

Matriarchist Party Manifesto

Our Family Clans will Save the World
by André Pilon
(Draft Version)

Table of Contents

Aviocracy voting with care wisdom and awareness	1
Aviocracy: voting with care, wisdom, and awareness	1
<i>Put motherhood at the center of our values</i>	1
<i>Give a crucial political role to mothers</i>	1
<i>Only our grandmothers will have the right to vote</i>	1
Grandmothers' exclusive right to vote ideological foundation	2
<i>A new word: Aviocracy</i>	2
<i>Compare democracy and aviocracy</i>	2
Democracy: the least bad political system	3
Is it possible to make everyone aware of everything?	3
We never have time to educate everyone every time	3
<i>The majority game</i>	3
Everyone must be competent about everything when it comes to politics	4
Seldom relevant government proposals	4
Exceptions make us continue to believe	4
Cynicism is at its peak	4
<i>Grandmothers become antennas of political positioning</i>	4
Grandmothers naturally radiate benevolence	4
Equal political power for all maintains confrontation and division	5
<i>Why settle for the least bad political system?</i>	5
The inability of our democracy to solve the child poverty problem	5
Can participation rates close to 100% be possible at Municipal and School Board Elections?	6
<i>The right to vote and eligibility</i>	6
<i>Popular consultations become much more affordable</i>	6
Mandatory Referendums: Reproduction, Sexuality, War Abroad	6
<i>Justify ourselves to our descendants</i>	6
<i>Aviocracy is a refinement of democracy</i>	7
<i>References</i>	7

Aviacracy voting with care wisdom and awareness

Aviacracy: voting with care, wisdom, and awareness

Put motherhood at the center of our values

Moving from our capitalist patriarchy to modern matriarchy will not be a simple evolution of our way of life. After centuries or millennia of denigration, putting motherhood at the center of our society's values will disrupt the rest of our value system. It's even hard to imagine for most of us here in the Western Hemisphere, who are immersed in omnipresent patriarchy for generations.

Our current way of life will inevitably lead us to painful social episodes in an increasingly nearer future. In the end, we should instead consider a real revolution, which we can happily foresee peaceful and progressive.

We cannot avoid these tragedies without making radical changes, even in our most fundamental beliefs. For example, will democracy, as we worship it, enable us to deal with the challenges before us? For us, the answer to this question is no. And we want to offer a credible and viable alternative in the long term.

Give a crucial political role to mothers

Some constituents of matriarchies can thus integrate rather directly into our society. For example, an in-depth study of the most well-known matriarchies makes it possible to realize that respect for motherhood generally results in a mothers' fundamental role at the political level. The principle aims to compensate for the responsibility of women who become mothers by giving them the exclusive right to choose the political representatives of the entire community.^[1] There is usually an assembly of matriarchs, one of whose roles is to select governmental delegates, obviously in consensus.

Only our grandmothers will have the right to vote

In principle, this is not so far from the electoral functioning of our universal suffrage democracy. However, we would explicitly have to limit the right to vote to our matriarchs. And in our society, all we need is to grant the role of matriarch to all our grandmothers automatically. Therefore only our grandmothers will have the right to vote at the next election (or widespread consultation) and the following (unless otherwise decided by them).

The impacts of such a change will undoubtedly be very numerous. And in our modern matriarchy supporters' opinion, they will surely benefit the medium and long term. Here is the ideological foundation that we propose for this idea:

Grandmothers' exclusive right to vote ideological foundation

1. The fundamental element of human life is motherhood. We vow it all our respect and all our admiration;
2. To achieve genuine social equity between men and women, increased political power reserved to mothers compensates motherhood responsibilities;
3. Benevolence linked to motherhood leads a mother to take care of all her children and to accept them as they are;
4. Maternal awareness and wisdom mature as a woman moves from mother to grandmother. At this point, the grandmother's maternal abilities transcend her immediate family's boundaries and incline her towards caring for the entire community. The grandmother obtaining the right to vote celebrates this meaningful life event;
5. In the same way, the transition from grandmother to great-grandmother represents the right to vote transmission to the next generation;
6. The voting grandmother naturally encourages consensus among her extended family clan members and policies' fairness between humans and nature, young and old, men and women, and between rich and less wealthy. While notwithstanding their impact on future generations.

A new word: Aviacracy

We propose a new word, aviacracy (from Latin "Avia", which means grandmother), to represent this idea of the exclusive voting right to grandmothers. We are aware that this word is a direct attack on one of the fundamental aspects of human rights charters: the universality of suffrage and its equality. But when our civilization's very survival is at stake, we believe it legitimate to question one of its fundamental aspects.

