RES PUBLICA:
AN
INTERNATIONAL
FRAMEWORK
FOR EDUCATION
IN DEMOCRACY

DRAFT

Revised January 2006

**Civitas: An International
Civic Education Exchange Program**

of the

Center for Civic Education

Res Publica: An International Framework for
Education in Democracy

Introduction

Res Publica: *An International Framework for Education in Democracy* is an attempt to develop a cross-cultural and trans-national general statement of the central meanings and character of the ideas, values, principles, and institutions of democracy. Its further purpose is to identify common elements of this knowledge that should be included in the curriculum of any nation wishing to promote an understanding of democratic citizenship and its practice. Begun in 1996, the project's previous drafts have been commented upon by reviewers in every inhabited continent.

The Framework is being developed in the belief that there is a need among educators in democratic nations for a resource that attempts to survey the field of education for democratic citizenship and to set forth comprehensively its principal content.

It is important to understand that the Framework is intended as a starting point for discussion, rather than an attempt to pronounce a set of authoritative dogmas. Thus, like democracy itself, the Framework is to be viewed as perpetually unfinished, subject to continuing debate and emendation.

The intended audience for the Framework ranges from teachers and educational policy makers responsible for civic education programs to curriculum developers, and teacher education and credentialing institutions responsible for training competent classroom teachers. The Framework can also be used as a resource by any group or individual interested in democracy. The Framework is not intended, however, as a student text.

We ask readers in any part of the world to comment freely and critically on this Framework on a continuing basis.

Introduction

The purpose of *Res Publica: An International Framework for Education for Democracy* is to provide a general statement of the meaning and practice of democracy that the people of any country can use as a resource in developing programs to educate citizens for democracy. *Res Publica*:

■   articulates a framework of ideas—concepts, values, principles, and structures— for the creation of educational programs on democracy.

■   treats the study of democracy by citizens as an independent domain of inquiry.

■   provides a basis for analysis, comparison, and evaluation of political systems in terms of the fundamentals that underlie democracy.

■   encompasses and integrates ideas from many disciplines in order to provide a broad perspective useful in reflecting on the virtues and problems of democracy.

■   provides the basis for arguments for democracy and acknowledges arguments against democracy.

■   provides a comprehensive view of the field that educators and policy makers may find helpful in developing programs in education for democracy.

■   highlight the importance of inquiry and debate to democracy by organizing the inquiry according to questions suggestive of an approach to teaching and learning consistent with democratic values.

Res Publica is not intended to be

■   a "final answer." Though prescriptive in character, it addresses democracy's problematics. Its objective is to promote robust debate and discussion.

■   a complete program; particular countries would need to add material specific to themselves to the material in the text.

■   a curriculum or textbook; rather it is intended as a resource to be used to develop curricula and textbooks.

■   a position on the "best" form of democracy; it acknowledges that a number of forms may be desirable.

Audiences. The primary audiences of this framework are policy makers, curriculum developers, academic specialists, teacher trainers, textbook writers, documentary and other media producers, teachers, and evaluators. Other audiences include parents, civic groups, professional organizations, and governmental agencies.

Primary uses of the framework include:

■   Creating and evaluating civic education programs

■   Developing textbooks and other educational materials

■   Teaching about democracy

■   Discussion and debate about democracy

**An International Framework for
Education in Democracy**

I.   What is democracy?

II.   Who belongs and who governs in a democracy?

III.   Why choose democracy?

IV.   What conditions support democracy?

V.   How does democracy work?

VI.   How do democracies emerge, develop, survive, and improve?

VII.   How does democracy shape the world and the world shape democracy?

I. What is democracy?

A. What does "democracy" mean?

B. What are major forms of political systems other than democracy?

C. What are power and authority and what is their place in a democracy?

D. How do civic life, politics, and government provide spheres for the practices of democracy?

E. What is the relationship of government "founded on the people" to idea of a "constitution"?

F. What is "constitutionalism" and what is its relationship to "constitution"?

G. What is the relationship between law, constitutionalism, and democracy?

H. What is the relationship between democracy and human rights?

I. What are the essential characteristics of democracy?

I. What is democracy?

Across the world today, "democracy" is a rallying cry for the reformation of civic life and political order. The values, principles, and structures of democracy provide the prevailing standard by which political systems are judged. But the concept and practices of democracy are neither agreed upon nor, in many cases, well understood.

Democracy is not a simple idea. It cannot be encompassed in a simple definition. The seven parts of this *International Framework for Education in Democracy*, taken together, provide an explanation of democracy as an idea and offer a portrayal of the various ways in which the democratic idea is implemented in the world. The *Framework* begins with a basic explanation of some of the [**key elements**] of democracy and each succeeding part builds upon and extends this initial understanding of the concept of democracy.

A. **What does "democracy" mean?** A knowledge and appreciation of democracy as a **form** of civic life and political system requires an understanding of the basic concept of democracy. It requires an awareness of the common misuses and abuses of the term. It also requires a comprehension of the distinctions between the theoretical **types** of democracy: "liberal" (individual-centered) and "non-liberal" (community-centered). And, finally, it requires a description of the **kinds** of democracy that are observable as systems of workable government.

  1. **Basic concept of democracy and common misuses and abuses of the term**

      a. **Basic concept of democracy.** The word democracy is derived from the Greek words *demos* or "people" and *kratia* meaning "authority" or "rule." Thus "democracy" may be defined simply as "rule of the people." Classically the term *demos* referred to the lower classes, which constituted most of the population of a society. Over time, "the people" has come to mean the entire population or the citizenry of a country.

      Understanding the concept of "democracy" is more complex and demanding than merely defining a word. Building on the earliest origins of the word, the concept of democracy as "popular self-government" rests on the principle that the people as a whole are considered the foundation of political life. They are the ultimate source of authority, their interests and welfare are the principal ends of government, and their rights are the foundation of justice, the ultimate standard of the good society.

      In a democracy, political power is legitimized (becomes [**morally**] authorized) only when it arises from the people. It can arise from the free decisions of the people as a whole only when each person has the liberty to make fundamental political choices. Thus, liberty is the fundamental precondition for the very concept of self-government. "Self-government" embraces both individual and collective aspects of self-rule or "autonomy"—a word derived from the Greek *auto (*self) and *nomos* (law or binding custom).

      There are two ways in which the legitimization of government by the people takes place. First, the people never give up their inherent authority to make and remake their form of government. Second, the people continuously authorize the use of political power in their name by officials and institutions that remain accountable to them. Thus, in a democracy the people

      • **authorize** ("author") the fundamental plan of the political system at its beginning and approve the subsequent design of its institutions and

      • **consent** (agree to) to the conduct of the offices of government established as part of that system, including the actions and policies of those institutions.

Therefore, the concept of democracy is centered on the principle of the **sovereignty of the people** or **"popular sovereignty."** In democratic theory, the people cannot give up their sovereign power, nor can they give up their inherent liberty to give and withhold their consent to government. In effect, they have inalienable ownership of their government. Even in a representative democracy, where the people authorize others to act on their behalf, they do not in fact surrender their power; the people merely delegate it to others who serve as their trustees. According to the principle of popular sovereignty, authority flows from people to those in positions of political power, not from rulers to the people.

Since it is founded upon the sovereignty of the people as a whole, the concept of democracy at its most basic level includes majority rule and respect for those in the minority, because they are part of the whole people. [**In some cases the idea of majority rule is modified in various ways in societies where consensus is highly valued. For example, some systems use various forms of weighted voting or super-majorities.**] In its status as an integral part of the people, a minority may never legitimately be treated unfairly. All members of the polity possess a political status of equal citizenship. Therefore, to the degree that any part of the people of a political community (whether individuals or groups) is excluded from full participation in political life or is unfairly targeted for negative or detrimental treatment, a [**political system**] is [**not fully**] democratic.

In addition, since democracy is founded upon the premise of individuals governing themselves, elements of personal liberty must exist in the practice of any democracy. But this basic concept of democracy does not, by itself, include the protection of a full range of individual rights or the right of minorities to be treated differently from everyone else (liberalism). Nor does it include the principle of a full range of limits on government (constitutionalism).

No existing or historical political order fully realizes the basic idea of democracy. Nonetheless this idea of democracy can be used as a standard by which a person can evaluate a country as being more or less democratic.

Basic concept of democracy summarized here. CB to do.

b. **Common misuses and abuses of the term "democracy**." Many countries claiming to be democracies do not meet the criteria of the basic idea of democracy outlined above. Such claims may arise from a misunderstanding of the concept or from the intentional misuse of it. To understand the concept of democracy, it is helpful to understand how and why the terms "democracy" and "democratic" have been corrupted and misused. These terms have been invoked to

- cloak despotic regimes that manipulate and appeal to popular sentiment but which violate fundamental rights of the people, e.g., demagoguery.

- disguise a despotism in which political participation and elections are mere showpieces rigged by government to accomplish predetermined outcomes, e.g., sham democracies.

- incorporate only highly selective elements of democracy or incorporate some elements in a distorted fashion, e.g., an election that empowers an autocracy; majority rule that becomes a tyranny of the majority.

- invoke the rhetoric of the "people's will" without using democratic procedures to determine that will, resulting in, e.g., mob rule, "dictatorship of the proletariat."

- misrepresent a partial interest which may have substantial public support as if it were the equivalent of the common good.

2. **Basic theoretical types of democracy.** Any political system must structure the relationship between the individual and the community. Democracy must attempt to organize this relationship in such a way that both the integrity of the individual and the wellbeing of the community are protected and realized. Practical political arrangements, however, may require a choice of emphasis on the behalf of the individual or the community. Although a democratic political system may choose to emphasize the individual or the community, the awareness and recognition of the alternative choice must provide a counterbalance. Where either emphasis is taken to an extreme, democracy loses the moderation necessary for its durability and stability. To deny the importance of the integrity of the individual or the wellbeing of the community is to attack the foundation of a democratic political order.

   While acknowledging the need to accommodate the integrity of the person as an individual and the unity of the people as a whole, the fundamental commitments or animating spirit of any functioning democracy will be oriented more toward the individual or toward the community. Further, a given political system may reflect different choices of emphasis over the course of its history or even, at the same time, in different aspects of political life.

   Democratic political systems embodying these different orientations may be categorized as **individual-centered** or **community-centered**. These two categories reflect a distinction between what has been called "private liberty" and "public liberty." Private liberty refers to the capacity of the individual, as an independent agent, to act autonomously. Public liberty refers to the capacity of the people, as an independent polity, to govern themselves. The more modern understanding of the concepts of "personal liberties" and "political liberties" has its origins in this distinction.

   Any particular democracy that can exist in practice will be a mixture of these two theoretical orientations—individual-centered and community-centered. These orientations are in fundamental tension, which cannot be completely resolved in a democracy without undermining the autonomy of the individual or the sovereignty of the people as a whole, both of which are essential to democracy. Democracy must be committed to the self-determination of the person as well as to the self-determination of the whole people. One of these commitments may predominate, but in a democracy it must not do so to the exclusion of the other.

   Any democracy will embody a particular configuration of attributes from individual and community-centered theories that reflects the ethos of a society and its institutions. (For example, a particular democracy might emphasize individual freedom over social equality.) Even within a given democracy, in the course of its history, the emphasis on the status of the individual or the community might change.

   To the extent that the status and autonomy of the individual predominate in a democratic political system, it may be categorized as a "liberal" type of democracy. To the extent that the status of the community predominates, it may be categorized as a "non-liberal" type of democracy, or in more extreme cases, where the status and autonomy of the individual are minimized, an "ill-liberal" type of democracy.

   a. **Individual-centered theory.** This theory holds that all political authority should be derived from free individuals acting in concert with other free individuals. When a political association is based upon the priority of the individual, the resulting political system is characterized as "liberal." The term "liberal" is derived from the Latin word "liber," meaning "free."

      "Liberalism" is a political theory that the principal, essential purpose of government and politics is the protection of the autonomy and rights of the individual, beginning with the individual's right to life itself. In a liberal political system, the common good is understood as the aggregation of individual

goods and interests rather than as having an independent collective character. In liberal theory, authority is grounded on and limited to the use of governmental power for the protection of the life, liberty, and property of individuals.

In a liberal type of democracy, the individual is primary and the essential rights of the individual are emphasized. Rights are considered essential when they are necessary to the person's life, liberty, and property. Such rights of the individual may even take precedence over the interests of the people as a whole or the community, e.g., conscientious objection to public policies such as compulsory military service. More typically, however, when the interest of the community as a whole is acknowledged, it is conceived in terms of the collectivity of individual interests and those social values that make individual rights secure. Thus, in a liberal type of democracy, the rights of individuals are considered an integral part of the common good. Community goods like common defense, systems of criminal law, security of contracts, and economic prosperity may be seen as culminations of a liberal democracy's commitment to the interests and welfare of individuals.

The institutions and processes of liberal democracy must, therefore, be designed to protect the political, economic, civil, and personal rights of the individual as fundamental to the very nature of the political system (e.g., freedom of conscience and religion, freedom of personal as well as political expression, a right to property, and a right to privacy—the right to be let alone). The activities in the private sphere of a liberal democracy are protected from interference by government unless government can provide compelling, overriding reasons predicated on liberal values themselves. In particular, however, the essential rights of the individual and the autonomy of the private sphere must be protected against intrusion by majority will.

b. **Community-centered theory.** This theory holds that all political authority should originate in the collective acts of the people as a unity or the acts of founders serving on their behalf. These founding acts must be validated by the community. When a political body is organized around the priority of the community and the pursuit of a collective way of life, the resulting political system may be characterized as "non-liberal, " [**such as in a**] "social democracy," [**which is non-liberal in the sense that certain economic freedoms are curtailed.**] In systems like this, the primary purpose of government is to serve the collective interest of the community or the general welfare of the society. The well-being of the people as a whole is foremost and may take precedence over certain rights and interests of particular individuals.

In a non-liberal type of democracy, the public rights and interests of persons to participate in the decision-making processes and political life of the community are recognized and protected as fundamental to the very nature of the political system (e.g., right to vote, right to associate for political purposes, freedom of the press, freedom of political assembly, the right to seek and hold public office). A non-liberal democracy, however, might not recognize certain rights regarded as fundamental by liberal democracies such as freedom of conscience and religion, personal expression, and the right to a private sphere.

Thus, non-liberal democracy is designed to serve the interests of the community and the rights of the people as a whole. The emphasis in this type of democracy includes the right to establish and enforce community values over the protests of individuals and in conflict with their interests. The scope of the public domain may preempt the right to privacy.

Within non-liberal democracy in practice there may be a wider range of examples and greater divergence among instances of political systems than in liberal democracy. The category of non-liberal democracies includes:

11

- classical republics, in which there were democratic elements such as popular participation and representation but where civic virtue and an emphasis on the common good were primary

- social democracies, in which providing for the welfare of the constituent groups of the society (e.g., children, workers, the aged) is paramount, as contrasted with maximizing individual liberty

- "communal commonwealths," in which the political system is understood as the common property of all of its citizens and the status of the citizen is derived entirely from membership in the common association. Thus, the identity and standing of the person is subsumed in the common mores of the community.

- modern "electoral democracies," in which a single component of democracy—elections assessed to be essentially free—is held to be sufficient to qualify a political system as democratic. So long as officials have been chosen by the electorate, the daily practices of government do not need to meet standards derived from democratic values or principles.

c. **Combining individual- and community-centered theories of democracy.** No actual democracy is purely individual-centered or community centered. Every democracy embodies a mixture of these two theoretical orientations as well as gradations of emphasis on either liberal or non-liberal characteristics.

- **Mixtures of liberal and non-liberal types of democracy**. Neither real liberty nor true authority can exist in extreme conditions of unalloyed individualism or collectivism. Unless a political system reflects a hybrid of individual-centered and community-centered theories it will not meet the criteria of the concept of democracy, because by definition democracy is committed to both individual and collective self-determination. Unless a political system reflects a well-composed mixture of liberal and non-liberal types, it will not be a stable democracy because it will not have moderated extreme individualism and collectivism, neither of which is compatible with democratic self-governance. Therefore, democracies cannot be pure versions of individual or collective theories; they must combine elements of both liberal and non-liberal types of democracy [**so long as non-liberal elements do not denigrate basic individual liberties.]**

- **Gradations within liberal and non-liberal types of democracy.** Even within the two theoretical types of democracy, there are elements of political practices and institutions that reflect values that would be consistent to a greater degree with the animating spirit of either individual- or community-centered theories.

  - Any political system will have political practices, laws, and institutions that reflect individual-centered or community-centered theories. For example, parliamentary systems may be seen as reflecting community-centered theory in that without a sufficient consensus in both the community and parliament, the existing governmental administration falls. In contrast, coordinate-powers ("separation of powers") systems may be seen as reflecting individual-centered theory. [**This is because]** they are designed to accommodate conflict among individuals and among group interests, within society and among governmental institutions and political leaders, without requiring consensus for the government to continue to operate.

  - The number and predominance of the elements reflecting each theory may vary among democratic political systems. For example, a non-liberal democratic political system may exhibit a strong commitment to the development of civic virtue, but not to economic equality among citizens. Another example might be a liberal democratic system committed to comprehensive freedom of expression, but which emphasizes the moral instruction of its young citizens.

- Each element within a political system may display greater consistency with one theory or the other. For example, within an individual-centered theory, freedom of expression will be understood as the right of the individual to communicate his or her distinctive identity or point of view. This may be extended to forms of expression that are novel or even repugnant to prevailing social sentiment. By contrast, within a community-centered theory, freedom of expression might be restricted to freedom of speech on matters of official governmental policy. Or, because of the collective right of the people to accept or reject the political system itself, freedom of expression might extend to all aspects of the public domain including the advocacy of ideas that threaten the foundations of the political order.

- A democratic political system may also contain one or more elements, each of which reflects both theories. For example, economic rights may sustain the individual's security while at the same time contributing to the community's prosperity. Nevertheless, the particular way an element, such as economic rights, is manifest in a political system reflects the influence of either individual-centered or community-centered theories. Thus, under the first theory, economic rights might be geared more to individual initiative; under the second theory, they may be geared more to egalitarian distribution.

- The combination of individual- and community-centered elements existing in any democratic political system imparts a distinctive character to that system. The various elements will be configured so that they reinforce, counter-balance, compensate for, and even conflict with each other. For example, a democracy might operate by majority rule, counter-balanced by the power of the judiciary to protect the rights of individuals. Also, for example, the right to self-determination might be protected for the individual who for religious reasons chooses to avoid inoculation against contagious disease in conflict with the right of the community to promote public health.

3. **Observable kinds of democracy.**

The basic concept of democracy sets forth certain characteristics of a political system. Liberal or non-liberal systems are referred to in this *Framework* as "types" of democracies. But this "concept" and these "types" do not include all of the choices of elements needed to create a workable political system, e.g., the choice of direct or representative democracy. Depending upon which structural elements of politics and government are chosen, different "kinds" of democracy (as they will be referred to in the *Framework)* will emerge historically or be established deliberately.

Note: do chart to illustrate use of terms, e.g., forms, types, kinds

In any political system, power must be organized and channeled. In a democratic system, the power of the people may be organized and channeled in a number of fundamentally different ways, but the sovereign people always retain the ultimate authority even if they do not always exercise it directly.

The following are alternative kinds of democracy which represent different political configurations of the people's delegation of their authority. In practice, moreover, elements of the following kinds of democracy are mixed and their combination may vary over time within a country.

a. **Direct or representative democracy**

- **direct democracy -** citizens rule directly, usually through popular assemblies.

- **representative democracy -** citizens choose individuals to rule in their place or on their behalf, and delegate power to one or more legislative bodies.

b. **Majoritarian or consociational democracy**

- **majoritarian** - laws are passed by simple majority vote either by the people or by legislative assemblies.

- **consociational or supermajoritarian** - laws cannot be passed without the approval either of a legislative supermajority (such as two-thirds or three-quarters) or of defined communal groups, e.g., ethnic groups. In some cases these arrangements amount to power-sharing by two or more ethnic or cultural groups. [**Consociational democracy also involves other provisions to require broad consensus on important decisions, to represent different groups in proportion to their population, and to restrain the majority.)**

c. **Competitive or consensual democracies**

- **competitive** - the processes of deciding political issues are designed to accommodate a struggle among divergent interests and goals in which there may be winners and losers.

- **consensual** - the processes of deciding political issues are designed to harmonize divergent interests and goals into a mutually acceptable agreement.

d. **Centralized or decentralized democracies**

- **centralized -** a single government is paramount and can overrule its subservient local or regional components or it can dispense with them and rule localities directly.

- **decentralized** - each of two or more governments (or levels of government) has sufficient power for some ends, but neither is paramount in all spheres. In some cases they must share responsibilities (e.g., a federal system).

B. **What are major forms of political systems other than democracy?** In addition to knowledge of the basic choices that shape particular democracies, one must examine basic choices and justifications underlying other political systems in order to understand democracy in comparison with alternatives.

1. **The foundations and justifications of alternatives to democracy.**

a. **The identity of the rulers.** Political systems may be ruled by the one, the few, or the many. Political systems have traditionally been designated as monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy—or, in their perverted forms, tyranny, oligarchy, or "mob rule." These traditional forms may also be mixed and in some cases the best form of government was considered to be a constitution that mixed the three non-perverted forms.

b. **Membership in the political system** can be based upon:

- ethnicity or "blood"

- civic identity predicated on an attachment to certain common political values and principles

- a "cosmopolitan" idea in which membership is potentially open to anyone

c. **The relationship between the rulers and the ruled** may be based on

- paternalism (including natural/familial relations)

- domination (including conquest or subjugation)

- consent or agreement (including covenantal relations)

d. **The justification for a political system—**whether authority is exercised by the one, the few, the many, or mixtures of these—may be based upon:

- power derived from inheritance

- justification by tradition

- "right of conquest"

- power based on one's stake in society, e.g., wealth and social standing, property

- "divine right" bestowed upon an individual, family, clan, or a "chosen" people

- special knowledge or virtue, such as knowledge of "God's will" or "the laws of history"

- superior intelligence in the science of government

- claims that persons have liberty in nature that must be recognized and preserved by any legitimate political authority

- consent of the governed

2. **Classification of forms of political systems other than democracy.** A number of political systems exist, or have existed, which rely upon these foundations and justifications or upon combinations of them. Aspects of these forms of political systems may also appear in existing functioning democratic systems. In some cases, this mixture may strengthen or moderate the democratic form of government and other cases they may contradict its justification or undermine its foundation. These systems include:

a. **Monarchy** ("rule of the one") is usually represented by a single individual (called king, queen, czar, emperor, chief, emir or other title, implying hierarchical preeminence). Monarchy is based upon the principle that the people have a unity and commonality that can be personified by a single ruler. That ruler is obligated to have the best interests of the community at heart. One of the attributes of monarchy, especially hereditary monarchy, is that the monarch represents the community over time. Several types of monarchy have existed, some survive today, and some may yet be established.

15

- **Traditional monarchy** is a system in which power is held by a ruler whose legitimacy is usually based upon inheritance. There have been instances, however, of elective monarchy, and such monarchies may trace their authority back to an original election. In traditional monarchy, the ruler is considered to be sovereign but is constrained by the power and influence of an aristocracy as well as by custom. In modern monarchies the ruler is usually constrained by constitutional principles and sometimes even by popular opinion.

- **Absolute monarchy** is a system in which the ruler's power is unrestrained, e.g., by an aristocracy, custom, or constitution. **Enlightened despotism** is a variant of absolute monarchy in which a ruler claims to use absolute power for the good of society, on the basis of superior knowledge, wisdom, and personal virtue.

b. **Constitutional "monarchy**" is a system in which authority is either symbolically embodied in or focused upon a monarch. But political power, with a few exceptions where vestigial powers may be retained, is exercised by other institutions, especially legislative bodies, or by an aristocracy. In a constitutional monarchy the monarch does not exercise power directly, but only through other institutions which may be representative of the society. Most contemporary instances of constitutional monarchy exhibit aspects of liberal democracy, such as protection of individual rights and free elections. [**Most contemporary political systems called constitutional monarchies are, in fact, liberal democracies.**]

c. **Aristocracy** is the rule of the few who are considered to have the wisdom, knowledge, and character to act on behalf of the fundamental interests of a society as a whole. Historically, the authority of the aristocrat has been based on merit arising from the cultivation of intellect and character which develops a deep seated concern for the well-being of the community and a capacity to ascertain it and act on the behalf of the common good. In this regard, the aristocracy may devote a particular solicitude for the weakest members of the society. Classically conceived, an aristocracy is composed of the "best" members of society or the "elect" who rule for the public good, and not just in their own interest.

d. "**Liberal" regimes** are political systems built upon the principles of liberalism. They are structured to protect the autonomy of the person conceived as a rational being capable of exercising liberty. The public good is considered solely as the accumulation of the interests of discrete individuals. The idea of a political community as having a collective interest separate from and superior to the interests of the individuals that make it up is denied. But individuals are understood as capable of making common cause for the protection of their general interests. To the extent that majority rule endangers individual liberty, liberal systems are anti-majoritarian in their political processes. Thus they provide for free and fair elections but all of the people are not included in the electorate for fear that not everyone is sufficiently qualified to make judgments affecting the liberty and welfare of others. As a consequence of commitment to individual liberty and limited participation, there is a narrowed domain in which government can legitimately exercise authority and make policy. [**While non-democratic liberal regimes have existed both historically and in a few minor examples today, in the contemporary world liberal regimes only flourish in the context of democracy.**]

e. **Oligarchy** is rule by a small number of persons relative to the population, who rule in the interests of themselves or their class, rather than for the common good. They may claim, however, that the interests of their class are equivalent to the interests of the country. In times of crisis, in the absence of an effective, duly constituted authority, a small group may assume power claiming a capacity to restore and maintain order. They may uses crises as devices for seeking their own advantage and attempt to maintain their power in order to preserve their advantage.

