

Resolved

The communistic allocation mechanism present in the American electoral system is leading to market inefficiencies just as it did in the economic arena.

Introduction

Why do some organisms flourish while others die out? For all the complexity of life the answer is simple, those creatures that are able to adapt to changes in their environment quickly enough will survive while the rest will go the way of the dinosaurs. But the idea of environmental change demanding adaptation is not exclusive to the world of living things. Ideas too must be dynamic if they are to last in an increasingly capricious world.

Why has The United States been so successful in the past? Why is America the only remaining super power today? What accounts for America's current greatness? The answer to all 3 questions is simple – historically America has been willing to embrace the changes needed to overcome whatever challenges it faced. Whether the task was mobilizing a depressed economy to win a World War or connecting the nation with thousands of miles of highways, America has been able to adapt and succeed. Now the time has come for the United States to embrace change with regards to its outdated electoral system.

The cornerstone of the American experiment, the constitution, has the ability to amend itself which has been the saving grace of the US government for the last two hundred some odd years. As societies progress, attitudes change and new technologies come into play, a government must be able to address these transformations if it hopes to survive. The ability for a government to adapt to its surroundings is as important to its continued existence as adaptability has been for the survival of countless organisms from the single celled amebas of yesteryear to the complex humans of today. And just as life is dynamic, constantly being improved to better suit its ever-changing environments, so too must the American government, specially the American voting system, change if it wishes to remain the alpha-creature on this planet.

Evolution is a very long and slow process, but radical changes in the environment can often force radical changes in an organism. In America, such a radical environmental change has taken place, but the adaptation has thus far lagged. There is a problem with the organism that is the United States electoral system and I propose a radical adaptive change.

What is this great environmental change that the American voting system faces? The advent of the internet and the ensuing information age. We now have an unprecedented ability to progress due to new technology. Therefore, being the city upon a hill¹ that we are, we have an obligation to do so. Perhaps H.G Wells put it best, “Our political contrivances; just as our domestic and mechanical contrivances need to undergo constant revisions as knowledge and understanding grows.”² One thing is for sure, in the last fifty year our knowledge and understanding has grown drastically but our political contrivances have stagnated.

¹ A reference to John Winthrop's 1630 sermon entitled “A model of Christian Charity”, in which Winthrop proclaimed the Massachusetts bay colony to be a city upon a hill watched by the rest of the world.

² Take from page 987 of H.G Wells' Outline of History Fourth Edition.

Problem

Simply stated, the political leaders of this country are not interested in serving the nation's best interests. The problem is not that American politicians are selfish or inept; rather the problem stems from the flawed way in which our current electoral system motivates politicians. It is a structural defect; it is a problem of allocation. The state planned³ allocation is too frugal in some accounts and too frivolous in others and inefficient by all accounts.

The phrase "one person, one vote" pretty much sums up the American voting system.⁴ But the idea is inherently flawed. Common sense will dictate that a system where an educated, well-informed, employed and overall contributory member of society wields as much political power as an illiterate, brainless moron is a deficient practice. Today, we have a system in which the needs of a derelict and the needs of an upright citizen are treated with equal importance. I ask the reader to examine this statement of "one person, one vote" with American Principles in mind.

At first glance, "one person, one vote" only seems fair. And surely America stands for what is fair. But how fair is "one person, one vote" really? To examine this axiom, I think it is best to look at a socio-economic system that 50 years ago would have landed the writer and reader in a House of Un-American suspicion⁵ for simply mentioning. I am, of course, referring to communism.

What is communism but the economic embodiment of the idea one person, one equal share?

That is, if there are 1,000 people and 10,000 head of cattle then everyone is entitled to 10 head of cattle, their *equal* share. This is regardless of if you are the cattle rancher who raises 50 head of cattle or one that raises 2. Under ideal communism everyone is allotted their equal share of the GDP regardless of their contribution. Now, what at first seemed fair, an equal share for all, seems infinity unfair. "One person, one vote" is the governmental equivalent of the communist economic system.

With communism people pool their communal talents and work to create an end product that is notoriously inefficient and inferior to that produced by capitalism. Today our voting system is pooling the communal interests of its citizens and the result is a system that makes poor decisions. In the communist economic system, people are not motivated to work efficiently. In the communist electoral system, politicians are not motivated to govern efficiently. It is a plain fact, some people are more vital to this nation than others, and they are the ones we must tend to.