The first political change we are proposing is limited to the right to vote. However, we still insist on the principle of identifying our grandmothers as the fittest among us to establish and maintain a fair and sustainable political system for us all. Faced with the Iroquois nation's survival, Barbara Alice Mann does not hesitate to state this principle clearly^[2].

We thus fully assume the implications of aviacracy on our societies' fundamental principle of equality for all. We believe that ultimately, our grandmothers are best able to make decisions and set our collective well-being. However, to ensure a quick and efficient transition, our proposal only targets the right to vote in our current political system. The question to ask us then becomes: Will a voting right reserved for grandmothers (aviacracy) better serve our society than universal suffrage (democracy)?

Once a credible system can be an alternative to democracy, it becomes possible to identify each option's advantages and disadvantages.

Compare democracy and aviacracy

Aviacracy (grandmothers' right to vote) ensures that virtually all persons with voting rights have a minimum of wisdom, life experience, and conscience to regulate the entire population's operation^[3]. On the contrary, universal suffrage democracy offers no guarantee in this respect. Instead, we can assume the opposite for a considerable number (if not a majority) of voters in a democracy^[4].

Democracy: the least bad political system

Throughout its history, great thinkers of democracy had seriously questioned its long-term viability^[5]. One can especially doubt the fundamental objective of our democracies' builders. Their goal was never really about giving power back to the people.^[6].

Just because a communist civilization collapsed at the end of the last century does not mean that our failed democratic system has suddenly become ideal^[7]! It was the least bad of the political systems. Today, we want to make aviocracy a fair political system with its exclusive right to vote for grandmothers. Our society can implement a viable and satisfactory system in the very long term for the entire population.

Democracy's appealing theoretical strength is to distribute political power equally to all, without distinction. At the time of monarchies, it was a considerable gain. Furthermore, faced with a totalitarian or theocratic political regime, it is undeniable progress today for many people.

However, we can legitimately ask ourselves if it is still the best option for our people today. Why would the less competent of us hold the same power as the wisest? Because it's the least bad of the political systems? Are our democracy's publicly exacerbated antagonisms likely to help us face the enormous challenges that stand before us at the beginning of the 3rd millennium?

Is it possible to make everyone aware of everything?

Democracy implies political power spreading among all, or if you want: the "one person (adult and citizen), one vote" doctrine. It is a very noble idea in theory. That implies, however, that it must be possible to make everyone sufficiently aware of all political issues to make informed decisions whenever a debate arises.

In practice, we must agree that this is not realistic at all. Modern social life has become increasingly complicated. Only a tiny minority of the population can have a full enough vision to form an enlightened opinion for each specific political issue.

We never have time to educate everyone every time

Believing being able to brief the entire population on every issue is also an exciting position. But in most cases, the time allotted for debate will never be enough to achieve this goal, if only for a majority of the population. Unfortunately, there is rarely more than a minority of us who are available or just interested in deepening their knowledge over a specific issue.

The majority game

Politics in democracy then becomes the majority game. To get elected, parties will have to present positions that can appeal to an electorate that is generally not seriously aware of the issues involved. These positions will often be so far away from the reality that experts in the field will not even be able to enlighten the public on the issues.

At the other extreme, another part of the population will not be interested in the debate. And yet, these people have the right to vote like everyone else. Few of us question this paradox. Instead, we accept it because it is part of the game of democracy.

Everyone must be competent about everything when it comes to politics

It is as if in a democracy, since everyone's vote equals the other, we expect at the same time that every one of us should have the same political interests. And be interested in all political subjects! Yet, our society recognizes from the outset that we have very diverse personal interests. So why suddenly should we have the same concerns when it comes to politics?

At the political level, too, we each have our particular interests. Why "force" oneself to have an opinion on subjects for which we know that our competence is limited? Sometimes some have no interest in politics. Why wait for any political decision on their part?

Seldom relevant government proposals

Generally, the government will tailor a proposal to try to rally a majority. That is between people aware of the issue's stakes, too few, and others who are not interested or little. It will, therefore, be somewhat irrelevant, only attractive. Almost everything that unfolds around corruption in awarding public contracts in recent years in the West is an eloquent example of this dynamic.

Exceptions make us continue to believe

There are, of course, exceptions. Sometimes some subject packs a sufficient proportion of the population, and a more appropriate proposal occurs. We then keep believing in this egalitarian foundation of democracy. One can think of this relatively serene debate about medical assistance in dying in Canada.

