

Bringing democracy into disrepute. The quangocracy's case against London Mayor Ken Livingstone should be thrown out of court.

Senate to confirm Brett Kavanaugh to the U. Supreme Court, calling on the House Judiciary Committee to begin immediate hearings on whether to impeach Judge Brett Kavanaugh on multiple counts of sexual assault, perjury, and bringing the judiciary into disrepute. Evidence has emerged that Justice Kavanaugh lied repeatedly under oath to the U. Senate Judiciary Committee in his and confirmation hearings to serve on the U. Court of Appeals for the D. Circuit and in his confirmation hearings to serve on the U. Furthermore, during the Supreme Court confirmation process, the Senate received credible testimony that Justice Kavanaugh committed sexual assault in his past. The petition calls on The House Judiciary Committee to conduct a full factual investigation of these allegations. Christine Blasey Ford has presented powerful and credible testimony that Brett Kavanaugh sexually assaulted her when she was 15 years old. And, there are serious allegations from two other women that he committed other acts of sexual violence. All of this warrants an immediate impeachment investigation. Senate has recklessly confirmed Judge Kavanaugh to the U. Supreme Court, the evidence remains that he committed perjury multiple times during these hearings and during his nomination hearings in and for a seat on the U. It is imperative for the House Judiciary Committee to begin an impeachment investigation of Justice Kavanaugh. A judicial officer who has committed perjury, let alone sexual assault, does not belong on the Supreme Court or on any court in America. The Senate rushed through this process without taking the opportunity to conduct a real investigation of the serious charges against Kavanaugh. Congress must begin an impeachment investigation of Judge Kavanaugh immediately. Supreme Court Justices, can be impeached and removed from the judiciary for committing perjury and other offenses. Federal Judge Thomas Porteous was impeached by the U. House and convicted by the U. Senate in on grounds which included that he "knowingly made material false statements about his past to In , the New York Commission on Judicial Conduct determined that a state family court judge, then 65 years old, should be removed from office because of a sexual assault that he had committed at age 25, 13 years before entering the judiciary. The Framers of the U. Constitution understood that corruption in the process of obtaining a federal office is an impeachable offense. In the constitutional debates over the impeachment power, George Mason asked rhetorically: Supreme Court and his former position on the U. Circuit, should, as with Judge Porteous, lead to his removal from the federal judiciary and should disqualify him from ever holding a future federal office. For more information or to sign the petition, visit: This is the world we cover. Because of people like you, another world is possible. There are many battles to be won, but we will battle them togetherâ€”all of us. Common Dreams is not your normal news site. We want the world to be a better place. If you can help todayâ€”because every gift of every size mattersâ€”please do.

Chapter 2 : "Discipline the rascals who are bringing the Labour Party into disrepute" "Labour Party"

Special Investigators must avoid personal or private discussions with interviewees which would bring into disrepute the administration of justice, and refrain from asking questions solely to embarrass, insult, abuse, belittle or demean an individual.

