

Understanding Comparative Politics

Angelo Byrd



UNDERSTANDING COMPARATIVE POLITICS

UNDERSTANDING COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Angelo Byrd



Understanding Comparative Politics
by Angelo Byrd

Copyright© 2022 BIBLIOTEX

www.bibliotex.com

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any manner without the prior written permission of the copyright owner, except for the use brief quotations in a book review.

To request permissions, contact the publisher at info@bibliotex.com

Ebook ISBN: 9781984662408



Published by:

Bibliotex

Canada

Website: www.bibliotex.com

Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction	1
Chapter 2	Corporate Governance	28
Chapter 3	The State in a Global Context	69
Chapter 4	Understanding of Democratic Politics	95
Chapter 5	Direct Democracy and Comparative Politics	138

Chapter 1

Introduction

Politics and Government

Politics is a process by which groups of people make collective decisions. The term is generally applied to the art or science of running governmental or state affairs, including behaviour within civil governments, but also applies to institutions, fields, and special interest groups such as the corporate, academic, and religious segments of society. It consists of “social relations involving authority or power” and refers to the regulation of public affairs within a political unit, and to the methods and tactics used to formulate and apply policy.

Etymology

The word *politics* comes from the Greek word *politika*, modeled on Aristotle’s “affairs of the city”, the name of his book on governing and governments, which was rendered in English mid-15 century as Latinized “Polettiques”.

Thus it became “politics” in Middle English c. 1520s. The singular *politic* first attested in English 1430 and comes from Middle French *politique*, in turn from Latin *politicus*, which is the latinisation of the Greek *politikos*, meaning amongst others “of, for, or relating to citizens”, “civil”, “civic”, “belonging to the state”, in turn from *polites*, “citizen” and that from *polis*, “city”.

History

The history of politics is reflected in the origin and development, and economics of the institutions of government.

Native Americans

Lewis H. Morgan, author of *Ancient Society*, considers the American Indians to be the link between the primitive and patriarchal state of society.

Patriarchal Societies

All patriarchal societies are known by certain characteristic features:

- Male kinship is prevalent. Men are counted as kin because they are descended from the same male ancestor.
- Marriage is permanent. It is not until one woman is married to one man that certainty of fatherhood appears in society but it is not a general rule of patriarchal society for polygamy does exist in the earlier stages of social development.
- Paternal authority is the ruling principle of the social order. In ancient Rome, the patria potestas extended to all descendants of one living male ancestor; it comprised control and punishment, not to mention questions of life and death.

These features of the development of the patriarchal state of society are as common among the Jews as among the Arabs,

among the Aryans as among the Dravidians and even among the Germanic and Celtic peoples. The patriarchal state of society consists of two stages, tribe and clan. The tribe is a large group of hundreds of members who descend from one common male ancestor, sometimes from a fictitious character satisfying the etiquette that descent from the male is the only basis of society. The clan, on the other hand, is a smaller group reaching back into the past for only four generations or so to a common well-known male ancestor.

The clan always breaks down into smaller units when its limit is reached. The tribe or larger unit is the oldest. When the tribe breaks down, clans are formed. When the clan system breaks down, it leaves the households or families as independent units. Finally, with the withering away of patriarchal society, the family is dissolved and the individual comes into existence.

The State

The origin of the state is to be found in the development of the art of warfare. Historically speaking, all political communities of the modern type owe their existence to successful warfare. As a result the new states are forced to organize on military principles. The life of the new community is military allegiance. The military by nature is competitive.

Of the institutions by which the state is ruled, that of kingship stands foremost until the French Revolution put an end to the "divine right of kings". Nevertheless, kingship is perhaps the most successful institution of politics. However, the first kings were not institutions but individuals. The earliest kings were

successful militarily. They were men not only of great military genius but also great administrators. Kingship becomes an institution through heredity. The king rules his kingdom with the aid of his Council; without it he could not hold his territories. The Council is the king's master mind. The Council is the germ of constitutional government.

Long before the council became a bulwark of democracy, it rendered invaluable aid to the institution of kingship by:

- Preserving the institution of kingship through heredity.
- Preserving the traditions of the social order.
- Being able to withstand criticism as an impersonal authority.
- Being able to manage a greater deal of knowledge and action than a single individual such as the king.

The greatest of the king's subordinates, the earls in England and Scotland, the dukes and counts in the Continent, always sat as a right on the Council. A conqueror wages war upon the vanquished for vengeance or for plunder but an established kingdom exacts tribute. One of the functions of the Council is to keep the coffers of the king full. Another is the satisfaction of military service and the establishment of lordships by the king to satisfy the task of collecting taxes and soldiers.

The State and Property

Property is the right vested on the individual or a group of people to enjoy the benefits of an object be it material or

intellectual. A right is a power enforced by public trust. Sometimes it happens that the exercise of a right is opposed to public trust. Nevertheless, a right is really the creation of public trust, past, present or future. The growth of knowledge is the key to the history of property as an institution. The more man becomes knowledgeable of an object be it physical or intellectual, the more it is appropriated. The appearance of the State brought about the final stage in the evolution of property from wildlife to husbandry. In the presence of the State, man can hold landed property.

The State began granting lordships and ended up conferring property and with it came inheritance. With landed property came rent and in the exchange of goods, profit, so that in modern times, the "lord of the land" of long ago becomes the landlord. If it is wrongly assumed that the value of land is always the same, then there is of course no evolution of property whatever. However, the price of land goes up with every increase in population benefitting the landlord. The landlordism of large land owners has been the most rewarded of all political services. In industry, the position of the landlord is less important but in towns which have grown out of an industry, the fortunate landlord has reaped an enormous profit.

Towards the latter part of the Middle Ages in Europe, both the State - the State would use the instrument of confiscation for the first time to satisfy a debt - and the Church - the Church succeeded in acquiring immense quantities of land - were allied against the village community to displace the small landlord and they were successful to the extent that today, the village has become the ideal of the individualist, a place in

which every man “does what he wills with his own.” The State has been the most important factor in the evolution of the institution of property be it public or private.

The State and the Justice System

As a military institution, the State is concerned with the allegiance of its subjects as disloyalty is a risk to its national security.

Thus arises the law of treason. Criminal acts in general, breaking the peace and treason make up the whole of criminal law enforced by the State as distinguished from the law enforced by private individuals. State justice has taken the place of clan, feudal, merchant and ecclesiastical justice due to its strength, skill and simplicity. One very striking evidence of the superiority of the royal courts over the feudal and popular courts in the matter of official skill is the fact that, until comparatively late in history, the royal courts alone kept written records of their proceedings. The trial by jury was adopted by the Royal Courts, securing its popularity and making it a bulwark of liberty. By the time of the Protestant Reformation, with the separation of Church and State, in the most progressive countries, the State succeeded in dealing with the business of administering justice.

The State

The making of laws was unknown to primitive societies. That most persistent of all patriarchal societies, the Jewish, retains to a certain extent its tribal law in the Gentile cities of the West. This tribal law is the rudimentary idea of law as it

presented itself to people in the patriarchal stage of society, it was custom or observance sanctioned by the approval and practice of ancestors.

The state of affairs which existed in the 10th century, when every town had its own laws and nations like France, Germany, Spain and other countries had no national law until the end of the 18th century, was brought to an end by three great agencies that helped to create the modern system of law and legislation:

1. *Records:* From the early Middle Ages in Europe there come what are called folk-laws and they appear exactly at the time when the patriarchal is becoming the State. They are due almost universally to one cause: the desire of the king to know the custom of his subjects. These are not legislation in the sense of law-making but statements or declarations of custom. They are drawn from a knowledge of the custom of the people. Unwritten custom changes imperceptibly but not the written. It is always possible to point to the exact text and show what it says. Nevertheless, the written text can change by addition with every new edition.
2. *Law Courts:* By taking some general rule which seemed to be common to all the communities and ignoring the differences, English common law was modeled after such a practice so that the law became common in all the districts of the kingdom. The reason why in the rest of Europe, there was no common law till centuries later is because the State in those countries did not get hold of the administration of justice when England did. One of

the shrewdest moves by which the English judges pushed their plan of making a common law was by limiting the verdict of the jury in every case to questions of fact. At first the jury used to give answers both on law and fact; and being a purely local body, they followed local custom. A famous division came to pass: the province of the judge and the province of the jury.

3. *Fictions*: Records and Law Courts were valuable in helping the people adapt to law-making but like Fictions, they were slow and imperfect. Though slowly, Fictions work because it is a well known fact that people will accept a change in the form of a fiction while they would resist it to the end if the fact is out in the open.

Finally there is the enactment of laws or legislation. When progress and development is rapid, the faster method of political representation is adopted. This method does not originate in primitive society but in the State need for money and its use of an assembly to raise the same. From the town assembly, a national assembly and the progress of commerce sprang Parliament all over Europe around the end of the 12th century but not entirely representative or homogeneous for the nobility and the clergy. The clergy had amassed a fortune in land, about one-fifth of all Christendom but at the time, in the 12th and 13th centuries, the Church was following a policy of isolation; they adopted the rule of celibacy and cut themselves from domestic life; they refused to plead in a secular court; they refused to pay taxes to the State on the grounds that they had already paid it to the Pope. Since the main object of the king in holding a national assembly was to collect money, the

Church could not be left out and so they came to Parliament. The Church did not like it but in most cases they had to come.

The medieval Parliament was complete when it represented all the states in the realm: nobles, clergy, peasants and craftsmen but it was not a popular institution mainly because it meant taxation. Only by the strongest pressure of the Crown were Parliaments maintained during the first century of their existence and the best proof of this assertion lies in the fact that in those countries where the Crown was weak, Parliament ceased to exist. The notion that parliaments were the result of a democratic movement cannot be supported by historical facts. Originally, the representative side of Parliament was solely concerned with money; representation in Parliament was a liability rather than a privilege. It is not uncommon that an institution created for one purpose begins to serve another. People who were asked to contribute with large sums of money began to petition. Pretty soon, sessions in Parliament would turn into bargaining tables, the king granting petitions in exchange for money. However, there were two kinds of petitions, one private and the other public and it was from this last that laws were adopted or legislation originated. The king as head of State could give orders to preserve territorial integrity but not until these royal enactments were combined with public petition that successful legislation ever took place. Even to the present day, this has always been the basis of all successful legislation: public custom is adopted and enforced by the State.

In the early days of political representation, the majority did not necessarily carry the day and there was very little need for contested elections but by the beginning of the 15th century, a

seat in Parliament was something to be cherished. Historically speaking, the dogma of the equality of man is the result of the adoption of the purely practical machinery of the majority but the adoption of the majority principle is also responsible for another institution of modern times: the party system.

The party system is an elaborate piece of machinery that pits at least two political candidates against each other for the vote of an electorate; its advantage being equal representation interesting a large number of people in politics; it provides effective criticism of the government in power and it affords an outlet for the ambition of a large number of wealthy and educated people guaranteeing a consistent policy in government.

These three institutions: political representation, majority rule and the party system are the basic components of modern political machinery; they are applicable to both central and local governments and are becoming by their adaptability ends in themselves rather than a machinery to achieve some purpose.

The State and the Executive System

The administration is one of the most difficult aspects of government. In the enactment and enforcement of laws, the victory of the State is complete but not so in regards to administration the reason being that it is easy to see the advantage of the enactment and enforcement of laws but not the administration of domestic, religious and business affairs which should be kept to a minimum by government.

Originally, the state was a military organization. For many years, it was just a territory ruled by a king who was surrounded by a small elite group of warriors and court officials and it was basically rule by force over a larger mass of people. Slowly, however, the people gained political representation for none can really be said to be a member of the State without the right of having a voice in the direction of policy making. One of the basic functions of the State in regards to administration is maintaining peace and internal order; it has no other excuse for interfering in the lives of its citizens.

To maintain law and order the State develops means of communication. Historically, the “king’s highway” was laid down and maintained for the convenience of the royal armies not as an incentive to commerce. In almost all countries, the State maintains the control of the means of communication and special freedoms such as those delineated in the First Amendment to the United States Constitution are rather limited.

The State’s original function of maintaining law and order within its borders gave rise to police administration which is a branch of the dispensation of Justice but on its preventive side, police jurisdiction has a special character of its own, which distinguishes it from ordinary judicial work. In the curfew, the State shows early in history the importance of preventing disorder. In early days, next to maintaining law and order, the State was concerned with the raising of revenue. It was then useful to the State to establish a standard of weights and measures so that value could be generally accepted and finally the State acquired a monopoly of coinage. The

regulation of labour by the State as one of its functions dates from the 15th century, when the Black Plague killed around half of the European population.

The invariable policy of the State has always being to break down all intermediate authorities and to deal directly with the individual. This was the policy until Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* was published promoting a strong public reaction against State interference. By its own action, the State raised the issue of the poor or the State relief of the indigent. The State, of course, did not create poverty but by destroying the chief agencies which dealt with it such as the village, the church and the guilds, it practically assumed full responsibility for the poor without exercising any power over it. The Great Poor Law Report of 1834 showed that communism ran rampant in the rural areas of England. In newly developed countries such as the colonies of the British Empire, the State has refused to take responsibility for the poor and the relief of poverty, although the poor classes lean heavily towards State socialism.

Recognizing the great power of the State, it is only natural that in times of great crisis such as an overwhelming calamity the people should invoke general State aid. Political representation has helped to shape State administration. When the voice of the individual can be heard, the danger of arbitrary interference by the State is greatly reduced. To that extent is the increase of State activity popular. There are no hard and fast rules to limit State administration but it is a fallacy to believe that the State is the nation and what the State does is necessarily for the good of the nation.

In the first place, even in modern times, the State and the nation are never identical. Even where “universal suffrage” prevails, the fact remains that an extension of State administration means an increased interference of some by others, limiting freedom of action. Even if it is admitted that State and nation are one and the same, it is sometimes difficult to admit that State administration is necessarily good.

Finally, the modern indiscriminate advocacy of State administration conceals the fallacy that State officials must necessarily prove more effective in their action than private enterprise. Herein lies the basic difference between Public and Business Administration; the first deals with the public weal while the second deals basically in profit but both require a great deal of education and ethical conduct to avoid the mishaps inherent in the relationship not only of business and labour but also the State and the Administration.

The Varieties of Political Experience

States are classified into monarchies, aristocracies, timocracies, democracies, oligarchies, and tyrannies. Due to an increase in knowledge of the history of politics, this classification has been abandoned. Generally speaking, no form of government could be considered the best if the best is considered to be the one that is most appropriate under the circumstances.

All States are varieties of a single type, the sovereign State. All the Great Powers of the modern world rule on the principle of sovereignty. Sovereign power may be vested on an individual as in an autocratic government or it may be vested on a group as

in a constitutional government. Constitutions are written documents that specify and limit the powers of the different branches of government. Although a Constitution is a written document, there is also an unwritten Constitution. The unwritten constitution is continually being written by the Legislative branch of government; this is just one of those cases in which the nature of the circumstances determines the form of government that is most appropriate. Nevertheless, the written constitution is essential. England did set the fashion of written constitutions during the Civil War but after the Restoration abandoned them to be taken up later by the American Colonies after their emancipation and then France after the Revolution and the rest of Europe including the European colonies.

There are two forms of government, one a strong central government as in France and the other a local government such as the ancient divisions in England that is comparatively weaker but less bureaucratic. These two forms helped to shape the federal government, first in Switzerland, then in the United States in 1776, in Canada in 1867 and in Germany in 1870 and in the 20th century, Australia. The Federal States introduced the new principle of agreement or contract. Compared to a federation, a confederation's singular weakness is that it lacks judicial power. In the American Civil War, the contention of the Confederate States that a State could secede from the Union was untenable because of the power enjoyed by the Federal government in the executive, legislative and judiciary branches.

A. V. Dicey in An Introduction to the Study of the Law of the Constitution, the essential features of a federal constitution are:

- A written supreme constitution in order to prevent disputes between the jurisdictions of the Federal and State authorities;
- A distribution of power between the Federal and State governments and
- A Supreme Court vested with the power to interpret the Constitution and enforce the law of the land remaining independent of both the executive and legislative branches.

Political Party

A political party is a political organization that typically seeks to attain and maintain political power within government, usually by participating in electoral campaigns, educational outreach or protest actions. Parties often espouse an expressed ideology or vision bolstered by a written platform with specific goals, forming a coalition among disparate interests.

As an Academic Discipline

Political science, the study of politics, examines the acquisition and application of power. Political scientist Harold Lasswell defined politics as “who gets what, when, and how”. Related areas of study include political philosophy, which seeks a rationale for politics and an ethic of public behaviour, political economy, which attempts to develop understandings of the relationships between politics and the economy and the governance of the two, and public administration, which examines the practices of governance. The philosopher Charles Blattberg, who has defined politics as “responding to conflict

with dialogue,” offers an account which distinguishes political philosophies from political ideologies. The first academic chair devoted to politics in the United States was the chair of history and political science at Columbia University, first occupied by Prussian émigré Francis Lieber in 1857.

Left-Right Politics

Recently in history, political analysts and politicians divide politics into left wing and right wing politics, often also using the idea of center politics as a middle path of policy between the right and left. This classification is comparatively recent and dates from the French Revolution era, when those members of the National Assembly who supported the republic, the common people and a secular society sat on the left and supporters of the monarchy, aristocratic privilege and the Church sat on the right.

The meanings behind the labels have become more complicated over the years. A particularly influential event was the publication of the Communist Manifesto by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels in 1848.

The *Manifesto* suggested a course of action for a proletarian revolution to overthrow the bourgeois society and abolish private property, in the belief that this would lead to a classless and stateless society.

The meaning of left-wing and right-wing varies considerably between different countries and at different times, but generally speaking, it can be said that the right wing often values tradition and social stratification while the left wing often values reform and egalitarianism, with the center seeking

a balance between the two such as with social democracy or regulated capitalism. Norberto Bobbio, one of the major exponents of this distinction, the Left believes in attempting to eradicate social inequality, while the Right regards most social inequality as the result of ineradicable natural inequalities, and sees attempts to enforce social equality as utopian or authoritarian.

Some ideologies, notably Christian Democracy, claim to combine left and right wing politics; Geoffrey K. Roberts and Patricia Hogwood, "In terms of ideology, Christian Democracy has incorporated many of the views held by liberals, conservatives and socialists within a wider framework of moral and Christian principles." Movements which claim or formerly claimed to be the left-right divide include Fascist Terza Posizione economic politics in Italy, Gaullism in France, Peronism in Argentina, and National Action Politics in Mexico.

Authoritarian-Libertarian Politics

Authoritarianism and libertarianism refer to the amount of individual freedom each person possesses in that society relative to the state. One author describes authoritarian political systems as those where "individual rights and goals are subjugated to group goals, expectations and conformities", while libertarians generally oppose the state and hold the individual and his property as sovereign. In their purest form, libertarians are anarchists, who argue for the total abolition of the state, while the purest authoritarians are totalitarians who support state control over all aspects of society. For instance, classical liberalism is a doctrine stressing individual freedom and limited government. This includes the importance of

human rationality, individual property rights, free markets, natural rights, the protection of civil liberties, constitutional limitation of government, and individual freedom from restraint as exemplified in the writings of John Locke, Adam Smith, David Hume, David Ricardo, Voltaire, Montesquieu and others.

The libertarian Institute for Humane Studies, “the libertarian, or ‘classical liberal,’ perspective is that individual well-being, prosperity, and social harmony are fostered by ‘as much liberty as possible’ and ‘as little government as necessary.’”

World Politics

The 20th century witnessed the outcome of two world wars and not only the rise and fall of the Third Reich but also the rise and fall of communism. The development of the Atomic bomb gave the United States a more rapid end to its conflict in Japan in World War II. Later, the development of the Hydrogen bomb became the ultimate weapon of mass destruction. The United Nations has served as a forum for peace in a world threatened by nuclear war.

“The invention of nuclear and space weapons has made war unacceptable as an instrument for achieving political ends.” Although an all-out final nuclear holocaust is out of the question for man, “nuclear blackmail” comes into question not only on the issue of world peace but also on the issue of national sovereignty. On a Sunday in 1962, the world stood still at the brink of nuclear war during the October Cuban missile crisis from the implementation of U.S. vs U.S.S.R. nuclear blackmail policy.

Political Corruption

Political corruption is the use of legislated powers by government officials for illegitimate private gain. Misuse of government power for other purposes, such as repression of political opponents and general police brutality, is not considered political corruption. Neither are illegal acts by private persons or corporations not directly involved with the government. An illegal act by an officeholder constitutes political corruption only if the act is directly related to their official duties. Forms of corruption vary, but include bribery, extortion, cronyism, nepotism, patronage, graft, and embezzlement. While corruption may facilitate criminal enterprise such as drug trafficking, money laundering, and trafficking, it is not restricted to these activities. The activities that constitute illegal corruption differ depending on the country or jurisdiction. For instance, certain political funding practices that are legal in one place may be illegal in another. In some cases, government officials have broad or poorly defined powers, which make it difficult to distinguish between legal and illegal actions.

Worldwide, bribery alone is estimated to involve over 1 trillion US dollars annually. A state of unrestrained political corruption is known as a kleptocracy, literally meaning “rule by thieves”.

- “Favoritism is the only use of power.” Richard L Kempe
“Politics is the art of creating situations involving the threat of loss.” Richard L Kempe.

Government

Government refers to the legislators, administrators, and arbitrators in the administrative bureaucracy who control a state at a given time, and to the system of government by which they are organized. Government is the means by which state policy is enforced, as well as the mechanism for determining the policy of the state.

The word government is derived from the Latin verb *gubernare*, an infinitive meaning “to govern” or “to manage”.

States are served by a continuous succession of different governments. Each successive government is composed of a body of individuals who control and decide for the state. Their function is to enforce laws, legislate new ones, and arbitrate conflicts.

In some societies, this group is often a self-perpetuating or hereditary class. In other societies, such as democracies, the political roles remain, but there is frequent turnover of the people actually filling the positions.

In most Western societies, there is a clear distinction between a government and the state. Public disapproval of a particular government does not necessarily represent disapproval of the state itself. However, in some totalitarian regimes, there is not a clear distinction between the regime and the state. In fact, leaders in such regimes often attempt to deliberately blur the lines between the two, in order to conflate their interests with those of the polity.

Types of Governments

- *Authoritarian:* Authoritarian governments are characterized by an emphasis on the authority of the state in a republic or union. It is a political system controlled by unelected rulers who usually permit some degree of individual freedom.
- *Constitutional monarchy:* A government that has a monarch, but one whose powers are limited by law or by a formal constitution, such as the United Kingdom
- *Constitutional republic:* A government whose powers are limited by law or a formal constitution, and chosen by a vote amongst at least some parts of the populace. Republics which exclude parts of the populace from participation will typically claim to represent all citizens.
- *Democracy:* Rule by a government chosen by election where most of the populace are enfranchised. The key distinction between a democracy and other forms of constitutional government is usually taken to be that the right to vote is not limited by a person's wealth or race. A Democratic government is, therefore, one supported by a majority of the populace. A "majority" may be defined in different ways. There are many "power-sharing" or "electoral-college" or "constituency" systems where the government is not chosen by a simple one-vote-per-person headcount.
- *Dictatorship:* Rule by an individual who has full power over the country. The term may refer to a system where the dictator came to power, and holds it, purely by force -

but it also includes systems where the dictator first came to power legitimately but then was able to amend the constitution so as to, in effect, gather all power for themselves.

- *Monarchy*: Rule by an individual who has inherited the role and expects to bequeath it to their heir.
- *Oligarchy*: Rule by a small group of people who share similar interests or family relations.
- *Plutocracy*: A government composed of the wealthy class. Any of the forms of government listed here can be plutocracy. For instance, if all of the voted representatives in a republic are wealthy, then it is a republic and a plutocracy.
- *Theocracy*: Rule by a religious elite.
- *Totalitarian*: Totalitarian governments regulate nearly every aspect of public and private life.

