

# Slip of the tongue

(April 2024)

A quite revealing slip of the tongue of the President of the United States a few days ago:

- "Are you ready to choose freedom over democracy?"
  - "Are you ready to choose unity over division?"
- 

While one would be adamant to insist on the prominence of *Freedom*, one would think that *Democracy* is only a tool supposed to guarantee *Freedom*, which it fails to achieve.

There is not a single mention of the word *Democracy* in the U.S. Constitution, which however does refer repeatedly to *Freedom* and *Liberty*.

The Constitution enounces popular aspirations quite clearly in its preamble:

1. Justice,
2. Tranquility,
3. Common Defence,
4. General Welfare, and
5. The Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.

As for the President's second question, it so happens that *Democracy* only exists **because** of division, not thanks to unity.

*Democracy* should be called rather *Pleonocracy*, from the Greek root *πλείων* (more numerous, majority) <sup>1</sup>. If such a thing as a unitary people existed (*δῆμος*: land or people), then *Democracy* could make sense, although the notion would then be redundant and useless, but there is no such thing as a unitary people.

The philosophy of the Enlightenments, which inspired the Founding Fathers before there was even a President <sup>2</sup>, seems to have succumbed since 1789 under the relentless assaults of 45 neo-washingtons and their questionable *éminences grises*.

Modern *Democracy* seems to serve only the purpose of pitting one half of the population against the other, violently and hysterically, at the expense of *Freedom*, and

---

<sup>1</sup> A proposed alternative could be *Elithiocracy*, from Greek *ήλίθιος* : foolish, senseless (could be rightly confused with *Elitocracy*, which however would be a barbarism).

<sup>2</sup> Until the then military Commander in Chief maneuvered the Constitutional Convention to his personal advantage.

of appointing one incompetent politician rather than another, or one after the other (their day always comes, like in a Congress of Dogs, each Amorous Stud patiently waiting in turn for reproductive access to Lady Bitch in Heat).

However, the Crusaders of Universal Democracy (those professional politicians who benefit from it), claim that the Whole World envies Western Democracy and can't wait for the West to come and destroy their countries in order to impose *Democracy* on them.

Whereas it is well worth remembering that the only objects of importance are individual freedom, justice, tranquility, common defence, and general welfare. *Democracy* does not substitute for the above. *Democracy* is only a tool, which has been perverted by politicians and has lost its original purpose.

According to the Western political specimens, is it reasonable to believe that some industrious populations on the other side of the planet should crave a state of perpetual revolution and instability with some transient caretaker knocking down the existing policies every other year to replace them by the exact opposite?

**Question:** in your opinion, which of the following options seems preferable?

1. A very competent and honest caretaker with decades of experience, albeit not elected directly;
2. A chaotic, vulgar, and outrageously expensive electoral system in which one caretaker will be chosen by (partially) universal suffrage among two equally incompetent but equally ambitious candidates, each promising to destroy outright the policies of his opponent;
3. An incompetent and dishonest caretaker without any experience, and in addition not directly elected;
4. A well-organized, polite, respectful, and inexpensive electoral system in which one caretaker will be chosen by absolute universal suffrage among several very competent and benevolent candidates, each committing to preserving stability and concern for the losing parties.

**Suggested answer,** from the most to the least undesirable:

3                      2                      1                      4

If possible, please provide a few international examples for each option.

Do you think that the absolute undesirability of the worst option necessarily justifies the desirability of the runner-up, or shouldn't the modern Citizen Philosopher obstinately attempt to improve the model without preconceived opinion?