

## UK Parliamentary Reform

Dear one-votes,

Our country is in a mess. I don't think that this is a controversial statement.

Our citizens must gather together and create an environment in which everybody is happy to live. Happy is an ephemeral state so let us say contented without being complacent. The citizens must go back to basics and examine everything that is happening in this country and conclude whether these happenings provide added value to the populace with regard to the happiness of the whole. This used to be referred as “in the public interest”. Who decides what is in the public interest? The government without consultation with the public! A one-way street. We shall now decide what is in the public interest. If we turn down this opportunity then quite frankly we do not deserve to live on this wonderful planet.

Question. Do we need to have a government at all? No. Simple! Currently we are ruled by people who view us with complete contempt – the full extent of which will be revealed in the coming years. The government have sold us out to the Great Reset without our consent from a referendum. You don't get much more contemptuous than that! All the political parties have been complicit in this. The country is controlled outside and inside the parliament by puppets who work on behalf of the Great Reset (GR) and a treasonous UK charity called “Common Purpose”(CP). This explains why there is no opposition because all parties are working to the same end – the agenda of GR.

These two organisations are bent on destroying our spirit, our sense of identity (wokes), our families, our friendships and our businesses. They wish to isolate all of us. Their aims are to control us even down to examination of the way we think. They plan a credit system as our only source of income which will emanate from the government. There will be no cash or property ownership. Everything you buy will be controlled by the government and they will bar any purchases you make on-line which are not made with companies controlled by GR. Greed is their primary weakness and will be their downfall. When cash has gone you will be defenceless since all the banks and all the world's large businesses, including energy, media, Big Pharma and telecom, are currently controlled by the GR holding company, Vanguard, through direct shareholdings or via their many subsidiaries. I have not found any article that explains who owns Vanguard.

I am still amazed at how few people are aware of this conspiracy by GR. Surely it must be blindingly obvious when one considers that 193 countries are all doing the same thing at the same time in response to a virus which is hardly dangerous enough to lock us all down. Why are all the countries shutting us up, restricting our freedoms and imposing tyranny upon us contemporaneously. The odds are massive against this so there must be puppet masters or conspirators pulling the strings of the government leaders. The people that run Vanguard – who we never see. Wake up. Now!

The World Economic Forum is the public face of GR and is financed by large companies and private membership subscriptions. They have written two books in which they mention population reduction. 7.3 billion people is too many for GR to control. I have visited many websites and the general consensus is that over a period of years (not known) the plan is to reduce to about 10% of the current population so there will be only 700 million people left on this planet and they will all be rigidly controlled and subservient to GR. The rest will go to heaven earlier than they planned.

I now return to my previous comment about there being no need for us to be governed. The word government I view as pejorative. From birth to death I need to be governed. In case I do something wrong? Am I born a sinner? I envisage a parliament whereby the members of the government become facilitators towards to the common objective of making the people of this country happy and prosperous. We will not be treated with contempt any more.

People say we have democracy in the UK. They must be joking. One vote every five years for a political party. The political party has a manifesto which can run to 80 pages. Hardly anybody is going to read the manifesto since they are incredibly dull and nobody expects the political party that comes to power to stick to it anyway. Harold Wilson said that a week was a long time in politics so to plan five years ahead is futile.

Is there any advantage for the voters in having political parties? No. Political parties are just gangs. They hamper the free expression of the individual MPs when voting through the use of whips and other methods. Why are they formed? Power. They have no intrinsic value. They are funded by large organisations such as unions or large companies, wealthy individuals and membership subscriptions and anybody else that wants to influence the policies proposed by that particular party. Key word. Corruption.

Anybody that wants change by trying to become an MP generally perceives that the only way to achieve change is by joining a political party. They have sold their soul to the party. Change can only be brought about by using one's soul/spirit so nothing happens. The laws, codes of practice, taxation rates etc are all set for the sole purpose of keeping the ruling party in power so the electorate is completely disenfranchised. The voters are merely pawns at the behest of the party propaganda machines. The prospective candidate may stand as an independent but their chance of success would be incredibly slim unless they own a TV station or have some extraordinary prominence in the community. If the latter then the salary of an MP probably would not interest them. They could form a political party themselves.

