

Iowa has spoken -  
A call for democratic parties in the USA

Manfred K. Warmuth

1-4-12

Iowa had his caucuses yesterday and I am quite upset.

It happened again in the greatest "democracy" of the world. This small state with a highly non-representative population for the US is setting the stage for who will be the next president. I live in California, the most populous state, which for some reason, gets its say close to the end, when things are decided already.

Totally unfair and idiosyncratic! If I want to optimize my political influence in the US, then I have to move to Iowa?

Here is the fix. Only parties should be allowed that are democratic in the sense that all its important decisions have to be decided in fair elections. The choice of presidential candidate is certainly important. Another one is choosing the head of the party. My notion of fair election is commonsensical:

one vote per member in one nation wide election.

This type of requirement of a party is standard for example in Germany. Under German law, the US system for choosing its presidential candidates would be considered undemocratic and therefore both the "Democratic Party" and the "Republican Party" of the US would not be legal in their current form.

If you are convinced that this is a minor issue, then imagine for a moment that California would have the first primary. In that case our choice of presidential candidates would be probably quite different. How different? Even though I would love to return the favor and present Iowa with a California slate, this is exactly the kind of political discussion I hate. Of course, California should not be first. That would be totally unfair in the same way. The key issue is how can we fix this archaic system and find a democratic way for choosing party candidates.

The politicians have shown no interest in fixing this. It requires a revolt of the people. The people of this country should go to the supreme court and require that the parties choose their candidates in a fair way.