

Tristan Davis

From: Office of Commissioner Clark
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2026 11:36 AM
To: Commissioner Correspondence
Subject: Docket Correspondence

Good morning,

Please place the attached email in Docket No. 20260000. Thank you!

Hannah E. Branum

Executive Assistant to Commissioner Clark
Florida Public Service Commission
2540 Shumard Oak Blvd.
Tallahassee, FL 32399

(850) 413-6004



**FLORIDA PUBLIC
SERVICE COMMISSION**

From: Steven Jenkins <aboriginalamerican1776@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2026 11:30 AM
To: Office of Commissioner Clark <Commissioner.Clark@psc.state.fl.us>
Subject:

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

The institutional landscape of Florida operates through a mechanism of structural disenfranchisement where the 60% supermajority requirement for constitutional amendments functions as a mathematical cudgel against the will of the populace. By mandating that any citizen-led initiative must reach a threshold that was historically unmet even by the very bill that established the rule, the state has engineered a system of minority rule. In the specific case of Amendment 4 in 2024, the failure to secure reproductive rights despite a clear 57.17% majority demonstrates how a minority of 42.83% is granted the absolute power to nullify the democratic preference of the majority. This disparity is not a byproduct of functional governance but is a calculated application of institutional inertia designed to prevent the codification of civil liberties that a significant portion of the electorate explicitly demands.

The administrative hypocrisy becomes scientifically evident when comparing the gatekeeping of human rights to the unchecked exercise of power regarding legislative redistricting and the rigging of electoral maps. While the Florida government demands an nearly impossible consensus from its constituents on matters of bodily autonomy, it simultaneously bypasses the electorate entirely to engage in aggressive partisan gerrymandering. This creates a bifurcated reality where "the people" are subjected to the rigors of a supermajority, yet the ruling party exercises unilateral authority to carve the state into safe districts that ensure their continued dominance. The refusal to put redistricting to a public vote reveals a strategic awareness that such maps would never survive

the same 60% threshold they weaponize against social progress, highlighting a systemic corruption where the government selects its voters rather than the voters selecting their government.

The resulting political environment is one where the state government plays a sophisticated game of make-believe, pretending to be a passive observer of "the rules" while actively manipulating the board to its advantage. By choosing to implement a 60% barrier for public initiatives while retaining absolute control over the mechanics of the election itself, the Republican leadership has effectively chosen the capabilities of an all-powerful entity for its own preservation while presenting a facade of helplessness to its constituents. This is the ultimate paradox of the "superhero" with no capabilities; the government claims it cannot act on the majority's desire for reproductive rights due to the law, yet it possesses the total capability to manipulate the geography of power to ensure those laws never change. It is a totalizing system of control that treats the democratic process not as a means of representation, but as a series of obstacles to be navigated, bypassed, or reinforced depending on which outcome best serves the maintenance of the ruling party's hegemony.

The state of Florida exemplifies a deeply entrenched and fundamentally corrupt political regime that systematically undermines the core tenets of democratic governance, sovereignty, and the constitutional rights of its citizens. A primary instrument of this systemic corruption is the imposition of a supermajority requirement, specifically a 60% threshold, for the passage of any legislative measure within the state. This artificially inflated support barrier functions as a calculated device designed explicitly to prevent the implementation of progressive reforms and popular legislation, regardless of the actual will of the majority. Rather than serving as a safeguard for stability or bipartisanship, it operates as a cloaked mechanism of disenfranchisement, disabling the expression of the people's true preferences and effectively allowing a minority of entrenched political interests to veto the collective voice of the populace. This threshold is not rooted in any constitutional or democratic necessity but is instead a manipulative tool crafted to serve the interests of those in power, ensuring that no meaningful change can occur unless supported by an unachievable supermajority, thus cementing an oligarchic control over the legislative process.

