

# **THE CIVIL MANIFESTO**

Kyle Hinds

The Civil Party

## Contents

<b>1. Economics</b>	<b>4-13</b>
<b>2. Justice</b>	<b>14-18</b>
<b>3. Immigration</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>4. Foreign Policy</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5. Education</b>	<b>21-25</b>
<b>6. Health Care</b>	<b>26-30</b>

## **Opening Remarks**

Every so often, a new and profound system is proposed that challenges the current perceptions. These perspectives may at first appear radical or outright dangerous, but in time are embraced and integrated into the fabric of a nation. The radical of today may be the wise of tomorrow. For this reason, it is advised that one read this manifesto in its entirety with both an inquisitive and open mind. In this way, it can be seen precisely how communities may be refined into the civilized societies of tomorrow.

## Economics

Many are never taught economics in school. For those of us fortunate enough to have some background in economics, we understand that healthy economics is mandatory for a civil society. Economics can be thought of as the science of value. In a communist society, the state owns the means of production and has sole discretion over private industries as well as the "free" market [1]. Effectively, in communism there is no free market; as theoretically everyone would have equal ownership of the means of production. There may be hypothetical benefits to this political philosophy, but in reality there are apparent downsides. The intent of communism is to keep everyone fed, housed and alive, which is one of its positive aims. The communist goal is to prevent the free market from leaving the working class destitute, while those in the capitalist class enjoy a lifestyle of luxury and extravagance. In practise however, it is the government that becomes enriched while the people suffer. Why? Governments may be able to take care of basic needs, but are generally ill-equipped to orchestrate an entire market of commerce. As a result of people not being allowed to embark in free enterprise, business and investment are discouraged, and as a result, the "wants" of society fail to be satisfied.

Wealth "potential" can be viewed as the collective needs and wants of society or of the world in general. The more of these needs a nation is able to satisfy both domestic and abroad, the wealthier that nation can be said to be. This idea of "wealth" as "value" is intrinsic to the Civil platform. It is our whole-hearted belief, that to succeed we must build a "wealthy" society and not just a "rich" society. A society's economic output can be measured by their GDP. Wealth however, isn't as easy to measure as we shall soon see [2]. In a capitalist society, the

free market reigns almighty and is revered as sacred. But is it *really*? As philosophers had once discovered and what intellectuals of today know, it is in fact *democracy and freedom* that are sacred, and it is precisely the democratic nature of the free market structure that has enabled it to be so successful. The free market is quite efficient in many circumstances but it is by no means immune from critique. The good thing about capitalism is its efficacy as a means to an end. The free market has an extraordinary ability of matching supply with demand [3]. If something is scarce and in demand, the price reflects this fact by increasing. If the supply exceeds demand, the price decreases. When these demands are "wants", the free market is second to none. The issue arises when the free market is used to address "needs". Food, shelter and healthcare are all examples of needs that are currently addressed by the free market. We should however, also address the fact that needs and wants are not always mutually exclusive. We all need food and shelter, but do not necessarily need a mansion with gourmet cooked food. At the same time, it's quite embarrassing and frankly shameful that such a "wealthy" nation as Canada has homeless people, poverty and a healthcare system that doesn't even meet all of the basic needs a Canadian should expect to have met [4]. This is not even to mention the fact that a large portion of hospital funding in Canada comes from donations, further creating disparities in the service received from one hospital to another [5]. *Well, that's just the way it is I guess...* but is it the way it has to be? It is if we are reluctant to explore ways to refine our economic system. We must instead remember the past, embrace the moment, and look to the future.

The good thing about socialism is both its intent and function; as it attempts to combine the benefits of both communist and capitalist ideologies [6]. While in theory many socialist practices seem ideal, the issue is that a proper socialist economic system has never

been successfully implemented and the exact definition is somewhat ambiguous. For this reason, we will not refer to this ideal platform as "Socialism" but rather a "Civil Society" or "Civil Economics". It should be noted that no country is completely communist or capitalist, but rather exist in a spectrum that we have arbitrarily defined. It has been taught that communism is left, and that capitalism is right. In reality, life under either a communist or fascist regime would bare more similarities than differences [7]. The reason for this is because both systems concentrate power at the top, and strip power from the middle and lower classes. In communism, those with the power to enforce, rule. In capitalism, those with capital influence those with power to carry out their desires, and thus indirectly rule as well. Which system is the better of the two is irrelevant, because if the system is not perfect, it is incomplete. If power concentrated in the hands of a few was genuinely better for all, it wouldn't be so bad. But trickledown economics didn't work and likely never will; the rich reinvest and effectively sit on hoards of capital [8]. Corporations are economically incentivised to cut costs by laying off staff, automating tasks with Artificial Intelligence, and in general, stifling the competition. If businesses are small, competition can keep them all in check. There are anti-monopoly laws, none of which matter when a corporation is too rich for the laws to apply anyway [9]. There may be infinitely many more Band-Aid solutions, but often when you find yourself trying to patch a problem, perhaps it's time to sit back and look at the problem from another perspective. The issue is that as a society, we value what is **profitable**, rather than profiting from what is **valuable**. *What are we supposed to do then just print money? I mean money doesn't just grow on trees and someone has to pay for it. Besides if we try to tax the rich they*

*will simply leave and the economy will suffer.* Fair point, but to answer the question, yes we print the money. This would be a good time to discuss just what "money" actually is.