Equality is a fairy tale; the world is full of alphas, epsilons and everything in between. To see evidence of this one merely has to open his eyes and ears to see that some people are taller, smarter, more attractive, or funnier than others. Anyone with reason can not argue that absolute human equality exists. The United States has firmly established that absolute economic equality should not exist. Why then do we have absolute equality when it comes to our voting system?

³ State Planned is a term used to describe the method of allocation and production in the communist economic system. This criticism is a foreshadowing of later criticism of this economic system.

⁴ With the notable exception of the Electoral College foolishness we have inherited from our forefathers.

⁵ The House of Un-America Activities sought out and persecuted communist in post-war United States.

Solution

If a system where the absolute equality of “one citizen one vote” is in fact an inequality then what is truly fair? To answer this question I look to an economic system championed by the American and other free peoples of the world. I am, of course, talking about capitalism.

Under a capitalist system, a person theoretically receives his contribution to the gross domestic product. In other words, compensation is directly linked to contribution. A person of intellect who works hard and produces 100 widgets will receive \$100,000 while a lazy or dimwitted person who produces 10 widgets will only receive \$10,000. Those with ability, drive and vision are given a larger share of the economic pie than those who are dumb or indolent. It is from this inequality that the greatest fairness of the American tradition has arisen.

Essentially capitalism not only makes the economic pie larger by motivating people to work harder and more efficiently, but also allots the bigger pieces to those who have worked to grow the pie. Capitalism serves as a mechanism by which those who contribute more get more back. This reward system has been responsible for making America great for over 200 years. If capitalism has worked so well as our economic system then why not employ its principles with respect to our voting system as well? It is time to abolish the absolute equality of our voting system that has led to such unfairness. It is time for our voting system to transform.

The main goal of the capitalistic economic system is to grow the economic pie. One way it does this is by allocating more purchasing power to those who have contributed more to that pie and thus provides motivation to produce. Conversely, Contributocracy does not attempt to grow voting power since there is a sort of zero sum associated with the concept. That is, for someone to gain more relative voting power—more of a percent of the total vote—someone else must inevitably lose it. Instead the primary goal of Contributocracy is to allocate voting power based on one’s contribution to society. This, in turn, should put leaders in power who are concerned more with the needs of the contributory members of society - the true best interests of America.

Contributocracy would do this by affording a sort of voter capital to those who have contributed to the nation. In turn, the voters would “spend”⁶ their voter capital at elections and instead of the leader being chosen by a strict numerical majority, the outcome would be determined by a count of the voter capital. And like monetary capital today, voter capital would differ from citizen to citizen.

Best Interests Defined

And just what are the best interests of the country? They are certainly not the collective interests of the masses measured by the number of heads, but rather the collective interests of the citizenry weighted by how they choose to employ their heads. Quite simply: the best interests of America are the interests of those who have contributed to America’s greatness; the interests of those who obey the laws, who pay their taxes, who serve in the military and who choose education over ignorance.

⁶ Not literally since one’s voter capital would not go down after they have voted.

To see this let's take the example of a hypothetical county where 55 percent of the people are uneducated, lazy leeches, that do not want to work, do not want to pay taxes or contribute in any way to the nation they inhabit. Then, by way of the current system, the nation would elect a man who catered to the needs and wants of the unemployed, welfare grabbing leeches. This leader would not do what was best for the country because the people who elected him do not care what is best for the county. This leader is trying to please the greatest number of people and in doing so has destroyed the country. It is a degenerate democracy; it is the post Periclean democracy of Athens in which the statesmen would do anything for votes. No system where politicians court the dregs of society and the righteous man alike can stand for very long.

By following the capitalist ideology and applying Contributocracy, we will have created a government focused on the needs of those who have created and maintained the American way of life not those who have leeches off it. And this can only be achieved by valuing the votes of contributing members of society more highly than those of non-contributing members.

Contributocracy in Outline

But who is a contributory member of society? How should we divvy up this voter capital? Ay there's the rub. There are an infinite number of things that make a person a contributory member of society but a finite number of them are quantifiable and have existing infrastructure. The criteria for voter capital I propose, in no particular order, are: tax dollars contributed, years of military service rendered, level of education achieved, and adherence to laws.

