

1: Is democracy compatible with capitalism? by Allana MacLean on Prezi

Yes, democratic socialism is compatible with Catholic social teaching Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, June 26, (Corey Torpie / Courtesy of the Ocasio-Cortez Campaign).

Democracy, with all its problems, also has its paradoxes. Regular elections lead to short government life-time. This seems to result in more emphasis on short term goals and safer issues that appeal to populist issues. It also diverts precious time toward re-election campaigns. Anti-democratic forces may use the democratic process to get voted in or get policies enacted in their favor. Communism economic preferences, and liberal vs authoritarian political preferences may allow for non-democratic policies under the guise of democracy. Democracies may, ironically perhaps, create a more effective military as people chose to willingly support their democratic ideals and are not forced to fight. Some of these are discussed further, here: Voting in non-democratic forces. Two examples of this paradox are the following: Hitler and his party were voted in. He then got rid of democracy and started his gross human rights violations and genocidal campaigns as a dictator. Hamas was also recently voted in by Palestinians. The lack of aid, upon which the Palestinians have been quite dependent contributed to friction amongst Palestinians who support Hamas and those that do not and this has been amplified by the worsening economic situation there. The Hitler example highlights the importance media and propaganda play and the need for continued open self-criticism to guard against these tendencies. Minorities losing out to majorities. Another criticism of democracy is that sometimes what the majority votes for or prefers, may not necessarily be good for everyone. A common example plaguing many countries which have diversity in race and religion is that a dominant group may prefer policies that undermine others. Some quick examples include Nigeria which has large Christian and Muslim populations; some Muslims there, and in other countries, want Sharia Law, which not all Muslim necessarily want, let alone people of other faiths. If only a very slight majority can override a very large minority on such an important issue as how one should live, then there is a real chance for tension and conflict. Another example is India, often help us an example of pluralism throughout the ages, despite all manner of challenges. Yet, unfortunately an Indian government report finds that its claims to religious integration and harmony are on far shakier grounds than previously believed. This can come through various outlets, including, a diverse mainstream media, institutions such as religious and legal ones, schooling, family upbringings, etc. Equally important are the underlying economic conditions and situations of a country. Generally, it seems, where economically people are generally doing well, where the inequality gap is not excessive, people have less of a reason to opt for more defensive, reactionary or aggressive policies that undermine others. The fear of the public and disdain of democracy from elites while publicly claiming to supporting it. People often see democracy as an equalizing factor that should not allow the elite or wealthy in a society to rule in an autocratic, despotic, unaccountable manner. Instead they have to respond to the will of the people, and ultimately be accountable to them. Furthermore and ideally, it should not only be the wealthy or elite that hold the power. There should be some form of equality when representing the nation. However, this has also meant at least two accompanying phenomena: Interestingly, leading up to the US mid-term elections, amidst all sorts of allegations of corruption coming to light, in an interview by Democracy Now! Karl Rove, the influential, but controversial, advisor and strategist for President George W. What people do not realize about [Karl Rove] is that everything about him is political utility. When he looked at what was going on with the megachurches Karl decided he was going to take these gigantic churches on the Christian right and to turn them into a gigantic vote delivery system. This is not a man who has deeply held religious faith. This is just one example, where parties have simply targeted people to get votes for power. And yet, many in the religious right believe that Bush represents them and some even see him as an instrument of God, showing just how effective political utility and manipulation has been. Noting that different people refer to, and think of democracy in different ways, even some despots have called themselves democratic! For such volatile ingredients can at times be unstable unless in carefully measured and monitored combinations. John Stuart Mill whose *Essay on Liberty and Considerations on Representative Government* are two of the great books of the modern world, came to believe that every adult yes, women too