Money is a universally agreed upon store of value. Gold and Bitcoin are both forms of money [10]. A currency is both a medium of exchange and a measure of value with the sole purpose of being spent. The Canadian and US dollars are fiat currencies that are controlled by the monetary policies implemented by their respective governments [11]. Nation backed currencies used to be just as good as money because one could redeem them for gold. Today, however, our "money" is backed by nothing other than the government's word. In fact, the United States owes more USD than there is USD in circulation [12]. Money is created and given to federal banks, who then loan it out to the population for interest [13]. The only problem is that there are only two ways to pay back that interest; either by printing more money thus devaluing the currency, or by taking it from someone else who has it. Effectively, the interest owed on the money supply doesn't exist until it is created, or paid off by way of confiscation of assets. The next time you hear of someone getting their house foreclosed, contemplate for a moment on the fact that they just lost the game of musical chairs. The main point to take home is that it is a game; it is a system we have created with built in mechanisms which overwhelmingly result in a certain percentage of the population failing. In reality, we are on the same team and we should all embrace this fact. There is however some good to our current system though. It's looking quite shaky and many economists predict a financial collapse as a result of our careless spending and borrowing [14], but before we cover that, it would be beneficial to outline the benefits to such a system as well as the motivations for removing the gold backing of our currencies.

Firstly, gold has historically been seen as a hedge against the economy, and is usually inversely correlated [15]. People invest in gold to store their wealth. It is said that in ancient Rome, a decent toga cost an ounce of gold [16]. Today, the price of gold is about \$1300 USD per ounce, which could buy a pretty nice suit. The example illustrates how the purchasing power of gold has been relatively stable over time, and that increases in the gold spot price can be alternatively viewed as the weakening of the currencies we use to measure that value. In the early 1970's an ounce of gold could be had for \$35 USD, quite a fraction of today's spot price. This is a result of many factors; inflation being the most prevalent one. Under ordinary circumstances, inflation happens when a currency supply increases faster than the growth measured by the real output of that economy. As a result of fiscal policies, fiat currencies have typically not at all been a good store of value. This is precisely why people invest in stocks or bonds; to avoid the reduction in purchasing power that inflation causes. If they don't invest, they simply must spend the currency. Gold however, is something we hold onto, as it is money meant to store accumulated wealth. Unlike currencies, gold cannot just be printed. So earning more gold either involves mining it, which is finite and very expensive, or getting it from someone else who has it. If an individual held 10% of the world's gold and refused to sell, a century from now they would still have roughly the same percentage of the total global gold supply and hence purchasing power; provided that gold remained the standard. If they did the same with the global supply of fiat currency, they'd only have a fraction of the total supply after compounded inflation. The only way to avoid this is to invest in an asset that either beats or matches inflation. This inadvertent consequence isn't necessarily a bad thing; as it encourages spending and investing, the two very things needed to grow an economy. This is especially true



when a currency is performing well relative to other forms of money such as gold. One needn't look further than the peak of gold in 2011 at \$1900 USD, and then the subsequent collapse down to \$1100 USD in 2015. Clearly, a gold hoarder didn't do better than the S&P500 or the USD during that time period, so deflationary forms of money like gold aren't always the best place to store wealth in the short term. In fact, the value of fiat currencies can appreciate even when there is inflation. The value of any currency is determined on the FOREX market, which take many factors into account when calculating a currency's spot price. With this in mind, we explore what factors might increase the value of the Canadian Dollar.

There are many things that can impact the price of a currency, from economical, to political and social factors. The value of a currency is correlated to what it can buy as well as the collective faith in the nation backing that currency [17]. An abundance of currency is only as valuable as what it can buy. Take the hypothetical scenario; would you prefer to have the equivalent amount of \$100 million in the year 1020 or \$10 Million in the year 2020? Personally, I would prefer to have the \$10 million because the lifestyle that \$10 million affords you today is more luxurious than what all of the money in the world could have afforded in 1020. Because of technology and innovation, there is more "value" in what can be bought and it is this concept that should be the center of focus; not the amount of currency created, but rather the value of the goods that can be had with the currency. The issue with government backed currencies isn't the inflation caused by increasing the money supply, but rather, it's where the money goes. Currently, it goes to the national banks who decide the interest rates and subsequently, the cost of debt [13]. If instead this "inflation" were given directly to the people, the supply wouldn't change at all; the only change would be the distribution. This could be issued under

the title of "The Citizens' Dividend". Perhaps by way of a crypto-economic platform tied to SIN Identification, citizens would receive direct deposits into their accounts. The inflation would effectively be divided up amongst the population. Those that own the majority of the total supply would need to earn this excess currency back by offering goods and services. If not, their percentage of the currency supply would slowly diminish. In the current system, money from inflation is in fact given to the population, only the capital is loaned out for interest that must be paid back, and to avoid the effects of inflation one must stake their capital in an investment instrument. If the currency were directly given out, without doing anything, an individual's share of the total currency supply would approach a ratio of  $(\text{Market Cap})/(\text{Population Size})$  as time progressed. This would still be advantageous over deflationary currencies, as there would be newly minted currency to reflect the expanding economy. Those with the most capital would be constantly trying to prove to the free market why they deserve their spot, instead of the middle class trying to prove with their labour why they deserve to exist. *A basic income? That would just make everyone lazy, work to earn your keep!* Several concrete studies and literature would lead one to believe otherwise. The basic income has been correlated with lower societal health costs, higher academic attendance, and an increase in both economic and social productivity [18-20]. Fortunately however, we no longer live in a society where human labour is as mandatory as it once was. In 1870, almost half of the U.S. population was employed in agriculture. As of 2008, less than 2 percent of the American population was directly employed in agriculture [21, 22] and yet enough food is produced for all. The reason for this is technology. Technology makes tasks more efficient or automates them completely [23]. This is okay when more jobs are created, but when a trucking industry of 3 million drivers gets