The charges against you seemed to be particularly crude and hastily thrown together. Why do you think the right responded in such an amateur, sloppy fashion? Over-confidence, or the need to score a swift high-profile scalp in the aftermath of a disastrous conference for them? The right has developed an overabundance of confidence. The slapdash manner " to say the least " that they employed to exclude, suspend or expel other members of the Labour Party convinced them that they were invulnerable; they thought they could get away with anything! It was a particularly bad piece of fiction, not doubt. But it would require a meticulous textual analysis to compare this letter with other letters sent to party members to establish whether they were especially careless in my case. I suspect you would find that they were just as slapdash and shoddy with most people as they were with me. How important was the surge of support you received from individual party members and organisations like CLPs, etc? There have also been many rumours of disquiet at top levels of the party and anger against McNicol and his compliance unit. Was it a combination of pressure from above and below that explains your victory? The support that people offered me was amazing. It was a major factor in their efforts to quickly wriggle out of the hole which they had dug for themselves. The solidarity offered from comrades in the movement here was wonderful; but of particular significance was the international campaign. This started in the United States and continues to grow. The scale of this solidarity is truly astonishing. The number of signatures " and the political and academic standing of individuals who have signed up " is truly humbling, from my point of view. However, I am not so vain to think this is all about me! Even after my expulsion was rescinded and the news announced, very large numbers were still signing up to the international online petition in support of reinstatement and investigation of the procedure used to expel me. I think the international support " once the witch-hunters got wind of it " was instrumental in making the leadership realise that the actions of these people were sinking the Labour Party into serious disrepute " not only nationally, but internationally. We are talking now about a surge of support from below here. There were also quite a few rumours that leading members of the party expressed genuine disquiet about this whole fiasco. I have not been contacted by anyone from this level of the party, I have no strong evidence " however, there have been enough unconfirmed reports to assume that the idea is not totally fanciful. How important do you regard it that they withdraw this accusation? It was broadcast, in that sense. Now this is a very serious thing! It is serious morally; it is serious legally. Of course, they have prevaricated with the ploy that this charge of anti-Semitism is based on some junk definition that they appear to set a lot of store by. Frankly, the so-called definition is a load of rubbish. It is specifically designed for abuse, not to identify genuine anti-Semitism. Throughout the exchanges with the witch hunters, I have been clear that I reserve my right to take things further legally. However, first I require an immediate apology and retraction. There was a general feeling that the witch hunters had torn off more than they could chew this time " and so it proved! But there are many comrades out there that have been suspended, expelled. What are the next steps in the fightback? We still have some powerful resourced enemies out there! Well, la luta continua! There is an urgent need to discipline the rascals who are bringing the Labour Party into disrepute with these scurrilous and unfounded accusations. It is a question of disciplining these individuals. This is important, but there are three additional political points. This cannot be allowed to continue. This is calumny on the Labour Party! This must be fought and stopped dead in its tracks. This vile campaign must be defeated and expunged from the party. What needs to be done here is a fundamental overhaul of the clause in the Labour Party rule book that allows these bans and proscriptions. The rule is formulated in such a way that it virtually cries out for abuse. Let me quote it to you: For instance, it is certainly arguable that CND is a political organisation. By the same token, the Palestine Solidarity Campaign is a political organisation. Does membership of these organisations make you ineligible for membership of the party? For instance, when they accused me of supporting the Communist Party of Great

Britain and Labour Party Marxists, I was genuinely not able to say yes or no to the charges. For example, I support the call for all unions to be affiliated to Labour: The CPGB has argued this quite forcibly against other groups on the left and I think they are right! So how can someone be expelled let alone automatically expelled! A member is expelled without any chance to defend themselves, to answer their accusers or even know who has said what about them. This runs counter to natural justice. I do seem to recall that not long ago a certain Anthony Blair falling the wrong side of this rule in the general election no action was taken, I believe! They are badly formulated:

Chapter 3 : Bring Into Disrepute | Definition of Bring Into Disrepute by Merriam-Webster

This embarrassing incident will bring the entire committee into disrepute. My bankruptcy brought me into disrepute.