At this point I must remind the reader that the "capitalism" which we enjoy in America has an asterix next to it. We all want something pure but the reality is that the alloy is much stronger. Accordingly, our economic system is not capitalism in its purest form. Mankind has found that pure capitalism is imperfect, and that while the recipe for the perfect economic system is primarily capitalistic in nature, it can be improved upon by sprinkling a few socialist programs like Social Security, minimum wage laws, and Medicare. For this reason, in the determination of voting points no one should have less than one voting point and no one should have more than ten. That is, people should "max out" in every category so that someone who contributes a billion dollars in taxes will not have a million times the wealth related voting power of someone who contributes only a thousand tax dollars. Also one should not be able to be awarded all ten points based on any one category. This voting point ceiling and floor acts as a sort of socialist like safety net between the communist voting system of today and the capitalist voting system of tomorrow. This safety net is needed to protect against rule by the extremes of society: rule by the extremely wealthy, the extremely educated or the men and women extremely dedicated to the military.

Voting Criteria

Taxes

The taxpayer; that's someone who works for the federal government, but doesn't have to take a civil service examination. -- Ronald Reagan

A nation, like a business, can not function for an extended period of time without money coming in. Those who pay more in tax dollars allow for greater national project such as highways, schools and Star Wars⁷. A strong balance sheet is the foundation for any nation. So isn't it only fair that someone who contributes a million dollars annually to build the nations infrastructure and defense be allotted more voting power than someone who only contributes ten thousands dollars? Those who put more money in, should get more voting power out. It is only logical.

By no means am I advocating that those who make excessive amounts of money are more scrupulous than those who do not. In fact, I would be far more inclined to argue the opposing view. Therefore, I would suggest that a cap be placed in the realm of one hundred thousand dollars so that someone paying 1 million dollars in taxes would not receive any more tax related voting capital than someone paying one hundred thousand dollars in taxes. This cap would also serve to curtail a plutocracy.

Military service

War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things. The decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks that nothing is worth war is much worse. The person who has nothing for which he is willing to fight, nothing which is more important than his own personal safety, is a miserable creature and has no chance of being free unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself.

--John Stewart Mill

People sleep peaceably in their beds at night only because rough men stand ready to do violence on their behalf.

--George Orwell

Those who serve in the armed forces put their lives on the line to protect the interests of their country. They are doing the nation a great deed by providing force to protect American interests in the same way that those who contribute tax dollars are providing money to protect American interests. A standing army is invaluable to any modern nation and those who contribute their time should be duly rewarded with voter capital.

But how to frame voter capital from military service, especially in relation to other criteria, is a sticky situation. How many tax dollars are equitable to putting one's life on the line? That is a question I shall dare not answer. Instead I will make a suggestion- let this criterion float. In peacetime, let it be worth less and in times of great peril let it be worth more.

⁷ "Star Wars" was the term that many scientists used to refer to the Reagan's SDI program. The term originally had negative connotations in that many scientists thought the idea of SDI was outlandish and could only occur in science fiction. Today, both supporters and critics use the term.

Laws Observed

Law is order, and good law is good order.

--Aristotle, Politics

Law and order are quintessential to a nation's stability and survival. In simplest terms, a person who obeys the laws of a society is a good citizen of that society.

Someone who murders, rapes and steals does not deserve to have their needs treated the same as the needs of someone who obeys the laws. Crime is an epidemic in America. Is disenfranchising criminals the answer? No. But it does serve to ensure that leaders put the needs of criminals second to those of law abiding citizens.

I propose that all citizens be granted the full voter capital at birth and that capital will diminish only as laws are broken. Moreover, it is important to distinguish against infractions that would diminish voter capital and those that would not. After all, it hardly seems fair that a minor, innocuous offense such as a parking ticket should serve to disenfranchise someone.

Education

Whenever the people are well-informed, they can be trusted with their own government.

-Thomas Jefferson

Education is the adapter which will make the nomadic spirit of freedom and self reliance compatible with the cooperation and wealth and security of civilization.

-H.G Wells, Outline of History

While the other criteria have primarily served as a means of determining if one deserves political clout, the education voting criterion is both that and a measure of how well an individual can wield that power. It is only by a significant emphasis on this criterion that Plato's philosopher kings will ever be sovereign.⁸ After all, if Democracy is built on any foundation more than the natural rights of men, then it is built upon education.⁹

Mill wrote about the necessities of education, especially skepticism, argument and debate, if there were to be true liberty. People must be educated if they are to be free. Accordingly, a misinformed voter is the greatest threat to national security. Empires are not destroyed from without until they have collapsed from within, and nothing will rot the core of the nation faster than pestilence of ignorance. Like an invisible virus ignorance infects those whose mind's immune systems are too weak to fight it off. Ignorance is the plague that killed Pericles¹⁰ and ostracized Aristides.¹¹

⁸ In Plato's The Republic the philosopher kings were the rulers of his utopian city state, called Kallipolis.

