

Part 3 - Dialogue Into Politics, Democracy, Technology and Learning

This dialogue is primarily with California State Senator [John Vasconcellos](#) about the future of politics, the role of technology in the evolution of government, the role of government in the evolution of technology, and the role of learning in the evolution of both.

"The Gothic idea that we were to look backwards instead of forwards for the improvement of the human mind, and to recur to the annals of our ancestors for what is most perfect in government, in religion and in learning, is worthy of those bigots in religion and government by whom it has been recommended, and whose purposes it would answer. But it is not an idea which this country will endure." --[Thomas Jefferson](#)

"Leadership and learning are indispensable to each other". [John F. Kennedy](#), speech prepared for delivery in Dallas the day of his assassination, November 22, 1963

Page 2 — #1: 1991 - A Proposal to Assemblyman John Vasconcellos If we could jump 20 years down the road and take an aerial view of the new politics one of its most obvious differences from the old would be the degree to which the "WE THE PEOPLE" part were actually engaged in doing it - indeed that **the very idea of "political participation" had been transformed.**

Page 3 — #2: 1994 - Virtual Nation - The Ethics of Interface - Fort Ord, Ca. Its signature difference will be the level of participation possible (granularity and frequency). Its foundational assumption that **radically changing the quality of participation possible will effect the dialogue in ways reframing and rehashing issues can no longer address.**

Page 4 — #3: 1997 - Designing for Democracy Conference - Distributed Dialogue Processing (DDP): (Note this item is comparatively conceptually complex) DDP is a ground floor layer of communication infrastructure that **provides the constituents in a human system the means to engage one another in a contextually synchronized, situationally relevant, and low-overhead-to-participate, distributed dialogue.** DDP provide a means for processing the experiences of such a constituency and maximizing the opportunity for each contributor to learn from the experiences of each of their constituents. DDP provides each constituent with the means to exercise their core capacity to make and articulate the kind of meaningful distinctions characteristic of participating in a Dialogue while also providing 'owners' / facilitators the means to see the aggregate patterns of constituent experience in relation to their areas of responsibility and to respond to them individually or in groups that dynamically constellate around common interests or needs.

Page 7 — #4: 2000 - Bill Bradley for President Technology & Governance Proposal Outline The future of humanity is being significantly influenced in every way and at every level by technology – who has it and who doesn't – what it could do in principal and what it will do constrained to the narrow economic interests of a few multi-national corporations. Given the enormous potential of technology **prudence demands that we get conscious, beyond the marketplace's invisible hand, to how and where to steward the technology's stewarding of us.**

Page 10 — #5: 2000 - The New Technology of Democracy - Senate and Assembly Joint Committee to Prepare California for the 21st Century. If we were to start over today and envision a new democracy that was design-enabled by the frequency and quality of citizen participation that modern technology makes possible what would it look like? How should California, situated as it uniquely is, right at the intersection between the evolution of technology and the evolution of democracy, be proactively involved in **defining the role of technology in the evolution of governance and the role of governance in the evolution of technology?**

Page 13 — #6: 2001 - A New Model of Democracy for the Cultural Creatives Brainstorming Meeting Many people seem to prefer to get behind - show up - for their particular issues and crusades, and yet for various reasons choose to stay out of the mainstream general political processes. I am such a one. They, like the individual stock traders, are ever less interested in buying into someone or some entities 'general' program. They want to 'invest' their precious life-attention-time where it feels like they can make a difference and where it means something to them. **What if we could offer them a way to participate in a constituency that isn't asking them to generally do or believe anything?**

"**You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should be doing for themselves**".
- [Abraham Lincoln](#)

#1: A Proposal to Assemblyman John Vasconcellos 8/25/91

John,

I think you are "right on" to seek a new human politics and I trust you know how much I agree with the merits if not always the centrality of the issues you have brought to the forefront. However, in my view the issues of the new politics are only one part of the equation, the other and perhaps equally important is the overall relationship that emerges between the people participating. In other words if we could jump 20 years down the road and take an aerial view of the new politics one of its most obvious differences from the old would be the degree to which the "WE THE PEOPLE" part were actually engaged in doing it - indeed that the very idea of "political participation" had been transformed.

