

THE 10x BETTER ELECTION SYSTEM

(AND WHY IT IS BEING ILLEGALLY SUPPRESSED)

This document describes a revolutionary election system being illegally suppressed by the U.S. government. It's a transparent, hack-proof, and completely fair election system. And the fact that it's a completely fair system (e.g., it makes all minority's voices equal to White voices) means that it's also a powerful civil rights idea. However, before I describe it in detail, let me inform you that it is being illegally suppressed by the federal government and describe plausible motivation factors for the suppression. (I met an undercover FBI agent who confirmed the idea is being suppressed but lied about the motives.)

Part 1: Why the Federal Government Would Want to Suppress This Idea

A. The FBI's History of Persecuting Civil Rights Activists (COINTELPRO)

The FBI's unconstitutional COINTELPRO program (1956–1971) was a covert campaign to surveil, infiltrate, discredit, and disrupt domestic political organizations. Its targets included:

- **Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.** – The FBI tried to blackmail King, sent him an anonymous letter suggesting he commit suicide, and wiretapped his phones.
- **Malcolm X** – The FBI infiltrated his organizations, spread false rumors, and monitored his every move.
- **The Black Panther Party** – The FBI used illegal wiretaps, forged letters, and encouraged violent conflict between rival groups.

The program was explicitly designed to "neutralize" leaders who advocated for racial equality and political change. The FBI's justification was that these activists were threats to national security, but in reality, they were exercising their First Amendment rights.

They used various deceptive tactics to accomplish their criminal goals, including lying and creating fake documents (to discredit innocent civil rights activists) and even criminal frame-ups. They also regularly used local police departments as proxies to execute their dirty work (e.g., assassination of Fred Hampton).

Why the 10x Election System is a Civil Rights Idea: The random-sample election system makes every voice equal. It eliminates the demographic skew in voter turnout (e.g., white, wealthy, older voters currently dominate). For the first time in history, minorities, working-class people, and young voters would have the same statistical weight as any other group. This would fundamentally change the political dynamics of the country, likely shifting power toward the Democratic Party and away from the Republican Party. The FBI has a documented history of targeting civil rights leaders who sought exactly this kind of change. It is therefore entirely

plausible that the same agency would try to suppress an idea that would achieve, through mathematics and transparency, what activists have fought for decades to accomplish.

B. The CIA's History of Using False "Election Fraud" Pretexts

The CIA has a long, documented history of lying to Congress, the media, and the American public. Former CIA Director Mike Pompeo famously said in 2019: "I was the CIA director. We lied, we cheated, we stole. We had entire training courses." One of the agency's most effective tactics has been to manufacture or weaponize false claims of election fraud to justify destabilizing or overthrowing governments that the U.S. wants removed. When the Cold War excuse of "anti-communism" became less credible, Washington switched to "democracy promotion" – and with it, the ability to cry "stolen election" became a powerful propaganda tool.

Here are three clear examples where the CIA and the U.S. government used a false or heavily manufactured election fraud pretext to intervene, impose sanctions, or topple a leader:

1. Nicaragua (1984): Manufacturing a Boycott to Sabotage Legitimate Elections

After the 1979 revolution, the leftist Sandinista government scheduled national elections in 1984 to prove their democratic legitimacy.

- **The CIA / U.S. Claim:** The Reagan administration and the CIA launched a massive propaganda campaign branding the election a "Soviet-style sham" and a totalitarian farce. They claimed opposition was suppressed and the vote could not be trusted.
- **The Independent Reality:** The primary opposition leader, Arturo Cruz, withdrew from the race, giving Washington the perfect talking point. However, it was later revealed that Cruz was secretly on the CIA payroll and had been pressured by the agency to drop out specifically to sabotage the election's credibility.
- **The Verdict:** International observer teams from Western Europe, Canada, and the U.S.-based Latin American Studies Association (LASA) concluded that the election was remarkably fair, open, and competitive, with the Sandinistas genuinely winning around 67% of the vote. The CIA completely fabricated the "sham" narrative to justify continuing their illegal proxy war and mining Nicaraguan harbors.