A reckless and cavalier abuse of democracy: Superficially it has the appearance of a great democratic event. In reality it risks bringing democracy into disrepute. In the wake of the vote for Brexit, Kenneth Rogoff, a professor of economics and public policy at Harvard University, has written an excellent, thoughtful article on this: What follows is largely my own reiteration and comment on his argument. At the outset it is important to be clear about two things. The first is that I unequivocally believe in democracy. As I suggest below and as Rogoff argues it was actually a fairly terrible way of going about the decision. Secondly, it needs to be emphasized that the question posed by the referendum was not a typical political issue. The gravity, importance and implications of the result were repeatedly discussed during the campaign although little of this resonated with the wider public. The overwhelming majority of legal, constitutional, economic and financial experts warned of the dangers of Brexit, both in the short and long term; at the very least, this was an indication that the issue needed to be treated with great care and thoughtful consideration. It is right that in a democracy questions of such fundamental importance as EU membership are decided democratically. But was a referendum the best way of doing so? And if referenda are in general a good way of making some political decisions, was the specific vote over EU membership a good example of a referendum? To answer the first question it is important to distinguish between two forms of democracy: Direct democracy involves the people or, more typically, those people who qualify as citizens as a whole deciding on policy. There are few examples of direct democracy: Some modern democracies notably Switzerland and some constituent states of the USA resort to direct democracy through referenda on various issues, but no modern democratic system can be described as a direct democracy. The British political system is an example of a representative democracy: There are very good reasons why representative democracy is vastly preferable to direct democracy. Unlike ancient Athens, modern democracies are not small city-states in which the labour of women, slaves and foreigners enables the small number of citizens to participate in politics; they are large, highly complex societies and economies in which universal participation in politics would be impossibly unwieldy, beyond the capacity of most individuals to make informed decisions, and fraught with political risk. Representative democracy, by entrusting decision-making to elected officials dedicated to the sophisticated and difficult task of politics, is a rational and sensible arrangement for modern society and one that minimizes the risks of direct democracy. The EU referendum illustrates some of the risks of direct democracy. On an issue of long-term and national importance, a fraction over half the voters and little more than a third of the electorate has overruled the wishes of a fraction under half the voters and nearly two thirds of the electorate. It invited members of the public to decide on an issue likely to lead to national and international instability, with unpredictable risks and dangers both to Britain and the wider world. Many British citizens are educated and well informed, and are capable of weighing up the issues in a balanced, intelligent, critical and careful way. But many more are not. It is clear that many voters had little real idea of the issues; many voters engage rarely, if at all, in political debate, and, in so far as they do, rely on tabloid newspapers for their political information. Furthermore, there is the possibility that extraneous and irrelevant factors the weather on polling day, the national mood in relation to Euro , prejudice against immigrants that had nothing to do with the EU debate, a vote against Cameron or a vote for Boris rather than a vote on EU membership , a vote based on no more than instinct or emotion played a part. The referendum delivered, therefore, a snapshot of a deeply divided public mood on a particular day, and a result that statistically involved only a tiny margin between those who voted Leave and those who voted Remain. And yet the result is likely to affect many millions both in Britain and abroad who did not vote, as well as generations of people to come. In other words, the problem was not so much that a referendum was held in the first place, but rather that the specific EU referendum was fundamentally flawed in its design and conception. In a robust democracy, even comparatively minor issues go through rigorous and careful procedures. Checks and balances are built into the process. Legislation is debated and voted on several times; it has to pass through committees and both houses of parliament; and bad

legislation can be amended or repealed. Select committees scrutinize the work of the executive; parliament holds the government to account. In other words, for all its problems, idiosyncrasies and weaknesses, parliament works according to procedures designed to ensure political decisions come under thoughtful consideration and are not rushed. Even for minor laws, parliamentary procedure is robust and rigorous, embodying important checks and balances. The debate over EU membership is far from a minor issue; on the contrary it is the most important in recent British politics. Yet it is hard to claim that the referendum was designed with the robustness and rigour normally found in British political decision-making. To allow a decision of this magnitude to be reached by a simple majority of the public on a single day after a campaign of a few weeks and of extremely poor quality would seem laughable if it were not so tragic. The absurdity of this was compounded by the fact that the electorate were offered the option to leave the EU but without any proper debate or information about what would happen if that option was as it turned out to be successful. In effect the referendum was offering two paths, but one of which was blind, difficult and lacking in any map or guide. For all this the Prime Minister bears a heavy responsibility. For it was Cameron who pledged a referendumâ€”not for democratic reasons but in the expectation that by doing so he would end divisions within his own party and see off the threat of UKIP instead, in a grim irony, he exacerbated divisions and handed victory to UKIP. Worse than his high stakes gambleâ€”he bet the nation, and possibly Europe, in order to win a narrow tactical victoryâ€”was the reckless and ill-considered design of the referendum itself. There were various ways in which he could have built checks and balances into the process: But he did none of these things, doubtless fearful of antagonizing UKIP and the right-wing of his own party. The referendum was a hubristic abuse of democracy on the part of Cameron that threatens to bring democracy itself into disrepute. However, an important note needs to be added to the above. In a campaign of extensive mendacity, the Leave campaign did not have a monopoly on lies: Not only did this not happenâ€”it was never likely to, and was presumably a dishonest but unsuccessful campaigning scare tacticâ€”but the claim was fundamentally dishonest in the first place.