We have spoken in the past of my belief that the future of politics will be dramatically changed by the role of technology. Not just technology as an issue - technology as a significant force in the mediation of collaboration and dialogue about issues. I believe technology is destined to mediate a heretofore impossible relationship between "representatives" and the "represented" - one that provides the people represented meaningful ways to participate (to think and feel included - value adding) while redefining the representative as a leader/facilitator of the dialogically focused collaboration based activities.

Given the fact that your matrix of relationships includes IBM, Apple, Tandem, H.P., Next, Pac Bell, Cal Leadership, Lou's work on collaboration, Tom Peters, Bill Isaacs - that you represent a district known throughout the world for its technical leadership - (in short that you have access to the world's leading resources on computing, communications, organizational design, collaboration, team learning & dialogue) it seems to me that you should convene these resources and propose the pioneering project of developing and locally testing (modeling for the state and the world) an entirely new relationship between yourself and your constituents. Somebody is going to do it. Given your ambitions and your connections and your district there is no one better situated anywhere in the world to catalyze this experiment.

I think you should propose this endeavor at your upcoming gala. I think it's the right call to action to engage many of your supporters - that it's both relevant and future oriented. John, I don't think this takes anything away from the issues you have worked so hard to champion. On the contrary if you can help facilitate a dialogical/collaborative model for allowing people to share in the political process, a healthier, esteeming state can't help but emerge.

David

P
A
R
T
3

#2: Virtual Nation - The Ethics of Interface
December 02, 1994
(extracted from Fort Ord Proposal for Virtual University)

Background: Politics

To develop and model a virtual political process that radically redefines a representative as one whose is responsible for refining the fidelity of their representation by having an ongoing ever more extended and inclusive person to person, real-time and technologically distributed, dialogue with their constituents.

I think learning to employ and extend state of the art distance, distributed and dialogical learning "mediation" systems will create a new kind of infrastructure through which what we mean by "participating" in the political process will also undergo a radical reframe.

I believe a new form of politics will emerge. It will not emerge out of today's governmental system. It will emerge (initially in parallel) through a Virtual Nation (one forming today on the Internet and other large networks)

Its signature difference will be the level of participation possible (granularity and frequency). Its foundational assumption that radically changing the quality of participation possible will effect the dialogue in ways reframing and rehashing issues can no longer address.

The greater the level of participation possible (granularity and frequency) the less political "representation" required - the greater the need for education regarding participation (both how to and substantively about what)

This new relationship will be mediated by technology and technology always effects who uses it - the alphabet effect is a case - voter apathy is a case - not only are we "what we eat" - we become what we use - technology not only effects how humans do things it effects how humans internally relate to and process meanings.

Just as our current governmental systems are a form of technology - a crude form in which the issues of voting (in terms of the range of choice and the frequency of choosing) and representation and lawmaking and executing all reflect a distributed people mediation system (one designed for a kind of representation that was technically possible over 200 years ago [horseback and walking]) a new form of technologically mediating a political body of people is both possible and (as the recent election demonstrates) needed today.

As it is inevitable such a system will form it behooves us to consider its implications for both body politic and the ecology of the bodies & minds who will use it.

In essence I think that the underlying ETHIC of INTERFACE of such a system will be the "COMMON SENSE" and BILL OF RIGHTS of the next generation of government. In addition to the distributed and virtual political constituencies possible "on-line" I propose and think it critical that we establish an experimental virtual space in a common local space: Fort Ord. That we create a community within a community capable of testing out the tools and processes of a new kind of democracy and do it in a learning environment suited to that purpose

#3: Designing for Democracy: Distributed Dialogue Processing

Distributed Dialogue Processing

Background:

Distributed Dialogue Processing (DDP) is a ground floor layer of communication infrastructure that provides the constituents in a human system the means to engage one another in a contextually synchronized, situationally relevant, and low-overhead-to-participate, Distributed Dialogue™. DDP provide a means for processing the experiences of such a constituency and maximizing the opportunity for each contributor to learn from the experiences of each of their constituents. DDP also provides each constituent with the means to exercise their core capacity to make and articulate the kind of meaningful distinctions characteristic of participating in a Dialogue. The best way to understand the functional nature and design intent of Distributed Dialogue Processing is to understand its premises:

Premise 1) There is an implicit relationship between every person that contributes 'content' to a product, process, service or issue (thought in the form of words or work product in the form of artifacts) and the person(s) (constituents) who interact with that contribution. Each contribution defines a constituency. This constituency consists of all those involved or related to the creation and intention behind the contribution and all those who interact with the contribution. (Where 'contribution' can be broken down into elements as granular as a word)

Premise 2) In its most elemental form, relationships within the constituency are governed by the following 3 laws of human systems:

I) The success of any effort to design, develop or improve any 'system' ...

