

When the Business Case Is the Satire: A Decision Memo on "A Modest Proposal"

The proposal's precision is not evidence of wisdom; it is the mechanism that exposes what happens when economic utility is allowed to replace human worth.

When the Business Case Is the Satire: A Decision Memo on "A Modest Proposal"

Decision and executive summary

The decision is not whether to adopt Jonathan Swift's proposal. The proposal is deliberately grotesque: the sale and consumption of poor Irish infants is presented in the language of a rational economic, culinary, and public-policy solution. The decision is how to read and use the text responsibly as a business-minded operator.

The recommendation is to treat the work as a stress test for commercial reasoning. It demonstrates that a proposal can appear unusually strong on scope, cost, supply, demand, stakeholder benefits, operating mechanics, and objection handling while remaining morally indefensible. In fact, the proposal's calculations and implementation details are what make the satire work. They convert children into inventory, mothers into suppliers, wealthy households into customers, and suffering into an apparently attractive margin opportunity.

For a menu innovation leader, the practical lesson is direct: a complete business case is not necessarily a good business case. Before unit economics, scalability, or customer appeal can carry a decision, the underlying value proposition must survive a more basic test: does the model preserve the humanity and agency of the people whose lives, labor, or bodies create the value? If the answer is no, improving the model only makes the failure more efficient and more difficult to recognize.

Swift's speaker begins with a visible and urgent problem. Poor mothers and children crowd streets, roads, and cabin doors; mothers beg because they cannot earn an honest livelihood, while children grow up in rags. The speaker links unsupported childhood to theft, emigration, and servitude. He then claims that existing methods cannot support or employ poor children before they reach an age at which they can work or steal.

From there, he introduces an apparently self-contained solution. Of 120,000 children born to poor parents annually, 20,000 would be retained for breeding and 100,000 sold at one year old. The children would be marketed to wealthy people as nutritious food. Their skins could become gloves and boots. Mothers would be encouraged to nourish the children so they became plump and valuable. Slaughterhouses could be established in Dublin. The scheme would supposedly benefit mothers, landlords, taverns, cooks, wealthy diners, and the national economy.

Every element is designed to sound actionable. The speaker supplies a target population, an age threshold, a supply allocation, a customer segment, product specifications, processing infrastructure, seasonal demand logic, and a list of claimed economic benefits. He also rejects alternatives, acknowledges objections, and claims disinterest. This is not accidental excess. It is the mechanism by which the text exposes a society that already treats poor people as burdens and commodities.

The central conclusion for decision-makers is therefore negative but useful: do not confuse quantification with legitimacy. Precision can clarify a sound proposal, but it can also conceal an unacceptable premise. The first question in innovation is not "Can we make the economics work?" It is "What, and whose, value are we optimizing?"

Context: an urgent problem presented for optimization

The speaker's opening is effective because it starts with observable distress rather than with the shocking recommendation. Poor mothers and children are described as visibly destitute across towns and countryside. The mothers beg at streets, roads, and cabin doors. Their children are dressed in rags. The problem is not presented as isolated hardship; it is framed as a large, persistent grievance affecting the kingdom.

The proposed scope is intentionally broad. The speaker says the solution should include the whole number of infants whose parents are unable to support them, not only the children of professional beggars. This matters because it moves the issue from an easily dismissed extreme population to a wider group of laborers and poor families. The text's alleged customer and cost problem is therefore built on a substantial, recurring supply of children whose parents lack sufficient income.

The speaker also identifies downstream consequences. Children without support may become thieves, leave their country to fight abroad, or sell themselves into servitude. Young laborers who cannot find work are said to waste away from insufficient nourishment. Elderly, sick, and disabled people are described as dying from cold, famine, filth, vermin, and neglect. The social problem extends beyond one product category or one demographic. It includes unemployment, hunger, family insecurity, landlord pressure, and the abandonment of vulnerable people.

This is the first important operating distinction: the problem is real within the world of the text, but the proposed remedy is not. Swift makes the initial diagnosis credible enough that the reader can understand how a policymaker might be tempted by an apparently inexpensive intervention. The horror comes from applying commercial logic to a human emergency.

A menu innovation leader will recognize the structural appeal of this framing. A proposal that begins with a visible customer or operating pain point, defines the affected population, identifies a recurring cost, and promises relief can move quickly through an organization. But Swift's text asks whether the problem has been framed in a way that already strips people of agency. If the affected population is described only as excess demand, maintenance cost, or raw material, the business case may be internally coherent while externally cruel.

The proposed mechanism: from public expense to saleable product

The proposal's core move is a grotesque reversal. At one year old, children who have been treated as a public expense are said to become a source of food and clothing for others. The speaker describes a healthy, well-nursed one-year-old as nutritious and suitable for consumption. He provides a weight progression from birth to one year, adding pseudo-scientific measurement to the culinary description.

The mechanism has several linked stages.

First, the speaker defines the supply. He estimates 120,000 poor children born annually after subtracting children of financially secure families, miscarriages, and infant deaths. He then allocates 20,000 for breeding and 100,000 for sale at one year old. The language is bureaucratic and impersonal. Reproduction becomes production planning; children become a managed population.

