Question 3 is bad for democracy

Justin Kunimune, postdoc at MIT Plasma Science & Fusion Center
808 398 3956, 44A Spencer Avenue, Somerville

Elections in Massachusetts are by no means perfect, or even good. Turnout is low, and many incumbents run unopposed. Despite one party consistently holding a supermajority, the legislature is one of the least transparent and least effective in the country. So it's understandable that Question 3, which promises election reform, is appealing to many.

Nevertheless, I was disappointed to see the Globe endorse it, because Question 3 would *not* help. In fact, it would probably make things slightly worse. All-party primaries engender vote-splitting, which sometimes causes candidates from the minority party to win elections. To avoid this, parties are incentivized to influence candidacies behind closed doors. Rather than increasing competition, Question 3 would actually *decrease* it by reducing the number of candidates who run.

Question 3 is almost exclusively funded by private equity and venture capital firms, who likely hope it will help them by electing more business-friendly Democrats. The real solution to our governmental problems in Massachusetts is broader civic engagement, stronger transparency laws, independent redistricting, proportional representation, and ranked choice voting. Don't let private equity and venture capital firms sell us this false solution – vote no on 3.

For a more information, see kunimune.blog/2026/10/13/question-3-is-for-the-rich/.