MODERN CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM – REBALANCING THE 3 BRANCHES OF GOVERNMENT FOR GREATER GOVERNANCE EFFICIENCY ON U.S.A EXAMPLE

Rafal Pruchniak*

Abstract: This manuscript presents a more efficient form of democratic governance which, however, maintains very strong checks and balances. Although, legislation could be passed by the executive as well, all legislation would have to be approved by the courts to be economically sound and socially just. Supreme Court would take on the role of a powerful moderator-arbiter efficiently flowing legislative agendas which would be subject to higher standards of review. All of the branches would be electronically elected, ranked and ultimately responsible to voters provided they followed the elevated standards. This novel system has potential to be adopted around the world as it is politically neutral and could quickly catch up with technological advancements. The article contains other multiple governance efficiency enhancements related to free speech and electoral processes.

Keywords: Constitution; Reform; Governance; Efficiency; Electronic

* New York University, School of Law, US.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

I. Conflicting Laws – President vs. Legislature 5

A. Minority Rule: Efficiency vs. Balance of Power 5

B. Role of Supreme Court in Vetos 5

C. Polarization vs. Ranked Choice Voting – How and Who Gets Elected Matters 6

D. Election Funding - Who Pays for Elections and to Whom Matters 6

II. What is "Economically Sound and Socially Just" Standard? 7

A. Elected Judges – Who Will Interpret the Law Matters 7

1. Judges Elections and Compensation 7

B. Congress Persons and Other Federal Employees – Terms, Salaries, Bonuses, Compensation Agency 8

C. Rankings of Governmental Employees 9

1. Doubtful Security in Inefficiency of an Unpopular Agenda ... 9

2. Electoral College Obstacle 10

III. Two Party or Multiparty System? 11

A. Need for Public Referenda and its Independent Agency 12

B. Gerrymandering vs. Protecting Voting Rights of Poor Voters 12

C. Impeachment of the President 12

D. Electronic Voting and Its Impact on Other Countries 12

IV. Free Speech Yes But Not Repetitive Known Misleading Statements 13

A. Reasonableness Doctrine 13

B. Role of Speakers – an Alternative 13

V. Unblocking Vote and Flow of Political Agenda 14

A. Electronic Voting at All Legislative Bodies 14

B. Prosecuting the President, House and Senate Leaders 14

C. Judicial Police 14

D. Independent Attorney General 15

E. Secret Vote on President's Nominees 15

Conclusion 15

INTRODUCTION

For various reasons democracy is widely believed to be the best governance system, although not perfect, which is also well understood.[1] This belief is a problem in and of itself and a trap for governments around the world which should at least attempt to improve democracy and its processes. After reading how ineffective, the U.S. most effective senator[2] was, I thought to myself there needs to be a better system and why not make it as close to perfect as possible. Here is what I devised:

1. President would have competing legislative powers to the legislature.

2. Legislature with a small majority 55%[3] of electronically casted votes could veto the president.

3. President could veto the legislature, however also a small majority of 55% could defeat the presidential veto.

4. Supreme Court (one of its multiple panels[4]) could strike down laws that are not "economically sound or socially just."

5. Availability of electronic public referenda on economically sound and socially just topics, and public vote of confidence for the executive.

These simple 5 changes would dramatically improve governance effectiveness, would also bolster diversity, equity and inclusion agenda and could potentially be widely adopted around the world. The broad constitutional requirement that all laws be economically sound and socially just would by its own definition strengthen the need for equity, inclusion and diversity.

While I cannot empirically prove the benefits of these reforms in this article yet, student surveys for example and student moot political proceedings would. The plan going forward is to involve interested students in this research.