should have the vote, but only after compulsory secondary education had been instituted and had time to take effect. In some countries, healthy cynicism has given way to outright contempt or excessive cynicism at anything a government official promises! What this does mean, however, is that those with ambitions of power and ulterior agendas have to therefore resort to even more propaganda and media savvy manipulation, as Crick notes: For both autocrats and despots depend in the main on a passive population; they had no need to mobilize en masse Napoleon was to say: Long before the Soviet Union broke up, a group of Russian writers touring the United States were astonished to find, after reading the newspapers and watching television, that almost all the opinions on all the vital issues were the same. We tear out their fingernails. Here you have none of that. How do you do it? The buildup to the Iraq invasion is also an example of the lengths that governments of two democracies, the US and UK, would go to to gain support for their cause. Limited time in power means going for short term policies Many democracies have rules that elections must be held regularly, say every 4 or 5 years. The short life span of governments is there for an important reason: Yet, at the same time, the short-termism that results has its problems too. Today, the politics of the United States and Great Britain become more and more populist: Some governments find this opposition has foreign support, or, because of their own failures has created a vacuum either a power vacuum, participation vacuum or some other failure that has allowed people to consider alternatives seriously. When a legitimate government is then deliberating, or taking, stronger actions, that government can easily be criticized for rolling back democracy, acting dictatorially or in some way undermining the rights of their people. This can then strengthen the non-democratic opposition further. There are unfortunately countless examples of such foreign and domestic interference with potential and actual democracies to be listed here. It is common for example, to hear of say the former Soviet Union doing this. Unfortunately, while less common to hear about it in the mainstream, western governments have also been complicit in overthrowing and undermining democracies in other parts of the world in favor of puppet regimes, be they dictatorships or pseudo democracies. Two useful resources to read more about these include J. One recent example worth highlighting here is Venezuela, where Hugo Chavez managed to reverse a coup against him. This coup was aggressively supported by many in the Venezuelan elite media and also by the US. After the coup, news channels that actively supported the coup in to oust Chavez, were still allowed to remain in operation which many democracies would not usually tolerate. The main media outlet, RCTV, aggressively anti Chavez, was denied a renewal license in , not because it was critical of Chavez policies, but because a pre-Chavez government law did not look too kindly on broadcasters encouraging coups after all, what government would! RCTV and their supporters tried to insist otherwise; that this was an issue of free speech. The US mainstream media has generally been hostile to Chavez as has been the Bush administration itself , and this was therefore added to the other mis-characterizations often presented , lending credence to the view that Chavez is a dictator. In essence a law enacted during the previous dictatorial regime backed by the US and others is now being turned around and used against Chavez as another example of power-grabbing. Chavez is not helping his own cause by his often vocal and inflammatory antics, but it should not be forgotten how much foreign influence may be contributing to the undermining of democracy tendencies. Venezuela has been through a succession of dictatorships and many supporters of the previous regimes are in the anti-Chavez groups. Regardless of whether one is pro- or anti- Chavez, it certainly seems that democratic participation has increased during his tenure, given all the increased political activity, both pro- and anti-Chavez. On this particular issue, the point is not to ban stories on Creationism; they are better taught in religious classes, not science classes. Yet, often missed from that is that scientific theories are usually based on a well-substantiated explanation that gets tested whenever possible, whereas religious ideas usually are required to be accepted on faith. More generally in the United States, there is however, a growing concern at the rise in an extreme religious right that wants to replace the democratic system with a Christian State. Although we are accustomed to hear about Muslim extremists pushing for religious-based states in various Middle East countries, this example is one in a democracy where despite the principle of a separation of Church and State, Christian religious extremists push forward with their agenda, anyway. Those with money are more likely to be candidates It is a common concern in many democratic countries that those with sufficient funds, or fund-raising capability are the ones who will become the final candidates that voters

choose from. Others, who may be more democratic, but are either poor, or lack the finances of the leading contenders, or will not likely support policies that influential mega donors support, will often lose out. Yet, one would think in a democracy, time should be afforded to make all popular voices hear, not just the leading four from the two main parties, as that just results in the leading four becoming unfairly popular at the expense of the rest, and makes the concern they raise into a self-serving argument. Understandably, finding time for all candidates might not be practical if there are many, but always limiting it to the four from the two leading parties results in the same choices people have to choose from each time, limiting diversity especially when many feel the two leading parties are quite similar on many issues. Attempts to suggest caps on finances of any sort to address this undue influence are met with support from those who have little, but ferocious resistance from those who stand to lose out. Newspapers and other media outlets are often less than impartial in election campaigns. The high concentrated ownership of major media outlets does not always bode well for democracies as it puts a lot of influence into a handful of owners. In the US, it can be argued that the differences between some Democrats and Republicans are quite small in the larger context, and the media owners come from the same elite pool, thus reinforcing the impression of vast differences and debate on major issues. The result is that many get put off and the remaining who do want to vote have access to just a few voices from which to make any notion of informed decisions. In summary, democracy does not automatically require free markets and free markets does not automatically require democracy. Leading up to World War II, a number of European nations saw their power determined by fascists, often via a democratic process. Today, many European democracies attempt a social model of economic development ranging from socialist to somewhat managed markets. In the Indian state of Kerala, for example, a party was voted in that has put communist practices in place with some reasonable success. Of course, many communist regimes in reality have also been accompanied by dictatorships and despots in an attempt to enforce that economic ideology. And during the beginnings of free markets, the major European powers promoting it were themselves hardly democratic. Instead they were dominated by imperialist, racist, colonialist and aristocratic views and systems. The point here is that by not making this distinction, policies can often be highlighted that appear democratic, or even could undermine democracy depending on how it is carried out as many African countries have experienced, for example. As a recent example, as South Africa came out of apartheid, it was praised for its move to democracy, its truth and reconciliation approach and other political moves. Less discussed however, were the economic policies and conditions that followed. A report describing a conference celebrating 10 years of South African independence from Apartheid noted how difficult a democratic system is to establish when combined with factors like regional and international economics i. The question of how the international world relates to and indeed is responsible for some of the problems was also deliberated at the conference. While the consensus was on Africans Indeed, some of the economic problems of the countries in the region can be traced back to their relationships with former colonial masters. More recently, the structural adjustment programmes of the s continue to affect the economic stability of SADC countries The link between globalisation and democratisation was further debated in the economic session of the conference. Suffice to say, democracy is threatened when a state cannot determine its own budget. The conditionality cripples the development of a socially transformative democracy. A number of the debt rescheduling agreements have fostered cutbacks on social spending, and have created conditions of further economic marginalisation and social exclusion of the poor. In the long term, the consolidation of democracy is threatened because the conditions have the effect of fostering social unrest.

