Strasserism in the US

I have several problems with the current system in the USA, that I feel could be addressed by a more meritocratic system. Here is a quick overview of things I would like to cover now and in the future. These issues are all very intertwined, and I will probably dip my toes into each of them while focusing on a more specific problem.

*Division instead of Unity(Part 1)

*Ignorant Voters(Part 2)

*Party Values (Part 3)

Division Instead of Unity

Party politics in the United States is currently divided between two main parties, the Democrats and the Republicans. There are some other third parties out there, but the are so far behind in power that a vote for them is considered to be a vote that is thrown away. The parties are split on many issues, but a few big ones seem to really divide the nation. Things like the environment, abortion, politics of war and peace, drug legalization, and immigration are some of the issues that are represented by the two parties; and it is these issues that segregate the nation into groups of people who are always in opposition.

An example of a big issue that causes a lot of emotional reactions and fighting amongst the people is abortion. As a republican candidate it almost a duty to say that you are pro-life. Conversely as a democrat you must recognize a woman's autonomy and support her right to choose. This is a heated topic that has lead to everything from protests, to fights, to bombings.

Because of issues like these, many in the United States find themselves chained to one party or the other. If you are a Catholic who believes abortion is a mortal sin, you have a moral obligation to vote republican, despite for example, the fact that the Catholic Church has publicly stated their concerns about issues such as global warming, which is clearly an area that Republicans are deficient in.

The environment brings up a personal struggle of mine and probably many others who have fringe political beliefs. I like nationalism and I like feeling that our country is united; I felt this strongly when I experienced the patriotism after 9/11. Because of this, I like the nationalistic tendencies of Trump, but due to my background in environmental science, I abhor his environmental policies. I like his stance on guns and some other things, but the environment alone has me feeling pretty trapped this election.

With no one available who really supports my beliefs, I will probably end up "throwing my vote away" by voting for the newly anti-capitalist green party who have smartly recognized that capitalism plays a big role in the destruction of our environment.

These are examples of why people in the US tend to pick one or two "hot-button" issues and vote based on those alone. Things get very complicated, very quickly, if you don't just identify yourself with an 'R' or a 'D' and vote accordingly. The result of this is, of course, people fighting over very closely held beliefs, which causes about half our country to be in conflict with the other half, and as they say, a nation divided against itself will fall.

So how would meritocracy help to solve this problem?

My own personal favorite view of meritocracy is one in that people vote for representatives within their occupation rather than within their party. It would be a sort of guild system where for example, the farmers might democratically elect one of their own to represent the agricultural industry and serve as an adviser to the person (dictator) in charge. If for whatever reason this representative were found to not be faithfully representing the wishes of his particular guild, he could be voted out.

The way that this helps to keep the country from being divided, is that we have experts in each field that are not motivated by financial gain, but by what is best for the nation. If I knew that behind every dictator, was a group of experts that had the nations best interests in mind, I could rest a bit easier. That is a level of trust that we just don't have with our politicians today as many of them are uninformed about some of the very things that they stand for. I mean, Trump thinks Global Warming is a scam created by the Chinese...

This would not eliminate *all* conflict that we face in the US. Issues like Abortion are still a moral issues that will probably never be resolved to everyone's satisfaction, but it does eliminate quite a few policy issues and it allows people to automatically be informed voters. By being informed in your own occupation, and knowing that your votes in this area are being represented by another expert in the field, you can clearly see that your will is being acted on, in the best interest of the nation. Due to the homogeny of the system you can trust that the same process is being gone through in other guilds.

If for some reason the dictator decides against your guilds wishes, at the very least you will know that he has been informed correctly about the situation, and made his decision with the facts presented to him. Also, your elected leader should be able to communicate the decision of the dictator back to you in a language that you can clearly understand and relate to. I would have to assume that the dictator would communicate his decision to the people as well so that all could see how this decision helps the nation. This level of transparency should facilitate a more unified nation as

all would be able to see the reasons and directions behind each decision, and see how exactly the decision is a net benefit. This also opens up the possibility for discussions between Guild leaders to work out compromises based on their expert knowledge of the problem. It's clear that to find a good compromise the problem must be well understood; this is something I find very lacking in US politicians today.

