

Earn a Verified Certificate for this course!

[Get Started](#)

x

[Forums / General Discussion](#)[Help](#)

Council of Competence

✉ You are subscribed. [Unsubscribe](#)🔖 No tags yet. [+ Add Tag](#)Sort replies by: [Oldest first](#) [Newest first](#) [Most popular](#)[Johann Quiring](#) · 2 hours ago 🔒

Hello,

we have a great problem in government. The problem is low competence of the politicians. How we can move the best people in the nation into government.

What if we would abolish the Senate and create a Council of Competence. A council that should be voted by the House of Representative and choose only the brightest and smartest people in the nation. This council would have only one duty to design bills and send it to the House for adoption. The house would not have the right to create a bill only to adopt the bills from the council.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[Anonymous](#) · 2 hours ago 🔒

That would be a horrible idea.

The notion of having the house and the senate elected independently is to minimize concentration of power.

A divided congress, like we have today, is precisely what the framers intended, so to make it difficult that any single branch of government has too much power.

You are basically defending parliamentary rule, which is the system of government most popular in Western Europe. You can summarize it as a dictatorship in which the dictator is replaced every time that there are elections for the elective body (House of Commons, Parliament or whatever).

In Europe, a continent that has been totalitarian for most of the last 2000 years, the idea of a dictatorship in which the keys to power are passed among a selected few, this idea might be interesting. In the US, which was born as the anti "totalitarian Great Britain", not so much.

Everything in the constitution is designed as to minimize the situation that you suggest.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

Joel Kovarsky · 4 minutes ago 

Johann,

You cannot be serious. This is quite a wild assertion. You want the partisan House, whose members are elected every two years and often determined by very narrow local and parochial interests, to start picking a "Council of Competence"? Do those people get re-chosen every two years? Given our past history, and the early problems getting the states to even select their own Senators, I have to agree with anonymous--this would be a regressive and far less democratic system. What is the competence of House members to select for competence? Are the "best people" the scholars? Arguably not in terms of running a political system. And then I am left with the cynical implications of David Halberstam's book, *The Best and the Brightest*: http://www.newyorker.com/talk/2007/05/07/070507ta_talk_packer .

In Halberstam's own words:

"The basic question behind the book," he later wrote, "was why men who were said to be the ablest to serve in government this century had been the architects of what struck me as likely to be the worst tragedy since the Civil War."





We know that not everyone agreed with his Viet Nam War analyses, but the point remains--are the "best and the brightest" the best political managers? Perhaps more mundane is how do we measure competence for political office? The Founders--at times competing but certainly skilled partisans--most certainly considered these issues.

↑ 0 ↓ · flag

[+ Comment](#)

New post

To ensure a positive and productive discussion, please read our [forum posting policies](#) before posting.

B	<i>I</i>			 Link	<code>	 Pic	Math		Edit: Rich ▼	Preview
<div></div>										

☐ Make this post anonymous to other students



Subscribe to this thread at the same time

Add post

