cold Civil War.

These myths also endure as a result of proactive message management – propaganda –

¹⁷ Nation Books, 2004. See: <http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/1560255773?v=glance>

¹⁸ http://www.usatoday.com/life/columnist/mediamix/2003-09-14-media-mix_x.htm;
also see: <http://people-press.org/reports/display.php3?ReportID=39>

by both the government and the corporate media (which are increasingly one and the same¹⁹). Just as creating and fueling the divide enables government power consolidation, so too must the myths be perpetuated to preserve the general sense of status quo. This subversive control over the appearance of normalcy leaves much of the population perceiving no justifiable cause to pursue peaceful revolution. How can we help them see?

Ruthless Honesty

To evolve the Cold Civil War into peaceful revolution, We The People must begin to heal the divide created to separate us. We must learn to communicate and become united in rejecting the government's illegitimate claim to power. To begin community level bridge-building, members of the reality-based community should devote themselves to ruthless honesty.

There are two main components to ruthless honesty. The first is distinguishing false alternatives from genuine opportunities for progress. For example, is it enough to have voter verifiable paper ballots, if we still have secret vote counting, corporate campaign funds and voting machines, partisan election officials, disenfranchisement, unequal media and debate access for candidates, and a winner take all system? The ruthlessly honest truth is that voter verifiable paper ballots, or any other excellent and necessary election reform, on its own, cannot ensure conclusive election outcomes and create a basis for confidence in the results reported. We must define these standards as our minimums, and anything less as a false alternative.

Ruthless honesty also requires the disciplined judgment to recognize when one claims to view facts a certain way while acting as if those facts are viewed differently. Prior to the "election" of November 2004, many people recognized that the conditions would guarantee an inconclusive outcome. Afterwards, these same reality-based people gathered lots of data to support claims of fraud. Yet instead of outright rejection of the "election" as simulated competition²⁰, calls for a re-count served to validate the legitimacy of the first "count." Ruthless honesty is not just necessary to bring new people into the reality-based community; it is even more essential that we first learn to distinguish our own contradictions.

Lying to ourselves is human nature and part of cognitive dissonance (which we all experience to a degree) and it is a habit insidiously reinforced by The Big Lie. While we can't hope to completely eliminate our own denial and self-deception, we can accept responsibility for the consistency of our own thoughts and actions. Ultimately, reality-based community members will have to become experts at helping others see how they are lying to themselves. This is easier said than done, but keeping these things in mind can facilitate a successful approach:

- We are being lied to and we are lying to ourselves;
- Telling someone flatly "you are buying a load of lies" or "you are lying to yourself" will likely create defensiveness;
- Before giving up a belief or accepting a new belief, one must first question the

¹⁹ <http://tinyurl.com/73d4r>

²⁰ <http://tinyurl.com/c71e6>

existing belief;

- The divide intentionally created to fuel the Cold Civil War relies upon inherent uncertainty as its very nature.

The goal here is not telling people what to think. Instead the point of such ruthlessly honest outreach is to help people confront, and attempt to reconcile, contradictory beliefs they already hold. There is a conclusion that can be suggested without appearing to be telling people what to think. It is simply that the contradiction was intentionally created by people who benefit from the confusion and division it causes. Depending on response, here we have an opportunity to open meaningful dialog about the very notion itself of the Cold Civil War.

“Yeah, but the real problem is...”

Common to the point of cliché, well meaning advocates of social change can often be heard exchanging analyses with the qualifier “yeah, but the real problem is...” Such exchanges are often about people intuitively recognizing when someone else is describing a false alternative. The next step is to “one-up” the diagnosis of the situation by presenting a more “real” problem. Often this too is a false alternative and the cycle continues.

Such intellectual explorations are really about digging for root causes, such as those described in this paper: inherent uncertainty, intentionally created divisions, and disregard for the Consent of the Governed (among others I have still yet to mention, such as peak oil and corporate personhood). Social change strategists need to be clear about root causes, end goals, and the small tangible steps in between. In general, we must do better at choosing goals, identifying the most effective path from beginning to end, and avoiding being diverted by false alternatives.

Memes

Memes are often regarded as “idea viruses,” expressions that are easily remembered, internalized and passed on to others. In this way, memes can be an action element to our own message management. Here are two complementary multi-purpose memes that work as I just described while also offering guidance on strategy development. Both of these memes work with mass communication as well as on the individual level.