Chapter 4 : Bringing the Office of the First Lady into Disrepute - racedaydvl.com

Definition of bring into disrepute formal: to give (something) a bad name The star player's drug use will bring the game into disrepute.

The question was raised following my last commentary. Billions of public money are involved in a time of austerity and financial crises. The European Council, the Council of Ministers and the Parliament could all be potential offenders and taken to Court. Further they are considering how to decide on the use of the tax money in secret. They do not only refuse to tell the public what is going on but they physically exclude the public and the press from meetings. This procedure is illegal. Right of entry or observation is involved. Legal action could be taken at this starting point. Politically the exclusion is also neo-Gaullist. It is completely against the democratic principles of the supranational Community system where every cent could be accounted for "democratically". A good prima facie case can be made for bringing a case for illegal action. Firstly, to exclude the public and press from the Conciliation Committee is illegal. This clearly falls foul of Article The Conciliation Committee agenda describes exactly the offending action: Considering draft legislation is its purpose and that exactly falls under article The Treaty paragraph says that an institutional consideration of draft legislation by Council or Parliament must be open. It is illegal to exclude the press and the public. The press and any member of the public has the perfect right to complain to the Court. The European Council was also considering draft financial legislation. They claim that are not covered by They are definitely covered by the article 15 as a whole. The previous line, The first article, Article 7 demands consistency between policies and actions. Thus the institutions should have consistent rules on open sessions and open formats. We have also definite proof in the handout signed by the 12 government leaders that the budget increase should be held to 2. They had a long discussion, that is, a consideration of draft financial legislation. They got deeply into details. We have the evidence of the financial discussions initiated by the President of the Parliament and the long discussion with him as further proof. He told the press afterwards he had never had such a long and detailed discussion with the European Council before. He told the press some of the details. What if we later found out that all the discussants were Mafiosi or were subject to inter-State blackmail? General principles mean the initial consideration of draft financial legislation. Outside the raw discussion of euros and cents, the European Council also discussed matters of mega-fraud. This involves the sum of more than billion euros for a rescue operation. It sparked a lot of criticism. Are the government leaders solving the problem or compounding it? Are they partners in crime? Is there a question of collusion in crime? That is not only my question but one lying before the German Constitutional Court. The topic came up because one Member State at least fraudulently changed national statistics. Secondly, the State then misspent public money. Thirdly, when the chickens came home to roost, other States helped out that fraudulent State. Why did the other Member States bail out this fraud and possibly those of other Member States who did the same thing. The German Constitutional Court is considering aspects of the matter at the moment. That is the reason why Treaty changes are necessary "because the bailout may well be illegal as it is based on supporting and committing fraud in support of other fraud. Some governments feel that stronger measures against fraud should be written in a Treaty. No one denies Treaty changes were also discussed. As a general principle, should not the public know about this? Why should the fact be secret? The public has another reason for insisting on openness, a procedural one. That is like blaming bureaucrats and not the politicians who demand certain things are done. Or blaming soldiers and not the generals who order them to commit atrocities. That meeting of the Conciliation Committee should be open without doubt. And therefore so should the European Council on which the Belgian Prime Minister sits, and the President of Parliament comes to discuss exactly the same matter with the other 26 government leaders. The moral argument is also important. There is case law. The public has a right to know everything about the raising of taxes and the use of its money. Representatives of the public should not close the doors on the public at any whim. This is especially the case when they are dividing up public money and deciding how much they should tax the public. It is not their pocket money. The European Court has upheld the legal necessity of proper consultation before all legislation. Without proper