One form of oligarchy is "plutocracy," the rule of the wealthy in a system where protecting the interests of those with money may be purported to protect the long-term interests of the country. It may

16

be claimed that if one has the capacity to acquire and keep wealth, one has the right and the capacity to rule. Another form of oligarchy is a military junta which may justify its rule through its claim that it can provide order against violence, that it has a secure grasp of the national interest, and/or that its special rationality can overcome the causes of disorder or chaos prevailing in society. [**Finally, oligarchical "democracy" is a political system in which the franchise is limited to certain groups, such as racial groups.**]

f. **Authoritarian systems** rule without the express consent of the citizens. Those in power claim to be capable of making decisions that ordinary persons are incapable of making. In these cases authority, the legitimate use of power, gives way to a system that is focused on command, decisiveness, and obedience and may project an image of paternalism. Those in power do not provide reasons for their actions and are not held accountable to anyone but themselves. In authoritarian governments, political power is concentrated in one person or a small group, and all other individuals and groups are entirely excluded from the exercise of political power. Nevertheless, a range of activity in non-political affairs is permissible for other members of the society, thus some level of civil society is permitted. Authoritarian governments may be welcomed when people are frustrated because of disorder, intractable problems, and inefficiency of government.

[**Authoritarian political systems are found in many forms such as military, one party, and multiparty "psuedodemocracy' or what has been called "electoral authoritarian regimes."**] These may include dictatorships by a single individual or by groups. Such dictatorships may use the form of the "one-party state" as a mask for the absence of free political choice by the citizens.

g. **Tyranny** is rule by unaccountable force wielded personally by a leader who governs by dominating the population. This form of rule is marked by lawlessness or arbitrary and unlimited exercise of power, often for the personal or factional advantage or glory of the leader. It is sometimes the consequence of demagoguery or the result of mob rule where the people may seem to have endorsed the leader at an earlier point in his or her career. But it may arise as a result of a leader's amassing force in the form of a military or paramilitary unit, the police, an internal security apparatus, or a body of armed supporters that make up the equivalent of a private army. This form of rule is usually an ad hoc arrangement, sometimes justified by circumstances portrayed as crises. This form of rule may arise through a [**military or civilian**] coup d'etat and typically has no provision for its regular institutionalization or succession.

h. **Totalitarian systems** are systems in which the entire range of human activity is subject to government direction and control. Society is conceived of ideally as a complete unity where individuality and deviation from a comprehensive ideology must be suppressed as a way of defending against threats to social order. The entire resources of the society, including the thoughts of its members, are mobilized to preserve the security of the system. Such systems, therefore, have not occurred before the twentieth century because the technology for total social control was not available.

Totalitarian systems are absolute dictatorships identified by features such as:

- unlimited scope of political domination and direction over society and the individual, including all forms of culture.

- complete suppression of civil society through prohibition of all forms of independent associational life and individual action.

- **Extensive mobilization of society through organizations of the party-state**

- **Pervasive state surveillance and lack of individual privacy**

17

- use of terror by secret police as a means of control, including extensive imprisonment and/or large-scale executions.h

- extensive use of modern technology as an instrument of control.

- all-encompassing ideology— reinforced by the educational system and mass media—from which the regime tolerates no dissent.

- mandated overt expressions of loyalty by the population, such as voting in sham elections, and participating in demonstrations, community service, and political rallies. **Those who do not express active support for the state are considered to be in opposition to it, which is forbidden.**

C. **What are power and authority, and what is their place in a democracy?** Like all political systems, democracies include arrangements of power and authority that respond to the need of human societies for governance. An understanding of democracy cannot be achieved without an understanding of the concepts of power and authority that are fundamental building blocks of politics and government.

1. **Power** may be defined as the capacity to effect outcomes by controlling, directing, or exerting influence, whether or not there is a right to do so[**that is, whether it is legitimate or not.]** Power can be exercised by such means as persuasion, force or threat of force, coercion, or manipulation. The possession or use of power in and of itself does not justify such power. To be justified, power must be derived from a source that is widely seen as legitimate and it must be used in accordance with the purposes for which it was created.

2. **Authority** is justified power or the legitimate right to act on behalf of someone or something other than oneself. **Political authority** is the legitimized and institutionalized right of officials to exercise power in the name of, for example, a supreme being, the state, the constitution, or the people.

   The exercise of authority carries with it an expectation of deference, that is, an implicit acceptance of the right to exercise it. Such authority, however, is always constrained by the principles that make it legitimate. Actions of those in authority that violate such constraints constitute a misuse or abuse of authority and are consequently not legitimate.

   The idea of authority does not mean that the ends sought by the authority or the means used to attain them are morally sound. Authority may be granted to use immoral means and/or seek immoral ends, e.g., an unjust war.

3. **Characteristics of political authority** include:

   a. **Legitimacy**: the belief that those in positions of authority have the right to claim and exercise power.

   b. **Stability:** the idea of authority usually implies that it continues over an extended period of time. Although authority may need to be confirmed by the people from time to time, it tends to disintegrate when those who exercise it are changed with great frequency.

   c. **Deference:** assent and respect habitually given to the exercise of power seen as legitimate.

   d. **Conditionality:** the use of authority must remain true to the purposes that make it legitimate.

4. **Sources of political authority**. Historically, typical sources of political authority include:

   a. **A supreme being** - Rulers may claim that their right to rule derives from a supreme being. Such rulers may include prophets and other religious figures as well as monarchs claiming a divine mandate for their authority. Democracy may claim that the will of God is reflected in the voice of the people.

b. **Birth** - Rulers have claimed authority as a right of birth, sometimes rooted in an original divine mandate, passed on through generations by inheritance and sanctioned by tradition. Such rulers include monarchs and aristocrats.

c. **Conquest or superior force** - Rulers have claimed authority over a people after they have conquered them ("right of conquest").

d. **Inherent or natural strength** - Rulers or dominant groups have claimed authority over other groups with the justification that they have superior moral, racial, or cultural traits and abilities.

e. **Moral obligation -** Rulers have claimed that because of the status and attributes bestowed upon them by birth (e.g., class, religion, family, gender), they have a duty to aid those less fortunate by using their superior gifts to govern on their behalf.

f. **Virtue** - Rulers have claimed authority as a consequence of their own virtue. The idea is that this goodness enables the virtuous to transcend human foibles and rise above personal conflicts.

g. **Knowledge** - Rulers have claimed authority based in superior knowledge that legitimized their rule. Sometimes this was philosophical or ethical knowledge or knowledge of the "laws of history."

h. **Wisdom** - Rulers have claimed authority on the basis of wisdom that includes deep understanding of, and superior judgment in, dealing with human affairs.

i. **Consent or covenant** - Rulers have claimed that their authority is legitimized by the consent of those they rule or as a result of a compact of individuals to make common cause. In democracies, **through a constitution and body of laws,** the power of government is delegated by the people who consent to its use to serve the purposes for which the government was established.

5. **Power and authority in a democracy.** Democracy is a means for transforming power into authority and using it for the public good. Thus democracy and power are not antithetical. But democratic government can use power only when is has been transformed into authority. Like any form of government, democracy requires authority in order to accomplish the purposes of the body politic. Democracy also enhances authority by providing a widespread and stable source of its legitimacy and by focusing its use on specific purposes.

Because democracy recognizes the ultimate power of the people in the conduct of public affairs, it necessitates a separation of political authority from any authority that has a source other than the human (e.g., God, science, or forms of revealed truth) or from the political people as a whole.

a. **Generation of power.** Democracy is a process for generating and sustaining power. By harnessing the dispersed power of individuals in a society, democracy concentrates this power so it can be used, as authority, on behalf of society.

b. **Transformation of power into authority.** Authority in a democracy is derived from the people as a whole who are intended to be the focus of the beneficial use of that authority. Thus the source of authority in a democracy establishes the ends for which authority is to be used. So long as authority is used to achieve these established ends it will be considered legitimate by those it governs.

c. **Purposes for which democracies generate and use authority.** Democracies have a large capacity for generating power. But, the justification for generating such power and transforming it into authority must limit its reach or extent. Purposes for which democracies use authority include:

- establishing and maintaining order and security

- **advancing the overall welfare of society**

- peacefully accommodating conflict

- focusing diverse interests and resources to achieve a unified objective

- protecting fundamental rights and freedoms

- determining the distribution of burdens and benefits

   d. **Division of human and divine authority.** The very possibility of human governance based on the will of the people requires that political power be separate from and not controlled or superceded by religious authority. This does not mean that political authority controls the religious realm in the conduct of religious affairs, nor does it mean that religious beliefs and values have no place in political deliberation or in public life.

D. **How do civic life, politics, and government provide spheres for the practices of democracy?** A commitment to democracy potentially affects and transforms all aspects of human life, especially those that pertain to the relationships of persons in any community. These may include the workplace, the school, the arts, the family, other personal relationships, and even the mentality of a people. Democratic practices take place in a number of spheres ranging from the most extensive sphere (civic life), to the narrower sphere (politics), and to the most intensively focused sphere (government). Both politics and government are contained within the sphere of civic life and government is contained within the sphere of politics. Distinguishing among these three spheres clarifies the domains in which democratic practices can take place.

   1. **Civic life.** Civic life is the public life of citizens concerned with the common affairs and mutual interests of the community and nation. Civic life is distinguished from private life, the personal life of the individual devoted to the pursuit of particular interests.

   2. **Politics**. Politics is the organized process for collective action found in all human societies. It enables people to accomplish goals they could not achieve as individuals. Politics is chosen as a means for reaching decisions by a group of persons in order to prevent or avoid violence. In this view, violence constitutes a breakdown of politics and results in its negation. Therefore, politics may be understood as a process by which **persons or groups**, whose opinions or interests may be divergent or in conflict:

      a. reach collective decisions, through non-violent struggle and/or accommodation, generally regarded as binding and enforced as common policy or rules

      b. seek the power to make decisions about such matters as the distribution of scarce resources, allocation of benefits and burdens, management of conflicts, and the aspirations of the community as a whole

      c. engage in competitive struggle to determine who gets what from scarce resources.

   3. **Government.** The term government refers to the authoritative and institutionalized leadership, direction, or control exercised over the inhabitants of a community, its territory, and its resources. This leadership, direction, or control is exercised through the making, implementing, enforcing, and adjudicating of rules and policies.

   4. **Necessity and desirability of politics and government.** Politics and government are a necessity in any society. Politics and government are integral to society in the sense that a society cannot exist without them. The conduct of politics and the establishment of government may reflect the aspirations of people in their fundamental desire to live together. Among the arguments supporting this proposition regarding the aspirations of people are the following:

a. The development of a political association is a natural process evolving from more rudimentary forms of association such as the family. Furthermore, human beings cannot fulfill their potential without politics and government (Aristotle and Cicero).

b. Human beings are incomplete, sinful, or depraved by nature and would therefore be insecure or endangered without government (Christianity, Islam, Judaism, other religions, some ancient Chinese philosophers, and modern skeptics).

c. Because some individuals threaten the lives and welfare of others, people feel compelled to protect themselves by forming a common association (*civitas* or commonwealth) for their security and common defense (Thomas Hobbes).

d. Politics necessarily arises whenever groups of people live together, since they must always reach collective decisions of one kind or another; in addition, organized political life enables people to accomplish goals they could not realize alone (John Locke and Jean-Jacques Rousseau).

5. **The purposes of politics and government**. Differing ideas about the purposes of government have profound consequences for individuals and society.

    a. **Purposes.** Among competing purposes of politics and government that have existed historically are:

    - providing for a people's security

    - improving the moral character of citizens

    - furthering the interests of a particular class or ethnic group

    - realizing a set of religious prescriptions or aspirations

    - glorifying the state

    - promoting individual security and public order

    - integrating diversity into a unified enterprise

    - enhancing economic prosperity

    - protecting individual rights

    - promoting the common good

    - achieving social equality

    - establishing justice

    b. **Consequences.** The primary objectives sought by a government affect relationships between the individual and government and between government and society as a whole. For example:

    - Promoting a religious or secular vision of what society should be like may require a government to restrict individual thought, expression, actions, and behavior, as well as place strict controls on the whole of society.

21

- Limiting the activities of government to protecting the security and property of the citizens may require restricting the power of government to intrude into their private or personal lives.

E. **What is the relationship of government "founded on the people" to idea of a "constitution"?**

The idea of constitution may refer to three levels — the elemental coherence of a people, the design of a polity, and the framework of a government. At each level the idea of a constitution provides human beings with the means to take possession of their lives and destiny.

A defined population is not in and of itself a civically united people with the potential to become "a political people" or "a body politic." To become such a civicly united people—i.e., a "civic people" or a "political association"—a population must be held together by relationships of mutuality or toleration sufficient to make a common life possible. This coherence of the population as a civic body may be conceived as an elemental "constitution" of the people in which they could recognize each other as potential fellow countrymen.

Such a coherence of the population constitutes the possibility for the development of a political people as a sovereign whole. This elemental constitution also provides the groundwork for the creation of an autonomous political unit or polity that may take any of several forms.

The values of the elemental constitution of the people are implicit in their relationships; they are not usually formulated explicitly. Further, all of these values may not even be susceptible to being fully articulated because many of them operate at a level of unstated or unconscious presumption. The more explicit constitution of any political system must be matched to this elemental constitution of a people. In more fully evolved systems, the explicit constitution of a polity formally articulates certain core values of the elemental constitution of the people as the foundation for political institutions.

The elemental constitution of a people, therefore, provides the foundation for the more formal constitution or makeup of a political system in which the people can create institutional arrangements appropriate for governing themselves. Thus a more formal constitution serves as the political embodiment of the spirit that animates the common life of a people. If this more formal constitution of the polity and the animating spirit of the people are not well fitted to each other, the political system has an unstable foundation incapable of sustaining the people's self-governance. The idea of three levels of "constitution," as underlying a political order founded on the commonality of its people, reflects a primordially democratic characteristic.

Once the design of a particular political order for a people has been established (e.g., a particular variant of republic or a monarchy), another aspect of the idea of constitution is the provision of a "charter of government" – a framework for governmental institutions which serves as fundamental or basic law. This charter usually takes the form of a written constitution. To be well founded, the provisions of the charter of government must reflect principles which are essential to the purposes of the people and which conform with their character. At the same time, the provisions of the charter of government must remain true to the defining traits of the polity, whether or not that polity is a democracy.

Because there are distinguishing variations among civic peoples, there is no universally applicable form of polity or political constitution that can be used everywhere. Nor is there a predefined set of governmental institutions that will successfully carry on the work of popular self-governance in every country. Thus, a well-founded constitution for a people must arise from the people themselves and cannot be given as a finished product by experts from outside.

1. **Concept of a "formal constitution."** A formal constitution—written, partially written, or unwritten—may set forth or reflect the fundamental values and public character of a people as a political community. The

concept of constitution may be a plan for a political system set forth in advance of its establishment, or it may be a derivation of principles that are embedded in an existing political system. A formal constitution embodies or sets forth the purposes and organization of political power and government for a society.

The concept of a formal constitution has at least the following variants: a "covenant" or "social compact" in which individuals agree among themselves to be a political people; a "contract" between a political people and their government; and a "basic law" that forms the foundation for a system of a rule of law. The term "constitution" may designate a

a. description of a form of government

b. document or collection of documents that set forth basic law

c. written document or series of documents, possibly with procedures for amendment, augmented over time by custom, legislation, and court decisions

d. set of settled understandings accepted as convention

e. higher, fundamental, or basic law that limits the powers of government, provides a standard to which all legislation and other activities of government must adhere, and sets the formal aspirations of a society

f. set of principles, values, and traits that characterize a political people

2. **Purposes and uses of formal constitutions in democracies**. Constitutions may be used to

a. create the powers of a political system and the functions of a government

b. prescribe the power and authority of the government as granted by the people

c. establish the standard of justice against which political authority and government action are judged

d. set forth a framework for the structure of government, empower the government, specify the offices of government and how they are to be filled, and establish the relationship between the people and their government

e. limit government's power in order to protect individual rights and promote the common good

f. creates space for the autonomous functioning of civil society and personal privacy

g. establishes the preconditions and the basic rules for an economic system

h. allocate power among components of the polity, such as constituent provinces or states

i. establish the rule of law and set the rules for the resolution of disputes in a peaceful manner

j. embody the core values and principles of a political system, as well as the aspirations of a society and directions for the future

k. serve as vehicles for change and for resolving social issues

l. provide a reference point or standard by which citizens can evaluate the actions of their government

F. **What is "constitutionalism" and what is its relationship to "constitution"?** Constitutionalism is the political theory [**and norm]** of limited government. This political theory is independent of a theory of liberalism or a theory of democracy, although its values are compatible with the principles of liberalism and democracy. Liberalism, historically, has served as the major vehicle for the limitation of government on behalf of the liberty of individuals. Modern democracies share the commitment of constitutionalism to limiting the powers of government to serving the common good as opposed to serving factional interests. Modern democracies also share the commitment of liberal constitutionalism to limiting government powers on behalf of protecting the rights of the individual.

Constitutionalism historically arose in part from the idea that there is a higher authority than human authority. According to this idea, one's obligations to that higher authority transcend one's obligations to government. Therefore, the rightful demands of government for obedience are necessarily limited. These limitations are grounded in a concept of a higher law that derives from a Supreme Being who rules earthly rulers.

In addition, another strand of constitutional history produced limitations on government power arising from the superior and inviolate status of the citizen in Greek democracy or Roman republicanism.

Endeavors throughout history to create good government have revealed that the establishment of a formal "constitution" (usually written down) is the best device for realizing the substantive principles of the political theory of constitutionalism, such as the liberal principle of protecting liberty and the democratic principle of making political power responsible to its people.

Constitutionalism as the theory of limited government arises from the transformation of power into authority. Under this theory, the only legitimate political power is constrained power and all authority is limited by the terms according to which it is delegated. Authority operates only by "commission"—that is it is power that is used on behalf of others who "authorize" it for specified purposes and under defined conditions. All authority also exists under an obligation to serve the best interests of those on whose behalf it is exercised. Authority therefore operates as a "trust" that emanates from a more fundamental source, and its use is conditioned continuously by the purposes for which it was originally established. These purposes and the principle of "trusteeship" not only constrain authority but sustain it as well.

As foundations of political systems, some formal constitutions reflect this theory of government limited by commission and trusteeship, and some do not. When a political system operates by commission and trusteeship, its constitution derives its authority from a higher source on whose behalf the power of government is both exercised and limited. This higher source (such as the People or God) is conceived of as sovereign. In cases of unlimited governments, constitutions may be used for purposes of deception, as cloaks to misrule, disguising the unconstrained behavior of those in power.

A political system, whether it has a formal constitution or not, will reflect the principles of constitutionalism only when its powers and institutions are limited to the terms of the constitution which reflect the foundational principles of commission and trusteeship. In this regard the constitution takes on the role of "higher law."

Thus there is a distinction between a polity (or government) with a constitution and constitutionalism (or constitutional government). Every political system has a "constitution," whether it is a "constitutional" system or not. In this sense the "constitution" is no more than a description of the makeup or composition of a political system. It portrays the way a polity is constituted—that is, how its foundation is set forth, its first principles articulated, its character shaped, and its government organized and operated. The fact that a political system has such a constitution—even if it is a formal written document—does not mean it meets the standard of constitutionalism. Under the standard of constitutionalism, governments must themselves be bound by rules.

To implement this standard, a "constitution" that reflects the principles of constitutionalism will serve as a "higher law." This higher law establishes and limits government in order to protect individual rights as well as to promote the common good.

1. **Constitutionalism.** Under the theory of constitutionalism, a political system takes on a defined form and character that obligate it to operate in a manner consistent with a set of established purposes and limits.

   The form and character of a political system may be set forth deliberately in fundamental documents that both describe and prescribe the shape and limitations of its power. Constitutionalism is both descriptive and normative; it thus lays out what can and cannot be done as well as what ought to be done.

   In establishing the form and character of a political system, constitution-making can be a profoundly democratic act. The process of public deliberation which leads to the endorsement of a constitution by the people has become an instrument for the creation of democracy. The very process of this deliberation seems to anticipate substantial participation of the people in the resulting political system.

   a. **Principles of constitutionalism.** According to constitutionalism:

   - power must be exercised in accordance with established standards

   - political systems must be limited in the ends they may seek and in the means they may use to pursue legitimate ends

   - ordinary laws must be made to comport with the "rule of law" by being evaluated according to a set of fundamental standards

   - the sovereign people of a democracy, in consenting to a constitutional system, agree to limit not only their government but also themselves, e.g., they are bound by the provisions of their constitution until they are formally changed.

   - the rights of individuals may be protected not only by limitations on the power of government, but also by guarantees of specific rights beyond the control of government, or by specific grants of powers to governmental institutions to protect rights

   - there are some aspects of life that are not the proper business of politics and government and are accordingly placed beyond the reach of its authority.

   b. **Constitutional government.** A constitutional government is one in which the constitution sets forth the foundation and extent of a government's powers. The constitution also provides effective means for limiting those powers and a means of moving towards a correspondence between the principles and values set forth in the constitution and the reality of political life. A constitutional government is one in which those in power must and do obey the limitations placed upon them by the constitution.

   c. **"Sham constitutions."** In the guise of purporting to honor constitutions or constitutionalism, some governments set forth misleading or "sham constitutions." These so-called "constitutions" bear little relationship to actual institutions and practices nor do they reflect a commitment to the limitations of constitutional government. In contrast to constitutional governments, unlimited governments are those in which there are no regularized and effective means of restraining power.

2. **The relationship between constitutionalism and the concept of "rule of law."** The concept of a rule of law requires that rules are set forth in advance and are widely known, that they are of general application, and that they are applied impartially. Rule of law applies both to governmental officials and to all other

25

persons in a country. The rule of law, therefore, means more than simply having laws or passing legislation. This principle contrasts with capricious rule based on arbitrary will and inclination, when persons who rule impose their own personal preferences that are invented for the occasion, applied with favoritism, and/or not made clear to those who are subject to them.

Under a minimalist understanding of a rule of law, the substance of the rules or laws need not comport with a standard of goodness or morality, so long as they are fairly and systematically administered. Thus a rule of law may exist in non-democratic political systems. Under a more extended understanding of a rule of law, laws must be compatible with higher standards of justice in order to qualify as law at all.

The rule of law can be used to restrict the actions of citizens and governmental officials alike in order to protect the rights of individuals and to promote the common good. The rule of law is one of the most effective ways to establish limited government. Because it is conducive to a regular and predictable political system, rule of law can enhance political power through a capacity to coordinate the expectations of large numbers of individuals and organizations.

Constitutionalism realizes in practice the abstract character of the "rule of law" by translating its precepts into a more explicit set of rules and provisions that can be interpreted and applied by institutions of government and by the people in public discussion and debate.

3. **Political, economic, and personal freedom as means of limiting government.** There is a reinforcing relationship between constitutionalism and political, economic, and personal freedom. Political, economic, and personal freedoms serve as a way of limiting government. In turn, limited government is essential to the protection of these freedoms.

   a. **Political freedom** involves people's right to control and influence governance. The existence of political freedom debars governmental encroachment upon the spheres in which people exercise this freedom including their right to express their opinions about public affairs. In exercising their political freedom the people assert their sovereignty over government.

   b. **Economic freedom** comprises a sphere of enterprise, organization, and activity independent of direct control by government. {**It is a fundamental element of a liberal society.]** It involves the acquisition, use, enhancement, transfer, and disposal of property. Because economic freedom involves people's right to conduct fundamental aspects of their lives and activities independently of unreasonable governmental supervision and intrusion, its existence creates independent centers of power that compete with and limit the scope of governmental power.

   c. **Personal freedom** consists of an autonomous zone where individuals or groups of individuals pursue ways of life and courses of action that do not require the sanction of political or governmental authority. It may involve, for example, the creation of families and friendships, the practice of religion, participation in associational activities, and the pursuit of artistic endeavors. These activities exemplify the self-determination of the individual and represent a source of independence and choice separating the person from direct control by government.

