

The Novum Trias Politica: survey for new three vertices as demarcating, delegating, and executing

Heejoong Gim

(gmlwnd7332@naver.com)

Abstract

Since the system for Trias Politica has been accepted as standard form of government in history, it has not reflected innovation from below. For this matter, I survey the problems of system of present government, and look at the process the alternatives have risen. And then I would suggest new form of government as three vertices as demarcating, delegating, and executing.

Preface

This is a criticism for the politics, not an essay. I have thought this concept in my century, 21 with the great events that have surged in human history. If not written down some comments as a critic, he cannot be called so. I present my whole paper to no one, but to my future people, eventually, to my forefathers.

The problems of our present government

It could not be said, our era has been backwards. As many people agree, our generations have achieved a lot of things including democracy, proliferation, and technology. But it should be noted that our scope has changed also. Someone who thinks his era are fitted needs to think for himself thoroughly. In this era, such a mind is very needed.

In fact, it could not be said that our era has much of problem. Actually, my point is that the era is admiring the change. What do I mean with the word "change" now? We remember the period with great progression as in the age of "Renaissance". What was the difference with the era? People may be afraid that some routine can be repeated again as was in the middle age. We remember the time that was done with a lot of changes by the rulers in that time. This can be said it has achieved some progressions or regressions. People usually support their leader with his defects. Some of object results can be factors for the direction by people, but as we know, this couldn't be the whole. People in the era of Renaissance all admired the change. This season was with much of revolutions

that have never been seen in our history. With Great Discovery, the black death, and the fall of Rome, people couldn't but strive for the change. We live in the age after Bitcoin, Covid, and fall of America, so as we. The point is that our government doesn't and couldn't reflect this rapid changes.

So we need to save our poor government, as the owner of that. In some sense, this means to give freedom for our regime. Since the government was built, we live in the life of control. But when people are in mere mind of reiteration, don't they always admire of changes? I want to see how the world would be changed while government would be innovated. And people may agree my argument lest this can be a disaster for them.

The point was whether the change could result in being detrimental. And then the question and answer arise again: are we happy than the past? This can be so hard inference to think. But as point will point, the fact of it doesn't matter: we just admire the change. I remember when I was in the poor kind who attends in church every Sunday. There, lectured the priest, that we can live in the heaven with total, absolute happiness. But then someone who was wit has questioned: how could we be excited in ever regularity in heaven. The priest has told us the simile. For the works or happenings of heaven couldn't be understood directly, we can adopt some similes. Imagine you can eat someday some pizzas, and then tomorrow some hamburgers, so you make your meals with every change in the heaven. All most have agreed that argument maybe. But as life goes on, someone didn't. Because he even adopted the argument of change in the regularity of heaven.

So as we, even in the earth. If the result could result in terrible, the Renaissance has served to change this world. That also contributes our scope of perception. As Hardin has neglected out the splendid technologies of our society in this paper of "Tragedy of the commons", our scope of perception may matter. But all of things may be trivial, because all of this matter could be argued without change.

We see the problems of the power of government again and again. This may say the problems of bureaucracy. As we have seen, much of problem has arisen with the neglects of people. This doesn't merely mean that wars were the conflicts between people and nation. As we see the contemporary history has begun with the crisis with 911 in US. But this matter is beyond the system of government, as it involved other nations and cultures. But my point is that at least we could have listened the sound of people. As government has as its advantage the specification, people has the diversity. If someone has sounded her fury for the government, and it received and predicted it, what was the difference of our history? Well, this could be a mere hypothesis absolutely. But as I argue, the most is the least.

The advent of challengers from below

As I see through the history of politics, the topic of Trias Politica was kind of the standard in the discourse of political organization. It was like the concept Trinity in Christianity sense. Every system of politics can be judged and justified only by it. For it declares the overall system including main branches of government, and the other should follow their commands. But it is general fact that this is not but a condition of restriction of the government.

Right, this is a standard even in the history. So it is concrete even in conservative sense. Actually from the Roman Politics, it has its history. And through much of history, it was established as the form of three in one, as like Trinity. I remember the eternal aristocrat called John Locke, who gave the eternal meaning in property right in his book, has made his aristocracy theory based on this Trias Politica. Since from the history of Senates, Consuls and Assemblies, it was said that the one is not the byproduct of the other but the supplement. As Locke has built his theory on it, he actually didn't mean that something concrete. But he said the abstract separation of powers should contribute the right for property. That was the classical sense of Trias Politica. But through the event of enlightenment, and especially the Revolutions, this sense goes through some different meaning. Some philosopher demarcated a critical sense, and even the positive, practical sense. This was from Rousseau and Montesquieu. They said, the separation of powers should be applied in the actual institutions to protect people of earth. So the general will should interact with Trias Politica, and it brought about the detrimental. Advent from below brought about the terrors. This brought about the concrete sense of government that government should be such a form. Actually, some sense through history, we can infer that was the meant consequence by John Locke, because he gave the liberty of form of government to his next generation. So the next philosopher of Enlightenment has suggested that our government should be the form by Montesquieu or Rousseau or etc. But this also mean that they misunderstood the public will as general will. That caused the concrete type of our present government as just this Trias Politica as this form. But as we noted so far, Locke didn't mean it, and we should reflect the public will, and we should consider this result as some aspect of history, namely a one dimension of good government. We cannot interpret the public will. We just suggest a form as good form. But I praise the work by Enlightenment as high praise, because they opened a freedom also. Because they gave the critical and important sense for people, it made the era for the citizen, and gave the baton as our generation.