Governance

Governance is the act of governing. It relates to decisions that define *expectations*, grant power, or verify performance. It consists of either a separate process or part of management or leadership processes. These processes and systems are typically administered by a government. In the case of a business or of a non-profit organisation, governance relates to consistent management, cohesive policies, guidance, processes and decision-rights for a given area of responsibility. For example, managing at a corporate level might involve evolving

policies on privacy, on internal investment, and on the use of data. To distinguish the term *governance* from *government*: “governance” is what a “government” does. It might be a geo-political government, a corporate government, a socio-political government or any number of different kinds of government, but governance is the physical exercise of management power and policy, while government is the instrument that does it. The term government is also used more abstractly as a synonym for governance, as in the Canadian motto, “Peace, Order and *Good Government*”.

Origin of the Word

The word *governance* derives from the Greek verb *kubernáo* which means *to steer* and was used for the first time in a metaphorical sense by Plato. It then passed on to Latin and then on to many languages.

Processes and Governance

As a process, governance may operate in an organization of any size: from a single human being to all of humanity; and it may function for any purpose, good or evil, for profit or not. A reasonable or rational purpose of governance might aim to assure, that an organization produces a worthwhile pattern of good results while avoiding an undesirable pattern of bad circumstances. Perhaps the moral and natural purpose of governance consists of assuring, on behalf of those governed, a worthy pattern of good while avoiding an undesirable pattern of bad. The ideal purpose, obviously, would assure a perfect pattern of good with no bad. A government, comprises a set of inter-related positions that govern and that use or exercise

power, particularly coercive power. A good government, following this line of thought, could consist of a set of inter-related positions exercising coercive power that assures, on behalf of those governed, a worthwhile pattern of good results while avoiding an undesirable pattern of bad circumstances, by making decisions that define expectations, grant power, and verify performance.

Politics provides a means by which the governance process operates. For example, people may choose expectations by way of political activity; they may grant power through political action, and they may judge performance through political behaviour. Conceiving of governance in this way, one can apply the concept to states, to corporations, to non-profits, to NGOs, to partnerships and other associations, to project-teams, and to any number of humans engaged in some purposeful activity.

Different Definitions

The World Bank defines governance as:

- The exercise of political authority and the use of institutional resources to manage society's problems and affairs.

The Worldwide Governance Indicators project of the World Bank defines governance as:

- The traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised.

This considers the process by which governments are selected, monitored and replaced; the capacity of the government to

effectively formulate and implement sound policies and the respect of citizens and the state of the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.

An alternate definition sees governance as:

- The use of institutions, structures of authority and even collaboration to allocate resources and coordinate or control activity in society or the economy.

The United Nations Development Programme's Regional Project on Local Governance for Latin America:

- Governance has been defined as the rules of the political system to solve conflicts between actors and adopt decision. It has also been used to describe the "proper functioning of institutions and their acceptance by the public". And it has been used to invoke the efficacy of government and the achievement of consensus by democratic means.

The State and Politics

Some suggest making a clear distinction between the concepts of governance and of politics. Politics involves processes by which a group of people with initially divergent opinions or interests reach collective decisions generally regarded as binding on the group, and enforced as common policy. Governance, on the other hand, conveys the administrative and process-oriented elements of governing rather than its antagonistic ones.

Such an argument continues to assume the possibility of the traditional separation between “politics” and “administration”. Contemporary governance practice and theory sometimes questions this distinction, premising that both “governance” and “politics” involve aspects of power.

In general terms, governance occurs in three broad ways:

1. Through networks involving public-private partnerships or with the collaboration of community organisations;
2. Through the use of market mechanisms whereby market principles of competition serve to allocate resources while operating under government regulation;
3. Through top-down methods that primarily involve governments and the state bureaucracy.

These modes of governance often appear in terms of hierarchy, markets, and networks - but also in democracies. For instance, the tripartite governance of the United States consists of three branches of power.

Corporate Organizations

Corporate organizations often use the word governance to describe both:

- The laws and customs applying to that direction
- The manner in which boards or their like direct a corporation

Fair Governance

A fair governance implies that mechanisms function in a way that allows the executives to respect the rights and interests of the stakeholders in a spirit of democracy.

Types of Governance

In contrast to the traditional meaning of “governance”, some authors like James Rosenau have used the term “global governance” to denote the regulation of interdependent relations in the absence of an overarching political authority. The best example of this in the international system or relationships between independent states. The term can however apply wherever a group of free equals need to form a regular relationship.

Chapter 2

Corporate Governance

Information Technology Governance

Corporate governance consists of the set of processes, customs, policies, laws and institutions affecting the way people direct, administer or control a corporation. Corporate governance also includes the relationships among the many players involved and the corporate goals.

The principal players include the shareholders, management, and the board of directors. Other stakeholders include employees, suppliers, customers, banks and other lenders, regulators, the environment and the community at large.

The first documented use of the word “corporate governance” is by Richard Eells to denote “the structure and functioning of the corporate polity”.

The “corporate government” concept itself is older and was already used in finance textbooks at the beginning of the 20th century. These origins support a multiple constituency definition of corporate governance.

Project Governance

The term *governance* as used in industry describes the processes that need to exist for a successful project.

IT Governance primarily deals with connections between business focus and IT management. The goal of clear governance is to assure the investment in IT generate business value and mitigate the risks that are associated with IT projects.

Participatory Governance

Participatory Governance focuses on deepening democratic engagement through the participation of citizens in the processes of governance with the state. The idea is that citizens should play a more direct roles in public decision-making or at least engage more deeply with political issues. Government officials should also be responsive to this kind of engagement. In practice, Participatory Governance can supplement the roles of citizens as voters or as watchdogs through more direct forms of involvement.

Non-Profit Governance

Non-profit governance focuses primarily on the fiduciary responsibility that a board of trustees has with respect to the exercise of authority over the explicit public trust that is understood to exist between the mission of an organization and those whom the organization serves.

Measuring Governance

Over the last decade, several efforts have been conducted in the research and international development community in order to assess and measure the quality of governance of countries all around the world.

Measuring governance is inherently a controversial and political exercise. A distinction is therefore made between external assessments, peer assessments and self-assessments. Examples of external assessments may be donor assessments or comparative indices produced by international non-governmental organisations. An example of a peer assessment may be the African Peer Review Mechanism. Examples of self-assessments may be country-led assessments that can be led by Government, civil society, researchers and/or other stakeholders at the national level.

One of these efforts to create an internationally comparable measure of governance and an example of an external assessment is the Worldwide Governance Indicators project, developed by members of the World Bank and the World Bank Institute. The project reports aggregate and individual indicators for more than 200 countries for six dimensions of governance: voice and accountability, political stability and lack of violence, government effectiveness, regulatory quality, rule of law, control of corruption. To complement the macro-level cross-country Worldwide Governance Indicators, the World Bank Institute developed the World Bank Governance Surveys, which are a country level governance assessment tools that operate at the micro or sub-national level and use information gathered from a country's own citizens, business people and public sector workers to diagnose governance vulnerabilities and suggest concrete approaches for fighting corruption. A new World Governance Index has been developed and is open for improvement through public participation. The following domains, in the form of indicators and composite indexes, were selected to achieve the development of the WGI: Peace and Security, Rule of Law, Human Rights and

Participation, Sustainable Development, and Human Development. Additionally, in 2009 the Bertelsmann Foundation published the Sustainable Governance Indicators, which systematically measure the need for reform and the capacity for reform within the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development countries. The project examines to what extent governments can identify, formulate and implement effective reforms that render a society well-equipped to meet future challenges, and ensure their future viability.

Examples of country-led assessments include the Indonesian Democracy Index, monitoring of the Millennium Development Goal 9 on Human Rights and Democratic Governance in Mongolia and the Gross National Happiness Index in Bhutan.

Seat of Government

The seat of government is defined by Brewer's Politics as "the building, complex of buildings or city from which a government exercises its authority". The seat of government is usually located in the capital. In some countries the seat of government differs from the capital, *e.g.* in the Netherlands where The Hague is the seat of government and Amsterdam is the Capital of the Netherlands. In most it is the same city, for example Ankara as the capital and seat of government of Turkey. In the United Kingdom, the seat of government is Westminster, a city within London, the capital.

The State and Sovereignty

A sovereign state is a state with a defined territory on which it exercises internal and external sovereignty, a permanent

population, a government, and the capacity to enter into relations with other sovereign states. It is also normally understood to be a state which is neither dependent on nor subject to any other power or state. While in abstract terms a sovereign state can exist without being recognised by other sovereign states, unrecognised states will often find it hard to exercise full treaty-making powers and engage in diplomatic relations with other sovereign states. The word "country" is often used to refer to sovereign states, although it means, originally, a geographic region. The first known states were created in ancient times in Egypt, Mesopotamia, India, China, Mexico, Peru and others, but it is only in relatively modern times that states have almost completely displaced alternative "stateless" forms of political organization of societies all over the planet. Roving bands of hunter-gatherers and even fairly sizable and complex tribal societies based on herding or agriculture have existed without any full-time specialized state organization, and these "stateless" forms of political organization have in fact prevailed for all of the prehistory and much of the history of the human species and civilization.

Initially states emerged over territories built by conquest in which one culture, one set of ideals and one set of laws have been imposed by force or threat over diverse nations by a civilian and military bureaucracy. Currently, that is not always the case and there are multinational states, federated states and autonomous areas within states. Additionally multiculturalism is currently adopted in many unitary and nation states following different processes of human migration such as population transfer, political migration, immigration and emigration.

Since the late 19th century, virtually the entirety of the world's inhabitable land has been parcelled up into areas with more or less definite borders claimed by various states. Earlier, quite large land areas had been either unclaimed or uninhabited, or inhabited by nomadic peoples who were not organised as states. However, even within present-day states there are vast areas of wilderness, like the Amazon Rainforest, which are uninhabited or inhabited solely or mostly by indigenous people. Also, there are states which do not hold *de facto* control over all of their claimed territory or where this control is challenged.

Currently the international community comprises around 200 sovereign states, the vast majority of which are represented in the United Nations. These states form what international relations theorists call a system, where each state takes into account the behaviour of other states when making their own calculations. From that point of view, states embedded in an international system face internal and external security and legitimation dilemmas. Recently the notion of an international community has been developed to refer to a group of states who have established rules, procedures, and institutions for the conduct of their relations. In this way the foundation has been laid for international law, diplomacy, formal regimes, and organizations. Sovereignty is a term that is frequently misused. Up until the 19th century, the radicalised concept of a "standard of civilization" was routinely deployed to determine that certain peoples in the world were "uncivilised", and lacking organised societies. That position was reflected and constituted in the notion that their "sovereignty" was either completely lacking, or at least of an inferior character when compared to that of "civilised" peoples." Lassa Oppenheim said

“There exists perhaps no conception the meaning of which is more controversial than that of sovereignty. It is an indisputable fact that this conception, from the moment when it was introduced into political science until the present day, has never had a meaning which was universally agreed upon.” In the opinion of Justice Evatt of the High Court of Australia “sovereignty is neither a question of fact, nor a question of law, but a question that does not arise at all.”

Sovereignty has taken on a different meaning with the development of the principle of self-determination and the prohibition against the threat or use of force as *jus cogens* norms of modern international law. The UN Charter, the Declaration on Rights and Duties of States, and the charters of regional international organisations express the view that all states are juridically equal and enjoy the same rights and duties based upon the mere fact of their existence as persons under international law.

The right of nations to determine their own political status and exercise permanent sovereignty within the limits of their territorial jurisdictions is widely recognised.

In political science, sovereignty is usually defined as the most essential attribute of the state in the form of its complete self-sufficiency in the frames of a certain territory, that is its supremacy in the domestic policy and independence in the foreign one.

In casual usage, the terms “country”, “nation”, and “state” are often used as if they were synonymous; but in a more strict usage they can be distinguished:

- *Nation* denotes a people who are believed to or deemed to share common customs, religion, language, origins, ancestry or history. However, the adjectives *national* and *international* are frequently used to refer to matters pertaining to what are strictly *sovereign states*, as in *national capital, international law*.
- *State* refers to the set of governing and supportive institutions that have sovereignty over a definite territory and population.

Recognition

State recognition signifies the decision of a sovereign state to treat another entity as also being a sovereign state. Recognition can be either express or implied and is usually retroactive in its effects. It doesn't necessarily signify a desire to establish or maintain diplomatic relations.

There is no definition that is binding on all the members of the community of nations on the criteria for statehood. In actual practice, the criteria are mainly political, not legal. L.C. Green cited the recognition of the unborn Polish and Czech states in World War I and explained that "since recognition of statehood is a matter of discretion, it is open to any existing State to accept as a state any entity it wishes, regardless of the existence of territory or of an established government." In international law, however, there are several theories of when a state should be recognized as sovereign.

Constitutive Theory

The constitutive theory of statehood defines a state as a person of international law if, and only if, it is recognized as sovereign by other states. This theory of recognition was developed in the 19th century. Under it, a state was sovereign if another sovereign state recognized it as such. Because of this, new states could not immediately become part of the international community or be bound by international law, and recognized nations did not have to respect international law in their dealings with them.

In 1815 at the Congress of Vienna the Final Act only recognised 39 sovereign states in the European diplomatic system, and as a result it was firmly established that in future new states would have to be recognized by other states, and that meant in practice recognition by one or more of the great powers.

One of the major criticisms of this law is the confusion caused when some states recognize a new entity, but other states do not. Hersch Lauterpacht, one of the theory's main proponents, suggested that it is a state's duty to grant recognition as a possible solution. However, a state may use any criteria when judging if they should give recognition and they have no obligation to use such criteria. Many states may only recognize another state if it is to their advantage.

In 1912, L. F. L. Oppenheim had the following to say on constitutive theory:

- International Law does not say that a State is not in existence as long as it is not recognised, but it takes no

notice of it before its recognition. Through recognition only and exclusively a State becomes an International Person and a subject of International Law.

Declarative Theory

By contrast, the “declarative” theory defines a state as a person in international law if it meets the following criteria:

- A defined territory;
- A permanent population;
- A government and
- A capacity to enter into relations with other states.

Declarative theory, an entity’s statehood is independent of its recognition by other states. The declarative model was most famously expressed in the 1933 Montevideo Convention.

Article 3 of the Convention declares that statehood is independent of recognition by other states. In contrast, recognition is considered a requirement for statehood by the constitutive theory of statehood.

A similar opinion about “the conditions on which an entity constitutes a state” is expressed by the European Economic Community *Opinions of the Badinter Arbitration Committee*. The Badinter Arbitration Committee found that a state was defined by having a territory, a population, and a political authority.

State Practice

State practice relating the recognition states typically falls somewhere between the declaratory and constitutive approaches. International law does not require a state to recognise other states.

Recognition is often withheld when a new state is seen as illegitimate or has come about in breach of international law. Almost universal non-recognition by the international community of Rhodesia and Northern Cyprus are good examples of this.

In the former case, recognition was widely withheld when the white minority seized power and attempted to form a state along the lines of Apartheid South Africa, a move that the United Nations Security Council described as the creation of an “illegal racist minority régime”. In the latter case, recognition was widely withheld from a state created in Northern Cyprus on land illegally invaded by Turkey in 1974.

De Facto and De Jure States

Most sovereign states are states *de jure* and *de facto*. However, sometimes states exist only as *de jure* states in that an organisation is recognised as having sovereignty over and being the legitimate government of a territory over which they have no actual control. Many continental European states maintained governments-in-exile during the Second World War which continued to enjoy diplomatic relations with the Allies, notwithstanding that their countries were under Nazi occupation. A present day example is the State of Palestine,

which is recognized by multiple states, but doesn't have control over any of its claimed territory in Palestine and possess only extraterritorial areas. Other states may have sovereignty over a territory but lack international recognition; these are considered by the international community to be only *de facto* states. Somaliland is commonly considered to be such a state. For a list of entities that wish to be universally recognized as sovereign states, but do not have complete worldwide diplomatic recognition.

Nations and Nationalism

Nations and Nationalism is an interdisciplinary academic journal covering nationalism and related issues. It is published quarterly on behalf of the Association for the Study of Ethnicity and Nationalism by Wiley-Blackwell. The journal is edited by Anthony D. Smith.

Aim

The first issue of *Nations and Nationalism* was published in March 1995. In their editorial for that issue, Anthony D. Smith, Obi Igwara, Athena Leoussi, and Terry Mulhall described the need for a journal devoted to the study of nations and nationalism, and identified the three basic aims of the journal as:

1. To be the vehicle of new research, both theoretical and empirical, and act as a forum for the exchange of views in the field;

2. To identify and develop a separate subject-area as a field of study in its own right, and unify the body of scholars in the field;
3. To bring to the attention of the wider scholarly community, and the public, the need to treat the subject-area as a well-defined field of interdisciplinary study, which requires the collaboration of scholars from a variety of intellectual backgrounds.

Nations and States

In this part, you will explore the nature of the state system and right to self-determination, as well as different methods of accommodating nations or other groups within a state structure through regional governments, federalism, and other arrangements. Also, you will find links to information about several states around the world.

Nation State

The nation state is a state that self-identifies as deriving its political legitimacy from serving as a sovereign entity for a nation as a sovereign territorial unit. The state is a political and geopolitical entity; the nation is a cultural and/or ethnic entity. The term “nation state” implies that the two geographically coincide, which distinguishes the nation state from the other types of state, which historically preceded it. The concept of a nation state is sometimes contrasted with city state.

History and Origins

The origins and early history of nation states are disputed. A major theoretical issue is: “Which came first, the nation or the nation state?” For nationalists, the answer is that the nation existed first, nationalist movements arose to present its legitimate demand for sovereignty, and the nation state met that demand. Some “modernization theories” of nationalism see the national identity largely as a product of government policy to unify and modernize an already existing state. Most theories see the nation state as an 1800s European phenomenon, facilitated by developments such as mass literacy and the early mass media. However, historians also note the early emergence of a relatively unified state, and a sense of common identity, in Portugal and the Dutch Republic. In France, Eric Hobsbawm argues the French state preceded the formation of the French people. Hobsbawm considers that the state made the French nation, not French nationalism, which emerged at the end of the 19th century, the time of the Dreyfus Affair. At the time of the 1789 French Revolution, only half of the French people spoke some French, and 12-13% spoke it “fairly”—Hobsbawm.

During the Italian unification, the number of people speaking the Italian language was even lower. The French state promoted the unification of various dialects and languages into the French language. The introduction of conscription and the Third Republic’s 1880s laws on public instruction, facilitated the creation of a national identity, under this theory.

The theorist Benedict Anderson argues that nations are “imagined communities” and that the main causes of nationalism and the creation of an imagined community are

the reduction of privileged access to particular script languages, the movement to abolish the ideas of divine rule and monarchy, as well as the emergence of the printing press under a system of capitalism. The “state-driven” theories of the origin of nation states tend to emphasize a few specific states, such as England and its rival France. These states expanded from core regions, and developed a national consciousness and sense of national identity.

Both assimilated peripheral nations; these areas experienced a revival of interest in the national culture in the 19th century, leading to the creation of autonomist movements in the 20th century.

Some nation states, such as Germany or Italy, came into existence at least partly as a result of political campaigns by nationalists, during the 19th century. In both cases, the territory was previously divided among other states, some of them very small. The sense of common identity was at first a cultural movement, such as in the *Völkisch movement* in German-speaking states, which rapidly acquired a political significance. In these cases, the nationalist sentiment and the nationalist movement clearly precede the unification of the German and Italian nation states.

Historians Hans Kohn, Liah Greenfeld, Philip White and others have classified nations such as Germany or Italy, where cultural unification preceded state unification, as *ethnic nations* or *ethnic nationalities*. Whereas ‘state-driven’ national unification’s, such as in France, England or China, are more likely to flourish in multiethnic societies, producing a traditional national heritage of *civic nations*, or *territory-based*

nationalities. The idea of a nation state is associated with the rise of the modern system of states, often called the “Westphalian system” in reference to the Treaty of Westphalia. The balance of power, which characterizes that system, depends for its effectiveness upon clearly defined, centrally controlled, independent entities, whether empires or nation states, which recognize each others sovereignty and territory. The Westphalian system did not create the nation state, but the nation state meets the criteria for its component states.

The nation state received a philosophical underpinning in the era of Romanticism, at first as the ‘natural’ expression of the individual peoples. The increasing emphasis during the 19th century on the ethnic and racial origins of the nation, led to a redefinition of the nation state in these terms. Racism, which in Boulainvilliers’s theories was inherently antipatriotic and antinationalist, joined itself with colonialist imperialism and “continental imperialism”, most notably in pan-Germanic and pan-Slavic movements.

The relation between racism and ethnic nationalism reached its height in the 1900s fascism and Nazism. The specific combination of ‘nation’ and ‘state’ expressed in such terms as the *Völkische Staat* and implemented in laws such as the 1935 Nuremberg laws made fascist states such as early Nazi Germany qualitatively different from non-fascist nation states. Obviously, minorities, who are not part of the *Volk*, have no authentic or legitimate role in such a state. In Germany, neither Jews nor the Roma were considered part of the *Volk*, and were specifically targeted for persecution. However German nationality law defined ‘German’ on the basis of German ancestry, excluding *all* non-Germans from the ‘Volk’. In recent

years, the nation state's claim to absolute sovereignty within its borders has been much criticized. A global political system based on international agreements and supra-national blocs characterized the post-war era. Non-state actors, such as international corporations and non-governmental organizations, are widely seen as eroding the economic and political power of nation states, potentially leading to their eventual disappearance.

Before Nation States

In Europe, in the 18th century, the classic non-national states were the *multiethnic* empires, and smaller states at what would now be called sub-national level. The multi-ethnic empire was a monarchy ruled by a king, emperor or sultan. The population belonged to many ethnic groups, and they spoke many languages. The empire was dominated by one ethnic group, and their language was usually the language of public administration. The ruling dynasty was usually, but not always, from that group.

This type of state is not specifically European: such empires existed on all continents, excepting Australia and Antarctica. Some of the smaller European states were not so ethnically diverse, but were also dynastic states, ruled by a royal house. Their territory could expand by royal intermarriage or merge with another state when the dynasty merged. In some parts of Europe, notably Germany, very small territorial units existed. They were recognised by their neighbours as independent, and had their own government and laws. Some were ruled by princes or other hereditary rulers, some were governed by bishops or abbots. Because they were so small, however, they

had no separate language or culture: the inhabitants shared the language of the surrounding region. In some cases these states were simply overthrown by nationalist uprisings in the 19th century. Liberal ideas of free trade played a role in German unification, which was preceded by a customs union, the Zollverein. However, the Austro-Prussian War, and the German alliances in the Franco-Prussian War, were decisive in the unification. The Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Ottoman Empire broke up after the First World War and the Russian Empire became the Soviet Union, after the Russian Civil War. A few of the smaller states survived: the independent principalities of Liechtenstein, Andorra, Monaco, and the republic of San Marino.

Characteristics of the Nation State

Nation states have their own characteristics, differing from those of the pre-national states. For a start, they have a different attitude to their territory, compared to the dynastic monarchies: it is semisacred, and nontransferable. No nation would swap territory with other states simply, for example, because the king's daughter got married. They have a different type of border, in principle defined only by the area of settlement of the national group, although many nation states also sought natural borders. The most noticeable characteristic is the degree to which nation states use the state as an instrument of national unity, in economic, social and cultural life.

The nation state promoted economic unity, by abolishing internal customs and tolls. In Germany, that process, the creation of the Zollverein, preceded formal national unity.

Nation states typically have a policy to create and maintain a national transportation infrastructure, facilitating trade and travel.

In 19th-century Europe, the expansion of the rail transport networks was at first largely a matter for private railway companies, but gradually came under control of the national governments.

The French rail network, with its main lines radiating from Paris to all corners of France, is often seen as a reflection of the centralised French nation state, which directed its construction. Nation states continue to build, for instance, specifically national motorway networks. Specifically, transnational infrastructure programmes, such as the Trans-European Networks, are a recent innovation. The nation states typically had a more centralised and uniform public administration than its imperial predecessors: they were smaller, and the population less diverse. After the 19th-century triumph of the nation state in Europe, regional identity was subordinate to national identity, in regions such as Alsace-Lorraine, Catalonia, Brittany, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica. In many cases, the regional administration was also subordinated to central government. This process was partially reversed from the 1970s onward, with the introduction of various forms of regional autonomy, in formerly centralised states such as France.