- curriculum, classroom, school district, pedagogy, project, product, process, service, issue, etc.

- in terms of its systemic performance:

 - organizational efficiency, cost-effectiveness, optimal achievement of intent

depends on the volume, dimensional extent (scope) and granularity (detail) of the feedback it can gather and learn from.

II) The volume, scope and detail of feedback flow in a system is inversely related to how difficult it is for its constituents...

- actual "customers"; learners, teachers, parents, administrators, curriculum providers, assessors, superintendents, board members, stakeholders, etc.,

to articulate their feedback in the moment and in the context of their interactions with the system.

III) A system's ability to learn from the feedback it gathers is directly related to how well its "owners"...

- persons responsible for any one or all of the resources available in the system

- persons responsible for any one or all aspects of the implementation, mission or intent behind a system (above)

process and understand (in relation to their areas of responsibility and priorities) the feedback they receive.

Premise 3) Taken to its finest level of granularity, the optimal 'place' from which to design a dialogical relationship between members of a constituency is the 'stutter'. Stutter: A perturbation in the flow - an involuntary 'drop-out' or 'disconnect' in the flow of engaging or interacting.

Every "stutter" in the flow of an individual's interactions with any "resource" (contribution) intended to support or facilitate their learning, performing, participating, using or enjoying...

all or any aspects of: a product, process, service, i.e., a course, book, computer simulation game, etc.

is a great opportunity for both the individual and for all those involved in providing what he or she is interacting with. Each "stutter" represents the *best possible source* of information from which to become more intelligent and more effective (independently and in relationship with one another.)

For the individual interacting with a resource, each stutter is a internal feedback signal indicating that something is missing, needed or incomplete. It also provides, if reflected on and distilled (disambiguated), the *best possible source* of internal information from which to understand what is missing or needed and, given the available options, how to best proceed.

For the people and organizations that benefit, profit or are responsible for providing the "resources", the *best possible source* of information from which to intelligently evolve and cost-optimally improve them stems from understanding...

in precise relation the specific interaction locations they are responsible for

where and why people stutter.

Based on these premises (and others related to learning which can be found @ www.implicitivity.com) DDP's design is oriented toward mediating a feedback-based dialogue at the level of 'stutters'. The design intent is two-fold:

- 1)** To reduce the barrier to constituent participation, by providing a context sensitive dialogue box that can be called in an instant and within which a constituent can see the patterns of previous constituent experience in relation to the exact context and situation they find themselves in. Should they find that their experience is not unique they can follow the paths of the constituents before them or reinforce an opinion or articulation of need as yet unsupported by the system. If there experience is unique then and only then do they spend any time articulating it (then time they spend is reduced dramatically because they don't have to articulate any of the context normally necessary to understand it).
- 2)** To provide 'owners' / facilitators the means to see the aggregate patterns of constituent experience in relation to their areas of responsibility and to respond to them individually or in groups that dynamically constell around common interests or needs. DDP's visualization tools allow an owner to see the distribution of constituent needs as they cluster around the owner's area(s) of responsibility. Because the dialogue process on the other end allows constituents to reinforce previous experiences, the owner is spared the tedious work of wading through what would otherwise be redundant. The owner is always dealing with what is fresh or the patterns in what is known.

In this sense DDP is analogous to a context sensitive discussion group processor that can be embedded at any location within the content accessed by a constituency.

Current Implementation

DDP is being implemented by the 2way corporation in Seattle, Wa., for use as an Intranet solution. It consists of 2 components: 1) An authoring tool which will allow a lay person to create the "seed crystal" scaffolding for facilitating a dialogue. As simple to use as an outlining word processor, the authoring tool enables 'owners' to create a branching 'form' that will enable their constituents to interact in the ways previously described and to embed that form (via a hyperlink) into any html document. 2) A server tool that will organize any SQL database to store the 2way dialogue scaffolding, that will push a Dialogue box and its context specific contents to a client browser (requires javascript and frames) and that will generate html 'reports' about the patterns and contents of constituent experience relative to each interaction location. The tool set is scheduled for shipment in June of 97.

