

*Online Library of Liberty. A collection of scholarly works about individual liberty and free markets. A project of Liberty Fund, Inc.*

Etymology[ edit ] In the English language , the word "individualism" was first introduced, as a pejorative, by the Owenites in the late s, although it is unclear if they were influenced by Saint-Simonianism or came up with it independently. Although an early Owenite socialist, he eventually rejected its collective idea of property, and found in individualism a "universalism" that allowed for the development of the "original genius. Individual An individual is a person or any specific object in a collection. In the 15th century and earlier, and also today within the fields of statistics and metaphysics , individual means "indivisible", typically describing any numerically singular thing, but sometimes meaning "a person. From the 17th century on, individual indicates separateness, as in individualism. Individuation The principle of individuation , or principium individuationis, [15] describes the manner in which a thing is identified as distinguished from other things. It is a completely natural process necessary for the integration of the psyche to take place. Thus, the individual atom is replaced by a never-ending ontological process of individuation. Individuation is an always incomplete process, always leaving a "pre-individual" left-over, itself making possible future individuations. For Stiegler "the I, as a psychic individual, can only be thought in relationship to we, which is a collective individual. On a societal level, the individualist participates on a personally structured political and moral ground. Independent thinking and opinion is a common trait of an individualist. Ruth Benedict made a distinction, relevant in this context, between "guilt" societies e. Methodological individualism[ edit ] Methodological individualism is the view that phenomena can only be understood by examining how they result from the motivations and actions of individual agents. Becker and Stigler provide a forceful statement of this view: On the traditional view, an explanation of economic phenomena that reaches a difference in tastes between people or times is the terminus of the argument: On our preferred interpretation, one never reaches this impasse: The function of the system is to maintain an inequality in the society and fields of human engagement. It supports the privilege theories that affirms position of certain individuals higher in the hierarchy of ranks at the expense of others. For better individuality cooperation is considered to be a better remedy for personal growth. Nobody will waste his life in accumulating things, and the symbols for things. To live is the rarest thing in the world. Most people exist, that is all. Oscar Wilde , *The Soul of Man under Socialism* , Individualists are chiefly concerned with protecting individual autonomy against obligations imposed by social institutions such as the state or religious morality. Susan Brown "Liberalism and anarchism are two political philosophies that are fundamentally concerned with individual freedom yet differ from one another in very distinct ways. Because of this, a civil libertarian outlook is compatible with many other political philosophies, and civil libertarianism is found on both the right and left in modern politics. They demanded greater personal autonomy and self-determination and less outside control.

## 2: Methodological Individualism (Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy)

*Individualism, a System of Politics [Wordsworth Donisthorpe] on www.enganchecubano.com \*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. This work has been selected by scholars as being culturally important, and is part of the knowledge base of civilization as we know it.*

However, the theoretical elaboration of the doctrine is due to Weber, and Schumpeter uses the term as a way of referring to the Weberian view. In *Economy and Society*, Weber articulates the central precept of methodological individualism in the following way: Thus we talk about them having plans, performing actions, suffering losses, and so forth. For Weber, the commitment to methodological individualism is very closely related to the commitment to *verstehende* or interpretive patterns of explanation in sociology. Updating the terminology somewhat, we can say that the defining characteristic of an action is that it is motivated by a mental state with propositional content, i. Action-theoretic explanation is central to social-scientific analysis, therefore, because without knowing why people do what they do, we do not really understand why any of the more large-scale phenomena with which they are embroiled occur. Thus methodological individualism is a slightly misleading term, since the goal is not to privilege the individual over the collective in social-scientific explanation, but rather to privilege the action-theoretic level of explanation. This privileging of the action-theoretic level is methodological because it is imposed by the structure of interpretive social science, where the goal is to provide an understanding of social phenomena. Actions can be understood in a way that other social phenomena cannot, precisely because they are motivated by intentional states. Yet only individuals possess intentional states, and so the methodological privileging of actions entails the methodological privileging of individuals. This is what defenders to the doctrine have tried to communicate, with greater or lesser degrees of success, by claiming that it is politically or ideologically neutral. Many writers claim to find the origins of methodological individualism amongst economists of the Austrian School especially Carl Menger, and doctrines articulated during the *Methodenstreit* of the 1890s. The atomistic view is based upon the suggestion that it is possible to develop a complete characterization of individual psychology that is fully pre-social, then deduce what will happen when a group of individuals, so characterized, enter into interaction with one another. Methodological individualism, on the other hand, does not involve a commitment to any particular claim about the content of the intentional states that motivate individuals, and thus remains open to the possibility that human psychology may have an irreducibly social dimension. Thus one way of accentuating the difference between atomism and methodological individualism is to note that the former entails a complete reduction of sociology to psychology, whereas the latter does not. Historical explanation may make reference to the actual content of the intentional states that motivated particular historical actors, but the sociologist is interested in producing much more abstract explanatory generalizations, and so cannot appeal to the specific motives of particular individuals. Thus sociological theory must be based upon a model of human action. And because of the constraints that interpretation imposes, this model must be a model of rational human action. Weber writes: The work of Talcott Parsons in the first half of the century was the most important in this regard, with the unification movement reaching its apogee in the collaborative publication in 1937 of *Toward a General Theory of Action*, co-edited by Parsons and Edward Shils. Yet shortly thereafter, partly due to problems with the unification program, Parsons abandoned his commitment to both methodological individualism and action theory, adopting a purely systems-theoretic view. Of course, this tradition has not always been in the ascendancy within the economics profession. Similarly, many have tried to discover correlations between macroeconomic variables, such as unemployment and inflation rates, without feeling the need to speculate as to why a change in one rate might lead to movement in the other. One of the earliest iterations of this debate occurred during the so-called *Methodenstreit* between members of the Austrian School in Economics and the German Historical School. It was only members of the second generation, first and foremost Friedrich von Hayek, who would explicitly identify themselves with the Weberian doctrine of methodological individualism and defend it through reference to the demands of interpretive social science. This leads many economists to eschew any reference

