EDA KARADEMIR

Erzurum Technical University, Department of Philosophy, Turkey

ALPER KARADEMIR

Aksaray University, Department of Politics and Public Administration, Turkey

RECONSIDERATION OF RIGHTS TO VOTE

Abstract:

This paper aims to elucidate how the weight of vote may be allocated in the current democratic systems to properly administrate a society on the basis of justice rather than simple equality that is today well accepted internationally. Towards this objective, the notion of current democracy will be briefly clarified within its historical origin. In this sense, the pros and cons of the current democracy approach will be examined to see its problematic issues. This examination will indicate that today's democracy is incapable of creating an efficient representation in the political area due to the methodology of voting system that is unjustly one person to one vote. The content of ''weighted voting'' system will be investigated suggested by John Stuart Mill whose claim would be better solution for the problems of today's democracy. Mill's ''weighted voting'' looks fairer and more effective in the implementation of proportional equality that includes absolute equality. While the conception of contemporary democracy takes mainly the term of 'absolute equality', Mill's approach accepts the term of 'proportional equality' that is the cornerstone to promote justice, which I also concern with the highest priority, both in theory and in practice. Mill's approach argues for "equality of equal's" and "inequality of unequal's" shaped in social life dependent on individuals' own preferences, since this hierarchical structure is not natural or permanent but temporary and transitional in a community, besides equality of opportunity does exist for every persons without exclusion of anyone. Although it may seem to be against the principles of today's empirical democracy, in fact his proposal may be considered as progressive. This progressive approach can develop both individuals and society and reveal better administrative. Then, this work will search for moral justification in order to demonstrate its fairness and qualifications to elect the best possible representative. Consequently, this work will end with two conclusions. Firstly, current democratic voting system might create injustice in treating unequal as equal due to equal voting although the main aim is to promote fair representation. The second is a normative one that the best possible democratic system might adopt the principle of multiple votes that treats not only unequal as unequal but also equal as equal. Both phenomenological and analytical manners are utilised as methodology. The coherence of concepts is debated in itself within the necessity of 'justice'.

Keywords:

Democracy, Political participation, ''the principle of multiple votes'', Mill's political philosophy

The Historical Background of Democracy

The term "democracy" can be defined simply as ''popular sovereignty'' that is characterized by some sort of equality among the political participants (Hazan and Kılıç, 2010) The collective decision-making in democracy is valid for all of the members within the group which refers to both the group which is running the government and the citizens themselvesThat type of government has a president and representatives who are, in principle, chosen or replaced by means of free and fair, periodic elections which are to involve the responses of the people. A related law determines the durations of each member's turn in office. The active political participation of citizens is recommended. All citizens are expected to be treated equally by the laws, and all citizens' human rights are expected to be protected. This democratic approach is implemented in different kinds of groups, such as families, organizations, and states, in regards to most democratic countries. However, from the past to present, there have been many different theory types of what a "democracy" truly is and should be. They have been provided by philosophers and theorists who often debate with each other about which construct is the most efficient and societally versatile. Some proposed definitions proclaim that democracy should be "the form of one's coming to power," "the guaranteed protection of minorities' rights against the tyrannies of the majority," and/or "the protection of human rights." Contemporarily, democracy is an internationally well-accepted and desirable system of administrating a society. Though the concept's meaning is widely contended, the definition of democracy cannot be misconstrued in terms of its main characteristics, such as legal equality, political freedom, and the rule of law. The problem of properly settling the "best democracy" debate can be resolved by addressing the system's main issues, for example, the outcomes of plurality on minorities, bureaucracy, the election system, political participation, and so on.

Historically, the term "democracy" originated from combining the words "demos," which means "people" and/or "full citizenship," and "kratos," which refers to power (Morris, Raaflaub and Castriota, 1998). Democracy was first implemented in the Greek city-states from 500-400 B.C. in which the people's assembly composed the sovereignty. However, only adult men who were in the military services were considered to be Athenian citizens, and women, slaves, children and foreign residents were excluded from legal citizenship, so they could not participate in political elections (Hansen, 1991). The Athenian democracy was one sample of direct democracy. Additionally, the then existing government's administrative and judicial officers were randomly selected, and all proclaimed Athenian citizens could participate in a legislative assembly. However, this democratic system took a lot of criticism from philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Jean Jacque Rousseau, and John Stuart Mill. Plato claimed that knowledge determines whether a decision is good, and not its number of supporters. Therefore, democracies' main problem is that one can end up being governed by inferior members due to the common principle of equal participation in politics.

