

The Founders' Warning & "If Not Then" Voting Argument
(Haimesian Argument #24 — Governance & Political Structure)
Author: Michael Richard Haimes

Abstract

This argument integrates the warnings of the American Founders about political factions with the Haimesian Argument #24.

INT Voting allows each citizen to say:

"If not my ideal candidate, then this explicit fallback."

This simple change restores moral hierarchy of choices, weakens factional capture, and realigns electoral politics.

1. Quick Definition of "If Not Then" Voting

In "If Not Then" voting, a voter explicitly declares: "If not X, then Y."

Example: "If not Ross Perot, then George Washington."

This is not just ranked-choice math; it is explicit moral fallback and sovereignty over one's secondary preference.

INT Voting is:

- Clear – First choice and explicit fallback.
- Transparent – No hidden elimination algorithm.
- Empowering – Restores moral hierarchy of choices.
- Simple – Easy for any voter to understand.

2. Historical Foundation: The Founders' Warning

2.1 George Washington

In his Farewell Address (1796), Washington warned that parties and factions:

- Turn citizens against one another and create "unconquerable animosity."
- Distract government from the common good.
- Invite foreign influence and manipulation.
- Empower "cunning, ambitious, unprincipled men."
- Turn elections into tribal conflict rather than rational choice.
- Weaken national unity.

2.2 James Madison

In Federalist No. 10, Madison described factions as:

- A dangerous vice and threat to liberty.
- An inevitable product of human passions and interests.

He tolerated factions pragmatically, seeking to dilute them through structure, not celebrate them.

2.3 John Adams

Adams warned that parties would:

- Divide the nation.
- Make truth subordinate to loyalty.
- Amplify passion over reason.

He predicted that a two-party system would become "the greatest political evil under our Constitution."

2.4 Thomas Jefferson

Before leading a party, Jefferson wrote that parties:

- Create blind allegiance.
- Destroy independent judgment.
- Elevate power above principle.

He once wished for a government “without parties,” even though he later used parties out of necessity

2.5 Alexander Hamilton

Hamilton, though a party builder, still held that parties:

- Easily slide into corruption.
- Encourage demagoguery.
- Create violent swings in policy.
- Place loyalty above truth.

Summary

Across Washington, Madison, Adams, Jefferson, and Hamilton:

- All saw factions as dangerous.
- All feared division, tribalism, instability, and corruption.
- None regarded entrenched parties as an ideal.
- Some tolerated parties only as an unavoidable side-effect.

Their combined testimony is a unified, serious warning against multiparty factionalism.

3. Haimesian Integration: Ethics vs. Multiparty Rivalry

In the Haimesian System, entrenched party conflict violates:

- Clarity – Truth becomes subordinate to party narratives.
- Compassion – Opponents are dehumanized.
- Dignity – Individuals are reduced to partisan labels.
- Harm-Minimization – Polarization structurally increases harm.
- Unity – The polity is fragmented and kept in conflict.

Thus, a multiparty tribal structure is a standing harm generator and is incompatible with Haimesian ethics.

4. Why Ranked Choice Voting Is Not Enough

Ranked Choice Voting (RCV):

- Redistributes preferences via an elimination algorithm.
- Can reduce spoiler effects.

But it does not remove party dominance, does not resolve deep polarization, and does not fully restore

5. “If Not Then” Voting as Structural Antidote

The Haimesian “If Not Then” Voting model gives each voter the explicit right to declare:

“If not my ideal candidate, then this specific fallback.”

This:

- Makes the voter’s hierarchy of values explicit.
- Provides a clear moral fallback instead of opaque algorithmic redistribution.
- Allows the voter to escape party traps by naming a non-party or cross-party second choice.

- Is simple and intuitive, preserving clarity instead of adding complexity.

By making fallbacks visible:

- Candidates are incentivized to become acceptable second choices across groups.
- Extreme base-only strategies weaken.
- Negative campaigning is discouraged.

6. Alignment with the Founders' Intent

The Founders wanted citizens to think independently and structures that resist domination by factions.

"If Not Then" Voting:

- Re-empowers the independent citizen envisioned by Washington.
- Helps dilute the factional tyranny Madison feared.
- Pushes back against the "greatest political evil" Adams foresaw.
- Moves closer to the party-free ideal Jefferson once desired.
- Supports Hamilton's desire for stability beyond demagoguery and partisan chaos.

Thus, INT Voting honors both the Founders' warnings and their aspirations, while aligning with Haimesian

7. Objections & Responses

Objection 1: "This will confuse voters."

Response: People already think and speak in conditional preference language: "If not X, then Y." INT s

Objection 2: "This just helps the same elites."

Response: Under plurality, elites are entrenched through spoiler fear. INT lowers barriers for credible r

Objection 3: "Isn't this just ranked choice with new branding?"

Response: INT is related mathematically but philosophically distinct. Its focus is explicit moral fallback,

8. Formal Statement of the Argument

Premise 1

The American Founders—Washington, Madison, Adams, Jefferson, and Hamilton—warned that factio

Premise 2

Multiparty tribal rivalry systematically violates Haimesian ethical principles of clarity, compassion, digni

Premise 3

Under multiparty rivalry, voting is degraded into a defensive act of tribal loyalty and fear, rather than a

Premise 4

Ranked Choice Voting modifies the mathematical procedure of counting votes but does not remove pa

Premise 5

The Haimesian "If Not Then" Voting model restores explicit voter agency by allowing each citizen to sta

Premise 6

By restoring independent, morally ordered choice to the citizen, "If Not Then" Voting better fulfills the F

Conclusion

Multiparty tribal systems are incompatible with both the Founders' warnings and Haimesian ethical arc