to intentional states and to focus purely upon statistical correlations between economic variables. The problem with this focus is that it leaves the economic phenomena unintelligible. Take, for example, the movement of prices. One might notice a constant correlation between the date of the first frost and fluctuations in the price of wheat. But we do not really understand the phenomenon until it has been explained in terms of the rational actions of economic agents: It is important to note, however, that while Hayek has a model of rational action as the centerpiece of his view, his is most emphatically not a form of rationalism. On the contrary, he puts particular emphasis upon the way that various economic phenomena can emerge as the unintended consequences of rational action. Even though the outcomes that people achieve may bear no resemblance to the ones that they intended, it is still important to know what they thought they were doing when they chose to pursue to course of action that they chose – not least because it is important to know why they persist in pursuing that course of action, despite the fact that it is not producing the intended consequences. All that they can see are changes in the immediate prices that they must pay for production inputs or consumption goods, and this is what they respond to. The large-scale consequences of the choices they make in response to these changes are largely unintended, and so any regularity in these consequences constitutes a spontaneous order. One person works his way through, choosing the route that offers the least local resistance. His passage reduces, ever so slightly, the resistance offered along that route to the next person who walks though, who is therefore, in making the same set of decisions, likely to follow the same route. This increases the chances that the next person will do so, and so on. It is a product of spontaneous order: We forget that these concepts are abstractions, used not to guide individual action, but rather to describe the net effect of millions of individual decisions. Hayek does not mention methodological individualism after the s. Indeed, the role that evolutionary explanations come to play in his later work implies a tacit retraction of his commitment to the doctrine. Popper, however, although making use of the term, did little to defend his commitment to it. Instead he left this job to his former student, J. It was also this debate that brought the doctrine to the widespread attention of philosophers. Unfortunately, the version of methodological individualism that Popper bequeathed to his student Watkins was considerably more difficult to defend than the one he inherited from Hayek. Since the beginning, the precepts of methodological individualism were thought to have been imposed by the special requirements of the social sciences. For both Weber and Hayek, it was the reflection of a key difference between the Geisteswissenschaften and the Naturwissenschaften. Popper, however, denies that there are any significant methodological differences between the two. The problem that this creates for the doctrine of methodological individualism is readily apparent. A social science that aims at interpretation, or that uses interpretation as part of the centerpiece of its explanatory strategy, has a very clear methodological reason for privileging explanations that refer to individual actions – since it is precisely the underlying intentional states that serve as the object of interpretation. But if social scientists are merely in the business of providing causal explanations, just like natural scientists, then what is the rationale for privileging individual actions in these explanations? There no longer appears to be any methodological reason for doing so. Thus critics like Leon Goldstein , and later Steven Lukes , would argue that methodological individualism was actually just an oblique way of asserting a commitment to metaphysical or ontological individualism. Yet in so doing, he grants that these half-way explanations the example he gives is the relationship between inflation and the unemployment rate , while they may not tell us everything we would like to know, need not be meaningless or false. Hegel and Karl Marx. Yet as time wore on, and the dangers of creeping totalitarianism in Western societies became increasingly remote, the fear of collectivism that underlay the debates over methodological individualism became increasingly attenuated. The reason for this can be summed up in two words and an article: Social scientists had always been aware that individuals in groups are capable of getting stuck in patterns of collectively self-defeating behavior. This in turn gave renewed impetus to methodological individualism, because it allowed theorists to diagnose with unparalleled precision the errors that social theorists could be and often were led into if they ignored the action-theoretic level of analysis. Individuals would benefit from acting to promote that interest, but they would benefit even more by sitting back while the other members of the group acted to promote it. As a result, no one may act to promote it. However, Olson confined this observation to large groups. In itself, there is very little new in this criticism. This means that

individual capitalists must stop hiring new workers at a point where marginal benefits still exceed the marginal costs. What is their incentive for doing so? They have an obvious free-rider incentive to keep hiring, since the benefits stemming from depressed wages would largely be enjoyed by rival firms, whereas the benefits of further hiring would flow to the bottom line. Fomenting revolution can be dangerous business, and so absent some other incentive such as class solidarity, even workers who were convinced that a communist economic order would offer them a superior quality of life might still fail to show up at the barricades. Yet these possibilities were largely overlooked, Elster suggests, because the failure to respect the precepts of methodological individualism, along with the promiscuous use of functional explanation, had led generations of Marxian theorists simply to ignore the actual incentives that individuals face in concrete social interactions. Beyond the critique of functional explanations, Elster does not advance any original argument in support of methodological individualism. He does, however, return to the earlier Weberian formulation of the position, with its emphasis on intentional action Elster. For example, he goes on to claim at various points that methodological individualism commits him to psychologistic reductionism with respect to sociology although he does not offer an argument for this claim. Elster does not draw as sharp a distinction as he might have between the commitment to methodological individualism and the commitment to rational choice theory. Indeed, he also assumes that the latter flows directly from the former. He claims that this conception of rationality is implied by the fact that decision theorists are able to represent the rational actions of any agent possessing a well-behaved preference ordering as the maximization of a utility function. Yet whether utility-maximization implies instrumentalism depends upon the version of expected utility theory that one subscribes to. Such an equation generally fails to distinguish what were for Weber two distinct methodological issues: There are multiple permutations. In fact, this would make greater sense, since game theory, strictly construed, has never purported to offer a general theory of rational action. The Nash solution concept, which provides the standard definition of a game-theoretic equilibrium, specifically excluded all forms of communication between the players and the solution does not work in cases where communication does intrude [Heath]. Thus much of the furor over rational choice imperialism has been based upon a failure to appreciate the limitations of that model in many cases both by its defenders and its critics. The question is whether an individual with a belief about water on earth, where water is made up of H<sub>2</sub>O, has the same belief as an individual with a belief about water in a parallel universe, where water has the same appearance and behavior, but happens to be made up of XYZ. The issue comes down to one concerning the individuation of mental states. This implies, among other things, that if one psychological state is incapable of causing anything different to happen than some other psychological state, then the two must be the same. As Fodor goes on to point out, the semantic evaluation of a mental state will typically be relational, e. He is able to offer a cogent account of why methodological individualism counts as a methodological constraint. Thus it is a methodological precept. It is simply unclear why Fodor chooses to call it individualism. With methodological solipsism, on the other hand, one can see why he calls it solipsism, but it is unclear what makes it methodological. In general, there is no question that, given any particular half-way explanation of a social phenomenon, it would always be nice to know what agents are thinking, when they perform the actions that are involved in the production of that phenomenon. The question is whether the explanation is somehow deficient, or unscientific, in the absence of this information. Nevertheless, it is worth noting two very common types of social-scientific inquiry that fall short of providing the sort of rock-bottom explanations that methodological individualism demands: During the 1960s, there was a precipitous decline in violent crime in the United States. Many social scientists naturally began to apply themselves to the question of why this had occurred, i. A number of different hypotheses were advanced: Since the decline in crime occurred in many different jurisdictions, each using some different combination of strategies under different circumstances, it is possible to build support for different hypotheses through purely statistical analysis. For example, the idea that policing strategies play an important role is contradicted by the fact that New York City and San Francisco adopted very different approaches to policing, and yet experienced a similar decline in the crime rate. Thus a very sophisticated debate broke out, with different social scientists producing different data sets, and crunching the numbers in different ways, in support of their rival hypotheses. This debate, like almost every

debate in criminology, lacks microfoundations. Nevertheless, we can easily imagine criminologists deciding that one particular factor, such as a demographic shift in the population i.