In my perspective, philosophers may be good administrators of such arrangements, as they are closest to the required knowledge. It seems that democracy is not a good

governance system, since it has the potential to naturally lead to forms of tyranny within the worst consequential governance systems (Plato. and Jowett, n.d.). Aristotle (Aristotle. and Gigon, 1971) also defined "democracy" as "the sovereignty of people's assembly," and distinguished it from other political embodiments. This is mainly because of its sheer number of participants at the stage of decision making, as well as its principle of political freedom. He, like his teacher Plato, interpreted the concept of democracy negatively, as, according to him, it could be excessive in the case of politics. However, under any circumstances, the first form of democracy in Athens could be interpreted as an important advancement, since it accepted political rights regardless of people's origin and wealth.

Democracy was first identified to exist within Athens. However, democracy re-awoke in the period of Enlightenment, which particularly critiqued the innate order of privilege rewardance in the then modern-time absolutism. Furthermore, in that era, Athens' direct democracy was replaced with a representative democracy, due to the physical necessities.

Montesquieu (Durkheim, 1965) wondered by how much monarchical governance could gain virtuousness while following its definitive structure as he criticized the implementations of the French monarchy which he lived under. Although he did not define himself as "democratic," nor could he be interpreted as a democrat, his thoughts on the issues of the degree of governmental control and authorities' restraints have thus conceptually softened the idea of sovereignty indirectly, and they have made significant contributions to the democratic culture. Montesquieu's train of thought led to the agendas of constitutional monarchies, which he supported.

Rousseau (Rousseau, 1968) declared that all humans were born equally in his famous book, 'Social Contract.' Regarding that claim, he made the analysis that when naturally good people live together in natural situation peacefully, they are free and uniformly equal, but when they are confronted with an unnatural situation, they lose their state of all-inclusive equality, as well as their instinctive sense of morality – they compete with each other, become self-centred, and are capable of consciously harming other people. From then on, positive interpretations of democracy began, and philosophers began to improve their theories of democracy in focusing on its members and their natures, or at least by limiting the constitutional power of the king in a changing monarchy; both focusses can be considered to be very important for the future developments of the essence of democracy.

The earliest form of democracy that most represented today's structure was viewed to be in the United States of America, as Alexis de Tocqueville (Tocqueville et al., 1945) concluded in his investigations. After emerging in a major American state which held the democratic law, Tocqueville was the first theorist of modern mass democracy with his analysis of the American democracy. According to him, although the governmental structure is not good for the most part, it should be adopted due to the absence of a better alternative (Hereth and Höffken, 1981).In his perspective, the democratic structure should be in accordance with the highest values of freedom so that the

principle of equality does not undermine freedom, and consequently undermine the democracy itself.

Toqueville examined the political developments, social structures, traditions, laws and ethics of America. The apparent arrangement was that administrators were directly elected by people, and elections were held every year in order to control the administrators' efforts and implementations, and they could not be re-elected. Presidents can be re-elected, but there is a constitutionally-written law which prevents them from being in office for a said amount of years. According to his analysis, the expansion of the Electoral College did not provide the expected benefits, since mostly mid-level managers were selected to participate in it, and *all* chosen members were white, adult males. One of the main reasons for the Electoral College's existence is the assumed insufficiency of voters' abilities to finely assess candidates and political issues. In that doubt, the advancement of freedom endangers democracy. The risk of the majority's tyranny over the minority can then be balanced by direct election and the brevity of the election period. It is also one way of restraining the majority from the "freedom of speech" power. It must be born in mind that blacks, women, Indians and children were excluded from the right to vote in that society at the time of his analysis. R. Dahl rightfully said that the democracy of Tocqueville's time was "a democracy among white males (Dahl, 1985)

Democracy is a form of government which has been historically developed in the aforementioned manner, and it is quite widespread today. Also, suffrage has been extended to include *all* adult citizens, as well as women. Among the main principles of modern democracy are the governance of the population, pluralism (having multiple political parties), the right to run for office, and the rights to vote, freedom, equality, rule of law, one's own beliefs (political or not), and to vote in free virtue, open-counting elections; all of which are regulated and organized by law. As many do, I believe that democracy may not be the best governance system, but with those attributes, it is the unrivalled system in the name of freedom, equality and justice.

