

1: Social and Political Elites | www.enganchecubano.com

The direct democracy of Athens was still represented, as well as affected, by leadership of a kind, by its peculiar elite. It followed such men as Pericles, Cleon, Cleophon. Yet, as this short list shows, the quality of this political leadership was on a steep slope of decline.

Such individuals exist in all societies, but beyond this mundane observation, social scientists are interested in why particular individuals attain positions of status and power. Does achievement reflect superior talent, or is it a product of social or cultural advantage? Why are some achievements valued over others? How does the distribution of elite positions in society reflect the particular social structures in which they exist? These questions are the focus of much research on stratification and social inequality. In the social sciences, the concept of elites refers to a more specific issue as well: At the heart of theoretical debates and empirical research on elites is the famous assertion of Mosca, p. Then the key questions concern the existence and nature of this dominant group. Is power over the major institutions of society highly concentrated, or is it broadly dispersed as "pluralists" claim? If a cohesive ruling elite exists, then who is in it and what is the basis of its power? What is the extent of its power in relation to the nonelite "masses"? Does this societal elite exercise power responsibly in the interests of society as a whole, or do elites maximize their own interests against those of subordinate groups? Reacting to the turmoil of European society in the early twentieth century, each developed arguments supporting the inevitability of elite rule in opposition to classical democratic theory, Marxian class analysis, and socialist political movements. For Pareto, elites in general were those holding leadership positions in business, politics, education, and other areas of accomplishment. Those individuals could be distinguished from the rest of "nonelite" society. He further distinguished between the "governing elite" – the segment of the elite with broad political power – and the nongoverning elite. His best known statements concerned the former group. Though famous for his work in mathematical economics, Pareto believed that most human behavior was nonrational, the expression of deep-seated "sentiments" and their observable manifestations, or "residues. For Pareto, the governing elites were those with dominant talents or leadership skills derived primarily from superior individual attributes. Borrowing from Machiavelli, he distinguished two ideal types of political leaders on the basis of their dominant personal qualities and motivations "residues". Both types were necessary, but Pareto tended to see a cyclical pattern of rule in societies in which "foxes" dominated in periods of upheaval and transition, only to be displaced by "lions" after the restoration of social order, chap. Pareto also noted that individuals in positions of power often attempt to maintain their privileged positions by closing off access for others. This risks social disruption by shutting off avenues of achievement and power to other talented individuals, who then mobilize to affect change. The "circulation of elites" refers to the process by which the ruling class is renewed periodically by superior individuals from other ranks. For Pareto, obstacles to elite circulation often resulted in the stagnation of the ruling class. Closed aristocracies and caste-like systems fostered tension, conflict, and eventually social change. Like Pareto, Mosca began with the assertion that elite rule is an empirical fact in all societies. Although he also noted the superior individual attributes of the "ruling class," his analysis was considerably more sociological than that of Pareto. Mosca emphasized the organizational advantages of the ruling elite in that they represented a relatively cohesive and easily organized minority against the disorganized masses Mosca, p. He also discussed the role of the "subelite," a technocratic stratum of managers, intellectuals, and bureaucrats that was increasingly important for elite rule in modern societies, pp. Social, economic, and technological changes often generated new opportunities and called forth new talents, bringing new elites into prominence. Mosca agreed with Pareto that closed systems of rule threatened social stability, since a stagnant elite impeded adaptation to change. In *Political Parties* [], Michels traced the necessity of elite rule in modern societies to the imperatives of complex organization. His classic study analyzed the German Social Democratic Party, but his arguments have been applied to a variety of organizational contexts. Once in power, leaders in organizations such as labor unions and political parties act to preserve their positions. Those who rise from lower levels in the organization are co-opted in a process that preserves the structure of power. The

resources available to institutional leaders and their relative unity of interest and perspective give them numerous advantages in maintaining their power over the unorganized rank and file. Over time, leaders develop similar interests and intraelite attachments that reflect their elevated position and separate them from the masses. For their part, Michels saw the masses contributing to elite rule through their general apathy and acquiescence. With his focus on organizational factors, Michels has been very influential in the development of contemporary elite approaches to power see Marger , pp. The former group includes the classical elite theorists and those who have extended their ideas see Field and Higley ; Burton and Higley In contrast, "critical" or "radical" elite theorists recognize the concentration of power in society but argue that this condition is neither inevitable nor desirable. Unlike the classical theorists who emphasized mass apathy or incompetence, critical elite theorists argue that elite domination is maintained through the manipulation and exploitation of nonelites. The most influential representative of the critical elite perspective is Mills Mills, Hunter , and other critical elite theorists developed their work in response to the dominance of "pluralist" studies of political power in the United States. Pluralism, as represented in the work of Dahl , Truman , Riesman , and others, held that power in modern democratic societies was widely dispersed and that those in decision-making positions were subject to significant mass pressures through electoral or other processes or the countervailing power of other institutional elites or organized interest groups. For Mills, the notion of a pluralist balance of power between competing interest groups was a romantic ideal rather than a description of political reality in the United States. He acknowledged the activities of labor unions, farm groups, professional associations, and other organized interest groups but argued that those groups operated mainly at the secondary, local, and "middle levels" of power. The power to make decisions of national and international scope rested with a "power elite" of individuals in top positions of authority in major corporations, the executive branch of government, and the military. Congress was consigned to the middle levels of power, along with most of the interest groups studied by pluralist social scientists. Mills traced the historical consolidation of the power elite to the growth of the federal government in the s and especially during World War II , as industrial production was coordinated with military needs through the government. That institutional alignment was strengthened in the Cold War years as the state expanded its commitment to national security, social welfare , and the direction of economic policy. By the s there was a significant shift in power from Congress to the executive branch, reflecting an expansion of government that required a complex information-gathering and administrative capacity. Congress lacked the resources and coherence required for modern state administration. Mills argued that most of the members of the power elite had similar values and interests, which reflected their similar backgrounds, common schools, shared membership in elite social clubs, and informal social interaction. He also emphasized the continuous professional interaction between these institutional leaders and the frequent exchange of top personnel between major corporations, the military, and the executive branch of government. Another factor contributing to the relative homogeneity of the power elite was their common experience at the apex of bureaucratic institutions. The skills, status, and even personality type required for success were similar in each sphere, reflecting their similarity of organizational structure Mills , p. The same social processes that had concentrated political power had created a society of increasingly fragmented individuals whose lives and interests were shaped for them from above. Information filtered selectively through bureaucratized institutions of mass education and the mass media, which became more susceptible to elite manipulation as they became more centralized. The media emphasized entertainment and consumption over information and critique. Educational institutions had developed into sites of large-scale vocational training rather than havens for the development of critical thought and an informed citizenry necessary for democratic politics Mills , chap. Pluralists argue that he exaggerated the unity of functional elites and neglected the influence of the electoral process and interest group competition. From the other direction, neo-Marxist and other class-theoretical analysts have been critical of the Millsian model for not acknowledging the extent to which political power is shaped by dominant economic interests see the debates collected in Domhoff and Ballard A key question in these disputes concerns the degree of elite cohesion. How much consensus or competition between elites is required to support an elite or pluralist model? What is the extent of elite competition? Is there a hierarchy of elites, with a ruling class or "power elite" on top, or a