⁹ The natural right of man is an Enlightenment idea developed in opposition of the divine right of Kings with is mentioned later. These natural rights can be seen in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence.

¹⁰ Pericles died in 429 BCE by the Great plague that stuck Athens. He was one of Athens most talented and devoted statesmen but was attacked personally by his fellow citizens for his love of capable woman not born of Athenian blood, Aspasia of Miletus.

But this malady has a readily administered cure. With both written and spoken words, in both classrooms and private studies the contagion is cured and immunized against. Ignorance, being a disease of the mind, impairs one's judgment and those afflicted should not be allotted the same voter capital as those with free minds. For free minds will never vote for an imprisoned state any more than they would for a horse as vice president.¹²

I believe this to be the most important criterion. We may only have the Republic for as long as we can keep it,¹³ and we may only keep it for as long as we are educated enough to do so. It is through reason and understanding that the nation's sanity will be preserved, not fear and mob rule.

If we look at education as the way in which one comes to understand the world he lives in, then those without it are without a proper understanding. And why should they be allowed to attempt to solve a problem which they do not understand? Those lacking education are merely speculators, guessing at a candidate as one guesses on the Bulletin Board, selling short a country's future with a lack of understanding.¹⁴

If education is the lens from which we view the world, than only those with clear vision should be at the nation's helm. By not empowering the educated, we risk scraping the hull on dross, venturing into vituperative waters, and eventually running the ship aground. If we are to remain the first vessel, then we need vigilant captains with a reputable knowledge of the sea.

Basically, I would agree that, "Votes in themselves are worthless things. Men had votes in Italy in the time of Gracchi. Their votes did not help them. Until a man has education, a vote is a useless and dangerous thing for him to possess. The ideal community towards which we move is not a community of will simply; it is a community of knowledge and will, replacing a community of faith and obedience."¹⁵

On Other Criteria

In deciding on these four criteria, I have lamentably discarded many others. There are a myriad of other factors that determine if a citizen is contributory or not. Things like participation in community service, the rearing of "good" children and general goodwill all fall into this category. But unfortunately, only a few are easily quantified and have

¹¹ Aristides, according to Herodotus, was the most worthy man in Athens. He was called Aristides the Just because of his humble demeanor despite his numerous military victories. He was ostracized by his political enemies, namely Themistocles. According to a story by Plutarch, one citizen voted for his ostracism, because he was "so bored by hearing him called Aristides the Just."

¹² Caligula, a Roman Emperor many consider to be mentally ill, supposedly appointed his beloved horse, Incinatus, to the position of Consul to the Senate. This position is relatively equivalent to the position of Vice President in modern day American in that the Vice President is the President of the Senate.

¹³ At the Constitutional Convention, a group of people asked Ben Franklin as he was leaving what type of government has been created to which he responded, "A republic, If you can keep it."

¹⁴ The Over the Counter Bulletin Board (OTCBB) is an index where stock are traded that do not meet the requirements of the major indices such as the NYSE or AMEX. These stocks are typically traded by speculators, who buy on insights not shared by the investment community at large. Selling short is a play on words deriving from the investment technique of short selling where an investor sells a stock they do not own and then tries to buy it back at a lower price. Short selling defies the general trend of the market and therefore is thought to carry a higher degree of risk.

¹⁵ H.G Wells, Outline of History page 830, fourth edition.

existing bureaucratic structures in place. That is, the IRS already knows how much each person pays in taxes, the legal system already records people's infractions, the Department of Defense keeps already keeps record of military service and there is already an established accreditation system in place for educational institutions.

Inherency

And it is only intelligible to purpose the question- If Contributocracy is the next step in governmental evolution, why hasn't it taken hold already? The answer lies in many factors. Firstly, if we view our government again as an adaptive organism then it is true that, "no animal will change when its conditions are good enough for present survival."¹⁶ In short, people are currently content with the less than perfect system and there is little clamoring for revolution. The problem is heating up, but the water has yet to boil.

Moreover, Contributocracy is not the next "step" in the ladder toward the perfect government as there are not steps on this golden ladder. There isn't even a ladder but more of an ever flowing wave. For governmental change is fashionably cyclical, and just as the Roman Republic was replaced by the Roman Empire, and 1648 gave way to 1848,¹⁷ governments are constantly cycling though themselves. Contributocracy is just a phase of the cycle transposed upward.