G. **What is the relationship between law, constitutionalism, and democracy?** In any society there is an ultimate source of the authority to make law. Law is a principal way that the decisions and actions of any political system are revealed and communicated. In a democracy, the people are the source of government's authority to make decisions for the public benefit. Law is the means by which these decisions are formulated as rules and implemented as public policy. Law can thus be seen as the language of public policy. Public policies can be implemented because they have been formulated in law.

Law provides an essential link between constitutionalism and democracy by translating fundamental principles into rules which government is obliged to enforce.

While law may be conceived as channeling and limiting human activity, it also supplies the chief medium for furthering the interests and purposes of a community. The more deliberative a society, the more it will rely on law and its interpretation to guide the activities of its governmental institutions and public scrutiny of them. Because a society's decisions have been reflected in law, widespread knowledge of the content of law may lead to holding government accountable for its fidelity to law. To the extent that law facilitates both deliberation and accountability, it promotes democracy.

1. **Constituent character of law.** Law provides the primary means for structuring organizations and establishing relationships in a society. In this sense law sets forth those basic arrangements and connections that give order to human life. In addition, because formally enacted law can be read and scrutinized, it need not be conceived of as immutable but as subject to reconsideration and change.

2. **Public policy.** If the essence of the political process is making public policy, that is the making of public decisions and choices, law is the instrument through which these decisions are expressed, implemented, enforced, and adjudicated.

3. **Continuity.** Law is the primary means of providing order, predictability, security, and survival for society. To the extent that law relies on precedent or a tradition of experience for its meaning, law enables a community to achieve self-consistency and reliability over time.

4. **Aspirations.** Law is a primary means by which society expresses and codifies its values, goals, and mores. In this regard, law may serve to shape as well as to reflect the aspirations of society. Law can also bridge social divisions and compensate for a lack of personal trust by creating formal obligations that can be enforced among parties who otherwise may be wary or suspicious of one another.

H. **What is the relationship between democracy and human rights?**

1. **Defining and explaining the rights of human beings.** A right is a justifiable claim to have or obtain something, not to be interfered with, or to act or be treated in a certain way. The rights of human beings may be conceptualized in three ways: natural rights, positive rights, and constitutional rights.

   a. **Natural rights** are understood as belonging to all humans simply as a part of their nature. Natural rights are innate or inherent to their existence as human beings. They are not bestowed as privileges by a constitution, a political system, or by government. As a result, human beings cannot give up these rights even if they choose or appear to choose to do so. Thus an "agreement" to give up natural rights cannot valid or binding. One cannot give up something that is an essential part of one's nature. Were this possible to occur, it would negate one's humanity.

   Natural rights are conceived as pre-existing the creation of a society and as existing regardless of a person's status or membership in any society or nation. The existence and legitimacy of natural rights are thus thought to be independent of positive endorsement or approval by governments. It follows that natural rights are fundamentally distinct from rights that are created by human action. In this view, governments are unable to *create* these rights. Governments can only *recognize* them. In fact, in order to be legitimate, governments have an obligation to do so.

   Furthermore*,* natural rights cannot be taken away by any person or government. Because they are "natural" rights, even when they are violated by government action, they remain "rights," and the government action is wrong. In this respect they are "inalienable" and indestructible. Therefore all legitimate forms of government are obligated to protect them.

   Natural rights are said to derive from two possible sources. The first is from nature itself understood as the all-encompassing "natural order of things." The second is from the more specific nature of the

27

human being. In either case, a commitment to natural rights may include a belief that such rights are derived from a divine Creator of human beings who made the natural order.

Entailed in the concept of natural rights is the idea that each human personality has independent moral value to be cherished and protected above all else. This proposition of the moral integrity of the human being has led to the belief that all individuals are of equal essential worth.

Because these rights are conceived as part the unified order of nature, they exhibit a coherence among themselves whose mutual reinforcement contributes to the enhancement of human life. Thus the rights to life, liberty, and property, for instance, can be considered as essentially a unitary right because each right implicates the others and all work together to protect and promote the quality of the human condition. In contrast to being a random selection of desirable ends, natural rights are connected into a pattern that reflects the larger needs and purposes of human existence.

From the perspective of a natural rights philosophy, all human beings can apprehend natural rights through their native moral sense, and they can comprehend them by using their innate capacity for reasoning. This proposition is itself a latent democratic idea because it asserts that the common person has instinctual ethical awareness and can make reasoned judgments about fundamental aspects of human existence and mutual relationships. Therefore, every person has the potential to be trusted with making decisions about the governance of himself or herself and of each other.

b. **Positive rights** are rights that are created by human beings either as a deliberate act or as a consequence of human association. They may be enacted as law or posited by a community in other ways. Positive rights are established and given sanction because they are articulated by an authoritative body or arise from a community's understandings and customs. They not only pose prohibitions on what government is allowed to do; they impose obligations for what government is required to do. They usually take written form and are published and promulgated. They may include, for example, personal rights, political rights, and economic rights.

Positive rights provide a basis for security of expectations. In this sense, citizens living in a system of positive rights have the opportunity to know and reason about what their rights are. Even for those who maintain that rights have a natural and inherent status, articulating these rights as positive enactments may provide a more secure basis for their protection. From this perspective, positive rights provide citizens a set of standards for judging government and looking after their own interests. Formulating rights in positive terms provides a means for the people, either directly or through their institutions, to articulate a specification of rights that they endorse, thus validating their right to self-government even when they may be imposing restrictions on popular rule.

The ability of citizens to know their rights and use this knowledge as a means of controlling government is a crucial attribute of democracy. The ability of citizens to control the enactment of rights and to limit governmental intrusions on those rights is a crucial attribute of constitutionalism.

c. **Constitutional rights** are rights specifically established by common consent or stipulation as the explicit basis on which persons agree to be governed. In this sense, constitutional rights provide the foundational conditions for the existence of government and serve as fundamental or higher law in much the same way as natural law. Constitutional rights are at the same time a form of positive rights. They are typically more general than statutory enactments. And in this regard, even though they take positive form, they reflect the more abstract character of natural rights. Constitutional rights may be understood as articulations or extensions of preexisting natural rights or as newly created rights that come into being through authoritative enactments by human beings.

Whereas positive rights rely on an articulation in law by the legislative power of a country, constitutional rights arise from sovereign enactment or endorsement by a people in the exercise of their right to establish the conditions for their self-government. In this sense constitutional rights take on the

character of higher law controlling the acts of government, irrespective of governmental will, in the same way that natural rights are thought to constrain whether government has recognized them or not. Constitutional rights, therefore, occupy a middle position between natural rights and positive rights in that they take the form of positive rights and have the effect of inherent rights.

2. **Defining "human rights."** The idea of a human right is that each person holds the right as an attribute of his or her humanity. The term "human rights" has come to refer broadly to those rights that are inherent in human nature, essential to human need, or fundamental to human purpose—whether these rights arise from natural, positive, or constitutional sources.

   From one perspective human rights and natural rights are one and the same thing in that human rights are inherent in all persons in virtue of their nature. From another perspective, human rights and natural rights overlap only partially. Some human rights may be identical with natural rights, some may contain attributes of natural rights, and some may be entirely independent. Thus some of what are called "human rights" may be interpretations of natural rights, some may be extensions of natural rights, and some may be newly invented by human ingenuity. Regardless of whether human rights are equivalent to natural rights, human rights are similar to natural rights in that they belong to every person as a consequence of membership in the "community of mankind."

   Transposition of human rights into positive rights takes place when the legislative power of a country enacts a provision protecting a right that is denominated a human right. A country may also incorporate or ratify some or all of those rights contained in international enunciations of rights such as the Universal Declaration of Rights.

   Translation of human rights into constitutional rights occurs when the sovereign power of a country authorizes a right that is conceived of as a human right. The sovereign power may also incorporate or ratify some or all of those rights contained in international enunciations of rights such as the Universal Declaration of Rights. In this fashion human rights are incorporated into a country's constitution.

   a. **Human rights as a regime of obligations.** The idea of rights entails the question of obligations to respect or fulfill them. Positions differ on what obligations, if any, arise from the concept of human rights. From the most conventional point of view, a set of human rights is not solely a list of desirable ends. It is a regime of obligations. It imposes duties upon human associations and individuals. Otherwise the statement that a value is a right is nothing more than an exhortation and it loses the compelling character of a claim of right. Thus the idea of human rights provides a systematic ordering of rights and obligations that supercedes the formal institutions of government and adhere to the individual irrespective of membership in any community.

   b. **Human rights as a set of desired ends.** From another point of view, human rights present a set of desired ends or values that every country should strive to achieve. But because human rights are not self-enforcing, when they have not been consented to, there is no basis for claiming that a country is obligated to fulfill them. Accordingly, human rights operate only as an external standard of judgment for a community's consideration and not as an independent constraint. Otherwise the sovereignty of even a democratic people would be diminished.

   c. **Movement for human rights.** Regardless of which of these points of view is accepted, the movement for human rights has been a force of increasing potency for transforming the world for more than three centuries. It has provided a basis for demands that governments respect rights fundamental to political and personal liberty and to fair and humane treatment. It has also legitimized such demands. There is no universal agreement, however, on the existence and status of human rights, i.e., whether they are natural, positive, or constitutional.

   d.   **Controversies over philosophical foundations.** Even for those who accept the concept of human rights as crucial to the transformation of political orders, the philosophical foundation for human rights is controversial.

- This controversy includes questions about whether human rights are obligatory on political systems, whether these political systems accept them or not. One position is that they are directly binding as a force of nature; another is that they must be "translated" into constitutional provisions or legal requirements before they can be authoritatively applied.

- Another aspect of the controversy questions the origin or source of human rights. From one perspective, "human" rights arise from international agreements as a sort of universal legislation that is either legally or morally binding on all civilized nations. This may take the form of treaties, declarations, covenants, and conventions. The alternative position is that "human" rights are the same as "natural" rights. From this perspective, the idea of "human rights" has evolved from the seventeenth-and eighteenth-century concept of "natural rights." This concept arises from the idea of rights inhering in nature and, in particular, rights that are attributes of human nature.

  In this sense, human rights cannot be fundamentally distinguished from rights arising solely from enactment by a legal system— that is "positive rights," such as a right to a particular minimum wage. Even when human rights are conceived of as requiring positive enactment they may still be regarded as having a higher or more fundamental status than other positive rights.

3. **Elaborating human rights.** The broad concept of human rights as universally essential to the human personality has inspired attempts to elaborate sets of particular and concrete rights that implement and extend natural rights. Essential human rights can only be actualized by translating them into more particular rights that entail rules and procedures that make them operational. For example, the three essential rights to life, liberty, and property, because of their encompassing generality, must be elaborated and protected by an array of specific rights, including those providing for procedural justice or due process of law. Not only must essential human rights be translated into more particularly applicable rights, but also these more specific rights must be protected and promoted by institutions designed for this purpose. In addition, some human rights may be purposively "coined"—by an act of deliberate creation, such as many of the rights of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. For example the right to periodic holidays with pay or the right to intellectual property.

   a.   **Formal classifications of human rights.** In the past century, three categories of human rights have come into common usage. These categories are

- **Personal, civil, and political rights.** This category includes rights considered essential to liberty and self-governance. They include the rights of the individual to freedom of conscience, thought, speech, and religious expression; and the right to freedom of association and to participate. Other rights sometimes included in this category include the right to be treated fairly by government, the right to access to an independent tribunal for the protection of human rights, the right to citizenship.

- **Economic and social rights**. This category includes rights considered essential to human life and human dignity. They include the rights to property, to social equality, and to a basic standard of living adequate to protect health, security, and well-being. Other rights sometimes included in this category include the right to work and to free choice of employment; to just and favorable working conditions and protection against unemployment; the right to equal pay for equal work; the right to form and join trade unions; the right to acquire, use, and transfer property; and the right to rest and leisure.

- **Cultural and solidarity rights.** This category includes rights considered essential to respecting the values and traditions of groups of people throughout the world. They include rights to collective self-determination and rights to language, religion, and culture. Other rights sometimes included are the right of parents to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children; and the right of the family to be protected by government.

Within and among these categories, there may be differences of opinion whether particular rights are inherent in human nature, essential to human need, or fundamental to human purposes and therefore should be considered as "human rights." There also may be differences of opinion over whether these rights are all of the same importance especially if they seem inconsistent with each other.

Some deny that human rights are universal. According to this view, rights are considered valid only because they are integral to a particular form of political order, such as the political rights essential to a democracy or the economic rights essential to a social democracy. This view may deny the validity of one or more of the categories of human rights or particular rights within these categories. Moreover one may claim that one or more of these categories of rights must be affirmatively expressed in constitutions or positively enacted by government in order to exist as rights at all.

In this latter sense, claims of human rights must be regarded as social aspirations or universal needs, or they may be considered as desires only. In any case, the array of rights reflected in these categories may produce entitlements or expectations that are mutually incompatible. Moreover, some particular rights in these categories may be achievable only at the cost of subordinating individual liberty to commitments arising from an understanding of other human needs. And in some cases a program to implement some of these rights may be used in a pernicious attempt to suppress other human rights (e.g., trading economic rights for political liberty, trading the promise of future social prosperity for personal rights).

4. **Human rights as implying standards for government and politics.** The values associated with human rights imply standards for the way government is to be formed, the purposes it is to serve, and the manner in which it conducts its activities. Thus the ends of government and the means used to attain them are constrained by the necessity not to violate basic human rights but to support and protect them.

5. **Democracy and human rights.** If human rights derive from a broad-based understanding of the nature and purpose of human beings (i.e., what qualities all human beings share in common), it may follow that the form of government most likely to effectively honor these rights is one in which political power is broadly based. Thus the concept of human rights finds its political parallel in democracy; and the connection between rights and democracy promotes the evolution of both.

Regardless of the source of rights, governments chosen and controlled by democratic majorities, **or by even broader political coalitions than a simple majority,** are logically more likely to respect rights that are held in common by the population. Those whose rights and interests are at stake can be expected to judge best whether they are well protected.

Although democracy may be conceived as congruent with human rights, there are some qualities of human rights that appear to be especially complementary to democracy and some that are especially problematic for it.

a. **[Human rights as necessary for democracy. Certain human rights, such as freedoms of political expression, association, movement, and assembly, are necessary in order to have free and fair electoral competition. In addition, democracy itself-including the right of all citizens to vote and run for office- is increasingly seen in international legal and philosophical discourse as a human right.**

b. **Human rights as complementary to democracy**. Human rights, seen as embodying the essential purposes of legitimate government, serve to provide a foundation for democracy and its authoritative use of power. A practical concern for the realization of human rights tends to focus the energy of a political system on the achievement of goals that benefit the entire population and contribute to the enhancement of a civilized way of life. Thus human rights flesh out the character of democratic governance beyond a preoccupation with the representation of interests and the popular will.

Democracy is reinforced when citizens are knowledgeable about their rights and can use this knowledge as a recourse against government power because they have the idea that it is legitimate for them to make strong claims against government power on behalf of their own fundamental interests or rights. At the same time, constitutionalism is enhanced when governmental power is bounded by its obligation to observe and protect the rights of persons.

Thus human rights may establish the basis for prohibitions on the use of governmental power by providing a countervailing force beyond limitations on the powers of government arising from its constitutional authorization.

Also, articulating, elaborating, and publicizing human rights—for the purpose of making them part of common discourse—enable citizens to make claims against governments, organizations, and individuals.

The need to establish institutions that have the purpose of promoting and protecting human rights contributes to worthiness of democratic governance.

c. **Human rights as problematic for democracy.** Enthusiasm for identifying and elaborating rights has led to expanding the list of rights and an increasing number of more specific rights. One part of this logic is that if a few rights are good, more rights are better. Another part of this logic is that if something is good and valuable, it should be enshrined as a right.

- **Problems of proliferation.** With the proliferation of rights classified as "human rights," the rights specifically elaborated to carry into practical effect the essential natural rights may lose their connection with those essential rights. What starts out as a strategy to make general human rights operational moves into a program to add new rights to the classic set of natural rights. With the multiplication of human rights, the fundamental and compelling character of the essential rights may be eclipsed and the instrumental rights may be considered equal or superior to the essential rights. Human rights in general may be devalued when relatively trivial rights are indiscriminately mingled with fundamental rights. In extreme cases the focus on less important rights replaces honoring the more important rights or is used as an excuse to suppress the more fundamental rights.

- **Problems of trivialization.** As these new rights increase in number they may tend to undermine the original rights because they lose the coherence of a mutually reinforcing relationship with each other. Instead lists of rights may appear to be composed randomly and to include everything that some people consider desirable. There may also be a tendency to equate essential rights with their instrumental rights and to consider all human rights of the same priority. The consequence is that not only are human rights devalued, but the very concept of a right itself becomes little more than the expression of a wish. The attributes which meet the criteria for classifying a value as a right may be altogether absent so that claims of rights become merely hortatory and not obligatory.

- **Problems of absolutism.** The style of human rights discourse may undermine the very process of democratic politics. When human rights are asserted as absolutes, they may preempt political decision making altogether. If human rights claims are considered to supercede deliberations about policy, they preclude the give and take of democratic decision making which results in compromise; thus these claims themselves are removed from public deliberation. In addition, a

32

limitless proliferation of human rights and a preoccupation with issues regarding them may lead to the exclusion of consideration of important public policy issues because human rights discourse dominates the public agenda. Finally, when the answers to public policy issues are presented as predetermined by human rights arguments, they eliminate the possibility of democratic choice and delegitimize the very process of public deliberation.

- **Distrust of politics.** The proliferation of human rights may arise from a deep-seated distrust of politics itself where institutions of government cannot be trusted to look to the welfare and interests of the people. By putting a large number of decisions beyond the reach of debate— whether by institutions, majorities, or individuals— the protection of rights is mandated and insulated from the political process. The problem is that this may leave little room for democratic decision making or delegitimize democratic choices that are inconsistent with the instrumental elaborations of human rights.

- **Unattainable expectations.** The proliferation of human rights may be so extensive or exacting that people's expectations are raised to an unattainable level. It may become impossible for government or other institutions to fulfill them all (because of such factors as resources or competing priorities or time). In these circumstances the competence of government is called into question and there may be a generalized popular sense of resentment at promises unfulfilled, an erosion of confidence in government, and a feeling that politics is meaningless.

6. **Determining the compatibility of human rights with democracy.** Depending on their character and formulation, human rights can be either compatible or incompatible with democracy because they may constrict the range of public decision making on the one hand or they may undergird the purposes of popular self-government on the other hand. Citizens must therefore be able to make judgments about the character and formulation of specific human rights as well as the concept of human rights in general. Persistent questions about the character and formulation of human rights include:

- Are some human rights more essential or fundamental than others?

- Are some human rights absolute? Are others not?

- Are any or all human rights obligatory on nation-states regardless of their consent?

- Under what circumstances, if any, may human rights be compromised on behalf of compelling public needs or interests?

- Do some categories of claims for human rights preclude public debate about policies that might affect them?

- Is it wise to limit the number human rights to a few very general rights or to embrace a large number of specific rights?

- Can human rights become obligatory for democratic countries and, if so, what is the justification for that obligation?

- What is the relationship between rights and obligations?

- What is the relationship between government's obligation not to infringe upon human rights and a mandate to protect and promote them?

- Is it legitimate for a country or an international organization to enforce the protection of human rights in nations that appear to violate them?

- Is there a human right to a political order in which life, liberty, and property are secure?

- Is there a universal human right to democracy?

I. **What are the essential characteristics of democracy? T**here is a set of indicators useful in assessing the extent to which a political system is democratic. These indicators must be derived from the basic concept of democracy as elaborated in both individual- and community-centered theories of political order. In a particular democratic system, some indicators may be more salient than others. There are two additional sets of indicators useful in assessing the extent to which a political system emphasizes liberal or non-liberal traits.

1. **Democratic indices.** In its way of life and institutions, democracy in all of its forms must embody certain fundamental values and principles. These include:

   a. **Popular sovereignty**: all legitimate power ultimately residing in the people. The consent of the people is necessary for powers of government to be just. Thus, authority flows from people to rulers, not from rulers to the people.

   b. **The common good**: the promotion of what is good for the polity as a whole and not the interests of a portion of the polity at the expense of the rest of society.

   c. **Constitutionalism:** the empowerment and limitation of government by an enforceable written or unwritten constitution. Constitutionalism includes the idea of the rule of law. Constitutionalism respects the principle that a law should be considered illegitimate if it is incompatible with the constitution.

   d. **Equality**: the right of all persons in a society to be treated equally. This right is embodied in principles such as equal justice and the equality of all individuals under law, [**including the equal right of all citizens (above a certain age) to vote and run for office.]**

   e. **Majority rule/minority rights**: the right of the majority or [**or in some cases supermajorities**) to rule, constrained by the right of members of the minority to enjoy the same benefits and share the same burdens as those in the majority. The majority must abide by the same laws as the minority, nor may a majority deprive a minority of its political rights.

   f. **Justice and fairness:** governmental decisions about burdens and benefits should be based on criteria that are not partial to specific groups. These decisions must be derived through procedures that reflect "fair play" or "fundamental fairness."

   g. **Political rights for citizens**: the authority to control government and hold it accountable as embodied in political rights, such as freedom of speech and of the press; the right to association, assembly, demonstration, and petition; and the right to vote in open, free, fair, regular elections.

   h. **Independent judiciary and juries**: the judicial system (including juries) providing decisions on an impartial basis in accordance with the law as the supreme criterion of judgment. As such, the judicial system must operate independently of any other agency of government, social organization, or corrupting influence.

   i. **Civilian control of the military and police**: the military and police subjected to the control of civilian authority.

    j. **Supremacy of secular over religious authority**: purely secular law and authority, arising from the consent of the people, with precedence in secular matters over religious law and authority.

    k. **[Political competition. That different political parties and organized groups should be able to comete for power and influence in society.]**

    l. **[Political alternation of succession. That no one individual, family, or group should be allowed to have an enduring monopoly on power.**

    m. **[Political and societal pluralism: that there should be multiple, alternative sources of information and vehicles for the expression of interests and ideas in society.**

    n. **[Freedom from fear: the right of individuals to be secure under a rule of law from exile, terror, torture, invasion of privacy by state actors, and arbitrary or unjustified detention.]**

    o. **Education of the public:** a widespread system of common education including schools and other avenues of instruction preparing citizens to exercise their rights and carry out their responsibilities.

2. **Liberal indices**. Liberal types of democracy place paramount value on the fundamental rights of the individual, and their institutions are designed to vindicate these rights. The following indicators distinguish the liberal type of democracy. Although some of these individual-centered indicators may occur in a non-liberal type of democracy, to the extent that they predominate, a political system may be characterized as liberal.

    a. **Private rights for all individuals**: an emphasis on protecting an autonomous sphere which is none of the state's business, including freedom of religion, expression, and association for all individuals.

    b. **Honoring individuality:** an emphasis on the right to be different insofar as one's actions do not interfere with a similar and equal right of others, even to the extent that this difference runs contrary to the values of the rest of society, e.g., the right to alternative lifestyles.

    c. **Expanded freedom of expression:** the protection of a greater range of rights to freedom of expression beyond speech that is limited to the conduct of public affairs. This range may include the articulation of literary and artistic images and ideas that may not be considered socially acceptable.

    d. **Constitutionalism extended:** emphasis on the affirmative protection of individual liberty through the guarantee of rights beyond the limitations on the power of government inherent in constitutionalism itself. Also, there must be institutions capable of securing these limitations (e.g., an independent judiciary and/or ombudsman responsible for protecting the rights of individuals).

    e. **Judicial protections**: an emphasis on using the judicial system to enforce the values inherent in the concept of limited government. Thus the independent judiciary will focus not only on the democratic rights of the people to be represented in their government, but also upon the individual rights of persons against governmental intrusion. These rights of individuals may conflict with the rights of the people to rule themselves through majorities, e.g., the right of the community to set standards of behavior versus the right of individuals to express themselves as they choose.

    f. **Separation of state and religion:** an emphasis on freedom of belief and religious association and expression so that the political authority and government are prohibited from prescribing or supporting a religious orthodoxy.

    g. **Accommodation of individual differences:** an emphasis on respecting the legitimacy of individual differences and on responding to them appropriately by making exceptions to general rules; e.g., accrediting religious beliefs as a justification for differential treatment.

h. **Market-based economy:** an emphasis on providing for a large degree of non-governmental economic ownership, market freedom, and decentralization of economic decision-making that provides an economic basis for political and personal freedom and legal protection for property rights of individuals.