What would be better?

This versatile meme is simple and easy to remember. Use it to:

- Steer complaints toward specific, solution-oriented brainstorming.
- Resolve partisan stalemates with centrist solutions that make the definition of “better” the center of the debate.
- Juxtapose proposed reforms with current reality.

The least you can do.

This motivational meme is great for identifying next steps.

- To help people overcome apathy or complacency, encourage them to identify the least they can do to have a tangible impact, and then to commit to doing at least that much.
- When an intermediate or long-range goal cannot be achieved in a single step, the least you can do reveals the lowest hanging fruit on the most practical path.
- When recruiting assistance, the least you can do is the lowest pressure pitch (you can't ask for less).

One ingeniously simple way to spread the word is The Whispering Campaign²¹, leaving leaflets, pamphlets, fliers, articles, etc. where they are likely to be found (i.e. public transportation or coffee shops).

The Last Straw

Think about the expression “the last straw,” which doesn't typically apply to an actual collection of straws. It refers to some threshold that has been reached after accumulating what seems like more than enough of something. But let's be literal. Imagine piling individual pieces of straw on the back of a camel. The camel can stand under the weight of only so much straw. So straw after straw is piled on until eventually one piece becomes “the last straw,” which becomes “the straw that broke the camel's back.”

These clichés illustrate the working mechanism for the sociological phenomenon called the Tipping Point. The Tipping Point is commonly thought of as that moment when the camel's back breaks, when a major change occurs. But Malcolm Gladwell advertises the broader and deeper meaning in the subtitle to his 2000 book “The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference.”²²More than just a moment of big change, Tipping Points necessarily occur as the result of a gradual, often unnoticed, accumulation or swell.

This is a profound lesson that should greatly shape the general formulation of social change strategies. Within the Tipping Point paradigm, “what would be better?” points the path ahead while “least you can do” identifies the footholds along the way. At each stop, “what would be better?” allows the “least you can do” to advance that gradual (but not inevitable) swell. This begs a crucial question for strategists and social change agents: how to generate cumulative impact?

The First Straw

NOTE: If you have not already done so, please read the [Voter Confidence Resolution](#) before concluding this paper.

Many things may grow larger without ever reaching a Tipping Point, and achieving peaceful revolution will not happen by accident. When we select our goals, our choices must reflect this understanding by including a means to generate cumulative impact, a way to ensure that more and more support means moving closer and closer to the Tipping Point.

²¹ <http://psstpsstpsst.blogspot.com/>

²² <http://www.gladwell.com/tippingpoint/>

In Arcata, CA, the first city to adopt the Voter Confidence Resolution (VCR), I've been having conversations about peaceful revolution, refusing to recognize the legitimacy of the U.S. government, and the reforms needed to produce conclusive election results with a basis for confidence in being genuinely represented. I have repeated these big picture goals throughout this paper. I believe that many people everywhere dream of realizing these ideals. We share a vision but lack a way to validate the scope of our constituency or harness its inherent collective strength.

The VCR was created to be the first straw, a template for a series of think global, act local actions. The VCR is designed to seed the growth of cumulative impact. We've already seen that the Consent of the Governed is not being sought and that we need to reject the assumption of the government's claim to legitimacy. Consider this question and the alternate assumption it boldly implies: "Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET?"

It is unlikely that anyone thinks the Consent of the Governed has been withdrawn simply because Arcata adopted the VCR. As other communities start to follow, however, and as the YET question gets reinforced through proactive message management, we have a formula for cumulative impact. It is only a matter of how many VCRs, how many communities must stand up, before the answer has clearly switched from NO, to YES, the Consent of the Governed HAS been withdrawn.

Building Consensus

It took over one year and countless revisions before the City Council of Arcata adopted the Voter Confidence Resolution. Arcata's language is now regarded as a template, and it is expected that most or all of the communities that come next will make modifications. Such differences will not undermine the intended cumulative impact, provided that three core aspects of the VCR are left intact.

1. There is no basis for confidence in the results reported from U.S. federal elections. Current conditions ensure inconclusive outcomes that will never receive unanimous acceptance.
2. No one single reform will ensure conclusive outcomes. A comprehensive election reform platform is needed to create a new basis for confidence in the results reported.
3. Since the Consent of the Governed is not being sought, we must ask: Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET?