This study will only theoretically try to tackle the stated problem; a later study would encase the application and/or potential problems of our suggestions. Although, a weighted voting system will gradually be suggested based on the idea of knowledge as a fundamental principle, in which the balance of knowledge is connected to voting. Another new, information-based grading system will be proposed by evaluating the performance assessment of each scheme. Therefore, this work is fundamentally trying to demonstrate that equal suffrage may not be the most adequate method when differences are present.

Surely, democracy has both negative and positive aspects. However, I find that the negative aspects of that system should be determined, then improved, as I also accept that the best feasible system is democracy. The correlated qualities of democracy will briefly be stated in the following section.

The Pros and Cons of the Current Democratic Approach

In literary works, such as those written by the authors (Mommsen, 1989), (Weber, Gerth and Mills, 1946), Melossi (1992), Dahl (1989), etc., some positive aspects of democracy were mentioned as follows:

- It is a form of legitimate sovereignty.

- It works towards the avoidance of tyranny.

- It promotes freedom and equality.

- The decisions made through the system are based on the majority principle.

- It is transparent. This is a blanket statement which is a nice motto however many time fails. Sentiments should not be accepted as factual, as true transparency is rare especially in modern-times.

- Elections continue at certain intervals, namely, if it is regarded necessary, figurehead leaders may be discharged without bloodshed or unjust punishment.

- Adult citizens are legally allowed to politically participate.

- The rights to vote and run for office are granted to all citizens, who also have the option to actively participate in politics and be trained by their residential states.

- The opposing party has a chance to come to power at the next election.

- Democracy consolidates economic freedom rights.

- Property rights are secured through contracts in an economic behaviour.

- It has the ability to find good use in radical opponent forces, such as in the cases of converting socialism into welfare, or ecological politics into the environmental protection policies.

- Democracy guarantees the rights to political participation and competition, not only regarding the domestic nation and its states The most important feature of democracy is the principle of the protection of human rights regardless of language, religion, race, colour, ethnic origin or wealth (Pourgerami, 1992).

There are many other benefits to a democratic scheme other that the ones listed above. At this point of our understanding, the many interpretations of the various democracies are vitally important, of course. Each positively-regarded attribute mentioned above can also be viewed in a negative light. These views of adversity have been expressed by authors like Plato, Aristotle(1971), Machievelli (Machiavelli and Güvenç, 1994) Offe (1992), Tocquevelli (1976), Hobbes (Hobbes, 1997), Fukuyama (1992), Habermas, (1981),Habermas (1973) and a few speak of the tyranny from the majority, excessive freedom, and the number of head states.

As demonstrated in the historical development above, Tocqueville also particularly revealed that democracy leads to conflict between freedom and equality, an impossible balance which is meant to be obtained irrespective of the abilities of the individuals. According to him, part of the issue in achieving the said balance lies in the potential favourability for presidents to have short terms, because they race to gain competence in influencing the masses and to strategically gain power instead of creating the best administrative methods. This is closely related to the quality of the electorate. So, the principle of "one person to one vote" may lead to make the parties' propaganda aim to influence the masses, no matter in which directions. This is because voters may be open to manipulation when it is persuasive enough. Fukayama (1992) claimed that a democracy may nurture "invertebrate citizens," which is not impossible, especially in countries which have not created market depth. A dependence on state institutions and the volatility markets may lead citizens to become pro-power, or to seem like they are, even if they are not. Also, the market-strengthening strategy may reduce the possibility of the change of power. In addition, a competitive democracy has extremely high costs. Its stated competition mechanism may result in not only an extreme polarization of voters, but also the negligence of general interest. Still, mass media, including propaganda, may play an important role in informing the public, and hence it could be a tool against any arising abuses of state power as it is utilized to orientate voters in the desired direction. Again, this most significantly impacts the electorate who are more susceptible to manipulation. Mass media can have serious effects on impending power, or in attempts to overthrow a particular group, within the previously mentioned, competitive political environment. The issue of clientelism the exchange of goods and services for political support, is also a problem that can easily be seen in many political atmospheres.