3. **Non-liberal indices**. Non-liberal types of democracy place paramount value on the fundamental rights of the community, and their institutions are designed to achieve this goal. There are certain indicators that distinguish the non-liberal type of democracy. Although these community-centered indicators may occur in the liberal type of democracy, to the extent that they predominate in a political system, it may be characterized as non-liberal.

a. **Social solidarity:** a sense of a common identity, cohesion, harmony, and shared purpose among members of a community; the absence of fundamental social conflicts; and widespread conformity and inclusiveness.

b. **Public morality**: an emphasis on adherence to pervasive social norms that government may enforce and inculcate. These norms may be imposed as the standard for private virtue.

c. **Economic equality and market regulation**: an emphasis upon the regulation of the market in order to achieve economic equality. This may be extended to include government ownership of economic resources.

d. **Protecting the commons:** an emphasis on the necessity of preserving the common inheritance of the physical environment, the earth and its resources.

e. **Security of social well-being:** an emphasis on insuring public health and safety.

f. **Regulation of the private sphere for the benefit of the community as a whole:** an emphasis on directing or controlling individual behavior that may be seen as undermining the sensibilities and welfare of the public.

g. **Emphasis on civility and temperance:** an emphasis on moderating individual actions and attitudes to promote adherence to commonly accepted standards of civil behavior; and the avoidance of conspicuous and excessive acquisition and consumption.

h. **Constitutionalism extended to social welfare:** an emphasis on constitutional provisions that mandate the widespread enjoyment of entitlements such as employment, housing, health and retirement benefits, income security, education, and leisure.

i. **Perpetuation of tradition:** an emphasis on reverence for inherited values, institutions, and practices.

II. Who belongs and who governs in a democracy?

A.   What is a political people?

B.   What is a nation-state?

C.   What is the status of the individual in various forms of political systems?

D.   What is the role of the citizen in a democracy?

E.   What are some competing ideas about the relationship between democratic values and standards for achieving citizenship.

F.   What are the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy?

G.   What opportunities do individuals in a democracy have to take part in civic life and to influence government?

H.   What are various dimensions or sets of relationships of democratic citizenship?

I.   What kinds of loyalties should be accommodated in a democracy?

II. Who belongs and who governs in a democracy?

The question of "citizenship" is the same as the combined question of who belongs and who governs in a polity. "Who belongs?" is equivalent to the question of who counts as a member of a political people. "Who governs?" is equivalent to the question of who rules in the political system. These questions cannot be considered separately, they must be examined in tandem.

A democratic polity will present a distinctive response to these questions: the answer to both will be the same—those who belong also govern. In addition, there is a reciprocity between these two most fundamental political attributes of the person, where the character of belonging is reinforced by the activity of governing and vice versa. In other types of political system, the answers to the two questions may diverge. Those who govern may not include all of those who belong, for instance.

A citizen is not simply an independent or free-standing bearer of rights. Citizenship can only exist in a political context. Citizenship must be understood in terms of its relationship to a political people and its kind of political system, both of which are required to constitute a nation-state.

Therefore an examination of citizenship in terms of who belongs and who governs must begin with an examination of the political context of citizenship.

A. What is the political context of citizenship?

1. **What is a polity?** A **polity** consists of the constitutional arrangement of the civic, political, and governmental attributes of a community. The prerequisite of a polity is the **civil association of a people** separate and distinguished from the rest of humanity. The creation and organization of political power for this associated people results in their functioning as a political people through the establishment of a **state** or **political system**. A civicly united people, formally organized as a state or political system, makes a **country.**

    Conventionally the term "country" has been used interchangeably with the term "nation." A country is the sort of entity that can belong to associations of other countries like the United "Nations." The term "nation" has been used in this sense, but it has also been used as the equivalent to "ethnicity." Because of these incompatible connotations, this *Framework* will not use the term "nation" to refer to a people organized as a political system. Instead it will use the terms "country" for generic purposes and the terms "nation-state" or "polity" when the political attributes of a country are involved. The term "ethnicity" will be used instead of "nation" to refer to ethnic groups.

2. **How does a civil association become a political people?**

    a. **What is a people?** A **"people"** refers to a body of persons who have a sense of solidarity or identification with each other. This identification is based on common traits such as shared geographic location, customs, beliefs, traditions, sense of kinship, language, and other aspects of culture or ethnicity.

    b. **What is a political people?** A body of persons who have formed a civil association, united by mutual obligations and public purposes (such as maintaining order and insuring its defense and prosperity), becomes a **political people**, when it is bound by a system of common rule. Persons who share such mutual obligations and public purposes, under a system of common rule, belong to a political people.

        A political people may be composed predominantly of a single "people" or ethnicity (e.g., Japan) or a number of "peoples" or ethnicities, a "multiethnic" nation-state (e.g., Russian Federation, former

Soviet Union, Belgium, India, Nigeria) or "cosmopolitan" nation-state (e.g., Australia or the United States).

3. **What is a nation-state?** A political people uses its sovereign power to organize and energize a state or political system, in order to establish a common rule and conduct its public affairs. The resulting political arrangement may take a variety of forms, but typically it takes the form of a nation-state. The tandem of "nation" and "state" in the term "nation-state" refers to the combination of a political people (the "nation") and its political system (the "state"). Through the nation-state, a political people claims jurisdictional sovereignty over a defined territory and its inhabitants.

    As power is organized, the formal institutions of *government* must be set up, and sustainable relationships between them and the people must be defined. The existence or formation of a political people raises the question of *who belongs*. The establishment of a state or political system raises the question of *who governs*.

    a. Nation-states differ in the foundational themes upon which they are based. These themes include

        *   ideology (secular or religious)

        *   common culture

        *   shared values and principles

        *   a sense of a shared future

    b. A **nation-state** may be composed of a single ethnic group or ethnicity or it may be a multi-ethnic or a cosmopolitan state.

        *   A **multiethnic state or polity** contains at least two population groups that identify themselves geographically and/or culturally as distinct. The identification and loyalty of these population groups are significantly oriented to themselves rather than to the nation-state as a whole.

        *   A **cosmopolitan nation-state or polity** is composed of diverse population groups whose primary identification and allegiance is to the nation-state as a whole. These groups may retain their ethnic or other basis of identity or they may assimilate into a majority culture or a newly forged collective identity.

        *   **Tension between ethnicity and nation-state or polity.** Issues arise within nation-states regarding multiple ethnic identifications within their borders, in cases where borders divide ethnic "peoples," or in cases where ethnic groups are dispersed or live in diaspora. For example,

            *   some individuals or groups may not accept membership or common identity with the political people

            *   some groups may have characteristics that are considered so different that they cannot be assimilated

A. **What is the status of the person in a political context?**

    1. **Social and political status.** The person may be

        a. included in or excluded from the political people

        b. ranked within a hierarchy

    c.   considered one among equals

2. **Legal status of "citizenship." C**itizenship, in a minimal sense, may refer simply to not being a "stateless person." In this regard, citizenship is a formalistic term meaning that one is a bona fide member of a nation-state. This membership may be achieved through the following means.

    a.   birth

    b.   residence

    c.   ethnic origin (where persons of a specified ethnicity have a right to return as citizens to their country of origin)

    d.   naturalization (a process through those who are not natural-born citizens of a country may become citizens of that country)

B. **What is the role of the person in various forms of political system?** Political membership cannot be conceived of apart from its context in a polity; it is also the case that the characterization of the person as a potential political subject and/or actor will vary according to the type of political system.

1. How a person is characterized politically varies according to different forms of political systems. This variation arises from differing understandings of the value and role of the person and/or differing understandings of the relationship between persons and the larger community. For example, a person may be characterized as

    a.   **Communal member**, e.g., under familial, ethnic, religious, or tribal governance

    b.   **Subject**, e.g., under monarchical, theocratic, autocratic, or dictatorial rule

    c.   **Citizen**, e.g., under self-government in a republic and/or a democracy.

2. The nature of a political system is revealed by the unstated assumptions and the expectations it holds in regard to the character of its constituents, their worth, and their behavior. Moreover, the relationship of the person to a political system substantially reveals the nature of that system. This understanding of citizenship goes well beyond the legal status of a person entitled to be issued official documentation, e.g., a passport. In contrast to this minimal conception of citizenship referring to having the status of a member of a nation-state, there is a more substantive conception of "citizenship" that underlies the way in which a political system regards its members. The following dichotomies provide a basis for portraying the role of the person in different political systems:

    a.   passive v. active

    b.   subservient v. autonomous

    c.   dependent v. independent

    d.   powerless v. empowered

    e.   child v. adult (or paternalistic v. nonpaternalistic)

    f.   usable/disposable objects v. having intrinsic value

    g.   a means for attaining governmental ends v. the ends for which government is established

3. The person's status in relationship to government may be one in which the person has

     a. duties or obligations arising from such sources as imposition, custom, agreement, or moral requirements to sustain the welfare of the community

     b. inherent rights (sometimes called "natural" or "human rights") that precede and are independent of the existence of government

     c. only those rights that are derived from membership in the political community. These defined rights do not precede government and they depend upon the decisions of the political system.

   4. In a democracy, the concept of citizenship links belonging and governing: the two are synonymous because in a democracy all citizens are equal members of the polity and have the right to hold office and to choose office holders. Moreover, they are the ultimate source of the authority of their government.

C. **What is the role of the citizen in a democracy?** The public life of a democracy is centered in the citizen. Citizenship may be conceived as an office of government, like any other, possessing its own rights and responsibilities. Under the principle of popular sovereignty, citizens collectively occupy the supreme office of democracy and hold its ultimate authority. This ultimate authority includes not only final decision-making power over who holds political office, but also the power to make and reconsider constitutions.

To be a citizen is to be a full and equal member of the body politic or the civicly united, sovereign people. An essential idea of democracy is that there are no classes of citizenship, no "second class" citizens.

Citizenship in a democracy is more than a legal status, it is a character or spirit, an ethos that guides relationships among persons and animates individual commitment to fundamental principles of democracy. Citizenship may also be seen as an "office," more fundamental than any other in a democratic political system. This office carries with it a set of affirmative expectations including the duty to act on behalf of the whole.

D. **What are some competing ideas about the relationship between democratic values and standards for achieving citizenship?** There are differing views about who should decide standards of citizenship and what standards for citizenship are compatible with democratic values and principles. For example:

   1. **Standards.** Alternative positions on criteria for citizenship compatible with democratic values and principles include the following.

     a. Because the body politic (*res publica)* or polity belongs collectively to the sovereign people, the people may adopt any standards they wish for admission to citizenship.

     b. Some standards for citizenship are incompatible with certain interpretations of democratic values and principles, e.g.,

       • arbitrary exclusions based solely on highly visible characteristics such as race, religion, or language
       • inclusion or exclusion of selected population groups in order to shift the balance of power

   2. **Appropriate decision-makers.** There are alternative positions about who should decide standards of citizenship. These positions reflect different and possibly conflicting interpretations of democratic principles.

     a. The people should decide directly as they decide upon provisions of their constitution.

     b. Institutions of government should decide through legislative, administrative, or judicial action.

    c.   International conventions and actions by international agencies through the establishment of norms should be followed.

E.   **What are the rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy?** The rights and responsibilities of citizens in a democracy differ from those of other regimes.

   1.   **The rights of citizens of a democracy.** Some rights are essential to the functioning of any democracy. Others are distinctive to liberal democracy.

      a.   **Rights of all citizens of a democracy.** The principal rights of citizens of all democracies are those that allow them to participate in the political process and thus to "own" the body politic. For example, they must have the right to vote in free, fair, regular elections; to examine the conduct of public officials; to hold office; to equal membership in the body politic; to petition; and to exercise freedom of political speech, press, political association, and assembly; and a right to an education that prepares them to participate in the democratic process.

      b.   **Additional rights of citizens of liberal democracies**. In addition to the rights of all citizens of a democracy, citizens of liberal democracies enjoy rights that extend beyond participatory rights. These include rights of privacy and property; freedom of religion, expression (literary, artistic, and similar freedoms in a private realm), and of private association; the right of due process of law and fair procedures, the right to serve on juries; and other civil liberties.

   2.   **The responsibilities of citizens of a democracy.** Some responsibilities are essential to the functioning of any democracy. Others are distinctive to liberal democracy.

      a.   **Responsibilities of all citizens of any democracy.** Citizenship in a democracy entails responsibilities in the exercise of the powers of citizenship. Among these responsibilities is that the powers of citizenship be used in ways that are consistent with fundamental democratic principles.

        In a democracy, citizens "own" the political system. Therefore, they ought to fulfill the responsibilities that ownership entails, e.g., using their political system wisely and passing it on intact or improved to future generations.

      b.   **Additional responsibilities of citizens of liberal democracies.** Because of the importance of individual rights in a liberal democracy, some people claim that the most significant additional responsibilities are to preserve one's own rights, protect the rights of others, and to secure these rights for future generations.

   3.   **Ideas about the relationship between rights and responsibilities.** The relationship between rights and responsibilities is often complex and it differs in different types of situations. For example:

      a.   **Rights and responsibilities as inherently reciprocal.** With certain exceptions, rights and responsibilities are two sides of a coin. The enjoyment of rights obligates the holder of the rights to fulfill corresponding reciprocal responsibilities. The existence of certain rights also entails an obligation on the part of other persons or the community to refrain from interfering with those rights and/or to provide the rights holder the capacity to exercise those rights.

      b.   **Political obligations as based upon consent.** By claiming or exercising rights in a political system, one expresses consent to fulfill responsibilities related to the use of those rights as well as a duty to sustain the system that supports them.

      c.   **Rights and responsibilities as independently justified.** Rights are not contingent upon an exchange in which one simultaneously assumes responsibilities. Responsibilities essential to the functioning of a democratic system and to the well-being of the larger community are inherently obligatory to citizens,

irrespective of the presence of rights. In both instances, the validity of rights and responsibilities is independently based.

4. **Comparing rights and responsibilities of citizens and resident noncitizens in democracies.** Resident noncitizens ("aliens") do not have all the rights and responsibilities of citizens, because they are not considered to be members of the sovereign people who govern the body politic. But they may yet have rights awarded and obligations imposed upon them that may be similar to those of citizens.

   a. **Rights.** Democracies may differ in respect to whether they accord certain rights to noncitizens. For example, resident aliens

      - usually do not have the right to vote. There may be instances, however, in which democracies allow noncitizens to vote in specific elections. Noncitizens may also be allowed to participate in the political process by other means such as by petitioning or taking part in political campaigns.

      - may not have the right to receive public benefits, e.g., attend public schools; receive income support or health services.

   b. **Responsibilities**. Like citizens, non-citizen residents of democracies must obey the law, respect the rights of others, and adhere to similar norms. However, they do not have all of the civic responsibilities of citizens, e.g., voting, serving on juries or in the armed forces. Democracies sometimes differ in the degree to which resident non-citizens are exempted from these responsibilities. In some cases, non-citizen residents have been subject to involuntary military service.

5. **Comparing the political rights of democratic citizens and members of other governmental systems.**

   a. In a democracy, the citizens govern. Therefore, democratic citizenship must incorporate the rights that enable the citizenry to govern itself either directly or indirectly. These include the rights to choose and/or hold accountable those who make and apply law, as well as the right to oversee the creation, implementation, and adjudication of law.

   b. In nondemocratic political systems, those in power can determine the extent to which persons have a right to participate in government. They also have the power to override the will of the people.

F. **What opportunities do individuals in a democracy have to take part in civic life, politics, and government?**

1. **Avenues or arenas for citizens to participate in civic life, politics, and government.** Democracies provide a wide range of means by which citizens can participate in civic and political life and attempt to influence the actions of government at local, regional, and national levels. These include:

   a. **Informal and associational activity**, such as conversations among citizens about public affairs, participation through organizations like interest or pressure groups, social movements, trade unions and religious organizations

   b. **political activity**, such as exchanges among citizens, face-to-face meetings of citizens with public officials; participation in political parties; pamphleteering; letters to newspapers; e-mail, fax, telephone campaigns; marches; and boycotts and protests

   c. **formal action to influence government**, such as voting in elections, petitioning government officials, seeking and holding public office, and challenging the constitutionality of governmental actions in a judicial setting

2. **Additional avenues or arenas available for citizens to participate in civic life.** The term "civic life" refers to the participation of citizens both in politics more narrowly conceived and in the broader realm of civil society. Thus in addition to influencing government, democratic citizens can in other ways act directly on their own within civil society to address community problems. Opportunities may be available within civil society through established associations or by the creation of new associations. Such associations may be informal groups and networks or formal organizations.

G. **What are various relationships of democratic citizenship?** A simple portrayal of citizenship characterized exclusively by the relationship between the person and the government is insufficient for a full understanding of democracy. In fact, democratic citizenship consists of multiple relationships that reinforce the connection between the individual and the community. Citizens' awareness of these relationships can enhance their sense of belonging and their capacity to rule.

1. A citizen's relationship to **him- or herself**, e.g., self-confidence, self-reliance, and self-discipline—the belief of individual citizens in their capacity to make discriminating judgments relevant to their lives as individuals; and a feeling of empowerment—belief in one's capacity to have an impact on civic life

2. A citizen's relationship to **other citizens**, e.g., civility and tolerance, respect for the rights of others, fulfillment of responsibilities, mutual deliberation, trust and cooperation, reasoned skepticism and wariness, holding each other accountable, competitiveness; sense of conviction and the confidence to express it, and reciprocity in giving reasons and expecting others to give reasons for the way he or she seeks to direct the use of public power

3. A citizen's relationship to the **immediate community**, e.g., consciousness of community membership, attentiveness to community affairs, consciousness of importance of participation, involvement in community affairs, promotion of social development

4. A citizen's relationship to **governmental institutions**, e.g., various forms of political participation, monitoring and influencing use of governmental authority, assessing performance of government, evaluating proposals for institutional reform, expressing opposition to the unconstitutional exercise of government power, achieving a sense of influence and of efficacy

5. A citizen's relationship to the **political system, e.g.,** patriotism or a sentiment of positive attachment to the country, loyalty to fundamental constitutional values and principles, action to improve effectiveness of democratic institutions, attentiveness to public affairs, social trust and truth telling, capacity to withdraw consent from constitutional arrangements

6. A citizen's relationship to the **sovereign people**, e.g., an individual's consciousness of membership in the body politic, contribution to the society, having a stake in sovereignty; civic pride; the right to leave or renounce citizenship; common attachments to other citizens, such as shared values and principles of government; common experience; common attachment to shared history, institutions, and way of life; and solidarity with the people as a whole

7. A citizen's relationship to the **world,** e.g., observance of human rights, capacity for global understanding, membership in international organizations, concern for the well-being of the earth.

H. **What kinds of allegiances and loyalties should be accommodated in a democracy?** All democracies must accommodate multiple loyalties. At the least, this accommodation must include acceptance of different political parties and political points of view. A multiplicity of political loyalties counteracts or prevents sterile social conformism and stimulates creativity and innovation. Controversy arising from tensions among these loyalties and the ideas they generate injects vitality into democracy. If such loyalties were not permitted, society would cease to be free.

Liberal democracy goes further in accommodating a wide range of allegiances and loyalties in a private realm. It not only accommodates diversity because of the positive consequences of diversity; liberal democracy respects the rights of the individual preceding the state that inevitably lead to diversity. Thus liberal democracy accommodates a wide range of public and private allegiances and loyalties. In this context, certain loyalties incompatible with democracy itself may, within limits, need to be protected.

1. **Loyalties conducive to democratic vitality.** The advantages of certain loyalties that make them conducive to democratic vitality include the following:

   a. Membership in numerous groups provides the individual a wide range of social experience and the opportunity to make choices among competing loyalties.

   b. Membership in groups such as religious, professional, or philanthropic groups, enhances the liberty of individuals to choose the kind of life they wish to lead.

   c. A variety of attachments by individual citizens lessens the hold of each loyalty and reduces the likelihood of excessive or fanatical attachments that imprison the individual.

   d. A large number of independent associations/organizations reduces the possibility that any one of them may have excessive or dominating power or influence in society.

2. **Conflicting loyalties that can be accommodated in a democracy.** Loyalty to individuals, groups, and causes sometimes comes into conflict with loyalty to the democratic polity. Such loyalties can be accommodated if they do not attempt to overthrow democracy and if they allow other individuals their own loyalties.

   a. Some religious beliefs conflict with loyalty to the state and its requirements of citizen allegiance. In some cases, religious beliefs are incompatible with military service. Such loyalties must often, however, be accommodated by democracy and especially by liberal democracy.

   b. There are alternative views about whether the concept of democracy is compatible with a demand by a political order for the "ultimate" loyalty of its citizens which supersedes all other commitments. It is clear that the liberal type of democracy would disallow such a demand. Other views include

      • the concept of democracy is not in itself incompatible with the demand for the ultimate loyalty of citizens because the authority of the people to make decisions and protect their state is absolute.

      • the concept of democracy is incompatible with a demand for the ultimate loyalty of citizens because the democratic rule of the people is inherently limited and a diversity of fundamental commitments protects the vitality of the democratic process.

      This incompatibility is especially evident in liberal democracy where the state is inherently limited in what it may demand of the citizen. For example, liberal democracy's respect for freedom of conscience and freedom of belief is incompatible with a demand for ultimate loyalty. Moral and religious principles may provide a kind of "higher authority" than the authority of the state. Thus, no one in a liberal democracy may be required to submit to a religious test for citizenship. Citizens

45

are free to accept or reject whatever religious, moral, or philosophical principles, concepts or creeds they wish, provided they do not interfere with the rights and liberties of fellow citizens.

3. **Loyalties incompatible with democracy.** The concept of democracy does not require allowing every form of loyalty.

   a. Democracies may refuse to tolerate groups that act against fundamental democratic principles or act to eliminate the rights of others.

   b. Multiple loyalties at the level of attachment to the nation-state itself (e.g., dual citizenship) may be incompatible with principles of democratic self-governance because individuals with such divided loyalties may not be equally committed to the interests of both of the communities.

   c. Any political system that is predicated on the rule of the people would not have an obligation to tolerate its violent overthrow. Therefore, it is not obligated to tolerate violent or unconstitutional actions intended to undermine or replace its system of government.

III. Why choose democracy?

A. What are some justifications of democracy?

B. What purposes and values are best served by democracy?

C. What are arguments against democracy?

D. Under what conditions might it be reasonable to suspend elements of a democratic system or to choose a political system other than a democracy?

III. Why choose democracy?

A choice is only a free choice if it is made in the knowledge of what is being chosen and what considerations might lead to the choice of alternatives. Thus in deciding whether or not to choose democracy individuals should be aware of both its benefits and its weaknesses, of arguments against as well as for it, and of circumstances where it cannot reasonably be expected to work effectively.

A.   **What arguments justify democracy?** To justify a choice is to defend it as well-founded. A justification sets forth the reasons for a choice, position, or judgment. A choice on behalf of democracy may be grounded on its "intrinsic" and/or "instrumental" merits.

1.   **Intrinsic justifications for democracy.** "Intrinsic" justifications deal with the qualities and outcomes of democracy that are inherent in the concept and good in themselves. For example, it is argued that democracy best provides for or capitalizes on:

   a.   **Self-realization of the individual.** Human beings can best pursue the fulfillment of their potential in a society where the capacity for self-determination is fostered.

   b.   **Self-determination of a people**. The people have a right to govern themselves, and they are also the best judges and guardians of their interests.

   c.   **Collective wisdom.** The people are qualified to govern themselves because they collectively have more wisdom than an elite, e.g., a social aristocracy or small group of experts.

   d.   **Popular capability and trustworthiness.** The people themselves are most capable of defining their common interests and they are the most trustworthy depository of the powers for the protection of their interests.

   e.   **Equality.** Each person is born politically equal in that there is no intrinsic or inherited right to command others or obligation to obey others. Therefore each person has a right to an equal share in governance.

   f.   **Justice.** Justice pertains most fundamentally to the whole of society. Because the people rule they have reliable avenues for establishing and maintaining the welfare of the whole community and each of its members and for seeking redress for perceived injustices.