replaced by self-driving software managed by 3 thousand developers, the outlook for jobs suddenly isn't looking too good. Taking a look at graphs of Moore's Law and job creation plotted against time further reaffirms the need for concern [24, 25]. But this is a great thing! After all, why would anyone want to *have* to work? Sure people like being productive, but why are we obsessed with the idea that people *must* work to survive? When drafting policies, those in office must think of the next decades to come, and not just the next years to come until re-election. The trend into the future is automation and is a direct result of the incentive structure behind capitalism; which is to accumulate more capital. Once you've bought out and neutralized all competition, the only thing left to do is cut expenses. One of the biggest expenses corporations have are its employees. Some jobs will require human intuition, but others won't, and as technology advances, the number of jobs that require humans will shrink. In calculus, we like to take the limits of functions as they approach infinity and observe behaviour. They tell us about the overall growth and trajectories of the functions in question [26]. There are a plethora of graphs to illustrate this point and they all indicate declining job creation as automation increases [27]. This should not be seen as a bad thing, unless of course you believe that everyone *must* have a job. The decline in job creation is merely a reflection of the economy striving towards ultimate efficiency. If a company can produce the same product with no human workers, then in essence, it is the most efficient it can possibly be. The need to hire more people with higher salaries and benefits, cuts into profits and leaves for an unhappy board of directors. Remember, the intent of capitalism isn't to help people; it's to get rich. The *hope* is that the end result will be wealth for all. Instead, those that understand the game have gotten dangerously good at it; so good that some refer to our current system as "Corporatism"

instead of capitalism. This is due to the fact that the competitive aspect has been effectively neutralized by big players [28]. Think about the last time a teacher ever taught anything related to starting a business. If you're like many other people, you've never had that conversation. The reason for this is because traditionally corporations have needed workers, and if everyone insisted on being an entrepreneur, there would be no one left to fill positions. As we head into the 2020's however, companies are downsizing, understaffing, outsourcing and automating tasks entirely [29]. This is excellent business practice, but terrible economic practice. Economics however, isn't the responsibility of private citizens, but that of governments. Why then, have we put all faith into corporations to create jobs for people, when it is their very goal to reduce costs? As a result of the growth in these mega corporations, positions have been polarized between the upper and lower class while the middle class has shrunk. As a result, there are less people with the purchasing power necessary to buy goods from these very same companies [30]. Combine this with global spiralling government debt and we have ourselves a perfect recipe for yet another financial catastrophe [31]. Restoring the middle class by way of the Citizens' Dividend would encourage spending, stimulate the economy and subsequently increase the value of the Canadian Dollar.

Looking at the hypothetical extreme case where companies lay off all workers, we see that only owners of capital or resources will be worth anything, as labour would no longer be a commodity valued in the free market. Long before this happens, there will likely be protests, violence and in essence, an absolute mess of a situation... but the way it has been does not have to be the way it will be. Many hope that history will repeat itself and that more jobs will be conceived of as new ideas are born. Even if one were to accept this premise, one would also

have to accept the fact that if the steady growth of computing power outpaces societies' collective ability to imagine new roles for human labour, it will make for a very uncomfortable and likely unsustainable transition period to say the least. Are we to really base our entire future and economic survival on a hope and whim? In the above scenario, a society implementing a Citizens' Dividend would see a middle class with purchasing power and a free market economy where the prices of goods approach zero, as costs to produce them also drop to zero. For instance, cheap and cleaner forms of energy may be both more efficient and more economical simultaneously; illustrating the gradual increase in the purchasing power of the dividend over time. Everyone will be fed, and while there will still be those that are rich, those that do become rich will achieve this because they have found a way to provide value where no other person or machine was able to; and this would indeed be well deserving of reward. It is not money that is the root of all evil, but rather the lack thereof it. The Dividend could very well address both the social and economic concerns about the current state of our political system. It may sound too good to be true, which is why the mathematics of inflation and wealth distribution has been referenced for both the skeptical minded and mathematically inclined readers [32].

It must also be noted that our current welfare system should not exist separately, but should instead be upgraded to the enhanced Citizens' Dividend. When on welfare, one must prove they aren't able to work, and are thus indirectly incentivized to remain unemployed, collect the benefits, and perhaps make some under the table cash [33]. With the Dividend, the income is guaranteed and completely separate from any money earned through work. From a psychological perspective, the incentive structure with the Dividend is sound. Automation will

also help the government become more efficient, resulting in more capital to invest. In the end, there is no left or right wing; something is either a smart idea or it isn't. Often, parties get voters to focus on personal issues that detract from the big picture, but identity politics aside, economic equality is the one thing you won't hear very many politicians speaking about. However, in order to build a civil society, it is something that we all must think about, converse about and do something about. We must transition from a system focused on survival, to one focused on success.

## Justice

The point of the justice system is to keep citizens safe. If that isn't being done the system has failed. Our justice system is currently focused on the idea of punishment [34]. You are guilty until proven innocent and everyone who has had the pleasure of doing business with the justice system knows this very well. If you get legal aid, your case will most likely not be dropped. Pay a well known lawyer? They and the prosecutor will talk about it over golf and work something out. The intent is one thing, the reality is another; and in a system revolving around money instead of value, this is precisely what you will get. Before we get into what is wrong with the justice system, we should start by acknowledging that the justice system is an expense. Just as a company would be most efficient with no human employees, a society would be most efficient with no jails or police. Unfortunately, this would likely lead to total anarchy. So to avoid a worse evil, we "invest" into a justice system. The only problem is that it's not *really* an investment. It is akin to "investing" in gold to avoid losing one's purchasing power. This differs from investing in an asset to gain purchasing power. With this analogy, we explore the question of what "investments" a society should make in order to reduce crime? For instance, if income inequality were a root cause of crime, the Citizens' Dividend among other investments would only help to address this issue [35]. Let us now explore the difference between an engineer and a police officer. An engineer invents things that we use. Presumably, those things can be sold for a profit. The engineer provides wealth and value to us. A police officer serves and protects. The police officer protects the wealth and value of society. Some may argue that this *is* value, but let us elaborate on what distinguishes the two. Without danger and a crime, police have no value. It is assumed that there always will be crime and thus always the need for

police. Engineers however, are valuable regardless of external factors; and it would be hard to argue otherwise as this manifesto was typed up on a computer designed by an engineer. This isn't to suggest in the slightest that we should get rid of the police, but on the contrary the question now becomes; what can we as a society do to reduce crime and thus make better use of our police spending? Perhaps additional training and courses could be offered to the police so that they may better understand and interact with the populations they police [36]. Perhaps portions of the funding should be diverted to other areas entirely.