Furthermore, the United States today is in a very unique situation. People aren't voting primarily based on what politician will provide basic necessities of live. For the vast majority of people, basic food, clothing, and shelter are not their top priority. Instead, people are voting along the lines of luxuries and morals. I would agree that the nuance to Democracy of Contributocracy would have been quite inefficient, even disastrous, had it been implemented in almost any other time, or even today in almost any other place. But the modern American state is different, and it is from this difference that we can derive a competitive advantage. Where the old states were rigid and solid in structure, the modern state is far more liquid. American's have no gentlemen class, and laugh at titles of Lordship and Dukedom. Today, education has replaced superstition and ability coupled with hard work has replaced absolute inheritance. Instead of oppression and poverty we have a land of opportunity- at least for those who take. God never did bestow his divine right in these lands, not for very long anyway.¹⁸ Perhaps it is time we take the experiment to the next level. Tell the tyrannous majority¹⁹ that there will be no taxation without *proportional* representation.

Moreover, it is only in the recent past that we have had the capabilities to make this change. This brings me to my last and gravest inherent barrier- ability to reform. Man could not have the chariot without first inventing the wheel. Likewise, society could not have afforded Contributocracy without the marvels of the information age. Without

¹⁶ H.G Wells, Outline of History page 661, fourth edition

¹⁷ Two particularly important years in European history, especially 1848 which was the year in which revolution swept the Europe and the globe.

¹⁸ The Divine Right of Kings stated that the Monarch was empowered and legitimized by God. Therefore, to go against the King would mean going against God.

¹⁹ John Stuart Mill in his book On Liberty warned of a system where the majority could impose their will upon the majority with absolute power.

computers and the internet Contributocracy could never be viable on the scale necessary to accommodate a nation of three hundred million. These new inventions have blossomed a new tree of opportunity and it is time we reap the fruits. As Al Gore said in the film An Inconvenient Truth, “Because the new technologies so completely transform the consequences of that old habit that we can’t just mindlessly continue the pattern of the past.”

Workability

Contributocracy is workable because America has the technology and the idea can be implemented with existing bureaucratic institutions. Computers and the internet opened up a new world of opportunities for this nation’s political system, but the allocation of voter capital has remained unchanged even though there has been a drastic environmental change. In the past, the ability to write changed the world irrevocably by allowing civilization changing advances such as codified law. The advent of the digital age has brought about no less of an absolute, irrevocable change.

Today, America could keep a record of everyone’s voter capital and have the file dynamically linked to the person’s income tax, legal status, education received and so forth and so on. Therefore, when a person’s file was modified their voter capital would be instantly updated to reflect that change.

Solvency

Contributocracy solves the problem of the inefficient and unfair allocation of leaders. The current system is based on the absolute equality principle of communism, which leads to such unfairness. Contributocracy remedies this situation by borrowing from the capitalistic allocation mechanism, where by he who contributes more gets more back. This mechanism will allow for greater overall fairness and also empowers leaders that have the best interests of the nation’s best in mind.

Advantages/Disadvantages

1.

The proposed voting structure could disenfranchise certain ethnic or political groups. By way of example, let us imagine that the members of a certain group, political or ethnic, typically do not contribute many tax dollars, do not participate in serving the country militarily, do not obey the laws and do not think it prudent to attend an accredited institute of higher learning. Yes, Contributocracy could effectively disenfranchise that group of people. But I ask – would you want those people actively participating in the electoral process to begin with? It would seem that they lack the know how and the merit to choose their own leaders.

2.

Today, in America, I hear a great clamoring for the cessation of immigration. “They will take our jobs,” goes the battle cry, “and destroy our nation’s values. They only

come here to bleed this nation dry, they don't care about America." But surely they are only our jobs for as long as we may keep them, and we are all immigrants to this country. As for the values of this great land, they are, as of the current system, nothing more than the collective ideals of the numerical majority. So yes, under the current system, if "they" do come here and are able to overcome "our" numerical majority then "they" will be able to change "our" values. "They" may, as of yet, bleed this nation dry and then assume ownership of it. But with Contributocracy, "they" can do none of this. If malicious immigrants are the enemy then Contributocracy will be the bulwark. For no number of immigrants who do not contribute will ever change our politics.²⁰

3.

Moreover, Contributocracy could be the light needed to cast off the dreary haze of dollar morality and leave in its place a more reasoned contributory morality.²¹ One positive externality is a state where people want to contribute. Truly, there are those who love this nation; who are not here to see what they can take but what they can give. It is the helm that should belong to them, for if it were not for their efforts there would be no ship. It is only logical.