In summary, the benefits are as follows, an executive with legislative powers could decidedly cut through typical inefficiencies of agreeing on legislation by multiple parties. However, the legislature being allowed to veto the executive would ensure that the majority interests are still represented. Presumably a more frequent

---

[1] A recent poll suggests Congress approval percentage can be as low as 16%. The Economist/YouGov Poll, page 54., January 12-14, 2025. https://d3nkl3psvxxpe9.cloudfront.net/documents/econTabReport_62FWpzz.pdf (Last visited February 6, 2025)

[2] Out of hundreds sponsored bills only handful become laws. For example, Senator Peters most effective lawmaker of 116th Congress sponsored 86 bills with only 10 of them becoming law. Carrie Moore, "The Do-Something Members of 116th Congress: Legislative effectiveness study from Vanderbilt, UVA identifies member success in advancing bills." March 17, 2021. https://news.vanderbilt.edu/2021/03/17/the-do-something-members-of-116th-congress-legislative-effectiveness-study-from-vanderbilt-uva-identifies-member-success-in-advancing-bills/ (Last visited February 6, 2025)

[3] Percent needed to veto the President could be set at of 55% of all votes or 51% of all votes including 25% of non-presidential party minority vote, thus bolstering minority input.

[4] There is a need for at least one more panel of Supreme Court judges in order to make it more efficient. Presumably two panels would make the Supreme Court twice as efficient. Judges should be elected for one 10 year term.

competitive election of such a president would also ensure minority interests are also considered more often. Finally, the Supreme Court would reduce potential duds from the executive or the legislature by basically disallowing legislation that is not economically sound or socially just as calculated by politically neutral Congressional Budget Office (or newly created independent Public Referendum Office). Legislation quality would also thus be improved. Electronic public referenda also on only economically sound and socially just topics or public confidence referenda would provide a backstop to politicians' excesses.

I will attempt in the article to describe more details and the dynamics of other related potential efficiency and fairness changes.[5]

I. CONFLICTING LAWS – PRESIDENT VS. LEGISLATURE

In case of conflicts between presidential law and legislature law, where no vetos were issued, Supreme Court would have the right to merge the laws, alter or invalidate them based on their being more socially fairer[6] and making better economic sense. The Supreme court input would thus keep the legislative process ball rolling.

A question arises whether budget could also be enacted by the president. Multiple solutions come to mind namely, legislature could vote first, or veto requirements of the president budget changes could be lowered to be easier to be issued during enactment of the budget or when conflicting with legislature approved budget.

A. Minority Rule: Efficiency vs. Balance of Power

Legislature's veto on Presidential legislation could also be further enhanced by being valid only with a higher percentage of minority vote for example 51% of all votes including 25% of minority of non-presidential party vote. This would ensure a more traditional balance of power without the risk of its concentration within the office of the president, while at the same time maintaining executive efficiency. The executive here would be more sensitive to the minority political views and this way president's power would be curtailed.

B. Role of Supreme Court in Vetos

Supreme Court could be allowed to increase or decrease supermajority to overcome the veto of the president. The Supreme Court could limit presidential veto in circumstances of repetitive veto abuses especially in narrow majority/minority balance margin in order to strengthen economic sense or social justice of the legislation.

For instance, in a 51/49 divided by party Congress 55% supermajority thresholds could be too high especially where the president over-crowds with its legislation the whole political-legislative agenda disregarding social justice and/or economic sense. An easy to imagine example of such injustice could soon be too rapid AI introduction and its laws or too burdensome climate change mitigation laws which

---

[5] Although, U.S. constitution was a first of its kind and was quickly copied by other countries, that, however, does not mean that the balance of power between executive, legislature and judiciary in modern constitutions around the world today is effective or even that it colloquially makes any sense given ineffectiveness of the legislature.

[6] Meaning; more socially just.

are hurting financially car drivers and miners respectively without the government's fair assistance and/or compensation.

In conclusion, the Supreme Court would take on a moderator-arbiter role here by focusing on the effective flow of legislation in a thinner legislative veto threshold of for example 52% from 55%. This would create more flexibility in the governance system, take into account minority view and increase likelihood of a compromise.

C. Polarization vs. Ranked Choice Voting - How and Who Gets Elected Matters

Across the world, many governments whether democratic or nondemocratic are poorly performing due to high cost of living, climate change, and wars. According to a Swedish think - tank half of democracies saw decline in their robustness in forms of nondemocratic pressures[7] - for example in Poland the Supreme court was replaced with ruling political party judicial cronies, U.S. experienced insurrection and many other countries saw reemergence of far-right anti-immigration, anti-trade political narratives. This need to cheat/manipulate by democracies in order to stay in power and their corresponding scapegoating of globalization effects and political polarization requires us to carefully rethink also how and who gets elected in addition to how effectively such representatives vote.