consultation previously legislation was thrown out and voided. One important ruling was in the Isoglucose case in the s. On the basis of this Parliament insisted that direct elections should take place. They were in the Treaties but had been refused for decades. Nominations were the Gaullist way to keep democracy down. The case was won by Pierre-Henri Teitgen arguing the case in favour of the power of a democratic Parliament and its prerogatives. Pierre-Henri Teitgen was a close friend of Robert Schuman in whose government he was a key minister. He was an eminent lawyer. He was later judge in the European Court of Human Rights , an institution that he was instrumental in creating. The Court said full procedural consultation was necessary before legislation could be declared valid. Consultation with the public in the budget discussions was denied by physically closing doors. An official had a list of those who were allowed to enter. All others were refused. This exclusion of the public at 2. Any other repetition at a Conciliation Committee is also illegal. The public is therefore welcome to come in great numbers to try to attend the next Conciliation Committee meetings. The dates are the 4, 8 and 11 November. For details journalists should contact the Parliament: The public is more than a partner in the legislation. It is the owner of the money and the boss of the people inside and running the institutions, such as European Council, Council of Ministers, Parliament and the Consultative Committees. It is no small matter. Improper raising of taxes is the cause of centuries of parliamentary struggles, wars and regicide. It led eventually to much of modern governmental law and legitimacy. Legally this issue of open public access and shut doors at institutional meetings on the budget is an open and shut case. The question only remains: Who will take up the case?

Chapter 5 : Moonlighting MPs bring Parliament into disrepute | Morning Star

"Discipline the rascals who are bringing the Labour Party into disrepute" November 2, November 2, expulsion, Labour Party, Moshe Machover New interview with Israeli Jewish socialist Mosh A© Machover whose rescinded expulsion is a major blow the right in the Labour Party.

Second, they often get these extra jobs because they are MPs and the moonlighting is filled with conflicts of interest that distort democracy. Phillips has been deputy editor of The House magazine, a glossy weekly aimed at MPs which has been owned by Ashcroft since last October. Phillips says the work takes two hours per month. The glossy magazine specialises in publishing positive profiles of MPs illustrated with attractive, well-lit photographs of them. The Dods Group publishes The House and the PoliticsHome website and runs a very extensive set of meetings at party conferences which bring together MPs and corporate sponsors. Both The House and Dods meetings have a cash-for-access feel to them, offering corporations a route to reach MPs. It looks like he bought the Dods Group to build his political influence and increase his political connections. Ashcroft bought Dods, the publisher of The House magazine, after he fell out with Cameron in Ashcroft was enraged Cameron would not make him a minister because of his offshore tax arrangements. Ashcroft suspended his donations to the Tory Party and began expanding his media interests. Ashcroft uses ConservativeHome to have a platform inside the Tory Party. Brady is a powerful Conservative MP because he is chair of the Committee which represents the interests of all Tory backbenchers. A PPS is not a ministerial role, so avoiding such a strict conflict of interest role, but it is an important job shaping Department for Education policy. Vouch puts on corporate events and does business-to-business marketing. Its clients include firms with an interest in education policy. Murdoch has made a number of failed attempts to run British schools. Warburton is chairman of Vouch. The firm uses his position as an MP in its marketing. This June he ran events at the Cannes Lions International Festival of Creativity " this is an advertising festival at the glamorous south-of-France city. You can follow him on Twitter SolHughesWriter.

bring into disrepute as in discredit Relevance ranks synonyms and suggests the best matches based on how closely a synonym's sense matches the sense you selected.

