*THESE ARE EXAMPLES OF OP-EDS FROM PREVEOUS SEMESTERS. THIS IS NOT THE THEME OF THIS OP-ED, OR THE RIGHT PRESENTATION FORMAT, THIS IS JUST TO GIVE YOU AN IDEA OF THE WRITING STYLE. THE THEME WAS THE FEDERAL ELECTION DEBATE.*

(Enlighten)

**The Left Needs Ranked Choice**

In Canadian politics, you don't vote for a party, you vote against one. It’s an issue that has consistently kept the same two parties in power, and that was especially highlighted during the last debate.

On the stage there were five candidates: four of which were actually interested in leading Canada (with Blanchet only being there to stir the pot and appeal to Quebec voters), three of which were left of the political spectrum and only one on the right. That presents a massive problem. With the PPC not being a viable candidate (they weren't even polling high enough to make it into the debates) it's safe to assume most right wing voters will dogpile on the Conservative party with the hopes of squashing the left.

And such creates the issue for progress, the leftist's own "prisoner's dilemma": Do we vote for the party we believe in, or do we vote for the party with the highest likelihood to succeed? Do we vote for new leadership and change, or do we stick with what feels safe against a hedged political party like the Conservatives?

This is Canada's loop. Leftist’s like to complain that Trudeau and the Liberal party don’t keep their promises, but even when presented with a strong viable alternative (like the NDP) leftists will vote Liberal anyway just because it's a safer choice. That's not how a political system should work.

The debate reinforced that sentiment. Trudeau spent the majority of the night on the defense being attacked left and right (in multiple senses of the phrase). However, between the shouting matches, the small windows for answering questions and mostly vague answers, was there even enough substance to swing a voter? There were moments of policy that stood out (such as Jagmeet stating he would make billionaires pay more in taxes) but they were fairly short lived. By the end of that debate, nothing on the left felt really distinct aside from Trudeau's perceived inaction. Meanwhile, O'Toole seemed fairly comfortable with his shoe-in as the only right wing candidate: nothing being said was going to swing a vote from him, and the left spent most of their time bickering amongst themselves.

If six people were ordering food and four picked pizza, albeit with slightly different toppings, they would go with a version of pizza, right? Not in Canadian politics: the remaining two people also voted for oysters. The same kind of oysters, and now that's what's for dinner. That's what O'Toole seemed to be betting on during that debate.

There is a solution to this, and it’s called ranked choice. For those who don’t know, ranked choice would mean that voters would get to rank their candidates at the ballot. If the first choices don't result in a candidate with at least 50% of the vote, then the worst polling candidate is removed and the voter's second choice is selected (had that original choice been removed). The process repeats until a candidate passes the threshold.

This prevents a riding from going to a conservative party even if the majority of voters voted for the left. It aleviates the pressure to vote with the herd. It's what Canada needs for change.

That debate wasn't enough to change votes. The moments remembered from it will be moments of drama, not political solutions. So now leftists are faced with the same cycle: do we vote Liberal to keep the Conservatives at bay or do we risk diluting the vote by voting for something new? Ranked choice would allow Canadians to able to vote without worrying about “throwing their vote away.” No more playing the game of voting against another party. As of now leftists voting for anything but the Liberals is voting with a leap of faith. It isn’t playing it safe, it’s taking a risk. Ranked choice would remove that risk and allow voters a vote of conscience. Canada needs it.

More provocative, “Heat”

**Maxime Bernier, The Absentee Debate Champion**

*The Supreme Art of War is to Subdue The Enemy Without Fighting - Sun Tzu*

We (as in all those political nerds binging every second of relevant news we can smash directly into our faces like a weapon) all watched Canada's potential leaders duke it out in the verbal ring last night. We saw them for their true selves that day, from Trudeau's arrogance to O'Toole's ambiguity, Singh's lack of character to Blanchet's character being attacked. This debate cost them all, (especially the moderator).

All except for one. Maxime Bernier.

Where was he during this mess?

Turns out, he was performing various interviews online. Several hour-long conversations with many Canadian podcasters, such as VivaFrei (David Freiheit), Jordan B Peterson, Michael Malice & Lauren Chen. Unlike his competition, he is continuing to do these interviews reaching hundreds of thousands from the combined viewership audiences.

The discussions themselves are also quite in-depth, pulling forth his inner thoughts and beliefs on many of his and his party's policy positions and future plans. All in a non-confrontational yet critical stance from his hosts, some even with a competent moderator. His interviews even had their comment sections opened, allowing viewers to discuss the videos further, thus cementing his views into their thoughts days before the election.

Compare this to yesterday's debate, where Blanchet sat around for 50 minutes and got called racist. Where Jagmeet and Trudeau played the roles of a petulant child and a weary father respectively. Where Trudeau 2 and O'Toole played the "Who is the better feminist" game only to come to a draw. Hell, can we even be sure if Annamie Paul is still the leader of the green party? Searching up "Canada Green Party leader" in google doesn't even return with her name on the right-hand side of Wikipedia.

Now I'm sure this all seems well and good for Bernie, in the land of the internet where only TROLLS and HaCkUrZ survive off the binary flesh of the gullible, but you would have to admit that you can't remember the last time you opened your cable to check for a good movie to watch. You would also admit to legacy media's desperate attempt to integrate itself into new online media over the past several years.

The internet is the way of the future, one that would seem to be leaving the rest of the candidates in the dust.

There has even been talk around the interwebs of potentially using a podcast form to replace traditional debate. Just imagine it, a 3 to 4 hour discussion with all of Canada's potential leaders in a single room, not restricted by time or arbitrary response limit, but free to actually discuss topics their voters want answers to. To logically make an obvious pick for Premier of themselves or fools of others. Actually getting hear past the buzzwords and shallow pandering

Hell, if Joe Rogan is ever willing to moderate such a spectacle, we could even see Jagmeet smoke a blunt with Rogan, and who doesn't want to see that?

Fentanyl For Thought...