Cynicism is at its peak

However, most of us have been repeatedly disappointed by political decisions in areas we care about deeply. These decisions seduced most of the electorate but did not adequately resolve the problem they claimed to address. To the point that today reigns a cynicism unhealthy towards politics^[8].

Grandmothers become antennas of political positioning

Rather than insisting on equality between all, aviocracy identifies grandmothers to become a kind of political positioning antenna for each family clan. Indeed, there will be many knowledgeable people around each grandmother. It is much more reasonable to believe that at least one or more people among them will be sufficiently familiar with a problem for a particular political issue. These people can feed the debates to those interested in each extended family. That will allow the family clan to make an informed decision through their grandmother's vote(s).

Grandmothers naturally radiate benevolence

Of course, aviocracy presents the theoretical risk of grandmothers posing as a threatening or dominant group. However, that has never happened in any known matriarchy. In a modern matriarchy, as in all existing or previous matriarchies, grandmothers will naturally radiate benevolence and ensure consensus

decisions making^[9]. They will consult their kin and make sure that the outcome considers everyone's opinions and needs. Their right to vote will most often only serve to express this consensus clearly.

In this sense, with an exclusive voting right for grandmothers, an aviocracy will give a fairer voice to every one of us than our universal suffrage democracy. Thus, the consensual nature of the debates that shall emerge from an "aviocratic" political refocusing on our grandmothers will be more appropriate to avoid the chaotic collapse of our civilization.

Equal political power for all maintains confrontation and division

It is not a question here of wanting to prevent anyone from intervening and putting forward their point of view. Instead, it is to recognize that giving equivalent political power individually to all of us is only one way of maintaining confrontation and division. Aviocracy makes it possible to realize that motherhood naturally brings altruistic behavior to mothers. This maternity skill is a great benefit that can be beneficial for the whole community. Aviocracy aims specifically to make us benefit from this.

Why settle for the least bad political system?

For decades we have been content with the least bad of the political systems. Yet, how many innovative ideas could have served the whole population well but did not come to fruition because of this flawed political system's weaknesses? How many of them could have convinced the community gathered around our grandmothers through consensual debates?

Imagine that you have a promising idea, which could make life better in your community. Would you try to have it adopted by referendum in our universal suffrage democracy, or otherwise in a society where our grandmothers would have an exclusive voting right? Or, conversely, does the inability to convince the majority of the electors of our democracy mean that your idea is not worthy? Would have it refused by an exclusive vote of the grandmothers not give more weight to this refusal?

The inability of our democracy to solve the child poverty problem

Our democracy has amply demonstrated its inability to solve crucial problems. For example, in 1989, there was a unanimous vote in the Ottawa Parliament to eliminate child poverty in Canada by 2000. Far from improving, the situation has deteriorated during the following 25 years^[10]. Are the people of Canada not rich enough collectively? Yes, of course! Does Canada's Parliament lack powers? Absolutely not!

There is an efficient solution to this problem, known for a long time. A promising pilot project took place in Manitoba in the 1970s (« Mincome »^[11]). This program would undoubtedly have solved this problem once and for all. But the Mincome project was abandoned, even before it could deliver its encouraging conclusions, almost 30 years later^[12]. It's a safe bet that if MPs had to deal with grandmothers' votes, they would have solved the issue, as solemnly promised.

Our political system is not even able to deal with a problem as simple as child poverty. So how can we trust that it will solve the issues of collective survival that we face?

Can participation rates close to 100% be possible at Municipal and School Board Elections?

Undoubtedly, many in every family clan are serious about schools and what is happening in their city. These members of each family clan will be able to give an enlightening point of view to others. There will be discussions leading to a consensus with the grandmothers of each family clan. It will be a question of giving meaning to the voting rights of grandmothers. So, we will have a better chance of choosing the right people in school and municipal elections. These will immediately become much more representative. We will probably even have participation rates approaching 100% in both cases.

The right to vote and eligibility

On the other hand, the question of the right to vote raises the delicate issue of eligibility. In Canada, it is a recurring topic at every public consultation. Who has the right to vote? And even one often wonders if it is only the people who hold the right to vote who voted.

Within an aviocracy, the question of eligibility and control of the vote will be much simpler. The civil status registers will serve as a basis for deciding who has the right to vote. There will, of course, be some details to be clarified, for example, for immigrant grandmothers. But the general principle may be the following: Only mothers, one of whose children has a child, but none of whose daughters are grandmothers will have the right to vote.