## 3: Roots of Texas Politics

*Wordsworth Donisthorpe () was an English individualist anarchist, inventor, pioneer of cinematography and chess enthusiast. His works include: Individualism: A System of Politics () and Law in a Free State ().*

An Analysis of Socialism. Among the lower forms of animal life we are at a loss to know whether to regard certain organisms, such, for example, as sponges, as individuals or as aggregations of individuals. But among the higher forms of life we have no difficulty. The animals best known to us are practically bounded by their skins, and it is very seldom that a question of individuation arises of any importance, though doubts have been expressed both in modern and ancient Courts of Justice as to whether the purchaser of a mare in foal is ipso facto the owner of the foal. In the vegetable kingdom the difficulties of individuation are considerably greater; if the rose-tree is an individual, what shall we say to the rose? Consider the growth of the strawberry, and of the banyan, which sends down roots from its branches to strike into the ground and themselves become trunks. One such tree, if it can be called one tree, has been known to measure more than five hundred yards in circumference round the trunks. Some would call the growth a single tree, and others would describe it as a grove of trees. Social organisms in this respect more nearly resemble vegetable than animal forms. It is difficult to define and demarcate the individual. Those who have not reflected upon this difficulty may readily realise it by trying to group the Edition: But if, on the one hand, there is difficulty in deciding in certain cases, in other cases, on the other hand, there is no difficulty whatever. No one will pretend that Yorkshire and Lancashire are two different and separate states. We all know the meaning of France, though we might find some difficulty in denning even that very precisely about the eastern boundary. Now, without attempting to define exactly the term State, or to follow Austin in his exhaustive inquiry into the question, let us take it for granted that in the main we understand pretty clearly what we mean by the term. Just as we know, in spite of the puzzles of individuation, that there are such individual things as oak-trees, so we know that there are such individual things as states. And let us trace the natural history of states from their first appearance on the planet. And first, as to their origin. The germ of the State must of course be looked for and found in that phase of social development known as complete savagery; and I would venture to say that the very first state which ever existed was a human family consisting of a mother and her offspring. With all deference to sociologists, the family is a state and the earliest form of state. The laws which govern the structure of the earliest form of state must be pre-social and therefore biological. These are the laws which underlie all political laws, and from which all political laws take their origin. It may safely be said that all the laws, the complicated laws of civilised nations, conflicting as they seem to us at the present day, are the lineal descendants of filial obedience and parental affection. And next, as to the growth of states. The family, as such, doubtless existed for a very long period without any tendency towards coalescence, but in course of time we find these families drawn together in little groups and loosely compounded under a single head. Whether this aggregation was originally due to conscious combination for purposes of mutual defence and other advantages, or whether it was simply a clannish Edition: All that it behoves us to note here is that in process of time we find the family consisting, not as among the lower animals of the mother and her offspring alone, but of the father together with his wives and all their children, many of whom are themselves fathers of families. In addition to these members of the family there were others who for various reasons were admitted into it. Here again, interesting as the subject is, I must come to a halt and content myself with referring those who wish to look deeper into this question of the structure of the early patriarchal system to the learned and fascinating works of the late Sir Henry Maine. Later still, we find larger families whose original head is no longer living, though there is no doubt that the sub-families composing it are apparently and professedly connected by blood. Whether the paterfamilias was as a rule the head of the senior family, or, as appears to have certainly been the case in some places, the youngest son of the deceased patriarch, or whether it was some other person elected or nominated or otherwise fixed upon, does not concern us here. The compound family existed, and we may call it a Gens or a Curia, or by any other name for which there is any warrant. Whoever the paterfamilias might be, there is something artificial in obedience to a brother as compared with filial obedience, which goes far to show that

the compounding and continued adhesion of these houses was a conscious and deliberate act of which the motive was the advantage of one sort or another derived from co-operation. Finally, these families and houses are found aggregated into what is called a tribe. And still later, as we sail down the stream of history we see these tribes themselves beginning to confederate. The interests which the tribes had in common, though not so deep-rooted or important as those which were peculiar to the members of the several tribes, were nevertheless an ever-increasing quantity. Probably the earliest trustworthy records of intertribal action are the historical references to the Greek Amphictyonic Councils. These Amphictyones were Edition: The tribes, no matter how great or how small their individual importance, had all an equal vote. Not even Athens or Sparta counted for more than one. And we see the same process going on in early Roman history. Curiously enough, the Amphictyones were concerned not only with the foreign affairs of tribes federated for offensive or defensive alliance, but also with the worship of the deceased common ancestor. As time wore on, these somewhat loose federations became more and more welded into a compact whole or nation. And this is the highest social aggregate with which we are as yet fully acquainted. Into the actual causes of these successive compoundings and recompoundings we have no time to inquire here. They are to be found set forth in Mr. Pari pesse with this compounding and recompoundings of social groups a transformation necessarily takes place in judicial procedure. The despotism of the paterfamilias continues to obtain recognition inside the family, whereas transactions between members of different families or between families inter sc are regulated in accordance with the laws of the Gens. Similarly, when the Houses become federated, a higher system of law governs the dealings between them. Some of the differences in procedure survive to a very late period in history, and prove a mystery and a stumbling-block to jurists and historians. For example, the Romans recognised a distinction between *res Mancipi* and *res nee Mancipi*, a distinction based solely on the mode of transfer required by law. The line of cleavage was in no wise coincident with the line of cleavage between our real and personal property. Slaves, oxen, horses, and certain other chattels, fall into the category of *res Mancipi*, Edition: May not ploughs be added to the list? Jurists have sought in vain to discover something common and peculiar to the members of this class, the true explanation being that whereas *res nee Mancipi* were transferred according to the rules of the smaller group, *res Mancipi*, on the other hand, were transferred by means of the process required by the law of the compound group. And for this reason: Hence, when houses, acres, and flocks came to be the subject of dealings between family and family, it was necessary that the dealings should satisfy the requirements of the wider jurisprudence. Nor is it difficult to see that a more solemn and involved ceremonial would tend to develop itself in transfers from one family to another. Simple delivery in the presence of the patriarch or other responsible witnesses would be sufficient evidence as to the ownership of a shield or spear amongst members of the same family. The transaction would be sufficiently notorious. The thing would change hands, and words would be used indicative of the *animus* of the parties. But in the case of interfamilial transactions much more would be needed. Not only are the things in which families would deal unfit for delivery from hand to hand as, for example, a flock of sheep or a range of pasture, but, furthermore, the representative of the State of the group-force is not present embodied in a single person ready to take note of the transaction. It is necessary either to convene those who in assembly represent the will of the federated families, or to perform such ceremonies as can leave no room for doubt as to the fact and the nature of the transaction. In Rome these ceremonies took the form of *mancipation*. Similarly, when tribes had already become welded into fairly homogeneous states, and were on the point of still further federating into larger nations, we find a new conflict of jurisdictions Edition: It is sufficient to note that at the time of the remarkable integration known as the growth of the Eoman Empire, the civil law was found unsuitable and inapplicable to the dealings between Roman citizens and members of surrounding states. Whether this new jurisprudence came into existence through a process of extracting that which was common to the races and peoples making up the new aggregate; or whether it was based as some alleged on the law of nature, i. The same process is at work amongst us at the present day. Nations and wide empires are themselves beginning loosely to aggregate and to become more or less federated. The legal systems of the several states are inapplicable to the dealings between members of such several states; and the outcome of the striving after order and amicable arrangement is what is known as international private law. If any body of rules on the face