Thus, we will need to tackle primaries polarization and related to it legislative non-performance and risk of power concentration. All these can be mitigated to a significant extent by more frequent and more electorate representative ranked choice voting elections conducted for efficiency purposes electronically. As an example, Estonia utilizes electronic election voting since 2001 and in 2023 over half of the votes were being cast online[8]. In addition, U.S. has a couple jurisdictions that already use ranked choice voting for example New York City[9], State of Alaska[10] and State of Maine.[11]

D. Election Funding - Who Pays for Elections and to Whom Matters

A need for more frequent elections would require correspondingly partially public funding to individual candidates who, however, submitted their political speech narrative and agenda to the courts for prior approval with the constitution by being economically sound and socially just. Since elections would be held twice as often, the first year of the reform public funding could correspondingly pay for half of the previous year election cost. This would be a good rule of thumb to lower the election costs. In future years per individual, per enterprise contribution limits could be rebalanced to be also economically sound and socially just.

---

[7] Reuters, "Half or world's democracies in decline, international watchdog says.", Nov. 29, 2022. https://www.reuters.com/world/half-worlds-democracies-decline-intergovernmental-watchdog-2022-11-30/ (Last visited February 6, 2025)

[8] Eesti Rahvusringhaaling, "Estonia sets new e-voting record at Riigikogu 2023 elections." March 6, 2023. https://news.err.ee/1608904730/estonia-sets-new-e-voting-record-at-riigikogu-2023-elections (Last visited February 6, 2025)

[9] New York City Charter, Section 1057-g.

[10] Alaska Statute Section 15.15.350.

[11] Maine Revised Statutes Title 21-A. Section 723-A.

Public election funding would allow outsiders to enter politics more easily just as it would foster new more independent ideas. Again, constitution should only allow speech and political narrative that is more likely than not economically sound and socially just. For example, current narrative of detention camps for undocumented immigrants and mass deportation is clear political populist manipulation making little economic sense given low unemployment and need for laborers.

The remainder private donations should be capped per individual and per enterprise with the limits set to enhance one person one vote rule with economically sound and socially just exceptions for enterprises and not-for-profits of great social importance. For example, these could be various rare disease foundations.

Nevertheless, these private donations should not exceed $200,000 purely to limit the cost of political narrative.

Dealing with AI and income and health inequality we need to give the power back to the individual voters away from special interests and corporations, while allowing for economically and socially constructive free speech.

II. WHAT IS "ECONOMICALLY SOUND AND SOCIALLY JUST" STANDARD?

This standard may be already developed in our culture and could further evolve with that culture's own evolution and hopefully through court rulings.[12] For example, the criminal and civil trials may indicate to us what is each life worth and what is its each individual contribution to the society. We know that each life is equal in value but each individual's contribution is not. These literal values would be necessary for instance to determine the cost of let's say health inequality. Then this inequality could be rebalanced through payments for healthcare or welfare payments all under economically sound and socially just standard.

A. Elected Judges - Who Will Interpret the Law Matters

Voters would have a stronger influence on judicial review, through elected by the public judiciary. Election of entire judicial branch would strengthen importance of public input.

1. Judges Elections and Compensation

In each state and circuit there would be 4 pools of recommended candidates with a law degree and a minimum of 8 years post legal bar experience. Academia pool recommended equally by faculty, staff and students organizations in ranked choice voting ("RCV"), U.S. attorney pool, recommended in RCV by U.S. attorneys and staff equally, U.S. Bar Association pool recommended in RCV by members, judicial pool recommended in RCV by judges and staff.

---

[12] Unfortunately, U.S. Supreme Court remains quite ambivalent about judicial review of economic policy stemming from legislation. This is especially troubling in era of social media being used for populistic purposes. See *FCC v. Beach Communications, Inc*., 508 U.S. 307 (1993). *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez,* 411 U.S. 1 (1973). But see *U.S. Department of Agriculture v. Moreno,* 413 U.S. 528 (1973) or *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center,* 473 U.S. 432 (1985).

Such candidates would be ranked and those at the first one third of each pool and first one sixth in the attorney pool, would be ranked choice voted again by the general public in that state or circuit to be elected for the office they seek. Supreme Court elections would reduce these pools to first one tenth of the recommended candidates out of which general public would rank choice vote.