The first point is an empirical fact: unverifiable votes, privatized source code, and secret vote counting make it scientifically impossible to know the true outcome of an election or to reliably reach the same result through a recount. This is why such great emphasis is placed on the word basis – no basis for confidence means no reason to believe what we're told. Ruthless honesty about inherent uncertainty serves well for consensus building on this point.

On the second point, suffice to say that even the individual reforms in Arcata's template version of the VCR become false alternatives without the rest of the platform to collectively address the true big picture goals. The consensus building challenge is determining the reforms both popular enough and comprehensive enough to synergistically produce conclusive results, a basis for confidence, and accountable legislators who truly represent We The People with the Consent of the Governed.

And the third point is really about whether the community is united enough to agree to draw a line in the sand—a consensus that the current level of government failure warrants working toward the different Tipping Point of People empowerment.

Maintaining these common themes allows each community to contribute toward the cumulative impact while still building consensus around their own reform platform. This is an ideal place to contrast the definition and basic notions of democracy with our current reality. Debunking the myth of democracy this way exposes The Big Lie and replaces it with a consensus vision of “what would be better?”

What's next?

Stephen Covey's “7 Habits of Highly Effective People”²³ recommends: Begin with the end in mind. My “end in mind” here is conclusive election results, a basis for confidence, and accountable legislators providing genuine representation. But it is still fair to ask: Does this constitute peaceful revolution? How will we know precisely when the Consent of the Governed has been withdrawn, and a Tipping Point has been reached? How can such a moment be identified in advance so it will be recognized when it arrives?

Returning to Rebecca Solnit's “Hope In The Dark” and paraphrasing her example of the definition of revolution: If we imagine a nation's leader being impeached, forced to resign, or otherwise driven from office, yet the corrupt and exploitative power structure is left intact, this is not revolution; for no matter how hated the fallen leader may have been, the balance of power in the relationship between the People and the government will remain unchanged. It is only when this balance has shifted that we may rightfully call it revolution. Since we currently have no say in elections, in influencing changes in leadership, revolution can be no less than restoring the franchise. In this way, peaceful revolution is not grandiose; it is the least we can do!

The immediate next steps needed are for community leaders across the country to hold workshops and teach-ins on the VCR. Local media must hear from citizens questioning the status of our Consent. City Councils need to see consensus being built in their communities and so ruthlessly honest efforts must be made to build bridges to the faith-based community. We are adopting a position of non-recognition, consistent with other forms of civil disobedience involving non-cooperation and non-compliance. Citizens must compel their local government to reject federal mandates that are counter to the interests of the People. This may include, among many other things, refusing to buy worthless voting machines, rejecting military recruitment, or setting local standards for

²³ <http://www.businessballs.com/sevenhabitssteven Covey.htm>

education. In addition, it is vital that we create parallel institutions²⁴ in as many sectors of life as possible, starting with parallel elections²⁵, and likely including improved and less bureaucratic health care, disaster response, transportation systems, democratized and locally owned media, and perhaps local currency exchanges²⁶.

What else?

This paper has focused on election reform as a front and center issue for peaceful revolution, the larger goal it must necessarily achieve. This is a strategic and tactical analysis of what is likely to extricate us from the regime under which we live. But just as Arcata alone cannot withdraw the Consent of the Governed, a resolution and an election reform platform will not be sufficient to achieve peaceful revolution. Rhetorical non-recognition must be joined by actual non-cooperation. Resistance on the municipal level will only follow widespread individual civil disobedience. This could include, among many other things, refusing military service or to pay taxes, ignoring “permission slips” such as licenses for driving or business, preventing operation of polluting or toxic industries, or holding extralegal meetings to discuss the formation of new governments.

We must also be talking about Peak Oil²⁷ — an issue as vital as election reform — before the global economy crashes. It is impossible to fully imagine all the ramifications but we should be planning for an all local/regional economy, and for not necessarily having access to routine things such as a commercial airline flight or business supplies delivered overnight. We should call upon or create local and regional committees to compile or conduct studies about what food is or could be grown in any area, how much of it, how many people could live on it, and what can be imported and exported. Expect barter to flourish and co-ops to thrive. Small businesses will become the norm and they will be inclined to pursue the triple bottom line²⁸, synergizing the pursuit of profit with the impact on the environment and on the community. Corporate personhood²⁹ must be abolished, and corporate charters renewed only for those companies who behave responsibly. Money and speech must no longer be equated.