2: History of Greece: Athenian Democracy

ARE THE RICH NECESSARY? 7. Are the Rich Compatible with Democracy?-Yes 33 Part Four Profit-making 41 8. Are Private Profits Necessary?â€”No 43 9. Are Private Profits Necessary?â€”Yes

Atlee, with Tom Atlee John S. Atlee is president of the which offers a breakthrough conceptual framework for responsible democratic management We live in a world where power is very unbalanced. Power imbalances are at the root of most social problems. Correcting power imbalances will go a long way towards solving many problems at once. The ability to influence or resist is what social power is all about. People with lots of money, muscle, status, intelligence, etc. In most but, significantly, not all circumstances, they have more social power. When a person or group has substantially more power than others, their relationships are not democratic. Democracy requires that social power be equal or balanced. In such circumstances, certain people may be given extra power. The main point is this: Any system that ensures that kind of balance-of-power is democratic. We find them being used to support the most anti-democratic policies. The social power analysis described in this essay provides solid, objective, social-scientific definitions of these badly-mauled terms - definitions against which to measure the propaganda of groups from the National Association of Manufacturers to the Communist Party. This social power analysis is intended to serve that purpose for people who are concerned about the concentration and irresponsibility of power in our society. They will find it provides a framework of ideas within which they can create solutions consistent with democratic institutions and ideals. It is possessed by all individuals and social groups and arises out of their connections to each other. Social power has two aspects: In theory it is possible to be socially neutral - to further our own interests or desires in ways which do not affect other people. In practice, however, the vast majority of our activities have some social impact. Social power comes in many forms, some of which are outlined in the box at the bottom of this page. There are many more. Likewise, social power can be changed from one form into another by those who know how to use it. And just as electricity is more easily transformed than most other forms of physical power, so there are differences in the various forms of social power. Which form is most transmutable depends on the circumstances. For example, in a war, physical force is probably most transmutable. In highly industrialized, interdependent money economies, financial power is usually the most transmutable. Again like physical energy, social power may be either active or merely latent -- like the power in a taut spring or a can of gasoline. Not infrequently possessors of social power fail to realize what power they have e. On the other hand, what seems like great social power is often based mainly on bluff, its effectiveness due to the ignorance or false beliefs of those over whom it is exercised. This is most obvious in games like poker, but it is a basic element in all power strategy, whether military, business, or political. This has been a chief reason for the lavish costumes, pageantry and ritual of authoritarian ruling groups throughout history. In the real social world these interlock and ramify in so many directions that it is almost impossible to isolate them. Social power usually occurs in big chunks, organized into systems or structures of power - family, community, religion, interest group, class, movement, political party, etc. The individual forms of power are important chiefly as the instruments of power strategy, manipulated by competitors for social power as generals manipulate soliders, supplies and weapons. No one form of power is "best. The social power possessed by any individual or group cannot be adequately evaluated by the mere sum of individual forms of power possessed - even where they can be added up. With social power, as with most other social phenomena, the whole is often greater or less than the sum of its parts, and is often different in kind. When one person becomes wealthy and another poor, there usually develops a greater difference between their relative social power than can be measured solely by their respective fortunes. This social truth underlies the Biblical saying, "To him who hath shall be given; from him who hath not, even that which he hath shall be taken away. It exists only in relation to our desires and our ability to satisfy them. People generally become conscious of freedom as a political problem or objective only when a gap develops between their desires and their ability to satisfy them. Although most people think of freedom as an absence of restrictions, that is only one facet of it. Real freedom is the ability to satisfy our desires. It has three aspects: Knowledge and recognition of our

desires and of possibilities for expressing and fulfilling them. Availability of means and opportunities including the statistical probability for satisfying our desires. The absence of restrictions, coercion, and other factors blocking self-determined realization of our desires. These three aspects of freedom are inseparable; there can be no real freedom unless all three are present. Freedom is intimately related to social power. On the one hand, social power usually generates greater freedom for whoever uses it. On the other, patterns of freedom greatly influence the extent to which various forms of social power can be exercised. There are objective and subjective dimensions to freedom. Most people believe they have more or less freedom than they actually have, and these delusions are manipulated by social powerholders to influence public behavior. With a limited number of prizes, many are forced to be losers. Likewise, to the extent there is high unemployment, workers are not truly free to work, but are forced by necessity to enter a "game" in which they have a high chance of losing. There are many extended families with ten or more children in the world whose main breadwinner gets only a few dollars a day. The children have to start work as soon as they are able. To say these children have "freedom" to get an education would be ironical. Coercion and restrictions by government have traditionally been recognized as basic limitations on individual freedom. But coercion by private individuals and groups can be equally serious. If thieves were free to steal, there would be no freedom of property ownership. When employers hire thugs to beat up union organizers, there is no freedom of union organizing. Widespread crime, pollution, militarism, homelessness, racial and sexual abuse, and so on, can make streets, communities, even food, air and water seem dangerous. People "hole up" in their homes. When parents or spouses become threatening, even homes can be dangerous, causing people to withdraw even further, into their frightened minds. Despite all the VCRs, water purifiers, and shopping malls, we can question how "free" people are to enjoy life. People often feel like they are free to choose, even though the options presented to them were created by someone else. Many supermarkets, for example, have thousands of products, none of which are organic. Shoppers experience the wide variety as freeing them to choose. Very few of them experience the omission of organic foods as a limitation. Psychologists, con men, and PR professionals have developed powerful technologies of manipulation that can cause people to act for reasons that are outside their control or awareness. People can think they are behaving freely and rationally when actually they are being heavily influenced by "compliance professionals. Cialdini [] for a fascinating introduction to this subject. Freedom is a function of social power. There is only freedom for particular individuals and groups to do certain things. Where there are fundamentally opposing interests, an increase in the power and freedom of one individual or group necessarily means a relative decrease in the power and freedom of the others. Unemployment increases the freedom of employers to get their pick of job applicants, to pay low wages, and to avoid protests from workers. For the same reasons, unemployment decreases the freedom of workers. Likewise in a drought in India, thousands of peasants may starve while grain merchants get rich. The total amount of freedom existing in a society as a whole depends on the overall distribution of social power. A free society is not achieved by trying to maximize the freedom of people as individuals, but by pursuing a balance or equality of social power among all individuals. This is because our individual freedom is necessarily limited by our living with each other in society. Traffic lights offer an excellent illustration of this. If a new traffic light is set up at an intersection, does it increase or decrease freedom? You have to stop if the light is red. Now while the light is green you are free to go through without stopping. If both streets are busy thoroughfares, with equal amounts of traffic, the new light would obviously increase the net amount of freedom for everybody. But what if one road were a busy superhighway and the other a small country road with only a few cars which had to wait half an hour for an opportunity to cross? Maybe the freedom of the minority should be given consideration by a light which stopped the superhighway traffic for brief periods at infrequent intervals. The timing of the light would make the difference. Or the total amount of freedom might be still further increased by constructing an overpass. Freedom, like social power, depends on circumstances. What increases freedom in the country may restrict it in the city. What increases freedom in self-sufficient economies may limit it in interdependent industrial societies. Restrictions on individual freedom tend to increase as societies become more populous and integrated, in order to preserve the maximum possible freedom for all. That is, restrictions increase freedom when they are democratically established and