2. Haiti (2000): Starving a Democracy over a Technicality

Left-wing populist Jean-Bertrand Aristide won the Haitian presidency in a 2000 landslide, and his Fanmi Lavalas party swept the legislative seats.

- **The CIA / U.S. Claim:** The U.S. government and intelligence apparatus declared the entire election illegitimate and deeply fraudulent, claiming the Haitian government had rigged the vote.
- **The Independent Reality:** The entire "fraud" claim rested on a minor mathematical technicality regarding how the top-voted candidates' percentages were calculated for

seven Senate seats (whether to count only the top choices or all votes cast). Even if calculated the alternative way, Aristide's party maintained an overwhelming majority.

- **The Verdict:** The Organization of American States (OAS) initially praised the election as a success, but under intense diplomatic pressure from Washington, changed its tune. The CIA and the U.S. used this manufactured "fraud" pretext to enact a crushing international aid embargo on Haiti, deliberately break the country's economy, fund anti-Aristide paramilitary groups, and set the stage for a 2004 coup where U.S. forces physically flew Aristide out of the country against his will.

3. Bolivia (2019): Weaponizing Flawed Mathematics

Indigenous socialist President Evo Morales ran for re-election in 2019. On election night, the preliminary quick-count tally paused, and when it resumed, Morales's lead had jumped just enough to avoid a runoff election.

- **The CIA / U.S. Claim:** The OAS issued a dramatic report claiming "clear manipulation" and a statistical anomaly that proved fraud. The Trump administration, fully backed by U.S. intelligence assessments, immediately weaponized the report to declare Morales illegitimate, fueling violent protests and a military-enforced coup that forced Morales into exile.

- **The Independent Reality:** Independent data scientists and statisticians from MIT and the Center for Economic and Policy Research (CEPR) conducted a thorough audit of the raw data and proved that the OAS report was based on completely flawed methodology. The shift in the vote count was not fraud; it occurred simply because the final votes to be counted came from deeply rural, indigenous areas that had voted overwhelmingly for Morales for over a decade.

- **The Verdict:** The claim of a stolen vote was a mathematical illusion used as a democratic cover story to replace a socialist leader with a right-wing, U.S.-friendly regime.

Why this matters for the 10x Election System: A truly hack-proof, transparent, random-sample election system would make it impossible for the CIA or any U.S. administration to credibly claim that an unfriendly foreign government "stole" an election. The modern pretext of election fraud – which has been used to justify sanctions, economic warfare, and military intervention – would evaporate. That directly threatens a key tool of U.S. foreign policy. It is therefore entirely plausible that powerful actors would try to suppress an idea that would eliminate their ability to lie about election integrity.

Part 2: The 10x Better Election System (And Powerful Civil Rights Idea)

Did you know that since not everyone votes on election day, it is also technically a poll? Mathematically speaking, anything less than the full population voting means that our elections are technically also just polls or surveys. And we already know how to conduct

intelligent polls (via probability & statistics), and the way we conduct the poll that decides who our leaders are on election day is anything but intelligent!

Notice that what we call "voter turnout" on election day is what mathematicians call a "sample size", and the sample sizes that we encounter in any probability & statistics textbook are typically on the order of just a few thousand (or even less) and are never in the tens of millions like on Election Day. It may seem counterintuitive, but the reason why we don't need overly large sample sizes can be understood with a simple analogy: Do we have to look at an entire bottle of green Gatorade to know it's green, or can we discern that it's green via just a single little drop? The answer is obviously the latter — but only if the Gatorade is mixed RANDOMLY. Similarly, the sample size that we call "voter turnout" on election day is NOT taken randomly because not all demographics vote equally.

The SMART way to conduct polls is via relatively SMALL (in the thousands, not millions) and RANDOM sample sizes, but we very unintelligently do neither! So how much better would our election process be if we implemented an intelligent poll instead? The answer is AT LEAST 10x better. If we can list out 10 or more upsides with only a single or no comparable downside, then conducting an intelligent poll is 10 or more times better than the unintelligent poll that we use today.

