

[Voting In The Primaries](#)

In the United States for the most part there are two prevailing political parties one of them being the Republican party (which I mention first because I am one) and the Democratic party. This holding true even though there are several other parties as the United States is a democracy that allows other parties though it does not really do much to encourage them. These other parties being the Libertarians, Communists, Socialists, Independents and others. As for the primaries they are basically what could be classified as an internal election within the Republican and Democratic parties (among those voters who are registered in the party) to chose which of their candidates will represent the party in the "General Election" which is the one that actually determines who will occupy the "White House" for the four years to follow.

This for the most part is a great thing about the American system that it actually allows the people or in this case the registered voters of each party to vote for the candidate they feel they want to represent their party in the general election as opposed to having the candidate picked out for them by a small group of people within the party. This system in a way even guarantees that the person chosen to represent either the Republican or Democratic party will at least enjoy the support of most of his or her party and therefore stand a better chance of winning in the general election then a candidate who is chosen by the party leaders. However I always ask myself can there be a downside to this system?

I believe there to be one flaw in all this and that not being so much in the system itself but in the way in which Americans tend to vote. If people vote for a candidate who has the same political views as they do or the one whose views come the closest out of all the candidates to their own then an errant choice can never be made. This if what I have stated happens. unfortunately however in many occasions this does not because party rivalry in America is so strong that it often occurs that when choosing a candidate to represent their party many an American will chose someone more for the reason that they stand a better chance of winning in the general election then any other reason. Meaning to them it is better to chose someone who will win for their party then someone who upholds their political ideology.

Of coarse I am not claiming that there is no importance in having ones party win the election but does this line of thinking not defeat the basic principle of voting for a candidate in the first place. To my way of seeing things the best and only logical reason to vote for a candidate is because the person whom we are voting for represents our political ideas or at least comes the closest from all the candidates to doing so for what is the rationale of voting for someone simply because he or she stands a better chance of winning? When thinking in this manner we should also not rule out the idea that if enough people refrain from voting for a candidate because that person might not necessarily win then it is almost certain that he or she will not as he or she will have lost perhaps millions of possible votes just because of this philosophy.

However it is unfortunate and sad that in the United States of America the country which in its relatively young history has had more leaders democratically elected then any other country on earth that many people do not vote for someone simply because they do not approve of that person's chances of winning. There is even a sense some people get that they are throwing away their vote if they give it to someone who has "no chance of winning". This as if casting a vote were like betting on a horse at the track where the object is just that, to pick a winner.

I even remember back in 1992 when my fellow Republicans (like Democrats alike in 2000 apropos Ralf Nadar) were telling some not to vote for Ross Perot not because he would not be a good man to lead the nation but because he stood no chance of winning. The arguments always returning to the same "why vote for someone who has no chance of winning?" or "don't throw away your vote". I however ask isn't the whole point of voting to do so for the man or woman whom we think is the best qualified to run the country rather then to just to have ended up on the winning side?

When it comes to this issue I have even noticed that in America, it is even a matter of shame at least for some to have voted for someone who did not win as if the point had been to pick a winner which obviously they did not. I for my part do not wish to tell people for whom to vote for or for whom not to vote for but to tell them that we should vote for the candidate and not for his or her chances after all we are casting a vote not I

About the Author

My name is Gianni Truvianni and as some of you may know I am a writer who simply adores the opera. This is something that I do not believe could have escaped the attention of anybody who has read either "Little Opera Singer" or "New York's Opera Society" which are two stories on this website strongly connected to opera. "New York's Opera Society" is the 1st chapter of a book which I have just completed by the same name which is available on www.new-york-society.com/nyos_salespage.htm so for all of those wishing to see how this story unfolds I recommend them to buy my book.