2.   **Instrumental justifications for democracy.** "Instrumental" justifications set forth the importance of democracy as a means or instrument for the achievement of desirable ends or outcomes. For example, it may be argued that democracy best provides for:

   a.   **Liberty.** Liberty is more likely to be protected in a system of popular self-government because the people are less likely to promote or tolerate encroachments on their own freedoms. Liberty will be more secure when power is checked by means such as free elections.

   b.   **Justice.** Human beings have a natural sense of fairness and a desire to be treated fairly. Participation in self-government may enlighten and extend their inherent capacity to identify and understand issues of fairness and thereby promote their commitment to its realization.

   Distributive justice, for example, is more likely to be served where power is diffused and shared because there is a public process of give and take in which interests are moderated and balanced.

   c.   **Rights.** Rights are more secure in a democracy than in other systems because they constitute its foundation; to undermine them is to undermine democracy itself. Therefore democracies must provide

means of protecting fundamental rights and of redressing their violation. Because of the emphasis upon the transparency of the workings of governmental institutions, the opportunities for citizens to monitor and influence decisions that may affect their rights are maximized.

d. **Accountability.** In a democracy, all power is derived from the people, who delegate authority. Officials therefore are held accountable for using their authority on behalf of the well-being of the people. Democracy is designed to ensure that government serves the interests of the governed.

e. **Intellectual development and self-respect.** The necessity for citizens to understand, reflect upon, and deliberate about public affairs stimulates and extends the intellectual development and enhances self-respect of the individual.

f. **Respect for the individual.** By entrusting citizens with the powers of political decision-making, democracy regards them as capable of mature judgment and choice and confirms respect for the individual.

g. **Personal responsibility.** The fact that political involvement requires the citizen to act, not just to deliberate, cultivates and affirms personal responsibility. Having the power to act places one in the position of being held accountable for one's actions.

h. **Peaceful change.** Since the ultimate source of political power remains with the people, those in positions of authority serve only with the people's approval. The withdrawal of their mandate to govern through the electoral process makes for peaceful change and eliminates the need for revolution.

i. **Orderly accommodation of conflict.** Liberty generates conflict of interests and ideas, and democracy derives energy from this conflict. Democracy cannot be preserved if this conflict is suppressed. Rather, democracy channels conflict into non-destructive avenues to take advantage of its productive potential and to avoid its damaging tendencies. Channeling conflict into the confines of accepted institutions provides for orderly change and stability.

j. **Self-reformation.** The complexity of governmental and social structures in modern democracies provides for alternative centers of expertise, influence, and power that can modulate each other and counter extremism, irrationality, and partiality. Because democracy emphasizes self-awareness about the practice and performance of government through open discussion, association, and advocacy, it is capable of correcting distortions that arise from irrational and partial social components. It may do so when the people, in their own political judgments, acknowledge the wisdom of thoughtful advocates and public-spirited institutions.

k. **Legitimacy**. In principle, all citizens in a democracy are consulted in matters of public policy through the political process, especially the electoral process. Since all are potentially consulted, democracy stands a greater chance of being considered legitimate in the perceptions of citizens than political systems which habitually consult only a portion (in many instances a small fraction) of their members.

l. **Innovation and commitment to progress.** Because democracy is committed to self-criticism, there is ongoing debate about how to refine and improve the political system and its policies. The resulting conflict of ideas and interests may prompt innovative and responsive solutions to public problems.

m. **Choice.** Democracy encourages different points of view to be expressed and different interests to be advocated, thereby providing alternatives and increasing the range of choice.

n. **Independence.** Citizens in a democracy are aware that they are free to think as they please and are confronted with a wide range of competing political views. They are also aware that all citizens in a democracy are political equals and that there are no subordinate political classes or castes. They are

thus more likely to form and voice independent political views than those living under political systems where subordination of those deemed to be inferior encourages deference.

o. **Stability.** A system of government based upon the entire body of citizens, many of whom are actively involved in forming and judging public policy, is more likely to be supported by those citizens than a society in which they have little or no voice. It will accordingly be more likely to achieve stability than alternatives that are based on more narrow segments of society.

p. **Quality of life.** In a democracy the people are best suited to determining society's interests and goals regarding their needs and their quality of life. Therefore, the decisions the people make for themselves are more likely to be accepted as a means of attaining desired ends.

B. **What purposes and values are best served by democracy?** Democracies promote many of the same purposes as many other kinds of government. Some of these purposes, however, may be more cherished and given a higher priority in democracies. Other purposes are distinctive to democracy; and additional purposes are unique to liberal democracy.

1. **Purposes and values of democracies in common with most kinds of government.** Democracies have a number of purposes and values in common with other kinds of government. One argument for democracy is that it more fully achieves some basic purposes and values than other kinds of political systems. For example:

    a. **Protection of life.** First among the purposes of most governments is protection of the lives of all those under it. Any politically organized society must provide for security and peacekeeping. Historical evidence indicates democratic governments tend to cherish life more than other forms of government do.

    b. **Territorial integrity.** Allied to the protection of life is the purpose of protecting the safety and integrity of the territory of a country and its political system from external threat. It is not clear that democracies protect their territories better than other systems, but they may secure their territory through more humane means than competing political systems do.

    c. **Justice and the common good.** In common with other legitimate forms of government, democracies must provide for justice and promote the common good. Widespread participation and the need for government to account for its actions on behalf of the common welfare increase the probability that justice and the common good will be served better in democracies than in competing political systems.

2. **Purposes and values distinctive to democracies.** Not only might democracies serve some common purposes and values better than other forms of government, certain purposes and values are distinctive to democracies. For example:

    a. **Protection of rights and liberties**. Democratic political systems place a priority on protecting equal rights and liberties of citizens.

    b. **Widespread dispersal of decision-making.** Democracy promotes widespread participation in the making of decisions regarding public affairs. The greater the number of people involved in this process, the greater the likelihood that those decisions will be well-considered.

    c. **Free flow of information.** Because information about public matters is essential for informed and effective political participation in civic life, democracies vigorously protect the generation, exchange, and expression of political information and ideas.

    d. **Transparency.** The right of the people to assess the performance of their government requires that the activities and decisions related to the people's business be open to public scrutiny.

e. **Prevention of abuse or misuse of power.** Because the people retain the ultimate power in a democracy, institutional means must be provided for insuring that those exercising delegated powers do not exceed or abuse them.

f. **Dynamism.** Innovation and creativity arise from such characteristics of modern democracy as the competition of ideas and interests, the dispersal of decision-making, a tendency not to take things for granted, and a belief in the possibility of change and improvement.

3. **Attributes characteristic of liberal** democracies. Liberal democracies emphasis purposes and values which give them their distinguishing characteristics. These include:

a. **Commitment to the worth and dignity of each individual.** Because liberal democracy is founded on the individual, it must respect the worth and dignity of each person. Thus individual differences are often seen as good in themselves and mutual toleration is valued highly.

b. **Protection of individual rights**. Because of the primacy of the individual, liberal democracies must protect a wide range of individual rights as fundamental to individual liberty. Such rights include freedom of conscience, freedom of religion, freedom of expression, the right to property, and a private sphere which, in the absence of compelling overriding reasons, is none of the state's business.

c. **Development of the individual's potential**. Liberal democracy is concerned with providing the conditions conducive to the full flowering of the individual's potential, including full development of individual faculties and talents. Rewarding industriousness according to personal merit is a priority of the society's understanding of justice.

d. **Civil society.** Civil society consists of individuals and their voluntary associations that are self-organized and self-governing within the legal framework of the state. The extent of freedom and the recognition of a private sphere in a liberal democracy results in a more developed and extensive civil society than in other systems. In addition, liberal democracy depends upon the existence of a non-governmental sphere as a principal site for the exercise of individual rights and a location for the achievement of the common good.

e. **Market-based economy**. Political liberty is enhanced by a market-based economy where economic decision-making is decentralized. Individual liberty is sustained by the capacity to initiate economic enterprise and to be rewarded for success or penalized for failure. Market-based economies tend to promote diversity and pluralism beyond the economic sphere. They disperse economic resources and decision-making. Moreover, the diversity and pluralism thus created enrich both civil society and the political process.

f. **Tension between individual rights and the common good.** Individual rights and the common good are both primary values in a liberal democracy. There is, however, an inherent tension between individuality and common good. This tension may produce conflict, but even in dealing with the conflict the tension cannot be destroyed without undermining the fundamental values of liberal democracy.

Attentiveness to both individual rights and the common good is necessary to the preservation of liberal democracy. Individual rights without attention to the common good can lead to anarchy. Attention to the common good to the exclusion of individual rights destroys individual liberty. These values must be continuously balanced while avoiding a fixed resolution that would endanger individual rights or jeopardize the common good.

g. **The open society**. The idea of the "open society" as summation of liberal society's attributes includes such features as freedom of expression; freedom of movement, including freedom for citizens to travel abroad and return unimpeded and for foreigners to visit; freedom of political and civil association and

for the full expression of "civil society"; possibility of change based on rational criticism, including openness to free scientific research and discussion; the rule of law; and widespread possibility for upward social mobility based on merit.

4. **Attributes characteristic of non-liberal democracies**. Non-liberal democracies emphasize purposes and values that give them their distinguishing characteristics. These include:

   a. **Stability.** Throughout history there has been a tendency for societies and their governments to become estranged from one another because they diverge in their goals, interests, and modes of behavior. Since non-liberal democracy extols cohesion, harmony, and shared purposes among members of a community, when this community controls its government democratically, it tends to promote stability in the relationship between society and its government. Therefore, the people will see an enduring and organic fit between themselves and their political system that leads to a resistance to fundamental change.

   b. **Sense of social place.** Members of a community-oriented political system tend to develop a feeling of being connected to the whole of their society across time and space. Because of the reverence for inherited values, institutions, and practices, a society will foster a sense of continuity, predictability, and reliability by instilling in its members a feeling that they belong to something larger than themselves.

   c. **Rootedness.** From the perspective of a non-liberal democracy, the person is not seen as a modular unit to be picked up and moved about in the interests of expediency, especially economic expediency. An importance is placed upon being "at home" in the geographic and cultural environment of one's origins. This sense of "rootedness" enhances security and a sense of well-being on the part of citizens.

   d. **Veneration and preservation of the homeland.** The people feel a deep attachment to their land and an identification with it. There is a sense that the people and the land are destined for and belong to each other. They feel a strong commitment to protecting and caring for their homeland.

   e. **Mutuality**. A strong sense of community strengthens ties of moral obligation of members of the community to one another.

   f. **Promotion of an egalitarian society.** Because extreme disparities of social and economic condition tend to disrupt the harmony of a community, non-liberal democracies are more concerned with promoting egalitarianism. Homogeneity among members of the community may be viewed as an important condition for the achievement of social unity.

   g. **Moral character.** Instilling a rigorous public and private morality is seen by non-liberal democracies as essential to the welfare of the community. In fact, there is little or no distinction to be made between public and private character. The people can only have a government that is as good as themselves. Therefore, the stability and welfare of the community depend upon a public morality that is suffused throughout the society. Moreover, public officials are seen as bearing a special responsibility. They can be entrusted with power only to the extent that their character exemplifies the values of this public morality.

   h. **Accentuating consensus.** Although conflict is inherent in any society, non-liberal democracy tends to mute conflict rather than thriving on and institutionalizing it. The community is understood as having an interest of its own, sometimes even independently of its individual members. Therefore, there is a need for members to develop a consensus upon the interest of the community in contrast to promoting their own individual interests and then compromising the differences.

C. **What arguments oppose democracy?** A long-standing intellectual legacy, historical experience, and continuing problems of contemporary democracies have produced noteworthy arguments against democracy. To the extent that these arguments are valid criticisms of democracy, they may indicate potential "pathologies" that democracies must face in order to maintain and improve themselves. In fact, recognition of these potential pathologies of democracy and the desire to avoid them or mitigate their effects have often guided the conscious design of democratic institutions. Criticisms of democracy include:

1. **Democracy produces a tyranny of the lower classes**. In the classical conception, democracy is a form of government that gives authority to the "people" or *demos*. But the *demos* was understood to be the large population of the poor in a society. Thus "democracy" was thought to result inevitably in mob rule because the poor, who were childlike and uneducated, were subject to the tyranny of their emotions and therefore easily manipulated by demagogues. Without the inclusion of other more "reasonable" classes in governance as a counterbalance to the irrationality of the *demos,* "democracy" threatened to project this tyranny of the emotions on the public domain. In addition, because of the partiality of the lower classes, democracy was considered to be a "perverted" form of government because it allowed one segment of the population to rule the whole society in its own interest as opposed to the common good.

   A residue of this thought persists. In the modern context, because democracy relies on majority rule and the largest numbers of voters may be found in the lower classes or a dominant nationalistic group, this form of government may produce policies that serve the exclusive interests of the lower classes or ethnic groups to the detriment of other segments of society and to the common good. Moreover, because mass media can influence the people by clever appeals to popular emotion or by other kinds of manipulation, democracy is vulnerable to irrationality projected onto the public domain.

   Because the people may desire a sense of certainty and security, leaders may increase their own power by exploiting their susceptibility to paternalistic promises to take care of them. Without the moderating and constraining influence of the rational and educated elements of society in public affairs, democracy may become a monstrosity with great power and little judgment. In such circumstances, given the capacity of technology for destructiveness and communications media for manipulation, democracy is a dangerous form of government.

2. **Democracy obscures the exercise of real power.** Even when democratic institutions appear to be functioning well, the real power relationships in a society can operate independently and out of public view. In fact, by diverting public attention away from the real centers of power, democratic processes may serve primarily to obscure and enable these latent powers which exist in any society whatever its form of government. Democracy, however, obscures the real exercise of power more effectively than other forms of government because other forms of government do not claim to be transparent and to allocate decision making power to the people. Precisely because democracy defines itself as a system based on public control and public accountability, the people are deluded into thinking they are determining policies of central concern when, in fact, decisions on the most important matters are made in centers of power beyond their control or the control of their government.

   So-called democratic government constitutes an elaborate charade. In modern democracies, independent centers of economic power and social influence carry out the most consequential work of governance. This understanding of the underlying or essential function of democracy may allow governmental institutions only a trivial range of choices among options that have been predetermined by the real centers of power. Or it may allow government only a role of implementation for decisions made elsewhere.

3. **Democracy denies or defies human nature.** Democracy is based on an unrealistic view of human nature. Persons are not equal in their physical or intellectual capacities. They may not be equal even in their political capacities. Democracy does not sufficiently acknowledge the consequences of this inequality in the design of its political processes. Thus, democracy may deny or suppress natural individual talent including those people most capable of political leadership. It may also overestimate the capacity of some individuals.

   Moreover, a realistic view of human beings must acknowledge that many people are more interested in and preoccupied by their own private needs and interests than in devoting their time and energy to promoting the common good.

   Another view is that it is natural for some people to want a beneficent parental figure to take care of them rather than to face the uncertainties and risks of freedom and caring for themselves.

4. **Democracy threatens order.** The people are a potentially turbulent and unreliable force with the capacity to be unpredictable, fickle, unaccountable, and susceptible to their passions and prejudices. This potential for disorder may make reliance on the people as the ultimate source of political authority and on their participation in decision-making a threat to social and political stability.

5. **Democracy undermines tradition**. By being preoccupied with the present, the people in a democracy may fail to take into account or deny the accumulated wisdom of the past. With the possibility of radical social change, democracy may renounce tradition and reject the continuity upon which an enduring civilization rests.

6. **Democracy destabilizes authority**. By distrusting persons in authority and refusing deference to them, and by constantly scrutinizing and challenging settled arrangements, the people may undermine regularity, certainty, leadership, and decisiveness. By debating moral positions and avoiding final determination of what is right, democracy also undermines certitude and the authority of moral absolutes.

7. **Democracy endangers justice.** Democracies, especially liberal democracies, place a high value on the individual and individual rights. This is often coupled with an erroneous presumption that individuals have equal capacities to exercise and protect their rights and interests.

   Democracy's emphasis on rights, particularly property rights, and a lack of adequate regulation of the exercise of these rights, can lead to an inequitable distribution of power and resources. Thus, among other wrongs, the rights and interests of the least advantaged elements of society are not cared for adequately. Democracy may not provide a disinterested protector of the rights of victims of inequitable or unjust treatment or circumstances.

8. **Democracy conflicts with globalization and universalism.** Democracy requires a political people separated from humanity at large and the political structures of an internally self-governing nation state not subject to external powers where international organizations make decisions binding on nation-states. Therefore democratic political systems are incompatible with a global structure of economic exchange and a universal system of justice and rights. Thus a global or universal set of rules is intolerable for democratic self-governance.

9. **Democracy erodes competence**. The emphasis on egalitarianism and exaltation of the "common man" leads to a denial of the value of expertise. A belief that everyone is essentially equal to everyone else results in the view that everyone has the same capacity for sound political judgment. Individuals are more likely to "follow the herd," trust sentiment rather than reason, be diverted by trivial matters, subject to charismatic manipulation, and incapable of acting upon knowledge and fundamental principles. These tendencies deny the value of an elite of virtue, merit, or expertise.

10. **Democracy impedes efficiency.** Democracy's inclusion of a wide range of constituencies and institutions delays decision-making or may block it entirely. In an age of complex problems requiring timely responses, the cumbersomeness of democracy may lead to inefficiency or to default on its obligations.

11. **Democracy is too costly**. The economic and social resources required to establish and maintain democratic institutions may be so high that it leads to inadequate resources available for fundamental human needs for significant segments of the society. On the other hand, if a predominance of resources is dedicated to subsistence, then resources for economic and political infrastructure are not available thus maintaining a cycle of poverty and autocratic rule.

12. **Democracy undervalues merit**. A simplistic understanding of equality in a democracy may make it synonymous with sameness, requiring the elimination of any kind of ranking. The emphasis on this idea of equality leads to a "leveling" or "dumbing down" of standards to a common denominator. In its extreme form, this way of thinking leads to lowered expectations, ridicule of excellence, anti-intellectualism, celebration of mediocrity, and avoidance of standing out in order to be accepted as one of the group. Thus, merit is undervalued and the benefits of merit are lost to society.

13. **Democracy jeopardizes liberty**. Liberty may be threatened by the force of public opinion, an overemphasis on equality, the tyranny of a majority, or dominance by powerful minorities.

    a. **Public opinion.** The importance of public opinion as the basis of political decisions in democracy may result in a tyranny of opinion so dominant that individuals are incapable of thinking independently and thereby of exercising their liberty.

    b. **Majority rule.** When political majorities look only to their own interests, they can deprive individuals and minorities of their rights. By contrast, the extent of the freedom allowed in some democracies to factional minorities (those devoted solely to their own interests) can place them in a position where their intense and selective preoccupation with their own values and interests enables them to deny the will of the majority.

    c. **Equality.** If equality is understood as "sameness," it may deny the significance of individuality and promote conformism at the expense of liberty and creativity.

    d. **Dehumanization.** The view of "the people" as being composed of indistinguishable units may lead to treating the people as nothing more than a homogeneous mass. The effect is not only loss of the individuality of the person, but also treating "the people" as having an interest and value totally separate from the individuals who compose it. This denigrates individuality and converts "the people" into an assemblage with a mob mentality that threatens the liberty of the individual.

14. **Democracy stifles creativity**. Mass culture associated with democracy channels tastes and production into commonly accepted formulas and patterns. Deviation from the norm is discouraged.

15. **Democracy inhibits innovation.** Democracy's emphasis on utilitarian or pragmatic values limits innovation, seeking an immediate and measurable payoff for human endeavor. The belief that democracy is the final stage in political development generates self-satisfaction that discourages political creativity and the imagination of alternatives or a consideration of democracy's flaws.

D. **Under what conditions might it be reasonable to tolerate nondemocratic institutions within a democracy, to suspend elements of a democratic system, or to choose a political system other than a democracy?** However desirable democracy's virtues may be, there may be circumstances in which people think the choice of democracy or incorporating some of its elements would be unwise. They might conclude, moreover, that it is desirable to tolerate some nondemocratic institutions or practices, or to make allowances for some nondemocratic features within democratic institutions. There may also be reasons to suspend democracy or to delay its establishment.

1. **Reasons for tolerating nondemocratic institutions within a democracy.**

   a. Institutions essential for securing the safety and territorial integrity of the country, such as an army, militia, or police might not be effective if they are democratically administered.

   b. Institutions essential for maintaining the economic health and viability of the economy, such as central banks removed from the direct influence of politics, might not be able to perform their functions if run democratically.

   c. In order to ensure its impartiality, the judiciary may need to be insulated from public opinion and the political process.

   d. Religious institutions may be ruled hierarchically in order to maintain their doctrinal certainty and organizational strength.

   e. A respect for liberty, social diversity, and, in liberal democracies, the private sphere may require democracy to tolerate non-democratic organizations within civil society, but not necessarily anti-democratic organizations bent on destroying democracy.

2. **Reasons for allowing non-democratic features within democratic institutions.**

   a. Organizations whose service depends upon expertise such as hospitals, schools, or universities, while they may be accountable to the community, may be organized on a hierarchical or non-participatory basis.

   b. Organizations whose success depends upon efficiency such as certain business corporations or public utilities, though indirectly regulated by democratic institutions, may be managed authoritatively.

3. **Reasons for suspending or delaying democratic systems.**

   a. Emergencies such as natural disasters, crises in economic systems, widespread insurrections, and medical epidemics, may justify the temporary suspension of democratic procedures and the imposition of emergency powers.

   b. Threats from outside a country's borders may make non-democratic forms of rule appear more practical in order to provide an effective defense.

   c. The full implementation of a democratic system may be delayed due to the lack of adequate political, educational, economic, or social conditions to support democracy. The implementation of democracy may require society to undergo transitional stages of development that are less than democratic.

IV. What conditions support democracy?

A. What forces shape any political system?

B. What social conditions enable, inhibit, and shape democracy?

C. What institutional characteristics enable, inhibit, and shape democracy?

D. In what ways may a democratic political system embody a mixture of democratic and non-democratic features?

E. How might democracy promote conditions that erode its foundations?

F. What characteristics of democratic political systems inhibit and counteract conditions that may erode its foundations?

G. Where does responsibility lie for maintaining democracy?

IV. What conditions support democracy?

Political systems cannot be constructed independently from the historical, natural, and cultural context in which they are to operate. Even when political systems are deliberately designed to establish democratic practices and processes, their institutions are shaped by fundamental aspects of their environment.

As a consequence of the different contexts in which political systems are established, the characteristics of specific institutions in one country may differ from those in another even though both are designed to achieve democratic governance. Moreover, the particular kind of democracy that is sought in one context may differ from that in another in order to take into account constraints and possibilities arising from their larger environment.

A. **What basic factors shape a political system?** An understanding of any political system requires an examination of its history, natural environment, and culture, as well as the deliberate choices that have shaped its character. This understanding, along with a systematic knowledge of alternative political forms, enables a society to shape its political life in a more informal manner.

   1. **History.** Political systems are shaped by historical experience. In some instances the historical development of a political system has been a gradual maturation with only minor interruptions. In other instances, political systems have changed suddenly as a result of internal forces or external imposition (e.g., French, Russian, Chinese and Indonesian revolutions; post-World War II Japan and Germany).

      Whatever historical legacy a political system may have, there may still be occasions when a people can deliberate and choose to modify its political system or to create an entirely new one. But even in such contexts historical experience may affect the choices available and the resulting political order.

   2. **Natural environment**. The physical characteristics and geopolitical situation of a society provide both opportunities and constraints in the development of its political system. The natural environment includes geographical territory and location, topographical features, natural resources and climate, and relative size and compatibility with its neighbors. Although these factors may influence the evolution, choice, or design of a political system, they do not necessarily determine it. Such factors may be accommodated, transformed, or overcome (e.g. federal systems used to cope with large areas).

   3. **Culture.** The ethos, customs, education, and social structure of a people are reflected in whatever political system the people inherits. They are also reflected in the range of choices of kinds of political systems it might establish (e.g., constitutional monarchy used for basically democratic governments that have evolved from monarchical roots.)

B. **What social conditions enable, inhibit, and shape democracy?** Some social conditions may be conducive to democracy, others may be detrimental to it, and others may be neutral in their effects on democracy. To say that some conditions are conducive to democracy is not to say that they are preconditions for the very existence of democracy.

   While each of the conditions or characteristics in the following lists may be important in itself, the workability of a given democracy does not depend upon the presence of any specific one or of one particular combination of characteristics. Different democracies exhibit these characteristics in varying degrees. The contributions of these characteristics to democracy will be the result of the way those present in any particular country reinforce each other.

   And while both conducive and detrimental characteristics shape any democracy, they are not necessarily permanent or static. As democratic institutions develop, they may modify the force of these characteristics or even transform or eliminate them.