Proposed Use:

The internet is rapidly becoming the wide area network of the entire planet. Its ubiquitous nature and the inexpensive browsers now available to anyone with a computer, make it the ideal 'place' for facilitating Distributed Dialogues. Perhaps the most significant venue for the application of the ideas behind DDP is in the development of alternative forms of representational government.

It is clear that a new form of politics must emerge. Its signature difference will be the level of participation possible (granularity and frequency). Its foundational assumption that radically enhancing the quality of participation will effect the dialogue in ways reframing and rehashing issues can't address. The greater the level of participation possible (granularity and frequency) the less politicized "representation" required (though the greater the need for education regarding participation both how to and substantively about what).

Just as our current governmental systems are a form of technology - a crude form in which the issues of voting (in terms of the range of choice and the frequency of choosing) and representation, lawmaking and executing all reflect a distributed people mediation system (one designed for a kind of representation that was technically possible over 200 years ago [horseback and walking]) a new form of technologically mediating a political constituency is both possible and (as the recent election demonstrates) needed today.

As it is inevitable such a system will form it behooves us to consider its implications for both body politic and the ecology of the bodies & minds who will use it. In essence I think that the underlying ETHIC of INTERFACE of such a system will be the "COMMON SENSE" and BILL OF RIGHTS of the next generation of government.

DDP can offer the evolution of emerging new political processes a dialogical infrastructure that can facilitate the new level of participation between and among its constituents.

#4: Bill Bradley for President Technology & Governance Proposal Outline

From: David Boulton [mailto:dboulton@implicity.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 11, 2000 2:44 AM
To: John Vasconcellos; John Vasconcellos
Subject: Proposal sketches

John,

What follows is not ready for Bradley. It's for you and for the others you consider potential participants in your 'Bradley-IT team'

Background...

The issue isn't how to use the Internet as a tool for helping get Bradley (or anyone else) elected, its what is America's leadership role in applying this technology to the maximum benefit of everyone? How shall we make use of this new technology such that it furthers the cause of participative democracy, serves the American Vision and empowers our people?

When people of succeeding centuries and millennia look back on the last half of the 20th Century and the beginning of the 3rd Millennium they will think of this time as the beginning of the age of virtuality(1) – as the time when computers and the web combined to give birth to an entirely new kind of technology enabled, yet deeply human, social infrastructure.

From the grocery store to the stock market, technology is revolutionizing every aspect of our lives. Within a few years virtually every person in the united states will have devices in their homes, schools, work places, libraries and public spaces that will enable them to access and benefit from the opportunities and resources of the internet.

I am suggesting that an opportunity exists for Bradley to galvanize voters by providing visionary leadership regarding the role of government in the evolution of technology and, relatedly, the role of technology in the evolution of government. The right new social vision for the technology is, in itself, a powerful, fresh and still open-to-claim vision-proposition for getting elected.

Proposal #1...

Like the Space Program's Man on the Moon Mission – long range, a call to industry as well as government, a socially mobilizing vision, a bold goal for the evolution of mankind and a stimulus to the economy.

Like the Human Genome Project – long range, scientifically credible, recognizes the value of its leverage to uncountable endeavors.

Like the Library of Congress – vastness, the nation's most implicate index.

Like PBS – commercial free, a resource for everyone to learn from.

National educational technology challenge: A PBS for the WEB: **The Planetary Learning Library (PLL) (1). A place where anyone can go to understand anything they might be interested in, when they wish to do it, and without cost.** Think of it as a national(2) on-line supplement to the education system from Kindergarten through University (both as a resource for the people who work in education as well as for the individuals wanting to learn).

P
A
R
T

3

Like PBS there would be no commercials, no banners, no bandwidth drag for any reason other than the content intended. Unlike PBS this space would be alive – its content/knowledge/meaning wouldn't just be broadcast rather it would be made available in ways designed to foster interactive learning. It would enable people to join in distributed dialogues about the range of meanings and implications associated with any 'human understanding'. In effect a system that enables anyone who is interested in learning about anything to be able to enter whatever it is "_____dia"(1)and enter a space devoid of any intent or content except that related to the sincere attempt to resource that individual's inquiry into understanding what is known and what is under dialogue about that _____.