Regular judges would be elected for 3 x 5 year terms. Supreme court for 1 x 10 year term. Post term former judges could work anywhere but would be renumerated by the government and the employer and collect extra salary for extra work or continue to collect that salary until death without working.

Combined extra perks typically offered by the academic institution or nonprofit organization such as housing or transportation would have to be reasonable and not exceed 100% of judges previous annual salary. Former judges could be compensated for guest lectures and interviews. Typical reasonable perks such as travel and lodging would be allowed when done together with the lecture or interview but could not exceed 100% of judge previous annual salary. All these items of extra income would be combined.

Former judges could publish multiple books yearly and receive compensation for these books. Former judges could work as attorneys. Former judges' children could obtain college tuition waiver if offered to other employees' children.

Judges and U.S. attorneys, Senators, Representatives salaries and other federal state and local employees, should be competitive with the private sector taking into consideration job security, hours worked, qualifications, perks, stress and other demands. Hours worked should be reported and routinely verified.

Judges would also be evaluated by independent compensation agency which would determine objectively motivating bonuses for example number of cases in a year vs number of successfully appealed cases.

Of course, judges including supreme court judges should recuse themselves from cases they or their family members have interest in or in which their participation could be viewed as impartial. In such cases special appellate judges from a circuit different than case in question could be randomly selected. Such special appellate judges would be elected by the public in normal elections for appellate judges and perform regular duties of appellate judges and the duties of special appellate judges, as described above remotely.

B. Congress Persons and Other Federal Employees - Terms, Salaries, Bonuses, Compensation Agency

Similarly, congress persons should be elected for 3 x 5 year terms. Congress persons would be allowed to work in private sector after ending term but would be renumerated by the government and the employer and collect extra salary for extra work.

So, for example if a congresswoman returns to work as sales representative of medical devices after 5, 10 or 15 years her former congress person 300 thousand salary/pension would vest in 50%, 75% and 100% respectively and be paid directly to

her if the employer furnishes a monthly statement that she met her performance targets. Fair market value compensation bonus could be added to the salary for extra sales and would need to be reported to the government. She would also have the option to not take the job or quit her job and collect her previous congress person salary but not bonus.

Congress persons and all other government workers would also be ranked by a specially established independent government compensation agency on their objective performance and paid motivating bonuses. The compensation agency would also monitor if congress persons met their objective hourly work quotas necessary for pensions to vest and not be forfeited.

Naturally terminations and downsizing would have to meet the economically sound and socially just standard which would require doing it for sound economic reasons taking into account output these workers generate, be conducted under a fair policy accounting again for merit, performance over the years etc.

The final decisions should be made by the independent compensation agency after legislation cutting funding and reducing headcount which met the economically sound and socially just standard. This would preclude political terminations while maintaining objective and merit based government workforce.

C. Rankings of Governmental Employees

Yearly rankings and total compensation of governmental employees and elected officials would be public. Each governmental employee and elected official would every year receive an objective point scorecard and be ranked accordingly. This would objectively enhance employee/official performance and strengthen public voting input accuracy.

1. Doubtful Security in Inefficiency of an Unpopular Agenda

The Achilles heel of this reform so far is the risk of electing a president who has power to efficiently do good things as well as "bad things." However, those bad things would need to still meet the economically sound and socially just test, as interpreted by Supreme Court and withstand potential for a legislature veto.

A question logically arises on what else could be done to create an effective emergency break such as vote of non-confidence for a prime minister in some European countries for example, or simply breaking by counting on inefficiency of unpopular agendas as in the U.S.?

This breaking by inefficiency of unpopular agendas needs to be thoroughly surveyed in several foreign countries and U.S. as it seems rather illusory. On a recent example U.S. Congress almost repealed health insurance for millions of citizens in a very unpopular attempt. Another example where popularity meant little would be reversing popular women's reproductive and health rights by the Supreme Court. Thus, instead of fear mongering of any governance innovation and having a cult-like treatment of U.S. archaic constitution let's do some political science research, conduct surveys and decide as voters whether we would be interested in a modern cutting-edge constitution, because our current system of governance is far from being perfect.