Insert somewhere

Factors that most commonly lead to the breakdown of democracy include, for example:

1. the poor performance of the democratic political system, as

2. stopped here

1

1. Characteristics of society as a whole. Attributes of a society—e.g., political attitudes and beliefs, as well as social composition, and distribution of wealth--have a significant bearing on the health of its democracy.	
Characteristics of society conducive to democracy. There are overarching and pervasive qualities of a society that are conducive to democracy and condition the character of its democracy. Examples are:	**Characteristics of society detrimental to democracy.** Certain qualities of a society, when they are sufficiently widespread, may undermine the possibility of democracy or contribute to its fragility. Examples are:
Political and social values that promote the peaceful competition of ideas and political programs within limited moral and institutional boundaries: • shared constitutional principles • broad commitment to using institutional means of making decisions and solving problems • ideological pluralism • **tolerance of differences and opposing positions** • **moderation and avoidance of extreme and dogmatism-pragmatism and flexibility** • equality in the political status of citizens • respect for and access to education and learning	**Political and social values** that undermine mutual trust among citizens and shared forums for peaceful discussion and debate and foster dogmatism: • absence of shared political or constitutional values • hostility toward and distrust of political institutions • antipathy toward participation in the political process • denial or limitation of education for some segments of society or disdain for learning in general • deep ideological cleavages
Social structure that fosters democratic civic skills, political moderation, and social mobility: • a large, developed middle class • an active and developed civil society • absence of extensive extremes of wealth and poverty • broad access to technological knowledge and resources • absence of rigid classes • competition among groups • social pluralism/diversity	**Social structure** that gives rise to chronic polarization among groups and the absence of shared common ground and obstructs social mobility: • a social structure consisting solely or mainly of rich and poor • rigid and extreme disparities in the distribution of wealth • formal and entrenched social stratification (class, caste, or gender) • rigid and antagonistic social factions • inequitable access to technological knowledge and

• a diverse array of elites with fluid membership	resources • a "ruling elite," a dominant and select group that is closed, obscure, and self-interested
Social attitudes conducive to the formation of "social capital," i.e., the accumulation of human resources which provides an "investment base" upon which a society can draw. Thus, social capital may provide an underlying popular consensus and a potential active engagement that can sustain constitutional political processes: • widespread social trust • **an attitude toward authority that is skeptical and watchful, but also respectful** • **belief in the legitimacy of democracy as the best form of government** • **civility and respect for the views, interests, and dignity of others** • absence of mutual hostility among socially fragmented groups • social egalitarianism • willingness to be engaged in deliberation concerning issues where problems may be ambiguous and solutions not readily apparent • acceptance of a norm of negotiation and compromise • concern for the community (ranging from local to national) that transcends preoccupation with private or parochial interests (e.g., family, immediate associates, religious, financial) • rejection of the notion the society has access to absolute truths, therefore there need not be occasion to deliberate, debate, or reflect, nor need there be toleration of dissenters	**Social attitudes** that inhibit the development of social capital. Without such an accumulation of human resources to draw upon, a society may be disabled by vigorous disputes about public policy or government action that could be accommodated by a society with deeper reserves of social capital: • alienation of large segments of the population owing to widespread poverty and other factors • social mistrust that inhibits individual or collective initiative • **rejection of political authority** • **unquestioning obedience to authority** • **rejection of the idea of democracy and democratic institutions** • **unwillingness to show respect for the views, interests, and dignity of others** • toleration of lawlessness and corruption and the belief that they are inevitable in any political system • broad preference for the perceived efficiency of military-style solutions to problems of society • attitudes and behaviors of superiority and inferiority among social groups pervading public life • existence of underlying animosities and persistent hatreds that can be manipulated by rulers to pit one segment of society against another in order to sustain autocratic rule • the selective use of historical legacies by leaders to divide their opposition, so they can use the machinery of government to maintain minority rule through an electoral process

2. Characteristics of individual members of a society. A variety of civically relevant attributes of individuals--including aspects of personal character and personal attitudes-- have a significant bearing on the health of a democracy.

Civic dispositions or traits of public and private character of individuals that may be conducive to democracy. A "disposition" is a propensity to think and act in certain ways. The health and character of democracy will be conditioned by how widespread these dispositions are among individuals, their distribution among segments of a society, and their strength. These dispositions include:	**Dispositions or traits of public and private character of individuals that may be detrimental to democracy.** Some dispositions may be adverse to democracy and/or may negatively affect its quality. In some cases, however, institutional arrangements that channel some of the following detrimental dispositions may have a positive effect on democracy, e.g., establishing fair procedures for accommodating competing selfish interests of power seekers, diverting a spirit of self-aggrandizement into service for the public good. These dispositions include:
Traits of personal character that promote habits of effective participation in civic life: • trustworthiness • civility • reflectiveness and skepticism • optimism—belief in the possibility of social improvement • compassion and empathy—ability to see from another's point of views • assertiveness • willingness to take the initiative • disposition to cooperate • sense of civic identity that transcends other identities	**Traits of personal character** that make effective civic cooperation unlikely: • individual self-importance and self-centeredness • fatalism which produces a sense of helplessness or hopelessness • apathy • isolation • passivity • cynicism • aversion to risk • narrow and exclusive identity that excludes the capacity to take on multiple roles
Attitudes towards oneself promoting an individual's active involvement in the civic arena: • sense of personal efficacy • confidence in one's capacity to understand public matters • belief in the value of one's opinions and judgments • self-discipline and self-governance	**Attitudes towards oneself** that either block entrance to the civic arena or make sustained effort unlikely: • feelings of inefficacy • lack of confidence in one's ability to protect one's interest • lack of confidence in one's ability to effect change • overestimation of one's capacity • abdication of responsibility for one's own welfare with a view that government has the major responsibility for one's welfare

Attitudes towards others likely to promote effective civic action in a democratic context: - respect for the rights and interests of others - tolerance for groups and individuals different from oneself - ability to put oneself in the place of others - solidarity with fellow citizens - cooperativeness - willingness to negotiate and compromise	**Attitudes toward others** destructive of democratic debate, deliberation, and decision-making: - unwillingness to tolerate or to listen to opposing views - absolutism which makes compromise with others impossible - inability to trust others - malicious intent to discredit or injure others - discrimination on the basis of such factors as gender, race, ethnicity, religion
Attitudes towards public affairs that further a capacity for public action and promote a willingness to look beyond self-interest to the public good: - civic mindedness, including: concern for the public good, reasonable expectations of government, willingness to educate oneself on the issues of the day - belief in the value of discourse on public matters - confidence that one can make a difference in public affairs - expectation that political and governmental institutions can effectively address public problems - critical attitude toward power that requires justification of its use - identification with and loyalty to constitutional principles of one's country - belief in democratic values and processes in general - willingness to be a protector of and contributor to democracy rather than just a consumer of its benefits	**Attitudes towards public affairs** that corrode public life: - inattention to public affairs - withdrawal from the public sphere - uncritical deference to expertise and authority of public officials - unrealistic expectations of political and governmental institutions - unwillingness to compromise which may produce political stalemate and failure to fulfill essential governmental responsibilities - factionalism in which one segment of society dominates public affairs to the detriment of the whole society - self-interested demands that intensify political competition beyond the capacity of the political system to accommodate - manipulative use of the political system at the expense of the welfare of others - perception that politics is nothing more than the buying and selling of political leaders and that the motivation of governmental officials is for their own gain

3. Characteristics of social groups and associations. The beliefs espoused by groups, the internal procedures of groups, the relationships among groups, and the relationships of groups to society as a whole may have a significant bearing on whether democracy functions in a healthy manner.

Characteristics of social groups and associations conducive to democracy. Groups and associations have their own characteristics apart from those of individuals that may contribute to the quality and well-being of democracy. Examples include:	**Characteristics of social groups and associations detrimental to democracy.** Some characteristics of groups and associations may be adverse to democracy and/or may affect its quality in a negative way. Nevertheless, the accommodation of such groups may have a positive effect on democracy—e.g., providing for freedom of belief, expression, and association and the peaceful accommodation of conflict. Examples include:
- Group ethos that encourages a sense of belonging and connectedness in a common enterprise - Group procedures that foster the attainment of civic knowledge and skills of their members - Teamwork that cultivates collegiality and leadership - Avoidance of the use of arbitrary criteria in acceptance of members - Interaction that helps refine and articulate interests and positions as well as generate creative responses to problems - Preservation of group heritage and solidarity, to the extent that they embody democratic values and practices or provide a mechanism for promoting the values of a common civic culture - Acceptance of the idea that if one can "lose today but win tomorrow" then one can accept the decision and persevere - Rejection of "winner take all" strategies - Toleration of opposing groups - Willingness of groups to allow multiple allegiances among their members and choice among affiliations, thus enlarging personal identity and enhancing engagement in civic life - Willingness of groups to form coalitions with other groups to increase their influence and broaden their perspectives on public matters - Self-restraint in pursuing group interests in deference to the public good	- Group-orientation that suppresses individuality and demands unquestioned acceptance of group thinking ("group-think") - Abandonment of personal responsibility and conscience in conformity to the group ("herd instinct") - Exclusivity that promotes solidarity but which may also promote fragmentation, alienation, and inequality of opportunity - Prohibition of dissent because dissent is viewed as disloyalty - Beliefs in the superiority of one's own racial, ethnic, or religious group that sustain unbridgeable cleavages in society - Splintering of the political system into groups of mutually hostile political parties based on social factions such as ethnic groups - Assertion that one's racial, ethnic, religious, or political group is the embodiment or sole redeemer of the country, thus usurping the identity of the sovereign people as a whole and taking their place - Refusal to recognize the humanity of members of some other groups, precluding the idea that all human beings inhabit the same moral universe - Insistence on non-negotiable demands which polarize the community and preclude compromise as a result of give-and-take in public deliberation - Belief in the legitimacy of "winner take all" outcomes - Belief that all political disputes must be framed in terms of a "zero-sum" game where whatever one side wins, the other side loses - Disavowal of a common civic identity among different groups

4. Characteristics of political leaders and public officials. Attributes of individual leaders in a political system, such as their attitudes toward the use of power and authority as well as their commitment to constitutional principles, have a significant bearing on the health of democracy.

Attitudes, behaviors, and practices beneficial to democracy. Political leaders and government officials bear special responsibility and are authorized to wield significant powers. Therefore, their attitudes, behaviors, and practices are of particular importance. Characteristics of political leaders and public officials beneficial to democracy include:	**Attitudes, behaviors, and practices harmful to democracy.** Certain characteristics of political leaders and government officials undermine the functioning of democratic institutions and the confidence of the citizens in their political system. Such characteristics also may deter more qualified persons from engaging in civic life. These include:
- fidelity to the letter and spirit of the country's constitution along with its fundamental values and principles - capacity to identify, articulate, and promote a vision of what is beneficial to the people - attentiveness to the expression of public will, allied with concern for the common good - respect for the country's laws and acceptance of a duty to uphold them - possession of the relevant knowledge and competence required to carry out the duties of office - willingness to compromise and cooperate with one's associates and with other leaders or officials, including political opponents - willingness to stand alone against one's associates and other leaders or officials in situations of honest disagreement - willingness to give up office upon the end of a term or at the loss of an election - willingness to exercise the authority of office or to exert the power of leadership - attentiveness to the strategic timing of action, knowing when to act, when to wait, and when not to act - concern for one's reputation in history or one's historical legacy	- belief in the preeminence of one's judgment, that one's values and goals are superior to the constitution and its fundamental principles, and that one's actions need not be confined by constitutional limitations - contempt for citizens and for the law - inaccessibility to the public - disregard for truth and reliance upon distortion and deceit - demagoguery in the manipulation of people by exploiting and appealing to primitive emotions and ignorance - an appetite for ever-expanding power or the exercise of power exceeding the limits of office - unwillingness or inability to acquire the knowledge requisite for efficient and effective rule - failure or hesitancy to use legitimate authority - corruption, including bribe-taking and nepotism - favoritism in public appointments - rigidity, absolutism, and unwillingness to compromise - impulsive action without due consultation and deliberation or excessive delay and indecisiveness - desire for fame and celebrity to the exclusion of public spiritedness

C. **What institutional characteristics enable, inhibit, and shape democracy?** Some characteristics of institutions enhance the health of democracy. Others are detrimental. Such characteristics, both positive and negative, shape the character of any democracy.

1. Characteristics of governmental institutions. Attributes of a country's governmental institutions, such as the allocation of their powers and the reach of their responsibilities, have a consequential effect on the health of a democracy.

Characteristics of governmental institutions conducive to democracy. Examples are:	Characteristics of governmental institutions detrimental to democracy. Examples are:
- Institutions that are limited to promoting the legitimate ends or purposes for which they were established. Such limits may be found in a constitution or in values and principles not stated formally but derived from the mores of a society. Such limits flow from the idea that government is the servant not the master of the people and that the fundamental rights of citizens cannot legitimately be abrogated. - Institutions limited to the use of justifiable means. Not all means useful in attaining legitimate ends or purposes are justifiable. Means must be limited in accord with the fundamental values and principles of democracy. - Institutions must be responsive to the problems of the society, routinely accessible and regularly accountable to citizens, and attentive to their welfare. Institutions must be flexible enough to meet a country's needs, whether emerging gradually or appearing suddenly. - Institutions must meet the general characteristics of "good governance." These include: - efficiency (accomplishing the ends of government without unreasonable cost, waste, and delay) - integrity (government without corruption and with fidelity to principle) - transparency (institutional processes are publicly observable, the grounds for decisions are discernable, and the foreseeable consequences of policies are contemplated and made known) - efficacy (effective responses to citizen demands and needs) - continuity and reasonableness (decisions on established policy and in accordance with the merits of each case) - wisdom (resourcefulness and depth of thought in problem solving); and - vision (broad perspective and concern for posterity). - Institutional procedures and arrangements reflect fundamental fairness in their dealings with individuals, groups, and the people as a whole.	- Institutions with ill-defined authority and responsibilities. Without defined boundaries, institutions may be overreaching in their exertion of power or underachieving in carrying out their responsibilities. In addition, without well-defined limits, governmental power may intrude into all aspects of society and individual life. - Institutions with unrestricted choices of means for attaining ends or purposes - Diffusion of governmental authority to the extent that accountability cannot be assigned - Indifference to the people arising from claims of official superiority of knowledge and competence - Checkpoints where veto power can be exercised are so numerous that stalemate is pervasive - Intrusion of the military into areas beyond its sphere of competence and authority - Institutions that reflect the qualities of "bad governance." These include: - Incompetence - Corruption - Rigidity (domination by a complex, inflexible, or unresponsive bureaucracy) - Non-transparency - Non-accountability - Self-interestedness (government more concerned for itself than it is for the country) - Short-sightedness - Arbitrariness (decisions based on the whims of those who govern and the passions of the moment)

2. Characteristics of a country's legal system. Attributes of a country's legal system, such as its rationality, transparency, and accessibility to citizens, may have a significant bearing the health of democracy.

Characteristics of a country's legal system conducive to democracy include:	Characteristics of a country's legal system detrimental to democracy include:
• The legal system embodies fundamental attributes of the rule of law, e.g., widespread promulgation of the law, formality, coherence, generality, intelligibility, predictability, impartiality. • Laws are understandable and available to the public. • People have a basic knowledge of the legal system, and its operations are open to public scrutiny. • People have a sense that the judicial system works fairly and that it promotes justice overall • Citizens have the opportunity to participate in the formulation, application, adjudication, and enforcement of laws. • The authority and scope of law is limited to ends justified by its purposes, which are seen as reasonable and legitimate. • The law is subject to review, reconsideration, and change in accordance with the fundamental purposes and principles of the society.	• The true purposes of laws are concealed and/or false purposes are attributed to them • The legal system is excessively complex with the result that there is confusion and inability to predict outcomes • The laws are inconsistent resulting in a conflict of outcomes that makes their application appear arbitrary • Laws are applied with partiality and caprice producing unfairness, popular disaffection, and disrespect for law and the legal system. • Laws are changed frequently or haphazardly with the effect that the system of law becomes unpredictable and unstable • The substance of laws and the operations of the legal system are inaccessible to public view and understanding • Laws are so complicated that coherent statements of them cannot be rendered. • Legal decision-makers refuse to or fail to provide justification for laws and legal decisions • Laws and decisions are regarded as fixed, immutable, and not subject to proposals for reconsideration

3. Characteristics of a country's economy and standard of living. Attributes of a country's economic condition--such as its capacity to generate wealth and the openness of its economic system to participation-- may have a significant bearing on the health of democracy.

Characteristics of an economy and standard of living conducive to democracy include:	Characteristics of an economy and standard of living detrimental to democracy include:
- The recognition and protection of private property and widespread ownership, providing a means to insure personal independence and security, as well as a counterweight to the power and reach of government. - A proliferation of economic interests arising from dispersed ownership that contributes to political diversity and multiple centers of power and influence. - Recognition of the need for an economy that is open, creative, flexible, and competitive - Such an economy diffuses economic decision-making, encourage productive enterprise, and mitigate the concentration of social and political power. - Such an economy will be substantially free of direct government management but may rely upon government regulation to facilitate its functioning and, in some cases, to channel its activities to protect the public interest. - Regulation by government may be needed to prevent or correct market failures and abuses of property, including the formation of monopolies or the degradation of the environment - Fairness in the process by which the benefits and burdens of the economy are distributed. The benefits of such a process provide prospects for individuals to change and improve their economic condition. - Achievement of a standard of living which allows for free and independent participation in public life and which fosters the individual's sense of having a stake in the well-being of the society. - Adherence to the rule of law - Transparency and accountability in the structure and operation of commerce - Existence of an infrastructure that supports, enhances, and regulates commerce, e.g., legal codes, regulatory bodies, financial institutions	- Concentration of wealth and economic power in government, in the hands of a few, or in a narrow segment of a society - Disparity of wealth that translates into a disparity of political power or the subjugation of individuals - Costs and complexity of participation in the market that inhibit entrepreneurship, stifle initiative, and result in rigidity and stagnation - A society with entrenched classes that perpetuate extremes of wealth and poverty. Such an economy aggrandizes the power and resources of a narrow segment of the society. - Barriers to economic mobility arising from social status that prevent the accrual of social capital and undermine democratic values such as equality of opportunity and progress - Extremes of wealth and poverty; extreme inequality in the distribution of essential goods and services may produce deprivation and misery incompatible in principle with the goals and values of democracy. - Unbridled pursuit of economic gain that results in inadequate compensation of workers, deleterious working conditions, higher costs for consumers, and the unaffordability of the necessities for life. The resulting impoverishment poses a public burden and effectively removes workers from the status of citizen. - Monopolistic conditions inhibit economic self-correction. An economy which is prevented from adjusting to changing circumstances atrophies or collapses. - Command of the economy where the state is the only employer and sole source of income. Both economic and political power is consolidated in governmental bureaucracies and removed from the autonomous organizations and individuals of civil society, which then cannot counterbalance governmental power.

4. Characteristics of a country's educational system. Attributes of a country's educational system--such as its quality, accessibility, and democratic orientation--may have a significant bearing on the health of democracy.

Characteristics of a country's educational system conducive to democracy include:	Characteristics of a country's educational system detrimental to democracy include:
• Congruence of the educational system with the ethos, needs, and purposes of a democratic society	• Education that induces passivity and automatic acceptance of a regime and its ideology
• Availability of education for all members of the society and requirement of basic education for all	• Education that is predicated on a rigid orthodoxy or unexamined truths, where the only questions that can be asked are those whose answers have been predetermined
• Development of universal literacy and numeracy, with the opportunity to develop knowledge and skills for carrying on one's life	• Use of authoritarian methods of instruction that inhibit creative inquiry, skepticism, and other democratic values
• Goal of enlightenment and critical inquiry as opposed to indoctrination and orthodoxy	• Exclusion of some segments of society from access to education
• Education intentionally designed at every level to promote civic competence and civic responsibility and to foster a reasoned commitment to fundamental constitutional values and the principles of democracy	• Allocation of public educational opportunity according to social, economic, or political status
• Education of each generation to ensure the continuation and improvement of democracy	• Failure to devote adequate financial resources to education
• Establishment and maintenance of high academic standards for students, teachers, and schools	• Failure to establish, assess, and enforce appropriate standards for students, teachers, and schools
• Cultivation of the intellectual capacities and professional abilities of teachers	• Low status accorded teaching as a profession and as a priority of a society
• Openness of educational institutions to public scrutiny, accountability, and control	• Failure to attract, train, and retain knowledgeable and skilled teachers
	• Failure to allow for the intellectual and creative independence of teachers

1   D. **How may a democratic political system incorporate institutions and practices that are not democratic in**
2   **character or which contain essential attributes that may be potentially detrimental to the health of**
3   **democracy?** A democracy may need institutions or practices, not democratic in their fundamental character,
4   which contribute to its functioning, stability, and survival. In addition, a democracy may require institutions
5   that, taken as a whole, contribute to the health of democracy even though they have core attributes that are
6   inherently non-democratic.

7   Some of these institutions and practices may be required for the achievement of the fundamental purposes of
8   government and for the continued existence of democracy as a political order. Some must be accommodated
9   because to prohibit them would be incompatible with the values of a free society.

10   1. **Institutions that may be non-democratic in character but are considered necessary or acceptable in a**
11   **democracy include:**

12   a. **Military, militia, and police.** Some public organizations such as the military, militias, and police may
13   be organized and administered in a hierarchical manner and in what might be regarded as an
14   authoritarian and, to some extent, a secretive and non-transparent style. To require such organizations
15   to adhere fully to democratic processes would impair their central functioning and their ability to fulfill
16   their roles within a democracy. Nonetheless, the non-democratic effects of these institutions and
17   processes must be minimized or ameliorated by checks that limit their powers and maintain their
18   accountability to the public—e.g., civilian control of the military, citizen boards to review police
19   action, "freedom of information" procedures.

20   b. **Religious organizations.** Central tenets of democracy include the respect for freedom of belief of
21   persons, the right of persons to associate for common purposes, and the protection of organizations that
22   results when persons associate for the practice and promotion of their beliefs. Even though actions
23   associated with the practice of religious belief may be within the regulatory scope of a democratic
24   government the belief itself is beyond the legitimate reach of government. And, because of the close
25   connection between belief and association, the form of governance of religious organizations is entitled
26   to substantial autonomy even if it may be undemocratic. Nevertheless persons who are members of
27   religious organizations are entitled to have their broader constitutional and democratic rights as
28   citizens protected.

29   c. **Business corporations and other organizations of civil society.** Corporate organizations within an
30   economy and some organizations of civil society typically have narrower interests than the society as a
31   whole. In the pursuit of these interests, they may emphasize some democratic rights (e.g., the right to
32   property, the right to petition or lobby government) to the detriment of others (e.g., equality).
33   Moreover, in order to protect their relatively parochial interests, some of the operations of such
34   organizations may be conducted in secret so that public access and use of knowledge unique or crucial
35   to their operations may be restricted. From these attributes that, considered alone, may be detrimental
36   to democratic values, the economic well-being of a democratic society may be enhanced as a result of
37   increased initiative, inventiveness, and productivity. In addition, the interests of some segments of
38   society may be attended to that would otherwise have been neglected (e.g., the interests of specific
39   groups such as the disabled and farmers). Nevertheless, such organizations must accommodate their
40   operations to the rule of law and the welfare of the society as a whole.

41   d. **Families.** The family is the first and most natural form of association. It is also the environment for
42   the first stages of the development of the person and for the person's introduction to community and
43   authority. The organization of the family, however, may typically be hierarchical and even
44   authoritarian. Because of democracy's respect for a private zone of autonomy in personal relationships,
45   these non-democratic attributes are tolerated. Nevertheless, the when the rights of individuals to
46   privacy and autonomy come into conflict with the authority of the family, a democratic government

1   may be obliged to intervene in order to protect the rights of the individual or the authority of the family
2   (e.g., to protect the individual against physical or mental abuse, or to vindicate the discretion of the
3   family to rear its children in accord with its beliefs).

4   e.   **Schools.** As institutions particularly geared to performing central functions for the broader democratic
5   community, schools are communities within themselves with their own institutional purposes. In order
6   to fulfill those purposes--inculcating knowledge, transmitting skills, and habituating students in
7   methods of inquiry--schools cannot be open to egalitarian participation in determining their goals and
8   methods. Nor can all of the rights that prevail in the broader community--where each individual has the
9   full panoply of the rights of self-government--be fully exercised in the school environment.