In these respects, it can be claimed that clientelism generally accepts the negative sides to democracy, especially the purposeful conflict between freedom and equality, the hollow abstract principle of equality, the ease of influencing voters, and the roles of mass media. Clientelism takes advantage of the increasing number of "spineless," democratic citizens who have been granted the right to vote. Above all of the listed problems, the most crucial one is seen to be the principle of abstract equality, which disregards the differences between individuals, and it triggers all of the others. This plan of ignoring differences may rightly lead some to criticize the concept of democracy in terms of the number of participating figurative leaders, the quality of management, and the existence of clientelism, "invertebrate" citizens, the polarization of voters, violation of human rights, prepossession, excessive influential power of mass media over the population, failure to provide opportunities to minority types, ideas and life styles that may provoke tyranny from the majority -which is the most extreme danger for democracies-, and so on. These consequences are those which may demolish the democratic structure.

If all things are considered, a lot of people vote based on personal interest rather than in considering the general good for a society, and admittedly if one exists in the majority, he/she probably is not exposed to social and/or professional environmental pressures, and they would not judge others who also endure hardships. Furthermore, in some

countries which lack market depth and depend on state institutions, the residents can easily have trouble in life solely because they are not part of the majority. The degree of awareness, and therefore the lacking degree of knowledge, is the primary influence on societal reactions such as this. To eliminate the struggles in question, the relevant knowledge must be sought in a process of initial awareness, researching and understanding them, and then actively trying to find the appropriate solutions. Moreover, possession of the right knowledge could be a weapon against leaders and candidates who are or could be unjust to the suffering populations.

First and foremost, the principle of (absolute) equality is the instrumental ideal that ensures justice, although it is still rising in power, as the course of events has gradually been exposing it as a sin qua non for legitimate justice. However, this principle of absolute equality brings injustice rather than justice, because it contradicts itself. For that reason, the concept of equality should be re-evaluated, and the result should be activated in politics. In today's democracy, every person has one vote that is well-accepted equally. However, this is, I claim, regressive to enforcing the proper meaning of equality as proportional.

Proportional equality considers everyone to be the same, particularly in relation to our subject, which is political participation. In this sense, there is need to investigate if the notion of "equality" is used properly. The negative consequences of abusing that state will be investigated in the upcoming section, and they are the main ground for our relevant claim that there should be a weighted voting system.

Debates on the Notion of Equality

The proper definition of the term "equality'' is much contested. Dworkin spoke of the involved debate in saying that people who extol or discredit it dissent from what they are extolling or discrediting (Dworkin, 1996). Thereby, it is necessary to make the definition of equality clear, particularly in its political meaning. This report mainly focuses on political equality in pursuit of those standards to support Mill's suffrage argument. In this sense, the principle of equality being closely related to justice will be shortly examined.

A correspondence between at least two or more differing objects, persons, or circumstances with a least one similar feature among them is essential for the term "equality" to be applicable. In other words, equality can only exist and be constructed in a situation of this bipartite relationship, since equality needs to be distinguished from "similarity" and "identity," which both correspond qualitatively to it, and evaluated after the two are understood according to the given scenario. Equality can be defined with the concept of similarity, but not with sameness. At least one difference between the subjects of study must be analogised in order to evaluate the situation's equality. By equational reason, objects or persons have to be identical to be wholly equal. If they are not identical, there are obvious differences in their objectives or mindsets, at least. Thus,

the concept of absolute equality is self-contradictory. Some interpret absolute equality to border on being solely a concept of belief. (Gosepath, 2001)

From its acquittal existences onward, equality has been closely connected to justice. However, the problem lies in determining what role it plays in that ideology. Justice is implemented as a reaction to an individual's actions, for one. Individual persons are liable for their own actions that determine who they are, or the position which they are in. Even choosing one reaction over another may not always be with votes, which is of course debatable. Since the responsibility belongs to the individual persons, proportional equality is ubiquitously and simultaneously the main criteria to establish justice without damaging the true meaning of equality that will be claimed as a proportional one. In the theories regarding this topic, this paper presumes that the principle of equal opportunity is present in full operation, as it should be. In these assumptions, determinism is not an issue to bring up.

Here, I assert that Rousseau did not acknowledge individuals' choices. I truly agree with Rousseau that people were born equally, however, people differentiate themselves in a society with their choices and actions. Each individual's choices impair their innate equality in their social life, so they naturally would fall into a state of inequality in at least one occasion in their lifetime. Even if the evaluation of being equally unequal is a true representation of absolute equality, its self-contradiction still denies the sought prospect of being proportionally equal, which I have dubbed as the true meaning of equality. Proportional equality also ensures the principle of justice, so therefore, "equal inequality" cannot guarantee true justice. Thus, even if the individuals in question were born equally, they would lose their equality with each choice and action.