In the recent electoral cycle of 2024, the state of Florida demonstrated its blatant contempt for democratic legitimacy through the failure of Amendment 4, a constitutional measure explicitly designed to secure reproductive rights for women, including the right to access abortion services. Despite the amendment garnering a clear majority support of 57.17%, it was defeated solely because it did not reach the imposed 60% supermajority threshold. This outcome underscores the fundamentally anti-democratic nature of the threshold itself, as it acts as an insurmountable barrier that systematically obstructs the enactment of widely supported policies. The defeat of Amendment 4 illustrates how the state's electoral system, cloaked in procedural legitimacy, effectively denies women their reproductive autonomy, rendering their majority support meaningless within the constraints of this artificially high support requirement. This reveals an institutional bias that favors conservative interests and suppresses the will of the majority, thereby eroding the legitimacy of the entire legislative process and illustrating the profound disparity between democratic ideals and actual governance.

Furthermore, a comprehensive examination of the historical record reveals that since its implementation, the 60% support threshold has never once been satisfied in the state of Florida. No bill, amendment, or legislative initiative—regardless of its popularity or the level of public backing—has ever crossed this artificially high support barrier. This fact exposes the threshold not as a safeguard or a democratic safeguard but as an intentional barrier designed to prevent change, maintain the status quo, and protect entrenched political interests from the will of the people. The lack of any successful legislation reaching this threshold, despite Florida's historical majority affiliation with Democratic voters, demonstrates that the rule is a tool of systemic suppression rather than a genuine feature of democratic governance. It serves as a barrier to progress, a method

of ensuring that even popular reforms remain out of reach, thereby cementing a form of institutionalized voter suppression cloaked in procedural legitimacy, and exposing the undemocratic nature of the state's governance architecture.

Meanwhile, Florida's government demonstrates an even more egregious level of systemic corruption through its brazen and outright illegal manipulation of electoral boundaries via gerrymandering. The state's regime refuses to allow its citizens to participate in a transparent, fair redistricting process by denying any form of democratic vote on district maps. Instead, it unilaterally engineers electoral districts to favor the Republican Party, effectively rigging elections in a manner that is both overt and unrepentant. This process is not merely a partisan advantage but a deliberate assault on democratic principles, directly contravening the fundamental right of citizens to have their votes accurately represented. By refusing to put redistricting proposals to a public vote, Florida's government exemplifies a blatant abdication of accountability, choosing instead to manipulate district boundaries through opaque, partisan gerrymandering that consolidates power, suppresses opposition voices, and perpetuates systemic inequality. This subversion of electoral integrity is a clear indication that Florida's political regime prioritizes maintaining its grip on power over honoring the democratic principle of fair representation, revealing an outright contempt for the electoral process and the will of the people.

In stark contrast to the overtly undemocratic practices of Florida's regime, many Democratic-controlled states have instituted redistricting reforms that incorporate public votes, judicial oversight, and transparent processes intended to reflect the genuine will of their populations. Florida's refusal to do the same exposes a deliberate double standard rooted in partisan bias and systemic corruption. While Democratic states acknowledge the importance of fair redistricting, Florida's regime arrogantly dismisses this democratic principle, opting instead for a clandestine process of gerrymandering that systematically disenfranchises minority voters and consolidates power within a narrow political elite. This practice ensures that electoral outcomes are predetermined, effectively silencing opposition voices and perpetuating systemic inequalities. The state's refusal to grant its citizens the right to vote on district maps reveals an institutional contempt that is both brazen and unconstitutional, illustrating how Florida's government employs undemocratic tactics to entrench its political dominance and suppress any genuine challenge to its authority.

Furthermore, the state's manipulative approach to representation extends beyond redistricting to its allocation of congressional seats. Instead of distributing seats proportionally or based on population data, Florida's government has arbitrarily designated only five congressional districts—an absurdly minimal number that starkly underrepresents the state's diverse and expansive population. If the purpose of representation were rooted in fairness and democratic principles, Florida would have allocated a significantly larger number of seats—potentially thousands—corresponding to its demographic complexity. Instead, the decision to limit itself to a mere five seats is a calculated move to diminish the influence of its diverse constituents and to perpetuate a skewed, unrepresentative political landscape. This decision underscores an outright rejection of democratic representation, revealing a regime that values power consolidation over the fundamental right of its citizens to be fairly represented in the national legislative process. The choice to underrepresent the state's vast and diverse population is a stark testament to the systemic corruption and anti-democratic ethos embedded within Florida's governing institutions.

