

First of all, I think democracy is a system that does not serve the vast majority of humans. Whether it was never intended to serve everyone or democracy has been a 250 year failure, it's time for humans to move on. All manner of dictatorships, wars, slavery, genocide, and domination have been committed by democracy. We can do better.

Even if I supported democracy, Americans need to get over what a handful of people decided hundreds of years ago. The Founders were bigots, patriarchs, and slave owners who wanted power for themselves and few other people. Hamilton himself at times suggested America would be best under a constitutional monarchy. In 1787 at the Constitutional Convention, Hamilton argued (unsuccessfully) for America to elect a monarch for life that could be impeach. He later denied having done so.

Hamilton also thought that only white men with substantial property should have a political voice, arguing that non-property owning men would simply vote however their masters or employers told them to vote. [<https://www.vindicatingthefounders.com/library/farmer-refuted.html>] It's the same faulty logic that politicians used to keep the vote from women ('What's the point they'll just vote how they're husbands want them to?') and people of color ('What's the point, they'll just vote how they're white superiors want them to?'). While I can find no comments on Hamilton and female suffrage (thank you Hamilton the musical for overwhelming the internet with information on the musical and obscuring things Hamilton actually thought and did!), we can only assume he was against it.

Likewise, Hamilton may have technically been against slavery, but only because he did not trust black people and wanted them all sent back to Africa (nevermind that black people had been in America for 150 years when he decided that, or that, you know, the destiny of black people should not be decided by white people). Is this really the kind of person we want to be taking advice from?

In Federalist 68, Hamilton's argument basically comes down to that everyday people cannot be trusted to make good decisions on their own. Even if given the right to vote, their vote needs to be tempered by professionals. Hamilton thinks that everyday people will be too emotional and easily swayed, or that foreign agents will be able to manipulate them too easily. (Even by his own logic, this is nonsense. Certainly the smaller a group is, the easier than can be swayed, threatened, or bought off.)

In what is completely laughable by today's insights (just think of whatever president is the biggest doofus to you), Hamilton argues that an electoral college will ensure that America only elects qualified and respectable leaders, "The process of election affords a moral certainty, that the office of President will never fall to the lot of any man who is not in an eminent degree endowed with the requisite qualifications."

For those of you who have made it this far, here's a little historical secret for you: the electoral college is all about chattel slavery and preserving the Southern slave-owning vote. [<https://time.com/4558510/electoral-college-history-slavery/>] The Southern elite did not want

enslaved people to be free or to have a say in how society was run, but they needed their numbers (at a reduced 3/5 rate) in order to be political contenders.

If elections were decided directly (and without electorates being calculated from how many representatives a state had), the South would have lost to the North horrendously. In 1800, for example, Pennsylvania had 10% more free people than Virginia, but through the electoral college, Virginia's massive amounts of enslaved people gave Virginia 20% more electoral votes. It is no wonder that Virginia politicians had such a heavy hand in shaping the American government and account for seven of the first eleven presidents. They literally designed a system of government where the more people they enslaved, the more political power they would have. It's repulsive.

If I haven't made my cases strongly enough, here is one more example. In 1800, Thomas Jefferson beat John Adams, but only because of "the extra electoral college votes generated by slavery". Yet another way that all the proclamations of Jefferson about freedom and liberty ring hollow in the face of his actions—he literally won the presidency on the backs of enslaved people.

This is the context that election reforms were debated in 1803. The resulting Twelfth Amendment did make clarifications about how presidents and vice presidents would be elected, but it did not change the electoral college. During the debates, "Massachusetts Congressman Samuel Thatcher complained that 'The representation of slaves adds thirteen members to this House in the present Congress, and eighteen Electors of President and Vice President at the next election.' But Thatcher's complaint went unredressed. Once again, the North caved to the South by refusing to insist on direct national election."

Sadly, the electoral college is just one of many ways in which America still lives in the afterlife of slavery. I would dare to add democracy itself to this list.