As an emerging force for the voice of Democracy, we must also be ruthlessly honest about the last time (if ever) we were all really 50 United States. The Cold Civil War is taking place in the Intentionally Divided States of America. As the VCR generates cumulative impact, the communities that have adopted it will network together. They will develop a consensus vision of a new Democracy based on the reform platforms recommended in their various similar, but not necessarily identical, VCRs. Our non-recognition and withdrawal of Consent can be embraced as a blank slate. Discussions on forming

24 <http://www.usjp.org/pubs/specialreports/sr87.html>

25 <http://www.ecotalk.org/ParallelElections.htm>

26 <http://www.ithacahours.com/>, <http://www.humboldtexchange.org/>, <http://www.westsong.com/smv/localcurrency.html>

27 “The Long Emergency,” Rolling Stone Magazine, 3/24/05. See: <http://tinyurl.com/b837p>
Also see: <http://www.endofsuburbia.com/>

28 http://www.bsdglobal.com/tools/principles_triple.asp

29 <http://reclaimdemocracy.org/personhood/>

new governments³⁰ should contemplate bioregions³¹, comprised first of local tribes and spokescouncils built on the practice of direct democracy³².

Each topic mentioned in this section warrants its own Blueprint to create an integrated approach to the Cold Civil War and beyond.

Conclusion

American ideals are thrust at us (and the world) virtually constantly. The pace of our lives in the 21st century often makes it difficult to examine exactly what passes for these ideals today. When current conditions are compared to such romanticized notions, a pattern of myths emerges, collectively called The Big Lie. We must pursue truth, justice, peace, human rights, environmental protections, sustainable communities, election reform and accountable government, because we are ENTITLED to these things.

We hold these Truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness -- That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just Powers from the Consent of the Governed, that whenever any Form of Government becomes destructive to these Ends, it is the Right of the People to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new Government, laying its Foundation on such Principles and organizing its Powers in such Form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their Safety and Happiness.

– *United States Declaration of Independence*

A generation from now, will our children and grandchildren regard this as their birthright? Is there any more precious heirloom to bequeath? If this isn't worth preserving, what is? We cannot pretend that we do not see what is happening around us. If you are revolted, revolt!³³

“In Germany first they came for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me-and by that time no one was left to speak up.” - Pastor Martin Niemoller

Keep your mind open, the future's coming. And all bets are off.

Dave Berman lives in Eureka, CA. He is the author of the [GuvWorld Blog](#) and the Voter Confidence Resolution, and he co-founded the Voter Confidence Committee of Humboldt County.

A Blueprint for Peaceful Revolution is archived online at [GuvWorld.org](#).

³⁰ <http://www.newcalliforniarepublic.org/index.html>

³¹ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bioregional_democracy

³² <http://www.onlinejournal.com/Commentary/120404Hasty/120404hasty.html>

³³ http://www.axisoflogic.com/artman/publish/article_6115.shtml

Epilogue

By Dave Berman, March 2006

Advocacy journalism is a term typically twisted into a slur, much the same as impugning the patriotism of peace activists. Such McCarthyist, Orwellian hypocrisy serves several purposes. For one, it can turn a defensive posture offensive by attacking the messenger rather than addressing the validity of the message. Next, it will muddy the waters, casting doubt on the “facts,” and creating inherent uncertainty. The [GuvWurld News Archive](#) has a section called Black Kettles for quotes that would be more true if the speaker of the quote was referring to himself. So, denigrating “advocacy journalists” is also a way to create cover for even more blatant efforts to shape perceptions and influence events.

Consider the New York Times. The newspaper broke the story of warrantless wire-tapping but not before sitting on the secret for more than a year, since prior to the 2004 “election.” Likewise, the Times has refused to investigate and report on the many unresolved inconsistencies and scientific impossibilities in the official story of 9/11. It is the same with revealing the many problems with current election conditions, and of course the perpetuation of the WMD lies before the Iraq invasion.

The NYTimes will influence public opinion no matter what is printed; it manipulates public opinion by what is not printed. The manipulation extends far beyond public opinion and actually contributes to one’s worldview about “reality.” In the Manchurian Nation, as I think history and literature suggest we should expect, actions can be greatly influenced by manipulating the common perception of reality. Is this not a description of advocacy journalism?