"polyarchy" Dahl of diverse institutional powers? Elite theorists acknowledge that individuals with different skills and constituencies hold leadership positions in a variety of institutions such as prestigious universities, private foundations, major civic organizations, and the media see Dye Pluralists view these institutions as relatively autonomous sources of societal influence. Although one may identify "strategic elites," or influential leaders, in a variety of fields Keller , they see no overall cohesion or uniform coordination of policy within a single ruling group. However, those defending an elite perspective argue that disagreements over particular interests occur within a general elite consensus on basic ideology and acceptable policy. Some who work in this tradition go further than Mills in emphasizing the prominence of class interests and corporate power over the political process and other institutions in capitalist societies Miliband ; Useem ; Domhoff , Indeed, the distinction between "elite" and "class "analysis disappears in many such works on the similarities and differences, see Marger From this perspective, prestigious Ivy League universities may harbor intellectuals critical of the existing power structure, that but only those academics with "acceptable" views are selected as advisers to political elites in turn must maintain acceptable levels of business confidence and campaign finance to remain in power. In a similar vein, all parties agree that in a modern democratic system, the "elite," however defined, must pay some attention to the "masses. Pluralists hold that the public has a significant influence on elite decision making through voting, public opinion, and the threat of social protest. From a different starting point, some class-based analysts note the role of working class mobilization or the effects of other nonelite social movements, such as the civil rights movement, that force changes in the polity and society Piven and Cloward By contrast, those who emphasize elite power tend to leave little room for the influence of nonelites in promoting major social change. Change is viewed as the result of elite mobilization, intraelite conflict, or the circulation of elites. Mills, for example, viewed the major societal decisions in the United States as the product of elite decision making, while more specific, localized issues were more likely to be negotiated at the "middle levels" of power. Domhoff considers major policy formation processes by looking at the "agenda-setting" power of elites, noting that while pluralistic interest group competition does occur on specific issues, the general parameters of public discourse and public policy are set in advance and behind the scenes through organizations such as policy planning groups and presidential task forces that bring elites together to build a consensus on major policy issues before specific proposals enter the formal legislative process. Other elite theorists point out that even in periods of mass mobilization over policy issues, the power of elites over the public agenda allows public sentiment to be deflected or diffused by temporary measures or by redirecting public attention to peripheral issues Prewitt and Stone , pp. This perspective, which is popular again today, holds that with the emergence of modern industrial societies and liberal democracy, elites increasingly represent a stratum of talented individuals filling important positions of leadership in dominant institutions see especially Keller ; see also Mannheim ; Aron Variations on this theme point to a "New Class" of "knowledge" workers in "postindustrial" managerial and information-based professions and a proliferation of new institutional elites that transcend the old hierarchies of caste and class Keller ; Bell From this perspective, modern elites are functionally necessary in a society of complex organizations and increasingly specialized occupations. The legitimacy of functional elites is supported to the extent that relatively equal opportunities to attain those positions are available to all talented and motivated individuals. The validity of this "meritocracy" model of power is directly related to the issue of elite recruitment and the extent to which positions of power are open to nonelites. Once again, at one level there is general agreement among all parties on the relative openness of modern societies in comparison to traditional systems in which elite "recruitment" often was based on birth. In contemporary societies, differentiation fostered a proliferation of institutional elites requiring specific talents and skills in a variety of fields see Keller However, beyond this empirical fact, the questions of contention are: The first question has been the subject of much research in stratification and will be dealt with only briefly here. The meritocracy model assumes equal opportunity for individuals, but considerable research has challenged this assumption. For example, if elite positions are based on merit, educational institutions must provide avenues for mobility and equal opportunity for talented individuals from nonelite backgrounds, but a basic criticism of functionalist theories of stratification is that existing structures of inequality create barriers to nonelite achievement see Tumin Beyond the obvious

inequality of economic resources and formal educational institutions, the work of Bourdieu and others Bourdieu ; Bourdieu and Passeron ; DiMaggio and Mohr has shown how the unequal distribution of "cultural capital" among groups in different locations in the class structure contributes to the reproduction of inequality in a variety of subtle ways. This research also points to the difficulty in assessing differences in "talent" among individuals or groups, since indicators such as "intelligence," cultural appreciation, and political knowledge may reflect a preexisting distribution of cultural resources. A more fundamental question regarding the openness of elite recruitment is: First, if the concern is the overall structure of power, as it was for Mills and most elite theorists, the success of a few upwardly mobile individuals from the lower strata does not affect the analysis: Power still may be concentrated in a few in key positions.

2: Elites and democracy in Ghana: A social network approach | African Affairs | Oxford Academic

An elite democracy refers to a system of government in which the leaders of large bureaucratic organizations, corporate, governmental or nonprofit, are able to exercise a significant degree of influence on society.

Biography[edit] Born on June 1, , in Omaha , Nebraska , Christopher Lasch came from a highly political family rooted in the left. Louis he won a Pulitzer prize for editorials criticizing the Vietnam War. He taught at the University of Iowa and then was a professor of history at the University of Rochester from until his death from cancer in . Lasch also took a conspicuous public role. Russell Jacoby acknowledged this in writing that "I do not think any other historian of his generation moved as forcefully into the public arena". Wright Mills but also in earlier independent voices such as Dwight Macdonald. At this point Lasch began to formulate what would become his signature style of social critique: Death[edit] After seemingly successful cancer surgery in , Lasch was diagnosed with metastatic cancer in . Upon learning that it was unlikely to significantly prolong his life, he refused chemotherapy, observing that it would rob him of the energy he needed to continue writing and teaching. To one persistent specialist, he wrote: His first major book, *The New Radicalism in America: His basic thesis about the family, which he first expressed in and explored for the rest of his career, was: When government was centralized and politics became national in scope, as they had to be to cope with the energies let loose by industrialism, and when public life became faceless and anonymous and society an amorphous democratic mass, the old system of paternalism in the home and out of it collapsed, even when its semblance survived intact. The patriarch, though he might still preside in splendor at the head of his board, had come to resemble an emissary from a government which had been silently overthrown. The mere theoretical recognition of his authority by his family could not alter the fact that the government which was the source of all his ambassadorial powers had ceased to exist. American Life in an Age of Diminishing Expectations , sought to relate the hegemony of modern-day capitalism to an encroachment of a "therapeutic" mindset into social and family life similar to that already theorized by Philip Rieff. Lasch posited that social developments in the 20th century e. He claimed, further, that this personality type conformed to structural changes in the world of work e. With those developments, he charged, inevitably there arose a certain therapeutic sensibility and thus dependence that, inadvertently or not, undermined older notions of self-help and individual initiative. By the s even pleas for "individualism" were desperate and essentially ineffectual cries which expressed a deeper lack of meaningful individuality. The True and Only Heaven[edit] Most explicitly in *The True and Only Heaven*, Lasch developed a critique of social change among the middle classes in the US, explaining and seeking to counteract the fall of elements of " populism ". He sought to rehabilitate this populist or producerist alternative tradition: It is very radically democratic and in that sense it clearly belongs on the Left. But on the other hand it has a good deal more respect for tradition than is common on the Left, and for religion too. He wrote that A feminist movement that respected the achievements of women in the past would not disparage housework, motherhood or unpaid civic and neighborly services. It would not make a paycheck the only symbol of accomplishment. It would insist that people need self-respecting honorable callings, not glamorous careers that carry high salaries but take them away from their families. Lasch was not generally sympathetic to the cause of what was then known as the New Right , particularly those elements of libertarianism most evident in its platform; he detested the encroachment of the capitalist marketplace into all aspects of American life. Lasch rejected the dominant political constellation that emerged in the wake of the New Deal in which economic centralization and social tolerance formed the foundations of American liberal ideals, while also rebuking the diametrically opposed synthetic conservative ideology fashioned by William F. Lasch also was surprisingly critical and at times dismissive toward his closest contemporary kin in social philosophy, communitarianism as elaborated by Amitai Etzioni. He explained in one of his books *The Minimal Self*, [23] "it goes without saying that sexual equality in itself remains an eminently desirable objective In *Women and the Common Life*, [24] Lasch clarified that urging women to abandon the household and forcing them into a position of economic dependence, in the workplace, pointing out the importance of professional careers does not entail liberation, as long as these careers are*