Popular consultations become much more affordable

It is important to note that in an aviocracy, the number of grandmothers holding the right to vote will be much lower than the number of electors of a universal suffrage democracy. Popular consultations will be, therefore, much more affordable. And so, they may eventually become more frequent. From then on, that will strengthen our governments' sense of representativeness.

Mandatory Referendums: Reproduction, Sexuality, War Abroad

The new constitution of our modern matriarchy shall impose a referendum on any law dealing with the reproduction modes and human sexuality (family law, abortion, pregnancy for others, in-vitro fertilization, prostitution, etc.). Similarly, according to the Iroquois constitution^[13], any declaration of war or deployment of military resources (troops or arms) abroad will also have to be submitted to a referendum first.

Justify ourselves to our descendants

Nowadays, it is vital to ensure the well-being of future generations. Therefore, the matriarchist constitution will include an obligation to any bill to justify itself to our descendants of the seventh generation. The governance of many Aboriginal peoples operates that way. It is found, for example, clearly stated by Chief Orel Lyons, guardian of the Onondaga people's faith, one of the five founding nations of the Iroquois Federation:

« Make your decisions on behalf of the seventh generation coming. Those faces are looking up from the earth, layer upon layer, waiting their time. Defend them, protect them; they're helpless, they're in your hands. That's your duty, your responsibility. »^[14]

Aviocracy is a refinement of democracy

We did the exercise of comparing Aviocracy and Democracy for educational purposes to understand this new political system. But the two are not opposed. On the contrary, it is quite the opposite. Aviocracy can be considered more as a refinement of democracy. Because basically, grandmothers will naturally foster consensus within families. So in aviocracy, power always remains in the hands of the people, but through their grandmothers.

References

1. « Previously, women conducted the selection of our leaders, and their behavior in the village, their forthrightness, their integrity, was a primary subject of the discussion that took place. We chose the cleanest men to guide our affairs. We chose the men with the greatest integrity, the strongest, the most forthright and upright men, to handle our affairs without regard to their political career goals. » (p. 48)
Lee Maracle, *Daughters of Mother Earth : The Wisdom of Native American Women*, Decolonizing Native Women
Praeger Publishers, 2006, ISBN : 0-275-98562-8
2. « In a resurrection of Indian ways of dealing with Indian issues, I propose that elder women, treaty and Non-Treaty alike, come together in a nationwide council to strengthen Indian bonds, East and West. This council will be run the old way, by the Grandmothers, their feet firmly rooted to the ground, judging other women by their messages and their deeds. Each woman is to bring the best gift of her community, to share unstintingly with all her relatives. All points will be patiently heard, and in the voices that raise them. Only once they have thoroughly examined the issues and concluded likely answers will the women turn the matter over to the men, retaining the right to overrule them, should their feet fly too far off the ground. » (p. 99)
Barbara Alice Mann | *Daughters of Mother Earth : The Wisdom of Native American Women*
Praeger Publishers, 2006, ISBN : 0-275-98562-8
3. « As female progenitors, grandmothers are generally accorded a high degree of respect cross-culturally, grandmothers are often perceived as bearers of wisdom, whose memories of the past and of genealogical links are often important assets » (p. 940)
Cheris Kramarae, *Dale Spender*, *Routledge International Encyclopedia of Women : Global Women's Issues and Knowledge*
Routledge, 2000
4. « A new study has thrown doubt on the ability of the average voter to make an accurate judgement of the performance of their politicians, showing that voter biases appear to be deep-seated and broad. »
Average voter is unable to accurately assess politicians, new research shows
Cambridge University Press, December 24, 2012^[†1]
5. « No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of Government except for all those other forms that have been tried from time to time. » (p. 574)
Richard Langworth, *Churchill by Himself : The Definitive Collection of Quotations*
Ebury Press, 2008
6. « Claiming "democracy" - without, however, giving more power to the demos - the moderns have not only trapped the people they claim to serve, but it is also the language itself that they have betrayed: how, from now on, bring to light the anti-democratism of speeches, practices, systems, and politicians classified under the label of "democrats"? The shift in meaning experienced by the word "democracy" is undoubtedly the main masterstroke of modern political

propaganda.» (loose translation)

Originale quote : « Se réclamant de la « démocratie » – sans toutefois donner plus de pouvoir au demos –, les modernes n'ont pas seulement piégé le peuple qu'ils prétendaient servir, c'est la langue elle-même qu'ils ont trahie : comment désormais mettre à jour l'antidémocratie des discours, des pratiques, des systèmes et des hommes politiques rangés sous l'étiquette de « démocrates » ? Le glissement de sens qu'a connu le mot « démocratie » constitue sans doute le principal coup de maître de la propagande politique moderne. »