Party membership has dwindled considerably in the last few decades such that the Conservative party and the Labour party have about 150,000 and 500,000 members respectively out of an electorate of about 50 million. That sends a message in itself. But how many of these people are active members? Things have reached the farcical stage that, out of a constituency average electorate of about 75,000, prospective candidates can be nominated by a majority of about 50 active members. The candidate, assuming that he represents the party with the most outrageous campaign, could become an MP with less than 50 votes. He has no reason to campaign at all. Democracy eh! Wonderful isn't it! The parties vet the constituency nomination. Sorry! Wrong colour. Wrong sex.

During the progress of the farcical three-year Brexit debate some MPs were saying "I am awfully sorry Prime Minister, but I feel that I must resign as your Putative Principal Personal Private Grovelling Secretary." All because they disagreed with the party view. Surely that must be the height of patheticism. Such obsequious behaviour typifies the party system. The party always comes first. This must change.

Time wasting is a huge drawback of the party system. None more so than PM's question time. Let us examine this in a conversation between the education minister who attends question time and his wife. So what do you do on the day of question time? I generally read the educational press beforehand. For three hours! Well no I make phone calls as well and check the post. Nothing important. Nothing important, OKKKK. So what do you do in the afternoon? Well I have lunch, a few drinks, talk to friends and maybe relax afterwards answering constituent's letters. Relax from what? What do you mean? I mean that you just had a huge adrenaline rush with all the shouting,

raised voices and booing. It is similar to footballers in the old days getting drunk on Saturday night after the match, supporters too - they have had an adrenaline rush also. I reckon you have completely wasted a whole day when you could have served your country. This happens every week! Cough. Splutter.

I doubt whether the PM wants to attend question time. It is solely for the benefit of the opposition. What if there was no opposition?

Reflect on the Brexit marathon. MPs were more often found in TV studios than anywhere else. There were murmurings in corridors about their party's prospects. There were raised voices in the bar. There were time-wasting debates in chamber. What was achieved? Well the party consciousness brought the government to a standstill at one stage. Nothing is achieved for the electorate by the debates in chamber because they are fundamentally for the benefits of the parties to impose their agenda and, as a result too adversarial and time-consuming. Debates are televised to give the appearance of some meaningful activity. I am not fooled. The Brexit "debate" when all 650 MPs had their say was a joke. I could tell what party they represented when they stood up and that they were going to say what the past speaker from their party said – which proved to be the case. Complete time-wasting.

Any time, any second, an MP is aware of the party that they serve is time wasted when they could be thinking about the country's problems. I would love to see a more studious approach to parliament. Well you never know.....

Another aspect of the party system is that the MPs of the ruling party are living in fear. Fear of losing power which leads to short-term decision making – just enough to last five years. This conveniently leads to the greatest disadvantage of the party system which is long-term planning. In fact I don't think we have a long-term plan on anything in this country. Health service, care sector, education, judicial system, prisons, the role of the Police, our defence, power generation. No plans there! They are all in meltdown. We must act quickly.

My approach to a new system of parliament is purely a conceptual one without having any knowledge of how parliament works. Well it doesn't - does it! I consider this an advantage since my mind is clear for creation. I am coming from a spiritual perspective. So I am starting as if 67 million people are stuck on an island without a government. How do they form an effective communication system such that everybody feels involved and that help is not far away. Where smiles, grins and laughter are permitted under Section 23 of the Social Behaviour Act 2022. How do they create an atmosphere that is INCLUSIVE and SUSTAINABLE. Sorry I couldn't resist that! Can they achieve this twin objective without killing 90% of the population? Yes. Let's give it a go!