governed by the requirements of corporate economy. *The Revolt of the Elites: And the Betrayal of Democracy* [edit] In his last months, he worked closely with his daughter Elisabeth to complete *The Revolt of the Elites*: For him, our epoch is determined by a social phenomenon: According to Lasch, the new elites, i. In this, they oppose the old bourgeoisie of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, which was constrained by its spatial stability to a minimum of rooting and civic obligations. Globalization, according to the sociologist, has turned elites into tourists in their own countries. The de-nationalization of society tends to produce a class who see themselves as "world citizens, but without accepting Their ties to an international culture of work, leisure, information - make many of them deeply indifferent to the prospect of national decline. Instead of financing public services and the public treasury, new elites are investing their money in improving their voluntary ghettos: They have "withdrawn from common life". Composed of those who control the international flows of capital and information, who preside over philanthropic foundations and institutions of higher education, manage the instruments of cultural production and thus fix the terms of public debate. So, the political debate is limited mainly to the dominant classes and political ideologies lose all contact with the concerns of the ordinary citizen. The result of this is that no one has a likely solution to these problems and that there are furious ideological battles on related issues. However, they remain protected from the problems affecting the working classes: In addition, he finalized his intentions for the essays to be included in *Women and the Common Life: The American Liberals and the Russian Revolution*. *The New Radicalism in America* *The Intellectual As a Social Type*. *The Agony of the American Left*. *The World of Nations*. *Haven in a Heartless World: Psychic Survival in Troubled Times*. *The True and Only Heaven: Progress and Its Critics*. *And the Betrayal of Democracy*, *W. Women and the Common Life: Love, Marriage, and Feminism*. *A Guide to Written English*. *Journal of Southern History*.

3: Christopher Lasch - Wikipedia

A democracy OF the elites is one in which elite social CLASSES of wealth, power, education, or heredity, govern the Democratic processes. For instance, Britain before the 19th century, Rome before the Caesars, Athens.

Do we have a government of the people, by the people, for the people? It is of the rich, by the poor, for the rich. The arrangement suits the state establishment that requires a dispensation with democratic credentials to manage political institutions. Its past adventures in directly managing political institutions have led to public dissonance. The use of money and the role of the moneyed in elections and politics have increased to an extent that the less endowed stand almost no chance of contesting, let alone winning, an election. The kind of money that has crept into politics is evident from the declarations of assets and liabilities that parliamentarians have to submit to the Election Commission every year. The cumulative value of assets declared by esteemed members for amounts to Rs The average value of assets for a member comes to Rs Strangely, the elected representatives are not legally required to declare their annual income and taxes they have paid, though they submit it once at the time of nomination for elections. Secret accounts of the rich and powerful This data is not exhaustive. While the gazette for has yet to be published, the one issued for includes declarations of the assets and liabilities of out of members of the National Assembly, members of the Senate, 25 of members of the KP Assembly, of members of the Punjab Assembly, and all members of the Sindh and Balochistan legislatures. The value of total assets will only increase if the data for MPAs is included. The average value of assets may, however, fluctuate. The value of assets in these declarations is based on self-estimates by members. The actual value may be far more than what is declared. The total value of assets of members in the National Assembly is Rs A party-wise analysis of the value of assets only strengthens the argument that the rich and mighty are the best choices for most political parties. The cumulative value of assets held by members of the national and provincial assemblies belonging to the PML-N whose declarations were available comes to Rs The 22 independents in the national and provincial assemblies whose declarations were available hold assets amounting to a whopping Rs3. However, there are exceptions. For instance, there are 29 members of national and provincial assemblies belonging to all major parties whose assets are less than a million rupees. The survey has examined key distributions across five standardised per capita consumption quintiles, each containing 20pc of the population. The first quintile contains the poorest 20pc and the fifth the richest. The average monthly income of people in the first quintile is Rs16,, the second Rs20,, the third Rs24,, the fourth Rs29, and the last Rs53, Clearly, a majority of members of the elected houses are not in sync with the needs of the poverty-strewn citizenry. Election is essential but not sufficient for democracy. The quality of representation is at the heart of democratic culture and institutions. The assets analysis only establishes that the electoral system is not ensuring genuine representation. The elected houses should not only be representative of the ethnic, geographic and religious diversities but also of the income classes. Unfortunately, the framers of the Constitution prescribed reserved seats for peasants, workers and women, who together form the majority of the population, and that too in local government institutions. Ironic indeed but affirmative action was recommended for the majority income class when in fact it should be for the minority income class – the rich. Incisive reforms are needed to enhance representation of the majority who belong to low and middle income groups. The issue can be dealt with through radical political reforms by making it mandatory for political parties to give tickets to people with limits on maximum annual income and assets, including 50pc tickets to women and 10pc to non-Muslim minorities. Some reserved seats may be allocated for the rich; otherwise they can be allowed to contest for Senate through direct election on a proportional representation basis with the province as the constituency. The proponents of democracy who are in power always hide behind constitutional rights and entitlements to defend the case of the rich and the mighty and not the poor and the downtrodden. Unless electoral and political reforms are radical, the citizenry will continue to wait for mega investments in education, health, clean water, housing, farm-to-market roads, agriculture, workers, the welfare system for women, farmers, labourers, pensioners, the aged, minorities and the disabled. The writer works with the Free and Fair Election Network. Published in Dawn, April 7th,

4: Elite theory of democracy | Anupam Verma - www.enganchecubano.com

Elite theory argues either that democracy is a utopian folly, as it is traditionally viewed in the conservative Italian tradition, or that democracy is not realizable within capitalism, as is the view of the more Marxist-compatible contemporary elite theory permutation.

His most recent book is *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy*. How would you sum up the last year? What has happened to the world order? The big surprise is that this wave of populist nationalism has happened in the home territory of classic, liberalist Anglo-Saxon areas. The other problem with Donald Trump is his utter lack of qualification for the job, be it preparation, character or temperament. Nothing since his inauguration has eased any of those concerns, either. So what would you tell the people that say that he just is a tip of the iceberg, representing a repressed, white rural demographic? Well, the majority of Americans voted against him. He has emotional support from a small group of people, but nothing close to the majority of the country behind him. The interesting aspect to his presidency for me is the role of the Republicans in this. When do they stall and say: Does his opinion influence the behavior of voters overseas, especially in the Netherlands and France, where elections will soon be happening? On one hand, the leaders there, of course, enjoy the praise of the U. On the other, you have a good amount of anti-Americanism in Europe. Is this wave of populism pushing European institutions into a crisis? In the next generation, Africa will literally pour into Europe. You must secure those outer water borders, and then look into internal borders. At the same time, migration is simply picking up in pace — some Poles moved to the United Kingdom in recent years. But is inter-European migration different from intercontinental migration? The European Union has done very little in terms of identity creation. In many cases, it has even been going in the other direction, where regionalism is prioritized. We have seen that in Scotland, for example, and Catalonia. The real question here though is sovereignty. Many of these separatist areas have their own institutions. The cultural picture of serenity is utopian though. Populism exists because institutions are elite-driven. The problem is inequality in economic integration. Is one side more favored than the other? Poles that take jobs away from Britons create resentment. Economic globalization has exceeded the boundaries of political globalization. The German-Greek debt debate is the best example of that, with Germans feeling angry about having to send taxpayer money to Greece. So after 70 years of somewhat successful multilateralism and a European effort of institution-building, we are going backwards? The focus and hope back then was on economic integration, and that through this economic globalization the cultures would integrate. The benefits of globalization were not shared equally, which is why there is a pushback. The majority of people still, as we said earlier, are on a national, if not regional level. Changing that will be extremely difficult and lengthy. What are the remedies? There is no blueprint remedy for what the debate asks for as of now. Education is certainly a factor, both generational and also retraining people in jobs that are faced by extinction, especially in jobs that are becoming more and more replaced by robots and AI. But what does that mean in the bigger picture? Are we supposed to disentangle politics, economics and culture and break down every international concept into a national and regional level? Or should we try to get everybody onto the same page and unify intentions going forward? So let me give you an example: Under President George W. Bush, an attempt failed. Essentially, the left and right of the debate both have a point. On the other side, the U. A national ID card would be a logical solution, but the left and right alike distrust the government too much to push such an idea through. The American political system is deadlocked, neither side wants to give way. WorldPost illustration "It seems [that] anything people read on the internet they consider valid," Fukuyama said of the recent uptick in "fake news. It actually bothers me more as a citizen than as an academic. It seems [that] anything people read on the internet they consider valid, although there is nobody standing in between the producer and consumer of information, as we are used to it from old-fashioned news. Now, Russia and China, amongst others, are actively playing a role in undermining the credibility of information, which constitutes a new form of warfare that is being conducted. On the other hand, I can argue that institutions have always been controlled by the elites, and that through the presence of the internet they

are losing their power. But that is all to be seen in the upcoming years. This interview has been edited and condensed for clarity.