Conceptually it might look like: a .dia(1) extension to the web that uses content organizing link-structure-standards that the browsers dynamically reconfigure themselves to on entry into the .dia1 space. The browsers would thus transform into learner-interface portals able to travel along explication or implication paths, rubinate through alternative representations, contextually relevant references and engage in auto-context synchronized distributed dialogues with anyone else in meaning space of a particular interest or need.

Obviously, this project is complex and I realize that there are many obstacles. I would argue that the obstacles are less than those faced when Kennedy proposed the moon mission, that they are less technically complex than mapping the human genome and that the project as a whole has the potential to do as much good for as many people as both of them.

There is much more I have to say on the subject – how to seed crystal its growth, how to design the interface, how to provide it with a distributed dialogue infrastructure... More on all that as the occasions warrant.

Proposal #2...

Inspire and lead a national dialogue that seeks to develop a policy illuminating vision regarding the role of technology in the evolution of government and the role of government in the evolution of technology.

Our government is a social-mediation machine (a low-tech WEB), the architecture and engineering of which is based on the number of representatives and frequency of congressing that was technically possible in the days of horse based transportation and mail delivery. If we were to start over today and envision a new democracy that was design-enabled by the frequency and quality of citizen participation that modern technology makes possible what would it look like?

The future of humanity is being significantly influenced in every way and at every level by technology – who has it and who doesn't – what it could do in principal and what it will do constrained to the narrow economic interests of a few multi-national corporations. Given the enormous potential of technology prudence demands that we get conscious, beyond the marketplace's invisible hand, to how and where to steward the technology's stewarding of us.

This dialogue would result in proposals for how the US should be involved with the emerging world of technology in the 21st Century. These might include:

National Cyberspace Agency(1)

Analogous to the Department of Transportation, NASA and the Department of the Treasury this agency would:

Develop strategies that could inform national policy on how to best leverage the emerging technologies to the benefit of national and international democracy.

Develop strategies that could inform national policy regarding the legal infrastructure of the emerging cyberworld.

Develop strategies for the US playing the role of strategic vision/venture capitalist with emerging technologies that have significant social or economic benefit.

Develop a new form of ‘voting’ on issues that is above ‘tampering’ suspicion and that is based on a frequency appropriate to the issues at hand not the term of the representatives involved.

Prototype a parallel representational democracy system (initially like non PAC driven governmental focus groups) that uses the web to enable people of common national and local interests to join and/or form constituencies and elect representatives responsible for facilitating ongoing distributed dialogues within the constituencies - dialogues that facilitate the mutual learning and actions of its members and that feed a different granularity of intelligence into the existing governmental system.

P
A
R
T
3

Here again there are many more things to add and to discuss. But I will leave it here until we get first reactions. John, again my apologies for the delay. I hope this is sufficient a sketch to take next steps with. Let me know how you want to proceed.

David

- 1) I am not attached to any names or labels. I have used PLL, .dia and National Cyberspace Agency as placeholders.
- 2) Possibly proposed as a United Nations project so everyone in the world with the (ever more inexpensively available) technology can participate, benefit from the learning it makes possible. This also positions Bradley as someone leading the US toward leading the WORLD. It also helps make news about the idea and Bradley's proposal of it -international news and international technical news. It's a way to contribute to the world significantly and cost-effectively and calls us into a working relationship with the rest of the world about human learning and how to responsibly facilitate and resource it.
- 3) For brevity I have made reference to some of my own earlier concepts some of the terms I have used like 'learner interface' most people will not be familiar with and will need to be replaced with long hand versions should we take this to next steps.

#5: Senate and Assembly Joint Committee to Prepare California for the 21st Century.

P
A
R
T

3

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Saturday, September 02, 2000 9:14 PM Subject: URGENT REQUEST

DAVID -

HELLO, FRIEND, HOW ARE YOU?