What could be a solution and check on the power of the legislating executive is a vote of no confidence for the president by the public in the form of a citizens' referendum for which signatures would need to be collected to meet a certain required threshold. Ideally this would be done online and on the phone both the initial signature threshold vote and the referendum vote. The referendum question would be defined and overseen by the supreme court.

10 million online initial e-signatures and 51% of the e-votes with 20 million casted votes minimum seems a rule of thumb, the first attempt that would require again more political science research, surveys and ultimately contemporaneous supreme court ruling on fairness of those threshold numbers.

Given recent abuses of power by for instance PMs in U.K. and Israel it seems likely the citizens non confidence referendum would be used and tested. Therefore, designing its thresholds would be critical and those thresholds should be small enough to be workable. The referendum question should also be approved by the Supreme Court as fair. Further practically the initial threshold and the minimum casted votes threshold should also be adjusted by the Supreme Court before each vote of confidence referendum to be fair and socially just.

To illustrate what could be the role of Supreme Court in a referendum I will use a not so recent presidential infidelity example; a fair referendum/vote of confidence question could be: "Did lying about extramarital affair to the public and the extramarital affair itself are grounds for removal from the president office of Bill Clinton?" Though given large percentage of statistical infidelity of 71% in the U.S.[13], perhaps the initial vote should be increased to 20 million and minimum casted votes to 40 million as 45 million voted for Bill Clinton in 1992 as a rule of thumb.

It should be also considered whether introductory initial vote of let's say of only 1 million of citizens would trigger Supreme Court review of constitutionality of the to be voted on issue in a referendum and the thresholds for the subsequent initial vote and minimum casted votes. Such a smaller referenda could be utilized in regular governance outside of vote of confidence realm which I will discuss in more detail further in this article.

2. Electoral College Obstacle

Although, Electoral College effectively gives weight/percentage wise more power to swing states reducing somewhat disparity and inequality between largest costal cities and smaller inland agglomerations and rural areas, such division of power seems very inefficient and development wise shortsighted.

As background, electoral college was enacted in 1787, when vast numbers of population were illiterate, and the founding fathers were worried about informed and

[13] PRNewswire Technopedia, "Infidelity Statistics: US Tops the Cheating Charts while 31% of Affairs Involve a Co-Worker"., September 09, 2024. https://www.prnewswire.com/news-releases/infidelity-statistics-us-tops-the-cheating-charts-while-31-of-affairs-involve-a-co-worker-302241988.html (Last visited February 6, 2025)

intelligent voting decision-making.[14] Currently, electors vote in 99% in accordance with their party affiliation[15] and voters have easy access to media.

More research would be needed to prove that a national unified plan for development and spending would be more optimal, in finding more wholistic development projects in the long run versus counting on electoral college relic in mitigating economic development disparities. Besides, the two senators per state allocation seems to somewhat work already in ensuring all state interests are preserved.

Consequently, a long-term, wholistic development strategy would be required for budget decisions to be economically sound and socially just and therefore in accordance with the constitution every day and not only before elections. Such development policy is well functioning in European Union ("E.U."), where taxpayers' funds out of E.U. budget are redistributed to most important policy projects largely escaping local politics in name of common E.U. good through shared multi-level management, general principles of partnership, equality, non-discrimination and sustainable development.[16]

In fact, E.U. cohesion policy reduces regional disparities and promotes economic and social convergence among member states.[17] By extending regional funding and grants to impoverished areas E.U. will have tripled every euro of investment going through the cohesion program by year 2047.[18]

Regarding founding fathers concern about informed voting, we need to rather focus on benefits of the free speech reform described in more detail further below.

III. TWO PARTY OR MULTIPARTY SYSTEM?

Generally, a two-party system is more stable and efficient as the winning party takes all and does not need to form a coalition to govern. For purposes of this reform, counterbalance to strong efficient presidency will be desired by strong two-party centrist legislature.

Conversely, countries with well-functioning multiparty system could rebalance the bigger relatively power of the legislating executive with easier to trigger and administer public referenda.

---

[14] Clare Roth, "The Electoral College will determine the winner." DW.com August 22, 2024. https://www.dw.com/en/what-is-the-us-electoral-college/a-69090790 (Last visited February 9, 2025)

[15] *Id*.

