

Pen to Power

Non-Partisan. Adversarial. Always.

SPICY MOON: Why the Democratic Socialists Are Dead Fucking Wrong About the Senate, Why the Founders Built It That Way, and Why Abolishing It Would Murder Minority Rights

Moon Geezer, Opinion

The Democratic Socialists of America want to abolish the United States Senate. Let's be clear about what this means. They want to eliminate the one chamber of Congress where Wyoming has the same voting power as California. They want to remove the institution that requires 60 votes to pass most legislation. They want to destroy the one structural check on pure majoritarian democracy that the Founders deliberately built into the Constitution.

And they're calling this more democratic. Which is either profoundly stupid or deliberately dishonest. Probably both.

The Founders Were Not Building a Democracy

Start with this: the United States is not a democracy. It is a federal republic. The Founders spent months arguing about this distinction because they understood something that contemporary political activists apparently need to relearn: pure democracy is tyranny with a voting mechanism.

James Madison wrote Federalist 10 because he had read his history and understood that democracies failed when they tried to protect minority rights through voting. Why? Because in a pure democracy, the majority votes to oppress the minority. The majority votes to take the minority's property. The majority votes to restrict the minority's freedoms. The majority simply outvotes the minority on every question. And if those majority votes are about what to do with the minority, the minority loses. Every time.

Madison called this the problem of faction. The Founders called it the tyranny of the majority. It is real, documented, and historically inevitable. Two wolves and a sheep voting on what's for dinner ends with the sheep on a plate. That's not democracy. That's just arithmetic.

So the Founders built a republic instead. A republic with a federal structure. The House of Representatives was designed to be proportional to population, meaning California and Texas and New York dominate by sheer numbers. The Senate was designed to be equal, giving every state two votes regardless of population. Wyoming gets the same power as California. Montana gets the same power as Texas. This forces compromise between high-population and low-population states. This forces the majority to negotiate with the minority.

This structure is not a bug. It is the entire fucking point.

The Senate is not anti-democratic. It is anti-majoritarian. Those are different things. The Founders rejected pure democracy deliberately. They rejected it because they understood that majority rule without minority protections produces tyranny.

Why Two Senators Per State Matters

Let's talk about actual numbers. California has 39 million people. Wyoming has 580,000 people. That's a 67 to 1 ratio. If representation was purely proportional to population, California would have roughly 67 times as much power as Wyoming in Congress. In the House of Representatives, California has 52 seats and Wyoming has 1 seat. This reflects population. This is proportional representation.

But in the Senate, California has 2 senators and Wyoming has 2 senators. This is not proportional. This is deliberately equal. This means that on every question that requires a Senate vote, California cannot unilaterally impose its will on Wyoming. Wyoming cannot impose its will on California either. They have to negotiate. They have to compromise. They have to find common ground.

The DSA calls this undemocratic. What they mean is that Wyoming shouldn't have as much power as California. What they're saying is that people in Wyoming shouldn't have the same protection against majoritarian tyranny as people in California. What they're proposing is that the majority should be able to outvote the minority on everything, with no friction, no negotiation, no requirement for compromise.

That is not more democratic. That is majoritarian tyranny with a voting machine.

The 60-Vote Threshold Is Not Obstruction. It Is Protection.

The Senate filibuster rule, which requires 60 votes to end debate and proceed to a vote on most legislation, is hated by every political faction when they are in the minority and beloved when they control less than 60 votes. When the party in power has 51 votes and wants to pass something, the filibuster is a "relic of the Jim Crow era." When the party in power has 51 votes and actually cares about getting things done right instead of fast, the filibuster is a "crucial protection against majoritarian excess."

The truth is simpler: the 60-vote threshold forces the majority to build consensus. It forces deliberation. It forces people with different views to actually negotiate with each other instead of simply voting their way through. This is not a bug. It is a feature. The Founders understood that legislation should be hard to pass. They understood that stability requires that laws have support beyond the minimal majority. They built the Senate to embody this principle.

The DSA hates this because it slows down their agenda. They want to pass their program fast, without negotiating with the other side. They want to ram through legislation on a straight party-line vote. And they're framing this as "democracy."

It's not democracy. It's mob rule with a suit on.

Why This Matters for Actual Minorities

Here's the thing that pisses me off about the DSA's position: they're calling themselves the party of minority rights. They claim to stand for workers, for people of color, for marginalized communities. And then they want to abolish the one institution that gives those communities any protection against pure majority vote.

Think about this. In the House of Representatives, California, Texas, Florida, and New York have 128 seats combined out of 435. That's 29 percent of the House. But California, Texas, Florida, and New York have 8 senators out of 100. That's 8 percent of the Senate. This means that on a question where those four high-population states want one thing and everyone else wants another, the four high-population states cannot impose their will in the Senate. They have to negotiate. They have to compromise.

Now imagine a Senate that is purely proportional. The four high-population states would have 58 senators. They could pass anything they wanted without a single vote from Wyoming, Montana, the Dakotas, or anywhere else. The rural communities, the smaller states, the regions that don't fit into the California or Texas political agenda, would have no power whatsoever.

That is not minority protection. That is majority tyranny. And the DSA is proposing it while claiming to speak for minorities.

What About AOC's Bullshit Dodge?

Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, when pressed about the DSA platform calling for abolition of the Senate, said it was "a constitutional question" and that "eliminating it would be a heavy lift." She created wiggle room. She refused to endorse her own organization's stated platform.

This is what you do when you know your position is indefensible. You say it's "complicated." You say it's "a constitutional question" as if the constitution isn't the thing that created the Senate in the first place. You say it would be "hard" as if that's an argument against it.

Here's what AOC should say if she actually believed abolishing the Senate was a good idea: "Yes, I believe in this. Here's why. Here's how we would do it. Here's what we would build instead." Instead, she's hedging. She's protecting herself from the criticism that would come from actually defending this indefensible position.

The Bottom Line

The United States is not a democracy. It is a federal republic. The Founders built it that way deliberately. They understood that democracy without federalism produces tyranny of the majority. They understood that protecting minority rights requires institutions that slow down legislation and force compromise.

The Senate is not anti-democratic. It is anti-majoritarian. It is designed to protect the minority from the majority. It is designed to make legislation hard to pass. It is designed to force negotiation and compromise.

The DSA wants to abolish this institution because they believe the majority should be able to impose its will without friction. They believe that if they win 51 votes, they should be able to pass anything. They believe that minority protection is a bug, not a feature.

They're wrong. Dead fucking wrong. And if they succeed, they will destroy the very institution that protects minorities from majoritarian tyranny. They will build the exact system that the Founders understood produces the worst outcomes: mob rule with a voting machine.

The Founders weren't perfect. They made terrible decisions about slavery, about women's rights, about who got to vote. But on this question, on the question of how to protect minority rights without abolishing majority rule, they got it right. The federal structure protects minorities. The Senate protects minorities. Equal representation per state protects minorities.

The DSA wants to destroy this because it slows down their agenda. Don't let them. Don't fall for the rhetoric about democracy. This is about tyranny of the majority. This is about imposing a political agenda without building consensus. This is about destroying the one institution that makes the minority matter.

That's the bottom line. Pen to Power follows the facts. The fact is this: the Senate protects minorities. Abolishing it would murder minority rights. And anyone who claims otherwise is either stupid or lying.

Moon Geezer
Pen to Power
pentopowermoon@gmail.com
Non-Partisan. Adversarial. Always.