

On Eleutherodemy

or the fallacies of Democracy and Liberty, Equality, Fraternity¹

(June 2026)

It seems to be a momentous fallacy that citizens should revere democracy. Although they were instructed indeed that the word "*democratic*" meant equality of all citizens, their ultimate quest is not at all for equality, since the object of the pursuit of social success and enrichment is precisely to rise above the fray. Meanwhile, those who do treasure democracy without a doubt are those who derive employment, emoluments, and power from it, namely those whose métier is to be elected to positions of power.

As for the rest of the nation, those who derive no thrill from controlling their brethren, the one concept they value above all else (once their bellies are full) is Liberty.

In classical Greek, liberty is *ἐλευθερία* (eleutheria), while the people is *δῆμος* (dêmos).

Therefore the actual system most people crave could be dubbed:

Eleutherodemy

Democracy, a word coined from *δῆμος* (dêmos, people) and *κρατία* (kratía, power) can in no way be their paramount ideal, for the power referred to in such a system of government is not that of a theoretical single People, but

¹ In French Revolutionary lingo: Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité

that of the majority over the minority, even when such majority numbers significantly less than half the population.

Furthermore, for as long as there will be political parties, all necessarily with deeply conflicting policies, in essence revolutionary (otherwise why have political parties), the country will live in a state of perpetual revolution, each party destroying upon inauguration the policies of the incumbent.

At which point the winning party imposes its policies and will on the citizens of the losing party, and there goes their Liberty down the drain, together with Equality between all, and also Fraternity, each voter of one faction hating, despising, fearing, and battling those of the other more adamantly than they would a foreign enemy at war.

As a matter of mere logics, a citizen imbued with the ideals of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity, and visited by feelings of fraternal love and respect could only cast a blank vote, so as not to impose his will on the other, while economy of means would soon suggest not to even travel to the booth ².

Since there can't be such a thing as one single People with one single set of opinions, and what is good for the goose is not necessarily good for the gander, reasonable government for all must first assume that the People endeavor to be reasonable, a task that may take quite a while to complete.

If the People were reasonable, its constituents would agree that each citizen is different, with varying needs and aspirations, and a consensus

² Some democracies mandate the trip to the booth, thus further inhibiting *ἐλευθερία*

must be reached by all on each aspect of governance, in a society where tolerance prevails over brutal intolerance.

In such a reasonable society, political parties become irrelevant.

We must all agree, assuming there should be a unique Head of State, that said individual must be benevolent, intelligent, diligent, competent, incorruptible, disinterested, and without personal ambition.

It should be self-evident that said individual must not be malevolent, unintelligent, sloppy, incompetent, corrupt, greedy, and consumed by personal ambition ³.

Being devoid of personal ambition, said individual could not voluntarily run for office and would have to be selected unbeknownst to him in a most impartial process, still to be devised, and probably involving novel electronic technologies.

The moral qualities of the chosen Head of State would be such that, notwithstanding his lack of personal ambition, he would naturally elect to accept the position and devote a number of years to the highest position.

His relatives should not be overly concerned with the prospect of future unsolicited ceremonial obligations, since in such a system there would naturally be no such position as that, for example, of an unelected First Lady, that most anti-democratic position.

All other governmental positions would be filled in the same fashion. Some resistance from ambitious professional politicians is to be expected.

³ But then, was there ever such a politician or statesman?