administered. This can only happen where there is relative equality of social power in horizontal social relationships and responsibility of social power in vertical relationships i. Freedom and democracy are inseparable for three reasons:

3: Why does "meritocracy" / "capitalism" co-exist with "democracy"? - Politics Stack Exchange

"Muslims don't like democracy" or "Islam isn't compatible with democracy" - that's what is often spewed by some of Islam's biggest critics. But a look at the big picture - a world where much of.

History of Greece A Brief Outline of Athenian Democracy The type of democracy practiced in Athens of the fifth and fourth centuries may not have been perfect. But it was the best government up to that time and superior to what most of the ancient world was living under. The key to Athenian democracy was Cleisthenes redrawing of the social-political landscape of Athens and Attica. Each of these thirds were located in one of the three areas of Attica which had been the way the city had been split up in the past. These were the center of the city, the coast and the area beyond the hills. Then these tritities were broken up in demes municipalities of varying sizes. A way to imagine this is to think about when you were in class and the teacher re-arranged the seating so that you and your pals would not be sitting together and distracting each other and the rest of the class. This helped you focus on school, kept you and your friends from causing trouble or over-throwing the teacher and helped you make new friends. Since there were thousands of people involved, the assembly could get pretty noisy and unruly. Once a year they would vote on whether to hold what was called an ostracism. If it was agreed, members of the assembly wrote the name of the person they wanted banished on a piece of pottery. The person with the most votes was exiled from Athens for ten years. He did not lose his property or his rights as a citizen and after ten years he was welcome back. But it achieved its purpose since fear of banishment kept those with lofty aspirations from being too aggressive. The Boule was a Council of comprised of fifty men from each of the ten tribes and they were the ones who decided on what the assembly would discuss. The members of the council were chosen by their demes municipalities and after serving were not permitted to serve again for ten years. An executive council of nine with a chairman and a secretary made sure things ran smoothly. The parliament in contemporary Athens is still called the Bouli. The chief magistrate of the city was called the Archon eponymous or ruler. The word anarchy means without an archon. His responsibilities included conducting investigations of legal cases, in particular those that involved the state. He was responsible for protecting the orphans and heiresses with no family and to appoint the choregos who was in charge of organizing the religious festivals. The office of Archon eponymous was held for only a single year, and that year was named after him. Archons were chosen by the Areopagus, the council of elders of the city, who were those who had previously been archons. The archon basileus was an elected and ceremonial office in charge of religious matters including the Eleusinian mysteries, and sacrifices. Murders also fell under his jurisdiction since the taking of a life was considered a crime against the gods since human life was sacred. The polemarch had some judicial responsibilities and was also in charge of overseeing the foreign laborers in Athens known as metics. Other official positions were chosen by lot and included among others, tax collectors, and market inspectors who patrolled the agora and made sure merchants were being honest. There were also courts with six judges known as the Thesmothetae who had little power since the Athenians believed that trials should involve mass participation. So in cases that were private suits of one individual against another there was a jury of citizens. Suits which involved officials of the state were tried by a jury of and the most serious charges like treason were tried by a jury of The more important the trial the more jurors were involved. The juries voted by secret ballot and were paid for their service, receiving roughly as much as a laborer per-day. The military in Athens was set up the same way as the Boule, corresponding to the tribes. Those who sat together on the juries did the same in the theatre too so you were part of a social-political para group or clique. In Athens where politics was all encompassing this was important. When viewed in the context of its time the Athenian democracy was an amazing achievement which introduced the concept of equal rights and the notion of accountability by routinely investigating officials and creating a system where no person or group could become too powerful. The function of the government was to guarantee justice to the people of Athens, a revolutionary idea at the time. Democracy may not be the best form of government, but it is the best one that we know of. Lets call it a work in progress. One thing must be said about Athenian democracy and that is that it was a full time job. Only people with a lot of leisure time on their hands could