They decided to look inside themselves first to discover who they are and how they wish to interact with each other. They are conscious beings comprised of mind and soul/spirit occupying a human body.

The mind creates thoughts and soul/spirit creates emotions and their lives are a constant interplay between the two. The brain is just a tool for the mind. Their perception is their reality. Their current perception is based upon their thoughts and emotional experiences to date. They can change their reality by changing the way they think of themselves. They decided not to blame others for their reality until they have examined what their heart says first before pointing the finger. The heart is the seat of the soul/spirit. They decided that the aim of their society is for each citizen to reach harmony between mind and soul/spirit. They realised that increased self-awareness can only be achieved by internal enquiry. This can involve examination of their time line from birth. The time line will assist the citizen in understanding their current reality and recognise any imbalances which need amending in the progress towards harmony between mind

and soul/spirit.

They decided that, since each citizen is a conscious being comprised of mind and soul/spirit, then they will deal with others as equals since they are also conscious beings comprised of mind and soul/spirit. They decided to meet strangers giving them unconditional respect as equals. They decided that the only crime is that of disrespect. They realised that this approach will remove awareness of the colour of a person's skin, their religion, their sex and physical handicaps when interacting. This will avoid preconceptions. They decided that all cries of help from citizens will be answered since they realised that their community will be judged by other communities by how they treat the most vulnerable of their number.

They also realised the importance of dictating one's own feedback. One has to give what one wants to receive. Sounds weird but is true as I have experienced it. If one wants love one has to give it first and others will return it by imitation. If you want respect then give respect to others before it is returned to you. All the above were taught in schools.

They appreciated that a central assembly must be established to serve the requirements of the whole and interface with other earthly communities. They called this parliament.

So they divided the community into 650 parts called constituencies. I have no idea where they got that figure from! Elections were taken in these constituencies and the winner became an MP. No political parties! Prospective candidates must be over 35 so that they have some life's experience to contribute to parliament and live (not a second home!) in the constituency. The intention of the electorate in each constituency is to pick the most aware and creative individual in their midst. The voters did their best to research all the candidates so that their vote had value. They were aware that in other communities too much power had been given or taken by their parliaments which led to arrogance or tyranny so they wished to keep the system as devolved as much as possible.

The 650 new MPs voted for their PM since they had to work with the PM. The PM could be removed if a certain number of MPs object to the premiership. The PM, after installing a cabinet, announced to the voters what the parliament intended to achieve over the five-year term of parliament. Each following year the PM discussed departures from the plan and what they have achieved in the last year. After a settling-in period of one year of parliament, the major department heads were required to attend for one hour on TV to discuss their department. This happened every three months for each head and the appearances were spread evenly over the country..

They decided that parliament would install a free 24-hour day landline for contact with the voters called the "one-vote line" to demonstrate equality. The intention was to attract ideas and obtain information from the voters to assist the parliament in their task. People can interpret this as a rant line. That is OK because a rant imparts information and can give rise to new ideas. It was not supposed to be an "agony aunt" line. The caller must have exhausted all other avenues before making the call if they have a gripe since the operators are well paid.

The one-vote operators were hired for their compassion, intelligence, patience and flexibility. In short they were a cross between a Good Samaritan and a diplomat. They received a one-week course in the workings of parliament, councils, charities and made aware of the funding available to UK businesses. They were paid about £50,000 to £60,000 a year initially on six-month contracts since, at the beginning the MPs had no idea what the response would be from the voters.

They decided to install a website called Postboard. Its sole use being for announcements from the PM. Examples such as "the one-vote lines received 5,023 calls yesterday which has overloaded

our 45 operators, so please can you cut your calls today to enable our operators to ring the 1,963 callers who could not get through. Thank you.”

