

## Two-Party Tyranny in America

### The History of the Problem, and the Best Legal Solution

The history of the Two-Party System in America is inseparable from the history of capitalism and labor in America. This history begins in 1500, when the royalty of Europe became informed that there could be, with reasonable certainty, land, trees, agricultural and mineral resources to be taken by force and exploited for their profit and benefit. The history of slavery in the western hemisphere begins at the same time, and the history of slavery is inseparable from the history of labor. A slave is a laborer, a worker, and the purpose of slavery was for the ruling class in America to have free or cheap labor. The harsh labor and all the types of dirty work considered demeaning by European-American nobility was to be performed by a permanently lower class, the lowest of lower classes being slaves. Slavery was questionable from the start, and it was always possible for a slave owner to be humane and treat their slaves more like employees. It was always possible, with a little imagination and a small amount of moral conscience to provide for the education of slaves, and even the common practice of indentured servitude with a time limit could have replaced slavery altogether. Indentured servitude of Africans in America, with a reasonable time limit such as seven years, including education and training to prepare for the free citizenship to come, would have transformed American slavery from a moral atrocity into a program of training for citizenship. To this day, many people, of all races, are not well-trained for citizenship. That is not an accident.

The American Nobility never believed in democracy in the sense that they never wanted to have labor, the majority of the people who were subsistence farmers or industrial employees, to share in the exercise of political or economic power. The political class in America always stood for the confinement of governing power in their hands, with no political power to be shared with the working people. The power to vote was initially confined to a male owner of land. Many historians have described the condition of white workers in the industrial mills of New England in the 1800's as only slightly elevated above the legal status of a slave. The employers controlled everything. In some cases the

laborers rented living space from the employer and bought their groceries from the company store. Many towns were known as "company towns," because a small group of owners owned most of the real estate: the factories, the homes, the commercial buildings. The workers were white, and they were not legally the property of their owners, but they were helpless.

They fought back, they organized labor unions. Occasionally they heard of the radically democratic ideas called "socialism" and "communism" that said the workers should share in the political power (socialism), or even exercise the greatest measure of political power (communism), called by some communist extremists "the dictatorship of the proletariat." To resist these democratic ideas, especially the concept that citizens should have economic rights as well as political rights such as "free speech," the ruling class called out troops of the United States Army to shoot and kill union organizers. And they did. This all occurred in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. The opposition of the ruling class to majority rule, democracy, and the sharing of political power called "socialism" was promoted in every forum. Any arguing in defense of socialism or the rights of working people was called "communism, atheism, anarchy," or just plain "rioting."

Recommended sources: *Labor's Untold Story*, United Electrical Worker's Union; *A Peoples History of the United States*, Howard Zinn; *The Hemingses of Monticello*, Annette-Gordon-Reed; *The Warmth of Other Suns*, Isabel Wilkerson; *Empire of the Summer Moon*, S. C. Gwynne. Film: *The Color Purple*, Amblin Entertainment, novel by Alice Walker; *Glory*, Frederick Fields Productions; *10,000 Black Men Named George*, Dufferin Gate Productions, *The Butler*, Laura Ziskin Productions, history by Wil Haygood; *Twelve Years a Slave*, Regency Enterprises, history by Solomon Northrup and David Wilson; *The Green Book*, Participant Media, history by Victor H. Green.

## How it started – unions, city mayors 1900-1950s

The complete and accurate story of the American Nobility's hatred of working people begins with the colonial experience. People from Europe, either looking for a new start or desperate to escape the conditions of poverty, were enticed by promises of free land

and a brief period of labor in exchange for the cost of the passage. The first form of capitalist enterprise, based on "land grants" by the royalty of Europe (land seized by military force) was the plantation. The plantation offered the possibility of great monetary profits and patriotic service (to one's European country) by access to tremendous natural resources that had been depleted in Europe over the centuries: lumber, the chemical products of lumber (charcoal, turpentine, pitch, tar), agricultural land for every type of crop, including feed for meat production, fish and all the products of the sea. The Grand Banks seamount was possibly the richest source of edible fish in the world. Some historians suggest that the Grand Banks and the waters off of Cape Cod had been visited by adventurous Portuguese fishermen (with the best navigational tools) before European colonization of the land.

