

# Competing visions paper 2

[History](#)



Teacher The arguments of J. Keene S. Cornell E. O'Donnell US History Chapter 8 that Should White Men Without Property Have the Vote? (pg. 224) can be summarized as a Robin Hood argument. It is grounded on the assumption that the poor has the tendency to covet and to share the plunder of the rich. And that it also runs the danger of the debtor to relax or avoid obligation of contract. He proposed that those who bear the burden of the state had earned a right to have a say in it.

I find these arguments to be invalid because it is discriminatory and defeats the purpose of the state. If Keene and O'Donnell's argument are to be used in running the state, the state becomes an agent of oppression that perpetuate the interest of those who have over those who do not have. The state no longer becomes an instrument of justice but rather an institution of oppression that rules with tyranny. Such is not the function of the government. Government is supposed to rule everybody and everybody should have a stake and say in the government and not only those who have properties.

Keene and O'Donnell's argument are also impractical. Suppose for the sake of argument that we will only let those who bear the burden of the state to have a say in it. What are going to do with those who do not have property? Are we just going to ignore them? Marginalize them? They happen to consist a very significant portion of society. We all know today that if we marginalize a certain sector of society that they will eventually resent it. Thus, an unjust society as proposed by Keene and O'Donnell will just create a social volcano and make the society combustible as it breeds dissent among those who do not have a say. Eventually, a revolution or uprising will happen just like in any other society in history where the people eventually revolted against an

<https://assignbuster.com/competing-visions-paper-2/>

oppressive state and the powers that be, including those who are privileged, are either deposed or harmed.

Such policy also further the gaps between those who are propertied and those who are not. In the long run, society will no longer be sustainable because it does not seek to empower others to become propertied also that they may be able to share the burden of the state. In this kind of society that Keene and O'Donnell proposes, people's station are static. Meaning, if you are poor, you will be poor all your life without any chance of improving your lot. So your kind multiplies while those who are propertied become greatly outnumbered. Until it becomes a point that those who are greatly outnumbered by the have nots until society could no longer sustain itself. Ideally, government should empower its citizen to also become propertied to be able to share the burden of the state in the long run and should be given a stake and say in the government regardless if he or she is propertied or not.