OR “the new business department (see below) is considering setting up a website called “Thames.” This website will only sell goods manufactured in the UK. In common with other websites named after rivers it will not pay tax in the UK. It will not pay any tax in the UK because parliament i.e. you will own it. Please go to the following website and vote as to whether you think this is a good idea. When you go to the website and vote you will see there is a section for people who voted yes to the idea to give their personal details if they wish to be involved in the project and they will be asked what they consider they can bring to the project. If you voted no there is a section for giving your reasons why not, which is optional. This site will be left open for 90 days. Thank you.”

OR on a quiet day. A football team is as good as its weakest player (Confucius)

OR After two years of negotiation with the French authorities we have agreed to accept 5,000 foreign citizens into the country who have been residing in Calais. We don't have their names yet.

OR The results of the recent survey about banning the manufacture of plastic ducks were 49,563 for and 1 (!) against.

OR Parliament wish to concentrate on the education system. We freely admit that because of the internet we haven't a clue how to educate you. So we invite replies from people who are aged 25 or under who are currently at school or have been through the UK school system. If your reply reads “it is crap” or “I hated it” we will treasure your reply but by itself it will not be enough to help the education of future generations. We really want to know the drawbacks of the existing system so if you didn't or don't like school please tell us why. Thank you. So we point you to the following website to complete a survey concentrating on how you obtain your knowledge and what are your interests.

We are not interested in your names because they are probably silly anyway, but you are welcome to give us your personal details if you wish to help us to improve the education system. We also want you to imagine what your childhood would have been like if you did not go to school. If we abolished school then we could save a lot of money couldn't we? We could pay for grandma's hip operation instead. There is no point in anybody wasting their time educating you if you are not interested in learning or do not understand the beauty of learning. Consider what you would do with yourselves if you didn't have to go to school – would you want to learn? Would you want to help your community?

We beg you to complete the survey for future pupils.

These are just a few examples of Postboard. Postboard can of course be used for referenda - most likely for moral issues involving, say, abortion law and capital punishment. The Postboard boss must have a sense of humour because he or she is in charge of the “one-vote line” operators, some of whom may be having a very bad day. He or she would also be in charge of receiving the results of surveys. He or she will also need to make postings every day on Postboard so humour is at a premium to keep the public interested so they will check it every day after the PM has approved the entries. I am trying to restrict the sexes to two for the sake of simplicity.

They realised that they needed a New Business Department (NBD) to be headed by a pro-active businessman or businesswoman of considerable experience in foreign trade, well-travelled, inspirational communicator and also an educator on the same salary as the PM. His or her brief was to act upon referrals from the “one-vote line” operators, develop and make contacts abroad to ascertain the needs of foreign trade ministers, check monthly import figures and what has been

imported and from which country. Basically to maximise the trade surplus. They needed to identify whether they could compete from scratch with the imports in-house or whether the product was already being made in the UK – in which case NBD called the importer to ascertain why they went abroad. They had to develop a system to obtain this information. The NBD was assigned to develop new businesses in the UK especially in areas of high unemployment and assist in training people in international trade and how to run a business in the UK. The NBD was paid by the government but was not under the ambit of a ministry although the NBD head may be asked to attend cabinet meetings. Staff were regularly interacting with other departments. The NBD head will be interviewed and appointed by the cabinet.

So, in outline, that is what the 67 million did.

I will continue in the present tense now. I will try to expand on what they did and why.

This following move I consider is fundamental since the “one vote lines” callers could be ringing about any topic so parliament must have everything covered so that the originator of the call has a reply from parliament in, within a reasonable period of, say, three weeks. All referrals must be attended to – otherwise the electorate will quickly lose confidence in the “one-vote lines”. The “one-vote line” operators will not give out a number direct to a caller – they will just take the caller's number and pass it on to the appropriate group or individual.

The Postboard boss, who hires and fires the “one-vote line” operators, will meet the new MPs (except the PM and the cabinet) and enquire as to their area of special interest. A list of, say, 200 categories will have already been chosen. The intention of the Postboard boss is to cover all the activities taking place in the UK and all the geographical locations in the world. The MPs do not require any prior knowledge of their chosen subject, which would be a bonus, but the subject must be interesting enough to occupy the mind of the MP for 5 years. The MPs should be allocated in minimum groups of 2 and probably a maximum of 7.