The nature vs. nurture argument is very prevalent in the field of psychology [37]. The nature argument might argue that humans are innately savages and will always behave as such. Conversely, the nurture argument might argue that environmental factors influence human behaviour, and thus people can be refined into civilians. Although instincts and evolution play an important role in human behaviour, there is significant experimental evidence to show that environmental factors can also have an influence on aggression and obedience [38]. Could it be the case that the justice system inadvertently causes more crime? If so, it would be quite a burden and not all valuable for society. First we must look at how distain for the justice system might manifest itself in the form of rebellious behaviour. *The police kick down your door and you are arrested for selling cocaine to feed your 6 year old daughter. The courts determine that the mother is also unfit to be a parent, and proceed to put your child in foster care. Meanwhile this is your second time being charged, and you are sentenced to ten years in prison. You will miss your daughter's entire childhood. Ten years later, after a decade of being dehumanized, abused and stripped of all but the very basic essentials of life, you are released from prison. The world is different place, and a lot has changed in just a decade's time. Your daughter is now 16 and barely knows you. She is all you thought about every night in prison and was one of the very*



*few things that kept you going. The feelings are not reciprocal however, and she resents you for leaving her to go into the foster care system. Your relationship may never be what it could have been. Meanwhile you have no money and begin to look for work but no one wants to hire an ex-convict.* How would you feel about the system? This is unfortunately the reality for millions of people across North America [39], and many of them gladly dive back into a life of crime both out of spite, but also due to the fact that it is the only way they know how to survive. Combine this with the fact that prisons are privatized in America, and profit is made when incarceration rates are high [40], and a whole list of other problems is revealed. *Well he should have known better, cocaine is dangerous drug and he deserves what he gets!* It is indeed... or is it? We won't be sure until scientific research can be conducted on a mass scale with a pure product [41]. In addition, the economic and social ramifications for pushing drugs into the black market are arguably far worse than the damage caused by addiction [42]. In fact, "drugs" should be considered a health matter and not a legal one. It is for this reason that this point will be addressed in further detail under the healthcare section. For justice, the main point to be understood is that as a civilized society, we should be reforming and rehabilitating instead of demonizing and punishing. This is not to be naive and suggest everyone will become saints, but it is to admit that there might have been another saint if it weren't for them resenting the system and becoming a demon. There may in fact have been many saints lost to the justice system. In Canada, we don't have the death penalty nor do we have privatized prisons, but we still have detention centers that lack basic human decency. It is often said you can learn a lot about a nation by how they treat their prisoners; what then would this say about us? In the United States, you have instances like that of a warden taking money allocated for inmate food,

and buying a beach house with it [43]. Where do we draw the line between being disciplinary and sadistic? The answer is that we use prisons to keep the population safe, and not as a primitive instrument of revenge.

*What about murderers, should we just let them enjoy a nice spa treatment?* Perhaps, if we can show statistically that doing so would reduce murders. If we punish someone and as a consequence there is more crime, we have failed. A quick look at Scandinavian countries where the penal systems afford prisoners some of the most decent standards of living, reveals much lower crime rates than in other western nations [44, 45]. Which would you prefer; a society where prisoners are treated well with low crime or one where we take our revenge and all suffer the increase in crime as a result? We must be careful not to sacrifice our civility in the pursuit of justice; once turned a complete savage very rarely is there any turning back. But before that happens, there is always a chance...

## Immigration

Immigration is a great way to bring about ethnic, cultural and ideological diversity. Ideally, it would be nice to let everyone become a citizen. It should also be noted that we are still very much a world based on nation states, and certain countries have values that differ substantially from ours. This isn't to say that *all* citizens in any particular country oppose our values, but it is to acknowledge that they do exist and that we should not be naive to this fact. We must seek out the citizens of the world that share our beliefs of civility and progress no matter where they may be. When someone is born in Canada, it is their birth right. When someone immigrates to Canada, it is a civil right granted. Canada should take in as many immigrants and refugees as we can afford to, and have a very clear plan for how they will integrate into our society and economy. If done from a purely philanthropic basis, we may lack the infrastructure to sustain the transition. We must have a methodical approach that involves the use of our education system to provide wealth and value to both the immigrants themselves and Canada as a whole. In exchange, we become enriched culturally and intellectually, as the best perspectives from around the globe shape the Canadian culture of tomorrow.