Second, he defines the product. The child is not merely food but a supposedly premium, healthy, versatile ingredient. A single child could provide two dishes at an entertainment for friends, with portions assigned to different household circumstances. The detail is deliberately domestic. Ordinary language about serving sizes and social occasions makes the underlying violence harder to evade.

Third, he defines the customer. Wealthy people are positioned as buyers, including households hosting entertainments and public figures responsible for civic feasts, weddings, christenings, and other celebrations. The proposal therefore turns elite pleasure into demand and poor children into the supply that satisfies it.

Fourth, he defines supplier behavior. Mothers are advised to let the children nurse plentifully in the final month so the product becomes plump and valuable. The mother is then promised an eight-shilling profit and the ability to return to work. This is

exploitation presented as empowerment: caregiving is converted into preparation for sale, while the sale is represented as income relief.

Fifth, he defines secondary yield. The child's skin can be artificially dressed into gloves and boots. The proposal thus claims to monetize every part of the product, demonstrating how a system that begins with commodification naturally expands into total extraction.

Sixth, he defines infrastructure. Shambles could be appointed in Dublin, and the children could be prepared immediately after purchase. This detail converts an abstract horror into a logistics model. The proposal is no longer only an argument; it has locations, processing steps, and throughput implications.

The operating logic is intentionally complete. It addresses supply, age, quality, portioning, customer demand, supplier incentives, by-products, processing, and distribution. That completeness is the trap. The reader may begin assessing feasibility before confronting the premise.

Evidence and the false authority of numbers

The speaker repeatedly claims the authority of careful study. He says he has turned his thoughts to the subject for years and that previous schemes rested on faulty calculations. This is a classic credibility maneuver: the speaker presents himself as the analyst who has reviewed the problem more rigorously than others.

He then supplies numbers. There are 120,000 children. A defined number is retained for breeding. A defined number is sold. Infants have assigned weights. Dublin would consume 20,000 carcasses annually and the rest of Ireland another 80,000. The national stock would supposedly increase by 50,000 pounds per year. These figures create the appearance of a model that can be checked, challenged, and implemented.

But the text's numbers are not reliable evidence for the proposal. Their rhetorical purpose is to make an absurd premise sound administratively mature. The speaker's arithmetic does not answer the ethical question; it distracts from it. The more exact the calculation appears, the more readily a reader might mistake confidence for truth.

This distinction should govern how the proposal is assessed as a decision memo. Evidence has at least two dimensions: whether the assumptions are credible and whether the objective is acceptable. Swift's speaker supplies apparent precision without either sufficient credibility or moral legitimacy. The estimates are part of the satire, and the proposed benefits are claims made by the satirical persona rather than validated outcomes.

The same problem appears in the list of winners. The scheme allegedly relieves the poor, gives mothers profit, benefits landlords, increases trade, creates custom for taverns, supports cooks, entertains the rich, encourages marriage, and improves husbands' treatment of pregnant wives. It is presented as a broad stakeholder solution.

Yet each claimed benefit exposes a contradiction. Mothers benefit only by selling their children. Landlords benefit because tenants possess something valuable that can be seized for rent after their corn and cattle have already been taken. Taverns and wealthy diners benefit from consumption. The national economy benefits by counting transactions and reduced maintenance costs. The proposal's "public welfare" language is therefore not neutral. It shows how a system can produce a wide map of financial beneficiaries while assigning all physical and moral cost to the powerless.

Alternatives and the real decision being avoided

The speaker does not merely introduce his own plan. He dismisses or bypasses a catalogue of nonviolent alternatives: taxing absentees, buying domestic goods, reducing luxury, improving thrift, ending faction, and showing mercy to tenants. These are the reforms the satire places in the reader's field of view.

The speaker says such expedients are useless until there is some sincere attempt to put them into practice. This is the text's most important decision insight. The problem is not that humane solutions are unimaginable. The problem is that those with power lack the will to enact them.

The outrageous proposal is therefore a substitute for action. It permits the ruling system to remain unchanged while pretending to solve the consequences of that system. Landlord exploitation remains. Political conflict remains. Luxury remains. The poor continue to lack food, clothing, housing, money, and trade. What changes is only the language used to describe the poor: they become an input to a supposedly efficient model.

For a commercial operator, this is the difference between solving a root cause and monetizing a symptom. The text does not authorize an outside framework or a modern analogy; its own alternatives are enough. When known reforms are rejected because they inconvenience powerful stakeholders, the organization may seek an easier intervention that changes the measurement rather than the condition. The satire warns that "cheap, easy, self-contained, and effective" are not adequate selection criteria when the mechanism transfers harm to people with the least power.

The speaker even invites opponents to propose another solution, provided it is equally innocent, cheap, easy, and effective and addresses the immediate inability

to feed the poor. This feigned openness controls the debate by forcing alternatives to compete against an impossible standard. It also suggests that critics who object to the premise must solve the entire crisis instantly or be dismissed.