The 16 Upsides (Pros):

1. More Accurate

The entire end goal of conducting an election is to measure the voice/will of the people AS A WHOLE, and an intelligent poll measures that collective voice FAR more accurately than the unintelligent poll. For example, if the true preferred candidate (Mickey) is up 51% to 49%, and we randomly sample only 20,000 voters in the U.S. eligible voting population, the probability of Mickey LOSING the election is only 0.23%. If Mickey were leading by 53%, with a random sample of just 5,000 voters, the probability of losing drops to 0.00102% — that's the true preferred candidate not being elected about once every 98,000 election cycles (or about once every 392,000 years)!

2. More Fun

One fun implementation closely resembles a lottery with cash prizes: the government provides a unique lottery ticket during registration. On Election Day, tickets are drawn live on television (just like a lottery) to select the random electorate. Winners receive a phone call from election officials, confirm their identity via security questions and voice recognition, and cast their vote. Winning lottery numbers and corresponding votes are publicly posted for full verification. Why not give all randomly chosen voters a few thousand dollars for their participation — and make Election Day a national holiday with optional NFL games? It is not written into the laws of nature that our elections can't be fun.

3. Makes Everyone's Voices Equal

One of the greatest aspects of this new election system is that it renders demographically skewed elections a thing of the past. It finally realizes in practice the dreams of countless civil/voting rights activists. Regardless of race, wealth, gender, or any other characteristic, all are equal under this new intelligent election system.

4. Not Everyone Has to Vote

The fact that we can much more accurately measure the will of the people with far fewer people voting is a definite upside, not a downside. It's simply mathematics. An individual casting a vote is only a tiny, almost minuscule step toward the end goal of measuring the will of the people AS A WHOLE. Why bother measuring an entire Gatorade bottle when a single drop tells us the same thing?

5. Much More Transparent

Since an intelligent poll requires only a small electorate and can be done via telephone, everything can be done in one central location with extreme transparency. We can build a building with literal transparent walls and floors, invite all independent media outlets, place cameras everywhere connected to the internet for 24/7 public observation, and publicly post all winning lottery numbers with their corresponding votes so anyone can verify the count.

6. Voting Machines & Paper Ballots Rendered Obsolete

Much anxiety has risen over voting machines being hacked (e.g., the Dominion \$787 million settlement scandal) and mail-in ballots being manipulated. Regardless of whether this has actually occurred, it undermines the entire election when people believe it has. This new system renders both voting machines and mail-in ballots completely obsolete, along with their associated risks.

7. Virtually Hack-Proof

Through sheer simplicity, transparency, and the non-existence of voting machines and paper ballots, an intelligent poll is virtually hack-proof. Someone cannot hack a voting machine that doesn't exist. Someone cannot manipulate a paper ballot that doesn't exist. And even if someone were to somehow hack a vote via the telephone system, the publicly posted lottery number and vote pairing allows immediate red-flag correction.

8. Election Fraud Much More Difficult

Since this new system is extremely transparent and virtually hack-proof, it makes it extremely difficult — if not virtually impossible — for candidates or governments to commit election fraud. It would also render FALSE ACCUSATIONS of election fraud futile. If this system had been in place in 2020, we almost certainly would not have experienced the subsequent chaos of January 6, regardless of which side you believed.

9. Literally Saves Lives

This last election cycle, held in the midst of COVID-19, exposed how dangerous it is for voters, volunteers, and election officials to physically attend polling locations. This new system makes it safer to hold elections during future national crises. If this system had already been in place, we would have avoided countless COVID cases obtained simply by waiting in line to vote.

10. Voter Mobilizations Unnecessary

This new intelligent poll voting election system makes the extreme hassle of enticing people to the polls a thing of the past.

11. Easier to Predict Elections

Pollsters currently have to go through the extra hassle of polling "likely" voters to correct for the skewed sample size of voter turnout. This new system eliminates that unnecessary extra layer since all eligible voters are equally likely to be chosen, making predicting elections much simpler and easier.

12. Environmentally Friendlier

Aside from saving trees by eliminating paper ballots, in this age of rapid climate change, the large amount of CO2 emitted by voters being transported to physical polling locations is problematic. This new system solves this problem since physical polling locations become unnecessary.