So they extended the concept of Trias Politica, and it reached ours. And then problem is that: We should consider the spirit of Locke and Montesquieu, Glorious and Enlightened, English and French. As Locke pointed out, though Trias Politica has great sense, it needs only to be applied as conceived sense, and the liberty by history should be respected. But it doesn't mean just the laissez-faire to the power. As Locke has pointed out his theory of social contract and the rebellion and regicide, in fact the fundamental source of power is from below, the people. And Montesquieu has detailed

such argumentation by his system of government. But in some sense, this could restrict people's power of liberty as drastically. So we should go in the middle. As history told us for the resolution of it, I remember some other interpretations of government.

There has arisen the theory of independence of part of government. Some concept here is like adhococracy and holacracy. Adhococracy may say the other type of government(-cracy) as in ad hoc (meaning as tactic method in hasty). It is also said as the independent model of government, but it wouldn't mean the same. Actually, these two concepts are in the area of business management, not administration. But my argument also means that the fusion of the public and the private. In adhococracy, the respected one is the ad hoc or auto-decision. It considers the rapid change for the time as our own. So it passed the baton for the below. The similar concept is like the holacracy. As "hola-" would mean, this emphasizes the relationship as the whole and part in organization. It doesn't consider the below as not the servant no more. The minor part of system is the totally different "part" from the whole, as the whole is just the whole as sum of the parts. Good bye, the king. This also means to treat the people not as the servant or practitioner, but as the real decider. Good bye, the common people. Actually, the two have come from different traditions or torrents, they insist the same. So now I say the new concept as hola-adhococracy, or "Holadhocracy".

But also, the other stream has flowed, namely the spirit of liquid democracy. As our society is so complex, the direct voting has failed in our history. But also, this is the age of "Directionism". So, to achieve this task of history, the new system has arrived to us. In this system, people don't need to vote directly, but can delegate their ballot to other trustful voters that may also delegate in future. Why does it represent the spirit of direct democracy? Well, it can be seen as it can poll the important policies directly by people. But actually, this is just the part of it, and the trivial. The spirit of liquid democracy lies in the division of labor even in the voting system. If one thinks the lags for the direct voting, no, at least the representative voting, one can solve it by accelerating it. I'm not fashioned in voting. It would be better to pass opportunity to the passion person. One may criticize that this system can devastate the system of democracy which should nurture and organize the public will as in direct or representative voting. But my saying for it is that this is also the choice by citizen or public. This is the saying that the passing their opportunity to vote is actually the divine choice of people. At first, we call imagine the problem of senior. I mean, ill-senior. Or, can I reflect the ill-people? As we contemplate them as they should have the right to vote, this is also impossible. Or it can be a violation. The total direct democracy in polling system supposes the freedom in their mental state, but totally in short time in voting. The better is to get the votes for them to their family, parents, or protectors. The passing not a voting is rather long-term process that can be more clear in public and this reduces the risk of misguidance of public will. We all misunderstood the real public will as just the votes. In some cases, perhaps many cases, the proper interpretation and

treatment may be the division of a labor named "voting". And we can see the potential future by this system. That is the extension of will.

This time is the age of extension. Some may argue that animal has its right, and even plant, earth, to the robot, object. I respect their opinions. But what's important before it is to consider the fair way to give them the right. I think in the linguistic sense, the mere right and political right cannot be distinguished, as one implies the other. But as we noted so far, there's some subject which cannot appeal their right directly. In that, we should consider the proper way to reflect their true right. So we consider the rather funny situation which uses the spirit of liquid democracy in this case.

Actually, who can represent animals? This couldn't be achieved by arbitrary sense by some community but the whole. Before considering the true will by the Other or if this could be possible, it would be natural to consider the professional or the relative. So it would be natural job to make representative the circle involved by the nurturers of the pets. So we need to give them some right to vote "instead of the pets". As we can see the case, this may can lead the mislead of the will by the nurturers. But what is important is the concern or respect. And this could lead the proper treatment of age of "Allness". So it is following that even in the Greek voting system, that only noble men got the right to vote the women, slaves, and foreigners, the internal right to vote has been put to them already, the noble man. I read history as the story of the will as this.

Settings of Novum Trias Politica

Goodbye, the common old Trias Politica, and welcome to the whole new Trias Politica. To replace the traditional, legislative, executive, and judicial(or federative), the new is the demarcator, delegator, executor.