The most obvious impact of the nation state, as compared to its non-national predecessors, is the creation of a uniform national culture, through state policy. The model of the nation state implies that its population constitutes a nation, united

by a common descent, a common language and many forms of shared culture. When the implied unity was absent, the nation state often tried to create it. It promoted a uniform national language, through language policy.

The creation of national systems of compulsory primary education and a relatively uniform curriculum in secondary schools, was the most effective instrument in the spread of the national languages.

The schools also taught the national history, often in a propagandistic and mythologised version, and some nation states still teach this kind of history.

Language and cultural policy was sometimes negative, aimed at the suppression of non-national elements. Language prohibitions were sometimes used to accelerate the adoption of national languages, and the decline of minority languages.

In some cases, these policies triggered bitter conflicts and further ethnic separatism. But where it worked, the cultural uniformity and homogeneity of the population increased. Conversely, the cultural divergence at the border became sharper: in theory, a uniform French identity extends from the Atlantic coast to the Rhine, and on the other bank of the Rhine, a uniform German identity begins. To enforce that model, both sides have divergent language policy and educational systems, although the linguistic boundary is in fact well inside France, and the Alsace region changed hands four times between 1870 and 1945.

Examples

The Nation State in Practice

In some cases, the geographic boundaries of an ethnic population and a political state largely coincide. In these cases, there is little immigration or emigration, few members of ethnic minorities, and few members of the “home” ethnicity living in other countries.

Clear examples of nation states include the following:

- *Albania:* The vast majority of the population is ethnically Albanian at about 98.6% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.
- *Armenia:* The vast majority of Armenia’s population consists of ethnic Armenians at about 98% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.
- *Bangladesh:* The vast majority ethnic group of Bangladesh are the Bengali people, comprising 98% of the population, with the remainder consisting of mostly Bihari migrants and indigenous tribal groups. Therefore, Bangladeshi society is to a great extent linguistically and culturally homogeneous, with very small populations of foreign expatriates and workers, although there is a substantial number of Bengali workers living abroad.
- *Egypt:* The vast majority of Egypt’s population consists of ethnic Egyptians at about 99% of the population, with the

remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities, as well as refugees or asylum seekers. Modern Egyptian identity is closely tied to the geography of Egypt and its long history, its development over the centuries saw overlapping or conflicting ideologies. Though today an Arabic-speaking people, that aspect constitutes for Egyptians a cultural dimension of their identity, not a necessary attribute of or prop for their national political being. Today most Egyptians see themselves, their history, culture and language as specifically Egyptian and not “Arab.”

- *Hungary*: The Hungarians or the Magyar people consist of about 95% of the population, with a small Roma and German minority.
- *Iceland*: Although the inhabitants are ethnically related to other Scandinavian groups, the national culture and language are found only in Iceland. There are no cross-border minorities, the nearest land is too far away
- *Japan*: Japan is also traditionally seen as an example of a nation state and also the largest of the nation states, with population in excess of 120 million. It should be noted that Japan has a small number of minorities such as Ryûkyû peoples, Koreans and Chinese, and on the northern island of Hokkaidô, the indigenous Ainu minority. However, they are either numerically insignificant, their difference is not as pronounced or well assimilated.
- *Lebanon*: The Arabic-speaking Lebanese consist at about 95% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a

few small ethnic minorities, as well as refugees or asylum seekers. Modern Lebanese identity is closely tied to the geography of Lebanon and its history. Although they are now an Arabic-speaking people and ethnically homogeneous, its identity oversees overlapping or conflicting ideologies between its Phoenician heritage and Arab heritage. While many Lebanese regard themselves as Arab, other Lebanese regard themselves, their history, and their culture as Phoenician and not Arab, while still other Lebanese regard themselves as both.

- *Lesotho*: Lesotho's ethno-linguistic structure consists almost entirely of the Basotho, a Bantu-speaking people; about 99.7% of the population are Basotho.
- *Maldives*: The vast majority of the population is ethnically Dhivehi at about 98% of the population, with the remainder consisting of foreign workers; there are no indigenous ethnic minorities.
- *Malta*: The vast majority of the population is ethnically Maltese at about 95.3% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.
- *Mongolia*: The vast majority of the population is ethnically Mongol at about 95.0% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few ethnic minorities included in Kazakhs.
- North and South Korea, are one of the most ethnically and linguistically homogeneous in the world. Particularly in reclusive North Korea, there are very few ethnic minority groups and expatriate foreigners.

- *Poland*: After World War II, with the extermination of the Jews by the invading German Nazis during the Holocaust, the Expulsion of Germans after World War II and the loss of eastern territories, 96.7% of the people of Poland claim Polish nationality, and 97.8% declare that they speak Polish at home.
- Several Polynesian countries such as Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu, etc.
- *Portugal*: Although surrounded by other lands and people, the Portuguese nation has occupied the same territory since the romanization or latinization of the native population during the Roman era. The modern Portuguese nation is a very old amalgam of formerly distinct historical populations that passed through and settled in the territory of modern Portugal: native Iberian peoples, Celts, ancient Mediterraneans, invading Germanic peoples like the Suebi and the Visigoths, and Muslim Arabs and Berbers. Most Berber/Arab people and the Jews were expelled from the Iberian Peninsula during the Reconquista and the repopulation by Christians.
- *San Marino*: The Sammarinese make up about 97% of the population and all speak Italian and are ethnically and linguistically identical to Italians. San Marino is a landlocked enclave, completely surrounded by Italy. The state has a population of approximately 30,000, including 1,000 foreigners, most of whom are Italians.
- *Swaziland*: The vast majority of the population is ethnically Swazi at about 98.6% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.

The notion of a unifying “national identity” also extends to countries that host multiple ethnic or language groups, such as India and China. For example, Switzerland is constitutionally a confederation of cantons, and has four official languages, but it has also a ‘Swiss’ national identity, a national history and a classic national hero, Wilhelm Tell.

Innumerable conflicts have arisen where political boundaries did not correspond with ethnic or cultural boundaries. For one example, the Hatay Province was transferred to Turkey from Syria after the majority-Turkish population complained of mistreatment. The traditional homeland of the Kurdish people extends between northern Iraq, southeastern Turkey, and western Iran. Some of its inhabitants call for the creation of an independent Kurdistan, citing mistreatment by the Turkish and Iraqi governments. An armed conflict between the terrorist Kurdistan Workers Party and the Turkish government over this issue has been ongoing since 1984.

After WWII in the Tito era, nationalism was appealed to for uniting South Slav peoples. Later in the 20th century, after the break-up of the Soviet Union, leaders appealed to ancient ethnic feuds or tensions that ignited conflict between the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, as well as Bosnians, Montenegrins and Macedonians, eventually breaking up the long collaboration of peoples and ethnic cleansing was carried out in the Balkans, resulting in the destruction of the formerly communist republic and produced the civil wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1992–95, resulted in mass population displacements and segregation that radically altered what was once a highly diverse and intermixed ethnic makeup of the region. These conflicts were largely about creating a new

political framework of states, each of which would be ethnically and politically homogeneous. Serbians, Croatians and Bosnians insisted they were ethnically distinct although many communities had a long history of intermarriage.

All could speak the common Serbo-Croatian Language. Presently Slovenia (89% Slovene), Croatia (88% Croat) and Serbia (83% Serb) could be classified as nation states per se, whereas Macedonia (66% Macedonian), Montenegro (42% Montenegrin) and Bosnia and Herzegovina (47% Bosniak) are multinational states.

Belgium is a classic example of an artificial state that is not a nation state. The state was formed by secession from the United Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1830, whose neutrality and integrity was protected by the Treaty of London 1839; thus it served as a buffer state between the European powers France, Prussia, the United Kingdom and the Kingdom of the Netherlands until World War I. Belgium is divided between the Flemings, the French-speaking and the German-speaking. The Flemish population in the north speaks Dutch, the Walloon population in the south speaks French and/or German]. The Brussels population speaks French and/or Flemish.

The Flemish identity is also ethnic and cultural, and there is a strong separatist movement espoused by the political parties, Vlaams Belang and the Nieuw-Vlaamse Alliantie. The Francophone Walloon identity of Belgium is linguistically distinct and regionalist. There is also a unitary Belgian nationalism, several versions of a Greater Netherlands ideal, and a German-speaking community of Belgium annexed from Prussia in 1920, and re-annexed by Germany in 1940–1944.

However these ideologies are all very marginal and politically insignificant during elections. China covers a large geographic area and uses the concept of “Zhonghua minzu” or Chinese nationality, in the sense of ethnic groups, but it also officially recognizes the majority Han ethnic group, and no fewer than 55 ethnic national minorities.

The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom is a complex example of a nation state, due to its “countries within a country” status. The UK is a unitary state formed initially by the merger of two independent kingdoms, the Kingdom of England and the Kingdom of Scotland, but the Treaty of Union that set out the agreed terms has ensured the continuation of distinct features of each state, including separate legal systems and separate national churches.

In 2003, the British Government described the United Kingdom as “countries within a country”. While the Office for National Statistics and others describe the United Kingdom as a “nation state”, others, including a then Prime Minister, describe it as a “multinational state”, and the term Home Nations is used to describe the four national teams that represent the four nations of the United Kingdom.

Estonia

Although Estonia is a country with very diverse demographic situation with over 100 different ethnic groups whereas only 68.7% are Estonians and the biggest minority group being Russians, the constitution defines as one of the main reasons

of the Estonian independence the goal to preserve the Estonian language, nation and culture, therefore Estonia could be still seen as a nation state despite the demographic situation.

The constitution reads:

- [The Estonian state] which shall guarantee the preservation of the Estonian nation, language and culture through the ages.

Israel

Israel's definition of a nation state differs from other countries as its concept of a nation state is based on the Ethnoreligious group rather than solely on ethnicity, while the ancient mother language of the Jews, Hebrew, was revived as a unifying bond between them as a national and official language.

Israel was founded as a Jewish state in 1948, and the country's Basic Laws describe it as both a Jewish and a democratic state.

The Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, 75.7% of Israel's population is Jewish. Large numbers of Jews continue to emigrate to Israel. Arabs, who make up 20.4% of the population, are the largest ethnic minority in Israel. Israel also has very small communities of Armenians, Circassians, Assyrians, Samaritans, and persons of some Jewish heritage. There are also some non-Jewish spouses of Israeli Jews. However, these communities are very small, and usually number only in the hundreds or thousands.

Minorities

The most obvious deviation from the ideal of 'one nation, one state', is the presence of minorities, especially ethnic minorities, which are clearly not members of the majority nation. An ethnic nationalist definition of a nation is necessarily exclusive: ethnic nations typically do not have open membership. In most cases, there is a clear idea that surrounding nations are different, and that includes members of those nations who live on the 'wrong side' of the border. Historical examples of groups, who have been specifically singled out as *outsiders*, are the Roma and Jews in Europe.

Negative responses to minorities within the nation state have ranged from cultural assimilation enforced by the state, to expulsion, persecution, violence, and extermination. The assimilation policies are usually enforced by the state, but violence against minorities is not always state initiated: it can occur in the form of mob violence such as lynching or pogroms. Nation states are responsible for some of the worst historical examples of violence against minorities: minorities not considered part of the nation.

However, many nation states accept specific minorities as being part of the nation, and the term *national minority* is often used in this sense. The Sorbs in Germany are an example: for centuries they have lived in German-speaking states, surrounded by a much larger ethnic German population, and they have no other historical territory. They are now generally considered to be part of the German nation and are accepted as such by the Federal Republic of Germany, which constitutionally guarantees their cultural rights. Of the

thousands of ethnic and cultural minorities in nation states across the world, only a few have this level of acceptance and protection.

Multiculturalism is an official policy in many states, establishing the ideal of peaceful existence among multiple ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups. Many nations have laws protecting minority rights.

When national boundaries that do not match ethnic boundaries are drawn, such as in the Balkans and Central Asia, ethnic tension, massacres and even genocide, sometimes has occurred historically.

Irredentism

Ideally, the border of a nation state extends far enough to include all the members of the nation, and all of the national homeland. Again, in practice some of them always live on the 'wrong side' of the border. Part of the national homeland may be there too, and it may be governed by the 'wrong' nation. The response to the non-inclusion of territory and population may take the form of irredentism: demands to annex *unredeemed* territory and incorporate it into the nation state.

Irredentist claims are usually based on the fact that an identifiable part of the national group lives across the border. However, they can include claims to territory where no members of that nation live at present, because they lived there in the past, the national language is spoken in that region, the national culture has influenced it, geographical unity with the existing territory, or a wide variety of other reasons. Past grievances are usually involved and can cause

revanchism. It is sometimes difficult to distinguish irredentism from pan-nationalism, since both claim that all members of an ethnic and cultural nation belong in one specific state. Pan-nationalism is less likely to specify the nation ethnically. For instance, variants of Pan-Germanism have different ideas about what constituted Greater Germany, including the confusing term *Grossdeutschland*, which, in fact, implied the inclusion of huge Slavic minorities from the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Typically, irredentist demands are at first made by members of non-state nationalist movements. When they are adopted by a state, they typically result in tensions, and actual attempts at annexation are always considered a *casus belli*, a cause for war. In many cases, such claims result in long-term hostile relations between neighbouring states. Irredentist movements, typically circulate maps of the claimed national territory, the *greater* nation state. That territory, which is often much larger than the existing state, plays a central role in their propaganda.

Irredentism should not be confused with claims to overseas colonies, which are not generally considered part of the national homeland. Some French overseas colonies would be an exception: French rule in Algeria unsuccessfully treated the colony as a *département* of France.

Future

It has been speculated by both proponents of globalization and various science fiction writers that the concept of a nation state may disappear with the ever-increasingly interconnected

nature of the world. Such ideas are sometimes expressed around concepts of a world government. Another possibility is a societal collapse and move into communal anarchy or zero world government, in which nation states no longer exist and government is done on the local level based on a global ethic of human rights.

This falls into line with the concept of internationalism, which states that sovereignty is an outdated concept and a barrier to achieving peace and harmony in the world, thus also stating that nation states are also a similar outdated concept. If the nation state begins to disappear, it may well be the direct or indirect result of globalization and internationalism. The two concepts state that sovereignty is an outdated concept and, as the concept and existence of a nation state depends on 'untouchable' sovereignty, it is therefore reasonable to assume that. Globalization especially has helped to bring about the discussion about the disappearance of nation states, as global trade and the rise of the concepts of a 'global citizen' and a common identity have helped to reduce differences and 'distances' between individual nation states, especially with regards to the internet.

Clash of Civilizations

In direct contrast to cosmopolitan theories about an ever more connected world that no longer requires nation states, is the Clash of Civilizations theory. The proposal by political scientist Samuel P. Huntington is that people's cultural and religious identities will be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world.

The theory was originally formulated in a 1992 lecture at the American Enterprise Institute, which was then developed in a 1993 *Foreign Affairs* article titled “The Clash of Civilizations?”, in response to Francis Fukuyama’s 1992 book, *The End of History and the Last Man*. Huntington later expanded his thesis in a 1996 book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*.

Huntington began his thinking by surveying the diverse theories about the nature of global politics in the post–Cold War period. Some theorists and writers argued that human rights, liberal democracy and capitalist free market economics had become the only remaining ideological alternative for nations in the post–Cold War world. Specifically, Francis Fukuyama argued that the world had reached the ‘end of history’ in a Hegelian sense. Huntington believed that while the age of ideology had ended, the world had reverted only to a normal state of affairs characterized by cultural conflict. In his thesis, he argued that the primary axis of conflict in the future will be along cultural and religious lines. As an extension, he posits that the concept of different civilizations, as the highest rank of cultural identity, will become increasingly useful in analysing the potential for conflict.

In the 1993 Foreign Affairs article, Huntington writes:

- It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations

and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future.

Scholar Sandra Joireman suggests that Huntington may be characterised as a neo-primordialist since while he sees people as having strong ties to their ethnicity, he does not believe that these ties have always existed.

Power

Political power is a type of power held by a group in a society which allows administration of some or all of public resources, including labour, and wealth. There are many ways to obtain possession of such power. At the nation-state level political legitimacy for political power is held by the representatives of national sovereignty. Political powers are not limited to heads of states, however the extent to which a person or group such as an insurgency, terrorist group, or multinational corporation possesses such power is related to the amount of societal influence they can wield, formally or informally. In many cases this influence is not contained within a single state and it refers to international power. Political scientists have frequently defined power as "*the ability to influence the behaviour of others*" with or without resistance.

For analytical reasons, I.C. MacMillan separates the concepts power:

- Power is the capacity to restructure actual situations.—
I.C. Macmillan

- Influence is the capacity to control and modify the perceptions of others.—I.C. Macmillan

One of the most famous references to power comes from the Chinese communist leader Mao Zedong:

- Political power grows from the barrel of a gun.— Mao Zedong

This quote has been widely misinterpreted, however. Mao explained further that, “Our principle is that the Party commands the gun, and the gun must never be allowed to command the Party.”

In contrast to Mao Zedong, Hannah Arendt claims that power and violence are opposites and that power is:

- “The human ability...to act in concert.”

Political Power and the Question of Good and Evil

Some opinions representative of Enlightenment, 19th century, modern, and post-modern views on the relationship between political power and concepts of justice, good and evil:

- *[J]udicial power, that sure criterion of the goodness of a Government...is, in a word, a necessary evil. — Jean-Louis de Lolme*
- *The power to rule is a necessary evil, and by this same token, alas, it can be called a good.— Émile Chartier*
- *Constituted power is concentrated power. — Giorgio Agamben*

- *[Constituted power] is the product of a grey, incessant alchemy in which good and evil and, along with them, all the metals of traditional ethics reach their point of fusion. It thus becomes a question of irresponsibility and “impotentia judicandi” [the inability to judge]...though one that is situated not beyond good and evil, but rather before. — Giorgio Agamben*

Separation of Powers

Charles de Secondat, baron de Montesquieu claimed that without following a principle of containing and balancing power, the world is constantly at risk. Separation of power must be in such grade, that any of the branches can operate without excessive limitations from the others; but interdependency between them must also be in such grade, that one single branch cannot rule out the other's decisions. This is the separation of powers principle.

Division of Power

A similar concept, termed “division of power”, also consists of differentiated legislative, executive, and judicial powers. However, while separation of powers prohibits one branch from interfering with another, division of power permits such interference. For example, in Indonesia, the President can introduce a new bill, but the People's Consultative Assembly chooses to either legalize or reject the bill. The model here is the Checks and balances system introduced in the United States Constitution.

Power Projection

This ability is a crucial element of a state's power in international relations. Any state able to direct its military forces outside the limited bounds of its territory might be said to have *some* level of power projection capability, but the term itself is used most frequently in reference to militaries with a worldwide reach.

Even states with sizable hard power assets may only be able to exert limited regional influence so long as they lack the means of effectively projecting their power on a global scale. Generally, only a select few states are able to overcome the logistical difficulties inherent in the deployment and direction of a modern, mechanized military force. While traditional measures of power projection typically focus on hard power assets, the developing theory of soft power notes that power projection does not necessarily have to involve the active use of military forces in combat.

Assets for power projection can often serve dual uses, as the deployment of various countries' militaries during the humanitarian response to the 2004 Indian Ocean earthquake illustrates. The ability of a state to project its forces into an area may serve as an effective diplomatic lever, influencing the decision-making process and acting as a potential deterrent on other states' behaviour.

Political Science Perspectives

Within normative political analysis, there are also various levels of power as described by academics that add depth into

the understanding of the notion of power and its political implications. Robert Dahl, a prominent American political scientist, first ascribed to political power the trait of decision-making as the source and main indicator of power. Later, two other political scientists, Peter Bachrach and Morton Baratz, decided that simply ascribing decision-making as the basis of power was too simplistic and they added what they termed a second dimension of power, agenda-setting by elites who worked in the backrooms and away from public scrutiny in order to exert their power upon society. Lastly, British academic Steven Lukes added a third dimension of power, preference-shaping, which he claimed was another important aspect of normative power in politics which entails theoretical views similar to notions of cultural hegemony. These three dimensions of power are today often considered defining aspects of political power by political researchers.

A radical alternative view of the source of political power follows the formula: information plus authority permits the exercise of power. Political power is intimately related to information. Sir Francis Bacon's statement: "Nam et ipsa scientia potentia est" for knowledge itself is power, assumed authority as given.

Hannah Arendt begins by commenting that political theorists from right to left all seem to agree that violence is "the most flagrant manifestation of power." Arendt says that violence and power are opposites and defines power as the ability of citizens to act in concert. "Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to the group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he "is in power" we actually refer to his being empowered by a

certain number of people to act in their name.” From her perspective that power and violence are opposites, Arendt correctly judged that the invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968 was a sign of the diminishing power of the Soviet Union and not a sign of power.

Authority

The word Authority is derived mainly from the Latin word *auctoritas*, meaning invention, advice, opinion, influence, or command. In English, the word ‘authority’ can be used to mean power given by the state or by academic knowledge of an area.

Weber on Authority

Max Weber, in his sociological and philosophical work, identified and distinguished three types of legitimate domination, that have sometimes been rendered in English translation as types of authority, because domination isn’t seen as a political concept in the first place. Weber defined domination as the chance of commands being obeyed by a specifiable group of people. Legitimate authority is that which is recognized as legitimate and justified by both the ruler and the ruled.

Weber divided legitimate authority into three types:

1. The first type discussed by Weber is *Rational-legal authority*. It is that form of authority which depends for its legitimacy on formal rules and established laws of the state, which are usually written down and are often very complex. The power of the rational legal authority is

mentioned in the constitution. Modern societies depend on legal-rational authority. Government officials are the best example of this form of authority, which is prevalent all over the world.

2. The second type of authority is *Traditional authority*, which derives from long-established customs, habits and social structures. When power passes from one generation to another, then it is known as traditional authority. The right of hereditary monarchs to rule furnishes an obvious example. The Tudor dynasty in England and the ruling families of Mewar, in Rajasthan are some examples of traditional authority.
3. The third form of authority is *Charismatic authority*. Here, the charisma of the individual or the leader plays an important role. Charismatic authority is that authority which is derived from “the gift of grace” or when the leader claims that his authority is derived from a “higher power” or “inspiration”, that is superior to both the validity of traditional and rational-legal authority and followers accept this and are willing to follow this higher or inspired authority, in the place of the authority that they have hitherto been following. Examples in this regard can be NT Rama Rao, a matinee idol, who went on to become one of the most powerful Chief Ministers of Andhra Pradesh.

History has witnessed several social movements or revolutions, against a system of traditional or legal-rational authority, which are usually started by Charismatic authorities. Weber states that what distinguishes authority, from coercion, force

and power on the one hand and leadership, persuasion and influence on the other hand, is legitimacy. Superiors, he states, feel that they have a right to issue commands; subordinates perceive an obligation to obey. Social scientists agree that authority is but one of several resources available to incumbents in formal positions. For example, a Head of State is dependent upon a similar nesting of authority. His legitimacy must be acknowledged, not just by citizens, but by those who control other valued resources: his immediate staff, his cabinet, military leaders and in the long run, the administration and political apparatus of the entire society.

Authority in a Liberal Democratic State

Every state has a number of institutions which exercise authority based on longstanding practices. Apart from this, every state sets up agencies which are competent in dealing with one particular matter. All this is set up within its charter. One example would be a port authority like the Port of London. They are usually created by special legislation and are run by a board of directors. Several agencies and institutions are created along the same lines and they exercise authority in certain matters. They are usually required to be self-supporting through property taxes or other forms of collection or fees for services.

Chapter 3

The State in a Global Context

The Western State

The Western United States, commonly referred to as the American West or simply “the West,” traditionally refers to the region comprising the westernmost states of the United States. Because the U.S. expanded westward after its founding, the meaning of the West has evolved over time. Prior to about 1800, the crest of the Appalachian Mountains was seen as the western frontier. Since then, the frontier moved further west and the Mississippi River was referenced as the easternmost possible boundary of the West.