So, the poor and middle class of Europe came to North America and became farmers, either subsistence farmers or production farmers. Later, industrial enterprises became the most popular, and most profitable capitalist schemes in America: guns and ships, thread, cloth, clothing, leather, shoes, farm tools, machine tools, wagons, railroads, everything, including "medicines" that cured every ailment. In order to have sufficient labor for these industries, people who do the work rather than sit in a mansion counting their money, the new American nobility needed to get the farmers and their children off the land. A complex interaction of economic factors accomplished that goal. Much of it looks like an accident of history, but much of it was also deliberately planned. Economic success for small farms became more and more difficult due to the costs controlled by the business elite – bankers, factory owners, real estate investors, the manufacturers of farming tools and supplies, the mortgage or lease on farm property. Between 1830 and 1850 the increase of knowledge among the population created interest in public schools paid for by local taxes. The desire for public education was driven by many positive motives. One of the motives was to do something constructive with the lives of children who were destined for poverty, and dangerous free time, when their parents lost the only thing they had of value, their farm. Therefore, the birth of public education in America included a plan to produce useful factory workers for the industrial enterprises of the young and ambitious United States, located mostly in the Northeast and central eastern states.

Unruly boys and girls needed to be transformed into obedient workers who showed up on time and followed the directives of their boss and the clock. No more wandering off on a nice day to go fishing. Factory workers became entirely dependent on the factory owners. They had to pay rent, buy food and clothing, and they no longer had the traditional resource to take care of themselves – a small family farm. In the South, the Africans captured and brought to America against their will were slaves owned by the plantation nobility left over from the colonization and theft of indigenous nations. The seeds of war over the status of labor, the status of working people, came from Europe from 1500 forward.

The meaning of labor, and wealth, is at the core of American history. The conflict between labor and wealth *IS* the story of America, and it continues. The kind of studies that we call "political science," are a continuous stream of stories about fighting between the wealthy capitalists and the dependent workers. One of the most famous and illustrative stories is the story of Sacco and Vanzetti (1920-21). It is a story about what is a labor union, and how the concept of a labor union is an act of organization intended to make the working class more independent, to maintain a system of labor where the working people exercise a reasonable share of political and economic power, instead of being economic slaves. The economic craziness of the 1920s in America is the result of over 80 years of capitalists using their economic power to control the two major political parties, the Republicans and the Democrats. Complex social issues such as women's rights and addictive substances – alcohol – entered into the political turmoil of America and distracted the people, accidentally or on purpose, from the ever-present conflict between capital control and labor's desire for independence.

The population patterns of past empires continued in the "new" American alleged experiment in democracy. That is, "free" people or lawless people lived in the "country," the "pagani" or pagans, which in the United States are called "hillbillies." Citizens lived in the cities. Classes were sorted by neighborhoods, persistent and familiar to today, and today and today. Stay away from the poor and dangerous neighbors – but they make good, cheap workers. The cost of labor is the only issue of interest to the Republican

Party. And history shows, the best way to keep labor cheap is to keep people desperate.

One of the outcomes of the 1800s in America is that some workers developed an interest in the economic principles that came to be called "socialism." The central principle of socialism rises beyond political or civil rights to the belief that social justice – a very Christian concept – requires also economic rights and political power exercised by the majority, the workers. The logical result is the minimal standard of democracy: every adult must possess the power of one vote freely cast and accurately counted. But further, the lives of individuals and families must not be controlled by investors and bankers. The rich usually view themselves as "the strong," and the poor as "the weak." Therefore, one of government's primary purposes is to protect the vulnerable weak from the selfish strong. That is socialism, or actually only the logical outcome of a real democracy. The first duty of government is to protect the public health and order, and the public health is not served if most of the population is engaged in an endless battle between investors and workers. It is easy to provide money, or "capital," for business if you already have money. It does not require time or physical exertion. But if you are required to provide your labor for the business, that means you must give up your time and your energy, your physical force and mental concentration. In other words, if you work for a corporate enterprise, all they need from you is your life. The investor who has money, obtained through laws written by their grandparents, keeps his or her time, makes no meaningful physical effort, and only needs to have conversations with equally comfortable friends about how things (business things) are going. This is what makes some working people very angry, even to go so far as was alleged of Sacco and Vanzetti in 1920 and 1921, to behave like an "anarchist."