The concept demarcator needs to define what the delegator is first. Delegator is the person who votes instead of other people. And this is applied as same as him, as he could delegate his vote to other believable someone. But the problems begin with this. The system delegate was introduced for the complex system of our society as it was done with their request in holadhocracy. So what is needed in this time is the scheme for the proper request. We need the professional even in the polling district. So it's kind of the conceptual division when it comes to comparing with delegation. Well, however, this has some meaningful and special sense. For demarcators can check the delegators. Think that one who has authorship guide the next polling district. That was be disaster which is not but the mislead the public will. So at least, the Demarcators should be fair and far with the concept of delegators, even in practice.

But what is important would be in practice. If some district is in argue, the primary task is clear:

the whole before the part. If we consider the cities polling, what is requested is how to divide the nation, namely the discuss in the nation. It would be not hard to discern who is the concerned people in nation polling. In this time, we can only select the demarcator who would divide the polling area by next voting. I call this person as central demarcator. In this polling, the one (or ones) would be chosen for the future. But can he decide every area of nation? No, Never. That was the total illness of our present that I said before. Even the demarcator would not be allowed to decide the policies by himself, but with the delegators who represent the public will. If the district of nation has been chosen, he doesn't have the right to concern the parts but the election of regional demarcators would begin. The same process goes on to the end. And in the end, are there the executors. What I mean as executors doesn't mean mere executors meant in traditional sense, but the whole of executors including legislative, executive, and judicial. As I mentioned, the regional demarcators are not just the rural or countryside of country. This can be the part of national administration. As central national dem' has chosen the division of the national dependence, this doesn't mean only the rural parts in the country. It can be the balance of the parts, checks, or anything but direct disturbance for the parts. Who decides this all? That's the people. But how? Through delegative voting system. But would people agree to do national work as so? That's the very hard question that needs to be verified through history. For it, and for the better part of it, I clear up the ambiguity. As central demarcators has separated the central, even the regional doesn't need to elect their demarctors. The process is this: The central is firmed, and the central is divided into such a different areas regional. Then as the proper process would go up, the natural election for that regional demarcators should be adopted. But this shouldn't be done as such: Before election, people can survey if they would elect the demarcators. That means that they have the primary right to choose if demarcator exists or not in this election. This is the primary liberty before all of things. What if they chose not to have demarcator as election? This also means that they chose to follow the choice from the top, namely central executor. This is actually the matter in the rural politics when it comes to the inability of small rural politicians. Well, perhaps this matter can be solved by proper demarcators elected, but we cannot but pass this matter to the subject of history.

And then I suggest the checks and balances of this novum trias politica.

Demarcates have the right to control the boundaries for the election. This can affect the delegates who misunderstands the public will, namely the votes and executes who misleads too.

Delegates have the capacity to decide who should be the proper laureate for the executes, including demarcates and common executes.

Executes have the ability to execute the needed policies for the proper polling administration such as making laws, advertisement, and restrict the potential corruption in demarcates and delegates such as prosecution, judiciary.

As seen through, they are circling the ballot, instead of law in traditional sense, first one is creating the ballots, second one is regulating the ballots, and third one is investing the ballots. This is much like the system of business management circling through the money. I believe, here arises the unity of public and private administration. So it would be so natural to concern the relationship between the money and the ballot. I would explain it with forthcoming article.

As much of country has adopted the system for the independent government as board or committee, demarcator doesn't need to be the one. And then, through this independent polling system we can choose the true interpreter of the people, as nation exists for it. So the last idea is remaining about the final central demarcator.

As I noted out so far, ballots are created out when the new boundaries are created. So as it is natural, someone can get much of ballots while other only one. This can bring the inequality in right to vote. But as I believe, money finally comes to everyone through innovation and redistribution of commodity, as the concern of pet has become that of everyone, the concern would be exploded and extended through, to us. This is the final trust in state. So here the question arises: who can decide the head of state? By the nature of the job, the past committee of demarcator cannot decide as the common committee discuss and declare. They should complete their job more firmly by law, not a common law, but the one constitutional high. Then the demarcator here is the job to give the opinion of suggested constitution, to make who can vote this poll, namely who is the people of nation, to decide who would be elected with which ability he has. But this should be the subject of deciding how to divide the primary central nation, which I call it as just the "prime", not disrupting the regional part never. So here remains who should participate in the election of "prime demarcator". They should be the conventional origin of members in the circle, named nation. But here the difference with convention. The participator should have many ballots as they participate in part circles in nation. Many ballots in many circles. For this is selecting not a national demarcator but the prime demarcator, the origin of every ballots. So here the whole of the interests in politics participates as government manages the whole of the money regulation. So at last, the head of state should be not anyone but the "Chairman of the Prime Demarcators" as he is the origin of state above delegators and executors.

This is my criticism for the present politics.