Classic tenets of journalism call for objectivity and neutrality. These are antiquated principles no longer universally observed. We must absolutely not feel bound by them. If we are ever to shift the balance of power between We The People and the government, advocacy journalism will be the single most crucial element to enable the necessary organizing. It is therefore critical that we learn how to be successful advocacy journalists. For many, this will require a different way of identifying and pursuing goals.

For further reading about selecting goals, please see [Are You A Public Servant?](#) and explore the [Reinventing Activism](#) proposal. By the GuvWurld definition, publicly stated goals separate advocacy journalists from those with a mere bias; an advocacy journalist is successful to the extent that such goals are achieved.

Resources and References

For further reading

Websites

<http://WeDoNotConsent.blogspot.com> (Dave Berman's new blog as of 6/1/06)

<http://guvwurld.blogspot.com>

<http://www.guvwurld.org>

<http://www.VoterConfidenceCommittee.org>

<http://www.HumboldtRevolution.org>

<http://www.VelvetRevolution.us>

<http://www.BradBlog.com>

<http://www.DemocraticUnderground.com>

<http://www.BlackBoxVoting.org>

<http://www.califelectprotect.net/>

<http://www.studycaliforniaballots.org>

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

<http://www.VotersUnite.org>

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

<http://election.solarbus.org/>

<http://www.orwelltoday.com/>

<http://www.ecotalk.org/VotingSecurity.htm>

<http://www.peace-out.com/>

<http://www.centeronconscience.org>

<http://www.Objector.org>

<http://girights.objector.org/>

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

<http://peakoil.blogspot.com/>

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

Continued ...

Resources and References

Continued

Articles

[9/14/05: Lone Star Iconoclast](#) – “Arcata City, Calif. Establishes Model Voter Confidence Resolution For Nation’s Cities To Follow”

[12/25/05: Scoop](#) – “California Activists Call the Cops on Diebold”

[3/3/06: Humboldt Advocate \(.pdf\)](#) – Interview With Dave Berman on Diebold

[6/26/04: GuvWurld](#) – “Advocacy Journalism, The Least You Can Do, and The No Confidence Movement”

[The Volunteer Strike \(.pdf\)](#)

[9/16/05: VoteTrustUSA](#) – “ Arcata, The Voter Confidence Resolution, and the Importance of Paying Attention”

[2/21/06: Paul Lehto](#) – “Officials say “Trust Us” When Very Basis of American System is Distrust!!”

[9/11 Cover-Up Guide \(.pdf\)](#)

[11/12/04: Global Research](#) – “Manufacturing Dissent: How “Progressives” Gave The Election To Bush”

[April 2003: Tim O’Dell](#) - “Seven Minutes To Midnight”

Acknowledgements

Invaluable support for GuvWurld has come from Jim Nelson, René Agredano, Harmony Groves, Dave Meserve, Paul Pitino, Mike Dronkers, Estelle Fennel, Pokey Anderson, Kevin Hoover, Shane Mizer, Shawn Warford, Charles Winkler, Rebecca S. Bender, Glenn Franco Simmons, Thom Hartmann, Peter B. Collins, W. Leon Smith, Paul Lehto, Michael Collins, Eddie Ajamian, Jeff Miller, Rady Ananda, Dan Ashby, Judy Alter, Brad Friedman, Kat L’Estrange, Emily Levy, Beth Hahn, David Cobb, Shauna Wilson, Don Maszle, Elizabeth Ferrari, Yuji, Jeff Anbinder, Aryay Kalaki, Jane Allen, Ian Blei, Tim O’Dell, Nathan Smith, Dan Faulk, Peter La Vallee, Nezzie Wade, Eileen McGee, Jim and Linda Sorter, Brian Willson, Gordon Anderson, Scott Menzies, Mark Konkler, Dave Ogden, Beth Herrmann, Jack McCurdy, Jon Koriagin, Kathryn Hedges, Kim Dennig, Larry Hourany, Carol Brannan, Tracy Herrin, Jack Nounnan, Noel Adamson, Verbena, and my family.

Hi Mom: NGU.

Inspiration: Michael Franti, “Sometimes I feel like I can do anything ... sometimes, I wanna cry.”

Has the Consent of the Governed been withdrawn, YET?