A sound decision process should reject that framing. An objection to an unacceptable mechanism is not answered by demanding a complete replacement on the same timetable. Nor should the existence of operational complexity in humane alternatives be treated as evidence that exploitation is practical.

Risks, tradeoffs, and stakeholder exposure

The proposal has no legitimate upside that can offset its core harm. Its alleged economic advantages depend on treating children as commodities and poor mothers as suppliers. The claimed relief for parents is inseparable from coercion. The claimed benefit to consumers is inseparable from elite consumption of the vulnerable. The claimed national wealth is inseparable from the reduction of human beings to inventory.

The text also surfaces several categories of downside risk.

Premise risk. The entire model depends on accepting that human beings can be valued primarily by their cost, weight, sale value, and secondary yield. Once that premise is rejected, the calculations do not merely need adjustment; the proposal collapses.

Stakeholder-power risk. The people supplying the product have the least power. Poor tenants have already lost crops and cattle and lack money for rent. Landlords, wealthy buyers, taverns, and public entertainers occupy the beneficiary side of the model. The distribution of value is therefore not incidental. It is the point.

Operationalization risk. Establishing shambles and preparing children after purchase would institutionalize the violence. Operational efficiency would not make the proposal safer or more acceptable. It would make the harmful premise more scalable.

Reputation and public-meaning risk. The proposal places infant consumption in the context of feasts, weddings, christenings, and public entertainments. This juxtaposition makes clear that customer appeal cannot be evaluated separately from what the product signifies. A product may be described as nutritious, profitable, and versatile while remaining fundamentally repellent because of its meaning and origin.

False-consensus risk. The list of supposed winners can create the impression that every stakeholder benefits. But aggregate benefit language can hide who bears the cost. "Advancing trade," "relieving the poor," and "giving pleasure to the rich" are presented together as if they form a coherent public good. They do not.

Credibility risk. The speaker closes by claiming no personal financial interest because he has no young children and his wife is beyond childbearing. This is an attempt to establish disinterested patriotism. The claim illustrates that a declaration of neutrality does not validate an argument. Disinterest in personal gain is not the same as sound judgment.

The principal tradeoff is therefore not between margin and complexity, or between supply and demand. It is between preserving the human subject of the problem and converting that subject into a commercial object. The proposal deliberately chooses the latter.

What remains uncertain-and what does not

The text leaves some factual details uncertain because its evidence is presented through a satirical speaker. The population estimates, weights, market forecasts, national-income calculation, and claimed consumer demand should not be treated as verified data. The speaker's expertise is asserted, not demonstrated. His economic benefits are stated, not independently established.

The text also uses religious and political hostility as part of the speaker's reasoning. The proposed reduction of the Catholic population is offered as an advantage, revealing sectarian prejudice rather than a legitimate measure of success. The claim that England would not object because the commodity could not be exported, and the hint that another country might consume the whole Irish nation, broaden the satire into national exploitation and domination.

Those uncertainties do not weaken the central interpretation. They strengthen it. The work does not require the reader to prove that the market could function. It requires the reader to notice how easily unsupported numbers, false expertise, consumer language, and stakeholder accounting can make cruelty sound like policy.

What is certain within the text is the pattern: visible poverty is reframed as a burden; conventional reforms are rejected; a vulnerable population is quantified; bodies are assigned economic value; infrastructure is proposed; and the resulting transactions are called public welfare. That pattern is the decision object.

Recommendation and next steps

The recommendation is to read "A Modest Proposal" as a rejection of business cases that optimize the wrong thing. Do not evaluate the proposal on feasibility, scalability, menu versatility, customer occasions, supplier incentives, by-product utilization, or national economic contribution before rejecting its premise. Those are precisely the dimensions Swift uses to make the proposal sound reasonable.

The next step is to apply a premise-first review to any proposal involving vulnerable people, unequal bargaining power, or the conversion of human needs into commercial inputs. The review should ask:

1. Are the affected people being represented as people with agency, or only as costs, demand, supply, or inventory?
2. Who receives the stated benefits, and who bears the physical, social, and moral costs?
3. Are quantitative assumptions credible, or are they functioning mainly as authority signals?
4. Does the proposal address the underlying condition, or does it monetize the consequences of an unchanged system?
5. Are objections being answered with evidence, or merely outmatched by claims of low cost, ease, and speed?
6. Would operationalizing the idea make the harm more visible and more severe?
7. Are the proposed alternatives being rejected because they are ineffective, or because those with power lack the will to implement them?

The final recommendation is not to seek a less grotesque version of the speaker's scheme. It is to preserve the distinction the satire demands: commercial rationality is a tool, not a governing value. Swift's proposal succeeds as satire because it demonstrates that a model can be numerically elaborate, operationally specific, and broad in its claimed stakeholder benefits while exposing profound indifference to human life.

The strongest decision rule is therefore simple: before asking whether a proposal can create value, ask whether it has already decided that some people are merely the material from which value will be extracted. If so, the problem is not the model's execution. The problem is the model itself.