Finally, the analogy of selecting a superhero with no capabilities, rather than one endowed with all-encompassing powers, encapsulates the core deficiency of Florida's political leadership—an emphasis on superficial appearances of control and legitimacy at the expense of substantive capacity and integrity. The state's leadership prefers symbolic gestures, arbitrary barriers, and superficial displays of authority that mask their inability or unwillingness to implement genuine reforms or uphold democratic principles. This superficiality is emblematic of a regime that is content to maintain a facade of legitimacy while actively suppressing the rights of its citizens, choosing spectacle over substance, and power over accountability. The entire system operates as a sham, a carefully constructed illusion designed to perpetuate systemic inequality and

authoritarian dominance, all while cloaking itself in the language of democracy—an insidious and repugnant betrayal of the foundational principles upon which democratic societies are built.

In other words, the procedural architecture of the State of Florida mandates a supermajority requirement wherein any proposed constitutional amendment must attain a 60% affirmative threshold of the electorate to be enacted into law, pursuant to Article XI, Section 5(e) of the Florida Constitution, which was itself ratified in 2006. This anti-majoritarian mechanism functions as an institutionalized disenfranchisement apparatus, designed to nullify the expressed will of a simple majority and to entrench minority rule under the pretense of democratic process.

In the 2024 general election cycle, Amendment 4—formally titled "Amendment to Limit Government Interference with Abortion"—was placed before the electorate. This proposed amendment sought to codify reproductive autonomy by prohibiting laws that proscribe, penalize, delay, or restrict abortion before fetal viability or when necessary to protect the patient's health. The ballot measure received 57.17% affirmative votes, constituting a clear majority of participating constituents. However, due to the structurally corrupt 60% supermajority threshold, the amendment was deemed failed, thereby denying bodily autonomy to millions of women based on the opposition of 42.83% of voters. Thus, a numerical minority was granted veto power over a majority, demonstrating the contemptible nature of a system that manufactures failure by design.

As a recent domiciliary relocated from the State of Colorado, I was not previously cognizant of Florida's 60% ratification threshold, necessitating independent verification through constitutional and historical record review. Empirical analysis reveals that since the implementation of the 60% threshold in 2006, no citizen-initiated constitutional amendment has successfully attained the requisite supermajority, including the very amendment that established the 60% rule itself. This fact illustrates the pathological hypocrisy of a governing apparatus that imposes unattainable standards it cannot meet for its own self-legitimation. The threshold exists not as a safeguard, but as a deliberate instrument of obstruction, ensuring that popular initiatives—particularly those concerning fundamental civil liberties such as women's reproductive rights—are systematically defeated regardless of majority support.

The duplicity and bad faith of the Florida governmental apparatus is further exposed by its selective application of direct democracy. When the issue involves partisan entrenchment through legislative and congressional redistricting—colloquially termed gerrymandering—the state categorically denies its constituents any plebiscite or referendum. The Florida Legislature, controlled by the Republican Party, unilaterally enacts electoral maps engineered to dilute oppositional voting power and to artificially inflate Republican seat allocation, a practice of structural election rigging. They refuse to submit this act of political cartography to a public vote precisely because they are aware it would fail to achieve the same 60% threshold they weaponize against women's rights. The calculus is transparent: if a fundamental human right supported by 57.17% cannot clear their rigged bar, then their own partisan power grab would be obliterated by public scrutiny.