of the earth presents the appearance of being based on equity pure and simple, surely it is this body of rules recognised by civilised nations as governing the dealings of members of different countries one with another. The principles underlying these laws will doubtless tend in time to swallow up the principles upon which are based the laws peculiar to the separate nations. History presents a picture of ever-increasing political integration. First, the only political unit is the group consisting of a mother and her offspring; then on the recognition of paternity we enter upon the patriarchal stage, in which the unit consists of the descendants of a living male together with his wives and slaves; the whole despotically governed by himself. Next we have clans or houses consisting of federated families descended from a common deceased ancestor, having a common name and worship and held together by common interests which tend to wax stronger and stronger. These gentes again tend to be recomposed in one or more degrees till we have the tribe and eventually the nation. Finally, nations are themselves showing signs of coalescence. At first the bonds which hold together the new federation are extremely slight and frail; but they tend to strengthen until the individuality of the component groups is almost, if not altogether, merged and lost. And concurrently with the political integration there necessarily goes a juridical integration. Frequently the new federation has proved itself unstable and premature, and has rapidly or gradually disintegrated. Nature places a limit on the process. We have seen the Macedonian Empire no sooner built up than falling to pieces again. So too the Roman Empire, after some centuries of a cumbrous and elephantine existence, broke up into fragments which proved to have more vitality than the great whole from which they were detached. Clearly there is a limit to the size of a state ruled by a single government. Now what is the law of the limit of political integration? In biology the limit of mass of any living organism depends on the power of co-ordination; that is to say, any part of the body being affected the whole must respond; otherwise it is not an organic whole, but a mere aggregate. The same holds good of social organisms, The size of such organism depends on its power of internal co-ordination. But as time wears on. We have better means of communication both in the way of locomotion and signalling. We have increased general knowledge, and more widely distributed information. And finally, we have the coming together of large masses of the population in towns. Hence, there has resulted a constant tendency towards increasing integration. Men can work together in larger numbers century by century. At the same time it behoves us to inquire whether the aggregations we see around us are themselves stable, or whether they are too large for equilibrium. Since the break-up of the Roman Empire there has been a constantly increasing tendency towards the welding together of tribes and small states into larger wholes. Take the history of these Islands. About a thousand years ago this England of ours was divided into no less than seven probably we may say eight separate kingdoms. Ireland was divided into at least five kingdoms, and Scotland consisted of a larger number of independent states.

## 4: Individualism: A System of Politics - Online Library of Liberty

*effects of individualism and collectivism on the individual's political attitude and behavior while disentangling the individual and national level effects based on multilevel modeling.*

The results also show that institutions do not exert a uniform influence on government size, with most spending taking place under majoritarian elections and presidential systems in the most collectivist countries. World Values Research Vol. In some countries, government size, as measured by expenditure, is large; in others, government expenditures comprise only a small portion of the government budget Torrisi, Nonetheless, although the literature on the factors that affect government size is extensive, the effect of cultural orientations on government spending has received limited attention Oorschot, Thus, although culturally shared values, and especially economic individualism, are cited as important factors in explaining low levels of government spending in the United States, there is a tendency to treat the U. The aim of this paper, therefore, is to show that cultural values should be taken into account in explaining cross-cultural differences in government size. Specifically, I argue that economic individualismâ€”a cultural orientation that emphasizes the values of individual autonomy, self-reliance, and achievement and is associated with support for capitalism and laissez faire and preference for a limited role of government in the economyâ€”should be negatively related to government spending. Because economic individualism is a cultural orientation, I draw upon theories and definitions of culture to build a theory about its role in explaining cross-national variation in government spending. At the same time, however, culturally shared values are translated into public policies through existing institutions. The negative effect of individualism on government spending is moderated by existing institutions and is stronger in countries with majoritarian elections and presidential systems. In addition, I find that in the least individualist countries, most government spending is observable under majoritarian elections and in presidential systems, which implies that the effects of institutions are not uniform and are dependent on the cultural orientations of the country within which they operate. Therefore, this study also contributes to the literature by demonstrating the conditional effect of institutions on policy outcomes. In cross-cultural studies, most research uses nations as cultural units, although the assumption that nations are more or less homogenous with regards to cultural values is questionable. On the other hand, although nations may not necessarily be homogenous in terms of shared values, forces towards integration in established nationsâ€”including a common dominant language, political and educational systems, shared mass media and national symbolsâ€”could be said to produce substantial sharing of culture Hofstede, Indeed, many nations are characterized by language policies mandating a lingua franca for use in education or government; such national education policies permit only slight regional variations in curricula or procedures and are small enough to be subject to relatively uniform geographical conditions Smith et al. Thus, to assess cultural unity within nations, Schwartz compares the within and between-country cultural distances across various nations. He finds that the cultural distance between samples 75 Arikan, , WVR 4 3: Such culturally shared beliefs and values provide limits and act as effective guides for individual action and behavior. In other words, culture provides group members with a range of possible behaviors for meeting various goals. In addition, the adaption of these shared values and assumptions by the younger generation through learning and socialization means that culture has a stable element. Cultural orientations influence the selection of what is considered socially important. Cultural beliefs and values also affect political outcomes by providing shared expectations and common points of concern and by constraining the range of options available to the members of a society. Most particularly, culture influences individual perceptions, categorizations, beliefs, ideals, values, and expectations Triandis, and is thus a judgment standard that shapes the way members of cultural groupings view their environment and evaluate various events and phenomena. As a result, individuals socialized into different cultural settings differ in the judgments and attributions they make about social and political issues. For example, Alesina and Glaeser show that Americans tend to attribute poverty to lack of individual effort and laziness, whereas citizens of most European countries blame contextual factors like luck or social and economic conditions. Yet nor should the dynamic nature of cultural orientations be exaggerated: Moreover,