About four million Italians came to the United States between 1890 and 1920, due to systemic poverty and natural disasters in Southern Italy. Approximately forty percent, or 1,600,000, returned to Italy because their opportunities in American were not sufficiently greater to justify the loss of culture and family ties in their homeland. During this same period the people of the United States fought over giving women "permission" to vote, and a legislative mistake that should go down in history as the most stupid act of any

nation ever: they made the manufacture and consumption of alcohol illegal. This they called "Prohibition," and instead of making American society healthier it created the pattern of an illegal substance underground black market that continues to corrode American society into the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The previously prohibited alcohol has been replaced with opioids and psychotropic drugs that the bureaucratic heads call "a controlled substance." The most outstanding fact about any controlled substance is that it is not controlled. They are all controlled by citizens who have no respect for the government or the law, and who respond effectively to the American free-market demand for addictive drugs. Americans have believed in the right to self-medicate since colonial times, and no one has invented a means to prevent them from exercising this alleged unwritten right. There should be a principle written in every history book and in every course in political science: "Don't pass a law that makes it illegal to do something that 30% or more of the people want to do." We discovered, after the prohibition laws, that somewhere between 50% and 90% of Americans wanted to drink alcohol on a regular basis. Some a glass of wine with dinner, others a case of liquor by noon, and others falling in between these extremes. Therefore, much of the roaring 1920's was spent breaking the law making and drinking alcohol accompanied by a hopeless, wasted effort to enforce a prohibition that no one really believed in. During this time of great distraction by the appearance of wealth, wild dancing, and great fun, the investors of America, who are really gamblers who have mastered the art of not working, dreamed up one of the first schemes to make fake wealth out of numbers on paper, which resulted in the great stock market crash of October, 1929. This disaster caused some people to wake up and smell the poverty.

Before the roaring twenties, the first two decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century brought progress and regress. On March 25, 1911, there was a terrible fire at the Triangle Shirtwaist Factory in Manhattan, New York, where 146 workers died because doors were locked and no effective fire escape route had been provided. Because females have nimble fingers and are good at sewing, those 146 workers were all women between the ages of 14 and 30. News of this disaster awakened many Americans to the meaning of a "sweatshop," which continued as a common industrial employment practice. The "owners" of the factory

paid each family \$75 per person killed, and were not convicted of any criminal negligence. But this profound injustice did garner support for the new International Ladies Garment Worker's Union.

This is just a teaspoon of the endless battle between capital and labor, the taste in the mouth of Sacco and Vanzetti, who were accused of attacking a factory office with guns, and being the most horrible disturbance of the quiet neighborhoods of America – "Anarchists!" But the history of Southern Italy arises out of the histories of ancient Greece and the Roman Empire. They have a long tradition of resistance against corrupt government, and this is viewed as a good thing. The "anarchists" of Southern Italy, if they lived in New England in 1776, would have guaranteed the success of the American Revolution. But by being about 140 years too late, they were just scary criminals. When I was a child and asked questions about political parties, my mother said that the Republicans are the party of the rich and the Democrats are the party of the workers. She was essentially correct, at that time in the late 1940s. But the Republicans have changed. Today, in 2022, the Republicans are the anarchists. They are opposed to the rule of law. They want the rule of men, of bosses, or commanders, or a dictator. Like Aaron Burr, they want our country to be the Kingdom of North America, and all of the billionaires are ready for the big party when they get their titles as lords and ladies and nobles. They are already nobles, but they still want the title to give public notice to all those who are not.

## Capital, Labor and Anarchy

Sacco and Vanzetti were angry, oppressed Italian-American workers, and they could have participated in the armed robbery of the Slater and Morrill Shoe Company in Braintree, Massachusetts on April 15, 1920. Two men, an armed guard and a paymaster, were shot and killed. This raised the criminal offense from armed robbery to murder. Historians do not agree as to whether Sacco and Vanzetti were guilty. Bias against Italians, all immigrants and "anarchists" at that time is well documented. If they were innocent of the charges, they might have wished they had done it. They believed that cruel, selfish factory owners who exploited the working class deserved to be robbed. To

them, the robbery of the owners' cash would have been a corrective "transfer payment," long before con-artists hired to be legislators used that term to discredit government relief for the working poor. Sacco and Vanzetti were found guilty and sentenced to death in July 1921.