In the 21st century, the states which include the Rocky Mountains and the Great Basin to the West Coast are generally considered to comprise the American West.

Besides being a purely geographical designation, “The West” also has anthropological connotations. While this region has its own internal diversity, there is arguably an overall shared history, culture, mind set or world view and closely interrelated dialects of English. As with any region of such geographically large extent and varied cultural histories, many subregions of The American West possess distinguishing and idiosyncratic qualities.

The “West” had played an important part in American history; the Old West is embedded in America’s folklore.

In its most extensive definition, the western U.S. is the largest region, covering more than half the land area of the United States. It is also the most geographically diverse, incorporating geographic regions such as the Pacific Coast, the temperate rainforests of the Northwest, the Rocky Mountains, the Great Plains, most of the tall-grass prairie eastward to Western Wisconsin, Illinois, the western Ozark Plateau, the western portions of the southern forests, the Gulf Coast, and all of the desert areas located in the United States.

The states from the Rockies westward have something of a dual nature of semiarid steppes and arid deserts in the lowlands and plateaus, and mountains and coniferous forests in the uplands and coastal regions.

The region encompasses some of the Louisiana Purchase, most of the land ceded by Britain in 1818, some of the land acquired when the Republic of Texas joined the U.S., all of the land ceded by Britain in 1846, all of the land ceded by Mexico in 1848, and all of the Gadsden Purchase.

Arizona, New Mexico, Nevada, Colorado, and Utah are typically considered to be part of the southwest, and Texas and Oklahoma are frequently considered part of the Southwest as well. Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming can be considered part of the Northwest, and the addition of the Canadian province of British Columbia comprise the Pacific Northwest. There is also another region of both southwest and northwest states called the Mountain West, which is Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Nevada, Montana, Idaho, and Wyoming.

The West can be divided into the Pacific States; Alaska, California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington, with the term West Coast usually restricted to just California, Oregon, and Washington, and the Mountain States, always Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Alaska and Hawaii, being detached from the other western states, have few similarities with them, but are usually also classified as part of the West.

Western Texas in the Chihuahuan Desert is also traditionally considered part of the Western U.S, though from a climatological perspective the West might be said to begin just west of Austin, TX where annual rainfall drops off significantly from what is typically experienced in the East, with a concurrent change in plant and animal species. Some western states are grouped into regions with eastern states. Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota and North Dakota are often included in the Midwest, which also includes states like Iowa, Illinois and Wisconsin. Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas are also considered part of the South.

It is rare for any state east of the Mississippi River to be considered part of the modern west. Historically, however, the Northwest Territory was an important early territory of the U.S., comprising the modern states of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin, as well as the northeastern part of Minnesota. Also, American sports leagues with a "Western" conference or division often have members east of the Mississippi for various reasons such as not enough true Western teams, not strictly adhering to geographic regions, etc. For example, the NBA and NHL each have a Western Conference with a member in Tennessee.

Demographics

The 2000 Census, the West's population was:

- 68.5% White
- 12.1% of Some other race
- 7.9% Asian
- 4.9% Black or African American
- 4.3% Two or more races
- 1.8% American Indian and Alaska Native
- 0.5% Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander
- 24.3% were Hispanic or Latino

As defined by the United States Census Bureau, the Western region of the United States includes 13 states and is split into two smaller units, or divisions:

1. *The Mountain States:* Montana, Wyoming, Colorado, New Mexico, Idaho, Utah, Arizona, and Nevada
2. *The Pacific States:* Washington, Oregon, California, Alaska and Hawaii

However, the United States Census Bureau uses only one definition of the West in its reporting system, which may not coincide with what may be historically or culturally considered the West. For example, in the 2000 Census, the Census Bureau

included the state with the second largest Hispanic population, Texas, in the South, included the state with the second largest American Indian population, Oklahoma, also in the South, and included the Dakotas, with their large populations of Plains Indians, in with the Midwest. However, it should be noted that the western half of Oklahoma and far West Texas, are usually neither culturally, geographically or socioeconomically identified with the South.

Statistics from the 2000 United States Census, adjusted to include the second tier of States west of the Mississippi, show that, under that definition, the West would have a population of 91,457,662, including 1,611,447 Indians, or 1.8% of the total, and 22,377,288 Hispanics or 24.5% of the total. Indians comprise 0.9% of all Americans, and Hispanics, 12.5%. Asians, important from the very beginning in the history of the West, totaled 5,161,446, or 5.6%, with most living in the Far West. African-Americans, totaled 5,929,968, or 6.5%—lower than the national proportion. The highest concentrations of black residents in the West are found in Texas—which is also considered a Southern state—and in California.

The West is still one of the most sparsely settled areas in the United States with 49.5 inhabitants per square mile (19/km²). Only Texas with 78.0 inhabitants/sq mi. (30/km²), Washington with 86.0 inhabitants/sq mi. (33/km²), and California with 213.4 inhabitants/sq mi. (82/km²) exceed the national average of 77.98 inhabitants/sq mi. (30/km²).

The entire Western region has also been strongly influenced by European, Hispanic, Asian, and Native Americans; it contains the largest number of minorities in the U.S. and encompasses

the only four American states where all racial groups including Caucasians are a minority. While most of the studies of racial dynamics in America such as riots in Los Angeles have been written about European and African Americans, in many cities in the West and California, European and African Americans together are less than half the population because of the preference for the region by Hispanics and Asians. African and European Americans, however, continue to wield a stronger political influence because of the lower rates of citizenship and voting among Asians and Hispanics. The Western United States has a higher sex ratio than any other region in the United States.

Because the tide of development had not yet reached most of the West when conservation became a national issue, agencies of the federal government own and manage vast areas of land. National parks are reserved for recreational activities such as fishing, camping, hiking, and boating, but other government lands also allow commercial activities like ranching, logging and mining. In recent years, some local residents who earn their livelihoods on federal land have come into conflict with the land's managers, who are required to keep land use within environmentally acceptable limits.

The largest city in the region is Los Angeles, located on the West Coast. Other West Coast cities include San Diego, San Bernardino, San Jose, San Francisco, Oakland, Sacramento, Seattle, Tacoma and Portland. Prominent cities in the Mountain States include Denver, Colorado Springs, Phoenix, Tucson, Albuquerque, Las Vegas, Salt Lake City, Boise, El Paso and Cheyenne.

Natural Geography

Along the Pacific Ocean coast lie the Coast Ranges, which, while not approaching the scale of the Rocky Mountains, are formidable nevertheless. They collect a large part of the airborne moisture moving in from the ocean. East of the Coast Ranges lie several cultivated fertile valleys, notably the San Joaquin Valley of California and the Willamette Valley of Oregon.

Beyond the valleys lie the Sierra Nevada in the south and the Cascade Range in the north. Mount Whitney, at 14,505 feet the tallest peak in the contiguous 48 states, is in the Sierra Nevada. The Cascades are also volcanic. Mount Rainier, a volcano in Washington, is also over 14,000 feet. Mount St. Helens, a volcano in the Cascades erupted explosively in 1980. A major volcanic eruption at Mount Mazama around 4860 BCE formed Crater Lake. These mountain ranges see heavy precipitation, capturing most of the moisture that remains after the Coast Ranges, and creating a rain shadow to the east forming vast stretches of arid land. These dry areas encompass much of Nevada, Utah and Arizona. The Mojave Desert and Sonoran Desert along with other deserts are found here.

Beyond the deserts lie the Rocky Mountains. In the north, they run almost immediately east of the Cascade Range, so that the desert region is only a few miles wide by the time one reaches the Canadian border. The Rockies are hundreds of miles wide, and run uninterrupted from New Mexico to Alaska. The Rocky Mountain Region is the highest overall area of the United States, with an average elevation of above 4,000 feet. The

tallest peaks of the Rockies, 54 of which are over 14,000 feet are found in central and western Colorado.

The West has several long rivers that empty into the Pacific Ocean, while the eastern rivers run into the Gulf of Mexico. The Mississippi River forms the easternmost possible boundary for the West today. The Missouri River, a tributary of the Mississippi, flows from its headwaters in the Rocky Mountains eastward across the Great Plains, a vast grassy plateau, before sloping gradually down to the forests and hence to the Mississippi.

The Colorado River snakes through the Mountain states, at one point forming the Grand Canyon. The Colorado is a major source of water in the Southwest and many dams, such as the Hoover Dam, form reservoirs along it. So much water is drawn for drinking water throughout the West and irrigation in California that in some years, water from the Colorado no longer reaches the Gulf of California.

The Columbia River, the largest river in volume flowing into the Pacific Ocean from North America, and its tributary, the Snake River, water the Pacific Northwest. The Platte runs through Nebraska and was known for being a mile wide but only a half-inch deep. The Rio Grande forms the border between Texas and Mexico before turning due north and splitting New Mexico in half.

The United States Coast Guard, "The Western Rivers System consists of the Mississippi, Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Cumberland, Arkansas and White Rivers and their tributaries, and certain other rivers that flow towards the Gulf of Mexico."

Climate and Agriculture

As a generalization, the climate of the West can be described as overall semiarid; however, parts of the West get extremely high amounts of rain and/or snow, and still other parts are true desert and get less than 10 inches of rain per year. Also, the climate of the West is quite unstable, and areas that are normally wet can be very dry for years and vice versa.

The seasonal temperatures vary greatly throughout the West. Low elevations on the West Coast have warm to very hot summers and get little to no snow.

The Desert Southwest has very hot summers and mild winters. While the mountains in the southwest receive generally large amounts of snow. The Inland Northwest has a continental climate of warm to hot summers and cold to bitter cold winters.

Annual rainfall is greater in the eastern portions, gradually tapering off until reaching the Pacific Coast where it again increases. In fact, the greatest annual rainfall in the United States falls in the coastal regions of the Pacific Northwest. Drought is much more common in the West than the rest of the United States. The driest place recorded in the U.S. is Death Valley, California.

Violent thunderstorms occur east of the Rockies. Tornadoes occur every spring on the southern plains, with the most common and most destructive centered on Tornado Alley, which covers eastern portions of the West, and all states in between and to the east.

Agriculture varies depending on rainfall, irrigation, soil, elevation, and temperature extremes. The arid regions generally support only livestock grazing, chiefly beef cattle. The *wheat belt* extends from Texas through the Dakotas, producing most of the wheat and soybeans in the U.S. and exporting more to the rest of the world. Irrigation in the Southwest allows the growing of great quantities of fruits, nuts, and vegetables as well as grain, hay, and flowers. Texas is a major cattle and sheep raising area, as well as the nation's largest producer of cotton. Washington is famous for its apples, and Idaho for its potatoes. California and Arizona are major producers of citrus crops, although growing metropolitan sprawl is absorbing much of this land.

Local state and Government officials started to understand, after several surveys made during the latter part of the 19th century, that only action by the federal government could provide water resources needed to support the development of the West. Starting in 1902, Congress passed a series of acts authorizing the establishment of the United States Bureau of Reclamation to oversee water development projects in seventeen western states.

During the first half of the 20th century, dams and irrigation projects provided water for rapid agricultural growth throughout the West and brought prosperity for several states, where agriculture had previously only been subsistence level. Following World War II, the West's cities experienced an economic and population boom.

The population growth, mostly in the Southwest states of New Mexico, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, and Nevada, has strained

water and power resources, with water diverted from agricultural uses to major population centers, such as Las Vegas and Los Angeles.

Geology

Plains make up most of the eastern half of the West, underlain with sedimentary rock from the Upper Paleozoic, Mesozoic, and Cenozoic eras. The Rocky Mountains expose igneous and metamorphic rock both from the Precambrian and from the Phanerozoic eon. The Inter-mountain States and Pacific Northwest have huge expanses of volcanic rock from the Cenozoic era. Salt flats and salt lakes reveal a time when the great inland seas covered much of what is now the West.

The Pacific states are the most geologically active areas in the United States. Earthquakes cause major damage every few years in California. While the Pacific states are the most volcanically active areas, extinct volcanoes and lava flows are found throughout most of the western half of the West.

History and Culture

Facing both the Pacific Ocean and the Mexican border, the West has been shaped by a variety of ethnic groups. Hawaii is the only state in the union in which Asian Americans outnumber white American residents. Asians from many countries have settled in California and other coastal states in several waves of immigration since the 19th century, contributing to the Gold Rush, the building of the transcontinental railroad, agriculture, and more recently, high technology.

The border states—California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas—all have large Hispanic populations, and the many Spanish place names attest to their history as former Spanish and Mexican territories. Other southwestern states such as Colorado, Utah, and Nevada have large Hispanic populations as well, with many names places also attest to the history of former Mexican territories. Mexican-Americans have also had a growing population in Northwestern states of Oregon and Washington, as well as the southern state of Oklahoma.

The West also contains much of the Native American population in the U.S., particularly in the large reservations in the mountain and desert states.

The largest concentrations for black Americans in the West can be found in Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, San Francisco, Las Vegas, Denver, Colorado Springs and parts of Arizona.

Alaska—the northernmost state in the Union—is a vast land of few people, many of them native, and of great stretches of wilderness, protected in national parks and wildlife refuges. Hawaii's location makes it a major gateway between the U.S. and Asia, as well as a center for tourism.

In the Pacific Coast states, the wide areas filled with small towns, farms, and forests are supplemented by a few big port cities which have evolved into world centers for the media and technology industries. Now the second largest city in the nation, Los Angeles is best known as the home of the Hollywood film industry; the area around Los Angeles also was a major center for the aerospace industry by World War II, though Boeing, located in Washington state would lead the aerospace industry. Fueled by the growth of Los Angeles—as

well as the San Francisco Bay area, including Silicon Valley—the center of America’s high tech industry—California has become the most populous of all the states. Oregon and Washington have also seen rapid growth with the rise of Boeing and Microsoft along with agriculture and resource based industries. The desert and mountain states have relatively low population densities, and developed as ranching and mining areas which are only recently becoming urbanized. Most of them have highly individualistic cultures, and have worked to balance the interests of urban development, recreation, and the environment.

Culturally distinctive points include the large Mormon population in the Mormon Corridor, including southeastern Idaho, Utah, Northern Arizona and Nevada; the extravagant casino resort towns of Las Vegas and Reno, Nevada; and, of course, the many Native American tribal reservations.

American Old West

Major settlement of the western territories by migrants from the states in the east developed rapidly in the 1840s, largely through the Oregon Trail and the California Gold Rush of 1849; California experienced such a rapid growth in a few short months that it was admitted to statehood in 1850 without the normal transitory phase of becoming an official territory. The largest migration in American history occurred in the 1840s as the Latter Day Saints left the Midwest for the safety of the West. Both Omaha, Nebraska and St. Louis, Missouri laid claim to the title, “Gateway to the West” during this period. Omaha, home to the Union Pacific Railroad and the Mormon Trail, made its fortunes on outfitting settlers; St.

Louis built itself upon the vast fur trade in the West before its settlement. The 1850s were marked by political controversies which were part of the national issues leading to the Civil War, though California had been established as a non-slave state in the Compromise of 1850; California played little role in the war itself due to its geographic distance from major campaigns. In the aftermath of the Civil War, many former Confederate partisans migrated to California during the end of the Reconstruction period.

The history of the American West in the late 19th and early 20th centuries has acquired a cultural mythos in the literature and cinema of the United States. The image of the cowboy, the homesteader and westward expansion took real events and transmuted them into a myth of the west which has influenced American culture since at least the 1920s.

Writers as diverse as Bret Harte and Zane Grey celebrated or derided cowboy culture, while artists such as Frederic Remington created western art as a method of recording the expansion into the west. The American cinema, in particular, created the genre of the western movie, which, in many cases, use the West as a metaphor for the virtue of self-reliance and an American ethos. The contrast between the romanticism of culture about the West and the actuality of the history of the westward expansion has been a theme of late 20th and early 21st century scholarship about the West. Cowboy culture has become embedded in the American experience as a common cultural touchstone, and modern forms as diverse as country and western music and the works of artist Georgia O'Keeffe have celebrated the supposed sense of isolation and independence of spirit inspired by the unpopulated and

relatively harsh climate of the region. As a result of the various periods of rapid growth, many new residents were immigrants who were seeking to make a new start after previous histories of either personal failure or hostilities developed in their previous communities. With these and other migrants who harbored more commercial goals in the opening country, the area developed a strong ethos of self-determinism and individual freedom, as communities were created whose residents shared no prior connection or common set of ideals and allegiances. The open land of the region allowed residents to live at a much greater distance from neighbors than had been possible in eastern cities, and an ethic of tolerance for the different values and goals of other residents developed. California's state constitutions were largely drafted by groups which sought a strong emphasis on individual property rights and personal freedom, arguably at the expense of ideals tending towards civic community.

The 20th Century

By 1890, the frontier was gone. The advent of the automobile enabled the average American to tour the West. Western businessmen promoted U.S. Route 66 as a means to bring tourism and industry to the West. In the 1950s, representatives from all the western states built the Cowboy Hall of Fame and Western Heritage Center to showcase western culture and greet travellers from the East. During the latter half of the 20th century, several transcontinental interstate highways crossed the West bringing more trade and tourists from the East. In the news, reports spoke of oil boom towns in Texas and Oklahoma rivaling the old mining camps for their lawlessness, of the Dust Bowl forcing children of the original

homesteaders even further west. The movies replaced the dime novel as the chief entertainment source featuring western fiction, later the community of Hollywood, Los Angeles became the headquarters of the mass media such as radio and television production.

California has emerged as the most populous state and one of the top 10 economies in the world. Massive late 19th-20th century population and settlement booms created two megalopolis areas of the Greater Los Angeles/Southern California and the San Francisco Bay Area/Northern California regions, one of the USA's largest metropolitan areas and in the top 25 largest urban areas in the world. Three more metro areas of Denver, Phoenix and Seattle have over a million residents, while the three fastest growing metro areas were Salt Lake City, Las Vegas, Nevada and Portland, Oregon.

Although there has been segregation, along with accusations of racial profiling and police brutality towards minorities due to issues such as illegal immigration and a racial shift in neighborhood demographics, sometimes leading to racially based riots, the West has a continuing reputation for being open-minded and for being one of the most racially progressive areas in the United States. Los Angeles is said to have the largest Mexican population outside of Mexico, while San Francisco has the largest Chinese community in North America and also has a large Gay/GLBT community, and Oakland, California has a large percentage of residents being African-American, as well Long Beach, California has a large Black community.

The state of Utah has a Mormon majority, while some cities like Albuquerque, New Mexico, Spokane, Washington and Tucson, Arizona faces Indian Reservations of Native American tribes, and there are Alaskan Natives and Native Hawaiians to bring forth a great deal of racial diversity.

Politics

The region's distance from historical centers of power in the East, and the celebrated "frontier spirit" of its settlers offer two clichés for explaining the region's independent, heterogeneous politics. Historically, the West was the first region to see widespread women's suffrage.

California birthed both the property rights and conservation movements, and spawned such phenomena as the Taxpayer Revolt and the Berkeley Free Speech Movement. It has also produced three presidents: Herbert Hoover, Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan.

The prevalence of libertarian political attitudes is widespread. For example, the majority of Western states have legalized medicinal marijuana and some forms of gambling; Oregon and Washington have legalized physician-assisted suicide; Most rural counties in Nevada allow licensed brothels. There is less resistance to the legal recognition of same-sex unions: California, Hawaii, Nevada, Oregon, and Washington recognize them.

The West Coast leans towards the Democratic Party. San Francisco's two main political parties are the Green Party and the Democratic Party. Seattle has historically been a center of radical left-wing politics. Both the Democratic leaders of the

Congress are from the region: House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi of California and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid of Nevada. Interior areas are more Republican, with Alaska, Arizona, Idaho, Montana, Utah, and Wyoming being Republican strongholds, and Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico being swing states. The state of Arizona has been won by the Republican presidential candidate in every election except one since 1948, while the states of Idaho, Utah, and Wyoming have been won by the Republican presidential candidate in every election since 1964.

As the fastest-growing demographic group, Latinos are hotly contested by both parties. Immigration is an important political issue for this group. Backlash against illegal immigration led to the passage of California Proposition 187 in 1994, a ballot initiative which would have denied many public services to illegal immigrants. Association of this proposal with the California Republicans, especially incumbent governor Pete Wilson, drove many Hispanic voters to the Democrats.

post-colonial state

The new nation-states that emerged out of the process of decolonization in the post-Second World War period. Also sometimes called the 'developmental state'. The post-colonial state has exhibited many features of the colonial state in its political formation. The British parliamentary model, for example, has been adopted by many ex-British colonies like India.

The post-colonial state has been characterized in two different ways—in terms of its political and economic agenda, and in

terms of its 'infrastructural capacity'. Most post-colonial states have started from an interventionist standpoint. However, the capacity of these states to implement their programmes has been affected crucially by the political system that has evolved in these states. The post-colonial state has been characterized as 'strong' or 'weak' on the basis of its capacity to implement political decisions—whether the political infrastructure is in place and functioning well or not.

This would distinguish a 'strong' state from a merely 'despotic' one. State capacity is, of course, linked to the economic resources available to the state but also to the evolving relations between the political executive and the bureaucracy on the one hand and state and civil society on the other. The 'embeddedness' of the state in society has been regarded by some as a feature of a 'strong' state in the context of cooperation of important state and societal interest groups, and by others as characterizing a 'weak' state where the state is penetrated by civil society and interest groups that are too strong for it to control. The weak capacity of the post-colonial state is also linked to levels of political violence, in that the governability of a society is dependent upon the political infrastructure of the state, in the absence of which the state increasingly relies upon the use of violence and sets up a pattern of counter-violence in societies. Governability is thus a continuing and growing concern for post-colonial states. Under globalization, the post-colonial state is facing new challenges. On the one hand, it has been argued that all states are 'hollowing out' and losing their pre-eminent position on the political landscape, while on the other, states are seen as repositioning themselves to take advantage of globalization. Post-colonial states have, in this context, also been called

'competition states'—competing to attract global capital. It has also been suggested that these states are facing a new form of imperialism—economic imperialism—as they 'race to the bottom' and become increasingly vulnerable and dependent upon global capitalism.

The State Of The Global Economy

The Global Economy

We begin the story by distinguishing:

- *The system state:* where the economy is now
- *The trajectory of the system over time,:* that is the series of system states from now into the future.

The System State of the Global Economy

The world is recovering from a global financial crisis the costs of which globally are somewhere between \$60 trillion and \$120. The emerging markets are recovering more quickly than the developed markets. But the recovery only took place at all because of huge bailouts by western banks of their distressed financial systems accompanied by a fiscal stimulus and easy monetary policy plus an enormous fiscal stimulus in China amounting to 25% of Chinese GDP.

The costs of the recent financial crisis arise as unemployment, lost output, default and income transfers to lucky members of the financial sector from the rest of the world.

Globally there is potential deficient demand and excess supply. Actual demand and supply has been kept high to avoid a Great Depression like the 1930's: instead of a Great Depression we have had a Great Recession.

Deficient demand results from the slow recovery of the USA, dirty floats of exchange rates in China and Russia because they want to keep their export prices competitive, and generally the need for the household, government and financial sectors in the west to deleverage.

The most recent financial crisis occurred because of over leveraging especially in the financial sectors, leading to over leveraging in household sectors due to asset price bubbles and lately government deleveraging. the need for governments to deleverage in the USA and the UK primarily because of the costs of their bailouts of their financial sectors and in other countries because of Ponzi government spending.

Excess supply in the world is also partly the result of bailouts and fiscal rescue packages which keep interest rates low and fiscal spending on investment in china and tax holidays and corporate bailouts. Another reason for excess supply is the attempt by the BRICS to maintain export led growth by keeping their exchange rates undervalued.

In the EU surplus countries especially Germany have undervalued currencies in real terms against other Euro countries; undervalued in real terms because unit labour costs in Germany are relatively low.