A specimen sample of categories could read as follows:-

- Youth recreation (3)
- Waste disposal (3)
- Autism – cause and education and work placement (3)
- Care of the physically handicapped (2)
- Care of the elderly (3)
- Engineering industry (3)
- Science and research (4)
- Retail sector (3)
- High streets (3)
- The environment- preservation mainly (2)
- Pollution (3)
- Banking sector (4)
- Cancer cures (4)
- Film and TV Industry - we want one! (4)
- International and national crime( specifically fraud and terrorism) (4)
- China (6)
- USA (6)
- Russia (4)
- EU (6)
- Brazil (4)
- Indonesia (4)
- New design for the NHS (7)
- Policing (3)

Prison system (3)  
New business ideas (3)  
Power generation (6)  
Rare minerals (3)  
Social media (5)  
Education system – create one that develops imagination (7)

That comes to 115 - so there are loads more. The MPs must be covering everything around the world and in the UK- that is the principle.

The above research will be their principal role. Every month they will meet and discuss their subject. They will invite others whose names have cropped up in their on-line studies. They will be paid day rates. The committee will be solely the MPs and nobody else would be salaried. Examples of invitees could be a journalist who is particularly knowledgeable about China, a doctor who has some very revealing views about the causes of autism and what jobs the autistic people are best suited to, a mother from Sunderland who has ideas about youth recreation, a corrupt ex-banker who wants to do some whistleblowing, a warder who has some ideas about finding work for ex prisoners or an ex-MP who is giving the benefit of their experiences. Just examples – basically anybody who has anything to contribute is welcome at these monthly meetings!

I think this would be immensely stimulating for the MPs because they will be learning so fast. I know how it feels because I have done over 2,000 hours research on-line in the last year which is more than I did on a 3-year degree course. I have a degree in the illusion created by GR. The MPs can contribute to parliament in debates on their chosen subject which is obviously good for the ego. The minutes of every monthly meeting on every subject will be mail-merged to all the other MPs. So that is about 200 emails a month received by each MP! At this stage the parliament will be buzzing. Information overload! But everybody will be up-to-date and unencumbered by party consciousness. They would be freely expressing and so would the populace after they have recovered from GR and the Covid scam. That's the aim. All freely expressing and gagging to learn new things. Needless to say there will be knowledge discovered by one group of MPs which will be of interest to another research group – this MUST be shared.

The debates in chamber are so formalised, boring, and, as explained earlier, incredibly time-wasting that I wonder whether we actually need MPs at all. This occurred to me half-way into the 3-year debate on Brexit. Hang on – who is running this country - I thought? It certainly can't be the MPs with blank time sheets for 3 years. The Civil Service? Or maybe the country just runs itself with all the countless laws put in place so we don't need MPs who have sold their soul/spirit to the party. No creativity there. Hence every activity in the country is in a complete mess.

Surely there must be a more efficacious method of passing motions and resolutions. A new motion emanates from the PM's office and is emailed to all the MPs. The MP has the following choices:-

Box 1 tick if agreeing to the motion  
Box 2 tick if disagreeing with the motion  
Box 3 tick if abstaining  
Box 4 tick if wishing to debate in chamber thereby leaving boxes (1) to (3) blank.

The PM will have agreed with the MPs what percentage of the MPs will give rise to a debate – could be 10% for example. All the MPs within a month will know what has happened in the other 199 monthly meetings, or, at least, have constructive notice if they have not read their emails. They therefore will be aware of most of the issues put forward in the PM's motions unless there are other issues that arise in which case most MPs will probably opt for a debate. There will be a vote in the chamber after the closure of a debate – the result of which will supersede the prior email voting. The MPs can create a motion themselves by contacting the PM's office. The PM, if happy, will

circulate the motion to all the MPs.