10   In the school environment, participants do not have the ultimate authority of self-governance as the
11   body of citizens do in the broader society. The lack of knowledge of many subjects among students,
12   including political knowledge, as well as their inexperience with self-government may justify
13   governance within educational systems that does not meet all of the criteria of democracy. Instead
14   teachers and other officials in the schools are charged by society with authority to govern the schools
15   on the basis of their knowledge and expertise. Without such institutional authority, schools would not
16   be able to fulfill their central function of cultivating democratic citizens with the capacity to govern
17   themselves and to participate effectively in the civic life of the larger community. Thus schools may be
18   organized in hierarchical structures and may be conducted in a directive manner.

19   Nonetheless, even though the internal processes of education in schools may not be fully compatible
20   with the democratic processes of the community at large, they should embody certain democratic
21   values, principles, and processes in their daily operation. Moreover, the non-democratic attributes of
22   schools should be accommodated only to the extent that they can be rationalized as conducive to the
23   goal of the schools to achieve democratic ends.

24   f.   **Government regulatory agencies.** Some specialized governmental agencies are established to provide
25   for the use of expertise focused on the administration of highly defined areas of social need, e.g.,
26   central banking and currency control, utilities, transportation, and environment. These agencies may
27   need to be relatively autonomous in order for them to carry out the functions they have been
28   commissioned to perform by a democratic political system. They also may be isolated from electoral
29   participation and removed from direct accountability to the people as a whole for their policies and
30   practices. Nonetheless, such agencies must be ultimately accountable to the democratic institutions
31   which created them and which retain the right to abolish them.

32   g.   **Independent judiciary.** For a judicial system to be able to exercise independent judgment and to
33   maintain integrity of legal decision-making, it must have substantial institutional autonomy. Thus a
34   judicial system should be insulated from popular passions and political influence. And the system may
35   also need to be filled with those who hold indeterminate terms not subject to regular electoral
36   accountability. Nonetheless, a judicial system may incorporate democratic features, such as the initial
37   election of judges, the direct or indirect electoral confirmation or review of judicial appointments, and
38   being required to provide public justification for their use of political power in the decisions that they
39   make The youth and inexperience of students as well as the purposes of schooling justify governance
40   that may not meet all of the criteria of democracy.

41 2. **Practices that may be intrinsically non-democratic but may serve democratic ends and thus be**
42   **considered acceptable or necessary in a democracy.** In some cases, there may be a conflict between an
43   individual's freedom and a democratic society's need for the contributions of each of its citizens. This
44   freedom of the individual may even include the right to refrain from participation in the political process.
45   Nevertheless, a democratic society may sometimes justify requiring participation in order to sustain a
46   political system that preserves liberty and protects the rights of fellow citizens.

1 Moreover, the realities of the conduct of political life may sometimes involve practices that may be
2 justifiable on pragmatic groups, but appear the same time to be counter to the spirit of democracy and/or
3 constitutionalism. Nonetheless, such practices cannot extend so far as to defeat the fundamental principles
4 of popular control and constitutional limits.

5   a.   Conflicts between individual freedom and democratic participation

6   • Required party registration and/or financial support

7   • Compulsory voting

8   • Conscriptive military or national service

9   • Required jury service

10   b.   Conflicts between expediency and principles

11   • Political patronage as an encouragement of popular participation

12   • Disciplinary commissions or tribunals that can remove office holders who have been chosen by
13   the people

14   • Meetings and hearings of government bodies closed to the public

15   • Use of emergency powers to respond to an immediate threat to the safety of the people

16 E. **How might democracy produce conditions that erode its foundations?** Even when a political system is
17   founded on sound democratic principles and it is working effectively, democracy may be eroded by conditions
18   and trends in the political system and among the people that result from democratic processes and ways of
19   thinking. For example:

20 1. The need to make decisions by counting votes tends to produce factions, divisiveness, and a winner-take-all
21   attitude.

22 2. The success of democracy in providing good government can produce complacency with the status quo or
23   collective self-satisfaction and individual self-preoccupation, leading to an exaltation of the private over the
24   public.

25 3. Success of a market-based system within a democracy can lead to inequalities in wealth that promote class
26   divisions that can undermine social cohesiveness.

27 4. Democracies enable individuals to accumulate and exercise political power. Corruption arises when
28   persons accumulate power and illegitimately use it to serve their particular interests at the expense of the
29   welfare of the whole society.

30 5. If democracy is so highly valued as a means of arriving at decisions, it may lead a presumption that all
31   matters in public affairs should be decided by the people rather than through institutions. Thus democracy
32   is carried to the extreme of "hyperdemocracy" where public decision is continuous, minute, and
33   destabilizing.

34 6. When one element of democracy is overvalued so that it becomes a substitute for the entire democratic
35   political system, the use of this element may be extended to such extremes that the system as a whole is
36   distorted, e.g., when referendums displace legislative deliberation, when majoritarianism determines the
37   fundamental rights of the people.

7. The success of democratic institutions in effectively addressing public problems may lead the people to be inattentive to political life altogether. This may result in abdication of the responsibilities of citizenship through a willingness to have others do all of their governing for them. This produces, in effect, the loss of democracy itself.

8. Among any people, there may be a tendency to take the fundamental principles for granted, to fail to understand them, or to forget them. When these principles are not used to inform political discourse and decision making, the foundations of the political system may be eroded.

9. An adulation of democracy could lead to the conclusion that society has reached its best and final stage which leads to rigidity, a resistance to criticism, and the transformation of democratic principles into a lifeless incantation or dogma.

F. **What characteristics of democratic political systems inhibit or counteract conditions that may erode its foundations?** Just as democratic principles may provide for a healthy political system, those principles also retain the capacity to protect democracy from destructive conditions and trends. For example:

1. The openness of democratic society to exploring possibilities, along with democracy's embrace of change, mobility, and self-criticism, may inoculate it against long term complacency.

2. Because democracy depends upon the public attentiveness of its people, democratic political systems depend upon transparency in their governance and broad publicity about their society. Both transparency and publicity draw attention to policies, actions, and trends that may endanger democracy. Habitual self-criticism made possible by open processes facilitates exposure and warning when the polity and the people may be in danger of losing their democratic identity.

3. Because democracy is established on a set of first principles, there is a natural tendency to invoke these principles in public reflection and deliberation. This frequent recurrence to first principles provides a means of keeping public affairs true to those principles. In a democracy, for leadership to be visionary, it must call the people back to their founding values.

4. In democratic political institutions, there are ongoing arguments concerning the meaning and application of founding principles. These arguments keep these principles in the people's consciousness and may lead the people to a fuller understanding and a greater attachment to them.

5. In a democratic political system, both institutional and informal means are available to challenge practices and habits that are not consistent with democratic values. Such means include constitutional review, legal action, political activism, a robust party system, public advocacy, and formal as well as informal education.

6. Because a democratic political system may not attempt to control all aspects of human life, sources outside of government are available to challenge perceived abuses and restore the integrity of the institutions. Moreover, when citizens understand that they may be the only source of correction for political problems arising from personal relations or from the society itself, this may foster a sense of responsibility, that only the people themselves are the ultimate protectors of democracy.

7. An understanding among the people that democracy is inherently vulnerable may bring home to them their responsibility to take care of democracy.

G. **Where does responsibility lie for maintaining democracy?** Responsibility for the future of a democracy lies with the people as a whole, who establish it, and for each of its citizens, whom it is established to serve.

1. **Extent of responsibility in a democracy.** The more widely political power is shared in society, the wider is the responsibility for maintaining the existence and wellbeing of the political order. In democracy, responsibility for maintaining the effectiveness of the political system and its constitution rests with the entire body of the people and with each citizen individually.

2. **Living democracy.** Citizens who embody the ethos of democracy live out its ideas in their daily lives (e.g., liberty, equality, community) and support its practices and institutions. As individual agents of democracy and its collective animating spirit, they are the principal means of its endurance.

1   **V. How does democracy work?**

2

3   A.   How does democracy use and channel conflict?

4   B.   What are institutions?

5   C.   Why does democracy require institutions of government in order to function?

6   D.   What alternative arrangements of governmental institutions serve the purposes of democracy?

7   E.   How is the people's business carried out through the institutions of democratic government?

8   F.   How do law and its specialized institutions contribute to the work of democracy? (to be added)

9   G.   What is the relationship between democratic governmental institutions and political parties?

10   H.   How do elections contribute to the working of democracy?

11   I.   How does civil society contribute to the performance of political and governmental institutions in a
12   democracy?

V. How does democracy work?

Democracy as a way of life and as a political system does not arise spontaneously as a natural state of mankind. It occurs only through the establishment of authority and government with the institutions that make it possible for the people to carry out their political will. Because democracy is considered to be more than a political system and its institutions, it encompasses the whole of the public domain of a community. The public domain can be seen as encompassing all aspects of the public life of the citizen. In a democracy, the people own their government, it is their property. The people are fundamental. Therefore, the purpose of institutions of democracy throughout the public domain is to reflect the purposes of the people and to act for the people in conducting their business.

Thus democracy is organized through a broad array of institutions to do the work that sustains human association and that accomplishes collective purposes. Democracy relies upon institutions that extend beyond the conventional political and governmental institutions to include all those institutions within the public domain that provide means for people to organize themselves to further their values and interests. It includes the institutions of civil society as well as those of politics and government.

These institutions range in fundamental character from *civic* to *political* to *governmental*. Because a democracy is based on the association of persons that makes a "people" into a body politic, and because the *civic* realm most broadly embraces the public life of the citizen, the civic institutions in which the people directly interact are the most fundamental to a democracy. These institutions include those of civil society such as voluntary associations, but they extend more broadly to include regularized relationships and durable patterns of interaction among persons and groups.

These *civic* institutions are the most fundamental institutions to a democracy even though political and governmental institutions are typically the principal focus of attention. *Political* institutions, such as political parties, are essential because they provide a means for the body politic to act collectively. *Governmental* institutions, such as legislatures, are also essential because they exercise power directly on behalf of the people to sustain order and achieve the people's agreed upon goals.

When large numbers of human beings live together and attempt to agree upon common goals, conflict is inevitable. In the public domain, the stakes are heightened not only because conflict may pervade society but also because the outcome of conflict may affect an entire society. Democracy recognizes the inevitability of conflict in human society. Democracy takes advantage of the potential of conflict as a resource for vitality, diversity, and progress. Conflict creates alternatives and the possibility of choice. Therefore, conflict can be seen as making liberty possible and as promoting democracy. But violent conflict may destroy both liberty and democracy. Democratic political systems respond to conflict in distinctive ways by providing peaceful means for accommodating and harnessing it through institutions designed to fulfill the purposes and principles of democracy.

A. **What are institutions?** Institutions are arrangements of formal roles and settled practices that have evolved or have been established to serve purposes and perform functions on behalf of society or groups within it. All forms of government require institutions to carry on their work. Institutions deal with multiple and conflicting demands and interests and make decisions regarding their resolution or disposition. They provide means for articulating common goals and serving the ends of a people as well as for channeling conflict into productive consequences for the society and for avoiding or suppressing violent conflict.

1. **Characteristics of institutions.**

   a. **Regularity and predictability.** Institutions tend to exist for long periods of time and to work in accord with established procedures. This durability and order may facilitate reliability and predictability. It may also result in dysfunctional stagnation and rigidity.

b. **Continuity and endurance.** Unlike persons, institutions have an indefinite life span. Although their incumbents may come and go, institutions may last for long periods of time and link generations. Thus, institutions may give society a sense of permanence and durability. They may also result in obsolescence and stultification, or they may lose sight of their original purposes.

c. **Memory and expertise.** Over the course of time, institutions develop their own internal "institutional memory" through traditions, histories, records, and the long service of individuals. This institutional memory provides a means for the transmission of acquired knowledge, expertise, and wisdom. Institutions may also be dominated by the past and resist change.

d. **Centers of power.** Established institutions, by their very nature, may provide a beneficial check on spontaneous aggregations of power that may be arbitrary and dangerous, e.g., courts of law v. mob rule. They may also result in stalemate and gridlock.

e. **Balance.** Institutions also may compete with one another and thus promote a balance of power which facilitates diversity and liberty, countering domination by any single power or combination of interests. They may also aggrandize themselves, overpowering individuals and other organizations perpetuating themselves beyond their utility.

2. **Varieties of institutions.** The following are varieties of institutions that may facilitate the functioning of democracy.

a. **Formal structures or organizations as institutions**—religious and charitable organizations; schools and universities; military services; branches of government, including, for example, legislatures, executive cabinets, and court systems

b. **Regular processes as institutions**—rule by majority decision, as in most legislative votes and general elections; trial by jury

c. **Established relationships as institutions**— marriage, friendship, doctor-patient, enduring political alliances, including international alliances, and coalitions

d. **Recognized patterns of behavior as institutions**—relying on the advice of cabinet ministers, resigning after a vote of no confidence

B. **Why does democracy require political and governmental institutions in order to function?** Political and governmental institutions are essential to the functioning of any democracy because they carry out the day-to-day work of public affairs and respond to opportunities and crises that may arise. Without institutions there is no practical means of carrying out popular self-government with binding consequences. *Political* institutions, such as political parties and in some cases the news media, are organizations that act as intermediary between the people and formal institutions of government power. *Governmental* institutions are bodies empowered by fundamental law, constitutions, or settled custom and convention to make, interpret, and apply policies through rules and laws.

This fulfillment of purposes and principles of a democratically organized "people" can be accomplished by a wide range of designs of particular institutions and arrangements among them (e.g., alternative designs of legislatures and alternative arrangements of the respective powers of legislatures and executives). Whatever designs and arrangements are created, however, the institutions that embody them must promote democratic means and ends. They must enshrine deliberation, debate, and respect for dissent; accommodate a wide variety of viewpoints; and deal with conflict peacefully. Finally, democratic institutions and their designs and arrangements must always be subject to reconsideration and revision by the sovereign people.

The complexity, specialization, and scale of modern democratic societies require that many decisions regarding public affairs be made by governmental institutions on behalf of the people rather than directly by the people

1   themselves. Moreover when decision-making is allocated to formal governmental institutions instead of direct
2   decision-making on policy matters by the people themselves, the people are in a position to judge public policy
3   from a distance that may enhance critical scrutiny and objective assessment. This distance enhances the
4   visibility of public policy and can enable the people to control public policy and demand accountability more
5   effectively.

6   The basic purposes and functions of democratic institutions of politics and government include providing
7   security, promoting social peace by managing or resolving conflict, securing liberty, promoting progress and
8   prosperity, regulating the production, distribution, and use of resources, preserving and enforcing rights and
9   obligations, providing for the education of citizens, thereby promoting the values of democratic government,
10 and representing the polity internationally.

11 Democratic institutions accomplish these purposes and functions by:

12 1. **Setting the public agenda to address public problems.** Civic, political, and governmental institutions are
13   a principal means by which democratic societies deal with public issues. These issues must be identified,
14   defined, and ranked in order of importance before they can be acted upon. This process is known as
15   "setting the public agenda." In a democracy, the full range of institutions— including civic, political, and
16   governmental—play a role in setting the public agenda.

17 2. **Acting on the public agenda.** The setting of the public agenda is nearly always in flux and subject to
18   reconsideration; however, once issues have come to the fore, political and governmental institutions are
19   expected to deal with them. If a course of action is adopted by governmental institutions to deal with a
20   specific item on the public agenda, that course of action becomes a "public policy." Such a policy may
21   include creating, revising, implementing, enforcing, or adjudicating rules and laws. It also may include the
22   creation of governmental or non-governmental agencies or the assignment of responsibilities to non-
23   governmental agencies. All of the stages of identifying issues and opportunities, as well as responding to
24   them, constitute the public policy process.

25 3. **Evaluating alternative policy options.** In a system of popular government, choices made in the process of
26   dealing with public issues must be evaluated through public debate, media discussion, expert opinion,
27   and/or through more formal mechanisms such as popular voting; or oversight by administrative, legislative,
28   and/or judicial institutions, as well as by specially created commissions.

29 C. **How do democratic institutions use, channel, and embody conflict?** Some forms of political systems are
30   threatened by conflict and attempt to suppress it or to eliminate its causes. Human beings have a natural
31   tendency to differ in their opinions or interests and to raise these differences to a level of conflict that may not
32   be accommodated without the intervention of institutions. Political systems that suppress conflict or eliminate
33   its causes deny human nature and repress liberty, which requires the right to differ and to express differences
34   that may have public consequences.

35 Conflict is intrinsic to democratic political systems. They may generate and harness conflict to provide energy
36 and resources to serve their purposes. Nonetheless, if democracy is to survive, it cannot tolerate every kind of
37 discord. While democracy encourages some kinds of conflict as essential or beneficial to its nature and
38 purposes, it must also provide peaceful means by which conflict can be expressed and managed and discourage
39 some conflict that is detrimental to its values.

40 1. **Conflict that enhances democracy.** The conflict of ideas and interests among institutions and
41   organizations, competition among policy options, conflict over the meaning and application of fundamental
42   principles and values are all inherent in the healthy functioning of a democracy.

43 2. **Conflict that impedes the establishment and threatens maintenance of democracy.** Democracy is
44   jeopardized by life-or-death struggles among powerful individuals, such as political and military leaders;

1   widespread schisms among rigidly defined, exclusive or uncompromising factions, such as ethnic,
2   religious, socio-economic, and linguistic groups; and warring components of government.

3   3. **Conflict resolution and conflict management in a democracy.** Conflict management and conflict
4   resolution differ in that conflict management refers to continuing conflict situations that resist solution, for
5   example, ethnic rivalry. Conflict resolution, by contrast, refers to situations in which conflict can be
6   successfully ended, such as a labor dispute.

7   Moreover, if democracies are to be stable, citizens must realize the importance of maintaining a proper
8   balance between conflict and harmony in political life. Thus in many cases, self-restraint of some citizens
9   and mediating efforts of others can prevent the escalation of conflict to the point where it threatens public
10   peace. But in other cases, conflict requires the intervention of government. In such cases, the means used
11   by government to deal with conflict must be consistent with democratic values and principles. Means of
12   conflict resolution and conflict management consistent with democratic values and principles include free
13   and fair elections, due process, arbitration, conciliation, proper use of police, and ground rules for
14   deliberation.

15   D. **What alternative designs and arrangements of governmental institutions accommodate conflict and serve**
16   **the purposes of democracy.** The internal design of institutions and the arrangement of their relationships with
17   each other constitute a response to the need to accommodate and harness conflict. For instance, rules for debate
18   within a legislative body may accentuate differences with an eventual view to reaching an agreement. Or
19   competitive interaction between legislative bodies may be constructed in order to enhance the deliberative
20   process. Also, the internal design and external arrangements among institutions may serve or disserve
21   democratic purposes.

22   The assessment of the design and arrangement of governmental institutions and the purposes they serve requires
23   more than an evaluation of their efficiency or their costs. Such an assessment requires the use of standards
24   arising from the need for governmental institutions to be workable and effective and to reflect democratic
25   values and principles.

26   1. **Standards for determining whether particular designs and arrangements serve democratic values**
27   **and principles.** The application of standards arising from democracy does not produce a single best choice
28   of designs and arrangements of governmental institutions. Nonetheless, two sets of standards are useful in
29   evaluating these arrangements. These two sets reinforce each other and both are essential for evaluating
30   democratic institutions.

31   a. **Standards related to the workability and effectiveness of institutions**

32   • adequate information is available for making decisions and is used thoughtfully in doing so

33   • procedures facilitate the gathering and due consideration of all facts, opinions, and judgments
34   required to make informed decisions

35   • responsibilities are clearly assigned to enable accountability

36   • functions are differentiated according to capacity and expertise

37   • functions among institutions are orchestrated to produce appropriate outcomes

38   • appropriate outcomes are produced in a timely manner

39   • decisiveness is facilitated in public policy making

1   b. **Standards related to the realization of principles and values.**

2   • Operation of institutions is open and transparent

3   • Widespread access to governmental institutions is provided to citizens

4   • Operation of institutions enhances the knowledge and critical capacities of citizens

5   • Accountability to the people is mandated and facilitated

6   • Competing viewpoints are encouraged and accommodated

7   • Deliberation is integral to decision making

8   • Procedures require fair hearing and consideration of diverse viewpoints

9   • Use of power is limited and checked by competition among institutions

10   • Procedures are fair, known, enforced, stable, and reliable

11 2. **Alternative institutional designs and arrangements used to serve the values and principles of**
12   **democracy and its workability.** The responsibility for making, interpreting, and applying public policy
13   must be assigned to institutions in any political system. These functions are typically called legislative,
14   judicial, and executive. Each of these functions may be delegated to an institution or branch of government
15   specifically designed to carry out its portion of public policy making. The functions also may be combined
16   and shared between or among institutions in various arrangements.

17   For democracy to be possible, political power cannot remain undifferentiated or concentrated in the hands
18   of one governmental institution or one person, as in an elective dictatorship. Governmental power must be
19   divided to preserve the citizen's liberty by avoiding concentration of power and to accommodate conflict
20   by providing multiple arenas for the expression of differences. Governmental power may be divided
21   among various levels of government and/or among institutions or branches differentiated by function.

22   a. **Alternative ways of allocating government power as a whole.** The degree to which governmental
23   power is centralized or decentralized will serve certain criteria better than others. For example, a highly
24   centralized system may increase the possibility of holding government accountable, while
25   decentralized systems may enhance the access of citizens. The allocation of specific powers to
26   different levels of government may also serve or disserve standards. For example, even though policy
27   may be established at a central level, its appropriate application may be better accomplished at a local
28   level.

29   • **Unitary systems.** In unitary systems, all governmental functions—making, interpreting, and
30   applying public policy—remain in the hands of a central government. Even when it delegates or
31   "devolves" a portion of its power to local governments, it retains the power to withdraw such
32   delegated power and to exercise it directly. While unitary systems may accentuate decisiveness
33   and efficiency in responding to urgent concerns, their concentration of power may result in
34   diminishing deliberation that would arise from competing levels of institutions.

35   • **Federal systems.** In federal systems, power is divided and shared between a central government
36   having nationwide responsibilities and constituent governments having more localized
37   responsibilities. Such systems provide for limits and checks on the use of power because of its
38   dispersion across levels of government. But they may cloud the identification of clearly assigned
39   responsibilities.

- **Confederal systems.** Confederation is a form of federalism in which power resides in the constituent governments at lower levels that delegate a portion of their power to a central government. Constituent governments may withdraw delegations of power and in some cases retain the option to secede. Such systems may encourage and accommodate competing viewpoints. At the same time, they may also work against stability and predictability.

b. **Alternative ways of organizing the principal functions of government.** Separating the functions of government and allocating them to specific institutions reflects strategies for realizing workability and effectiveness, as well as serving priorities among principles and values. The goals of workability and effectiveness of governance may be advanced by facilitating the interaction and competition of governmental bodies with functionally distinct power, or when separate bodies in some degree share the same power. But such separation may also impede decisiveness. The division of power among different bodies enables citizens to select members of more than one body, thus increasing the opportunities for the people to be represented. At the same time, the division and dispersal of power may confuse the question of who is responsible for governmental decisions.

- **Parliamentary systems.** In parliamentary systems, the power of government is held by a body often called a "parliament" which may exercise legislative, executive, and certain judicial functions. Parliamentary systems emphasize immediate and direct representativeness, robust debate as preliminary to policy making, and responsiveness to the popular will.

  Because the leadership of the executive is determined by the legislative, the legislature holds the executive immediately accountable. A parliamentary "vote of no confidence" which results in the "fall of the government," prompts the intervention of the people through elections to select a new parliament that then establishes a new "government." When executives govern with large majorities in a parliamentary system, checks on power are attenuated and government may be able to govern without effective limits, thereby undermining the principles of constitutionalism. Parliaments with minimal or unreliable majorities are characterized by a tenuous hold on power by the "government." This tenuousness may increase official attentiveness to shifts in popular sentiment, and/or it may decrease stability.

  In parliamentary systems there is a separate "head of state" and "head of government." Heads of state are either monarchs or "presidents" who have either permanent or fixed terms. They are not subject to the fall of "government." Such monarchs or presidents have no actual executive power. Their function is to personify the unity of the state and/or symbolize the people as a whole. They may, moreover, have some procedural responsibilities such as formally authorizing the leaders of parties to form a new government. Heads of government are typically prime ministers who exercise executive power.

  To the extent that there is a "separation of powers," the division is within the parliamentary body itself. Such separation may also occur in the form of an independent judiciary established by custom, by parliament, or by constitution. Separation of power within a parliament occurs when, for example, there is a distinction between cabinet ministers ("frontbenchers") and the other members of parliament ("backbenchers"). Backbenchers may serve as a check on the cabinet by threatening to withhold their support on a policy matter when that withdrawal of support threatens to topple the "government." And, in the case of an independent judiciary, there may be checks on parliamentary power when a court has the power to determine that the legislature has acted beyond the limits of its authority (i.e., *ultra vires*).