cultural change is usually slow, and when it occurs, it takes place more readily among younger than among older groups, resulting in intergenerational changes Inglehart, , p. Arikan, , WVR 4 3: Greif points out that during medieval times, collectivist orientations among the Magribi traders led them to rely on a collective mechanism to prevent cheating by agents, whereas individualist Genoese traders relied on a structure with low levels of communication and no collective punishment, which thus required the development of formal legal and political enforcement institutions. Similarly, Zerbe and Anderson show that culturally shared beliefs helped gold miners in California overcome collective action problems during the Gold Rush. Among these American gold miners and their European counterparts, commonly shared beliefs about equality, fairness, respect for property, and rewards commensurate with work provided for the development of property arrangements based on individual claims. Miners from Latin countries, however, worked in corporate ventures, and the Chinese worked as contract labor for wages, with individual miners subject to control by a company or controlling organization. Both Greif and Zerbe and Anderson show that culture provides members of a society with a common understanding of the problems to be solved and facilitates similar expectations among them, such as the expectation that a trader cheated by an agent will report that agent to other traders. Both examples also provide evidence for the effect of culturally shared values on cross-national variation in institutional arrangements. Based on these observations, economic individualism should affect government spending by providing common points of concern and coordinating citizen expectations. Most particularly, economic individualism stresses the values of achievement, competition, self-reliance, and individual autonomy in decision making in the economic sphere. Economic individualism has from the beginning gone hand in hand with the development of capitalism; and self-assertiveness, competition, and a desire for fame and thus presumably achievement were highly valued during the rise of capitalism in Europe Watson, Moreover, although earlier discussions of individualism portrayed it as an exceptional feature of the United States, research in cross-cultural psychology clearly shows that individualism is a cultural dimension that varies across societies. Because collectivist societies are characterized by the valuing of group interests at the expense of the individual, these societies can be expected to emphasize the moral duty of the society and the government to help those in need. These values should result in policy debates that emphasize individual responsibility and effort in the economic sphere, as well as the limits of government interference in the economy. These common points of concern within societies constrain the range of options available to the actors designing 4 The definition of individualism as concern for the well-being of the self as opposed to others does not bring with it a preference for the inequality of outcomes. The distinguishing feature of individualism is the perception of individuals as responsible for their own well-being. Hence, individualists, or individualist societies, should prefer government policies that support individual initiative. On the other hand, individualists may still prefer actions that would enhance the welfare of the poor and needy but should prefer that those actions be individual like charity and private donations. In fact, egalitarian cultures emphasize equality in the economic and political spheres in addition to social justice, freedom, and responsibility and honesty Schwartz, For example, King a, b observes that unlike their American counterparts, conservatives in Canada, France, Germany, and Great Britain are committed to making extensive use of state machinery and are not consistently anti- statist. In contrast, reforms expanding the role of the state in the U. In other cases, however, governments with different ideological orientations expanded public ownership, under varying circumstances, causing little controversy about the role of the state in economic policy. King also notes that interest groups in the U. That is, in the individualistic American society, there has been great concern for limiting government action in the economic sphere; whereas in more collectivist societies, even conservative elites and groups have not questioned whether it is the duty of government to provide social services. Although economic individualism should be negatively related to government spending, culturally shared values are translated into policy outputs through institutional structures, meaning that their effect on policy outcomes should be conditional on the existing institutions. Therefore, in addition to socially shared values, institutions act as another constraint on policy. In other words, culture is not the only source of policy outcomes: Institutional design therefore affects redistributive policies and explains some of the cross-national variation in government size. For example, majoritarian elections are more likely to produce single-party

governments than proportional electoral systems. According to Iversen and Soskice, majoritarian elections affect social policy and redistribution through the propensity for right-wing governments to be elected. These authors also argue that in a two-party majoritarian system, center-right parties are more likely to win elections and redistribute less than the center parties in proportional systems, which are more likely to enter into coalitions with left parties. Dispersion of political power within the state and the ability of minority interests to obstruct legislation are also cited as important factors in explaining government size and redistributive policy. According to Huber et al. In contrast, Persson and Tabellini point out that the greater concentration of powers in parliamentary regimes makes it easier for politicians to collude with each other at the expense of voters and results in higher rents, higher taxes, and higher government spending pp. Since preferences are reflected in policies through existing institutions that also act as constraints, institutions should moderate the effect of cultural orientations. In other words, majoritarianism should be associated with lower government spending, and this effect should be larger if the culture is individualistic. Thus, when elections bring to power parties whose voters value more equal income distribution, single party governments may in fact end up taxing and spending more. In these countries, even right-wing parties may prefer higher redistribution than their counterparts in more individualistic countries. Hence, although majoritarian elections may tend to lead to smaller governments, this may not always be the case: Scholars also argue that presidential systems lead to less government spending owing to the presence of veto players that block pro-spending legislation. Since individualism leads to preferences for smaller governments, when coupled with a presidential system that makes policy change difficult, the decrease in government spending should be larger Hypothesis 3. On the other hand, in countries where collectivism is a widely shared value orientation, veto players should be more likely to be pro-spending and therefore deter reform attempts toward decreasing expenditure. If so, then in less individualistic countries, presidentialism should be associated with higher redistribution Hypothesis 4. Testing these hypotheses first requires a measure of economic individualism at the national level. Therefore, the next section discusses the construction of this measure. Although the WVS contains no items specifically devised to measure individualism, it assesses child-rearing values and work-related goals that tap individual autonomy, self-reliance, and achievement. One advantage of these items is that they measure core values uncontaminated by salient events, political frames, ideology, and partisanship. That is, because culture is transmitted across generations, it differs from other concepts like attitudes or orientations toward contemporary issues and events, or preferences for or affect toward objects or events in the social and political system. These latter, although they may be influenced by existing cultural orientations, are neither basic predispositions nor adaptations through learning that are transmitted across generations. A measure of cultural orientation, therefore, should include items that reflect individual core values. Using individual values as indicators of broader cultural syndromes has several advantages. First, all cultures carry value components, guidelines about what is good, bad, and desirable. Lastly, values are quite stable psychological constructs that provide a convenient way of measuring culture, which is itself resistant to change in the short run. In fact, child-rearing patterns in collectivist and individualist cultures differ: Work goal items, on the other hand, are used by Hofstede to measure broader cultural syndromes including individualism. For this study, I chose the latest wave for which data are available, which for most countries is the fourth wave conducted between and Some countries, however, had to be dropped because of missing key items, sampling problems, or questionable respondent comprehension, so the final measurement model includes observations from 62 countries. As regards the ideal qualities for children, the WVS presents respondents with a list of qualities that children could be encouraged to learn at home and asks them to choose up to five. From these items, I select independence, imagination, feeling of responsibility, and hard work. Choosing independence and imagination as desirable child qualities could indicate valuation of individual autonomy and individual freedom. Because individualism is also associated with individual responsibility, I add responsibility to the item pool. Hard work, the final child quality included in the model, taps individual duty and obligations as opposed to autonomy and independence. The survey also contains items on work-related values. As in the child quality assessment, respondents are asked to choose from 11 items values that they think are important in a job. Here, however, the respondents are free to choose as many options as they like. Although not necessarily devised to