Bringing them into disrepute? They are doing a good enough job of that themselves. By investigating it and making the events public, we are both penalising you and providing a deterrent. There may be other yokels out there who might consider mooning the Prime Minister and we must put a stop to that. The community and the Prime Minister must be protected from yobbos who think they can just flash moons willy nilly. Their reaction is to attack more vigorously on all fronts. There were a couple of really memorable moments in these kangaroo courts I was accused in. Would you consider it fair to deny a convicted man appealing the decision "the record of his own trial? An appeal was lodged and the payment for transcript was made. When you take into account an appeal can contain no extra evidence, an appeal can only allege that an error was made in the original trial. The only evidence that can be used is the original trial record. Would any person consider it proper and legal to prevent the convicted man getting the trial record? What are they hiding? If the decision reached was legitimate, then why hide the audio? It needs to be released. The only conclusion that can be drawn from their refusal to hand it over is that it exposes the proceedings as a sham. It proves my version correct. My Barrister was in on the fix So after preparing my appeal documents before I had even heard the decision reached in Brisbane circus court some advice came in. Better get a lawyer son. Better get a real good one. This chick from South Australia who pretends to be a barrister probably means the one who makes coffee and wondered why I had given her 8 grand and a bunch of forms. An assertion one would consider most relevant considering the whole trial was about me importing these allegedly illegal things. But your honour "these things are on sale legally in Australia here " here and here. I can prove it. The District court judge asked the prosecution if they objected and the prosecution said they objected to me presenting that evidence. The Judge ruled I could not present the evidence, because the prosecution said Nu -uh.

Chapter 7 : Democracy in America, part 1: What's wrong with gerrymandering? | openDemocracy

In reality it risks bringing democracy into disrepute. In the wake of the vote for Brexit, Kenneth Rogoff, a professor of economics and public policy at Harvard University, has written an excellent, thoughtful article on this: ' Britain's Democratic Failure '.

Stein Ringen 20 October Introducing a system that enables the powerful to cheat democracy and to disenfranchise voters. American democracy has always been messy, rough and unruly. The political process has suffered under rampant manipulation, cheating and corruption. Today, by common consensus, the American political system is dysfunctional and Washington bogged down in gridlock. Dysfunction strikes deeper than good old rough politics. It is not only a matter of disorder in Congress, the presidency and the Supreme Court. Beneath is a problem of power. The disorder that is visible in governance is a result of power being sucked out of the constitutional system and of a political culture that has abandoned inclusiveness and fairness. If so, is the consequence not only dysfunction in Washington but also decline for America? When the American voters go to the polls on November 4, they will elect members of Congress, all of whom have to stand for election every second year. But in almost all of the districts the outcome will long since have been decided and there is no competition on election day. As many as seats are entirely safe for the Republicans and for the Democrats and another 26 almost safe. That leaves 40 seats in the middle that are up for grabs. Depending on the economic, racial, ethnic or age-wise composition of the district population, there may be a safe majority one way or the other. In districts with a mixed demography, the election can go either way. There are many reasons why districts are distinct in demography. People who resemble each other cluster together in where they live. The rich like to have other rich people as neighbours, the poor must live where they can afford to, retirees move to comfortable retirement areas and so on. An additional reason is gerrymandering. To gerrymander is to manipulate the boundaries of an election district so as to advantage one party. The American system is perfect for this trickery although gerrymandering occurs in many other democracies as well. Early in each decade, following the census, congressional election districts are redrawn as a result of population movements since the last census. And so are election districts for state senators and representatives. The authority over redistricting is in each state. Who controls the state, controls redistricting. Gerrymandering is an original sin that is as old as democracy in America. The habit is as prevalent today as it ever was. Congressional districts from one state to another look bizarre when mapped out, stretching up and down and back and forth across the state, zigzagging the boundaries so as to include, exclude or cut through neighborhoods as they go. The problem is probably getting more acute. Party strategists are getting more savvy and competent, and have better data and computer tools to work with. Small but strategic twigs of district borders can add up to big effects. The extent of gerrymandering cannot be specified since district borders may be manipulated more or less. But there is enough of it to affect election outcomes. In the congressional elections, the Democrats won 51 percent of the House vote but fell 17 seats short of a majority. Political scientists have estimated that they lost somewhere between 5 and 15 seats as a result of gerrymandering. In the absence of gerrymandering, more congressional districts would be up for grabs on election day, perhaps twice as many. Gerrymandering causes a range of democratic problems: That some seats are safe is unavoidable but is nevertheless awkward. Voters decide which party wins but not the person who will be their representative. In these seats, the real political battle is over the nomination, not the election. Nominations can more easily be manipulated than elections, for example by organised moneyed interests. Voters on the non-winning side will feel their vote to be worthless. Gerrymandering contributes both to low voter turn-outs and to a polarised Congress. In a district that has been manipulated, the election is reduced to a mere ritual to verify the pre-determined result. One form of gerrymandering is to split a group, say a predominantly black neighbourhood, between two districts, thereby reducing their block vote into a small minority in each district. A system that enables and allows the holders of power to cheat on democracy and that operates so as to disenfranchise voters, does not deserve respect. In the majority of states, the redrawing of district boundaries is in the power of the state legislature. In these states, there will be gerrymandering. In an

