

**From:** [Board Of Supervisors](#)  
**To:** [Jesseka Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: LR News: A major taking gone unnoticed.  
**Date:** Thursday, December 26, 2024 11:27:55 AM

---

**From:** [REDACTED] **On Behalf Of** local-revolutions@localparty.org  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 17, 2024 5:20 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** LR News: A major taking gone unnoticed.

\*\*\*\***CAUTION:**This is an EXTERNAL email. Exercise caution. DO NOT open attachments or click links from unknown senders or unexpected email.\*\*\*\*

Friends,

When a game host asks a leading contestant to pick a prize located behind one of three doors, a major aspect may go unnoticed.

After the contestant picked a door, the game host opens then one of the two remaining doors and shows that it is empty.

Then, the game host asks if the contestant wants to change doors.

Most often, the contestant sticks with the first choice.

- And that is the mistake.

With the original choice, the contestant knows that the chance is one-in-three to get the prize. Yet once the door with the empty cache was opened, the candidate thinks the chance is now one-in-two, either way, so there is no reason to switch doors.

- The contestant did not do the math; the option to double the chances to win the prize went unnoticed.

With opening up the door with the empty cache, this zero outcome did not get subtracted from any of the choices. The chance remained one-in-three for the door the contestant picked first against two-in-three for both other two doors combined.

*All that the game host did was show that one of the two other options was empty.*

- Conclusion: the unopened door of the two options now holds that two-in-

three chance all by itself.

The game host will not inform the candidate about the reality behind the setup of the three-door choices. This means that the game host (organization) can keep more of their money. The setup is not recognized by the contestant.

The candidate thinks that all is fair and walks away, most often without getting the prize.

--

This mathematical trick is called the Monty Hall problem. Apparently, birds are brainier than people in this respect and pick the other door for their second chance more often than humans do (and then receiving the nut).

<https://www.discovermagazine.com/planet-earth/pigeons-outperform-humans-at-the-monty-hall-dilemma>

--

--

When voters pick their political candidate who then occupies a seat on the city council, the voters may not take the inherent math of their voting system into consideration.

When a city is cut up in seven districts, for instance, folks do not recognize how that is a major taking because in the end they have someone sitting in the seat representing their district. All is fair, right?

It goes unnoticed that a very large group of voters (up to **49.99%**) got the shaft and did not get the person they had wanted to represent them.

Compare this to a city with seven council seats, but this time following Thomas Jefferson's voting system, which is proportional.

All of a sudden, the chance to go home empty handed drops to **12.49%** or lower. That is a major improvement of enormous proportions. One can get a representative this way who is far more representative of what the voters want. The political candidates must listen far better to the voters with Thomas Jefferson's voting system than with voting in districts. Plus, it is far cheaper to hold these elections.

The voters are not aware that their 'game host' rigged the elections.

- Cities and counties all across the United States, voting in districts, rig their local elections.

The political parties want to keep more political power for themselves, and do so wherever they can. Next to Red and Blue, the *political powers that be* do not want to compete with any other political colors; voting in districts keeps them in control a whole lot more.

Incumbents win more often in district voting than in proportional voting, for instance. The average representative can be up to ten years older in district voting than those selected with Thomas Jefferson's honest voting system.

--

For the Federal level, all is in line with the US Constitution. Like it or not, but there are lower standards in place for the Federal level. That is simply the way it is.

The Bill of Rights got written, however, to ensure that much higher standards would be in place for all other governmental levels.

The Ninth, Tenth, and Fourteenth Amendments ensure that governments at non-Federal levels cannot (should not) have unconstitutional elections in place. Were you aware of that?

- The powers that be are keeping folks in the dark, purposefully, and the major taking goes unnoticed.

Perhaps easiest to recognize is the fact that States are not allowed to abridge the privileges of the people (see Fourteenth Amendment). State and local governments are not allowed to rig elections in favor of the powers that be; they must honor the privileges of all US citizens inside their political territory per these higher standards.

Today, they are not fulfilling their US Constitutional obligation and they remain silent about the math behind the voting system they have in place.

--

Happy Holidays/Merry Christmas/Merry Crissmas!

May the new year bring us more cities that honor their citizens with full voting rights through the use of Thomas Jefferson's proportional voting system.

- All seats selected ***all at once***, each voter given a single vote ***in total***.

--

Fred-Rick Schermer  
Local Revolutions

A grassroots organization working toward more accurate representation in politics.