I do not see any virtue in a recess. I disagree with a complete closure of parliament. I feel that MPs should have, say, 5 weeks holiday per annum and they can take them any time during the year outside the weeks allotted for chamber debates. These could be, in a "normal year", four blocks of two weeks dotted throughout the year. Approval for MP's holidays will be given by the PM and the PM's Principal Private Secretary (PPS). A record of holidays will be kept by the PPS.

In summary, the MPs are required to be in parliament for 8 weeks plus 12 monthly meetings with their research colleagues. The rest of the time can be spent in their constituency doing research, dealing with local issues, reading minutes from other MPs' research projects and corresponding with their own colleagues. They will also be doing site visits in relation to their research and interacting with ministries along with replying to callers on the "one-vote lines". The relocation of MPs to their constituency means that they remain grounded at a grass roots level. This removes the risk of acquiring a cloak of hubris currently experienced by association with fellow gang members and the grandeur of the London office.

This working arrangement makes the MP's staff in Westminster redundant as the staffing would be arranged in the constituency. The aim is to devolve more power to the constituencies. The cabinet ministers would be full time employed in London including some MPs they may second to their department.

The MPs would be made titular heads of their local council. They would work with the council leader on a budget for income and expenditure for their constituency and submit to their personal contact at the Treasury by 28 February for the following year ended 31 March. Every month, say by the 15<sup>th</sup> following the month end, an actual income and expenditure will be submitted to the Treasury contact alongside the budget with explanations for variances over 10%. It would be wise, if only at the beginning, for the MP to actually meet their Treasury contact so that a personal relationship is established and for the contact to visit the constituency. This makes the figures come alive to the Treasury employee rather than some mumbo jumbo. It would be desirable if the Treasury contacts originated from the same areas as that of the MP's constituency.

The MPs would be advised to keep time sheets for themselves since their job is completely new and they would assist in spotting the reason for overwork and filling unoccupied time.

The new MPs will be providing added value to the parliament over and above those with party consciousness in residence at present, so they merit a higher salary. I suggest the following salaries to incentivise those people that are creative and aware who wish to stand for parliament:-

The PM and NBD chief £500,000 per annum

The Chancellor £400,000 per annum

MPs £150,000 per annum

I cannot really comment on any others since I am unaware of the respective responsibilities and workload of the other ministries.

The independence of the MPs will completely change the parliament's relationship with the Mainstream Media (MSM). Currently, MPs and those working in the party HQ are very sensitive to criticism from the MSM since it is a threat to their power base. Independent MPs will be able to move freely without fear amongst the electorate. They will have no reservation about expressing their views in public since these are personal views and not those of a party where discretion would be at a premium. They can be utterly themselves in front of the press or in a conversation in a pub. The "one-vote" lines encourage the electorate to speak freely so one can hardly deny the MPs free speech.

The “free” movement of MPs will be a great PR exercise since the electorate, who often see issues in black and white, will see that everything is a sea of different shades of grey and will be educated, as a result. They will also see that their MP is reachable and cares about the constituents. They will not feel constrained by a more formal meeting at the MP's surgery. The MP will spend more time in the constituency than they do now under the current party system.

Political parties set themselves up to be shot down due to their arrogance which is why the adversarial interaction between the two major parties spreads to their interaction with the press, which too becomes polarised. This polarises the electorate but most of them are so apathetic about politics because they know that they are completely disenfranchised. The press really are not very constructive since most articles are negative. The system with independent MPs will remove any control of the conduct of parliament from the MSM. There really is little mileage in a journalist criticising an MP for some minor behavioural issue when there are another 649 to pursue. Much better if it could affect 360 MPs from one party. The journalist, under the independent system, will have to produce well-researched, balanced articles on issues that benefit the UK population which could lead to them being asked to attend MP's research meetings on day rates. This will give kudos to the newspaper if their staff are advising parliament. The press will be working towards the same end – to improve our lot!