## Foreign Policy

Military. In Canada, many of us are not fond of the idea of a military. It is thought that militaries are for going to war, and that we being a peacekeeping nation, should have no need for a military. This is absolutely the wrong way of looking at a military. Militaries are just as much for wars as a firearm is for shooting. A sane individual doesn't just go around shooting indiscriminately but they may carry a gun as a tool that can be used for both protection and in self defence against an insane individual. This isn't legally allowed in Canada in most instances, but the analogy is still food for thought. Ideally, if it is known what your capacities are, the altercation can be avoided completely. Without a military, you don't have that leverage, and thus you have no sovereignty. Other countries may respect you as a peacekeeping nation, or they may view you as weak and treat you as such; the point of relevance is that a sovereign nation does not need approval from anyone but themselves. If one disagrees and wishes to challenge that sovereignty, they will be well aware in advance of the measures that can be taken to reaffirm that sovereignty. The unfortunate reality is that there are many individuals who hold beliefs and views that wouldn't measure up to the Canadian standard of civility. If every country were Canada there would be no need for militaries, and if everyone were mother Teresa, there would be no need for guns. It's okay and actually quite healthy to ponder what things could be like in an ideal world, for it is this vision that will serve as a path for us to traverse along. Canada should invest in scientific research that will help strengthen our military, allies, as well as the scientific community as a whole. It should be noted that the military was heavily involved with inventing the protocols that eventually became the internet, something which we all use mostly every day [46]. Not all military research is violent, but often things that benefit the nation, also benefit the citizens as well.

## Education

Undoubtedly, almost everyone is familiar with the phrase "Knowledge is Power". While cliché, the importance of this phrase will likely never fade. Humans are neither the biggest, strongest nor the fastest species on the planet, yet we rule. We are however, the most *intelligent* species on the planet [47]. Analogously, the people with the most power in the world are those who know how to wield knowledge to their advantage. The fascinating thing about intelligence is its magical ability to solve problems given time and persistence. It took a very long time and we still have much to learn, but never the less, we sit in air conditioned buildings, communicate over the internet and fly by airplane to other continents; quite impressive for a species that was hunting and gathering not too long ago [48]. But let us not be too seduced by how far we've come, for this blinds us of the vision of how far we can go. Equipped with the right knowledge, virtually anything is possible for mankind. In fact, much of what we think of as "wealth" was derived from knowledge. From fire, to the wheel, to the internet; all were a result of specified knowledge being applied in a particular way to solve a problem. Perhaps discovered accidentally, but used for centuries intentionally. It is for this reason that we must invest in the art of acquiring and applying knowledge to produce "value".

Our education system, as like mostly everything else, currently revolves around dollars instead of wealth. The entire University structure is set up such that a fraction fail, a fraction pass, and the minority get A's. I once had a professor tell me that the department mandated that no more than 30% of people got A's, at least 30% failed, and the rest landed somewhere in between. Revisiting our recurring theme, is this efficient? Ideally, we would like 100% of people

to get A's, and not just because the material was too easy, but rather because the system was so efficient at "educating" people that the success rate was 100%. Perhaps our ideal goal isn't realistic, but again, it always helps to envision what a perfect society would look like. If we can't even imagine where we're going, how can we ever expect to arrive at our destination? Our goal should be trying to get the percentage of students with A's as close to 100% as possible, not arbitrarily making things difficult just to keep up the facade that universities are genuinely just too challenging for the average person to complete. It is indeed challenging, but do these challenges come from meeting arbitrary deadlines, and doing the "academic dance"? Or is it challenging because the material is truthfully rigorous? In reality, the answer is both. On the one hand, we have an extremely intellectual community and an abundance of resources at the disposal of those inclined to learn. On the other hand we have a system that serves the professor instead of the student. I often found myself learning more from reading on my own than struggling to pay attention in lectures. However, if you don't come to lectures you are a "bad student" and even if subconsciously, will be penalized when the grades come out. This subjectivity and discretion even in the hard sciences is one of the fundamental flaws of the education system. If we are ultimately just paying to take tests that prove we know something, then why not have precisely that? We could have an accredited testing system where anyone, even those with no experience, could try their luck by taking an accredited test. Passing all of the tests would prove to anyone in doubt that the recipient was in fact a master of that given field. Universities then, would be institutions that prepare you for these tests. If it was observed that people who went to university tended to get A's while those who didn't tended to get D's, it would further reinforce the fact that universities actually educated people, instead of merely

testing. In this way, the best lectures from the top professors could be recorded and replayed for years until the curriculum changed. With the excess capital, more TA's could be hired to help with individual questions, and professors themselves would not have to be burdened with marking. They instead would merely lecture and profess their expertise in the given subject. If students didn't value the professors teaching style, they could simply learn the material on their own and take the tests at their own convenience. There would be no bias, whether positive or negative, because all tests would be marked by experts at a separate accredited testing organization. Universities have positioned themselves as the golden standard of education, and within that institution, professors have positioned themselves as the gatekeepers of knowledge, and gatekeepers of grades. I can personally attest to the fact that there are professors who take great passion in teaching and are invaluable to the educational process. In reality however, many professors aren't all that great and the academic system itself leaves a lot to be desired [49]. Professors may know a thing or two in their field, but it means nothing if students can't learn from it. Grades and GPA's are also useless and an arbitrary measure of success. Give a teacher an apple and you go from a B to an A. Refuse to do the "dance", and even if you genuinely know the material, one will find many professors reluctant to give an A. Some may even bump the grade down to a C. Why? Artificial scarcity. If everyone has a degree, it loses its rarity and thus the university's ability to charge a premium for that prized piece of paper. Some professors are indeed genuinely professional and unbiased, but the very possibility for bias, even if subconscious, gives reason to doubt the entire process. With most information now being freely available online, universities may soon find themselves struggling to convince younger generations why they should go thousands of dollars into debt, for a paper that

doesn't even guarantee a job. A job which may or may not even exist within five years time. If education is viewed as a want, this is fine. But if it is a need, changes must be made. Arguably, we live in a very sophisticated society and sophisticated knowledge is required as a result. Research can be conducted on the most efficient and stimulating ways to acquire knowledge, and those results can be implemented into the university curriculum and structure. Furthermore, the whole idea of a curriculum with semesters and a schedule may also need to change. It may or may not be as profitable, but we aren't after *profit*, we're after *value*. Unfortunately, a team of administrative staff that make \$50k/year, and take 5 business days to process a form about academic progress are a far cry from "valuable". They merely exist within a largely inefficient system that has managed to maintain its relevance and profits. The monopoly however, is ending, as MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) providers attempt to truly democratize knowledge [50]. The direction universities take will determine whether they become a relic of the past, or an integral part of the future.