measure economic individualism, some items should tap individualist rather than collectivist orientations. The country-level individualism measure is derived by saving factor scores from a measurement model based on a confirmatory factor analysis CFA in which items are averaged across countries. Admittedly, however, because the survey respondents were allowed to select as many work-related items from the list as they wished, country-level acquiescence bias could be a problem. To account for the potential error introduced by national level acquiescence,<sup>9</sup> I add a measurement factor, which is also specified as a latent factor. The CFI of the proposed measurement model is. Since the number of observations and degrees of freedom are rather small, it is not surprising to obtain fit indices that are below the acceptable threshold Jackson, To test the validity of my economic individualism measure, I compare it with the individualism measures of Schwartz and Hofstede, both of which capture the degree to which individual autonomy and freedom are valued in a culture. Their measures should thus be moderately correlated with my economic individualism measure, which is in fact the case:

## 5: Individualism | Definition of Individualism by Merriam-Webster

*The author confesses little reason to "expect popularity for this work. It is written without any party sympathy whatever." He fulfills on that dubious promise, and adds more reason for the book's unlikability, Still, there's a lot of good stuff in here.*

Freeman and Company , Tomaso Poggio adds one higher level beyond the computational level, that is the learning. I am not sure that Marr would agree, but I am tempted to add learning as the very top level of understanding, above the computational level. The three or four levels of analysis cannot describe every effect and there is unlimited number of levels between the three primary ones, levels of analysis will help understand how one force in political power affects another. Generally, power is the concept that collects all the analysis together. The lust for power is individual level of analysis, while the struggle for power is systemic level of analysis. It focuses on human actors on the world stage identifying the characteristics of human decision making. Kaiser Wilhelm II is considered to be the level from which the cause originated. It may have been his need for power to hide a sense of inferiority, or it may have been his inability to understand the intricacies of statecraft , the way Otto von Bismarck did. Or it may have been his idea about the monarchy and German destiny. All three possibilities are drawn from an individual level of analysis. Thus, war is caused by aggressive or warlike states, not by evil, inept, or misguided people or the structure of power in the international system. The failure of domestic institutions may also cause war. Domestic level cases may come from various characteristics of the domestic system. Capitalist and socialist economies generate different attitudes and behavior. The Muslim and Christian religions or democratic and nondemocratic political ideologies do as well. Stable and failed institutions are domestic level factors affecting state behavior. A great worry today is the existence of failed states, meaning states whose domestic institutions have broken down, such as Somalia. Another worry here is existence of a rogue state, such as North Korea , which may pass nuclear weapons on to terrorists. Any type of state come from the domestic level of analysis, but a failed state usually means an institutional breakdown at domestic level of analysis, whereas a rogue state often implies evil intentions by individual " individual level of analysis. Systemic level[ edit ] The systemic level of analysis explains outcomes from a system wide level that includes all states. The position of states constitutes the systemic structural level of analysis. This involves the relative distribution of power, such as which state; great, middle, or small power, and geopolitics ; such as which state is sea or land power. The interaction of states constitutes the systemic process level of analysis. At this level, we are concerned with which state aligns with which other states and which state negotiates with which other states. Thus, we can explain World War I in terms of the absence of system wide institutions, such as League of Nations , which was not created until after World War I to prevent such wars in the future. However, system wide institution does not always mean harmony among nations, as seen in the World War II. The cause of World War II is seen as the failure of a systemic institution, which led new institutions of the United Nations to carry on reformed legacy of the League of Nations. Global factors can be the outcome of individuals, interest groups, states, nonstate actors or even natural conditions " however they cannot be traced to the actions of any one state or even group of states. An example can be how the internet can shape how policy is formed, through social media or forums " where an idea is formed over time by a group of individuals, but the source is generally hard to determine. An environmental natural example is how global warming can help shape how society views certain policies, or help shape new policies themselves. Droughts caused by rising temperatures can cause global actors to form alliances to help procure critical resources - and as writers such as Peter Gleik and Michael Klare have shown, the possibility of "Water Wars" in dry countries in Africa and the Middle East are very possible.

### 6: Collectivism | Definition of Collectivism by Merriam-Webster

*Page - The acquisition of such talents, by the maintenance of the acquirer during his education, study, or apprenticeship, always costs a real expense, which is a capital fixed and realised, as it were, in his person.*

ADA Text Version Political culture is a shared system of values, beliefs, and habits of behavior with regard to government and politics. Multiple cultures may coexist in a society, but typically one culture is dominant and those dominant values, beliefs, and habits of behavior affect all members of society. Texas combines the individualistic and traditionalistic political cultures. Government activity is encouraged only to the extent that it creates opportunity for individual achievement. The traditionalistic political culture, emphasizing deference to elite rule within a hierarchical society and traditional moral values, represents the values of 19th century Southerners who migrated to the rich cotton land of East Texas. Taken together, individualism and traditionalism make Texas a politically conservative state, hostile to government activity, especially government interference in the economy. Government should spend little and tax little, if at all. Individual businesspeople should control their own fate and the economy. Texas political culture mixes economic conservatism with a conservative approach to social life, in which government becomes a barrier against any change to the political and socioeconomic hierarchy that might result from individual competition. However, while individualism and traditionalism generally reinforce a conservative political environment, they can also exist in uncomfortable tension with one another. In the case of such conflicts, which value trumps? Social Darwinists believe that poverty results from natural selection and is therefore not something to be fixed by government. However, there is also a strong populist streak in Texas political culture that believes government power should be used to protect individuals from exploitation by powerful corporations, excessive wealth, or government itself. This populist streak sometimes mixes with liberalism, which endorses government intervention as a welcome force in society. Or, if you live in the central part of the nation, you may prefer a bowl of individualistic political culture. Residents in the southern tier of states from the East coast to New Mexico relish the traditionalist political culture. In this culture, government acts as a preservative; keeping traditions and the existing social order safe from change. Only top chefs from established families or influential social groups should make this chili. Texas has its own unique bowl of political culture. It combines a mixture of traditionalistic and individualistic ingredients with a dash of the Old South and the frontier experience. This activity focuses on how the ingredients that make up Texas political culture are reflected in its public policies and practices. Launch Activity Virtual Roundtable Texas political culture combines the conservatism of the South with the individualism of a frontier state. Both contribute to a philosophy concerning government that "less is more. Please enable iFrames to view this content or visit Roundtable:

## 7: Individualism - Wikipedia

*Individualism is the moral stance, political philosophy, ideology, or social outlook that emphasizes the moral worth of the individual. Individualists promote the exercise of one's goals and desires and so value independence and self-reliance and advocate that interests of the individual should achieve precedence over the state or a social group, while opposing external interference upon one's.*

Go to start of metadata By Vaidehi Pidaparti, Kristen Vitro, Heather Whippie, and Lyla Youssef The classic debate between collectivism and individualism is apparent in practically every social movement, so it is not surprising to see this debate arise within the LGBT movement. Though all the members of the LGBT movement initially worked for the same set of general goals, two distinct groups formed as a result of conflicting ideals: Over time, the dynamics of these two groups changed--lesbians fragmented into their own group, transsexuals were forced into their own communities, and radical activists left their more conservative counterparts behind. However, despite the formation of various agendas within the LGBT movement, there is still a cohesiveness that unites all of these various subgroups when common goals need to be achieved. Thus, there is ultimately a need for both collectivism and individualism within the LGBT movement; individuals get the support they need from their "sub-communities" and exclusive groups, while the LGBT community as a whole serves to advance the rights and acceptance of gay, lesbian and other "queer" groups in our hetero-normal world. Though homophile groups such as the Daughters of Bilitis and the Mattachine Society are often accredited with pushing homosexual rights out into the open, the role of college students in the expansion of the LGBT movement has long been overlooked. In his essay, Brett Beemyn profiles student activism for gay rights and traces the impact that such activism had on the future of the gay liberation movement as a whole. Not only did the SHL promote being forthright about sexual orientation, but it encouraged its gay members to be proud of who they were. Oftentimes, for instance, the SHL would host "zaps", or discussions in which homosexuals would share their own experiences and learn from one another so as to create an environment uninhibited by social norms, fears and prejudices. Despite their emphasis on the concept of being gay, the SHL managed to attract a number of non-gay supporters. Interestingly enough, the majority of the SHL, at its onset, was heterosexual. In addition to the advantages given by heterosexual members, the SHL also made it a policy to not require members to identify themselves with their sexual orientations. Thus, the SHL quite successfully used the collectivist approach to spread the concept of homosexuality. As time went on, however, the SHL began to depart from its more inclusive standpoint and encountered a split between radical activists and those who wished to downplay being gay in order to avoid a great deal of publicity. In terms of identity politics, the gay and lesbian movement was quite divided. Some wanted to stress the similarities between homosexuals and heterosexuals, and thus attempt to assimilate into mainstream society. On the other hand, many activists were fed up with the heteronormal world and wished to break stiff social roles that had been forced upon them. They wished to redefine themselves as separate from the society that threatened to constrain them in every which way possible. Despite these opposing agendas, however, activists of both minds were able to achieve some key goals through the use of collectivism. In her essay, Mary Bernstein discusses this collectivist aspect of the gay and lesbian movement and addresses the gains begotten by such an approach. She especially highlights the homophile movement and groups such as the Daughters of Bilitis and the Mattachine Society as organizations that helped unify all of the divisions within the gay and lesbian movement so as to achieve a set of goals that would allow all divisions to pursue their respective agendas. Homophile groups mainly spearheaded efforts to educate health professionals, as well as other high-ranking officials, in order to reduce the stigma placed on being homosexual. As a result, these professionals would use their sway to change legislation, such as sodomy laws, to better benefit the gay community. Subsequently, a gradual social acceptance of homosexuality came into effect, and lesbians and gay men were more able to emerge from the closeted homophile movements and campaign more openly for their rights. Even though gay activists had a number of varying, and often conflicting, agendas, collectivism nevertheless proved to be vital to the survival of each sub-movement, and the gay movement as a whole.

Without the gains provided by the concentrated effort to educate others about homosexuality, society would not have been as receptive as they proved to be. Not only did it have an enormous impact at the time, but it motivated further radical activism. After the riot had ended, a new form of politics characterized the gay liberation movement--a confrontational politics that required its participants to openly express their dissatisfaction with the current government and its oppression of homosexuals. With this new form of social action numerous riots erupted, some of which drew blood. The violence of this radical method put a spotlight on the gay liberation movement and gave it nation-wide publicity. People all over the country were faced with the growing issue of homosexuality. In addition to the attention that the movement received, the new movement also attracted many new members. These new members were drawn to the group not only because of common sexual identity, but also because they shared a common political perspective. A vast majority of the new members were young radicals that believed in bravely boasting their homosexuality for the world to see in order to force the issue of homosexuality on the American public. Homosexuality was no longer something to be hidden from the world out of fear. Instead, with the title of being gay or lesbian the individuals knew that they were part of an organization that supported its members for who they were. Due to the fact that the American public met homosexuality with strong opposition, gays and lesbians formed tightly knit organizations and circles for support. This created an undoubtedly strong sense of community and brotherhood among its members because they all shared common ideals and experienced the same resentment. Through all of this the gay liberation movement adopted a separatist ideology. Even though they were recruiting thousands of new members, the gay liberation community was solely comprised of homosexuals because they were the ones that shared the common desire for eliminating the oppression of gays and enlisting equal rights. Gays and lesbians have always had to fight against discrimination and prejudice. With the American society uniting against the gays and lesbians a strong sense of union developed among homosexuals. These homosexuals united around the idea that homosexuality was a large part of political and personal identity. Homosexuality was met with resentment and was even labeled a mental illness because it deviated from the social norm of heterosexuality. The prejudices that lesbians and gays faced caused them to form groups that focused on political and social goals as an effort to gain equal stance in society. As time passed, a new generation of homosexuals emerged. This generation held very radical views and possessed an open sense of pride about being homosexual. The new radical theme of the gay liberation movement forced people in American society to acknowledge homosexuality and the lack of equal rights for gays and lesbians as a prominent issue. As the quest for equal rights continued, a sense of identity began to develop among the gays and lesbians. This sense of identity based itself off of the desire for equal rights and a sense of commonality. However, while the presence of a community emerged, the gay liberation transformed into a separatist movement. The gay community centered itself around issues involving the liberation of homosexuals, with their key focus being eliminating oppression and prejudice. The members of this group united to stand against society. By doing this they segregated themselves and their cause. This made it increasingly difficult to gain universal acceptance, which is something that they desperately needed. Nevertheless, the organization and its radical members continued to believe that they had to stand against all of society, rather than trying to incorporate themselves into it. Jeff Goodwin and James M. Identity politics surrounded the LGBT movement. The clashing outlooks on the Queer Theory and the role of transgender and bisexuals were prevalent and it was a constant battle. This, however, was perfectly understandable. While looking at the values of each of the two opposing groups within the LGBT movement, it is apparent that their principles and goals were not the same. This is a classic debate between assimilationists and separatists. Whereas queer deconstructs collective categories, the collective group builds the categories up. It supports them and gives the LGBT movement a public collective identity. Collectivists assert that the gays and lesbians share a minority status: They believe that this clear identity enables them to successfully resist this oppression and make political gain. Despite the large emphasis the article places on Queer Theory, Gamson includes a great deal of information concerning the older generation of gays and lesbians. The generational gap provides the main argument over the word "queer" and basically the distinction between the two groups pushing for equal rights in the LGBT movement; the older group generally making up the assimilationists emphasizing