5: Elite democracy - Newspaper - www.enganchecubano.com

Essay on Governing Elite. written about is "Greece and the Crisis of the Governing Elite." The article was a very interesting and in-depth look at the crisis befalling Greece and Europe as a whole.

History[edit] Italian school of elitism[edit] Vilfredo Pareto “ , Gaetano Mosca “ , and Robert Michels “ , were cofounders of the Italian school of elitism, which influenced subsequent elite theory in the Western tradition. Power lies in position of authority in key economic and political institutions. The psychological difference that sets elites apart is that they have personal resources, for instance intelligence and skills, and a vested interest in the government; while the rest are incompetent and do not have the capabilities of governing themselves, the elite are resourceful and strive to make the government work. For in reality, the elite would have the most to lose in a failed state. Vilfredo Pareto[edit] Pareto emphasized the psychological and intellectual superiority of elites, believing that they were the highest accomplishers in any field. He discussed the existence of two types of elites: Governing elites Non-governing elites He also extended the idea that a whole elite can be replaced by a new one and how one can circulate from being elite to non-elite. Gaetano Mosca[edit] Mosca emphasized the sociological and personal characteristics of elites. He said elites are an organized minority and that the masses are an unorganized majority. The ruling class is composed of the ruling elite and the sub-elites. He divides the world into two groups: Ruling class Class that is ruled Robert Michels[edit] Sociologist Michels developed the iron law of oligarchy where, he asserts, social and political organizations are run by few individuals, and social organization and labor division are key. He believed that all organizations were elitist and that elites have three basic principles that help in the bureaucratic structure of political organization: Need for leaders, specialized staff and facilities Utilization of facilities by leaders within their organization The importance of the psychological attributes of the leaders Contemporary elite theorists[edit] Elmer Eric Schattschneider[edit] Elmer Eric Schattschneider offered a strong critique of the American political theory of pluralism: Rather than an essentially democratic system in which the many competing interests of citizens are amply represented, if not advanced, by equally many competing interest groups , Schattschneider argued the pressure system is biased in favor of "the most educated and highest-income members of society", and showed that "the difference between those who participate in interest group activity and those who stand at the sidelines is much greater than between voters and nonvoters". The "range of organized, identifiable, known groups is amazingly narrow; there is nothing remotely universal about it" and the "business or upper-class bias of the pressure system shows up everywhere". He says the "notion that the pressure system is automatically representative of the whole community is a myth" and, instead, the "system is skewed, loaded and unbalanced in favor of a fraction of a minority". Wright Mills[edit] Mills published his book *The Power Elite* in , claiming a new sociological perspective on systems of power in the United States. He identified a triumvirate of power groups“political, economic and military“which form a distinguishable, although not unified, power-wielding body in the United States. Mills proposed that this group had been generated through a process of rationalization at work in all advanced industrial societies whereby the mechanisms of power became concentrated, funneling overall control into the hands of a limited, somewhat corrupt group. *The Structure and Practice of National Socialism*, “ , a study of how Nazism came to power in the German democratic state. It provided the tools to analyze the structure of a political system and served as a warning of what could happen in a modern capitalistic democracy. Floyd Hunter[edit] The elite theory analysis of power was also applied on the micro scale in community power studies such as that by Floyd Hunter Hunter examined in detail the power of relationships evident in his "Regional City" looking for the "real" holders of power rather than those in obvious official positions. He posited a structural-functional approach that mapped hierarchies and webs of interconnection within the city“mapping relationships of power between businessmen, politicians, clergy etc. The study was promoted to debunk current concepts of any "democracy" present within urban politics and reaffirm the arguments for a true representative democracy. Schwartz examining the power structures within the sphere of the corporate elite in the United States. William Domhoff researched local and national decision making

process networks seeking to illustrate the power structure in the United States. He asserts, much like Hunter, that an elite class that owns and manages large income-producing properties like banks and corporations dominate the American power structure politically and economically. Francis and Paul Gottfried in their theories of the managerial state. Burnham described his thoughts on elite theory more specifically in his book, *The Machiavellians*, which discusses, among others, Pareto, Mosca, and Michels. Burnham attempts a scientific analysis of both elites and politics generally. Putnam[edit] Putnam saw the development of technical and exclusive knowledge among administrators and other specialist groups as a mechanism that strips power from the democratic process and slips it to the advisors and specialists who influence the decision process. Gonzalez writes on the power of U. In *The Politics of Air Pollution: Urban Growth, Ecological Modernization and Symbolic Inclusion* and also in *Urban Sprawl, Global Warming, and the Empire of Capital* Gonzalez employs elite theory to explain the interrelationship between environmental policy and urban sprawl in America. His most recent work, *Energy and Empire: The Politics of Nuclear and Solar Power in the United States* demonstrates that economic elites tied their advocacy of the nuclear energy option to post American foreign policy goals, while at the same time these elites opposed government support for other forms of energy, such as solar, that cannot be dominated by one nation. Ralf Dahrendorf[edit] In his book *Reflections on the Revolution in Europe*, [16] Ralf Dahrendorf asserts that, due to advanced level of competence required for political activity, a political party tends to become, actually, a provider of "political services", that is, the administration of local and governmental public offices. During the electoral campaign, each party tries to convince voters it is the most suitable for managing the state business. The logical consequence would be to acknowledge this character and openly register the parties as service providing companies. In this way, the ruling class would include the members and associates of legally acknowledged companies and the "class that is ruled" would select by election the state administration company that best fits its interests. Martin Gilens and Benjamin I. Page[edit] In their statistical analysis of 1, policy issues professors Martin Gilens and Benjamin Page found that "economic elites and organized groups representing business interests have substantial independent impacts on U. Set out most extensively in his book *Golden Rule: The Investment Theory of Party Competition and the Logic of Money-driven Political Systems*, the theory begins by noting that in modern political systems the cost of acquiring political awareness is so great that no citizen can afford it.

6: Democracy and Elite | Intercollegiate Studies Institute: Educating for Liberty

The purpose of this study is to ascertain how certain important changes in Finnish society in the s altered the national elite structures and affected democracy.