Suppose we have two education systems; A and B. They both produce doctors. In the end, both are tested on their knowledge by an accredited organization. System B may be more profitable than A, but if A produces more competent doctors, that system is more "valuable" to society, and it is things like this that increase the value of the Canadian dollar in the first place. Arguably, the Canadian money supply could be doubled and the price of the dollar could still increase, if we also simultaneously produced double the value in society. That increase in value would be reflected in the free market sentiment of the Canadian dollar. Who wouldn't want to invest in a country that has all the best doctors, engineers and entrepreneurs? On the other hand, millions of jobless graduates with \$30k worth of debt from degrees that were meant only



to be purely academic in the first place, will hardly inspire confidence in the Canadian dollar or in the Canadian economy as a whole [51]. It must be acknowledged that attending university doesn't necessarily consist of strictly coursework; as there may be facilities and student groups among other extracurricular activities, that add value to the university experience as a whole. With that being said, it must also be shown that the education system succeeds at its intended purpose. University should not only be freely available to all citizens, but perhaps for certain academic fields in high demand, students should actually be paid to study the subject. Instead of University executives lining their pockets, the government could begin allocating grants more effectively, such that students and professors alike are better compensated for doing their part in becoming educated members in the civil society of tomorrow.

## Health Care

The end of the Controlled Drugs and Substances act. Effectively all substances will be legally available to the public. *Are you kidding me? You really expect me to support a government that turns half of the population into addicts and the other half into dealers?* To be candid, abolishing the controlled substance act has more to do with health care than crime. It is for this reason why abolishing it would be a great idea, and there would effectively be no *drug dealers*, but rather business men and medical professionals. Before returning to the idea of crime and drugs, we digress to discuss the negative impact the controlled substance act has had on health care. To reiterate, the free market isn't bad, quite the contrary. But capitalism does not always allow for a free market; especially when corporate players get so big that they can lobby the government to pass bills that suit their own interests [52]. This is why laws must be put in place so that in these situations, no amount of lobbying can restrict the free market. The Civil Party is not very fond of the idea of "prescription-based treatments". In fact, we see that there are only substances; some man-made, some natural. Some will enhance your health, while some will jeopardize it. It is our position that one should have the freedom to ingest anything they choose, but even if the law criminalized dangerous substances while promoting healthy alternatives, at the very least it would show consistency. We respect consistency in people, and we should expect no less of our government. The reality is that there are a plethora of legal substances that are extremely harmful to the body. Some, in fact many, may even cause death [53, 54]. To make things even worse, many of these "medical treatments" have natural alternatives that not only have no adverse side effects, but provide health benefits as well [55, 56]. *Why hasn't my doctor told me about them then? Surely if they were so good, the medical*

*professionals would know about them, sounds like a scam to me.* Unfortunately, some alleged remedies are scams, and because of the medical community's refusal to conduct large trials and the government's lack of funding, many have to rely on word of mouth or unconventional sources to decipher the truth. It is indeed possible that a pharmaceutical drug does in fact outperform a vaccine or natural remedy. Without a fair and transparent market however, we can never be certain which is truly superior. Fortunately, the internet is ripe and abundant with information, and with persistence, it is possible to find both cheaper and safer natural remedies to their pharmaceutical counterparts in many cases. *But if it's more efficient, and hence more valuable, why wouldn't my doctor try to sell me it?* We mustn't forget the critical point that differentiates value from profit; if someone receives a vaccine for a disease that was previously only treatable, the pharmaceutical company has now just lost a lifelong customer. In addition, they can patent a chemical compound, but they cannot patent a plant found in nature. The important lesson to be learned is that not everything that is profitable for an individual is valuable for society. The more easily we can spot these discrepancies, the better off society will be. We must always remember what perfection looks like and strive towards it.

Pharmaceutical solutions typically only mask symptoms. The aim of vaccines, herbal and biotech solutions however, is to address root causes of illness and enhance overall health with longevity. The former solution is more profitable, while the latter is more valuable. *Remember, money is all printed and we wrote the rules to the game we currently play. If someone is getting rich by someone else's suffering, we are entitled to change the rules and resume the game.* With this in mind, we revisit the original suggestion which was to abolish the controlled substances act, and why it will reverse two very bad things. Firstly, the act allows for those with capital to

persuade those in government to outlaw competing products under the guise of it being "unsafe" [52]. If we were children, one might agree with this strategy. However, as grown, competent and consenting adults, reaching a decision should not be difficult. In addition, there are more than a few pharmaceutical drugs that may kill you. Just take chemo therapy for instance [57]. There are many natural remedies for cancer; including cannabis, oregano oil, and blue berries. These, among many other herbal solutions, have all been shown in limited settings to be effective against cancer [58-61]. There is also advanced biotechnology being developed to train the immune system to target and destroy cancer cells [62, 63]. Despite this, Chemo along with many other pharmaceutical products, are treatments that pays the bills. This is because the doctors receive a commission for recommending a given drug, and receive nothing for suggesting you take a plant that can be grown in a garden. Even if it isn't the doctor's conscious intent, the very fact that the system is structured to promote pharmaceutical products should raise concerns [64]. This wouldn't be a problem if people were allowed to put any substance on the market; in that case the free market would choose the best product. But even in free markets, reports of dental fraud illustrate how profit can still catch unsuspecting customers in healthcare [65]. Additionally, with the controlled substances act, any proposed drug must be approved, but not before going through phase 1, 2 and 3 trials. These trials sometimes take decades to complete, and are terminated at the slightest sign of danger without even giving people the option of taking the treatment at their own risk. Innovation is met with skepticism, and with a lack of funding in addition to falling share prices, many of these companies go under. If they are bought out by a bigger company, they will often be put on the back burner while the new parent company moves ahead with their profitable pills. By decriminalizing all substances,