extreme example, in North Carolina in the Democrats won 51 percent of the House vote but only four of thirteen representatives. The problem is easy to solve by taking the drawing of district boundaries out of the hands of self-interested politicians. In about twenty states, the legislatures have delegated some authority over the drawing of district lines to redistricting commissions. Some of these, however, are set up so as to still give the majority party final control. Six states have delegated the authority over state district borders to nonpartisan or bipartisan commissions. The authority over both state and congressional district borders has been delegated to bipartisan or nonpartisan commissions in only seven or eight states – Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, New Jersey and Washington and sort of Iowa. California is often held up as the good example. Here, starting with redistricting ahead of the elections, the authority now sits with a commission consisting of 5 Democrats, 5 Republicans and 4 independents. Decisions require a majority in each of the three groups. The experience in the first round is good. The commission has worked orderly and efficiently and its decisions have stood up to challenge in the state Supreme Court. Attempts to overturn the new order have petered out. The state now has more competitive districts and more turn-overs in elections. The electoral process has gained in legitimacy. There should be no rational opposition to introducing redistricting by commission in all states. Gerrymandering is in some states to the benefit of the Democrats and in others to the Republicans. Either party, or no party, could win or lose overall in a reformed system. The clear winner would be American democracy. However, since there are strong local interests in not reforming, it is not going to happen on a state by state basis, at least for a very long time. Reform would therefore depend on Congress imposing a fair method of redistricting on the states. My recommendation would be a federal law with three main components: However, in its present state of dysfunction, Congress is not likely to take any initiative to rid American democracy of the blemish of gerrymandering. This will therefore remain another one of the many reforms Congress should make but will be unable to do. His book on the Chinese state, *The Perfect Dictatorship*, will be published this year.

Chapter 8 : Bringing the courts into disrepute : Shoot the messenger QLD style

Michael Ashby is Co-Founder and Communications Director for the National Pardon Centre. Get in touch with Michael by sending an email to mashby@racedaydvl.com or calling extension Michael Ashby est le co-fondateur et le directeur des communications au Centre du Pardon national.