There are 67 million people out there who are now enfranchised after having disenfranchised for centuries. They, initially, probably will not realise this. Power is not in the exercising but having the ability to exercise. They don't have to phone the “one-vote lines” - but they can if they wish. This option not being previously available. The electorate have lost the ability to vote for the PM but have received an open line to parliament – which country's citizens have that? They also have the choice of the individual they want to represent them. I suspect that most people vote for the party currently without having a clue as to the identity of their MP (as I do).

Are you still sceptical? I haven't started yet!

Postboard entry - Armageddon minus 30.

Message for the management of Glyphosate Infected Foods Ltd. I have been informed of certain nefarious practices conducted by your company which I set out below. If these practices have not ceased within 29 days then I will enter the following message on Postboard in 30 days time:-

“ due to the following unacceptable practices being operated by Glyphosate Infected Foods Limited, citizens (67 million) are advised to shop elsewhere for food.”

If you feel I am being unfair then please feel free to phone the “one-vote line” and ask the operator to give your contact number to the MPs dealing with the Retail Sector and mark it as “urgent”. Thank you. Lack of knowledge of Postboard is not an excuse!”

How's that? There were 25 phone calls to the “one-vote lines” on this matter of which 7 were referred to the Retail Sector MPs -18 callers were told that referrals had been made so they were happy. The relevant MPs took three days contacting the callers, two days in the PM's office and then the following day on Postboard. 6 days - no legal fees or lengthy court hearings. God! I love capitalism!

Is that exercising power? The PM is not telling the citizens to continue shopping at the stores. It is their choice whether they listen to parliament.

Postboard Entry - 3 months after the last election

## Message to the constituents of Rackham South

Your MP has admitted that he works for Common Purpose (CP), a treasonous charity whose aim is to subvert the progress of democracy in the UK. CP has connections with the EU and have been working to destroy us along with GR. These people are not allowed to hold higher offices. There will have to be a by-election.

These people are greedy, soulless and without compassion. They are easy to spot. I know it was the first election for you under the new system, but please try a little harder this time. By-election date to be announced in the next month.

It is advisable for the Postboard entries each day to be read out on TV and Radio News at times considered appropriate by the station to keep people informed who don't use the internet much, or at all. Postboard entries should be between 1 and 5 entries per day. Not too many, but not too few.

The single most important realisation or insight that underlies everything I have written is that we are conscious beings comprised of mind and soul/spirit. I leave you to think about this. I have written "Our Problem" which I strongly encourage you to read after this. For a long time I couldn't explain or classify it. I suppose the best way of describing it is a guide to problem-solving. I am suggesting to the one-votes that they can solve an awful lot of problems themselves without leaving everything to others. The past failure to do this is based upon laziness and, as a result, the one-votes have created a "nanny-state".

Nanny has got nasty now and is busy restricting all their freedoms with legislation, destroying their families, friendships, their businesses and is bent on bankrupting their country. Nanny is telling the most incredible lies and the one-votes still believe them. They have lost their power of critical thought. Many have died and many, many more injured for life.

Did you know that mask-wearing, social distancing, lockdowns and hand-cleansing are procedures in introducing neophytes to a satanic cult? Since all these were completely unnecessary one has to question why they were introduced. That is why. A well-kept secret. Nanny is a lot nastier than she appears to be!

The 67 million introduced the concept that the only crime is that of disrespect. This resulted from their acknowledgement that there are just so many crimes now that most people are criminals. This has given the police and the court system an impossible task. The system needs to be simplified. So the only one of meaning to their future community is lack of respect to another which specifically includes lack of self-respect. Lack of self-respect hinders citizens from respecting others which can lead to crimes of disrespect to others. The aim of the new community is for all the members to harmonise the mind and soul/spirit. This is their personal quest. I think there are far too many people in prison now because of society's blinkered approach to crime. The courts, police and the prison system should be concentrating on harmonising everybody such that crimes will not exist. Please refer to "Our Problem" where there are copious examples and sketches involving crimes.