As Aristotle stated, similar cases should be treated as similar if two persons have equal cases in one aspect, and they need to be treated in the same manners by solely focussing on the relevant aspect in "Nicomachean Ethics" (Aristotle. and Ross, 1959)). Also, Berlin (Cherniss and Hardy, 2004) stated that it is not rational to treat unequal statuses as equals without adequate justification, and vice versa. Proportional equality is more complex, and it can be economically relevant; it can be a hierarchical approach which assesses that a given output should result in an equal input. In the societal application, meritocrats like John Stuart Mill claimed that persons should be considered in accordance with their differing features. Hence, justice comes with proportional equality. Mill's approach to democracy - which is more compatible with proportional equality, and therefore justice as well - will be investigated in the upcoming segment.

Mill's Approach to Democracy

Mill (Wilson, 2002) was one of the most important philosophers of the nineteenth century, and he studied economics, moral and political theory, empiricism, liberalism, individual freedom, human well-being, as well as democracy. It is also worth saying that he was one of the first people who would defend the extension of suffrage to women.

Although Mill majorly constituted his discipline of democracy by looking at the United Kingdom as an example, Tocqueville's research, entitled "American Democracy," also affected his views. The research, as mentioned before, was about increasing social equality in correlation with the advancements of industrialism, gradually spreading suffrage, and solving the pertinent tension problems between equality, freedom and democracy. The issue of the best policy was a starting point for Mill, as previously noted. He maintained Jeremy Bentham's theory of utilitarianism that adopts the moral principle of the greatest happiness of the greatest number of citizens as a representative and participatory democracy. In other words, Mill tried to figure out the legitimate power limits that societies should have when they overrule their individuals, as well as the tensions of the possible tyrannies from the imbalances between numeric majorities and individual freedom.

Mill's basic elements of an ideal state are political participation and merit. While political participation secures the protection of the citizens' interests and the control of the mechanism-nominated state officials, the principle of merit secures the optimal utilization of the existing virtues and talents on behalf of public interest. (Thompson, 1976). There are two types of merit: instrumental and moral. The first is the abilities to identify optimal targets for individuals' interests and to choose the best tool in achieving them. The second is the ability to see the purpose of having the highest value of interest for both the individuals and societies in general.

Mill suggested the necessity of a representative government, for it is the best form in his perspective since all or the majority of its citizens can have their opinions of their governance heard through the selected number. (Mill, n.d.). In contrast to Rousseau, Mill presupposed rule-based representation. Representation is indispensable, and the represented majority checks whether or not the represented minority looks out for the majority's interest. Mill saw the expansion of the electorate, in which all groups have rightfully been included, as a tool against the power abuses of political authority. Mill dwelt on increasing representative governance in a controllable manner – a layer of selected, qualified political leaders, combined with the prevention of the majority resorting to despotism, and taking effective measures against incapable, unworthy citizens - rather than by maximizing political participation.

Mill assumed some principles regarding the ideal governance representation. A few will be listed below:

(1) People should be competent, willing, and qualified in order to participate in discussions and elections which concern public affairs.

(2) The legislative branch, namely the Chamber of Deputies, should never interfere with or carry out a task of the executive branch.

(3) A commission of suitable experts from the legislative branch can be utilized for decision-making guidance.

(4) There should be a balance in Parliament between the two largest classes in industrialized societies, the working and capital classes, in order to prevent the progression from being limited to and favouring only one social class. Adverse interests pin down the best interests and cooperation of each class.

(5) Mill made a distinction between true and false democracy. The false democracy was one of the dangerous consequences of representative governance.

(6) A Chamber of Deputies cannot fulfil its main task when it does not represent minorities in Parliament, because the minorities will resort to tyranny. (Mill, n.d.)

Mill also proposed the proportional electoral system which was later supported by Hare (1865).

 This system of representation may reveal abuses of power over those who opt out of speaking their minds. The right to vote contributes to citizens' personal developments, because voting citizens should research who to choose. In that way, the right, when utilized, potentially has educational value. According to Mill, one should not be entitled to vote just for the sake of equality, and I personally agree. People should be enabled that voice only when they are literate, directly withholding communities' social services, and not dependent of them to survive. However, if the right to vote is only valid for appearing in one political competence, the denominational legislative can be risky. So, Mill suggested a plural voting system. That is to say, while more competent voters use two or more votes, others use only one vote. According to him, simple political equality disrupts the principle of merit - one of his two fundamental principles -, and it is also detrimental to moral and intellectual development.