This leads us to another aspect of the need to deleverage; trade and current account surpluses in some countries and

corresponding deficits in others. China Russia and in the EU Germany have trade surpluses and the USA, the UK and Japan for example have corresponding deficits. Essentially the USA needs to save more and consume less: and China needs to save less and consume more. It should be clear that trade surpluses and deficits must net out to zero. For the thirty years or more the world has relied on the US economy to boost world demand. Currently there is not country or region able to replace the USA in this respect. This problem is compounded by huge consumer and government debt in the US which restricts spending and the need for China to have export led growth to avoid social disruption. Pressure in the USA exists to cut government debt and government financial deficit at time when unemployment in the USA is rising and growth is slow.

So the world economy faces dilemmas. The solution to one set of problems makes other problems worse. To a lesser extent the same issues face the UK as face the USA but relatively the UK is a minor economy.

As a framework for describing the system states I will use the meta model. but it should be remembered that the system state refers to a stat at a moment in time. The meta model consists of the underlying dynamics at q moment in time; inner and outer dynamics, layoffs, and orgrammar.

Trajectory; the Future

Trajectory describes the path of a system over time: the series of system states over time as the dynamics change over time. So trajectory is in time and system states describe moments in time.

It is important to distinguish system states from equilibria or equilibrium. A system must be in some state or other, but it is rarely if ever in equilibrium: things are always changing. Perhaps we have periods of tranquillity and that is what we mean by equilibrium. Trajectories over time may be gradual and continuous with little change in system states over short intervals over time: maybe change is sudden and dramatic. Normal curve thinking leads us to concentrate on averages and to believe that deviations from the average are unusual. In fact, black swans, or extreme events occur much more frequently than normal curve thinking leads us to believe. For example there has been more than 100 financial crises in the world over the last 30 years and typically senior management is concerned with managing extreme, unexpected events, sudden crises. A recent prime minister of the UK was asked what he worried about most: "events dear boy" he replied. Many managers would sympathise with this reply I think.

Let us think about possible trajectories for the global economy: possible scenarios, is probably a better phrase since we can't know the future. Almost certainly the Eurozone as it is now, will break up. The size of the breakup depends on events and policies. If PIIIGS debt is rescheduled, and somehow underwritten; if the euro crisis does not spread to Spain, Italy and further Greece, Ireland, Iceland many of the Baltic States and perhaps Portugal countries; if a blind eye is turned to bigger of these economies and the USA defaulting; in the latter case if the the dollar is allowed to depreciate; if the ECB allowed to take over the fiscal policy of the PIIIGS states, including perhaps Spain; if Saudi Arabia remains willing to act as a swing oil producer to prevent the price of oil rocketing; if financial institutions in the west are willing to accept more

regulation; even than any government dares to propose at the moment; if states are willing to cooperate rather than compete; if corporates drop the search for competitive advantage; if governments drop the discourse of competitive advantage; if we all become less greedy; if the rich become less greedy; if there are not too many natural disasters, wars or terrorist strikes; if some of these ifs don't happen, then things will be OK. One real source for optimism is informationalism, a cliché perhaps in one way, but not in all.

The information revolution will certainly have as big an effect on the world as the print revolution did in Europe in the sixteenth century. Just as the effects of the print revolution, were at the time, unpredictable, so we cannot know the impact of the information revolution on trajectories in the future. One effect may be to hasten new economy thinking, recognising interdependence: both in terms of feedback and domino effects and in terms of responsibilities of one organisation, one country, or region or individual to another.

Why should this happen? I don't know; it is a possibility. But one aspect of informationalism is that it is becoming clear that machines can perform many of the tasks we took to be exclusively human better than humans can. So questions may arise as to what humans are really about, including perhaps aspects that we call soul, or care, or humanity.

Interdependence: Some Case Examples

Interdependence is a theme underlying much of the session. It can take a system state form; that is synergies the idea that a system as a whole can be more than the sum of its parts. It

can also take a dynamic or trajectory form; that is feedbacks from one entity to another over time.

Interdependence in the global economy is discussed under a number of headings; blowbacks, domino effects, network effects, percolation, viruses, complexity catastrophe, externalities, synergies, the too big to fail problem and the Great Recession that began in 2007 and is still with us.

A problem that we find time and time again in telecoms and also in large organizations as varied as pharmaceuticals, beer and automobiles is that globalisation and informationalism have shortened product cycles and changed the nature of competition and the structure of costs. To compete, innovating firms have to incur high sunk costs which have to be paid back out of future revenues. But product cycles have got shorter meaning that there is less time to do so. Furthermore information travels fast and innovations can easily be copied: and firms who copy can do so at lower costs, undercutting the innovators. One of the features of the new economy is that the ratio of fixed costs to variable costs has risen, meaning that marginal costs are often very low and pricing at variable costs plus contribution leads to the commodification of many products and services. The same problems, in a slightly different form, occur in medium and small businesses. Perfectly good businesses small, medium and global, find themselves underperforming. The second example of interdependence is the Great Recession that began in the mortgage markets of the USA and Europe with the failure of Lehman Brothers and bankruptcy of 6 of the major finance companies in the USA Northern Rock and most of the big banks in the UK. Many were too big to fail: so governments had

to bail them out by nationalisation or guaranteeing their toxic assets. The crisis spread throughout Europe. It affected the entire world, through loss of output, unemployment and insecurity, resulting in a cost to the world of somewhere between \$60 and \$120 trillion. As result of bailouts and the size of Banks relative to the size of the economies in which they were owned, national governments, first Iceland, followed by Greece, Ireland, Portugal and perhaps Spain had to seek bailouts which in threaten the existence of the Eurozone. So the problem of bank insolvency has led to the insolvency of nations. Spanish debt for example is held by international banks, who have securitized it and passed it on through CDS and CDO's to other institutions who have.....and so on.

The third example relating to interdependence are natural catastrophes, man-made catastrophes and terrorism. These things are often independent with respect to causation. But, in their impact globally they are interdependent: they require, as do the first two examples, the same policy responses, new ways of thinking and co-operation rather than just seeking competitive advantage by nations or by firms.

Chapter 4

Understanding of Democratic Politics

Key elements of States organized under democratic principles

Among the 193 countries worldwide that are recognized by the United Nations, 123 are said to be democratic. Thus, more than half of those States have set up a form of government that is characterized by the participation of its people, under whatever form that may be. But what do we mean, anyway, when we talk about democracy? Each individual surely has his/her own perception of what democracy means; however what is the real explanation to give? What is democracy composed of? What are the required elements that would enable its establishment? And what are the required activities that would help to consolidate such a form of government? What are the advantages, where are the weaknesses? This brochure addresses these issues in depth and deals with other questions. It tries to bring light into this relatively blurry jungle of information that is turning around the theme of “democracy”. This handbook is particularly targeting ‘neophytes’ who are ready to absorb a basic notion of a broad democracy.

Following a primary explanation of the term under study, as an introduction, key elements known as specific characteristics of

democracy, will be defined in a more accurate way: Another paragraph will deal with how to keep up and strengthen an already effective democracy. This cannot be done without the participation of the population and that is exactly why it is important that you, as a young active member of the society in which you are living, be well informed.

To conclude, we will come to a point in which you are certainly interested in: The outlook of democracy. If you found our introduction quite interesting, all we need to do is to wish you a good reading for what comes next! The word 'democracy' is a term that comes from Greek and it is made up with two other words *demos*= People and *kratein*= to govern, to rule. "Democracy" can then be literally translated by the following terms: *Government of the People* or *Government of the Majority*. Democracy, as a State form, is to be distinguished from monarchy, aristocracy and dictatorship. You may have already heard about the most common definition of democracy: 'the *government of the people, by the people and for the people*'? To put it another way we can say that a government comes from the people; it is exercised by the people, and for the purpose of the people's own interests.

Fundamental Freedom and Fundamental Rights

Human rights are much more than a mere component of democracy. They represent sine qua non requirements for the well performing of a democratic system. The development and evolution of human rights are only possible when humans live in a democracy, given the fact that it is only within this system that the population itself can draw up the laws that will rule

and publicly control the three powers: the legislative power, the executive power and the judiciary power.

Moreover, human rights are only efficient when the State power is linked to an autonomy and independence right, and when all the individuals are treated on equal terms in front of this justice. In the same way, it is essential, in any democracy, to establish a clear separation of powers, so that the judiciary can be autonomous and independent. The result will be a triangular relation between Democracy, Human Rights and Separation of Powers, which thus represent interdependent elements. But with this, would you now be able to explain what 'Human Rights' really mean? A strict definition would describe them as rights that are inherent to the individuality of each person, in terms of protection against any inclination of the State to harm an individual; a human being is endowed with these rights the moment he/she is born and the State cannot withdraw them from him/her. They form the very foundations of the human relations that rule life in society, be it at international, national, local or family level.

What follows is a brief explanation of the different fields that they cover:

- The Individual Personality Rights constitute the core of human rights, given the fact that they include, for example, the right to life and the right to free personality development. Thanks to these rights, a human being can, for instance, be protected against attacks and manifestations of violence aimed at his/her person, and preserve his/her integrity and human dignity.

- Political and Civil Rights are there to make sure that each citizen can participate without any restriction to the political life of his/her community. This means that he or she should not fear any non justified sanction. The most important rights, in this matter, concern not only freedom of speech and freedom of the press but also freedom to hold meetings and to set up associations.
- Thanks to Social and Economic Rights, minimum living wage for the survival of a human being must be guaranteed for him/her. This includes, among others, the right to education, because it is necessary to start from the principle that everybody has to benefit from a training so as not to be left starving and deprived of resources, later on.
- Some relatively new rights have been added to this list: they are the *Third generation Rights*. They are there to demonstrate that human rights can evolve and that they are not fixed, stuck at their starting point. One can include in these rights, for example, the *Rights to Development*, which aim at reducing the gap that separates the rich and the poor. The *Rights to Environment* have also been added, in order to make sure that species that are vital to human are not damaged or even destroyed.

Those are formulas that all sound very attractive, but you must be wondering what to do to make sure that all these rights are effectively enforced; since empty formulas would not be of great help for you. You are totally right and some regulations have been made for that purpose: in 1945, upon

some States' instigation, the 'United Nations' were created; nowadays, almost all the States across the world are members of this institution. In 1948, it published the '*Universal Declaration of Human Rights* ', which, since then, have always evolved. In order to be able to see to its actual effectiveness, some commissions, subcommissions as well as committees have been put in place, like for instance, the "*Children's Rights Committee* ". In a situation where one State commits infringement of human rights, there is, at The Hague-Netherland, an International Court of Justice that is entitled to deliver sanctions to any offender.

The United Nations are supported by a large number of non-governmental organizations which, through the contribution of active militants in the protection of human rights, can establish and publish reports on diverse infringements of these rights: thus, they can get governments not to continue accepting such exactions.

There are for that matter several regional treaties aiming at protecting human rights: for instance, the "*African Charter of Human Rights and People's Rights* ". It was adopted in 1981 among the African Union Organisation, which was renamed "African Union", later on. It is supposed to take into consideration the African cultural values. To make sure that this treaty is effective, a committee and a court of justice for human rights and people's rights were instituted within this organisation. Upon a unanimous decision of its members, this court of justice was merged with the "African Court of Justice" in 2004. In Madagascar, there are several NGOs and associations that fight for the human rights' watch and respect.

Elections

Elections constitute one of the most important pillars of democracy. Those are the texts of *Electoral Law* that rule and clearly define both the organisation of these elections, and how to undertake the deduction of the votes in order to assign them to the corresponding seats. There is an active electoral law and a passive electoral law. Citizens who can use active electoral law have the right to vote whereas those who can use passive electoral law have the right to be elected. In most cases, the whole electorate can use both types of right. This does not mean, however, that any State which opts to carry out elections can be qualified as democratic right away: there are similarly other forms of government in which elections are practised.

Democratic elections, as such, must meet some requirements that you may already know a little:

- Democratic elections are free when citizens have the right to choose from several candidates or parties that can run for the election without any restriction. They must also be free to decide whether they want to use their right to vote or to abstain from doing so, if they prefer.
- Democratic elections are *equitable* when each citizen who can use his/her right to vote has at his/her disposal a vote and when neither his/her origin nor his/her sex, language, incomes or possessions, job or social stratus/class, sexual identity, training, religion or political convictions have an influence of whatever kind on the assessment of the value of his/her vote.

- In democratic elections, there must be no way of knowing for which political party or for which particular candidate a citizen has voted. They are then *secrete*, when each citizen can put his ballot in an envelope, without having been either watched over or influenced, in the secrecy of the polling booth, and when he/she is also able, in the same way, to put his/her envelope inside the ballot box afterwards.
- Democratic elections are, therefore, *public* and *transparent*. Which means on the one hand, that each citizen has the right to attend the counting of the votes when the ballot box is opened; this also means on the other hand, that it is possible to completely follow the whole process of the passage of the constituents' votes: starting from the ballots inserted into the ballot box till the final counting undertaken to establish the calculation that will eventually share out.
- It is also important to institute elections on regular basis. Everybody, in that case, has the possibility to know the date of the coming elections, and to get ready for that ahead of time. It is a way to make sure that the current government is defined within a time frame and that its people have the right to remove it from office. The electorate should represent the whole population, which is to mean that apart from the underage population, no group should be excluded.

- And finally, the electorate's votes should be final, meaning that the election results should be enforced effectively, which implies that they must be accepted as legitimate.

Regarding election process, there are in fact two separate systems: the absolute majority votes and the proportional ones. Both have crucial importance, given the fact that they influence not only the political structure but also the formation process of the political will. To settle the choice on which polling system to adopt, one has to take into account not only the political traditions and historical situations but also social conditions, because those, eventually, may authorize solely one of the two possibilities.

Several parameters may be subject to some variations: the internal regulations of the party, the relations between the parties, as well as the relations between the government and the Parliament, just as to the enforcement of either the absolute majority election system or the proportional one. An election loses its primary function if it is manipulated through the choice of a polling system; it will then have negative impact on the so-called "elected" organs which will then lose their legitimacy.

In the absolute majority system, the polling area is divided into as many constituencies as necessary, depending on the number of seats to be assigned. Those candidates or lists of candidates that can gather the majority of votes from their constituents will be assigned the seats to be filled.

This polling system brings about some advantages:

- With their programme, the candidates are dealing with a large proportion of the population with the purpose of trying to win the majority. Therefore, the contents of their programme are generally more rational, trying to avoid extreme points of views in this way.
- The government must effectively take into account the presence of the other political parties, thanks to the clearly established evidence from the majorities. In this system, the voters have a significant influence on the government. Its functioning is closely linked to the bipartite system.
- In the case where there is a private candidate or a candidate who does not belong to any list, there is a very close relationship between the Parliament and the constituency. The distance between the voters and their representatives remains small.

But there are nonetheless some difficulties that go with this absolute majority system:

- Overall, it is only the candidates from an important political party that can manage to gather the majority of the constituents' votes.
- This majority principle often prevents the representation of minorities within an organ with seats to fill. Not to mention the fact that some groups of voters who represent a relatively important number of constituents, but who are ranked at the second place in their constituency,

cannot be represented either, as only one candidate must win at the level of each constituency.

- Elections results can be rigged with the purposeful manipulation of the constituencies' size, because it is within the constituencies that the majorities are formed.

In the proportional system, the Parliament seats are assigned just as to the per centage obtained by the political parties over the total number of votes from the whole constituency. The assignment of seats thus reflects, much more than what happens in the absolute majority system, the effective choice of the population. The candidates are elected through the lists in their constituency.

Like the absolute majority system, this second polling system is characterized by some advantages:

- The proportional system allows the representation of all political trends, even that of the minorities.
- Thanks to this system, it is easy to create new political parties because all it takes is to have the capacity to obtain some per centage of votes in different constituencies to guarantee one's entry in the organ to be filled.
- At new elections, it is possible to avoid extreme political inversions, as the government is usually composed of coalitions, particularly in the case of parliamentary political systems, in which it is the parliamentary majority which determines the making up of the government.

Likewise, the proportional system is characterized by some difficulties:

- If one has to take into consideration all the existing political trends, a large number of political parties will indeed be represented at the Parliament. In general, none of these political parties can gather a majority and, consequently, it is in fact coalitions that are set up. Very often, small political parties are used as means to get the majority and, once included within the government, they benefit from a superior influence over the percentage effectively acquired during the elections.
- For the population, it is difficult to perceive which political party is exactly responsible for which policy; and thus, it will find it difficult to clearly target the decision to be made for the next poll.

In some countries like Germany, for example, proportional election right is submitted to a “restriction clause”. The latter stipulate that a political party must obtain a certain number of votes, in order to be allowed representations at the Parliament. This clause is used to avoid a profusion of small political parties at the Parliament. In Madagascar, until now, both election systems have been combined regarding lists and candidates, during legislative elections. During the 2002 legislative election, for example, the absolute majority system was used for candidates to be elected in constituencies that presented seats to be filled; whereas in constituencies where two seats were to be filled, it was preferred to adopt the proportional system with lists of candidates. During the legislative election in September 2007, the absolute majority

system was used with lists of candidates in the constituencies that had two seats available; on the other hand, in constituencies that had only one seat to be filled, the absolute majority system was used with candidates without lists.

The proportional system was also used in Madagascar during the 1993 legislative election, to promote the creation of parties in the framework of the political liberalization. There are different forms to be considered when you set up and implement democracy. There is no fixed recipe, valid as a rule, concerning elections and the two polling systems. Each country must take into consideration specific circumstances that define, with regards to the existing cultural, political and social fields, the best way to carry out elections.

Rule of Law

In a Rule of Law, there are fundamental principles and procedures that guarantee the freedom of each individual and which allow participation in political life. There is, first of all, the right to a free blossoming of individual personality. To sum it up, the power of the State is linked to the laws that rule it. Thus, the notion of Rule of Law is directly opposed to that of "Police State "or "Despotic State ".

In a democratic State, all the citizens are equal in front of the law, even State employees and administration. The latter can only take action when it has been vested with the accruing responsibility by law or by the Constitution. A *Rule of Law* is then always founded on the respect of law and Constitution. This is a system that holds the State accountable for its acts in front of the citizens and it also gives the latter the opportunity

to take a stand and to react just as to its acts. In this State ruled order, citizens are completely free to take part in political life as well. State of Law procedures are subject to some fundamental principles. What follows will be a brief explanation of these.

In the Constitution of a Democratic State of Law, the notion of “*independence of the judiciary*” is well rooted. This means that the judiciary is strictly distinguished from the executive and the legislative powers. The executive power is the power that enforces laws while the legislative assigns the power to put forward bills and to turn them into laws. It is only through the separation of powers that magistrates can carry out their job, free from either pressure or influence of any kind and in an independent way. They must only use rights and laws and cannot be destitute of their function without their agreement, as long as they have not, themselves, infringed laws. Moreover, it is necessary to make sure that the judiciary keeps the *monopoly of the verdict*. Indeed, what would be the use of an accused being declared not guilty by a judge, and the police still arresting him/her anyway? In a Rule of Law that works well, any intervention of the police, military or ‘gendarmes’ in the private life of a citizen implies that a judge has been entitled to give the order to do so.

Security Right constitutes as well another fundamental principle of Rule of Law, which means that each action of the State must be measurable and foreseeable. Citizens must be informed of what the State has the right to do, what they themselves can do and what is forbidden for them to do. Nobody must be sanctioned without legal ground and in general, laws must not be retroactive. In addition to the

principle of right security, there is the fact that *the administration is subject to laws*. The latter has only the right to take action within a framework assigned by the parliament majority. Each action initiated by the State must then be backed by a law which, in turn, is made legitimate on the basis of democratic principle. This regulation is linked to the notion of the *justifiable condition of the administration*. The control initiated by the judiciary must guarantee that the administration stays within what is stipulated by laws. Any citizen who deems an administration act to be unfair has the right to call on the judiciary to protest and to demand in this way a verification of the incriminated act.

Because administration subjection to law would only be a vain formula if a judge could not freely take action, it is argued that the precedence of the Constitution in front of the law can avoid some bad will of distorting facts. Thus, a Rule of Law ties politics to law and right, submits any expression of the power under judiciary control and guarantees in this way the citizens' freedom.

Separation of Powers

There are three State powers within a State:

1. The legislative power draws up and adopts laws;
2. The executive power enforces laws and government policies;
3. The judiciary power represents the legal framework for exercising the power.

You might already know that the term “separation of powers” actually means “division” of the State power into three parts. In a democratic State, the power of the State can be controlled and influenced efficiently, first and foremost, by itself. The State power must then be distributed among several organs. In general, it is the *Constitution* of a country that settles how the State power is to be distributed among different organs and what attributions are to be assigned to them respectively.

As a general rule, there are two government systems that need to be distinguished: the “parliamentary regime” and the “presidential regime”. In some countries, they are sometimes intermingled into mixed forms but the objective of this brochure is not to bring confusion to your mind, but on the contrary, to clarify notions! That is why we are going to take each system separately, to show you to what extent relations between the legislative and the executive powers can be different.

In parliamentary regimes, the government stems from the parliament that is elected by the people. Ministers within the Government can also be vested with a double mandate. The government is put in place by the Parliament and can be destitute in the same way at any time by the latter. The Government attributions and that of the parliament interlock. In general, it is the government that deals with documents for the drawing up and proposals of law. However, it cannot decide anything on the way those bills are passed. Each bill is subject to a vote at the parliament; consequently, the government depends on the parliament for passing the bills that it puts forward. Political parties play a very important role as the majority at the parliament constitutes the necessary

requirement for accession to government seats. At the parliament, the opposition plays an important role as an additional control instance of the power. To sum up, a parliamentary regime conveys the idea that the government and the parliament must act together. The government system of a parliamentary regime is put into practice in some countries such as Great Britain and Germany.

The government system of a presidential regime, on the other hand, is constituted in a different way: the United States of America represent the best known example. There, legislative and executive powers are separated, either at institutional level or in the concrete and technical exercise of the power. The President, representing the executive power, and the Congress, representing the legislative power, are vested with their office through well distinguished elections. Members of the government have no right to have a seat at the American Congress. Unlike a parliamentary regime, the Congress has no power to destitute a President, even if the latter is held guilty of an illegal action and is juridically liable to a sanction. The President, for his part, has neither the power to dissolve the Congress, nor the right to propose laws. Political parties, in this government system, play a relatively unimportant role.

This model conveys the idea that reciprocal control can be better carried out when the two powers, the legislative and the executive, are strictly separated. There is no infallible and immutable recipe that can be directly extended to all cases, as far as the organisation of the separation of powers in a modern democracy is concerned. But the most important thing is that the State power is not in the hands of only one person or a small group of persons, because in most cases, that ends up in

an abuse of power. In Madagascar, the presidents who succeeded each other in power have each laid down in the Constitution and put into practice “their presidential regime”, just as to their personal profile and their interests to be protected. From 1993 to 1996, an attempt to enforce some elements of the parliamentary regime failed. The result was the destitution of the former President by the Parliament.

The Parliament

Even if relationship between the Parliament and the Government can be very different in democracies, parliaments fundamentally always have the same functions. They are vested with the *office of proposing laws*. They hold the right to put forward proposals of laws. In the systems of parliamentary governments, this right is often assigned to the government, as it represents the majority in the parliament, and the likeliness of having a bill passed is greater in this case. In a general rule, the relative majority is enough to pass a bill. On the other hand, laws that deal with essential themes such as the Constitution, for example, often need a majority of two third or a referendum, to be validated.

The parliament is vested, in front of the government, with the *office of controlling*. In case of doubt concerning the work of the government, the parliament can create enquiry commissions or order the judiciary power to carry out investigations. In the parliamentary system, the National Assembly has also the possibility to destitute the government. In this system, control is rather between the government and the opposition, and much less between the legislative power and the judiciary power.

Parliaments are then mostly characterized by their *function of articulation and expression of political will*.

This means that:

- Members of Parliament articulate or express population will, because it is the population that they represent.
- Members of Parliament try to inform the population on their job, through public sessions, reports of those sessions in the media, as well as specifically targeted demonstrations; they try at the same time to support the population in expressing their political will.