devote the energy to this system, which brings us to the issue of slavery. The fact that even a relatively poor Athenian citizen could still afford one slave to plow his fields or work in his shop while he was debating laws in the assembly is what made a democracy of the people if you define people as free-Athenian-male-citizens. If only the rich had been able to afford the time to go to the meetings then the laws would certainly be different, favoring the rich instead of everyone. This is not to condone slavery. It is just a fact that slavery made democracy possible. Have you found it entertaining as well as useful? If so please show your appreciation by booking hotels through the travel agencies and the links found on my Greek Travel Agents Page. You can also book at Booking.

4: Democratic socialism - Wikipedia

ISBN: OCLC Number: Description: xiv, pages ; 21 cm: Contents: Why are we still so poor? --The appeal of science --Economic arguments --Are the rich necessary?-No --Are the rich necessary?-Yes --Are the rich compatible with democracy?-No --Are the rich compatible with democracy?-Yes --Are private profits necessary?-No --Are private profits necessary?-Yes.

Share18 Shares 2K It is an accepted fact that liberal democracy is the worst possible political systemâ€”except for all others thank you, Sir Winston. We are not perfectâ€”and neither are our governments, since they are made by humans too. It is most advisable to be skeptical, even of democracy itself. It assumes that all opinions are worth the same, which is quite a big leap of faith, since we are putting the same value on the opinions of the educated and the ignorant, and the law-abiding citizens and crooks. Even if you think that all people are created equal, it is obvious that their environments are very differentâ€”and as a result, so is their character. By assuming that all opinions are equal you are also assuming that most people are able to reach a rational, informed decision after seriously exploring all pros and cons. As a result, many candidates to political office resort to populism, pursuing policies that focus on the immediate satisfaction of whims instead of long-term improvements. Yes, we have tamed the forces of nature and discovered a lot of thingsâ€”and this Internet business is amazing. But human nature remains the same, more or less. Call it class struggle, xenophobia, nationalism, or whatever you likeâ€”the thing is that most of us identify with one group or another, and almost every meaningful group has alliances or enmities with other groups. This is part of human nature, and can work peacefully. But that possibility also favors a very specific kind of corruption: It can be as simple as paying money to someone in exchange for their vote, or giving someone a job in the office of the politician who commands the machine. So if someone tries to stop providing itâ€”well, they just made a large number of deadly foes. When Margaret Thatcher cut coal subsidies, for example, coal miners felt that their jobs had been threatened and became bitter enemies of Thatcher and her ilk. This leaves the minority relatively powerlessâ€”and the smaller it is, the less power it wields. Which means that the smallest minority of allâ€”the individualâ€”is effectively depending on his agreement with the majority. It is certainly easier than in a democracy, since in that case, officials have been elected by the people. If those officials have committed a crime in opposition to their official platform and without the knowledge of the public, it is simply their own fault and the people who voted for them are innocent. But if a candidate advocates curtailing human rights for a minority, and upon finding himself elected to office, carries out his plan. In a dictatorship they are just discreetly hidden, sometimes in plain sight. In a democracy, which tends to rely on moral superiority, this is difficult to carry out. People have a right to knowâ€”at least in theory. Spying and covert operations are part of the daily workings of the state, admittedly sometimes for the greater good such as when the police infiltrate a criminal organization to put their members on trial. But their efficiency runs against their transparency. A perfectly democratic system would be transparent, and as such, no covert operations could be effectively carried out. In many democratic countries, your vote only measures up against other votes in your district. So if your district runs a majority system and you vote for a losing runner, then your vote was useless. According to this theorem, so long as there are more than two candidates, there is no possible voting system that can ensure the satisfaction of three crucial criteria for fairness: If these criteria are left unsatisfied, it effectively means that democracyâ€”at least in its purest formâ€”cannot work.

5: Is Capitalism compatible with Democracy? | www.enganchecubano.com

Therefore, old western democracy is compatible with good governance, modern western democracy isn't. The difference between the old one and new one can be seen here: China: top 1 tier, government; 2nd tier, super rich; 3rd tier, media.

Democracy is the idea that a body of the population may vote on the direction of government to some degree. The people could vote if they wanted Saddam to continue to be President. If you voted no however Capitalism is the belief in a competitive market and all that fun stuff. Capitalists often feel government is the worst management system for a business. Meritocracy is the concept that a particularity job or duty should to to the best candidate to perform that task, and that should be the only metric by which we consider candidates for a position. Liberalism is basically to Communism what Capitalism is to Socialism, that is, Capitalism is a core tenant of Liberalism in Economics but not everything Liberalism is about. At the end of the day, most Americans are Liberals including the "Conservatives Now, all this is to say that not everything is inherently "anti-communist". Just Capitalism and Liberalism. Both Liberalism and Communism are amicable to Democracy, just different forms of it. Actually, Liberalism originally was sort of quiet on the organization of government. John Locke actually favored a Liberal Monarchy as his structure system. Americans loved them some Lockian Liberalism but really had a historical love of Greco-Roman Government structures Democracy from Greece, Republicanism from the Romans Finally, Capitalism and Communism both like Meritocracy, but use it differently. The USSR tended to place people in jobs that they were going to be the best at Capitalism will generally hire anyone for a basic job and "let the cream rise to the top" Jobs that require higher demands are given to people who can prove they can perform the best at this task Remember his original reason to hire Homer Simpson: Homer was really good at finding potentially dangerous situations, pointing them out, and getting people to pay attention

6: Democracy: A Social Power Analysis

Democracy is a style or form of government. The goal of democracy is essentially that we citizens have certain inalienable rights and that the www.enganchecubano.com country in which we live is community property and belongs to the citizens and not for instance to an omnipotent king.