13. Much Less Costly

Our current inefficient election system — with costly voting machines, physical polling locations, ridiculously high sample sizes, paper ballots, and shipping fees — is absurdly expensive. This new system renders all of the above obsolete. So much money can be saved that we can easily afford to give cash rewards to the randomly chosen electorate as a way to stimulate interest and engagement.

14. Increase Voter Engagement

Since we can implement an intelligent poll voting system in a fun way with a holiday, cash prizes, etc., it almost surely entails a substantial increase in voter engagement — and might even spawn an interest in probability & statistics as people grow curious to understand the mathematics behind the "magic."

15. Strengthen/Spread Democracy

With our controversial recent elections, our democracy has become somewhat of a joke to many around the globe. One of the nicest consequences of employing such a superior voting system is that other democratic nations will surely copy us, and other non-democratic nations will be more open to adopting democracy.

16. Eliminates Voter Intimidation at Polling Locations

This system completely eliminates the very real problem of voter intimidation and harassment that occurs at physical polling locations. Thousands of voters — especially women, voters of color, and gender-nonconforming individuals — have reported verbal harassment, aggressive poll watchers, armed individuals, and police presence creating fear. Because this new system conducts everything privately over the phone with a fully anonymized lottery selection, those dangerous encounters become a thing of the past. This is a profound moral and practical upgrade that makes the intelligent poll system even more clearly superior.

Cons (None Yet):

I have \$100 to anyone who is the first to conjure up a downside (con) that's on par with one of the 10+ upsides listed above — nobody has been able to articulate one to me! Send your best downside/con to my X account: @notanalien101 (Israel Flores). Note that the con must be AFTER the system is implemented and it must apply to the people AS A WHOLE. Therefore saying "politicians will never agree to do it" is NOT a con because we're obviously talking about a con AFTER the system becomes a reality.

Versatility of Intelligent Election Systems

A version of an intelligent election system can be applied in every country or place that holds elections. All that is meant by "intelligent election system" is one that measures the collective will of the people via a scientific poll (random sampling), especially one with safeguards to make it virtually hack-proof. The specific system described here can be further improved by incorporating a ranked choice voting system into the mix. This U.S.-tweaked version is presented for familiarity and as an introduction to more intelligent systems.

Will an Intelligent Voting System Ever Become a Reality?

If you're thinking this intelligent election system will never become a reality, think again. Imagine that we lived in a world with only old black and white analog TVs. Now imagine a genius engineer created detailed blueprints for the latest flat screen TV and started sharing them openly. With enough engineers acquiring the knowledge, someone would eventually build it — because the flat screen TV is many, many times better than the old black and white set. Similarly, conducting an intelligent poll voting system is many, MANY times better (at least 10x better) than our current system. The U.S. is definitely not the world's only democracy — most countries in the world are democracies of some kind. After one nation implements this system, most if not all will surely follow. How many black and white TVs are still around? Therefore, kindly begin sharing the good news! :)

Probability Equation

The probability equation used to calculate Mickey's aforementioned chances of losing the election is an excellent model for calculating the probability of the true preferred candidate not being elected in a two-candidate election system with a large eligible voting population. (The "true preferred candidate" is simply what statisticians would call the candidate with the highest percentage population mean.)

For our first Mickey example: if the true preferred candidate (Mickey) is favored with 51% true support ($p = 51\%$), and we randomly sample 20,000 voters ($n = 20,000$), the probability that he or she will not be elected is less than 0.23% — much less than 1%.

For our second Mickey example: if the true preferred candidate is favored with 53% true support ($p = 53\%$), and we randomly sample only 5,000 voters ($n = 5,000$), the probability that he or she will not be elected is less than 0.00102%. That's the true preferred candidate not being elected about once every 98,000 election cycles — or about once every 392,000 years!

$$f(n, p) = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=0}^{n/2-1} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} & ; \text{if } n \text{ is even} \\ \sum_{k=0}^{(n-1)/2} \binom{n}{k} p^k (1-p)^{n-k} & ; \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \end{cases}$$

n = sample size

p = true population percentage of **pre**ferred candidate

$f(n, p)$ = probability of **pre**ferred candidate **not** being elected