A forth function, that of *election office*, concerns only the National Assemblies of parliamentary government systems. In this case, it is the members of parliament who elect or destitute the Head of Government, and sometimes, all the members of government. In some countries, it is also the members of parliament who elect the members of the High Court of Justice.

We have clarified in a very general way the parliament offices; but now we need to know what effectively the tasks of each of these parliamentarians are, or, in the case of a second Chamber, the tasks assigned to senators. Members of Parliament are elected to the parliament as representatives of the people by abiding to the principle: one citizen, one vote. That is why the number of Members of Parliament in the constituencies is set proportionally to the number of population.

You must have already wondered what deputies do all along the day. As a general rule, they are subject to a double pressure as they must demonstrate their attendance at the parliament, on the one hand, and at their constituency on the other hand. In their constituency, they arrange appointments with some organizations or other institutions, grant audiences and talk directly to the citizens to try to understand issues about their place of work.

Work within the parliament is not limited to meetings in which all the deputies participate. There are, in addition to that, several circles and working groups, special committees and commissions that make up an important part of the daily job of a deputy. In general, it is experts that are invited in the special committees, to exhibit their knowledge on a specific theme. Then follows some discussion on the different points of view and joint work is done in order to find out some common grounds. There are also talks about bills/drafts, prior to bringing them to the Assembly. In most countries, deputies are vested with parliamentary immunity to protect them against the arbitrariness of the executive. Immunity implies that deputies are not exposed to lawsuits and judicial sanctions all along the duration of their parliamentary mandate.

Two political principles emerge within a democracy and play a crucial role in the way a deputy works; those are: the *majority principle* or the *competition principle* and the *consensus principle*.

The majority principle or competition principle is founded on the principle of majority, which means that decisions are made on the majority basis. As a general rule, there is in this

system, a great number of political parties which compete with each other. In this case, the advantage is that decisions can be made rapidly, and that the government can work in an efficient way. Normally, in this case, the parliament benefits from the mechanisms and structures that are willing to express and take into consideration the interests of the minority groups in their decision making process at the parliamentary level.

The consensus principle, maximum actors are included in the political process. There is an attempt to make decisions through consensus.. This brings the advantage that nobody has to feel excluded in the expression of his/her point of view. But at the same time, this type of decision making involves long discussions beforehand, and gives to minorities the opportunity to integrate their interests in the process of discussing the points of view.

Democratic Pluralism

In a democracy, pluralism is considered and applied as a form of social order and policy. In the field of politics, pluralism implies that a large number of interest groupings and associations that get together freely are reciprocally in a situation of competition to win influence on social and political life. These groupings can be of political, economic, religious, ethnic or of any other nature. A plural society is characterized by respect, acceptance and recognition of all points of view; no matter how different or diverging they can be; and their dissemination, as well as their enforcement should not be faced with any obstacle. Pluralism is based on controversial discussions whose results are often built on compromises which eventually satisfy all the involved groups, or at the very

least, are acceptable as a whole. In pluralism, either dialogues, points of view exchanges or discussions, as well as ideas and opinions that are debated there have a constructive feature within the framework of social processes of expression of ideas and political will of citizens, even if they are either contrary to or opposed to the regime in place or even closer to the opposition.

You may have already noticed that, even in a plural society, some interest groupings are more influential and stronger than others, and that in reality, the competition principle does not apply in the simple, fluid and easy way we have just described it. But it is exactly for this reason that the State has the important role of detecting possible flaws in the competition system, and to find out the necessary palliative measures. There is, for example, the possibility to provide additional aid to the weakest interest associations, to make them more competitive. These state regulation measures are necessary to maintain pluralism in action.

In pluralist societies, in parallel to these interest associations that solicit socio-political or economic influence; there are groupings that directly covet posts: those are the political parties.

Like many other citizens, you must already have raved at political parties, because they have, for example, promised to take some measures, and they have not done anything about it afterward. In spite of these criticisms that one can direct to political parties regarding the results of their work, it is necessary to recognize that they constitute nevertheless a necessary and indispensable element to any democracy. People

can exercise their sovereignty through these political parties; it is really thanks to them that they can react in an effective way.

The alternative would be to elect a representative, as a population, and to take on all the tasks that are the duties of political leaders. But this is just not possible, given their large number and the complexity of the themes. Instead of that, it is necessary to have groupings and political parties, to put people forward as candidates for different government offices, to discuss solutions to problems that come up and to represent the interests of their voters. In this way, they constitute, on the one hand, spokesmen/-women for ideals and political objectives of the population.

On the other hand, these political parties take part in a decisive way in the construction of population political will, as they know how to grasp the positions of this population in order to articulate and shape them in the midst of the discussions. It is not enough to consider the parties as mere messengers that convey information on the people to the leaders. They must also be considered as active groupings that contribute to the construction of political will, because they take as well the role of mediators for instance, when there is a conflict between the point of view of the people and that of the parliament, or between the government's opinion and that of the president.

In general, it is the people who share the same ideals and the same points of view who get together to create a political party and to integrate their programme proposal in the policy. In a plural society, the creation of political parties is free, which means that every body has the right to create a party. In a

general rule, political parties have also a core programme that reflects its values and its long term objectives, as well as an electoral programme, which is rather a short term oriented one.

Because political parties within pluralist societies must face important tasks, it is important that they be organized in a transparent and democratic way. This implies, on the one hand that each citizen can freely and openly integrate a political party; and on the other hand, it must be stipulated that each member has the right and the possibility to participate in the definition of the party line, at the election of the leader of the party and the appointment of candidates to political and state functions.

In addition to their role in the articulation of the population's interests, and the building up of its political will, it is also the political parties that put in place the required personnel to the government offices. As they link the people to their representatives, or the representatives of the people to the leaders, parties are as indispensable in the political scenery of a plural society as the interest groups and associations described earlier.

The Government and the Opposition

The leadership of a community will fare better if taken on by only one person or a small group, as long as this community is expected to be able to act. You must already have noticed this in your daily life, in a more reduced framework. When one class or working group has to discuss something, the first thing to do is to elect a leader; to put in place and maintain a

structure. Without this leader, the debate takes place in a disorderly manner and coming up with results is difficult. If we transpose this image to the case of the State, we can see clearly why it is necessary to have a government.

The government, which is always supported by the parliament or presidential majority party can only function with an intact and efficient state administration, which enforces the decisions. The administration helps not only in the drawing up of the new laws but also in their enforcement. It is then possible to say that the state power is not taken on by the government alone, but it also calls for the concrete adhesion of the administration to manage a country in a reasonable way. In democracies, the administration is institutional, centred on its personnel and is ideologically non-identical to the majority party. It stays permanent, to serve the State, and not the party of the majority, no matter which party holds the majority and supports the regime in power.

In a democratic State, there is always an opposition that exists parallel with the government. During the elections and at the level of the different state organs, in most cases, there is one or several opposition parties that confront the party of the power in place. The opposition controls the government. It constitutes a beacon for the government. Its presence is necessary to guarantee an exchange of points of view that are characterized by useful controversies.

Democracy in fact feeds its dynamic on such permanent conflicts between points of views, and on the discussions that result from them. But you must be wondering since when conflicts are positive or are of some use? Anyway it is with help

of a discussion without either taboo or restriction, during which all opinions are freely expressed that all the perspectives can be addressed and the best solution can then be found. This idea is conveyed in a Malagasy proverb saying that by gathering and synthesizing many people's ideas, it is possible to reach the highest levels of reasoning sphere.

In the best cases, the opposition party is for that matter always the potential substitute of the majority party and already exercises, for that reason, a pressure on the government. It criticises the measures taken by the government party and tries at the same time to put forward its own programme. In the daily life of the parliament, the opposition can directly influence the drawing up of the laws.

In general, it is not possible to initiate some amendments of the Constitution without its agreement; by negotiating skilfully, or by imposing in a tactful way; it can also change other bills drawn up by the government. Besides, the opposition plays the role of expressing interests that are not taken into consideration by the government, as well as that of ensuring that all relevant issues have been discussed openly and in depth. To meet all those expectations, the opposition must be vested with parliamentary rights. The majority party must not have the right to change the rules of the game in such a way that it could give rise to some disadvantage for the opposition. The latter must have the possibility of challenging the government and of putting forward its criticisms.

It is important anyway that, during election campaigns, the opposition have the same advantages as the party in power. It must have the same access to the press, the radio and

television and that its programme can be presented freely in the streets. Despite all these rules, a fair game between the government and the opposition is only possible if the two parties respect the fundamental principles of democracy and if they are ready to willingly take action just as to these principles.

We have just described the general framework that defines the working context of the opposition, but you surely have the impression that at a particular point or another, things do not happen in such a simple way and without any problem in practice. This impression is totally justified because the job of the opposition is not as easy as that, even in modern democracies.

It may happen that a party stays in the opposition for years and, over time, loses its motivation to continue leading hot discussions, or to put forward its own programme. Meanwhile, the opposition is always obliged, through the different interest groups, to work with the government party. During this cooperation, it can easily go beyond its role of control instance.

That is why, nowadays, law texts are so complex and so complicated that it is necessary to have a correct global grasp of reality, of first class information, to be able to draw up correctly. The government is vested, in this field, with a huge advantage, because it can depend on the work of the administration. For an opposition that often does not have a large number of experts at its disposal, it is far more difficult to put forward law texts. The most efficient support for an opposition to be functional is the public opinion that is well aware of itself, which knows how to make constructive

criticisms. In a society that considers parliamentary conflicts as something productive; the opposition can integrate its ideas and contributes in a decisive way to the establishment of democracy. The people also play an important role as referee, as it is the citizens who vote their government at regular period of time. In democracies, each citizen can adhere and freely belong, and without any fear of reprisals, to a chosen opposition party according to his/her interests and convictions.

This makes part of the fundamental right of a citizen and will make sure that the opposition does have the freedom and the possibility to present its ideas, opinions and society projects to the citizens. This allows the latter to have and to know alternatives to government proposals. That is why citizens can vote freely in democracies: they have at their disposal several options and can choose the best suited.

In several African countries that have chosen to set out for democratic transformation towards the end of 80s, the “Opposition Charter” or the “Opposition Statute” constitutes the judicial foundation for the opposition work. There is an attempt to protect the opposition from the arbitrariness of the executive power and the party in power, and to give to all parties—be they in power or in the opposition, the same chance to win in the democratic race. Some specific regulations have been included regarding the funding of the parties, the rights and obligations of the parties on power and the opposition parties, as well as access of the opposition parties to state media. In Madagascar, in 2002, in the framework of the ‘States General of political parties “, the law on parties that had existed since 1990, was deemed obsolete by all the parties; but

it has not been changed yet until now. Reforms on election law have been debated since 2000. Madagascar does not have any opposition charter.

Public Opinion and Freedom of the Media

Public opinion is of a decisive importance for democracy. Are you wondering why? Public opinion is made up with citizens or specific groups that reflect on their community and express their criticisms, their proposals or their agreement to influence the construction of political will. It is not possible to talk about only one, but of several public opinions because in a plural society, there are always several stands. Public opinion is then a tool to control the politicians that lead the country. On the one hand, this is important for the opposition as the latter is only potentially active in front of the government through this public opinion. Indeed, what important changes would an opposition bring if it was only able to express criticisms in closed rooms? It is when the opposition represents its stands and opinions, finds itself obliged to react, otherwise it is running the risks of disaffection or destitution, from its citizens.

Moreover, public opinion serves the whole population in its effort to display criticisms and its incitements to well defined actions. Each citizen has the right to gather information and to contribute somehow to the expression of public opinion when he/she organises, for instance, a meeting in order to exchange information. In this context, political and social human rights play an important role: the freedom of opinion, as well as freedom to hold meetings and to set up associations which allow citizens to participate in the expression of public

opinion, without having to put up with any pressure. Public opinion then constitutes a controlling tool, which is very important in a democracy and which implies that it is only politicians who confront this public opinion who can display true interest for citizens' desiderata.

What articulates public opinion, or more accurately, public opinions? How can you, for example, know what happens every day in politics? And what are the instances that inform you on the current controversies concerning society?

As far as the dissemination of positions and opinions are concerned, it is the media, that is to say television, radio and newspapers, but also more and more, internet, that play a decisive role. In the current mass societies, communication can only be carried out through mass media. Interchanges of information can only be done through the direct contacts of dialogues, because over time our societies have become too populated. Political parties, particularly, must call on the media to lay their projects and their stands in front of the population. Democracies are not any more basically characterized by direct communication, but rather by media communication. It is by the way for this reason that the media are considered as the "fourth power" coming after the judiciary, the executive and the legislative powers, because they constitute in fact the most important controlling tools of the public opinion.

However, the media can only play this role outside any form of state influence. The freedom of the press, another fundamental freedom, also plays an important role in this context. There are several organizations of public utility all over the world which

are devoted to the observation of the press freedom in each country, as well as the protection of journalists who feel threatened due to the researches that they carry out for their profession. You may have already heard about the “*Freedom House*” organisation? It publishes many times a year a report entitled “Freedom of the Press”, in which the press of different countries are put into categories for being free, partially free or not free.

In addition to possible state restrictions, there is also an internal evolution within the media that represents a danger for plural expression in the publication of information intended for public opinion. One can notice a recrudescence of monopolies, in fields as diverse as the press, radio and television: several newspapers or several television broadcasting stations are under the management of the same company. This is mostly due to the fact that, nowadays, a large quantity of capital assets and technical knowledge is necessary to create a television station or a newspaper. Consequence: it is not everybody that can participate in the expression of public opinion.

The main worry lies mostly in the fact that monopolies of opinion are set up through such concentration, which no longer allows any expression of opinion, any construction of personal idea or global political will, any publication of information respecting pluralism. And when we say that the media constitute a ‘fourth power’, we can only question this evolution. It is particularly a danger for the establishment of plural democracy in countries undertaking transformation. Officially, the press is not censored in Madagascar. Nevertheless, the access for the opposition and the citizens

«that think otherwise» to state media is quite difficult or even impossible. Some politicians who have success have sometimes their own modern media enterprises at their disposal.

Democracy does not keep up all alone!

You might have had a feeling through the preceding part that a democracy endowed with all the key elements is firmly established and will function as well for ever! Democracy unfortunately is not considered as a permanent building, like a stable and well constructed house for instance, that will stay unchanged beyond the centuries.

Democracy is rather a process that must be maintained and consolidated permanently. It is not just a type of State, with simple procedures and simple mechanisms. It is not enough then to have three separate State powers, to have citizens ready to run for the legislative elections, that a head of State or a mayor be elected every four or five years and that there are several political parties, etc.

Democracy must be taken on by the whole population and all the aggregate of political elite. It can only be established and consolidated when it put forward a conviction that is shared by all the members of society: thus, ways of thinking and behaving, *e.g.*, the political culture, must be based on and directed to democratic values. The following paragraphs will give you some information on important elements that have been chosen to feature the process of democratic consolidation: decentralisation, fundamental democratic values, government leaders and political education.

Decentralisation

In your country, who makes the decisions when a new road, for instance, or a new market has to be built or renovated? Is it the local, communal or regional authority, or the central State, that is the minister or the Head of State? Decentralisation means that the administration of a country is not based on the central instances, but to a certain point, decision making processes are entrusted to the basic community.

It is then more reasonable to directly make decisions at regional levels where the inhabitants are directly concerned by their impacts. When the government system is organized with the purpose of staying close to the population, the identification of the inhabitants with the instances of their region, which means political participation, can increase. For many people, it is more logical to get committed in politics when they effectively have the possibility to make themselves the decisions that directly concern them.

Thus, in the framework of decentralisation, the central government transposes its power and authority to the local and regional structures set up outside the central State: those structures will then be able to plan, decide and manage themselves their own business. These local and regional structures are called regional bodies.

At the top of the regional bodies, there are the representatives, elected within the population that live there. Administrative structures exist, parallel to the regional bodies, to represent the central State at local level: they are then managed by State

civil servants. The latter represent the central State, control and support the representatives elected locally.

Regional bodies are organized according to the following principles:

- Affaires are dealt with at the level that corresponds to the body which is the closest to the issues to be addressed. In other words: the solution to a problem is entrusted to subordinate levels, as long as the latter can and are willing to take care of those issues to be addressed. This is the principle of subsidiarity.
- Regional bodies are neither administratively subordinated to the central State, nor to its local representatives.
- Regional bodies are managed by themselves.
- Regional bodies live on population contributions, their decision competence and responsibilities have been transposed.

When a State is decentralized in its structure, this means that the regional bodies take on the decision competence and responsibilities of the population. It is then necessary that they have at their disposal their own financial resources.

Decentralization is very useful for the consolidation of democratic structures. It makes the access of the inhabitants to political decisions much easier. It increases the inhabitants' motivation to get involved in politics; and this political commitment is probably greater than in countries with centralized organization. In some great countries, like in

Madagascar by the way, those who live far from the headquarter of the government and its political structures have no possibility to take part in political life, apart from elections, when there is no regional structure.

Nevertheless, decentralization does not mean that the central government is not important. It is exactly the opposite that is true as the government must show enough political will and commitment to be able to establish such a change. Decentralization is not only an administration restructuring, but also a political process of transformation. Apart from the administration, these changes affect all the levels and all the sectors of society.

Here are some examples of States with a decentralized organisation: the Federal Republic of Germany, Switzerland, Great Britain and the USA. Madagascar belongs to the group of countries in which centralized organizational structures are part of the tradition, like France and other former French colonies.

In these countries, the decentralization process is always torn between centralism and the participation of regional bodies, in a context of democracy consolidation. In those countries, the decentralization process is highly politicised, to the detriment of the fact a democratic mode of government is being established.

Democratic Governance

Governance is the exercise of a power or of an authority with the objective of managing the affairs of a State, an organization or a society. Democratic governance, or 'good governance', is

based on the enforcement of the fundamental values of democracy in the power exercise. But what are in fact these fundamental values of democracy?

Given the fact that democracy constitutes a conviction, its orientation concerns fundamental values that help human beings to apply democratic transformations and to try to live this democracy. Those fundamental values, among others: justice, equality, solidarity, tolerance, pluralism, the taking into account of the minorities, non-violence, dialogue and negotiations, free community life. Democracy then respects and takes into consideration, as much as possible, the interests of the minorities in the framework of the adoption of majority decisions. The most important principles of good governance that can be drawn from the fundamental values of democracy are: participation, efficiency, efficacy, sense of responsibility and responsibility, the act of reporting, adaptation capacity, transparency, rule of law and participation.

Good governance is always composed of two aspects:

1. A socio-political and human dimension that defines, among others, the role and functions, as well as the political participation of the different actors, including the way of thinking, behaviour and leadership style of the leaders;
2. A technical dimension that defines, among others, norms, administrative and financial procedures, accounting, evaluation indicators etc.

The more the government neglects the socio-political dimension, the more pronounced technocratic tendencies there

will be, or even an authoritarian style of government and leadership, which will get citizens, mostly in newborn democracies, to have negative considerations towards their leaders and towards the policies that latter implement.

You surely have already understood that good governance is not only based on the State or its leaders, but also on all the actors and all the groups of actors that take part in the democratization and development of the country.

The main actors of the system of good governance is then composed of, apart from the State, the regional decentralized bodies, the political parties, the civil society and the private sector as well as the citizens, of course.

In a good governance system:

- The roles are clearly defined, well distinguished and balanced among different actors and groups of actors, in the law texts as well as in practice.
- The interests of the different actor groups are articulated in decision making.
- Leaders are characterized in the exercise of their power by a democratic behaviour and a democratic type of leadership, like the taking into consideration of the fundamental values of democracy, the respect of contrary opinions of others, the taking into consideration of laws and rules in force, tolerance, capacity and good frame of mind for dialogue, discussions, non-violence.

- In front of this, citizens and groups of actors are encouraged to express themselves, to take part in the processes of decision making and to control the exercise of power by the leaders in place.
- Between the two camps, the controlling mechanisms always function well and in a transparent way; the channels of information and communication are fluid and efficient.
- There are informal and formal participation structures that function well for consultations, concertations, dialogues and negotiations, in which all citizens and social groups, man and woman, young and old, minorities or majorities can and have the right to participate freely and without any fear.

Political education represents an efficient means for the institutionalization and interiorization of the fundamental values and other democratic cultural elements.

Political Education

Nowadays, commitment can become a crucial problem in our democracies if it is present in the least measure. People also talk about "*aversion for politics*". This means that the majority of the population does not want to take part in politics, to participate in elections or to get committed in anything. We can also talk about a globally negative opinion vis-à-vis the political activities and structures. What is this political aversion due to generally?

There are several factors that may contribute to it. First of all, the relationship between the voters and the elect can deteriorate when the elect, for example, do not respect laws and conventions, and that as a result, confidence disappears among voters. Moreover, the expectations of the voters can be deceived when the elect do not react at all, or react in an unsatisfactory way to existing issues. Evidence of the deteriorating relationship between the voters and the elect can be noticed with the decreasing number of the political party members, and also a decrease in turnout rate.

The latter is particularly problematic because at the same time, the legitimacy of the politicians goes down as well. Secondly, aversion for politics comes up when political education is insufficient whereas political processes are becoming more complex. The end result is that the population cannot develop personal judgment of its own and is not therefore able to get involved in politics. Thirdly, people get the feeling that the diverse parties do not differ much from each other because of lack of ideas, and so they are not motivated to go to vote. Fourthly, the mass media have a tendency to talk about political events in a negative way, rather than a positive manner. There are always more pleasant reports to read but they are so superficial, at the place of important information. This image is transmitted to the population and blocks the motivation to participate in politics. Fifthly, as they are, rules and institutions have been created in such a way as to complicate population participation.

In countries like Madagascar and other African countries that have experienced population movements in the framework of democratic transition, certain parts of the population tend to

have bad opinion of leaders because the reforms and transitions requested by those voters and promised during election period have not been realised. Apart from social and economic reforms, there are often fundamental institutional reforms, as well as the change of behaviours in favour of democratic fundamental values and types of leadership. It is mostly those countries that are currently undergoing a democratic transformation process and which can neither take the liberty of having aversion for politics, nor commit civil disobedience; indeed, who would do otherwise than establish democracy and bring social development?

In order to strengthen social commitment and awareness of the democratic values, particularly among young democracies, political education is indispensable. Political education can make political culture move towards democracy. But what can you really learn in political education?

In addition to the training and the consolidation of awareness regarding democratic values, this is about learning to better know the fundamental structure of politics. Indeed, how would you get committed in politics if you have no information about either the functioning, or about how to get committed? Basic knowledge on the most important questions is transmitted so that people will be able to have a personal idea on the subject. And the same problems come up each time: how would the population draw up and represent their own point of views on some questions if there is no information accessible publicly? It is at this point that you realise very clearly that political education is not yet well valorized.

Besides, knowledge on information and the media are transmitted as well. Political education is, on the one hand, mostly conveyed by the state, by proposing for instance a course on politics at school; but prior to that there is a course on the exercise of power and the leadership style of the members of the State. The latter always represent as many models as regards the application of democratic fundamental values. Secondly, some organizations in the civil society are equally engaged in political education.

As a whole, political education transmits basic knowledge on politics. It is used to train people by giving them a basic understanding of politics and some political process. Thanks to this knowledge, they should be able afterwards to develop personal judgment and to get involved in politics. In democracies, political education does not concern only the population as a whole or the youth: it also concerns the whole society, that is to say, the intelligentsia and the elite of the political leaders. In Germany for example, there are “popular universities” and political foundations for that. The Friedrich Ebert Foundation, one of the German political foundations, for example, is devoted to political education in order to convey the spirit of democracy to the ordinary citizens, the leading elite and the future generations, in all the different fields of our existence. Among other things, this foundation organizes, through training seminars, discussion forums and meetings.

But a brochure like this one equally contributes to that by informing you and helping you to better understand democracy.

Does the future belong to democracy

Does all this mean that it is only in democracy that peace, welfare and liberty reign? To answer this question is not that easy. Anyway, it is clear that democracy can bring an important contribution in making citizens feel that it is good to live in a State, to express themselves freely, to know that the economy is thriving and security guaranteed.