About the Author

Dave Berman is the author of the new book, *We Do Not Consent*, comprised of 20 essential essays from his [GuvWurld Blog](#) with a Foreword by nationally renowned election protection attorney Paul Lehto. GuvWurld's most notable achievement is the development of the Voter Confidence Resolution (VCR), which has so far been adopted by City Councils in Arcata and Palo Alto, CA. The VCR states there is no basis for confidence in U.S. federal election results. The VCR also describes election conditions which do not seek the Consent of the Governed, challenging the assumption that such Consent exists. A stand alone white paper, and the final chapter in Berman's new book, *Blueprint For Peaceful Revolution* spells out how the VCR is envisioned as a catalyst for large scale social change.

As a founding member of the Voter Confidence Committee of Humboldt County, CA, Berman has become a regular figure in local news. He has reached broader audiences on the Thom Hartmann and Peter B. Collins syndicated radio shows, via frequent public speaking appearances, and through news coverage in sources as diverse as the Lone Star Iconoclast in Crawford, TX and Scoop, based in New Zealand. Berman makes his community organizing the focus of his blogging, which he calls advocacy journalism. The success of this writing style is defined only by the real world change it helps to produce. Since launching the book, Berman has suspended GuvWurld to start another blog, <http://WeDoNotConsent.blogspot.com>. The book, *We Do Not Consent*, is available through the blog as both a free .pdf download and a hard copy for purchase. Berman is available for media interviews, workshops, panel discussions and keynote addresses.

Contributions

I hope you enjoy this free online version of *We Do Not Consent*. To purchase a hard copy of the book for \$10, [click here](#). Or, please feel free to [make a donation](#) to support the *We Do Not Consent* blog. Thank you.

Testimonials

“If in the future we have vital elections, the “no basis for confidence” formulation that GuvWurld is popularizing will have been a historically important development. This is true because by implicitly insisting on verification and checks and balances instead of faith or trust in elections officials or machines as a basis for legitimacy, it encourages healthy transparent elections. It’s also rare that a political formulation approaches scientific certainty, but this formulation is backed up by scientific principles that teach that if you can’t repeat something (such as an election) and verify it by independent means, it doesn’t exist within the realm of what science will accept as established or proven truth.”

— Paul Lehto, Attorney at Law, Everett, WA

“Dave Berman has been candid and confrontational in challenging all of us to be “ruthlessly honest” in answering his question, “What would be better?” He encourages us to build consensus definitions of “better,” and to match our words with actions every day, even if we do only “the least we can do.” Cumulatively and collectively, our actions will bring truth to light.”

— Nezzie Wade, Sociology Professor, Humboldt State University and College of the Redwoods

“Dave Berman’s work is quietly brilliant and powerfully utilitarian. His *Voter Confidence Resolution* provides a fine, flexible tool whereby any community can reclaim and affirm a right relation to its franchise as a community of voters.”

— Elizabeth Ferrari, San Francisco, Green Party of California

“Give a damn about the world you live in? Give a damn about what you and I both know is one of the most shameful and destructive periods in American history? If so, do something about it. You can start by reading *We Do Not Consent*.”

— Brad Friedman, Creator/Editor, BradBlog.com; Co-Founder, VelvetRevolution.us

“This is an important collection of essays with a strong unitary theme: if you can’t prove that you were elected, we can’t take you seriously aselected officials. Simple, logical, comprehensive. ‘Management’ (aka, the ‘powers that be’) needs to get the message. ‘The machines’ are not legitimizers, they’re an artful dodge and a path to deception. We’ve had enough...and we most certainly DO NOT consent.”

— Michael Collins covers the election fraud beat for “Scoop” Independent Media

“What’s special about this book (and it fits because there’s nothing more fundamental to Democracy than our vote) is the raising of consciousness. Someone recognizing they have no basis for trusting elections may well ask what else is being taken for granted.”

— Eddie Ajamian, Los Angeles, CA

“I urge everyone to read “We Do Not Consent”, and distribute it as widely as possible.”

— B Robert Franza MD, Seattle, WA

WE DO NOT CONSENT

<http://WeDoNotConsent.blogspot.com>

Fair Use: This material may be downloaded and distributed free of charge and without requesting further permission provided no changes are made and attribution is given to <http://guvwurld.blogspot.com>.

eBook published by Agreda Communications