I'M OUT OF SESSION FINALLY FOR THE YEAR - TIL JAN 1 2001 - HURRAY! AND I JUST WOKE UP TO THE RECOGNITION THAT WE'RE CONDUCTING OUR FOUNDING RETREAT OF OUR MEMBERS OF OUR NEW JOINT LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE TO PREPARE CALIFORNIA FOR THE 21ST CENTURY - THIS COMING WED & THUR IN SANTA BARBARA.

I NEED YOUR HELP RIGHT AWAY WITH (AT LEAST) #2:

I'M ENCOURAGING MY COCHAIR SARAH REYES TO JOIN ME IN RECOMMENDING TO OUR MEMBERSHIP THAT WE FOCUS ON 2 INITIATIVES IN THE COMING YEAR:

- RACE & DIVERSITY & INCLUSION - FOCUSED ON THE THEME THAT SINCE WE'RE GOING TO BECOME A STATE WHOSE WORKING POPULATION WILL BE 2/3'S OF COLOR BY 2010 - THIS UTILIZATION OF ALL OUR TALENT IS ESSENTIAL FOR OUR ONGOING PROSPERITY. I EXPECT BRIAN WILL BE ESPECIALLY ABLE TO HELP US GET CLARITY ON THIS ONE.

- TECHNOLOGY - IN PARTICULAR (YOU'LL RECOGNIZE THE PHRASING) OBSERVING & HOPING TO HELP NUDGE THE CONTINUING INTERACTION OF THE CONTINUING EVOLUTION OF TECHNOLOGY AND OF GOVERNANCE - TOWARDS ENHANCING SELF-GOVERNANCE. HERE IS WHERE I COULD SURE USE YOUR HELP, DAVID - HAVE YOU WRITTEN A 1-PAGER (OR SOMETHING AKIN TO THAT) WHICH WE COULD USE (HEY, PLAGIARIZE) TO GIVE TO OUR MEMBERS FOR THEM TO CONSIDER, DISCUSS?

I'M ASKING MY STAFF TO GIVE SOME HEAVY DUTY ATTENTION TO THESE 2 TOPICS AND TO COME UP WITH DOCUMENTS PRESENTING EACH FOR OUR MEMBERS ON THURSDAY.

LET ME KNOW, MY GOOD FRIEND -

ALOHA - JOHN

-----Original Message-----

Sent: Sunday, September 03, 2000 7:48 PM

Subject: Re: RE: URGENT REQUEST

HI DAVID - GOOD FINDING YOUR MESSAGE -

WHAT I'M PARTICULARLY WANTING IS SOME FURTHER EXPLICATION OF THAT WONDERFUL FOCUS YOU PROVIDED ME EARLIER - ATTENDING TO NURTURING & MAXIMIZING THE INTERSECTION OF THE EVOLUTION OF TECHNOLOGY & OF GOVERNANCE - INTO A FORM I CAN PRESENT TO MY 21ST CENTURY JOINT COMMITTEE COLLEAGUES, HOPING THEY CHOOSE IT AS A PRIME TOPIC FOR US TO ILLUMINATE FOR ALL CALIFORNIANS.

JOHN

Paper in Support of California Senate Meetings Sept 4, 2000

The New Technology of Democracy

The future of humanity is being significantly influenced in every way and at every level by technology – who has it and who doesn't – what it could do in principal and what it can do constrained to the narrow interests of a few multi-national corporations. Given the enormous potential of technology and its unprecedented scope of influence over modern life, prudence demands that we become more conscious and intentional (beyond the marketplace's invisible hand) in stewarding the technology's stewarding of us.

What is our leadership responsibility in applying this technology to the maximum benefit of everyone? How shall we make use of this new technology such that it furthers the cause of participative democracy, serves the American Vision and empowers our people? **What is the role of technology in the evolution of governance and what is the role of government in the evolution of technology?**

Our 'system' of government is, after all, a complex social technology (a low-tech WEB). The 'architecture' and 'engineering' of this 'technology' was based on the number of representatives and frequency of congressing that was technically reasonable in the days of horse based transportation and mail delivery. **If we were to start over today and envision a new democracy that was design-enabled by the frequency and quality of citizen participation that modern technology makes possible what would it look like?**

It is clear that a new form of politics is already emerging. Its signature difference will be the level of citizen participation it makes possible (in detail and frequency). **Its foundational assumption: that radically enhancing the quality of participation will affect the governing dialogue in ways reframing and rehashing issues can't address.**

Technology is destined to enable a heretofore-impossible relationship between "representatives" and the "represented" - one that provides the people represented significantly more meaningful ways to participate (to think and feel included - value adding) while redefining the representative as a leader and facilitator of the new forms of constituency.