4.

The inherent flaw of inheritance is regrettable indeed. But as some may inherit a good work ethic, good looks or an aptitude for academia from their parents others still may inherit wealth. Therefore, for simplicity's sake, I would not degrade the tax dollars received from inherited wealth.

Potential Criticisms

Retrogression

Some may see this new electoral system as a regression of sorts, as a destruction of an ideal that democracy has fought long and hard to attain, as a reneging on the axiom of "one person, one vote." But something is not better than something else merely because it has come afterwards; after all, the Dark ages were after the Pax Romana. One may critically reference the Democracies of yesteryear when the vote of a noble counted as much as the vote of an entire village. But I assure you that Contributocracy is anything but; it serves to enfranchise not a random elite but a select group of contributory members of society.

Aristocracy

²⁰ David Easton, in his book The Political System, described politics as "the authoritative allocation of values for a society."

²¹ Nietzsche in his book On the Genealogy of Morality used the term slave morality to refer to the oppressed disdain of the nobleman's strength and power.

One may ask if this proposed government is an aristocracy. I would respond with an examination of the word aristocracy, which is derived from the late Latin aristocratia, “government of the best”. So I say to the questioner, yes Contributocracy is an Aristocracy in that it is a rule by the true best.

Gerontocracy

As outlined, the voter capital criteria are inclined to lead to a sort of de facto gerontocracy. This flaw stems from the obvious fact that people tend to be achieve more education and contribute more tax dollars as they grow older. So in order to avoid this unwanted externality, I proposed two possible solutions.

We could normalize the voting power based on age. That is, if the 20 – 25 year old age group comprises 5% of a nation’s populations, then that age group will account for 5% of a nations voting power. Though, this system does have the potential disadvantage of discounting more contributory generations and placing a premium on the votes of less contributory ones.

OR

We could amortize the initial investment into the individual over that individual’s lifetime, with larger payments due later in life.

To illustrate this idea let’s take the simple example of Tom O’Neil. When Tom is born and for the subsequent score of years after that or so, he is unable to contribute significantly to the state in terms of taxes, military service. In this period of this life, Tom is becoming educated and, hopefully, obeying the laws. These first 18 years of life are a time when the state is investing in Tom by providing him with an education, roads, safety, etcetera. Now, in order to avoid the pitfall of gerontocracy, we must take this initial investment and depreciate it from Tom’s voter capital as he ages. Think of it as a sort of deferred payment student loan that encompasses the costs of one’s entire upbringing. The payments do not start until Tom is say twenty five or thirty, and do not weigh heavily until he is say forty or fifty. (Another safeguard against a potential rule of the elderly is the criterion of law’s observed. At 18, everyone is granted full voter capital for this category and the clean slate can only be sullied from there.)

Conclusion

In America, we hold our economics dearer than our politics. No true American would stand for absolute egalitarian economics. Economic communism was our Carthage, and, accordingly we salted the earth that sustained its ideology.²² But, for some reason, Americans are accepting of an absolute egalitarian voting system. I recognize that, in America, economics trumps politics, but I do not see why the two subjects should

²² When Rome destroyed Carthage after the Third Punic war it salted the soil.

have opposing ideologies. Surely, an ideology cannot be correct for one facet of society and wrong for another.

I defend the argument of a selective increase of real enfranchisement along two lines; what is fair and what works best; in other words equity of allocation and pragmatic efficiency. The contributory members of society not only deserve a larger political influence but will also be able to run the country more efficiently with this added power in hand. Once voter allocation is readjusted, the invisible hand²³ of politics will take effect and choke the specter that once haunted all of Europe²⁴.

Mill²⁵ warned of a tyrannous majority imposing its will upon the rest of us simply because of numerical superiority. A thousand worthless tyrants are surely worse than one and one is intolerable. So I say raise the guillotines and draw up the nooses by the thousands, for it is time we put an end to the incessant ramblings and whims of this undeservingly enfranchised corps. Let us put the good citizenry at the helm so they might guide this nation soundly. It is time the politicians court the builders and maintainers of this nation not merely the inhabitants of it.

© Strazzulla 2008

²³ The “Invisible Hand” is a term found in Smith’s Wealth of Nations and is strongly associated with the free market economy.

²⁴ Marx begins the Communist Manifesto with the line “A specter is haunting Europe – the specter of communism.”

²⁵ In his book On Liberty John Stuart Mill used a term “tyranny of the majority” to refer to the majority imposing its will on a defenseless minority.