In this context, it is becoming more and more important that even different States cooperate and make efforts to develop models that are common to their States or to the continent. It is only in this way that wars can be avoided and that anarchy and chaos would not reign. With the help of modern means of communication, no State in the world should leave its citizens in ignorance or in doubt regarding their rights and the freedom that take place in other countries. If it wants to avoid that its citizens try to claim these same rights by means of revolution or coups, it must be ready to allot those to them in advance.

There is still a long way to go for all the States in the world to be democratically ruled and for “all authorities to stem from the people”. Many countries, including Madagascar and other African States, undertook important steps as “transition” along the democratization path, towards the end of 80s and the beginning of 90s.

The goals of democratization consist in:

- Changing the authority structures of the power and the government;

- Creating new procedures, new mechanisms and new forms of social participation, and finally,
- In creating the socio-political conditions necessary to social development.

We must not forget that democracy represents a path to development. The democratization process then leads to development, through democracy. The newly created procedures, mechanisms, structures of power and development conditions must evidently be consolidated.

The key words in this field are:

- The taking into consideration of and the promotion of fundamental freedoms and fundamental rights;
- The democratization of elections;
- The promotion of plural media, as well as multipartite systems that function;
- The emergence of political cultures and a governance that is based on the democratic values;
- Furthering of democracy, and finally,
- The promotion of a rapid and sustainable economic growth that takes at the same time into account the social interest ranges of society.

This is the reason why democracy consolidation concerns all interest groups, all population parties as well as all social fields and actors. Democracy requires a permanent

participation of the citizens because contrary to autocratic State forms that require the subordination of submitted people, it is only strong, thanks to the strength of responsible citizens. Research outcomes have shown that the young in particular do not feel concerned about politics. It is supposed to be due to, among others, the fact that young people below the age of 18 often have no right to speak/take the floor; consequently, they are not of any interest to politicians, given that they do not represent any vote at the elections. When one has no right to speak, there is obviously a decrease in the motivation to want to get committed at all. However, this is very important because, indeed, it is those young people who can help print their values in society. Furthermore, there are other paths and means to express or materialize one's engagement. Have you ever tried to become a member of an organization? To participate does not necessarily mean that you want to become a politician. In addition to State institutions, a healthy democracy needs a basic structure made up with organizations such as parties, associations and clubs, or initiatives of citizens who support democracy. It is necessary to freely take responsibilities and get involved.

If you want to do something, you could for example go to a club or Fokontany meeting, to see what is decided there, and maybe even bring your personal opinion. Or else, you can meet with friends in order to exchange information on political events and discuss these. Participation consists in willingly exercise influence on decision making processes, on whatever field and whatever level that is. It is only in this way that democracy can be built, interiorized and kept alive! You too, and you indeed, are an actor of democracy!

Chapter 5

Direct Democracy and Comparative Politics

Comparison with Representative Democracy

Direct democracy is a form of government in which people collectively make decisions for themselves, rather than having their political affairs decided by representatives. Direct democracy is classically termed “pure democracy”. Depending on the particular system in use, it might entail passing executive motions, making laws, electing or dismissing officials and conducting trials. Direct democracy stands in contrast to a representative democracy in which the decisive authority is vested in a subset of people, usually on the basis of election.

Many countries that are representative democracies allow for three forms of political action that provide limited direct democracy: referendum, initiative. Referendums can include the ability to hold a binding referendum on whether a given law should be rejected. This effectively grants the populace which holds suffrage a veto on government legislation. Initiatives, usually put forward by the populace, force the consideration of laws or amendments, without the consent of the elected officials, or even in opposition to the will of said officials.

The earliest known direct democracy is said to be the Athenian democracy in the 5th century BC. Although it may be argued that it was not a liberal democracy because women, foreigners and slaves were excluded from it. The main bodies in the Athenian democracy were the assembly, composed by male citizens, the boule, composed by 500 citizens chosen annually by lot, and the law courts composed by a massive number of juries chosen by lot, with no judges. Out of the male population of 30,000, several thousand citizens were politically active every year and many of them quite regularly for years on end. The Athenian democracy was not only *direct* in the sense that decisions were made by the assembled people, but also in the sense that the people through the assembly, boule and law courts controlled the entire political process and a large proportion of citizens were involved constantly in the public business. Modern democracies do not use institutions that resemble the Athenian system of rule.

Also relevant is the history of Roman republic beginning circa 449 BC. The ancient Roman Republic's "citizen lawmaking"—citizen formulation and passage of law, as well as citizen veto of legislature-made law—began about 449 BC and lasted the approximately 400 years to the death of Julius Caesar in 44 BC. Many historians mark the end of the Republic on the passage of a law named the *Lex Titia*, 27 November 43 BC.

Modern-era citizen lawmaking began in the towns of Switzerland in the 13th century. In 1847, the Swiss added the "statute referendum" to their national constitution. They soon discovered that merely having the power to veto Parliament's laws was not enough. In 1891, they added the "constitutional amendment initiative". The Swiss political battles since 1891

have given the world a valuable experience base with the national-level constitutional amendment initiative. In the past 120 years, more than 240 initiatives have been put to referendum. The populace has been conservative, approving only about 10% of these initiatives; in addition, they have often opted for a version of the initiative rewritten by government. Another example is the United States, where, despite being a federal republic where no direct democracy exists at the federal level, almost half the states provide for citizen-sponsored ballot initiatives and the vast majority of the states have either initiatives and/or referendums.

Some of the issues surrounding the related notion of a direct democracy using the Internet and other communications technologies are dealt with in e-democracy and below under the term *electronic direct democracy*. More concisely, the concept of open source governance applies principles of the free software movement to the governance of people, allowing the entire populace to participate in government directly, as much or as little as they please. This development strains the traditional concept of democracy, because it does not necessarily give equal representation to each person. Some implementations may even be considered democratically-inspired meritocracies, where contributors to the code of laws are given preference based on their ranking by other contributors.

Ideas regarding the desirability of direct democracy are usually in comparison to its widespread alternative, representative democracy. Direct democracy is also comparable to deliberative democracy, which may incorporate elements of both direct and representative forms of democracy.

- Political parties. The formation of political parties is considered by some to be a “necessary evil” of representative democracy, where combined resources are often needed to get candidates elected. However, such parties mean that individual representatives must compromise their own values and those of the electorate, in order to fall in line with the party platform. At times, only a minor compromise is needed. At other times such a large compromise is demanded that a representative will resign or switch parties. In structural terms, the party system may be seen as a form of oligarchy. Meanwhile, in direct democracy, political parties have virtually no effect, as people do not need to conform with popular opinions. In addition to party cohesion, representatives may also compromise in order to achieve other objectives, by passing combined legislation, where for example minimum wage measures are combined with tax relief. In order to satisfy one desire of the electorate, the representative may have to abandon a second principle. In direct democracy, each issue would be decided on its own merits, and so “special interests” would not be able to include unpopular measures in this way.
- Voter apathy. If voters have more influence on decisions, it is argued that they will take more interest in and participate more in deciding those issues.
- Scale. Direct democracy works on a small scale. Town meetings, a form of local government once common in New England, have worked well, often emphasizing consensus over majority rule. The use of direct democracy on a larger scale has historically been more difficult, however.

Nevertheless, developments in technology such as the internet, user-friendly and secure software, and inexpensive, powerful personal computers have all inspired new hope in the practicality of large scale applications of direct democracy. Furthermore ideas such as council democracy is a proposal to enact direct democracy in nation-states and larger groups.

- Manipulation by timing and framing. If voters are to decide on an issue in a referendum, a day must be set for the vote and the question must be framed, but since the date on which the question is set and different formulations of the same question evoke different responses, whoever sets the date of the vote and frames the question has the possibility of influencing the result of the vote. Manipulation is also present in pure democracy with a growing population. Original members of the society are able to instigate measures and systems that enable them to manipulate the thoughts of new members to the society. Proponents counter that a portion of time could be dedicated and mandatory as opposed to a per-issue referendum. In other words, each member of civil society could be required to participate in governing their society each week, day, or other period of time.
- Ochlocracy. In association with organizational biases and logical errors, systemic bias within a direct democracy could, in theory, lead to sub-optimal outcomes for a population. Decisions dealing primarily with factual analysis could be manipulated by individuals or organizations, influencing public opinion and therefore the outcome of a direct democracy's decisions.

Ancient Athens

Athenian democracy developed in the Greek city-state of Athens, comprising the central city-state of Athens and the surrounding territory of Attica, around 500 BC. Athens was one of the very first known democracies. Other Greek cities set up democracies, and even though most followed an Athenian model, none were as powerful, stable, or as well-documented as that of Athens. In that experiment in direct democracy the people did not elect representatives to vote on their behalf but vote on legislation and executive bills in their own right. Participation was by no means open, but the in-group of participants was constituted with no reference to economic class and they participated on a big scale. The public opinion of voters was remarkably influenced by the political satire performed by the comic poets at the theatres. Solon, Cleisthenes, and Ephialtes all contributed to the development of Athenian democracy. Historians differ on which of them was responsible for which institution, and which of them most represented a truly democratic movement. It is most usual to date Athenian democracy from Cleisthenes, since Solon's constitution fell and was replaced by the tyranny of Peisistratus, whereas Ephialtes revised Cleisthenes' constitution relatively peacefully. Hipparchus, the brother of the tyrant Hippias, was killed by Harmodius and Aristogeiton, who were subsequently honoured by the Athenians for their alleged restoration of Athenian freedom.

The greatest and longest lasting democratic leader was Pericles; after his death, Athenian democracy was twice briefly interrupted by oligarchic revolution towards the end of the Peloponnesian War. It was modified somewhat after it was

restored under Eucleides; the most detailed accounts are of this fourth-century modification rather than the Periclean system. It was suppressed by the Macedonians in 322 BC. The Athenian institutions were later revived, but the extent to which they were a real democracy is debatable.

Switzerland

In Switzerland, single majorities are sufficient at the town, city, and canton level, but at the national level, double majorities are required on constitutional matters. The intent of the double majorities is simply to ensure any citizen-made law's legitimacy.

Double majorities are, first, the approval by a majority of those voting, and, second, a majority of cantons in which a majority of those voting approve the ballot measure. A citizen-proposed law cannot be passed in Switzerland at the national level if a majority of the people approve but a majority of the cantons disapprove. For referendums or propositions in general terms, the majority of those voting is enough.

In 1890, when the provisions for Swiss national citizen lawmaking were being debated by civil society and government, the Swiss adopted the idea of double majorities from the United States Congress, in which House votes were to represent the people and Senate votes were to represent the states. This "legitimacy-rich" approach to national citizen lawmaking has been very successful. Kobach claims that Switzerland has had tandem successes both socially and economically which are matched by only a few other nations, and that the United States is not one of them. Kobach states at

the end of his book, “Too often, observers deem Switzerland an oddity among political systems. It is more appropriate to regard it as a pioneer.” Finally, the Swiss political system, including its direct democratic devices in a multi-level governance context, becomes increasingly interesting for scholars of European Union integration

United States

Direct democracy was very much opposed by the framers of the United States Constitution and some signers of the Declaration of Independence. They saw a danger in majorities forcing their will on minorities. As a result, they advocated a representative democracy in the form of a constitutional republic over a direct democracy. For example, James Madison, in Federalist No. 10 advocates a constitutional republic over direct democracy precisely to protect the individual from the will of the majority.

He says, “A pure democracy can admit no cure for the mischiefs of faction. A common passion or interest will be felt by a majority, and there is nothing to check the inducements to sacrifice the weaker party. Hence it is, that democracies have ever been found incompatible with personal security or the rights of property; and have, in general, been as short in their lives as they have been violent in their deaths.” John Witherspoon, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence, said “Pure democracy cannot subsist long nor be carried far into the departments of state—it is very subject to caprice and the madness of popular rage.”

Alexander Hamilton said, “That a pure democracy if it were practicable would be the most perfect government. Experience

has proved that no position is more false than this. The ancient democracies in which the people themselves deliberated never possessed one good feature of government. Their very character was tyranny; their figure deformity...”

Despite the framers’ intentions in the beginning of the republic, ballot measures and their corresponding referendums have been widely used at the state and sub-state level. There is much state and federal case law, from the early 1900s to the 1990s, that protects the people’s right to each of these direct democracy governance components. The first United States Supreme Court ruling in favour of the citizen lawmaking was in *Pacific States Telephone and Telegraph Company v. Oregon*, 223 U.S. 118 in 1912.

President Theodore Roosevelt, in his “Charter of Democracy” speech to the 1912 Ohio constitutional convention, stated “I believe in the Initiative and Referendum, which should be used not to destroy representative government, but to correct it whenever it becomes misrepresentative.”

In various states, referendums through which the people rule include:

- *Referrals* by the legislature to the people of “proposed constitutional amendments”.
- *Referrals* by the legislature to the people of “proposed statute laws”.
- *Constitutional amendment initiative* is the most powerful citizen-initiated, direct democracy governance component. It is a constitutionally-defined petition process of

“proposed constitutional law”, which, if successful, results in its provisions being written directly into the state’s constitution. Since constitutional law cannot be altered by state legislatures, this direct democracy component gives the people an automatic superiority and sovereignty, over representative government. It is utilized at the state level in eighteen states: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon and South Dakota. Among the eighteen states, there are three main types of the constitutional amendment initiative, with different degrees of involvement of the state legislature distinguishing between the types.

- *Statute law initiative* is a constitutionally-defined, citizen-initiated, petition process of “proposed statute law”, which, if successful, results in law being written directly into the state’s statutes. The statute initiative is used at the state level in twenty-one states: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming. Note that, in Utah, there is no constitutional provision for citizen lawmaking. All of Utah’s I&R law is in the state statutes. In most states, there is no special protection for citizen-made statutes; the legislature can begin to amend them immediately.
- *Statute law referendum* is a constitutionally-defined, citizen-initiated, petition process of the “proposed veto of

all or part of a legislature-made law”, which, if successful, repeals the standing law. It is used at the state level in twenty-four states: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Idaho, Kentucky, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

- The *recall* is a constitutionally-defined, citizen-initiated, petition process, which, if successful, removes an elected official from office by “recalling” the official’s election. In most state and sub-state jurisdictions having this governance component, voting for the ballot that determines the recall includes voting for one of a slate of candidates to be the next office holder, if the recall is successful. It is utilized at the state level in eighteen states: Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Montana, Nevada, New Jersey, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington and Wisconsin.

There are now a total of 24 U.S. states with constitutionally-defined, citizen-initiated, direct democracy governance components. In the United States, for the most part only one-time majorities are required to approve any of these components.

In addition, many localities around the U.S. also provide for some or all of these direct democracy governance components, and in specific classes of initiatives, there is a supermajority voting threshold requirement. Even in states where direct democracy components are scant or nonexistent at the state

level, there often exists local options for deciding specific issues, such as whether a county should be “wet” or “dry” in terms of whether alcohol sales are allowed.

In the U.S. region of New England, many municipalities practice a very limited form of home rule, and decide local affairs through the direct democratic process of the town meeting.

Electronic Direct Democracy

Electronic direct democracy or E-democracy is a form of direct democracy which utilizes telecommunications to facilitate public participation. Electronic direct democracy is sometimes referred to by other names, such as open source governance and collaborative governance.

EDD requires electronic voting or some way to register votes on issues electronically. As in any direct democracy, in an EDD, citizens would have the right to vote on legislation, author new legislation, and recall representatives.

Technology for supporting EDD has been researched and developed at the Florida Institute of Technology, where the technology is used with student organizations. Numerous other software development projects are underway, along with many supporting and related projects.

Several of these projects are now collaborating on a cross-platform architecture, under the umbrella of the Metagovernment project. EDD as a system is not fully implemented in a political government anywhere in the world, although several initiatives are currently forming. Ross Perot

was a prominent advocate of EDD when he advocated “electronic town halls” during his 1992 and 1996 presidential campaigns in the United States. Switzerland, already partially governed by direct democracy, is making progress towards such a system.

Senator Online, an Australian political party running for the Senate in the 2007 federal elections, proposed to institute an EDD system so that Australians can decide which way the senators vote on each and every bill. A similar initiative was formed 2002 in Sweden where the party Aktivdemokrati, running for the Swedish parliament, offers its members the power to decide the actions of the party over all or some areas of decision, or alternatively to use a proxy with immediate recall for one or several areas.

Relation to other Movements

Many political movements within representative democracies seek to restore either some measure of direct democracy or a more deliberative democracy, as well as consensus decision-making. Such movements advocate more frequent public votes and referendums and less of the so-called “rule by politician”.

Collectively, these movements are referred to as advocating grassroots democracy or consensus democracy, to differentiate it from a simple direct democracy model. Another related movement is community politics which seeks to engage representatives with communities directly.

Some anarchists have advocated forms of direct democracy as an alternative to the centralized state and capitalism; however, others have criticized direct democracy and democracy in

general for ignoring the rights of the minority, and instead have advocated a form of consensus decision-making. Libertarian Marxists, however, fully support direct democracy in the form of the proletarian republic and see majority rule and citizen participation as virtues. The Young Communist League, USA in particular refers to representative democracy as “bourgeois democracy”, implying that they see direct democracy as “true democracy”. Sociocracy shares the aims of direct democracy, expressing it as the right of citizens to control the conditions of their lives.

It uses consensus decision-making for policy decisions and believes that majority vote is counter-productive because it creates inequality. To create “equivalence”, sociocracy delegates policy decisions to those who execute them, not to a separate policy-making body like a Board of Directors or a Senate.

Representatives continue to participate in the body that elected them as well as in the body in which they serve as a representative. This overlapping participation maintains consensus between bodies, not just within them. Sociocracy believes it is majority vote and autocratic decision-making that disenfranchise both voters and workers, not representational democracy.

Representative and Liberal democracy

Representative Democracy

Representative democracy is a form of government founded on the principle of elected individuals representing the people, as

opposed to autocracy and direct democracy. for example, two countries which use representative democracy are the United Kingdom and Germany.

It is an element of both the parliamentary system and presidential system of government and is typically used in a lower chamber such as the House of Commons or Bundestag, and is generally curtailed by constitutional constraints such as an independent judiciary or an upper chamber. It has been described by some political theorists as Polyarchy.

Characteristics

The representatives form an independent ruling body charged with the responsibility of acting in the people's interest, but *not* as their proxy representatives nor necessarily always just as to their wishes, but with enough authority to exercise swift and resolute initiative in the face of changing circumstances. It is often contrasted with direct democracy, where representatives are absent or are limited in power as proxy representatives.

Edmund Burke was an early proponent of these principles:

- It ought to be the happiness and glory of a representative to live in the strictest union, the closest correspondence, and the most unreserved communication with his constituents. Their wishes ought to have great weight with him; their opinion, high respect; their business, unremitting attention. It is his duty to sacrifice his repose, his pleasures, his satisfactions, to theirs ever, and in all cases, to prefer their interest to his own. But his unbiassed opinion, his mature judgment, his enlightened conscience, he ought not to sacrifice

to you, to any man, or to any set of men living. These he does not derive from your pleasure; no, nor from the law and the constitution. They are a trust from Providence, for the abuse of which he is deeply answerable. Your representative owes you, not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays, instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion.

There is no necessity that individual liberties be respected in a representative democracy: one that does not is an illiberal democracy. A representative democracy that emphasizes individual liberty is a liberal democracy. Today, in liberal representative democracies, representatives are usually elected in free and fair multi-party elections. Different methods of selecting representatives are described in the article on electoral systems, but often a number of representatives are elected by, and responsible to, a particular subset of the total electorate: this is called his or her constituency.

Powers of Representatives

Representatives sometimes hold the power to select other representatives, presidents, or other officers of government

The power of representatives is usually curtailed by a constitution or other measures to balance representative power:

- An independent judiciary, which may have the power to declare legislative acts unconstitutional
- It may also provide for some deliberative democracy or direct popular measures. However, these are not always binding and usually require some legislative action—legal power usually remains firmly with representatives.

- In some cases, a bicameral legislature may have an “upper house” that is not directly elected, such as the Canadian Senate, which was in turn modeled on the British House of Lords.

History

A European medieval tradition of selecting representatives from the various estates to advise/control monarchs led to relatively wide familiarity with representative systems. Representative democracy came into particular general favour in post-industrial revolution nation states where large numbers of subjects or citizens evinced interest in politics, but where technology and population figures remained unsuited to direct democracy.

Edmund Burke in his speech to the electors of Bristol classically analysed their operation in Britain and the rights and duties of an elected representative.

Globally, a majority of the world’s people live in representative democracies including constitutional monarchy with strong representative branch– the first time in history that this has been true. It has been the most successful form of civics since absolute monarchy.

Relation to Republicanism

The related term republic may have many different meanings. It normally means a state with an elected or otherwise non-monarchical head of state, such as the Islamic Republic of Iran or Republic of Korea. Sometimes in the US it is used similarly to liberal democracy.

For example:

- “The United States relies on representative democracy, but its system of government is much more complex than that. It is not a simple representative democracy, but a constitutional republic in which majority rule is tempered.”

Liberal Democracy

Liberal democracy, also known as constitutional democracy, is a common form of representative democracy. Principles of liberal democracy, elections should be free and fair, and the political process should be competitive. Political pluralism is usually defined as the presence of multiple and distinct political parties.

A liberal democracy may take various constitutional forms: it may be a constitutional republic, such as the United States, France, Germany, Italy, or India, or a constitutional monarchy, such as the United Kingdom, Spain, or Japan. It may have a presidential system, a semi-presidential system or a parliamentary system.

Structure

The Liberal democracies usually have universal suffrage, granting all adult citizens the right to vote regardless of race, gender or property ownership. Historically, however, some countries regarded as liberal democracies have had a more limited franchise, and some do not have secret ballots. There may also be qualifications such as voters being required to register before being allowed to vote. The decisions made

through elections are made not by all of the citizens, but rather by those who choose to participate by voting.

The liberal democratic constitution defines the democratic character of the state. The purpose of a constitution is often seen as a limit on the authority of the government. Liberal democracy emphasises the separation of powers, an independent judiciary, and a system of checks and balances between branches of government. Liberal democracies are likely to emphasise the importance of the state being a Rechtsstaat that follows the principle of rule of law. Governmental authority is legitimately exercised only in accordance with written, publicly disclosed laws adopted and enforced in accordance with established procedure. Many democracies use federalism—also known as vertical separation of powers—in order to prevent abuse and increase public input by dividing governing powers between municipal, provincial and national governments.

Rights and Freedoms

In practice, democracies do have specific limits on specific freedoms. There are various legal limitations such as copyright and laws against defamation. There may be limits on anti-democratic speech, on attempts to undermine human rights, and on the promotion or justification of terrorism. In the United States more than in Europe, during the Cold War, such restrictions applied to Communists. Now they are more commonly applied to organizations perceived as promoting terrorism or the incitement of group hatred. Examples include anti-terrorism legislation, the shutting down of Hezbollah satellite broadcasts, and some laws against hate speech.

Critics claim that these limitations may go too far and that there may be no due and fair judicial process.

The common justification for these limits is that they are necessary to guarantee the existence of democracy, or the existence of the freedoms themselves. For example, allowing free speech for those advocating mass murder undermines the right to life and security. Opinion is divided on how far democracy can extend to include the enemies of democracy in the democratic process. If relatively small numbers of people are excluded from such freedoms for these reasons, a country may still be seen as a liberal democracy.

Some argue that this is only quantitatively different from autocracies that persecute opponents, since only a small number of people are affected and the restrictions are less severe. Others emphasize that democracies are different. At least in theory, opponents of democracy are also allowed due process under the rule of law. In principle, democracies allow criticism and change of the leaders and the political and economic system itself; it is only attempts to do so violently and the promotion of such violence that is prohibited. However, many governments considered to be democratic have restrictions upon expressions considered anti-democratic, such as Holocaust denial and hate speech. Members of political organizations with connections to prior totalitarianism parties prohibited and current or former members of such organizations may be deprived of the vote and the privilege of holding certain jobs.