Consequently, a pattern of systemic corruption emerges: Republican-controlled states systematically refuse to allow votes on gerrymandering their own maps because the act is inherently indefensible to their constituents, while simultaneously forcing votes on Democratic-aligned civil rights issues under deliberately impossible thresholds. No Republican-dominated state that engages in partisan gerrymandering has ever risked subjecting its map-rigging to a ballot initiative, because the process cannot withstand majoritarian consent. The Florida government's refusal to vote on gerrymandering while mandating votes on women's bodily autonomy constitutes a hateful, discriminatory double standard that exposes the institution as fundamentally hostile to both democracy and its constituents.

This leads to the logical absurdity of their fabricated constraints. If the Florida government is going to engage in make-believe governance and arbitrary self-dealing under the guise of procedure, why limit itself to merely stealing five congressional seats through gerrymandering? Why not simply award itself \$5,000 per legislator? The moral and legal distinction is nonexistent—both are acts of theft from the public. If one is going to select a political archetype to embody, choosing the powerless figure with no capabilities, while pretending to be constrained by rules, is the height of cowardice when compared to the alternative: openly possessing every capability and admitting the system is rigged. The government has chosen to be the impotent superhero, loudly proclaiming its hands are tied by the 60% rule for women's rights, while simultaneously acting as an omnipotent villain when it comes to preserving its own power through gerrymandered maps that never face a vote.

Ultimately, the State of Florida's imposition of a 60% supermajority threshold for the passage of any bill represents a draconian barrier to democratic governance, effectively disenfranchising a significant portion of the electorate under the guise of requiring overwhelming consensus. This exorbitant threshold is particularly egregious given its historical ineffectiveness; since its inception, no bill has ever attained the requisite 60% approval, not even the original legislation that enacted this threshold. This systemic obstructionism culminated in the 2024 referendum on Amendment 4, which sought to enshrine women's reproductive rights, specifically the right to abortion, into state law. Despite securing a majority vote of 57.17%, the amendment was summarily discarded, failing to meet the arbitrary 60% bar and thereby denying women fundamental reproductive autonomy in Florida.

This mechanism not only undermines the will of the majority but also weaponizes democratic processes to suppress critical social issues. The 60% supermajority rule serves as a cynical tool to thwart progressive advances by rendering near-impossible the passing of any legislation that challenges entrenched power structures. While the citizens are ostensibly granted the right to vote on momentous issues such as women's rights, the threshold ensures that even clear majorities are rendered irrelevant, highlighting a grotesque manipulation of democratic norms.

Compounding this travesty is the blatant hypocrisy and calculated disenfranchisement surrounding electoral redistricting, or gerrymandering, within the state. Unlike the performative exercise of public voting on socially significant yet divisive issues, Florida's Republican-controlled government brazenly circumvents any constituent input when it comes to redrawing electoral maps. This blatant subversion of democratic principles is designed explicitly to entrench partisan dominance and rig elections in favor of the ruling party without any pretense of public consent or legitimacy. The fact that no Republican-led state engaging in gerrymandering has ever subjected such manipulations to a vote starkly exposes a double standard: Democratic states are compelled to engage voters on redistricting, while Republican states impose politically motivated boundaries unilaterally.

This grotesque distortion of representative democracy reveals a political landscape where the government cynically pretends to honor democratic procedures only when it suits its interests, while systematically disenfranchising voters on issues that threaten the status quo. The absurdity extends even to symbolic gestures, such as Florida awarding itself a mere five congressional seats—an impotent figure that betrays the state's failure to leverage its influence effectively or fairly. This entire apparatus reeks of a government more invested in maintaining its grip on power through obfuscation, exclusion, and procedural rigmarole than in genuinely representing or empowering its constituents.

So, in sum, Florida's political framework, characterized by impenetrable supermajority thresholds and unapologetic gerrymandering, constitutes a cynical mockery of democratic governance. It weaponizes rules to silence majority voices on essential human rights while monopolizing electoral power behind closed doors. This

is not governance; it is an authoritarian masquerade dressed as democracy—an affront to every principle of representative government and social justice.