not only do we free up police and prison funding, we also bring competition back to a field that needs it most; health care. A significant percentage of healthcare professionals, who are supposed to be masters of human anatomy and biology, are busy pushing product instead of using their *valuable* knowledge to eradicate disease and extend lives. Many doctors do excellent work, and this would be a great time to acknowledge that. This proposal for healthcare reform however, is not addressed to them, but rather the pharmaceutical corporations, institutions and governing bodies in general. Finally, statistical analysis suggests that when drug use is decriminalized, crime, health, police costs, as well as the drug use itself, all decrease [66]. The money saved can be invested into mental health and treatment programs as well as into medical research. Not only would there be more competition in the medical field, but doctors would once again be free to use their expertise for a purpose we can all find value in, and not just in one that a corporation find profit in.

## Final Remarks

The Civil Party stands for no group exclusively, but for **all** inclusively. We remember the past, embrace the present, and optimistically await the future. Time is the most valuable asset and it is of the essence; so let's get this party started.

*-- The Civil Party*



[www.civilparty.ca](http://www.civilparty.ca)

## REFERENCES

1. Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1967). *The communist manifesto (1848)*. Trans. Samuel Moore. London: Penguin.
2. Stockhammer, E., Hochreiter, H., Obermayr, B., & Steiner, K. (1997). The index of sustainable economic welfare (ISEW) as an alternative to GDP in measuring economic welfare. The results of the Austrian (revised) ISEW calculation 1955–1992. *Ecological Economics*, 21(1), 19-34.
3. Kelso, L. O., & Adler, M. J. (2017). *The capitalist manifesto*. Pickle Partners Publishing.
4. Morgan, M. W., Zamora, N., & Hindmarsh, M. F. (2007). An inconvenient truth: a sustainable healthcare system requires chronic disease prevention and management transformation. *Healthcare Papers*, 7(4), 6.
5. Kassam, A. (2017, December 13). Canada's public health care system relies an awful lot on private money: Opinion | CBC News. Retrieved from <https://www.cbc.ca/news/opinion/private-health-care-donations-1.4444679>
6. Engels, F. (1999). *Socialism: Utopian and scientific*. Resistance Books.
7. Eysenck, H. J. (1956). The psychology of politics and the personality: Similarities between fascists and communists.
8. Arndt, H. W. (1983). The "trickle-down" myth. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 32(1), 1-10.
9. Blau, B. M., Brough, T. J., & Thomas, D. W. (2013). Corporate lobbying, political connections, and the bailout of banks. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 37(8), 3007-3017.
10. Nakamoto, S. (2009). Bitcoin: A peer-to-peer electronic cash system
11. Wray, L. R. (1998). *Understanding modern money* (Vol. 11). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
12. Thorpe, S. (1970, January 01). Simon Thorpe's Ideas on the Economy. Retrieved from <http://simonthorpesideas.blogspot.com/2013/04/total-global-debt-and-money-supply.html>
13. Ireland, P. N. (2000). Interest rates, inflation, and Federal Reserve policy since 1980. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 417-434.
14. Acharya, V. V., Eisert, T., Eufinger, C., & Hirsch, C. (2018). Real effects of the sovereign debt crisis in Europe: Evidence from syndicated loans. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 31(8), 2855-2896.
15. Bampinas, G., & Panagiotidis, T. (2015). Are gold and silver a hedge against inflation? A two century perspective. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 41, 267-276.
16. Kohl, K. (2017, March 29). How Much Does an Ounce of Gold Buy? Retrieved from <https://www.energyandcapital.com/articles/how-much-does-an-ounce-of-gold-buy-/76952>
17. Rey, H. (2001). International trade and currency exchange. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 68(2), 443-464.
18. Standing, G. (2013). India's experiment in basic income grants. *Global dialogue*, 3(5), 24-26.
19. Forget, E. L. (2011). The town with no poverty: The health effects of a Canadian guaranteed annual income field experiment. *Canadian Public Policy*, 37(3), 283-305
20. Van Parijs, P., & Vanderborght, Y. (2017). *Basic income: A radical proposal for a free society and a sane economy*. Harvard University Press.
21. Daly, P. A. (1981). Agricultural employment: Has the decline ended. *Monthly Lab. Rev.*, 104, 11.
22. Employment by major industry sector. (2017, October 24). Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/emp/tables/employment-by-major-industry-sector.htm>
23. Rotman, D. (2013). How technology is destroying jobs. *Technology Review*, 16(4), 28-35.
24. Schaller, R. R. (1997). Moore's law: past, present and future. *IEEE spectrum*, 34(6), 52-59.
25. Brynjolfsson, E., McAfee, A., & Spence, M. (2014). New world order: labor, capital, and ideas in the power law economy. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(4), 44-53.