Francis Dupuis-Déri, L'esprit antidémocratique des fondateurs de la « démocratie » moderne Article publié dans la revue AGONE, no 22, septembre 1999, pp. 95-114 (visité le 2023-07-13)^[12]

7. « In the West, we have idolized the democratic system to such an extent that we have lost all critical thinking about it, going so far as to substitute for the word justice. » (loose translation)

Originale quote : « En Occident, on a ce point idolâtré le régime démocratique qu'on a perdu tout esprit critique à son endroit, allant jusqu'à le substituer au mot justice. »

Jacques Dufresne, La démocratie et l'éducation Encyclopédie de l'Agora (visited June 19th, 2018)^[13]

8. « ... eight out of ten (79%) say they have "little or no trust at all" towards "politicians in general". » (loose translation)

Original quote : « ... huit personnes sur dix (79 %) affirment avoir « peu ou pas confiance du tout » envers les « politiciens en général » . »

Guillaume Bourgault-Côté, Le Québec désabusé de ses élus^[14]

LeDevoir, March 24th, 2016 (visited April 21th, 2016)

9. « On the political level, the matriarchal consensus principle is of utmost importance for a truly egalitarian society. The consensus principle is the foundation for building new matriarchal communities. It prevents splinter groups, cliques, or individuals from dominating the group. It brings about a balance between the genders and between the generations. » (p. 5)

Heide Goettner-Abendroth, The Way into an Egalitarian Society : Principles and Practice of a Matriarchal Politics (visited June 19th, 2018)^[15]

10. « Even as Canada's economy has more than doubled in size, child and family poverty is worse in 2014 than it was in 1989 at both the national and the provincial level. »

Child poverty, 25 years later: we can fix this Campaign 2000 Ontario, November 2014^[16]

11. « The purpose of this experiment was to assess the social impact of a guaranteed, unconditional annual income, including whether a program of this nature would cause disincentives to work for the recipients and how great such a disincentive would be. »

Mincome^[17]

12. « Only two groups of people worked fewer hours: married women and adolescents ... When they left the labor market to give birth, they stayed longer at home ... adolescents, and boys in particular, have reduced their hours of work because they took their first full-time job at a later age. ... they stayed longer at school. ... the success rate in high school (Grade 12 ! Grade) increased during the course of the ... experience ... hospitalization rates decreased by 8.5% in the subjects of the experiment. » (loose translation)

Original quote : « Seulement deux groupes d'individus ont travaillé moins d'heures : les femmes mariées et les adolescents ... Quand elles quittaient le marché du travail pour donner naissance, elles restaient plus longtemps à la maison ... les adolescents, et les garçons en particulier, ont réduit leurs heures de travail, car ils ont pris leur premier emploi à temps plein à un âge plus avancé. ... ils restaient plus longtemps à l'école. ... le taux de réussite à l'école secondaire (Grade 12 ! Terminale) a augmenté au cours de l'expérience ... les taux d'hospitalisation ont diminué de 8,5% chez les sujets de l'expérience. »

Stanislas Jourdan, Canada : Retour dans le passé de la « ville sans pauvreté » (visited June 21th, 2018)^[18]

13. « The War councils had to run their decisions by the Clan Mothers' councils and the men's Grand Council. ... The Clan Mothers had the ability to disband war councils and declare peace. » (p. 127)

Bruce Elliott Johansen et Barbara Alice Mann, Encyclopedia of the Haudenosaunee (Iroquois Confederacy) Greenwood Press, 2000

14. Orel Lyons, allocution American Indian Studies Program, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, April 17, 2008 (from 11 min. 20 sec.)^[19]

^[†1] <http://phys.org/news/2012-12-average-voter-unable-accurately-politicians.html>

^[†2] http://classiques.uqac.ca/contemporains/dupuis_deris_francis/esprit_anti_democratique/esprit_anti_democratique_texte.html

^[†3] http://agora.qc.ca/documents/la_democratie_et_leducation_2

^[†4] <http://www.ledevoir.com/politique/quebec/466350/sondage-leger-le-devoir-le-jdem-le-quebec-desabuse-de-ses-elus>

^[†5] http://www.hagia.de/fileadmin/user_upload/pdf/the_way.pdf

^[†6] <https://campaign2000.ca/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/ONRC2014.pdf>

^[†7] <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mincome>

^[†8] <http://revenudebase.info/2012/12/06/evelyn-forget-experimentation-mincome-canada/>

^[†9] <https://nnidatabase.org/video/oren-lyons-looking-toward-seventh-generation>