Is Catholicism Compatible with the American Experiment? Edinburgh, United Kingdom - July 28, According to Deneen, the main argument among American Catholics will concern the relationship of modern liberal democracies and, at a deeper level, the American Founding with Catholicism. It reaches further back to the early modern period often called the Enlightenment. The intellectual developments associated with the Enlightenment shared an emphasis on 1 asking every belief and institution to justify itself rationally, and 2 applying the tools associated with the scientific method to as many spheres of life as possible. Another Enlightenment hallmark was an emphasis on utility, including the usefulness of particular habits and institutions. The tendency to absolutize empirical reason, for instance, has surely narrowed Western conceptions of human reason. Nor were all Enlightenment thinkers committed to reasoned discussion. Palmer illustrated that Voltaire not only regularly deployed ad hominem polemics against his critics but often successfully invoked the courts to silence them. Chronologically speaking, there were early and late Enlightenments. National expressions also significantly differed from each other. The late-French Enlightenment associated with figures like Rousseau, for example, departed in important ways from its Scottish counterpart. Even within particular Enlightenment settings, there was plenty of diversity. Hume was an outlier in his irreligion compared to other Scots such as the immensely influential Francis Hutcheson, who was like many Scottish Enlightenment thinkers a believing Christian clergyman. Take, for instance, religious toleration. With rare exceptions, religious minorities in the pre-Enlightenment European world were subject to debilitating legal restrictions. Jews invariably suffered the most as a result of such oppression. Many eighteenth-century Enlightenment thinkers were deeply critical of these arrangements. It consequently viewed imports negatively, discouraged free trade between nations, and encouraged collusion between governments, powerful merchants and monopolistic guilds. Mercantilist economic assumptions encouraged war as countries jostled to control trade routes and colonies. It was also unjust. Are there tensions between Catholicism and particular Enlightenment ideas? But as American Catholics engage this discussion one whose significance embraces Evangelical and Eastern Orthodox Christians as well as orthodox Jews they would do well to avoid sweeping generalizations and acknowledge and explore the nuances of the Enlightenment more carefully. Reason itself, given to us by God, surely requires nothing less.

7: Democracy – Global Issues

The question, therefore, is not whether liberal democracy is compatible with Islamic fundamentalism – clearly it is not – but whether it is compatible with Islam itself.

The goal of democracy is essentially that we citizens have certain inalienable rights and that the land.. The goal of democracy is that govt essentially is a servant of the people at large and serves the people and generally represents the will of the people withing reason and also considering certain rights that a minority should have. A democracy is not simply totally majority rule. The majority could not decide to arrest all the minority and euthanize them Real democracy realizes that while it is majority rule that individuals and indeed minorities have certain rights as well. The goal of Capitalism is to be a fair and open market place which leads to price, demand and supply being efficient. Capitalism is an economic system. It is the way in which a democracy decides that is best to conduct its economic activity. It is most compatible with the spirit of democracy in the sense that there is freedom to conduct business, a freedom that also leads to economic efficiencies just as democracy leads to intellectual efficiencies of ideas. In a capitalistic economy, everyone looks out for their own best interest and negotiations are conducted at arms lenght. A capitalistic economic is best when devoid of certain things that can diminish efficiency. For instance monopolies are not good for capitalism because it is a corrution of the market, artificially inflating prices and diminishing choice and service. Capitalism must be regulated, otherwise, it would be like having a card game and cheating being allowed This is where capitalism goes wrong.. Some people feel that total laissez faire is what capitalism means. Even Adam Smith argued in favor of things that were pretty much progressive and liberal ideas such as progressive taxation, the need for a good public education system, preventing monopolies, and reducing the influence of the rich and big business on politicians to keep the field level, and he was right on the money. The problem we have today is that a pendulum has swung in favor of the rich and and big business and big money. Corporations are bigger than ever, industries are more monopolized than ever, the rich and big corporations are paying record low taxes and making record high profits The field is not balanced. They control the media.. This is why you keep seeing laws and policies being put in place that make no sense if the goal is to serve and represent the people The goal today is to protect and enhace profits above all else

8: nationalism compatible with democracy? | Yahoo Answers

The fathers of American democracy, including George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams, and James Madison, were very rich men. With estimated net worth (in today's dollars) ranging from \$20 million to \$ billion, they were likely all in the top percent of the wealth distribution, demonstrating that the accumulation of capital is.