[16] Magdalena Sapała,"The European Structural and Investment Funds", Brief, Members' Research Service, European Parliament. Pages 2 and 3. July 2015. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2015/565873/EPRS_BRI(2015)565873_EN.pdf (Last visited February 6, 2025)

[17] Joint Research Center, European Commission, "Cohesion policy benefits EU economy and lowers regional disparities." April 11, 2024. https://joint-research-centre.ec.europa.eu/jrc-news-and-updates/cohesion-policy-benefits-eus-economy-and-regions-2024-04-11_en (Last visited February 6, 2025).

[18] *Id.*

A. Need for Public Referenda and its Independent Agency

Online referenda's enhanced accessibility and Supreme Court review of social justice and economic sense, would create more viable governance tools that would decide with more ease contentious topics such as women's right to choose or reparations for the colonial era.

Statistical analysis could be employed here by Supreme Court reducing the initial vote count in a referendum predominately impacting women and not increasing the minimum casted votes in a referendum on reparations despite those would predominately be paid by persons that were not responsible for slavery as examples of pursuing fairer referenda.

However, public referenda would need independent and apolitical pre-referendum analysis to calculate for example damages related to legacy of slavery today be performed. Such calculation would be done in similar manner to Congressional Budget Office score which should be estimated by an apolitical office similar to Federal Reserve which is independent and not at risk of terminations for political purposes.

The expertise and independence of such established "Public Referenda Office" would counterbalance an elected Supreme Court operating under Social Justice and Economic Sense clauses presumably leaving some more leeway in the hands of such well briefed public.

B. Gerrymandering vs. Protecting Voting Rights of Poor Voters

Neither party should be allowed to gerrymander. Voting districts should be periodically reset to give poverty stricken populations adequate to their numbers representation whether in inner-cities or rural areas.

Social justice and economic sense clauses would clearly disallow gerrymandering but the constitution should require resetting districts to fairly represent the poor and disenfranchised. Specifically, inner city predominant renters vs suburbs owners vote should not be diluted. Predominantly, heavily indebted rural areas should also be reset to mitigate any vote dilution effects.

C. Impeachment of the President

Checks and balances of impeachment should be made easier as they would affect and counterbalance a more efficient executive. Thus, all crimes should be potentially impeachable with a simple or small majority. In other words, the executive should be held accountable at a standard like any other citizen.

D. Electronic Voting and Its Impact on Other Countries

US and other nations should fund a non-for-profit independent institution that would help design, implement and monitor standardized independent electronic elections.

The voter identity should be encrypted for the public. However, the encrypted number and vote should be public to enhance the vote credibility.

Private				Public
Public				
Social security number equivalent	->	*encrypted number*	->	*vote*

IV. FREE SPEECH YES BUT NOT REPETITIVE KNOWN MISLEADING STATEMENTS

Courts should have the right to gag individuals and groups including political parties from speech that is known to be unethical, unjust, immoral, unfair, unfeasible, unreasonable, false, manipulative and/or misleading to protect the public and public discourse quality.

For example, using individual act to justify a policy towards a larger group is used by media to get a point across. However, this method is often abused in election manipulation and the courts should establish rules requiring additional statement of relevant statistics or disclosure that individual acts do not define a group etc.

A. Reasonableness Doctrine

The reasonableness doctrine is used in a number of countries, including the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia.[19]

The standard is commonly used by courts there to determine the constitutionality or lawfulness of a given piece of legislation and allows judges to make sure that decisions made by public officials are "reasonable." Statistical research would have to be conducted to determine to what extent unreasonable legislation was prevented in countries with reasonable clause vs. countries without it.

Prevention here could be active or passive where risk of the clause application by the courts on its own raises legislative standards. Reasonable clause scope would also need to be then compared to potential scope of economically sound and socially just clauses which seem to be more directional and finer in its application.

B. Role of Speakers - an Alternative

Speakers could also receive each year a special delegated vote allowing them to vote on behalf of the entire congress or groups of congress persons. The delegation would dramatically increase efficiency of the congress. Such speakers' legislation could be vetoed by the president, or vetoed by congress in a majority vote. The delegation could be withdrawn completely, also with a majority.