So the electorate have disposed of political parties. They have spent considerable time on deciding who is the most appropriate individual to represent them as their MP - thereby showing respect to the successful candidate. The MPs have returned that respect by opening the one-vote line. The voters MUST do the research on the prospective candidates to find the individual best suited to sorting out the mess this country is in. That is the primary objective of an MP. I don't care if the turnout is only 10% - at least I will know that 10% of the electorate care and have given a positive vote - although 10% is disappointing! If voters can't make up their minds, don't care about elections, can't be bothered, I will just vote for what Dad or Mum says, then please DON'T vote. It shows disrespect to the electoral system if you do! The system is asking the voters for positive

votes. The system is asking the voters to give of themselves – read all the websites, go to hustings, listen to candidates at the door, read leaflets, talk to others. Believe in the new system and believe that you made the best choice. If you don't make the effort then how can you expect the MPs to respect you? There is no room for apathy or laziness. I want this country to buzz!!!

The prospective candidates are baring themselves in front of the electorate. To be able to do this they must have conducted a lot of self-enquiry – which is great because they are increasing their self-awareness as a consequence. They are exploring what makes them a suitable candidate and what special attributes they can bring to parliament. They are deciding their best approach to the campaign. Are they better at one-to-one or writing a website or behind a microphone or in debate? Lots of soul searching - very healthy! An unsuccessful candidate may not be disappointed because, if they attracted attention for a particular reason, parliament may wish to hire them, but just not as an MP.

The current MPs should be disqualified from standing for parliament in the first election under the new system (so 5 years). There are a number of reasons for this:-

- (1) they are under a shroud of party consciousness. This needs time to heal. They need to freely express themselves in parliament.
- (2) I am not aware of any MP who did any research on-line about GR. That is a conspicuous omission. If they did then they were too cowardly to speak out.
- (3) all the political parties are serving the GR agenda by their actions or inaction so that, by association, makes every MP culpable for our demise and the consequent deaths and injuries (mental, physical or both).
- (4) many MPs are committing fraud, deception and are guilty of more serious offences.

Any person found working for, or has worked for, CP should be disqualified for holding high office anywhere in the UK for life.

I have no idea what the readers are thinking right now. Let me emphasise that all the political parties are responsible for this demise. How are voters placed at the next election after nearly 2 more years of evidence has been placed before them. Which party should I vote for? To hell with it! I won't vote. Well I could vote for an independent. Which is precisely what I am saying. There is no party system left as they are all controlled by GR and CP. Now is precisely the time to change the face of parliament. Now.

It is only with new faces that corruption in every facet of our country can be removed. Otherwise we have the ridiculous position whereby in 2024 the same party or another party purports to remove the corruption which all parties have created. Doesn't make sense does it? Another party makes no sense either. PR is pointless as you still have parties. Who is going to finance a new party (or worse - new parties!) ? Are they going to reveal the source of their donations. It is hell revisited. We know what it is like. We are in it now. It is a long time since we had an independent enquiry into anything in the UK. Let's do it now.

The first thing the new PM must do is order an audit of the Treasury and the NHS finances. Test our water and foods consumed, the injections administered by dentists, the air et al. Do we still have our gold reserves? £225 billion value was the last I heard. Have they been mortgaged as collateral against loans. Who has loaned the UK all the Covid funds? There will be many skeletons. What are our assets and liabilities? What is our opening balance sheet? What off-balance sheet commitments have been made?

We cannot wait until 2024 when we will have no freedom left and more and more people will die and be injured unnecessarily.

We need MPs who are aware. who think outside the box, who respect the electorate and the sanctity of the individual. We need MPs who bring love, empathy and compassion to bear in the performance of their work. It is only these people who can remove the stench of corruption that pervades this country.

Fellow one-vote.

Please read “Our Problem”

13 March 2022