Probably the living thinker and doer whom I admire the most after Reihan! Of course, Thiel is most famous for co-founding PayPal and now being a very successful investor with a winning hedge fund and venture capital firm. I even read his slightly juvenile but, like everything Thiel touches, brilliant book *The Diversity Myth*. When I saw a video of him mentioning and commenting on the old French classic *The American Challenge* I was positively giddy with excitement. His talks on the financial crisis over at BigThink is one of the most illuminating takes on the financial crisis out there. Most recently, Thiel, a hardcore libertarian, has a post up at Cato Unbound also one of my very favorite locales on these interwebs arguing basically two things: Democracy is not just incompatible with capitalism but just not very good, basically because the losers will use the political system to tax the winners into submission ; Libertarians need to give up on politics, and society basically, and build their own libertarian havens, be it in cyberspace, outer space or through seasteading. Yes, democracy lends itself to boneheaded redistribution, and ham-fisted government interventions into the economy. Even personal freedoms aside, even the most capitalist-friendly regimes are actually not so capitalist. If you look at China, there are large amounts of unleashed capitalist fury, so to speak, but it is always within a government-managed system. Conservatives frequently deride the European Union as an undemocratic technocratic pseudo-super state, but the reality is much more complex. Megan McArdle is very happy that Ben Bernanke, unelected and unaccountable, has a bigger role in the response to the financial crisis than Maxine Waters, and is only able to take the dramatic steps he is precisely because he is unaccountable, and so am I. The historical record of unelected governments in this regard is not very good. Democracy is not so much about electing people as having a process and a system of checks and balances that ensures that basic rights are protected. No democratic country is as pro-free market as Thiel, or myself, would like, but I would wager that no authoritarian regime is better than the democratic alternatives on that score, and will remain so for the foreseeable future. Furthermore, I would wager that even though no democratic country is as pro-free market as is advisable, they are still headed slowly, so slowly in the right direction. Even after the financial crisis, the political consensus is still much more pro-free market than it was 40 years ago. Politics is messy, it moves slowly, in fits and starts, with one step forward and two steps back, and there are real problems with financial regulation only happening in the aftermath of crises, but I still like it better than the alternatives. Thiel mentions three possible avenues: I actually agree with Thiel on cyberspace: In the late s, the founding vision of PayPal centered on the creation of a new world currency, free from all government control and dilution – the end of monetary sovereignty, as it were. In the s, companies like Facebook create the space for new modes of dissent and new ways to form communities not bounded by historical nation-states. By starting a new Internet business, an entrepreneur may create a new world. The hope of the Internet is that these new worlds will impact and force change on the existing social and political order. The limitation of the Internet is that these new worlds are virtual and that any escape may be more imaginary than real. The open question, which will not be resolved for many years, centers on which of these accounts of the Internet proves true. I agree with him on the tremendous potential of the internet to bring about change to the world, and that whether this change is more real than virtual is a question that will be answered over the long term. As for outer space, Thiel believes that [b]ecause the vast reaches of outer space represent a limitless frontier, they also represent a limitless possibility for escape from world politics. I think this is naive because, to put it simply, escaping world politics is not escaping politics. Wherever there is more than one man, there will be disagreements about how to live, how to allocate resources, and these disagreements can only be resolved through politics or violence, and for many issues pollution, defense, mere libertarianism has few answers. Nation states already compete for citizens, and yet we still have Zimbabwes and North Koreas. The same reasoning can be applied to settling outer space. Lord of the Flies, anyone? Thiel should be wary about

ham-fisted, redistributive democratic government, but I would pose to him that, for the long run, it is still the least bad alternative, and that things really are "albeit ever so slowly" moving in the right direction. Leave a Reply Ken McLeod wrote a really good series on modern politics in space collectively called the Fall Revolution. You have done a nice job of pointing out the many fallacies here you forgot to mention that Paypal kind of sucks performance-wise but I have a deadline facing me so I think take a few minutes to add my brilliant take on libertarianism: The pure libertarian position is that society should place no constraints on the individual. But of course this is impossible so then libertarianism has to creep up the continuum of societal constraints until the porridge is not too hot or too cold, but just right. We have waved a hand in a general direction that we agree might be nice to move towards. But what pure Libertarians miss is the role of Religion in constraining those problematic impulses while providing for the poor as well. Look at Leviticus It is that type of balance that we need, yet neither pure Democracy nor pure Libertarianism will get us there by themselves. Just my two cents. Good post and criticism though. It provides a very nice empirical defense of democracy. I have read some interesting thoughts about sea-steading but not as a way to avoid being taxed into submission. I keep a bluewater capable boat, mostly for pleasure; but also as a hedge against black swan scenarios. At times, I have difficulty imagining a democracy having anything else but a capitalist economy. Allow me to be tedious for a second as I develop some points. Democracy, representative democracy, aims to satisfy the will of a given set of people. Capitalism operates on the behest of the individuals who constitute the market, and who endeavor to allot rare resources in ways they deem rational. Sometimes a democracy may hinder the resource-allocating mechanisms of capitalism in order to satisfy an intangible good. Who else are winners? The previous owners of skype and stumble upon. Maybe the winners can go sea steading together? Can i suggest the indian ocean? Back when it was still a startup it was a great service with tons of potential. After all you can boil down liberalism and conservatism as well to a few general mottos that have little practical meaning. I very much agree with that. The French revolution, much like the American one, was ignited by a tax revolt, from the bourgeoisie who were the most economically productive but paid a disproportionate share of taxes because the aristocracy was exempt and thereby subsidized by the bourgeoisie. I think the redistributionist thing comes from WW2, and the role of the Communist Party in the French Resistance and in the ensuing social and political bargain. Since the conservative opposition was a Colbertist one, ie statist, the common enemy was capitalism. First of all, I sincerely believe that free market capitalism is not just a great engine of economic efficiency, but also of social justice. So free markets and technology! Social justice is really something I think about a lot for a free market guy, and I really think social justice properly understood and free market capitalism properly understood as opposed to big business corporatism are very much compatible. Second of all, we know that until he was 30, Jesus was a carpenter. I like to think he was an entrepreneur and small business owner, and that he very much approves of entrepreneurship.