The right to vote should be based on knowledge, and not based on wealth. There should be no indirect elections. Indirect elections may reduce public participation in administrations and the public's impacts on governance. In those systems, people do not directly choose the president, but they select the jury members who choose the president. Mill explained that the primary dangers of this situation are hindrances to the formation of public debates, a lack of voter training, and damage to the political consultation process. To make matters worse, the accountable people can probably be changed, and the elected people can be jury members instead of grass-root members, and vice versa.

The voting process in elections should be open. Secret votes can strengthen the motive of self-interest. John Mill believed that people are responsible for their votes in open voting systems. He also felt that an open voting process may influence and/or improve the voters' behaviours. In his points of view, the members of Parliament should not be subsidised by the Parliament, and funding for election campaigns should be monitored. Candidates should be limited to the amount they can spend on advertising themselves. These limitations may prevent the possibility of them improperly influencing voters. Additionally, representatives should not have salaries; instead they should be

subsidized by their voters because selfish, ordinary people and demagogues may wish to be selected just for the salary. According to Mill, the term of office for selected people should be limited. He thought that an election period should be neither too short, nor too long. His plan stated that elections should occur every 3 or 5 years. No matter who is selected, the term of office may be lengthened so they can fulfil their duty to the public. If it is too short, this period may be insufficient to enable advancements. The related view of re-election was a positive one – it stated that it is an incentive for the elected people to work more towards public welfare. Mandatory power was opposed because the government officials could act without considering the parliamentary elections. The plan also proclaimed that a second council is not required in Parliament. If the class interests of the majority in the first parliamentary election cannot be put off, then the decision may be useful. The Parliament should concentrate on execution. The authorities' responsibilities and decisions should not be separate. The Council of Ministers should be elected by neither people, nor deputies. A state-centralized structure is preferred to a federal state structure. However, if differences between regions and population groups are too large, the federal structure could be useful.

It can be considered Mill's plan as the theory of a qualified representative democracy. It had precautions to the tyranny of the majority, and it found that when citizens were misinformed, they developed. On the other hand, it may be asserted that Mill gave way to the current democracy simply because he defended the representative governance. Some radical critics argued that his theory of the right to vote being dependant on literacy and on directly withholding was his way of preventing the working class from holding political power, and thus leaving it all to the majority (Smart, 1990). However, I think that their claim is invalid, since today the rate of illiteracy is very low, and states provide free reading and writing courses. Having said that, there are those who supported John Stuart Mill, by arguing that his ideas prevent conflicts by taxing different political groups and certain social classes. Mill also saw himself as a democrat (Mill, 1957; Thompson 1976), though he had meritocratic standpoints.

It should be noted that despite the criticism, Mill argued for a representative democracy in a period when many people were opposed to popular sovereignty. The right to vote was restricted to a portion of the male population, and the growing proletarian class was outside of this group. Some views saw his scheme as a "democratic, elite sovereignty theory," some (Smart, 1990) as an "elitist democracy theory," and some as a "participatory democracy theory claimed that when examining Mill's theory of democracy, it is seen that he tried to improve its three functions. These are, first, the educational function of political participation as an integral part of the training and guaranteed lawful age of citizens; secondly, the protection of citizens' interests against negligence and/or abuse, and thirdly, securing that qualified citizens who are able to undertake political tasks have more penetration due to the principle of merit. In other words, the theory finds individual benefits to be creditable, and that they should have a reasonable share in sovereignty as an important aspect in political participation.

Conclusion

In this paper, I have examined whether or not the right to vote should be regarded as an equal "one person to one vote." In the first means of approaching this objective, the historical development of democracy has been provided briefly. Unlike in the past, the right to vote has been extended to all adult citizens regardless of language, religion, race, ethnic origin, gender, wealth, and so on. At the present, to have an equal right to vote, the only compulsory condition is to be a legal citizen. When the negative and positive aspects of democracy are examined, and the negative aspects have been approached for improvement, the principle of absolute equality was determined to be the source of the problem. I argued against the principle of absolute equality by calling the voting process a problematic issue, and I did so because the idea of absolute equality is conceptually self-contradictory, far away from promoting true justice, and it may lead to some problematic issues in practice. When the term "equality" was evaluated, it was broken down into two forms: absolute equality and proportional equality. While the first basically accepted every person as an equal, the latter tried to pick out the differences between individuals' abilities, and so, proportional equality was more in depth and promising. Even absolute equality may bring injustice when unequal statuses are considered equal, and proportional equality is more capable of bringing justice because it assesses only equal statuses as equal.