By 1926, the case had drawn worldwide attention. As details of the trial and the men's suspected innocence became known, Sacco and Vanzetti became the center of one of the largest causes celebres in modern history. In 1927, protests on their behalf were held in every major city in North America and Europe, as well as in Tokyo, Sydney, Melbourne, São Paulo, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Dubai, Montevideo, Johannesburg, and Auckland. Sacco and Vanzetti were executed in August 1927. [See references and source notes on Wikipedia as well as in various history textbooks.]

## Republican-Democratic coalitions to stop socialists

At this stage of American history, people did not show respect for the grievances of the working class only with protests and demonstrations, but also with votes. In 1911, the same year as the great Triangle Shirtwaist Fire, 74 American municipalities had elected a socialist for the office of mayor or a similar major municipal office. Socialist parties and socialist candidates presented a serious threat to the comfortable dominance of the Republicans and the Democrats. They needed to do something about that, and what they did is they entered into an agreement to form a coalition to keep the socialists out of office. In some cases, such as in Schenectady, New York in 1913 and 1915, that coalition and its anti-socialist purpose were open to the public. But what developed in nearly all of the states was an unwritten agreement to promote and protect restrictive election practices which would prevent any other party from gaining public support. This American election institution was not established by law and it could not be established by law. To openly and officially obstruct all political parties except for two would be an obvious violation of the letter and the spirit of the Constitution. But they did not have to pass any laws that expressly prohibited competing parties. They just proclaimed that we



are the greatest democracy in the world and we have a two party system. And the American people swallowed it hook, line and sinker. The two party partners claimed that they would protect America from "extremism." It appears that they did for a couple of decades, and then after World War II, after the working women and men accomplished the fastest industrial production in history, and joined unions, the interest in "socialism" as a higher form of democracy was revived. Four-term Democratic President Franklin Delano Roosevelt (1933-1945) supported the concept of economic rights, and you can find the list of Roosevelt's economic rights online (and on this website). That is why the violent anger against the idea of economic rights is often expressed as hatred of the Democrats. Republicans and right-wing extremists suspect that the Democratic Party will pass laws that could make America become a democratic-socialist republic. Might that be true?

What do these words mean in the Constitution of the United States?

**Article 4, Section 4** The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a Republican Form of Government, and shall protect each of them against Invasion; ...]

What does "republic" mean? *Res publica* ?

The promotion of democratic socialism as a good thing was lethally damaged by the great battle between two sick men, Adolf Hitler and Joseph Stalin. Hitler rose to power in Germany through a long process of strident promises that he would make Germany great again after the humiliating treaty following World War I. His strategy, and his book *Mein Kampf*, created the National Socialist German Workers Party (1920-1945) with some help from Anton Drexler. The Nazis became so symbolic of evil that their style of uniform appears in the famous film *Star Wars*. In 1924, Joseph Stalin took over what could have been a benevolent revolution in Russia. Lenin (Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov), the leader of the communist movement in Russia, had dreams of having Russia reform its medieval society both economically and politically. But Lenin died (January, 1924) before he could make the transition from revolutionary to responsible nation builder. Stalin did not handle power like an optimist. His main political strategy was to imprison, enslave or kill political opponents. As crazy as he was, he presented himself to the world

as the heir to Lenin, and the leader of the Communist International Conference (1919 – 1935, aka Comintern). The Comintern was supposed to bring benevolent communism to every nation of the world, but Stalin's nut case personality and dictator behavior made communism look like a satanic cult with an army. Hitler and Stalin agreed not to enter into war, both men knowing that the great question of the time was who would attack first. Many people in the West attribute all this craziness and violence to Karl Marx, but Marx was a scholar in political economics and he died in 1883.