26. Shifrin, T. (2005). *Multivariable mathematics: linear algebra, multivariable calculus, and manifolds*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
27. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2012, December/January). Jobs, Productivity and the Great Decoupling. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/12/12/opinion/global/jobs-productivity-and-the-great-decoupling.html>
28. Winkler, J. T. (1976). Corporatism. *European Journal of Sociology/Archives Européennes de Sociologie*, 17(1), 100-136.
29. Orlando, J. (1999). The fourth wave: The ethics of corporate downsizing. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 9(2), 295-314.
30. Horrigan, M. W., & Haugen, S. E. (1988). The declining middle-class thesis: a sensitivity analysis. *Monthly Lab. Rev.*, 111, 3.
31. Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2011). From financial crash to debt crisis. *American Economic Review*, 101(5), 1676-1706.
32. Benhabib, J. (1980). Adaptive monetary policy and rational expectations. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 23(2), 261-266.
33. Hadley, R., & Hatch, S. (2018). *Social welfare and the failure of the state: centralised social services and participatory alternatives*. Routledge.
34. Bradley, C. M. (1993). *The Failure of the Criminal Procedure Revolution* (pp. 43-44). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
35. Kennedy, B. P., Kawachi, I., Prothrow-Stith, D., Lochner, K., & Gupta, V. (1998). Social capital, income inequality, and firearm violent crime. *Social science & medicine*, 47(1), 7-17.
36. Buerger, M. (2004). Educating and training the future police officer. *FBI L. Enforcement Bull.*, 73, 26.
37. McCall, R. B. (1981). Nature-nurture and the two realms of development: A proposed integration with respect to mental development. *Child Development*, 1-12.
38. Milgram, S., & Gudehus, C. (1978). Obedience to authority.
39. Austin, J., Bruce, M. A., Carroll, L., McCall, P. L., & Richards, S. C. (2001). The use of incarceration in the United States. *Critical Criminology*, 10(1), 17-41.
40. Shichor, D. (1995). *Punishment for profit: Private prisons/public concerns*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
41. Biondich, A. S., & Joslin, J. D. (2016). Coca: the history and medical significance of an ancient Andean tradition. *Emergency medicine international*, 2016.
42. Bagley, B. M. (1988). US foreign policy and the war on drugs: Analysis of a policy failure. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs*, 30(2-3), 189-212.
43. A Sheriff Used \$750K in Inmate Food Funds to Buy a House. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://money.com/money/5202982/sheriff-inmate-food-funds-beach-house/>
44. Lappi-Seppälä, T. (2007). Penal policy and prisoner rates in Scandinavia.
45. Pratt, J. (2008). Scandinavian Exceptionalism in an Era of Penal ExcessPart I: The Nature and Roots of Scandinavian Exceptionalism. *The British journal of criminology*, 48(2), 119-137.
46. Abbate, J. (2000). *Inventing the internet*. MIT press.
47. Roth, G., & Dicke, U. (2005). Evolution of the brain and intelligence. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 9(5), 250-257.
48. Marlowe, F. W. (2005). Hunter-gatherers and human evolution. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews: Issues, News, and Reviews*, 14(2), 54-67.
49. Wolk, R. A. (2011). *Wasting minds: Why our education system is failing and what we can do about it*. ASCD.



50. Pappano, L. (2012). The Year of the MOOC. *The New York Times*, 2(12), 2012. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html>
51. Denhart, C. (2013). How the \$1.2 trillion college debt crisis is crippling students, parents and the economy. *Forbes Magazine*.
52. Martinez, B., & Goldstein, J. (2007). Big pharma faces grim prognosis. *Wall Street Journal A*, 1, 12.
53. 146616355903929. (2016, November 13). The code I'm still ashamed of – freeCodeCamp.org. Retrieved from <https://medium.freecodecamp.org/the-code-im-still-ashamed-of-e4c021dff55e>
54. Lexchin, J. (2015). Why are there deadly drugs?. *BMC medicine*, 13(1), 27.
55. Chevallier, A. (2016). *Encyclopedia of herbal medicine*. Penguin.
56. Meuss, A. R. (2000). Herbal medicine.
57. O'Brien, M. E., Borthwick, A., Rigg, A., Leary, A., Assersohn, L., Last, K., Tan, S., Milan, S., Tait, D., ... Smith, I. E. (2006). Mortality within 30 days of chemotherapy: a clinical governance benchmarking issue for oncology patients. *British journal of cancer*, 95(12), 1632-6.
58. Neto, C. C. (2007). Cranberry and blueberry: evidence for protective effects against cancer and vascular diseases. *Molecular nutrition & food research*, 51(6), 652-664.
59. Johnson, J. J. (2011). Carnosol: a promising anti-cancer and anti-inflammatory agent. *Cancer letters*, 305(1), 1-7.
60. Massi, P., Vaccani, A., Ceruti, S., Colombo, A., Abbracchio, M. P., & Parolaro, D. (2004). Antitumor effects of cannabidiol, a nonpsychoactive cannabinoid, on human glioma cell lines. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, 308(3), 838-845.
61. McAllister, S. D., Christian, R. T., Horowitz, M. P., Garcia, A., & Desprez, P. Y. (2007). Cannabidiol as a novel inhibitor of Id-1 gene expression in aggressive breast cancer cells. *Molecular cancer therapeutics*, 6(11), 2921-2927.
62. Toussaint, B., Chauchet, X., Wang, Y., Polack, B., & Gouëllec, A. L. (2013). Live-attenuated bacteria as a cancer vaccine vector. *Expert review of vaccines*, 12(10), 1139-1154.
63. Cyranoski, D. (2016). CRISPR gene-editing tested in a person for the first time. *Nature news*, 539(7630), 479. Retrieved from <https://www.nature.com/news/crispr-gene-editing-tested-in-a-person-for-the-first-time-1.20988>
64. Fuller, C. (1998). *Caring for profit: How corporations are taking over Canada's health care system*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
65. News, CBC. "Is Your Dentist Ripping You off? Hidden Camera Investigation (CBC Marketplace)." *YouTube*, YouTube, 15 June 2015, [www.youtube.com/watch?v=ix0OV6rNqi0](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ix0OV6rNqi0).
66. Hughes, C. E., & Stevens, A. (2010). What can we learn from the Portuguese decriminalization of illicit drugs?. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 50(6), 999-1022.