Discriminatory behaviour may be prohibited, such as refusal by owners of public accommodations to serve persons on

grounds of race, religion, ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation. For example, in Canada, a printer who refused to print materials for the Canadian Lesbian and Gay Archives was fined \$5,000, incurred \$100,000 in legal fees, and was ordered to pay a further \$40,000 of his opponents' legal fees by the Human Rights Tribunal.

Other rights considered fundamental in one country may be foreign to other governments. For instance, the constitutions of Canada, India, Israel, Mexico and the United States guarantee freedom from double jeopardy, a right not provided in other legal systems. Similarly, many Americans consider gun rights to be important, while other countries do not recognize them as fundamental rights.

Preconditions

Although they are not part of the system of government as such, a modicum of individual and economic freedoms, which result in the formation of a significant middle class and a broad and flourishing civil society, are often seen as preconditions for liberal democracy.

For countries without a strong tradition of democratic majority rule, the introduction of free elections alone has rarely been sufficient to achieve a transition from dictatorship to democracy; a wider shift in the political culture and gradual formation of the institutions of democratic government are needed. There are various examples—for instance, in Latin America—of countries that were able to sustain democracy only temporarily or in a limited fashion until wider cultural changes established the conditions under which democracy could

flourish. One of the key aspects of democratic culture is the concept of a “loyal opposition”. This is an especially difficult cultural shift to achieve in nations where transitions of power have historically taken place through violence. The term means, in essence, that all sides in a democracy share a common commitment to its basic values.

Political competitors may disagree, but they must tolerate one another and acknowledge the legitimate and important roles that each play. The ground rules of the society must encourage tolerance and civility in public debate. In such a society, the losers accept the judgment of the voters when the election is over, and allow for the peaceful transfer of power. The losers are safe in the knowledge that they will neither lose their lives nor their liberty, and will continue to participate in public life. They are loyal not to the specific policies of the government, but to the fundamental legitimacy of the state and to the democratic process itself.

Origins

Liberal democracy traces its origins—and its name—to the European 18th century, also known as the Age of Enlightenment. At the time, the vast majority of European states were monarchies, with political power held either by the monarch or the aristocracy. The possibility of democracy had not been seriously considered by political theory since classical antiquity, and the widely held belief was that democracies would be inherently unstable and chaotic in their policies due to the changing whims of the people. It was further believed that democracy was contrary to human nature, as human beings were seen to be inherently evil, violent and in

need of a strong leader to restrain their destructive impulses. Many European monarchs held that their power had been ordained by God, and that questioning their right to rule was tantamount to blasphemy. These conventional views were challenged at first by a relatively small group of Enlightenment intellectuals, who believed that human affairs should be guided by reason and principles of liberty and equality. They argued that all people are created equal, and therefore political authority cannot be justified on the basis of “noble blood”, a supposed privileged connection to God, or any other characteristic that is alleged to make one person superior to others. They further argued that governments exist to serve the people, not vice versa, and that laws should apply to those who govern as well as to the governed.

Near the end of the 18th century, these ideas inspired the American Revolution and the French Revolution, which gave birth to the ideology of liberalism and instituted forms of government that attempted to apply the principles of the Enlightenment philosophers into practice. Neither of these forms of government was precisely what we would call a liberal democracy we know today and the French attempt turned out to be short-lived, but they were the prototypes from which liberal democracy later grew. Since the supporters of these forms of government were known as liberals, the governments themselves came to be known as liberal democracies.

When the first prototypical liberal democracies were founded, the liberals themselves were viewed as an extreme and rather dangerous fringe group that threatened international peace and stability. The conservative monarchists who opposed liberalism and democracy saw themselves as defenders of

traditional values and the natural order of things, and their criticism of democracy seemed vindicated when Napoleon Bonaparte took control of the young French Republic, reorganized it into the first French Empire and proceeded to conquer most of Europe. Napoleon was eventually defeated and the Holy Alliance was formed in Europe to prevent any further spread of liberalism or democracy. However, liberal democratic ideals soon became widespread among the general population, and, over the 19th century, traditional monarchy was forced on a continuous defensive and withdrawal.

The dominions of the British Empire became laboratories for liberal democracy from the mid 19th century onward. In Canada, responsible government began in the 1840s and in Australia and New Zealand, parliamentary government elected by male suffrage and secret ballot was established from the 1850s and female suffrage achieved from the 1890s.

Reforms and revolutions helped move most European countries towards liberal democracy. Liberalism ceased being a fringe opinion and joined the political mainstream. At the same time, a number of non-liberal ideologies developed that took the concept of liberal democracy and made it their own. The political spectrum changed; traditional monarchy became more and more a fringe view and liberal democracy became more and more mainstream. By the end of the 19th century, liberal democracy was no longer only a “liberal” idea, but an idea supported by many different ideologies. After World War I and especially after World War II, liberal democracy achieved a dominant position among theories of government and is now endorsed by the vast majority of the political spectrum.

Although liberal democracy was originally put forward by Enlightenment liberals, the relationship between democracy and liberalism has been controversial since the beginning. The ideology of liberalism—particularly in its classical form—is highly individualistic and concerns itself with limiting the power of the state over the individual. In contrast, democracy is seen by some as a collectivist ideal, concerned with empowering the masses. Thus, liberal democracy may be seen as a compromise between liberal individualism and democratic collectivism. Those who hold this view sometimes point to the existence of illiberal democracy and liberal autocracy as evidence that constitutional liberalism and democratic government are not necessarily interconnected. On the other hand, there is the view that constitutional liberalism and democratic government are not only compatible but necessary for the true existence of each other, both arising from the underlying concept of political equality. The research institute Freedom House today simply defines liberal democracy as an electoral democracy also protecting civil liberties.

Liberal Democracies Around the World

Several organisations and political scientists maintain lists of free and unfree states, both in the present and going back a couple centuries. Of these, the best known may be the Polity Data Set and that produced by Freedom House. There is agreement amongst several intellectuals and organizations such as Freedom House that the states of the European Union, Norway, Iceland, Switzerland, Japan, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, South Korea, Taiwan, the United States, India, Canada, Israel, Mexico, South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand are liberal democracies, with Canada having the largest land area and

India currently having the largest population among the democracies in the world. Freedom House considers many of the officially democratic governments in Africa and the former Soviet Union to be undemocratic in practice, usually because the sitting government has a strong influence over election outcomes. Many of these countries are in a state of considerable flux.

Officially non-democratic forms of government, such as single-party states and dictatorships are more common in East Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa.

Proportional vs. Plurality Representation

Plurality voting system award seats just as to regional majorities. The political party or individual candidate, who receives the most votes, wins the seat which represents that locality. There are other democratic electoral systems, such as the various forms of proportional representation, which award seats according to the proportion of individual votes that a party receives nation-wide or in a particular region.

One of the main points of contention between these two systems, is whether to have representatives who are able to effectively represent specific regions in a country, or to have all citizens' vote count the same, regardless of where in the country they happen to live.

Some countries such as Germany and New Zealand, address the conflict between these two forms of representation, by having two categories of seats in the lower house of their national legislative bodies. The first category of seats is appointed according to regional popularity, and the remainder

are awarded to give the parties a proportion of seats that is equal—or as equal as practicable—to their proportion of nation-wide votes. This system is commonly called mixed member proportional representation.

Australia incorporates both systems in having the preferential voting system applicable to the lower house and proportional representation by state in the upper house. This system is argued to result in a more stable government, while having a better diversity of parties to review its actions.

Presidential vs. Parliamentary Systems

A presidential system is a system of government of a republic in which the executive branch is elected separately from the legislative. A parliamentary system is distinguished by the executive branch of government being dependent on the direct or indirect support of the parliament, often expressed through a vote of confidence.

The presidential system of democratic government has become popular in Latin America, Africa, and parts of the former Soviet Union, largely by the example of the United States. Constitutional monarchies are popular in Northern Europe and some former colonies which peacefully separated, such as Australia and Canada. Others have also arisen in Spain, East Asia, and a variety of small nations around the world. Former British territories such as South Africa, India, Ireland, and the United States opted for different forms at the time of independence. The parliamentary system is popular in the European Union and neighboring countries.

Issues and Criticism

Liberal democracies do not respect will of the majority except when electing representatives. This effectively means that a small number of elected representatives make decisions and policies about how a nation is governed, the laws that govern the lives of its citizens, and so on. In addition to the electoral process, the will of the majority is also restricted by the constitution or precedent decided by previous generations. The real power is actually held by a relatively small representative body and also minority interests. Thus, some argue that liberal democracy is merely a decoration over an oligarchy, a plutocracy, or a plutarchy; political theorist, Robert A. Dahl, has described liberal democracies as polyarchies. For these reasons and others, opponents support other, more direct forms of governance such as direct democracy, or consensus.

It has generally been argued by those who support liberal democracy or representative democracy that minority interests and individual liberties must be protected from the majority; for instance in Federalist No. 10 James Madison states, “the most common and durable source of factions has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold and those who are without property have ever formed distinct interests in society”. In order to prevent a minority, in this case, land owners, from being marginalized by a majority, in this case non-land owners, it prescribes what it calls a republic. Unmoderated majority rule could, in this view, lead to an oppression of minorities Another argument is that the elected leaders may be more interested and able than the average voter. A third is that it takes much effort and time if everyone should gather information, discuss, and vote on most

issues. Direct democracy proponents in turn have counter-arguments. Switzerland is a functioning example of direct democracy.

Many democracies have elements of direct democracy such as referendums, plebiscite, and models of “Deliberative democracy”. For example, Venezuelan president Hugo Chávez has recently allowed referendums on important aspects of the government. Also, several states in the United States have functional aspects that are directly democratic. Uruguay is another example.

Many other countries have referendums to a lesser degree in their political system:

- Dictatorship of the Bourgeoisie: Some Marxists, socialists and left-wing anarchists, argue that liberal democracy is an integral part of the capitalist system, is class-based and not democratic or participatory. It is bourgeois democracy because ultimately politicians fight only for the rights of the bourgeoisie. According to Marx, representation of the interests of different groups is proportional to the amount of money they are able to spend on financing the campaigns of nominees during elections, and is also proportional to their financial ability to lobby during a political term. For this reason in decision-making the public interest is distorted according to the weight of the wealth of the represented groups and individuals. Because of this multi-party democracy under a capitalist system is seen as distorted and undemocratic, operating in a way that facilitates the interest of the wealthy owners of the means of production, whose

interest according to Marx is to be obligated to share less of their fortune and economic power with their employees, which means their interest is the exploitation of the lower-class. According to Marx, parliamentary elections are an opportunity citizens of a country get every few years to decide who among the ruling classes will misrepresent them in parliament. The cost of political campaigning in representative democracies favors the rich, a form of plutocracy who are a very small minority of the voters. In Athenian democracy, some public offices were randomly allocated to citizens, in order to inhibit the effects of plutocracy. Aristotle described the law courts in Athens which were selected by lot as democratic and described elections as oligarchic. Liberal democracy has also been attacked by some socialists as a dishonest farce used to keep the masses from realizing that their will is irrelevant in the political process, while at the same time a conspiracy for making them restless for some political agenda. Some contend that it encourages candidates to make deals with wealthy supporters, offering favorable legislation if the candidate is elected—perpetuating conspiracies for monopolization of key areas. Campaign finance reform is an attempt to correct this perceived problem. In response to these claims, United States economist Steven Levitt argues in his book *Freakonomics* that campaign spending is no guarantee of electoral success. He compared electoral success of the same pair of candidates running against one another repeatedly for the same job, as often happens in United States Congressional elections, where spending levels varied. He concludes:

– “A winning candidate can cut his spending in half and lose only 1 per cent of the vote. Meanwhile, a losing candidate who doubles his spending can expect to shift the vote in his favour by only that same 1 per cent.”

Media

Critics of the role of the media in liberal democracies allege that concentration of media ownership leads to major distortions of democratic processes. They argue that the corporate media limits the availability of contesting views, and following the Propaganda Model of Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky, argue this creates a narrow spectrum of elite opinion. This is a natural consequence, they say, of the close ties between powerful corporations and the media and not due to any explicit conspiracy. Systemic bias shapes the content of the media outlets to correspond with corporate interests. Although freedom of speech is secured and protected by the state, only those that adhere to that limited spectrum of opinion are granted significant and consistent access to the major media outlets.

Media commentators also point out that the influential early champions of the media industry held fundamentally anti-democratic views, opposing the general population's involvement in creating policy. Walter Lippmann, for example, sought to “put the public in its place” so that those in power would be “free of the trampling and roar of a bewildered herd,” while Edward Bernays sought to “regiment the public mind every bit as much as an army regiments their bodies.” They also say that even though law ensures the right to free speech,

the ability to spread information to large numbers of people is limited to only those who can afford it.

Proponents claim that constitutionally protected freedom of speech makes it possible for both for-profit and non-profit organizations to debate the issues. They argue that media coverage in democracies simply reflects public preferences, and does not entail censorship. Especially with new forms of media such as the Internet, it is not expensive to reach a wide audience, if there is an interest for the ideas presented.

Limited Voter Turnout

Low voter turnout, whether the cause is disenchantment, indifference or contentment with the status quo, may be seen as a problem, especially if disproportionate in particular segments of the population.

Although turnout levels vary greatly among modern democratic countries, and in various types and levels of elections within countries, at some point low turnout may prompt questions as to whether the results reflect the will of the people, whether the causes may be indicative of concerns to the society in question, or in extreme cases the legitimacy of the electoral system.

Get out the vote campaigns, either by governments or private groups, may increase voter turnout, but distinctions must be made between general campaigns to raise the turnout rate and partisan efforts to aid a particular candidate, party or cause.

Several nations have forms of compulsory voting, with various degrees of enforcement. Proponents argue that this increases

the legitimacy, and thus also popular acceptance, of the elections and ensures political participation by all those affected by the political process, and reduces the costs associated with encouraging voting.

Arguments against include restriction of freedom, economic costs of enforcement, increased number of invalid and blank votes, and random voting. Other alternatives include increased use of absentee ballots, or other measures to ease or improve the ability to vote, including Electronic voting.

Ethnic and Religious Conflicts

For historical reasons, many states are not culturally and ethnically homogeneous. There may be sharp ethnic, linguistic, religious and cultural divisions. In fact, some groups may be actively hostile to each other. A democracy, which by definition allows mass participation in decision-making theoretically also allows the use of the political process against 'enemy' groups.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the partial democratisation of Soviet bloc states was followed by wars and civil war in the former Yugoslavia, in the Caucasus, and in Moldova. Nevertheless, statistical research shows that the fall of Communism and the increase in the number of democratic states were accompanied by a sudden and dramatic decline in total warfare, interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, and the number of refugees and displaced people. This trend, however, can be attributed to the end of cold war and the natural exhaustion of said conflicts, many of which were fueled by the USA and the USSR.

In her book *World on Fire*, Yale Law School professor Amy Chua posits that “when free market democracy is pursued in the presence of a market-dominant minority, the almost invariable result is backlash. This backlash typically takes one of three forms. The first is a backlash against markets, targeting the market-dominant minority’s wealth. The second is a backlash against democracy by forces favorable to the market-dominant minority. The third is violence, sometimes genocidal, directed against the market-dominant minority itself.”.

Bureaucracy

A persistent libertarian and monarchist critique of democracy is the claim that it encourages the elected representatives to change the law without necessity, and in particular to pour forth a flood of new laws. This is seen as pernicious in several ways. New laws constrict the scope of what were previously private liberties. Rapidly changing laws make it difficult for a willing non-specialist to remain law-abiding. This may be an invitation for law-enforcement agencies to misuse power. The claimed continual complication of the law may be contrary to a claimed simple and eternal natural law—although there is no consensus on what this natural law is, even among advocates. Supporters of democracy point to the complex bureaucracy and regulations that has occurred in dictatorships, like many of the former Communist states.

The bureaucracy in Liberal democracies is often criticized for a claimed slowness and complexity of their decision-making. The term “Red Tape” is a synonym of slow bureaucratic functioning that hinders quick results in a liberal democracy.

Short-Term Focus

Modern liberal democracies, by definition, allow for regular changes of government. That has led to a common criticism of their short-term focus. In four or five years the government will face a new election, and it must think of how it will win that election. That would encourage a preference for policies that will bring short term benefits to the electorate before the next election, rather than unpopular policy with longer term benefits.

This criticism assumes that it is possible to make long term predictions for a society, something Karl Popper has criticized as historicism.

Besides the regular review of governing entities, short-term focus in a democracy could also be the result of collective short-term thinking. For example, consider a campaign for policies aimed at reducing environmental damage while causing temporary increase in unemployment. However, this risk applies also to other political systems.

Anarcho-capitalist Hans-Herman Hoppe explained short-termism of the democratic governments by the rational choice of currently ruling group to over exploit temporarily accessible resources, thus deriving maximal economic advantage to the members of this group. He contrasted this with hereditary monarchy, in which a monarch has an interest in preserving the long-term capital value of his property counter-balancing his desire to extract immediate revenue. He argues that the historical record of levels of taxation in certain monarchies (5–8%) and certain liberal democracies (40–60%) seems to confirm

this contention. On the other hand, in modern hereditary autocracy of North Korea the state controls the whole economy while many liberal democratic states score very high on rankings of economic freedom.

Public Choice Theory

Public choice theory is a branch of economics that studies the decision-making behaviour of voters, politicians and government officials from the perspective of economic theory. One studied problem is that each voter has little influence and may therefore have a rational ignorance regarding political issues. This may allow special interest groups to gain subsidies and regulations beneficial to them but harmful to society. However, special interest groups may be equally or more influential in nondemocracies.

Majoritarianism

The tyranny of the majority is the fear that a direct democratic government, reflecting the majority view, can take action that oppresses a particular minority; for instance a minority holding wealth, property ownership, or power. Theoretically, the majority is a majority of all citizens. If citizens are not compelled by law to vote it is usually a majority of those who choose to vote. If such of group constitutes a minority then it is possible that a minority could, in theory, oppress another minority in the name of the majority. However, such an argument could apply to both direct democracy or representative democracy. In comparison to a direct democracy where every citizen is forced to vote, under liberal democracies the wealth and power is usually concentrated in the hands of a

small privileged class who have significant power over the political process. It is argued by some that in representative democracies this minority makes the majority of the policies and potentially oppresses the minority or even the majority in the name of the majority. Several de facto dictatorships also have compulsory, but not “free and fair”, voting in order to try to increase the legitimacy of the regime.

Possible examples of a minority being oppressed by or in the name of the majority:

- Those potentially subject to conscription are a minority possibly because of socioeconomic reasons.
- The minority who are wealthy often use their money and influence to manipulate the political process against the interests of the rest of the population, who are the minority in terms of income and access.
- Several European countries have introduced bans on personal religious symbols in state schools. Opponents see this as a violation of rights to freedom of religion. Supporters see it as following from the separation of state and religious activities.
- Prohibition of pornography is typically determined by what the majority is prepared to accept.
- Recreational drug, caffeine, tobacco and alcohol use is too often criminalized or otherwise suppressed by majorities, originally for racist, classist, religious or paternalistic motives.

- Society's treatment of homosexuals is also cited in this context. Homosexual acts were widely criminalised in democracies until several decades ago; in some democracies they still are, reflecting the religious or sexual mores of the majority.
- The Athenian democracy and the early United States had slavery.
- The majority often taxes the minority who are wealthy at progressively higher rates, with the intention that the wealthy will incur a larger tax burden for social purposes.
- In prosperous western representative democracies, the poor form a minority of the population, and may not have the power to use the state to initiate redistribution when a majority of the electorate opposes such designs. When the poor form a distinct underclass, the majority may use the democratic process to, in effect, withdraw the protection of the state.
- An often quoted example of the 'tyranny of the majority' is that Adolf Hitler came to power by legitimate democratic procedures. The Nazi party gained the largest share of votes in the democratic Weimar republic in 1933. Some might consider this an example of "tyranny of a minority" since he never gained a majority vote, but it is common for a plurality to exercise power in democracies, so the rise of Hitler cannot be considered irrelevant. However, his regime's large-scale human rights violations took place after the democratic system had been abolished. Also, the Weimar constitution in an

“emergency” allowed dictatorial powers and suspension of the essentials of the constitution itself without any vote or election.

Proponents of democracy make a number of defences concerning ‘tyranny of the majority’. One is to argue that the presence of a constitution protecting the rights of all citizens in many democratic countries acts as a safeguard. Generally, changes in these constitutions require the agreement of a supermajority of the elected representatives, or require a judge and jury to agree that evidentiary and procedural standards have been fulfilled by the state, or two different votes by the representatives separated by an election, or, sometimes, a referendum.

These requirements are often combined. The separation of powers into legislative branch, executive branch, judicial branch also makes it more difficult for a small majority to impose their will. This means a majority can still legitimately coerce a minority, but such a minority would be very small and, as a practical matter, it is harder to get a larger proportion of the people to agree to such actions.

Another argument is that majorities and minorities can take a markedly different shape on different issues. People often agree with the majority view on some issues and agree with a minority view on other issues. One’s view may also change. Thus, the members of a majority may limit oppression of a minority since they may well in the future themselves be in a minority.

A third common argument is that, despite the risks, majority rule is preferable to other systems, and the tyranny of the

majority is in any case an improvement on a tyranny of a minority. All the possible problems can also occur in nondemocracies with the added problem that a minority can oppress the majority. Proponents of democracy argue that empirical statistical evidence strongly shows that more democracy leads to less internal violence and mass murder by the government.. This is sometimes formulated as Rummel's Law, which states that the less democratic freedom a people have, the more likely their rulers are to murder them.

Political Stability

One argument for democracy is that by creating a system where the public can remove administrations, without changing the legal basis for government, democracy aims at reducing political uncertainty and instability, and assuring citizens that however much they may disagree with present policies, they will be given a regular chance to change those who are in power, or change policies with which they disagree. This is preferable to a system where political change takes place through violence.

Some think that political stability may be considered as excessive when the group in power remains the same for an extended period of time. On the other hand, this is more common in nondemocracies.

One notable feature of liberal democracies is that their opponents rarely win elections. Advocates use this as an argument to support their view that liberal democracy is inherently stable and can usually only be overthrown by external force, while opponents argue that the system is

inherently stacked against them despite its claims to impartiality. In the past, it was feared that democracy could be easily exploited by leaders with dictatorial aspirations, who could get themselves elected into power. However, the actual number of liberal democracies that have elected dictators into power is low. When it has occurred, it is usually after a major crisis have caused many people to doubt the system or in young/poorly functioning democracies. Some possible examples include Adolf Hitler during the Great Depression and Napoleon III who become first President of the young Second French Republic and later Emperor.

Effective Response in Wartime

A liberal democracy, by definition, implies that power is not concentrated. One criticism is that this could be a disadvantage for a state in wartime, when a fast and unified response is necessary. The legislature usually must give consent before the start of an offensive military operation, although sometimes the executive can do this on its own while keeping the legislature informed. If the democracy is attacked, then no consent is usually required for defensive operations. The people may vote against a conscription army.

However, actual research shows that democracies are more likely to win wars than non-democracies. One explanation attributes this primarily to “the transparency of the politics, and the stability of their preferences, once determined, democracies are better able to cooperate with their partners in the conduct of wars”. Other research attributes this to superior mobilization of resources or selection of wars that the democratic states have a high chance of winning.

Stam and Reiter also note that the emphasis on individuality within democratic societies means that their soldiers fight with greater initiative and superior leadership. Officers in dictatorships are often selected for political loyalty rather than military ability. They may be exclusively selected from a small class or religious/ethnic group that support the regime. The leaders in nondemocracies may respond violently to any perceived criticisms or disobedience. This may make the soldiers and officers afraid to raise any objections or do anything without explicit authorisation. The lack of initiative may be particularly detrimental in modern warfare. Enemy soldiers may more easily surrender to democracies since they can expect comparatively good treatment. Nazi Germany killed almost 2/3 of the captured Soviet soldiers. 38% of the American soldiers captured by North Korea in the Korean War were killed.