No historian can legitimately claim that Karl Marx would have supported the violent attitudes and methods of the Nazis or the Russian-led Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (U.S.S.R.) under the dictatorial leadership of Stalin (1924-1953). Marx sympathized with workers who were terribly exploited from 1830 through the 1880s. He said that the workers needed to unite and actively demand economic change, but he did not suggest that everyone who disagreed should be killed. The economic insights of Karl Marx are actually benevolent and potentially very helpful when viewed through a rational perspective. If we look at the big picture, socialism is a set of ideas similar to the public-interest concepts that give us homeowners insurance and a farmers' cooperative. Socialism is a set of principles to guide fairness in economic relationships, but it is not a set of rules for decision making. Democracy is a set of principles for decision making, the most basic principle being that those affected by a decision should participate in that decision. We don't expect decisions made by "the people" to be consistently better than decisions made by "the experts," but we have a lot of experience with decisions made by "the experts," including some of the worse decisions conceivable. A group of people who prefer democracy for decision making could use the democratic process to choose socialism. This is what the two-party system does not want you to hear, to read, or to believe. If you like fairness, when you read *Das Kapital* (On Capital) you will see that Karl Marx was not talking about killing anyone; he was talking about economic policies that would be fair to the workers who produced the wealth of society. He was trying to address the problem of teenage boys and girls working in textile mills ten hours a day for six days a week and losing a hand in a loom machine, ... AND when workers' compensation did not exist. He wanted political power and economic policies to show

some influence from what was supposed to be the dominant religion of Western Civilization.

The socialist mayors dwindled gradually due to the "Red Scare," Senator Joseph McCarthy, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and the cold war between the USSR and the USA following World War II. I grew up near Bridgeport, Connecticut, one of the most heavily industrialized cities in the country. But Bridgeport was also strong on civic spirit and public health. There were so many public parks in Bridgeport that it was nicknamed the "Park City." My mother and I often shopped in Bridgeport in the 1950s, and I remember seeing socialist Mayor Jasper McLevy walking on Main Street. He was a thin man who looked like he could use a bowl of stew. There was a story that when Bridgeport got hit with a bad snow storm, some citizens would complain about the slow pace of snow removal. McLevy's usual response was "The sun will take care of it." Sounds like socialist McLevy was a fiscal conservative.

### Propaganda scare – socialism equals communism, hatred of FDR for promoting economic rights

Out of the Great Depression brought to us by the bright entrepreneurs of Wall Street, came the election of 1932, where FDR was elected President because he promised the working people of America, and the starving people of America, a "New Deal." Wikipedia and many history textbooks recite the socialist economic programs enacted by Congress, and vigorously promoted by FDR, to correct the destructive effects of using the stock market and a casino for the super-rich. One of the most famous, still of great benefit today, was the Tennessee Valley Authority. Another was the Hoover Dam. For a while it looked like there could be fair economics and social justice in America. But then, just as the economic recovery looked like success for the New Deal, the fear of another great war took over, when Hitler invaded Poland on September 1, 1939. China and Japan were already at war. It is interesting that the Nazi attack of Poland was almost exactly ten years after the day that Wall Street attacked the world. The Germans suffered

severely from Wall Street's wrecking of market investing around the world. The German currency became useless and widespread poverty became the punishment imposed on Germany by her enemies. Attacking the "communists" ghosts that the Nazis saw everywhere, with an advanced war machine built by German industry, was the path chosen by the German people to make Germany great again. Americans rose to the occasion by building the weapons of war and logistical supplies more quickly than anyone thought possible. The allies (including the USSR) "won" the war, but the victory was barely satisfactory. The world was a shambles, and the USA was the strongest industrial power that had not experienced bombing. The "cold war" continued the battle between capitalism and communism, or socialism. The defenders of capitalism immediately played their cards by insisting that any form of "socialism" was actually the Stalinist communist bear come to devour American virtues. Their goal was to discredit the economic justice legislation of the FDR Democrats by arguing that Democrats equal socialism equals communism. Joseph McCarthy became their champion. McCarthy was a U. S. Senator from Wisconsin from January 1947 through April 1957.