I have studied and observed my people for decades and, cultural relativism or not, some parts of our cultures need to be discussed. Africans love power just for the love of it. Those Africans who possess the power never seem to use it for the benefit of the weak. The African man prefers to have power first rather than money, because he knows that when he gets the power, he can always effortlessly get the wealth later. He needs the power to deal with and be superior to his neighbours; he needs the power to oppress his people; he needs the power to perpetuate all kinds of evil and crime, hardly giving a thought to the repercussions or the end game that he himself would die one day; he needs the power to carry out revenge against imaginary and real enemies and rivals; he needs the power to steal audaciously from his people and country. That is the African man for you. The African leader misapplies and abuses power without a second thought. This is probably part of our genetic make-up. You have virtually given him immortality and immunity from worldly inconveniences. The society is replete with examples of this abuse and misapplication of power. Look at the police, the military, and the paramilitary like customs, immigration, and drug enforcement officers in Nigeria. It is therefore no wonder that when some people find themselves in positions of power and authority, they become power-drunk and irresponsible. This is even made worse by the fact that these people usually cheated or rigged or forced themselves into such responsible positions. The result is a mockery of democracy and governance as we are experiencing in Nigeria today, and as a matter of fact, in many African countries. We often, mistakenly, regard politics as a game. Well, if it is a game, then it is a perilous one, and should not be trivialised as we often do, because playing or practicing of politics defines and impacts the lives of millions of people; it defines their well-being and puts the responsibility of looking after the welfare of millions of people squarely in the hands of a few people who regard themselves as political leaders or simply, politicians. If these few politicians fail, then the effect on the society is massively fatal. Again, this is what we are experiencing now in Nigeria. But back to our very own current First Lady: If not for the abuse of power and office that we Africans so much love to perpetrate, the Office of the First Lady should normally be a respectable and welcome addition to good governance, responsibility and a healthy democratic dispensation. It hardly matters if the position is catered for in the Constitution or not. Mrs Obama and others before her have an Office of the First Lady. Wikipedia But in Africa, where positions of authority and power tend to make us drunk and irresponsible, it is adding more oil to the fire and giving liberty to illegality and opportunity to oppress, loot the treasury and generally obfuscate the masses and distort democracy, governance and politics. Even the glamorous Mrs Victoria Gowon was not that forward and impetuous. She was the first real First Lady of the nation. The late Mrs Maryam Babangida, despite my misgivings about her husband, was also very modest. So was Mrs Maryam Abacha, despite the despotic rule of her husband. The late Mrs Stella Obasanjo knew her place and her stand with her husband, and kept her excesses to a minimum. Dame Patience has rubbished that office and has brought it into great disrepute and ridicule, but I am not surprised. Her previous very lowly position in the Nigerian society is perhaps responsible for making her behave like she does. She has to prove to the world that she has arrived. And with a rather lame husband behind her, literally, we are not surprised. Dame Patience needs to respect the law and behave with decorum, protocol and some measure of dignity. Her husband did not become President by her doing; it is the people of Nigeria that voted him into Aso Rock and these people warrant to be served with all respect and humility. Her attitude is inappropriate, hence an affront on our collective psyche. She must be called to order. However, her behaviour and lack of decorum might not be unconnected with her interests in politics. Jonathan, who is notorious for greed and corruption, has acquired extensive landed properties in both Rivers and Bayelsa states. Her desire to control the politics of her home state of Rivers State is a big element in a simmering political crisis that turned bloody last week. Lawmakers loyal to Mrs. Jonathan stormed the state legislature with a contingent of thugs in a daring attempt to hijack the

leadership of the legislative body. You may wish to know that Mrs. Perhaps that explains it all, perhaps not. The problem is that we are not hearing her own side of the story, and maybe for good reasons too, else any attempt by her to defend herself may fall flat and make it worse for her and her husband and the Presidency. Who knows, the party might even be affected since these days there is no clear delineation between the Party and the Government. However one should recognise and commend some current and former States first ladies such as Mrs Abimbola Fashola of Lagos; Mrs Onarie Duke, former first lady of Cross River; former first lady of Lagos, now Senator Remi Tinubu; and Mrs Eki Igbinedion, formerly of Edo State I always thought it would have been better to elect her rather than her dim, clueless and corrupt husband. With these ladies, you can see and feel the class and modesty and humility and of substance, combined with their breeding and education. Dame Patience has brought the position or Office of the First Lady of the Federation of Nigeria into absolute disrepute. Therein lays the problem. Humility is the quality of being modest or respectful, even when you possess power, authority and wealth. Humility, in various interpretations, is widely seen as a virtue in many religious and philosophical traditions, being connected with notions of egoless-ness. Dame Patience apparently does not consider humility as a virtue. It is no use proffering solutions; we are beyond that. We all should know better. We are not going to be in any position forever. Let the Truth be said always, I always maintain. He also writes on topical issues for iNigerian.

Chapter 9 : representative democracy “ Past and Present Progressive

Employees bringing a company into disrepute Employees and their conduct outside of work. Employers have a significant amount of control over their employees when they are at work - during their working hours and on the premises where they undertake their work.