9: 10 Reasons Why Democracy Doesn't Work - Listverse

That is why the rich get richer. They print the money, give it to themselves through the banks, and then the corporations get it through loans they make with the bank. By the time the common man gets the money, it is worth a lot less than when it was printed.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4. Where I depart from the interview itself I use grey font. Most Muslim majority states today were originally conceived as secular or quasi secular democracies. But since the mid twentieth century many of these states have moved closer to the Islamic state paradigm – that is, with the onset of Islamization and political Islam that swept through the Muslim world in the wake of the Iranian Revolution in A return to the Caliphate? The interviewer asks if it is not a fact that the Caliphate, the union of religion and the state, that is at the heart of Islam. The Caliphate thus cannot be repeated. The Islamic states that have arisen in more recent times are not replications of the Caliphate. Rather, they are modern attempts to legitimize ruling elites. Failure of theocratic and secular autocracies Today it is becoming increasingly clear that experiments with Islamic states have been failures in promoting citizenship rights, modern dynamic economies, social justice, democratic rights. Saudi Arabia, Iran, Sudan. Yet neighboring these countries we have others ruled by secular autocrats their states are not run as Islamic states where the human rights situations are as bad or worse: Rahim argues that today Muslims are increasingly and overtly rejecting both authoritarian Islamic states and authoritarian secular states. The Arab uprising was the most obvious illustration of this. All these surveys show that Muslims reject the various forms of authoritarian rule. It is this compulsion that is rejected by many Muslims. Why the Muslim Brotherhood has emerged ahead from the Arab Spring Yet in the recent elections in Egypt we have the Muslim Brotherhood winning electoral success. Rahim finds that this is another example of where many Islamist parties achieve political success after a prolonged period of authoritarian rule. Rahim sees this as the result of such groups like the Brotherhood having established very strong roots and networks within the local communities during that period and they have been able to draw upon these community roots when running for elections. Certainly Islamist groups like the Brotherhood did not initiate the Arab uprising, but they benefitted from the ousting of the autocratic Mubarak in Egypt, for example because of their grass-roots networking. Liberal and secular democratic movements lacked anything like this. In the case of Syria, we have no clear idea yet on the identity of the Syrian rebels. Hope for the future But with respect to nonviolent protests in other parts of the Muslim world, this is the kind of paradigm [Wasatia democracy] that many democrats in the Muslim world are attracted to as opposed to the violent groups for regime change. We cannot make sweeping generalizations about the processes of regime change in Syria, in Egypt, in Tunisia, etc since they are all quite different political scenarios. And it is the variety of situations throughout the Muslim world that Rahim explores in detail in her book. In fact such research refutes such popular simplifications. It sounds like the sort of information that should be far more readily accessible to the wider public.

Chapter 5: Exposition of Paramattha Dhammas 111 (Nibbana) Writing by hand in a digital age The Biochemistry of archaea (archaebacteria) Empowering yourself I. The safeguard of civil liberty in Japan. John Stuart Mill on liberty full text Hackett Criminal profilers and the media : profiling the Beltway snipers Gateway to hell, a gateway to paradise Report of the Committee of Claims, on the petition of Henry Hill. 20 Loves labour lost GOOD GOODIES (Fawcett Crest Non-Fiction) Encouraging Your Childs Science Talent Catalogue of late Roman coins in the Dumbarton Oaks Collection and in the Whittemore Collection Using Computer-Based and Electronic Library Materials A thief of a Christmas. Windows 7 professional tutorial Flurothyl convulsive therapy GMAT CAT (computer-adaptive graduate management admission test) Stretched Horizons Morning light piano sheet music Coxcomb Variations IV. THE STATIONS OF THE WAY 64 Simple repair and preservation techniques for collection curators, librarians and archivists Jbtaxesofhallie 2016 2017 price list The Bishops address at the opening of the general conference in adjourned session at Napanee, January 9th Reel 212. Marion, Marshall, Mason Counties Feminism in The Netherlands Petra de Vries Fundamental Accounting Principles F.A.P. w CD, NetTutor Powerweb (16th Edition) Seeing ourselves everywhere Secret Truths a Young Adults Guide for Creating Peace Land, growth and governance : tenure reform and visions of progress in Zimbabwe Mandivamba Rukuni and Sti V. 2, pt. 1. Containing the Income Tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961 as amended by various finance other amending Principles of Existing EC Contract Law (Acquis Principles) AIMING FOR THE STARS EBK Pt. 1. Learners guide Prone moves on the ball Drink and disorder Maths exercises for grade 1 Alzheimer disease David Knopman War abroad and war at home