## False alarms – Joe McCarthy and J. Edgar Hoover

From the 1940's and into the 1950s Senator Joe McCarthy and FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover argued that totalitarian communists were everywhere, including the U.S.A., and they had a plan to take control of the United States. McCarthy insisted that there was a communist spy on every street, an infiltrator in every government office. He attracted so much attention that his viewpoint came to be called "McCarthyism." Many of his allegations of secret communist plots and spies in government offices were investigated and none uncovered the alleged communist invaders. There were communists in the United States, but they were only outsiders exercising their first amendment rights to freedom of belief and free speech. There is no record of a communist party candidate ever being elected – or appointed -- to any office in the United States. In 1959 J. Edgar Hoover published a book entitled *Masters of Deceit*, which presented Hoover's view that communists in America were working hard to seduce the American people with lies. If

you find a copy of this book and read it, you will see that much of what Hoover predicted would unfold has been accomplished, but by Republicans and not communists, unless of course McCarthy was right and the Republican Party has been secretly infiltrated by the communists. President Trumpolini has been suspiciously admiring of Vladimir Putin and the Russian Communist Party, and his wife Melania (his handler?) is fond of Russian military uniforms.

## Warning from a Conservative President

### Eisenhower's Farewell Address, January 1961

In January 1961 Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had served as the Supreme Allied Commander in the Allie's successful invasion of Hitler's fortress Europe, delivered a famous farewell address. In that speech Eisenhower warned the American people of a politically powerful permanent military industry.

*He said that in the decade following the end of World War II, This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence-economic, political, even spiritual-is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.*

*In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist.*

## The liberal 1960s, Democratic leaders assassinated

We usually think of the 1960s in America as a time of rampant liberal politics and "left-wing" activity. Starting with the election of President John F. Kennedy and following with folk songs, the hippie movement, women's liberation, the Vietnam War eclipsed at home by anti-war protests, burning bras and draft cards, the Black Panthers and the Civil Rights Act. The Beatles and sex, drugs and rock and roll. But let me invite you to step outside of your U.S.A. borders and watch from a mountain top. What happened between

November 1963 and June of 1968, four of the most influential leaders of legitimate liberal politics were assassinated: John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King Jr., and Malcolm X (Little). If you do some research on the assassination of President Kennedy, you will come across evidence that more than twenty people who claimed to have information regarding the assassination of JFK, including famous journalist Dorothy Kilgallen, died under suspicious circumstances. You can add to that group Marilyn Monroe, a friend of the Kennedy family. Looking at America of the 1960s from that distant mountain top, do you see a political faction murdering their political opponents? Did President Kennedy, and the other three, do something that made the right wing feel insecure, angry, enraged? Check it out. JFK had issued executive orders that were directed against systemic racist policies at the state and municipal levels. MLK, RFK, Malcolm X, all represented liberal or left-wing ideology. An ideology that millions of Americans believe is only right: social justice, racial justice. Standing on that distant lookout, what do you see? What do you wonder? What was President Lyndon Johnson's "War on Poverty?" The drama of the 1960s encompassed the continuation of the seesaw battle between the rich and the workers, capital and labor, between conservatives and four assassinated liberals.

## 21<sup>st</sup> century, manipulation of people leads to disaster of Republican Party going fascist

The period from 1970 through 1999 continued an ongoing battle between two goals: A) a "great" or just society, or B) the dominance of government by big corporations – and everybody staying in their place. In 1989 the Soviet Union collapsed for reasons that may appear simple or complex. To me, the Soviets committed suicide by their bad but deeply entrenched habit of politicizing science. Every policy had to conform to an extreme and irrational communist doctrine. That pattern will destroy any nation. The centralized, bureaucratic economic system was so ineffective that shoppers stood in long lines to buy something while not even knowing what it was they would be able to buy when they got to the store counter. Coal miners in Eastern republics protested that they

did not have soap to wash the coal dust off their bodies. Thus, the Americans believed they had accomplished a great victory over communism. And, the "conservatives" of America, and the super-rich corporation class, developed a plan in 2016 that came to look like the revival of the American Civil War. President Trumpolini described the Klan and other White Supremacists as "very fine people." He devoted his four years as President to the destruction of the "administrative state," which means destruction of the government agencies that are supposed to protect the territory, the people, the law and public health. The American voters, viewed from a distant mountaintop, are making the same disastrous and puzzling mistake as the Soviets – the politicization of science.