How should California, situated as it uniquely is, **right at the intersection between the evolution of technology and the evolution of democracy**, be proactively involved in defining the role of technology in the evolution of governance and the role of governance in the evolution of technology? How should we take up the challenge history has handed us? **It is California's destiny – our destiny as its leaders - to take up this challenge and become the architects of the new technology of democracy.**

Some starting points to explore:

California Cyberspace Agency (placeholder)

Develop strategies that could inform policy on how to best leverage the emerging technologies to the benefit of California and national democracy.

Develop strategies that could inform policy regarding the legal infrastructure of the emerging cyberworld.

Develop strategies for playing the role of strategic vision/venture capitalist with emerging technologies that have significant social or economic benefit.

Develop a new form of 'voting' on issues that is above 'tampering' suspicion and that is based on a frequency appropriate to the issues at hand not the term of the representatives involved.

Prototype a parallel representational democracy system (initially like non PAC driven governmental focus groups) that uses the web to enable people of common national and local interests to join and/or form constituencies and elect representatives responsible for facilitating ongoing distributed dialogues within the constituencies - dialogues that facilitate the mutual learning and actions of its members and that feed a different granularity of intelligence into the existing governmental system.

Partner with technology companies in envisioning and proto-architecting the new technology of democracy.

P
A
R
T
3

#6: A New Model of Democracy for the Cultural Creatives Brainstorming Meeting

February 23rd 2001 - San Francisco Ca.

An alternative, additive 'organizing principle': CROSS CONNECTIONS

People have causes. They have many reasons: economic interest, moral crusade, justice and equality, association with personal or family crisis, personal satisfaction through participation... 3

Many people seem to prefer to get behind - show up - for their particular issues and crusades, and yet for various reasons choose to stay out of the mainstream general political processes. I am such a one.

They, like the individual stock traders, are ever less interested in buying into someone or some entities 'general' program. They want to 'invest' their precious life-attention-time where it feels like they can make a difference and where it means something to them.

Implicit in their particular interests are their values.

By identifying core values (probably involved) in the issues and causes that people are directly supporting we would see that there are commonly shared values. These common values are the normal 'glue' of a party or coalition. But, again, these people don't want 'over generalization' they are not wanting to jump on the bandwagon – they want to put their self-investment where its important to them.

What if we could offer them a way to participate in a constituency that isn't asking them to generally do or believe anything? What the constituency provides them is a way to locate themselves in a (many) virtual community(s) in which they share core values. For example – they are hot on sustainable agriculture and one of the 10 constituencies that includes sustainable agriculture also has 12 other issues they are in total agreement with (even though they wouldn't otherwise go out of their way to support them) The other constituencies have some value conflict for them so they join this one. By doing so, they agree/pledge that they will come to the aid (petitions, votes, possibly \$\$) for the other issues of this constituencies and conversely everyone else in this constituency is pledging to come to the aid of their issue. Like an insurance pool or a grocery coop – strength through number – yet differentiated and personally relevant.

An opportunity exists to provide these individual political actors a way to draw upon one another's strengths, as and when needed, by allowing them each to remain focused on the issues they are hot upon. Yet this 'system' in the aggregate is a party – is what we are talking about.

For every person who is hot about an issue this approach allows them to recruit help – to improve what it is they are up to. That means that the support for each issue in the matrix we are talking about goes up.

This isn't to be mistaken for on-line voting – though technology represents the mediating environment – that's all its doing – people can act in the world (and in cyber when evolved and ready).

Each person benefits, each cause benefits, a mediating institutional system evolves that is quantum-democratic – alignment via issues and value without imposed over generalization. The people we have been talking about would in effect be coming together to take and participate in a new politics and yet they would be doing it in a highly individualized way. Community via differentiated, individualized participation – I think that is what the Cultural Creatives and are looking for

I know this needs a lot of fleshing out and I am out of battery power as I am flying to SF –so look beyond this rough cut underdeveloped articulation – what do you think of the Jewel I am pointing to here?