I also declare that my work is in accordance with the all the said guidelines provided by the faculty. I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep sense of gratitude towards my course teacher, Mr. Avinash Samal for giving me constant guidance and encouragement throughout the course of the project. I would also like to thank the University for providing me the internet and library facilities which were indispensable for getting relevant content on the subject, as well as subscriptions to online databases and journals, which were instrumental in writing relevant text. Insofar as national events are decided, the power elite are those who decide them. Wright Mills According to Mills, understanding the middle classes it is not something much difficult, but understanding the very top of modern society requests discovery and description. These writers attacked classical democratic thought and also Aristotle and Karl Marx. Majority rule, they insisted, is impossible. Every society is divided into those who rule and those who are ruled; and the rulers constitute only a small minority of any society. It is the few, under any political system, who exercise effective control. History features a continuing struggle among elites. That struggle will never end, and a classless society cannot be created. Elite theory is a theory of the state which seeks to describe and explain the power relationships in contemporary society. Through positions in corporations or on corporate boards, and influence over the policy-planning networks through financial support of foundations or positions with think tanks or policy-discussion groups, members of the "elite" are able to exert significant power over the policy decisions of corporations and governments¹. In Defence of Elitism. Research Methodology This research is descriptive and analytical in nature. Accumulation of the information on the topic include wide use of secondary sources like books, e-articles etc. The matter from these sources have been compiled and analysed to understand the concept from the grass root level. The structure of the project, as instructed by the Faculty of Political Science has been adhered to and the same has been helpful in giving the project a fine finish off. To these might be added C. The classical elitist thesis does not merely assert that in a society the minority makes decisions and the majority obeys. This is an obvious truth with no power to explain political relationships. The elitist argument is stronger; it states that the dominant minority cannot be controlled by the majority, whatever democratic mechanisms are used. An implication of this is that the supposed elite constitute a coherent, united and self-conscious group and these qualities appear in nearly all definitions. The theory of elites was presented systematically by Vilfredo Pareto in his work "The Mind and Society". Accordingly, elites are seen by Pareto not as the product of economic forces nor as building their dominance on their organizational ability but as the outcome of what Pareto believed to be human attributes constant throughout history. Interest groups such as unions, and employers who also play the democratic game by competing for a share in the national product, are all part of the one elite. The ruling class controls most of the wealth, power and prestige in society and exercises all power. Whatever form of government might be adopted. The rules are not competent to replace it. This view point is deducible from his famous passage regarded as the most concise statement of the general elitist position, the passage reads: In all societies two classes of people appear "a class that rules and a class that is ruled. Accordingly, no mechanism for ensuring the accountability of the leaders to the public, no ideology which enshrines the principle of majority will can prevent the elite from imposing its supremacy over the rest of society. Wright Mills, who adopted an institutional approach, shares with Burnham the belief that the status and compositions of elite cannot properly be explained in terms of the talents or psychology of its individual members but must be studied in the context of the economic and social structure of the particular society. Such contract may range from conscious conspiracy to a mere consensus amongst the leaders as to policies and values. James Burnham James Burnham presents an economic approach to elite domination. This is as opposed to Pareto, who adopted a psychological approach. His contention in the Managerial Revolution was that the capitalist system was in decline and would be replaced by a society controlled economically and politically by managerial elite. Social change occurs as a result of a shift in the

composition of the elite – old elite replaced by a new one. An egalitarian, classless society is inconceivable in the conditions of advanced industrialized societies with their need for technical training and expertise. This may be an act of inevitability rather than rational calculation. It became fashionable for regimes of all shades and colours to claim to derive their powers to govern from the people, hence their recourse to democracy. The result was the birth of a new theory elitist theory and practice democratic elitism of democracy these new elite theorists define democracy from the minimalist perspective, which prescribes the criteria of democracy as regular electoral competitions, usually in a multi-party system, and thus, governmental succession by constitutional electoral procedures, guaranteeing the rule of law. In political and theory, power elite consider a small group of people who control a disproportionate amount of wealth, privilege, and access to decision-making of global consequence. Mills describes the relationship between political, military, and economic elite. Wright Mills, among the best known power-elite theorists, the governing elite in the United States draws its members from three areas: Even though these individuals constitute a close-knit group, they are not part of a conspiracy that secretly manipulates events in their own selfish interest. For the most part, the elite respects civil liberties, follows established constitutional principles, and operates openly and 11 Elite Theory of Democracy peacefully. It is not a dictatorship; it does not rely on terror, a secret police, or midnight arrests to get its way. Nor is its membership closed, although many members have enjoyed a head start in life by virtue of their being born into prominent families. Nevertheless, those who work hard, enjoy good luck, and demonstrate a willingness to adopt elite values do find it possible to work into higher circles from below. If the elite do not derive its power from repression or inheritance, from where does its strength come? Basically it comes from control of the highest positions in the political and business hierarchy and from shared values and beliefs. Democratic Elitism The relationship between the democratic state and its elites is a matter of some controversy. The debate has undergone several vicissitudes since the "classical elitists" began it in the late nineteenth century. The role of elites within democratic governments presents democratic theorists with one of their thorniest problems. On the one hand, democracies are based upon some type of political equality among citizens- an equality which must be politically significant. On the other hand, wherever we look, we find political inequalities, sometimes great ones, within democracies. Democratic theorists have long held that there is a practical and theoretical problem concerning the place of elites within democratic politics. We cannot attain a balanced 12 Elite Theory of Democracy appreciation of the role elites play in political democracy until we appreciate the important distinction between democratic organizations and a democratic polity. Largely interred in the inter-war years, it was resurrected by Wright Mills and others in the s and given impetus by electoral studies and the "political behaviour" movement. There were some who saw elites and elitist tendencies as inimical to democracy and those who believed the two could quite easily be reconciled. Among the latter were the so-called "democratic elitists. Modern society is based upon a complex division of labour and upon large-scale economic and political organizations. The administration of these requires high skill, intelligence and experience. This fact leads to a division of the population into two groups. On the one hand are the highly skilled managers, administrators and bureaucrats; on the other are the unskilled masses⁴. In the resulting hierarchy, the former occupy positions of power and privilege, while the latter are restricted to non-policy-making functions. Because of this fact, and because those who hold positions of power will not surrender them voluntarily, the policy-makers tend to consolidate themselves into a class which defends its privileged positions against any attempts by the masses to displace it. This The subject of elite power seems even more relevant today. Since the s, social and economic policy-making has continued to disproportionately benefit those in power. Inequality in the US and similar capitalist democracies has risen steadily. The real incomes of the middle and lower classes have stagnated or declined in recent decades. There are fewer, more powerful chief executives, presiding over larger conglomerates. Their incomes are hundreds of times greater than average earnings. Individual international financiers control rather larger capital amounts than they ever did before. The invasion of Iraq demonstrates that tiny groups of politicians and advisors are still able to push the US and other nations into major conflicts with little accountability. Declining levels of voter turnout and trust as well as large social movement protests in mature democracies are testament to the growing dissatisfaction of publics with their elites. On the other hand, ruling elites appear more constrained by

circumstances. Politicians, financiers and CEOs all know rather less than they did about those sectors they manage. They are professional leaders, lacking experience or knowledge about what they decide on. It is a world of technical expertise, complexity and risk. Politicians are not equipped to challenge expert advice on economics, military capabilities, health systems and a wealth of other policy areas. So too, the erratic power of a powerful and varied news media has offered greater challenges to elites wishing to gain or maintain power. Politicians of all over the world, more than ever, are dependent on favourable news outlets and large financial war chests to fund advertising blitzes. In effect, decision-making and wealth, and hence power, are more concentrated and centralised, but the wielding of power by individuals may be more constrained. The mechanisms of control, from financial to new tax rules, are more inhuman and unforgiving, even for ruling elites. The range of intermediaries, who have an influence on elites, has extended. Journalists, editors, technical and expert networks, accountants and bureaucrats, at home and abroad, both aid and restrict elites. Risks and consequences are difficult to fathom. Paradigm shifts are harder to achieve. This is the fourth time the company has been fined in the last four years. The first three fines were imposed by the UPA government. But nobody can reliance industries are not paying any heed to governments fines⁶. It completely disregards any possible social or economic basis for class-stratification. This is a way of asserting that authority-subordination relationships are the basic relationships in society. A scientific demonstration of this assumption is still awaited. It is further based upon the questionable historical prognostication that ". This confusion is especially likely to occur in elitist theory in-so-far as it follows the method of lumping all socio-economic systems and all types of social organizations into one category, even such disparate ones as the modern states, trade unions and corporations, all under the label "large-scale social organizations.