A more delicate and flexible change and posture would be to delegate such vote to the speaker and two other congress persons or groups congress persons and allowing withdrawing of such delegation with less than majority vote. For maximum flexibility delegations could encompass a specific reform. A good idea would be to allow citizens in a referendum to block such delegation or veto individual legislation.

---

[19] Hadas Gold, Richard Allen Greene and Amir Tal, "Israel passed a bill to limit the Supreme Court's power. Here's what comes next" CNN., July 24, 2023. https://www.cnn.com/2023/07/24/middleeast/israel-judicial-reforms-vote-explained-mime-intl/index.html (Last visited February 6, 2025)

Enhancing speaker powers on its face seems a less radical governance alternative and it could be in theory easier to pass. We as voters and global citizens should rethink the described reform and honestly answer to ourselves whether the proposed reform is that futuristic or rather American constitution is that outdated. Would there be "room" in this alternative for a legislating president? Well, there is room for entire congress voting now thus competition, different perspective and discussion with an effective legislating president in theory should be quite beneficial.

A question emerges again whether each quasi-speaker with delegated 55% of legislators power as described above could veto president's legislation? In my opinion, mutual veto powers could at times lead to a compromise and at times to a tit for tat paralysis. Thus, the role of Supreme Court in raising or lowering required veto percentage in such political impasse would be particularly important. Similarly crucial in such an impasse would be public referenda. Although this seems to add level of complexity and uncertainty to this new system of governance in theory, practically it could infuse dynamism into this system and generate more representative and effective decision making.

V. UNBLOCKING VOTE AND FLOW OF POLITICAL AGENDA

Given naturally easier electronic voting only a larger group of congress persons should be able to submit an issue / proposal for vote. 15 – 20 votes to bring a vote to the floor should suffice as a matter of efficient and representative policy. This would also help maintain a centrist congress.

Furthermore, Supreme Court should be allowed to block or modify any counter vote by the president or the speaker if its purpose was to impact the passed by entire congress legislation. Supreme Court should have similar blocking or modifying rights in reverse situations or conflicting situations with public referenda. In conflict with public referendum the 3 branches could vote to override with majority vote a public referendum result. Presumably, voters would have a chance to electronically vote out of office such branches members in subsequent elections.

A. Electronic Voting at All Legislative Bodies

Remote work opportunities for all legislative bodies including electronic voting are critical to their effectiveness and efficiency and would bring legislators closer to current standards and private citizens productivity.

B. Prosecuting the President, House and Senate Leaders

The risk of electing sociopaths, although diminished by the described earlier free speech and election reforms, would require more opportunities to remove such politicians from office, whether by courts, congress or in a public referendum. The current FBI policy, of not prosecuting a sitting president, proved dangerous in the U.S. and Israel. It simply delays the stick and offers only carrots instead and thus it should also be changed.

C. Judicial Police

To diminish potential for constitutional crisis, judicial branch should have separate enforcement policing powers, with appropriate federal funding, and also co-management powers of shared police force in addition to the above described own judicial force. Such enforcement policing could be used in contempt processes and enforcement of judicial decisions. Co-management of shared police force would be beneficial in large cases needing more personnel.

These specific judicial branch capabilities would bolster checks and balances and coequality among governmental branches.

D. Independent Attorney General

Independent Attorney General similarly to federal reserve would also decrease the potential for constitutional crisis.[20] Currently, the AG is reporting to the president creating conflicts of interest and overly politicizing the Justice Department.

E. Secret Vote on President's Nominees

Congress vote on president's nominees should be cast in secret to maintain stronger congressional oversight and merit based voting eroded currently by risk of political reprisal, autocratic and group think tendencies of many politicians.

CONCLUSION

To sum up we truly need a convenient internet (and phone) form of voting to elect and hold politicians accountable. Otherwise, we will keep living in a not so "free" as often manipulatively advertised society. I hope this article will spur readers interest in constitutional reform currently being obstructed by a dogmatic treatment of the American constitution.

[20]See Fareed Zakaria CNN interview with Rachel Barkow on the brewing constitutional crisis and flaws of the U.S. constitution from Feb 23, 2025. https://www.cnn.com/2025/02/23/politics/video/gps0223-americas-fragile-justice-system (Last visited February 23, 2025).