I asserted, as Mill did, that a so-called equal voting system is not fair and does not bring benefits. An equal voting system should be converted to a weighted voting system that is based on knowledge. This may also be an incentive to improve both the individuals *and* the whole society. Moreover, this proposed solution is more compatible with the principle of justice. In addition, weighted voting systems seem to be able to prevent some widespread problems with democracy, such as the inadequate governance qualities, clientelism, "invertebrate" citizens, the violations of human rights, polarization, the tyranny from the majority, the failure to promote further opportunities to the minorities, etc.. With these views, I suggest that a weighted voting system may promote the democratic health of societies due to its integrations and support of knowledge.

References:

ARISTOTLE., and GIGON, O. (1971). *Politik*. Zürich: Artemis.

ARISTOTLE., and ROSS, W. (1959). *The Nichomachean ethics*. London: Oxford University Press.

CHERNISS, J. and HARDY, H. (2004). *Isaiah Berlin*. [online] Plato.stanford.edu. Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/berlin/ [Accessed 14 Jul. 2016].

DAHL, R. (1985). *A preface to economic democracy*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

DAHL, R. (1989). *Democracy and its critics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

DWORKIN, R. (1996). *Freedom's law*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

DURKHEIM, E. (1965). *Montesquieu and Rousseau*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University of Michigan Press.

FUKUYAMA, F. (1992). *The end of history and the last man*. New York: Free Press.

GOSEPATH, S. (2001). *Equality*. [online] Plato.stanford.edu. Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/equality/ [Accessed 14 Jul. 2016].

HABERMAS, J. (1981). *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

HARE, T. (1865). *The election of representatives, parliamentary and municipal*. London: Longman, Green, Longman, Roberts & Green.

HAZAN, E. and KILIÇ, S. (2010). *Demokrasi ne alemde?*. İstanbul: Metis Yayınları.

HANSEN, M. (1991). *The Athenian democracy in the age of Demosthenes*. Oxford, UK: B. Blackwell.

HERETH, M. and HÖFFKEN, J. (1981). *Alexis de Tocqueville*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.

HOBBES, T. (1997). *Leviatan*. México: Ediciones Gernika.

MACHIAVELLI, N. and GÜVENÇ, N. (1994). *Prens*. Cağaloğlu, İstanbul: Anahtar Kitaplar.

MELOSSI, D. (1992). *Weak leviathan and strong democracy*. Berkeley, CA: Center for German and European Studies, University of California.

MILL, J. (n.d.). *Representative government*. Raleigh, N.C.: Alex Catalogue.

MILL, J. (n.d.). *On liberty*. Raleigh, N.C.: Alex Catalogue.

MORRIS, I., RAAFLAUB, K. and CASTRIOTA, D. (1998). *Democracy 2500?*. Dubuque, Iowa: Kendall/Hunt Pub. Co.

MOMMSEN, W. (1989). *The political and social theory of Max Weber*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

PLATO, and JOWETT, B. (n.d.). *The republic*. Champaign, Ill.: Project Gutenberg.

POURGERAMI, A. (1992). *Authoritarian versus nonauthoritarian approaches to economic development*. Holland: Kluwer Academic.

ROUSSEAU, J. (1968). *The social contract*. Baltimore, MD.: Penguin Books.

SMART, P. 1990: ''Some Will be More Equal Than Others'' J. St. Mill on Democracy, Freedom and Meritocracy, in Archive für Rechst- u. Sozialpbilosopbio76, 308-323.

TOCQUEVILLE, A., BRADLEY, P., REEVE, H. and BOWEN, F. (1945). *Democracy in America*. New York: A.A. Knopf.

THOMPSON, D. (1976). *John Stuart Mill and representative government*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

WEBER, M., GERTH, H. and MILLS, C. (1946). *From Max Weber*. New York: Oxford University Press.

WILSON, F. (2002). *John Stuart Mill*. [online] Plato.stanford.edu. Available at: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/mill/ [Accessed 14 Jun. 2016].