7: Types of democracy (article) | Khan Academy

This month, the Tocqueville 21 Blog will be featuring a series of articles and interviews on the subject of elitism and democracy in contemporary France.

To me, this book loses its way and stops being about elites in revolt or not in the last section of the book. This is a pity, as I think the start was particularly interesting. Now, is a significantly long time ago, even if it does seem like yesterday, and yet a lot of what is said here could have, in fact, been written yesterday. The main thrust of the start of the book is that the growing inequality in our society is producing such a disconnection between those who rule and those who are ruled that they might as well live on separate planets. Nevertheless, growing inequality is an international phenomenon and it is having many of the same impacts across the globe as it is in the US. In the first half of the nineteenth century most people who gave any thought to the matter assumed that democracy had to rest on a broad distribution of property. They understood that extremes of wealth and poverty would be fatal to the democratic experiment. Ideas, like property, need to be distributed as widely as possible. In practice, diversity turns out to legitimize a new dogmatism, in which rival minorities take shelter behind a set of beliefs impervious to rational discussion. The physical segregation of the population in self-enclosed, racially homogeneous enclaves has its counterpart in the balkanization of opinion. Although hereditary advantages play an important part in the attainment of professional and managerial status, the new class has to maintain the fiction that its power rest on intelligence alone p39 Social mobility does not undermine the influence of elites; if anything, it helps to solidify their influence by supporting the illusion that it rests solely on merit. It merely strengthens the likelihood that elites will exercise power irresponsibly, precisely because they recognise so few obligations to their predecessors or to the communities they profess to lead. The teaching function would be concentrated in a class of professional specialists, whereas it ought to be diffused throughout the whole community. An educational establishment was just as dangerous as a priestly or military establishment. The more closely capitalism came to be identified with immediate gratification and planned obsolescence, the more relentlessly it wore away the moral foundations of family life. It has become strictly functional: We eat and drink on the run. Our fast-paced habits leave neither time nor "more important" places for good talk, even in cities the whole point of which, it might be argued, is to promote it p As neighbourhood hangouts give way to suburban shopping malls, or, on the other hand, to private cocktail parties, the essential political art of conversation is replaced by shoptalk or personal gossip. Increasingly, conversation literally has no place in American society. In its absence, how "or, better, where" can political habits be acquired and polished? Instead we find college graduates working in jobs for which they are vastly overqualified.

8: The Revolt of the Elites and the Betrayal of Democracy by Christopher Lasch

17 Elite Theory of Democracy Conclusion Elite theory emphasizes, in several different streams, that society always has been and always will be controlled by a small group called the elite. This group is composed of those individuals who are superior performers in society.

Abiy Ahmed and Lemma Megersa, in November According to the dominant assessment , the crisis in Ethiopia reflects the absolute antagonism between two well-defined blocks. Nevertheless, this block has made gestures of opening up that were unthinkable a few months ago, and promises more. It has released more than political prisoners, including key leaders of the legal opposition. ANDM has made a similar gesture. Never before have the official news channels of Oromia and of the Amhara region, as well as the private media, enjoyed such a degree of freedom of expression. For its detractors, however, the proclamation of a second state of emergency, on February 16, is evidence that this block still favours force as the tool of getting its way. In response to mass protest, they say, it has simply yielded some tactical ground, which it will subsequently recover, while ultimately keeping hold of the essential. How the opposing camp is seen The opposing camp is seen as the proponent of radical change. It is also weakened by its fragmentation, disorganization, woolliness, and disunity over objectives. This camp is unanimous in its pursuit of one primary, specific and concrete goal: However, it is much less explicit and clear about what to put in their place. In fact, like the ruling power itself, this opposition is enamoured of catchall slogans: Like the ruling power itself, this opposition is enamoured of catchall slogans: This assessment is too simplistic to reflect the complexity and indeterminacy of the situation. In fact, there are two crises, not just one. Obviously interconnected, their origins, the players involved, and the objectives sought, are different: Elitist conceptions of power Underpinning everything is the elitist conception and practice of power. Under the influence of the radical student movement, the revolution of that led to the fall of the Emperor simply modified its expression, but not its essence. Social organization, in which imperial absolutism and its successive hierarchized variants, right down to the individual level, ultimately derived from divine will, gave way to an organization dominated by a new elite whose legitimacy was rooted in knowledge. A fundamental postulate is that the absolute nature of power at its apex is immanent and intangible. But well beyond the circles of government, the vast majority of Ethiopian elites, be they political, economic, social, or cultural, subscribe to the same vision. How many countries are there where the name of a political figure is generally preceded or followed in the press with the abbreviation Dr. At the other end of the social scale, this segregation is widely internalized. So a fundamental postulate is that the absolute nature of power at its apex is immanent and intangible. This is the only way that it can play its fundamental role: It was totalitarian in the etymological sense, in that it extended well beyond the political sphere alone. In particular, there was no boundary between institutional position, family position, and business position: Meles Zenawi pushed this to the extreme, becoming an unchallenged embodiment of personal power. With his sudden death, the elitist structure he had established has collapsed. If it has been done chaotically, that structure nevertheless had no choice but to seek to rebuild itself. In recent months, this attempt at reconstruction has entered a phase of acute crisis. A succession of meetings was held by the four ethnic components of the governing coalition with the official aim of examining the progress and results of this process. The meetings were longer lasting more than a year and more bitter than ever before, so were expected to yield a roadmap out of the crisis. They churned out the same leitmotif: However, nothing in the official releases suggested a meaningful inflection in the main components of the political line. Power struggle Ultimately, therefore, all the available information points to the fact that the main cause of the breakdown in the governing coalition is a power struggle. The leaderships have been heavily criticized, have performed their acts of contrition and undergone purges and promotions, culminating in a big first: The major feature of this event, stressed by all observers and greeted in some places with popular jubilation, is that he is Oromo. What is mainly at stake in the crisis at the top is a new redistribution of powers and resources within the coalition and along ethnic lines: Does the election of Abiy Ahmed mark the beginning of the end of this leadership crisis, the start of a return to working order? The battle has been interminable, long in the balance,

riddled with byzantine manoeuvres. One reliable observer of the political scene, close to TPLF, sums up the process in three stark words: The TPLF put forward no candidate, so would hold the casting vote for one of the three candidates, each of whom was assumed to have the support of his respective party. In a clear sign of its political decline, the TPLF failed. This election confirms a fundamental turning point in the regime. In addition, the TPLF is facing increased defiance in Tigray itself, on the part of the population in general, intellectuals, and even its own officials. They accuse their leadership of being unable to push through the kind of development in Tigray that has been enjoyed by other regions like Oromia or Amhara, and at the same time of being riddled with corruption. The other parties come out of it no better. The inner divisions inside these parties have become deeper. More and more ordinary members, but also mid-level officials, turned a blind eye to or even supported the popular protests, even within the administration and the regional security forces.