Any thoughts on this? Areas to improve and expand on?

(Hopefully this is readable. I actually have a very hard time keeping track of my thoughts on mobile due to the small screen. I lose track of previous things I've written and instead of one long thought, I jump around from ideas to unconnected ideas. Curse my diagnosed ADHD!)

Truthfully, I'm not convinced that Strasser actually wanted a dictator, in fact I'm have read some things that say otherwise, but I need to do a bit more study to be sure.

I *personally* like the idea, because I think it helps when there are conflicts of interest to have someone who has a more "outside" view of things that can make a decision. Without someone who is purely concerned for making decisions that benefit the nation, I fear that each syndicate would only be concerned about benefiting their own group and not able to see the big picture. My hope would be that the right person in charge, who is receiving expert information, would be able to direct industry quickly and intelligently.
If this could be avoided and each syndicate/guild could be trusted to always have the best interests of the nation in mind, and would be willing to work together to achieve that in a quick and efficient manner, then I would drop the leader thing. It is mostly something that I think helps to make things move more quickly.

As far as his qualifications, like everyone else, he is chosen through merit. He would be selected based on both his intellect and character through educational performance combined with military service.

The dictator thing is currently a personal preference rather than a for sure Strasserist posistion. Like I said, I need to do some more research on it, just busy with a lot of life stuff that seems to pull me away!

For this section I want to focus on the problem of ignorant voters and how meritocracy would affect this.

First let's point out the problem. Currently in the United States there is often a huge disjunction between who you are voting for, and what exactly that candidate does. It is often the case that votes are made based on social and geographic pressures. A common reaponse to why someone votes democrat or republican is that their whole family is either the former or the latter.

Having grown up in a small mostly republican voting city, then moving to a large city later in life, I often dealt with the feeling that I had stepped into some surreal new world. Everything was similar but it often felt like I stepped into opposite land. Newspapers, TV, and radio which used to tell me the evils of the democratic party, now sang their praises. At some point I started arguing with my family about politics instead of agreeing with them and eventually I started voting Democrat. Then on a fateful vacation back home I started reading the newspaper my family read, and my eyes were opened. Their newspaper still pushed the same anti-democrat agenda as before even though it didn't match up with what I had read just earlier that day! This is when I realized the geographic segregation of politics.

Understanding this led me to an epiphany. *I didn't know anything when it came to what I was voting on. I only knew what media told me.* I, like many people had only the faintest of ideas of what my candidate supports. Yeah I knew the main points, but let's take fracking for example. All I know about fracking is that the people with a "D" next to their name usually say its bad, and I've been told they are the ones who care about the environment, so I would think that it is something to be avoided.

But I don't know why. Hell, I don't even know exactly what fracking is, how it works, or what kind of damage it could potentially do. To really understand it, I would need a lot of scientific knowledge on top of that. Now imagine that in order to not be ignorant with our votes we need to have a decent understanding of science, law, geo-political issues, war and tactics, distribution, economics, etc. and it starts to look very unrealistic that we could ever be completely informed with our votes. Even worse, our politicians can't be experts in this many fields either!

So we end up with a very unfocused and generally ignorant system, both in the elections, and in those we elect.

So how would a meritocracy help with this? Well my personal favorite model, a sort of guild system, has a pretty obvious answer which is that when people vote based on their occupation, they are already knowledgeable in regards to what they are voting on.

There is a level of trust that we can give to each "guild" because they have the expertise and the training necessary to make the best decision for the good of the nation and its people.

Occasionally these guilds will have competing or conflicting interests. Decisions on actions would then need to be made by the leader of the country. But again, the information he would be given would come straight from experts and he should be able to make a smart and relatively quick decision on what actions should be taken.

This seems to me to be a far better system than the one that liberal democracy has presented us with. When an urban youth votes democrat, what does he know of how

that affects the farmer, and on the opposite side how can the rural dwelling republican understand the need for social programs when he isn't confronted on a daily basis by those who are suffering. How can a scientist make descision on global politics? How can a politician, understanding what the "right" action is, go against those that vote them into office? There are many problems related to correct information and correct action in a liberal democracy that would be addressed by a meritocratic system.