## A Story of Neighbors and Guardians

Here is a parable intended to illustrate the political conditions of the U.S.A in 2022: I live in a neighborhood where two neighbors of mine are always fighting – Jack and Mack. They each feel that they are right and the other neighbor is all wrong. They get angry at me because I want them to stop fighting. They both claim they have the right to fight. They fight all the time, sometimes at night. I often go out to stop the fight and the noise, and to prevent an escalation to serious violence causing injury or murder. On occasion I talk to each of them privately, and when I do it seems like Mack is a reasonable person, and he seems to want what's best for the neighborhood and for me and my family. So, in reality, I support Mack. But Jack is different. He seems to be full of hate and is totally fixed in his viewpoint and never changes his mind. In fact, he has shown me more than once that he thinks that if you change your mind that means you are weak. Tonight is the night of reckoning. I went out to stop their fighting and they are carrying clubs and neither will listen to reason. I am yelling at Jack to stop before someone gets killed. Mack keeps yelling at me telling me that he is on my side, does not want any harm, and he wants to be a good neighbor to me and to everyone. Jack has lost control and directed his anger at me, but I just want peace and sanity. Jack has started beating me with his club and has knocked me down on the ground. I am afraid this is it, my last moments alive. Jack keeps clubbing me. The pain is terrible. I believe I have heard the cracking of my bones. If Jack connects his club to my head I will be gone. I

ask Mack to help, stop Jack from killing me. I can see Mack standing there, watching me get beaten, and Mack keeps yelling, "I am a good neighbor. I would never hurt you or anyone." I cry out to Mack: "Mack! Help me! Stop Jack. Stop him!"

So here is the question. What must Mack do to protect me, to stop Jack from killing me? Is Mack able to stop Jack? Is Mack willing to stop Jack from killing me? What if Mack starts crying? What if Mack yells at Jack and says "You are breaking the law!" I feel the wetness of my own blood. My skull is cracked and I am floating in and out of consciousness. Mack, the Democratic Party, has failed, and there never was a political party able to protect us. No one is safe now. All of us neighbors should have gotten together long ago and driven both of them out of the neighborhood.

## Why People Don't Vote (Research Reports)

Information on this issue is readily available online and in various books. The main reasons that non-voters give for not voting includes the major political issues of our time. Listed below are reports that I found in April 2019.

[Care 2]

1. My vote doesn't matter.
2. I don't like the candidates and hate the "lesser of two evils" strategy.
3. It's too rainy, snowy, hot, cold outside.
4. It takes too long. I hate waiting in line.
5. I don't know if I'm registered.
6. I don't know where my polling place is.
7. My polling place is too far away to walk there, and I have no car.
8. My work won't give me time off to vote.
9. I'll be out of town on election day.
10. I'm a student at school in another state.

[Bustle]

1. I can't get to the polls.
2. I'm not into politics.



3. I don't like the candidates.
4. My vote won't count.
5. Registration is too hard.
6. The weather is too bad.
7. Nothing in politics can change.

[YSA Youth Service America]

Young people who don't vote:

1. Not encouraged by candidates, campaigns, family, friends, neighbors.
2. Not taught how the government/elections work – don't know enough.
3. Too difficult, obstacles, busy, takes too much time.
4. Not interested in politics; won't make a difference.

[literacynet --- Common Cause]

1. My vote won't make a difference.
2. The candidates are all equally bad, choosing lesser of two evils.
3. Elected officials are a bunch of crooks.
4. Elected officials are dishonest ... similar to 3
5. Money rules politics, small group runs government, they don't need to have more people involved.
6. No point in learning about government, does not affect my life.
7. Candidates don't do the work necessary while in office, just concerned with the next election.
8. Candidates fail to uphold their campaign promises.
9. Politics is dirty, personal attacks, lying, campaigns repulsive.
10. Local selfishness rather than addressing national interest, the more difficult technological, economic and political problems.

[science news for students]

1. Registration takes work.
2. Education deficient? Don't know enough to vote.

3. Two parties may not be enough.
4. Apathy and burnout.

### Four Steps to Democracy

- 1) Punish all Republicans for Voter Suppression (2022)
  - 1) No Party-registration, mandatory voting (2024)
    - 2) Rank Choice, Fusion, Party Coalitions
    - 3) Amendment to Make U.S. Senate Proportional

**Our votes make history**  
**We must vote Nov 2022**