Second state of emergency The circumstances of the proclamation of the second state of emergency are symptomatic of these dissensions. The leaderships of these two parties have an ambivalent and divided attitude to the popular protest movement. Nobody controls it, certainly not they. Its target is the positions and advantages unfairly acquired by the establishment, and OPDO has certainly not been a back marker in this race for illicit privileges. In addition to the divisions between the four components of the governing coalition, there are varying degrees of dissension within each of them. Abiy Ahmed As well as the explosions of joy in Oromia in particular, congratulations and promises of support have come from all quarters, including websites close to the TPLF. On the points that have attracted the most interest, Abiy Ahmed simply reaffirms more vigorously positions that have already been presented. Towards the diaspora, in general very hostile to the regime: It is also its obligation to ensure that the law is respected. All these ambiguities obviously affect how much room for manoeuvre Abiy has. Rather than enjoying a clear mandate that would give him a strong political footing, he is likely to have to play things by ear, handicapped by the recurrent conflicts between the different factions that could continue to divide the leadership, including determined opponents who have no intention of burying the hatchet. Rather than possessing a roadmap corresponding to the intentions that he affirms "or are expected from him" there are significant forces which would rather see continuity take precedence over profound changes, let alone those the legal opposition is clamouring for, and in particular the Qeerroo. The Qeerroo So who are the Qeerroo? In the absence of field research, the answers are hypothetical and contradictory. According to some, they are a new social group, of a kind never seen before, the product of downward social mobility associated with urbanisation. The emerging middle class seems to be holding back. It is probably afraid that major disorder may deprive it of the small gains it has achieved. Essentially, inhabitants of cities and towns the urban population has quadrupled in 30 years, who have broken from the peasant economy and the traditional values of the previous generation, largely undereducated though secondary school enrolment has also quadrupled over the same period, the quality of education has not kept pace and therefore underemployed and frustrated, and, by contrast with the parochialism of the previous generation, open to ideas and images of the world thanks to their mobile phones and increasingly the web. They are the ones igniting the street, whereas the emerging middle class usually at the forefront in democratisation movements seems to be holding back, especially in Addis Ababa, where it is the most concentrated. It is probably afraid that major disorder may deprive it of the small gains it has achieved and result in confrontations as bloody as under the Derg dictatorship. They represent the whole of the younger generation, urban and rural, educated and uneducated, working and unemployed. Whichever is the case, the authoritarianism and condescension of the regime, and their own professional exclusion, have left the Qeerroo angry and with a sense of being harassed, despised and ignored. In any case, their target is the very core of the age-old system of power: Their aim is more to force the gates of a previously closed elite, than to promote the real equality between citizens laid down in the constitution. For the Qeerroo, therefore, this part of the legal opposition belongs to the rival camp. For them, entire sections of OPDO fall within this category, especially as they are seen as equally authoritarian and equally mired in corruption. They are prepared to give him a chance for the moment, basically because he has the backing of Lemma Megerssa, the only leader they fully trust. However, they were motivated by two flagship measures: The Qeerroo are first of all demanding authentic self-rule for their region, i. Because of this, they influence the power struggles within the governing elite and

therefore interact with the crisis it is experiencing. Moreover, while it is credible that their movement has been able to develop some kind of network structure of local nodes, as an underground force its organization and cohesion are necessarily limited. Finally, no one today is able to measure the level of support it receives from older generations, which in any case undoubtedly varies from one region to another, and according to age, social status, etc. Is it an avant-garde very much ahead of the curve of the broad movement of popular demands, or it is a faithful expression of that movement? Even overwrought, embryonic, sketchy, unstructured, this mass movement provides the legal opposition with a providential opportunity to break out of its marginal role. It is making every effort to channel and structure it. If it succeeded, the political landscape would be totally changed. However, for the whole establishment, both majority and opposition, the Qeerroo also represent an unpredictable threat, because no one knows where and how far it could lead. No one knows We do not know whether, in their most recent meetings, the leadership structures of the EPRDF were able to set a political course out of the crisis. Apart from its numerical weakness and its disorganization, the legal opposition is divided on the two key issues: No one knows the precise goals or the level of organization of the Qeerroo and therefore whether they would be able to form a representative entity with clear objectives. In particular, it would end the state of emergency, abolish the main repressive laws and send the military back to their barracks. Secondly, the general context is too fluid and chaotic, the respective strengths and objectives of the different political forces too uncertain, to construct a reform process on solid and consensual foundations. In particular, like it or not, there is no force currently able to replace the EPRDF at the heart of the political process. There is no quick, black-and-white way out of the crisis, but only different shades of grey and step-by-step tweaks and adjustments. Shades of grey Although the legal opposition has adopted radical postures, in the short term it probably expects no more of Abiy Ahmed than a series of gestures that indicate that he is moving in the direction it would like. The closure of the notorious Maekelawi prison, the restoration of the Internet, the re-release of notorious activists after their recent release and then re-arrest, are symptomatic of this approach. It will maintain the popular hope that his election has aroused. However, the disregard of the institutions as defined in the constitution is at the heart of the crisis. Ultimately, the only route to its successful end is regulation through institutional mechanisms, which means that the only real possibility is elections, whether early or within the normal electoral cycle.

9: Focus: Elites and Democracy in France - Tocqueville21 : Tocqueville21

Authoritarianism and the Elite Origins of Democracy systematically documents and analyzes the constitutional tools that outgoing authoritarian elites use to accomplish these ends, such as electoral system design, legislative appointments, federalism, legal immunities, constitutional tribunal design, and supermajority thresholds for change.

Mordecai Roshwald If the Declaration of Independence holds as self-evident truth that all men are created equal, there is considerable evidence to refute this assertion. Surely experience tells us that we are not equal: Then, of course, there is a wide spectrum of nuances between each of these polarities. It may be argued, and it has been maintained, that the differences are due to environmental conditions and external circumstances, whether geographical, historical, material, or social. This explains not only cultural differences, but also individual inequality. The children of affluent parents succeed better than the progeny of the poor. The superiority of social class is reflected in the performance of its members. Yet, with all due consideration to this argument, the present writer insists on the basic diversity and inequality of humanity. But let us adduce a personal argument, which may well represent the findings of many others, and which may prove much more convincing. Irrespective of the conditions under which I have grown up, I am, and believe to have been from birth, inferior in my actual and potential capacity as a painter to Leonardo da Vinci, inferior in my musical talent to Mozart, in my poetic proclivity to Homer, in my scientific capability to Einstein, in my basketball agility to Jordan, in my capacity as a sprinter or a long-distance runner to the respective Olympic champions. No, men, and women, are not created equal. They differ in their abilities, which are diverse and complex, they differ in intelligence, they are not alike in their physical qualities, they may differ in their moral character whether in the latter case the difference is innate may well be questioned. Humanity consists of countless personalities, each combining diverse elements of physical and mental qualities in a distinctive way. Some of these qualities appear to be innate. Just as it is rare to find two individuals whose features are indistinguishable, so it is difficult to find individuals whose personalities are identical, and as external features display differences in beauty, so internal characteristics may vary in their degree of excellence. Yet, if the Declaration of Independence errs in its assertion of human equality, it may well be right in allotting the same rights to every human being—namely, Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness whatever it may mean. For even though we may be different from one another and some of us inferior to others, in one sense or another, we all have the right to Life and to Liberty, and to the pursuit of what we seem desirable, as long as we do not infringe on the rights of others by our pursuits. It is to secure these rights that governments are established, or their function is justified. Thus, individual rights lead to the establishment of social and political institutions. The Declaration of Independence offers two grounds for the justification of political rule. One is that government secures the above-mentioned rights of the individual; another is that its power be derived from the consent of the governed. The first reason is functional—the assurance of benefits to the people. The second reason assumes the freedom, the sovereignty of the individuals over their own lives, which may be delegated to the government only by those individuals. The right to Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness is complemented by the right, the equal right, of all to establish government. Thus, while the government is to be established for the people, it must also depend on the basic decision and choice of the people. The two, essentially independent, grounds for the establishment and maintenance of government ought to be combined and coordinated. How this is to be done is not explained in the Declaration of Independence, but it is elaborated in considerable detail in the Constitution of the United States. This document does not require exploration and interpretation here, but it ought to be pointed out that the gist of its articles is not to establish rule by the people, as the believers in the democratic tripod would expect. The American Constitution expresses the trust in representative democracy, the rule by the few chosen by the many, a government deriving its authority from the people, but not a direct democracy, the rule of the people by the people themselves. The principle of representation in government is based on the assumption of inequality of human qualifications, as far as the capacity for managing public affairs is concerned. People choose a president, or have him chosen by the electoral college, because he has some qualities which make him better suited for the

job than others. They choose a senator, because they deem him politically wiser than themselves. At the same time, the principle of representation is based on the belief that the political official has to represent his electors, that he is not imposed on them by some external authority or power, but his authority originates in their will, the will of the people. In brief, representative democracy is based on the twin principles of equality of rights and inequality of political capacity and acumen. The authority of government, of good government, was to be derived from its intrinsic worth, and the will of the people, largely ignorant of the way of the pursuit of the political summum bonum, was of no account. It was Aristotle, with his ear closer to experiential reality, who developed the notion that quality and quantity have to be combined in the working of government