sameness and the younger generation emphasizing differences and separation. This ideology just does not mesh with the older generation. Primarily, they tend to believe that, to gain the rights they desire, they need to prove that they are just like everyone else. They are normal and they are everywhere and every type of person. These homosexuals are, in every way, similar to heterosexuals and, therefore, deserve the same rights. Secondly, most of the older generation cannot reclaim the word "queer" as the younger generation does. It is derogatory and is associated with very bad memories and crimes. These two disparities make up the major controversies between the groups. Whereas Queer Theory wants to be different and be proud of it, the collective group believes that to further their position in society, it is more effective to be the same and to not shout out the differences that not all gays and lesbians possess. This article is important in contrasting assimilation and separatist ideologies. Gamson expresses both sides very well and shows that both is a useful political tactic. Toward a Post-Queer Study of Sexuality. Queer Theory is a radical form of "deconstructionism. Though queer has been praised for its innovative, in-your-face defiant attitude, according to Green, " Green touches upon the inadequacies present in the theory by identifying two strains and applying them to specific historical cases of homosexuality. He identifies two different strains: Or, in slightly more explicable terms, Green points out that queer theorists tend to underestimate the differences between gay and straight. Yet, secondly, the queer theorists also neglect social roles that both straight and gays possess therefore overestimating straight and gay difference. Though this may sound contradictory, Green logically explains the two largest deficiencies in the Queer Theory through his use of historical context. By analyzing the Queer Theory, Green assists in comparing and contrasting this group and the less modern use of sociology within the LGBT movement. Though eager to be seen as different but still good, they ignore similarities with heterosexuals that the collective group tried to emphasize. And conversely, though obsessed with being different, they are also trying to get exactly the same treatment as heterosexuals, thereby ignoring any of their differences which the original collective group recognizes: Locating the Subject and the Self in Sexuality Studies. Everything is related and tied together in very technical and well thought out terms. It shows, in logical procession, that both Queer Theory and sociology in gender issues were involved in the deconstruction of sexual orientation. Green discusses numerous ideas from the work of Foucault, an authority on the subject of sexuality and gender studies, and contrasts them with Queer Theory. Though Green notes that to some the old school sociology may seem hopelessly outdated, he points out that Queer Theory and the older ideas of sociology are like "siblings, with roots in a parallel deconstructionist conception of identity" Though there may be many small differences, looking at the big picture, one can see that Queer Theory and the older sociological ideas all stem from the same collective ideas and groups. The LGBT movement, as a whole, is a collective group with very similar ideas to deconstruct the hetero-normal sexual orientation. This article is important in showing that, though the Queer Theory and the more conventional sociology are very different, they encompass the same general ideas and goals. As a result of the varying notions of homosexual identity, however, the LGBT movement eventually fragmented into a number of subgroups, each with its own agenda and set of ideals. Despite such dominance of individualism within the gay movement, the LGBT movement has retained the ability to unite whenever the homosexual, bisexual and transgender community has faced threats as a whole.

### 8: Individualism, a System of Politics by Wordsworth Donisthorpe

*Individualism, political and social philosophy that emphasizes the moral worth of the individual. The concept of an individual may seem straightforward, there are many ways of understanding it, both in theory and in practice.*

### 9: Level of analysis - Wikipedia

*Consequently, the political system in an individualistic political culture is as small and unobtrusive as possible, and it exists solely to protect those rights enshrining the individual, such as rights to free speech, assembly, religion, press,*

*property and self-determination.*

*Battle of Jutland The Art of War Plus The Art of Management (Career and Business) Rough diamonds a practical guide Ethiopian health sector transformation plan Russia, the UK, France, China and the tradition The salon/spa business 50 ideas that can change your life From a Syrian to a global jihad Sams Teach Yourself Linux in 10 Minutes Theatre as an east-west encounter Building Spelling Skills 6 Answer Key Arbitrage pricing theory vs capm Detective Phillip Osbourne In Prayers From A Teachers Heart Creation and restoration of coastal plant communities Understanding Mental Retardation (Understanding Health and Sickness Series) Understanding normal and clinical nutrition 10th edition Dreamweaver 8 Essential Training Java by Dissection Aviation assistance 101 Questions Women Ask About Relationships RAS-RAF-MEK-ERK pathway inhibitors Audio mastering essential practices El 12 planeta zecharia sitchin Construction, phase 1 Guide to writing essays Mutant year zero gamesmaster screen American incarnation Correspondence of John Locke and Edward Clarke. On the negative spirit Caroline Myss Essential Guide for Healers Little Ballet Treasury (Miniature Editions) A PATH THRU THE WEEDS On the quantification of horror : notes from the field Patrick Ball Encyclopedia of Race and Ethnic Studies Top 100 engineering colleges in india 2014 History matters minnesota holocaust Kolb experiential learning book A-Z of vegetable variety. Human wisdom of St. Thomas Aquinas*