Politics, b. A viable and sensible government is one in which the democratic principle of equality and the oligarchic notion of excellence are deliberately mixed. The general ideas of Aristotle, being somewhat peculiar to antiquity, had to undergo changes and modifications before being translated into the modern perception of Representative Democracy. Yet, the fundamental notion, that the wide democratic base of government and the select wisdom and virtue of an elite ought to be combined, became expressed in the principle of representation—the selection of the few by the many and the guidance of the governed by an elite. Modern democracy rejected the direct rule by the people, as practiced in ancient Athens, as it opposed the rule of an elite not accountable to the people, as propounded by Plato. It chose the ingenious way of creative compromise of Aristotle. The prevalent sense of contemporary America seems to be that Democracy is the rule of the people, for the people, and by the people. It is the people who are sovereign in principle, and it is the people who have the right to exercise this sovereignty not only at periodic elections, but also continuously between the elections. The elected representatives, including the President, are there to fulfill their assorted functions, but they must constantly and conscientiously watch the public mood and the popular opinion, and act in compliance with these. It is the popular will and the public sentiment which must be obeyed by the elected officials, even if such sentiment itself may not be consistent. To be sure, according to the law and the Constitution, the elected officials are not bound by public opinion. They are free to follow the dictates of their own conscience and the conclusions of their own reason. Yet, in practice, more often than not, they obey the voice of the people. The old adage *vox populi vox Dei* tends to be religiously observed by most elected officials. And if occasionally they do not follow the commands of the majority, they adhere to the wishes of a select group, a minor deity, on whom their election to office depends. How is the will of the people assured this overriding power? How do the people approximate the model of direct democracy, discarded by the Greek philosophers and their latter-day followers? This is achieved by two measures. One is the subservience of officials to public opinion, by relinquishing their right to retain their individual convictions, without concern for re-election. Another is the continuous probing of public opinion on current issues by means of polls—conducted by political parties, special organizations, media of communication. Such polls, usually based on a representative statistical sample, can gauge public opinion with a considerable degree of accuracy. Thus, as public opinion is consistently explored and the elected officials are inclined scrupulously to follow it, American democracy increasingly becomes direct democracy—if not *de iure*, then *de facto*. Is not Democracy the rule of the people—the whole people and not an elite, whether self-appointed or elected? The more the people dominate the political scene and control the government, the better! Who needs elites, anyway? The spirit of American democracy is opposed to elitism. We are all equal and let no one assume that he or she is better than others! If someone has elitist sentiments, he tends either to repress or to hide them. For being an elitist means that one assumes that some people are better than others in certain fields and therefore should be entrusted with a dominant or an authoritative position in that field. Yet, such a stance is exactly correct and it is shared, to some extent, almost by everybody, including the ardent egalitarians. Let us substantiate this assertion by a few examples. If we face a health problem, to whom do we turn? Is it our neighbor? Or do we poll the opinion of the community? If our automobile requires attention, we look for a suitable garage—again the professional elite—on the assumption that they know better how to take care of the machine than laymen in this field. If we want to enjoy a concert, we again turn to a certain group of musical elite, or buy a tape on which the performance of such a select group has been recorded. One need not multiply examples to show that civilization—especially modern civilization—relies heavily on expertise,

which is translated into the functions of specific elites in various and diverse spheres of human needs and activity. Indeed, the diverse elites are listed, though not exhausted, in the Yellow Pages. This reasoning should lead us to the conclusion that in public affairs and in political issues there are also those few who know better, in contrast to the crowd of ordinary citizens. Here, too, one would expect to find an elite, qualified experts who can guide us through the complexities of political endeavor. Unfortunately, this conclusion is not as obvious as it may seem. For there seems to be no professional preparation for political leadership the way there is such schooling for physicians, mechanics, musicians, etc. Still, we must not infer from these reservations that all people are equally competent in resolving the manifold problems facing society. Some, apparently, are better than others in this respect. According to the doctrine of Representative Democracy, such individuals may and ought to be identified and discovered through the process of democratic elections. The ordinary people, while less knowledgeable in matters politic, have the political instinct to choose those representatives who combine statesmanship, personal honesty, public dedication, and share the general philosophy with the voting public. These individuals will form the political elite during the prescribed term of their office. If they are judged to have failed, others will be elected in their place, when their term expires. To be sure, this may not be the best method of establishing and maintaining a government. People can be mistaken in their judgment of the candidates for office, or even deliberately fooled by them. The complexity of social problems facing the elected officials, as well as of the political issues confronting them, may prove to be above and beyond their capacity, as they are beyond the understanding of the electorate. Therefore the system is not perfect, though it seems the least flawed of those available to us. Why have representatives, why have an elite, in charge of public affairs? Let the people rule, and the more directly and comprehensively, the better. Indeed, the idea is floated of polling a sample of voters on specific issues, using modern telecommunication media, and thus gauging public attitude on various issues. This could be broadened to encompass major issues of policy. We would thus return to the direct democracy of Athens, using modern technological and statistical techniques in order to apply the ancient system of a city-state to a modern super-state. Alas, it is mistaken to conclude that direct democracy abolishes political elites. The direct democracy of Athens was still represented, as well as affected, by leadership of a kind, by its peculiar elite. It followed such men as Pericles, Cleon, Cleophon. Yet, as this short list shows, the quality of this political leadership was on a steep slope of decline. The direct democracy evolved to produce, or to become prey to, demagogues—leaders without vision or ideas, greedy for power, and both subservient to popular whims and ready to manipulate public sentiment. In the amorphous, fluctuating, erratic trends of public opinion, the demagogues create a temporary focus of purpose, which they readily discard, as soon as they sense a change in popular sentiment. They form an elite which is primarily concerned about its own advantage and power.

Khuswant singh short stories From Mississippi to the world Visions of spaceflight The Power of Awareness The Essence of Hell Portrait of a Lady (Konemann Classics) Algebra and trigonometry third edition Gray Morrow Visionary The labours of kingship Cornubia : gender, geography and genealogy in St Ives modernism Nedira Yakir Handling interaction Ancient Engineers The economics of banking 3rd edition The Emergence of Family into the 21st Century (National League for Nursing Series (All Nln Titles) Kingship and government in pre-conquest England, c.500-1066 Johnson of the Mohawks Labour law and relations Sony hdr xr150 user manual Strength and power Cigar Aficionados: Buying Guide Hydromatic quick-feathering propeller 65 Introduction: How this all began Eyewitness Travel Guide to Amsterdam The history of knowledge development in nursing The 11 Myths of Media Violence Modern American painting (Library of fine art) Best indian romantic novels When the saints go marching out. Brahms Piano Works 2 (Kalmus Edition) Cooking with Very Little Energy How to become a Christian, by H. Cecil. Exploraciones Y Descubrimientos Del Mundo Anatomy of revisionism Savoy house non-reverse hand held fan manual Survo 76 editor, a new tool for interactive statistical computing, text and data management A PICTURE BOOK OF JOHN AND ABIGAIL ADAMS The problem of food security Nobutoshi Akao Human rights in india in tamil Study Guide for Biological Psychology Aslan (The World of Narnia Series)