  Parliaments are usually divided into upper and lower houses. This division may serve the principle of the separation of powers by balancing competitive interests. It may also allow for the representation of different configurations of the people—for instance, the people aggregated proportionally by population, by state or province, and/or by profession or ethnic group.

80

1 Sometimes parliaments have only one house in order to enhance the direct responsibility of the
2 government to the electorate.

3 In parliamentary systems, cohesive political parties, which require the consistent loyalty of
4 members, are essential to the internal organization of the legislature. In parliamentary systems,
5 the chief executive or head of government is usually chosen by and from the majority party in the
6 lower house.

7 Where two or more parties form a coalition to attain a parliamentary majority in order to govern,
8 the necessity for agreement among them constitutes a check on power within government.

9 • **Coordinate-powers systems.** In coordinate-powers systems, powers are separated and distributed
10 among branches that embody legislative, executive, and judicial functions of government.
11 Coordinate-powers systems may incorporate the principle of "separation of powers," a device for
12 preventing the concentration of power in one or a few hands by allocating the distinct functions of
13 government to separate bodies.

14 In coordinate-powers systems, each separate branch has primary responsibility for certain
15 functions, but each branch also shares these powers and functions with the others, e.g., executive,
16 legislature, and judicial branches. In addition, the acts of each branch must be coordinated in order
17 for them to culminate in an outcome. For example, the enactment of a statue by a legislature does
18 not become law without the involvement of a chief executive. Power in these systems is "shared,"
19 for example, in that executive decisions such as judicial appointments and foreign treaties can be
20 nullified by the legislature.

21 In these systems, each branch of government may be answerable to the public through periodic
22 elections. They may also be accountable through a process of substantive review or
23 institutionalized checking by another branch which is itself answerable to the will of the people
24 expressed through elections or articulated through the constitution. Coordinate-powers systems
25 emphasize competition among the powers of the separate branches that checks the exercise of
26 authority. These systems also increase the number of avenues of access by the public to decision-
27 making bodies of government.

28 Because of the emphasis on balancing the institutions of government against each other in
29 coordinate-powers systems, there is a possibility of institutional stalemate that might result in
30 varying degrees of governmental or legislative paralysis. And because of the large number of
31 access points for influencing policy-making, coordinate-powers systems may accentuate the power
32 of interest groups.

33 Political parties in such systems serve primarily to translate the will of the people into policy
34 through decisions about the membership of representative governmental bodies. In such systems,
35 political parties are not essential to the formation of "the government" or an "administration."
36 But they are often the basis for the organization and functioning of the legislature.

37 • **Presidential systems.** Both parliamentary and coordinate powers systems may have a political
38 office entitled "president." The existence of an office called "president" is not, in itself, sufficient
39 for such a system to be a "presidential system."

40 Presidential systems are hybrid arrangements that combine selected features of parliamentary and
41 coordinate-powers systems, i.e., the direct accountability of legislative representation in
42 parliamentary systems along with the independent decisiveness of executive power of coordinate-
43 powers systems. In order to alleviate the possibility in coordinate-powers systems for stalemate,
44 the balance of power may be shifted to the executive to provide an enhanced capacity for decisive

1   action. In some cases, a president may enact policy by decree. The stability of the executives is
2   also secured by the provision of fixed terms of office for the presidency.

3   Presidents have the power to appoint prime ministers or premiers who subsequently form the
4   "government." Presidents can typically dismiss parliament and call new elections. Parliament may
5   also dissolve or "prorogue" the "government" by a vote of no confidence.

6   Presidents have other important powers, such as issuing important orders that may have the status
7   of law. They also appoint high civil servants and judges, negotiate treaties, and may call
8   referendums. They head the armed forces, and they may exercise exceptional powers during a
9   state of emergency.

10   3. **Alternative designs of legislative, executive, and judicial functions used to perform the work of**
11   **democracy.** Governmental institutions must not only serve the values of rule by the people; they must also
12   perform specific functions essential to government in order to do the day-to-day work of democracy. These
13   functions are allocated to specialized bodies or institutions within the overall arrangement of government.
14   These specialized bodies will display varying designs that have evolved or been created for the purpose of
15   carrying out their functions in accord with the values of democracy.

16   In a democracy, the people retain the power to judge the acts of government in accordance with
17   constitutional principles articulated by them or on their behalf. For the exercise of this all-important
18   democratic function, institutions are required just as they are for any other performance of political
19   authority. All of these institutions, in a democracy, must represent and act on behalf of the people.
20   Accountability of government to the people is not accomplished solely by elections, representation of the
21   people is achieved through legislative and executive bodies. Representation and accountability also may be
22   reflected in acts by judicial bodies.

23   a. **Legislative functions.** The legislative function represents the fundamental power of the people to
24   authorize laws and policies, either directly or through their delegates, for their safety and happiness.
25   This function therefore has two prominent parts: the power and obligation to make law, and the power
26   and obligation to represent the people.

27   Legislative bodies in democracies are to carry out these powers by reflecting the popular will and
28   common good, aggregating interests, making law, recognizing and responding to society's problems
29   and opportunities, providing alternative sources of political leadership, overseeing the functions of
30   other governmental bodies, providing a public forum for deliberation and investigation, and bringing
31   matters of import to public attention. In a democracy, the legislature is considered to hold the "power
32   of the purse" as the primary agency for acquiring and allocating funds.

33   The legislative function is organized in a specific body or bodies, e.g., Senate, Parliament, Legislature,
34   Assembly, Congress, House of Delegates, Duma, Diet.

35   Alternative designs that may serve the ends of governmental workability and democratic values
36   include:

37   • **Unicameral legislatures.** All of the law-making power granted to the legislative branch is
38   exercised by a single ("unicameral") body. In democracies, unicameral legislatures are directly
39   elected and are known by various names, such as House of the Nation, Parliament, or National
40   Assembly.

41   Single-house legislatures may be considered as having certain advantages: they may be more
42   representative because, in a simple and speedier system, the voice of the people may be more
43   clearly heard and more effectively registered; they may be more efficient in enacting law since
44   there is no need for the concurrence of a second chamber; they may provide greater accountability,

1   since responsibility clearly rests in one place; they may be easier for citizens to monitor since there
2   is only one law-making forum to keep track of; and they may be less expensive to maintain than
3   two-chamber systems.

4   • **Bicameral legislatures.** These are legislatures composed of two chambers, or houses. The
5   respective powers of the two bodies may vary. Although two houses may share the powers of the
6   legislative branch, they do not necessarily have identical powers. Relations between these two
7   bodies vary among political systems. For example, in some systems certain categories of bills
8   must originate in a designated house. In addition, the houses may differ from each other in their
9   roles with regard to other branches of government. For example, in some systems a designated
10   house may have the power to approve certain executive or judicial appointments.

11   The way in which the people are represented in the two bodies may also vary. For example, one
12   house may be based on geographic districts and the other on proportional representation of the
13   population.

14   Two-house legislatures may be considered as having certain advantages: they may be more
15   capable of formally representing diverse constituencies; they may check and balance each other,
16   reducing the risk that public welfare will be disserved by hasty or ill-considered measures; they
17   may facilitate a deliberative approach to legislation; they may multiply opportunities for the
18   people to be represented; and they may be more capable of providing more focused oversight or
19   control of the executive or judicial branches.

20   Because there may be a tendency of the legislative function to dominate the other functions, the
21   legislature in coordinate-powers systems is typically divided into two houses. This reflects the
22   principle of separation of powers. This division of the law-making branch may therefore serve to
23   diminish the power of the legislature in relation to the power of the other branches of government.

24   Two-house legislatures in coordinate-powers systems are commonly composed of a "lower" house
25   such as an Assembly, Chamber of Deputies, or House of Representatives; and an "upper" house
26   usually called a Senate, which is considered an upper house in that it is composed of fewer
27   members elected for longer periods than those in the lower house.

28   In parliamentary systems, the "lower" or larger chamber may be known as a House of Commons,
29   House of Representatives, or National
30   Council; and the "upper" or smaller chamber may be known as a House of Councilors, House of
31   Lords, Senate, or Federal Council.

32   Because one of the central functions of legislatures is to represent the people and their interests,
33   the basis of representation can be designed to enhance this function in response to the particular
34   characteristics of a society. The number of seats in lower chambers may therefore be based upon
35   population, with each member representing approximately the same number of constituents. The
36   membership in upper chambers may be organized to reflect regional or state divisions, religions,
37   ethnic groups, or professional classes. Upper chambers may be selected by other means than direct
38   elections, e.g., personal inheritance, appointment, and "indirect elections," in which voters elect
39   bodies such as state or provincial legislatures that in turn elect members of an upper chamber.

40   b. **Executive functions.** The executive function represents the fundamental power of the people to have
41   their will, as expressed in law, carried into action. The duty of the executive is to preserve the integrity
42   and authority of the law. Thus the executive's power and obligations are to carry out and enforce the
43   law. In this respect, the executive bears the burden of fulfilling the commitments of the law and wields
44   the "sword" of enforcement.

1 Traditionally, the executive power has been understood as a "dependent" power where the executive
2 serves in a "ministerial" function to carry out the law and policy determined by the legislature. But in
3 modern times and especially in coordinate-powers systems, some of the powers of the executive may
4 be exercised autonomously (e.g., "executive orders") and other executive powers must be exercised in
5 conjunction with other branches or divisions of government (e.g., money cannot be collected or spent
6 until it is appropriated by the legislative branch).

7 Acting independently, under a constitution that establishes the scope and limits of executive power, an
8 executive may be authorized to issue executive orders with an effect equivalent to law, to make
9 appointments within and outside of the executive branch, and to conduct international relations. In
10 contrast, some powers of the executive may be dependent upon the legislature, as when the executive
11 is authorized to make substantive rules within a discretionary range established by law. In addition,
12 some powers of the executive may be dependent on the judiciary as when a court issues a mandate that
13 can only be implemented by executive interpretation and action.

14 The executive power, whether vested in a single person or a small group, may symbolize the unity of
15 the people and serve to focus the attention and energy of the people on matters of national concern,
16 exhorting them to achieve larger purposes. In this regard the executive power has been understood at
17 times to be an exceptional power (called the prerogative) to take care of the safety of the people in
18 times of crisis or emergency and to bear the responsibility for directing the defense of the country
19 against external threats. The executive may exercise cultural leadership by honoring individuals and
20 groups in order to offer models that exemplify compelling values and achievements thus attempting to
21 shape the aspirations and self-image of the people. More concretely the executive may serve as "head
22 of state," representing the country in international affairs.

23 The executive power may extend to proposing legislation and other courses of action. Moreover, in
24 some cases, executives act independently to establish and carry out policy, using the justification of
25 national necessity.

26 In the course of fulfilling their role, executives frequently articulate a view of the common good or the
27 community's wellbeing to justify their actions. In doing so, they may seek to unify diverse and
28 contending interests in other institutions or in the political system at large and attempt to set the public
29 agenda.

30 Because executives often seek to inform their decisions and to justify them upon the basis of
31 specialized expertise and privileged access to information, they often assemble persons with special
32 knowledge on matters of public concern. This process enables the executive in a democracy to link
33 public policy decisions with the necessary technological and scientific information. This process and
34 its results may be made available to the public to legitimize the policy and educate the public.

35 Executive power may be organized in a specific office or body (e.g., Prime Minister, President,
36 Premier, Governor, Mayor, Chairman) or it may be distributed among several bodies (e.g., Presidium,
37 Council of State, Cabinet, Privy Council).

38   c. **Judicial functions.** The judicial function represents the fundamental power of the people to have
39 disputes over the interpretation and application of the laws and policies authorized on their behalf
40 managed by fair and impartial processes. This function takes place in a forum in which facts are
41 presented and tested, and arguments are formally articulated and evaluated. The judicial forum
42 provides for the removal of conflict from the place of its occurrence in society to an environment
43 where it can be managed or resolved peacefully in accord with established standards and principles of
44 justice. The judicial system provides a place outside normal political processes for individuals and
45 minority groups to appeal decisions taken in a majority-based governmental system that they believe
46 threaten their rights.

1. In order to maintain their impartiality and objectivity, the institutions within the judicial forum must be
2. independent and insulated from the control of other branches of government and from illegitimate
3. influence by interested groups. The arrangements of these institutions must include different levels and
4. phases to provide for the review and evaluation of judicial actions in order to supply a check against
5. error and the abuse of power.

6. Furthermore, a principal responsibility of the judicial function is to represent the people's fundamental
7. power of judgment by which they evaluate and challenge specific acts of governmental authority by
8. challenging the validity of a law and/or the means of its enforcement. Through this process, the people
9. have an institutional means to call into question the actions of their government. The use of judicial
10. power also requires deliberation and reflection upon whether the acts of government are in accord with
11. the foundational values and principles of the democratic political system.

12. Not only may people participate in the promotion of public policy objectives of their own through the
13. legislative and executive branches of government, they may also promote specific causes through the
14. initiation of legal controversies in judicial forums and through the advocacy of policies that might be
15. established by judicial action.

16. In a democracy, the people have a right to participate in the system when the power of government is
17. applied against members of the community. The institution of the jury is the most common form of this
18. popular participation. In this role of being an intermediary between the governmental power and the
19. individual, the jury represents the people, serving as the "conscience of the community," checking
20. governmental power, and opposing its abuse.

21. Judicial power must be organized in a system of jurisdiction that includes various levels of courts and
22. other bodies which often have specialized functions, e.g., civil, criminal, administrative, maritime,
23. military, appellate, arbitration, mediation, and constitutional. At the highest level of these systems,
24. courts may be called a Constitutional Court, Supreme Court, Privy Council, Court of Cessation, High
25. Court.

26. In some democratic political systems the legislative and executive branches may exercise certain
27. judicial functions. For example: executive branch functions may include the creation and adjudication
28. of administrative law. Judicial functions of legislative branches may include the power to discipline its
29. members and impeach and remove members of the executive and judicial branches. In some cases, the
30. upper house of a legislature may serve as a court of appeals.

31. E. **How is the people's business carried out through the institutions of democratic government?** Deliberation
32. plays the central role in democratic decision-making. Democratic deliberation requires freedom of expression,
33. an open exchange of ideas, and a diversity of positions, as well as the opportunity for associations to form freely
34. for collective action. Even more fundamentally, democratic deliberation is the process of coming to personal or
35. public judgment on issues in the public domain. Deliberation takes place both in the realm of individual thought
36. and in the realm of public debate. At both levels, decisions are made about appropriate courses of action. At
37. each level, the values and principles of democracy should condition the process of deliberation and set
38. standards of judgment concerning that deliberation and its outcomes. Democracy requires that deliberation be
39. more than exchange of opinion and aggregation of views into decisions. Decision-making by individuals and by
40. institutions must do more than employ democratic procedures and practices; it must be grounded in and
41. conditioned by democratic values and principles. If not, the formal mechanisms of democratic deliberation may
42. undermine democracy itself.

43. 1. **Personal deliberation.** A frame of mind is a set of basic assumptions and inclinations that presuppose
44. certain values, principles, standards, and ideas that shape the perceptions and judgments of the individual. It
45. also includes a set of expectations about how the processes of public deliberation and decision making are
46. supposed to operate as well as an understanding of how they do operate. Because democracy requires

85

deliberation at the personal and the public levels, a democratic frame of mind for the individual citizen is as important as a democratic constitution that provides a framework of principles for public affairs. Such a frame of mind serves the individual in much the same way that a constitution sets the foundation for public deliberation. In a successful democracy, there will be a sufficient congruence between a personal frame of mind for individual citizens and the public framework of principles for political action. But there will also be incongruence, where an individual's frame of mind may have the capacity to reform public principles or the public may have the capacity to inform the individual. Such incongruence is to be expected in a democratic system.

    a. **Influence of a democratic frame of mind on agenda-setting.** The frame of mind typical of democracy provides a distinctive means of identifying and understanding problems in the political world. A commitment to the common good as more important than the benefit of any particular segment of society, as well as a commitment to individual rights as constraints on power, tends to focus attention upon threats to these commitments and the possibility of enhancing these values.

    b. **Influence of a democratic frame of mind on the choice of ends and means.** A democratic frame of mind constrains and/or prescribes the range of choices of political ends and the means for achieving them. All deliberation requires that a range of ends and means be considered in terms of their desirability and efficiency. But the values and principles of democracy limit the range of acceptable ends and means, even if the ends might be desirable and the means efficient.

    Sometimes, however, there is no distinction between ends and means. Thus, for instance, individual autonomy and broad public participation are both ends and means in a democracy. In addition, a democratic end will not necessarily legitimize an undemocratic means, and democratic means do not legitimize undemocratic ends.

    Moreover, an individual's commitments to standards arising from sources other than the values and principles of democracy – e.g., personal, philosophical, or religious – may be paramount in his or her evaluation and choice of public policy. In these cases, an individual might conclude that the values and principles of democracy alone are insufficient to judge the worthiness of the ends and means of particular public policies. Thus the values and principles of democracy do not provide an absolute standard for deliberating about public affairs.

2. **Public deliberation.** Deliberation takes place in various formal and informal public settings as well as in governmental institutions. Deliberation requires free access to information—the currency of democracy—that enables the free and robust expression of ideas and opinions. Ideally, the deliberative process is transparent or open to public view and results in a wide range of choices being placed before the public for consideration and action. The forms of deliberation appropriate in a democracy are many and varied. They can be divided into "open" and "closed" forms.

    a. **"Open" deliberation.** Democratic deliberation is characterized by its "publicness"—it takes place in the open, before public view. Examples of public forms of deliberation include discussion and debate in:

- conversations of citizens about how to judge alternative public policies and how to vote in elections

- discussion of public issues conducted by a wide variety of civic organizations and educational institutions

- print and electronic media

- official bodies such as legislatures, courts, agencies, tribunals, regulatory agencies, political conventions, town meetings

86

b. **"Closed" deliberation.** Because in a democracy the people have a "right to know," a high priority is placed on conducting the public's business in the public's view. However, there are times when deliberation on public matters legitimately takes place out of public view. These situations include those in which democratic values themselves, such as privacy and due process, may be jeopardized; or national security may be at risk. They may also include situations in which the free and candid discussion of some choices essential to making wise decisions may be curtailed if it is left open to public view.

Regardless of the legitimacy of such non-public deliberations, means must be provided to ensure public accountability. Such means may include exposure by the media, "whistle blowers," elections, possibility of impeachment, public hearings, "watchdog" groups, the use of judicial procedures, and formal accountability to a representative body. Despite such safeguards there may be cases of inadequate public accountability and oversight. Examples of nonpublic forms of deliberation include discussion and debate on certain matters by:

- confidential conversations among citizens developing strategies for addressing public policy questions in public

- legislative bodies or their committees

- chief executives and their principal advisors

- military planning councils

- juries and appeals courts

- central banks

- administrative agencies

3. **Role of elites in carrying out the business of democracy.** In any large association of people, there may emerge a smaller set or sets of persons, often called "elites," that focus more intently upon the collective aims of the larger number. In this role, to the extent that they exhibit diligence in the performance and effectiveness in the guidance of public affairs, they accrue greater power over the making of decisions. In a democracy, however, such a set or sets of the "elite" inspire suspicion among members of a self-governing people when they are seen as posing as an "elect." In order to function, however, democracy requires groups of persons with political skills, knowledge, dedication, and expertise that can be brought to bear on the solving of public problems.

The existence of elites does not in itself constitute "elitism." Elitism refers to a situation in which a small group of people (whether or not it holds official positions) dominates a political system, perpetuates its own membership, and operates according to its own rules.

In order to attain legitimacy, elites must demonstrate their worthiness to represent the interests and welfare of the people as a whole. They must therefore demonstrate their accountability to the rest of the people, their workings must be transparent to the public, and their ranks must be fluid enough to facilitate access in and out of their ranks on the basis of merit or representativeness. The dynamism of modern democratic society generates numerous and diverse elites, and democracy can benefit from their competition for power and authority when it prevents a concentration of political and economic power and/or produces new ideas, better practices, and increased public awareness of alternatives. The functions of elites that contribute to the working of democracy include:

a.   providing a pool of competence for recruitment to public office.

b.   serving as public figures that inform and help mold public opinion.

c.   leading in institutions outside of government which have an impact on public affairs, e.g., religious, social, educational, and economic institutions

d.   formulating innovative concepts and approaches that enlarge awareness of possibilities for public choice

e.   indirectly influencing public affairs by training and informing more public actors

f.   providing a source of stability in times of change and uncertainty

g.   providing centers for the development of new ideas and plans which can take a long term perspective when the institutions of government are focused on the immediate

4.   **Opportunities for deliberation, choice, and participation for the citizenry at large.** It is of the essence of democratic political arrangements that they provide all citizens multiple and meaningful opportunities for choice and participation in public affairs. These opportunities encompass a wide range of activities at local, regional, and national levels including:

a.   voting in free and fair elections

b.   inaugurating or joining independent organizations that influence legislatures and executives

c.   contacting public officials directly and indirectly

d.   engaging in a variety of civic writing and publications including contacting media

e.   seeking and holding public office

f.   participating in political parties and working in election campaigns

g.   monitoring and influencing legislative deliberations

h.   attending and speaking in public meetings

i.   participating in marches, demonstrations, petitions

j.   contributing money to political parties or causes

k.   mobilizing groups and communities for political action

5.   **Standards for judging public policy in a democracy.** Standards to be used in judging public policy should include those related to their compatibility with fundamental values of democracy itself and those related to the substantive wisdom and desirability of the policy. Some of these standards are applicable to any democracy; some are applicable to liberal democracy.

a.   **Standards related to fundamental values.** Public policies should be judged in terms of whether they:

   • **protect individual rights**—such as those to freedom of belief and expression, equality of opportunity, privacy, property, procedural justice, and distributive justice

   • **promote the common good**—such as providing public order, national prosperity, protection of the environment, and distributive justice

   • **promote other important values, principles, and interests** - such as personal independence, limited government

b.   **Standards related to the substantive wisdom and desirability of public policy.** Alternative means of judging the advisability of public policy include

88

- **cost-benefit analysis**—in which costs of alternative polices are weighed against their likely benefits

- **comparison of changes over time**—in which indices are used to measure statistically relevant changes on such matters as inflation, employment, economic growth, health and longevity, education, corruption, and social pathologies such as crime and drug use

- **short-term versus long-term benefits**—in which decisions are made whether to forego short-term benefits for long-term benefits

6. **Recourse when citizens are dissatisfied with outcomes.** Democracies provide a number of alternatives for recourse for citizens who are not satisfied with specific policy outcomes or the general direction that government itself is taking. These include the opportunity to

a. vote to remove office holders

b. propose policies initiated and/or ratified by citizens

c. vote for new policies

d. petition government

e. seek assistance from ombudsmen or other intermediaries, including legislators who may often provide access for constituents who favor or oppose certain policies

f. sue in the courts to vindicate legal rights, to obtain injunctions, or to challenge the legitimacy of policy

g. form new political parties, become active in interest groups or other political organizations

h. change the constitution through the amendment process

i. appeal to international organizations for aid or redress of grievances

j. leave the country temporarily or permanently

F. **How do specialized institutions of law contribute to the work of democracy?** Law articulates or stipulates patterns of human purposes, relationships, and procedures in prescriptive form. Law may be seen as either enabling, or regulating, or both. By restricting and permitting, the processes of law are in fact an institution through which a community organizes and mobilizes itself so that it can act.

Because democracy encompasses the full public domain of a community, institutions of law are more extensive than the formal institutions of government such as the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. In a practical sense, specific legal institutions organize and operate activity in segments or zones of the community at large: the diffuse zone of civil society and the more defined segment of governmental institutions. In each zone, there are institutions that have evolved or have been designed to specialize in the creation, implementation, interpretation, and application of rules and procedures. These institutions not only perform specific work of democracy, they also embody the values and principles of democratic modes of interaction by engaging citizens in governing themselves.

1. **Legal institutions in civil society.** Legal institutions exist not only in government, but also in civil society. Law is used to provide a framework for the establishment and operation of formal institutions in civil society and to facilitate activity and choice in civil society. These formal or "legal" institutions may include corporations, partnerships, and contractual relationships. These institutions of civil society may be considered "legal" institutions because they make, enforce, and interpret "law" in the form of internally

89

1   binding rules. Thus legal institutions in civil society establish a contract-based law that provides order to
2   society as surely as the statue-based law of government.

3   When persons themselves create their own arrangements among themselves, through contract-based law,
4   they actualize their liberty. When they have the stable expectation that these commitments will be fulfilled
5   or enforced, they have added security to their liberty. Law understood in this way contributes to the
6   processes of self-rule because citizens give their own law to themselves. For example, individuals may
7   design and enter into contractual obligations with each other that both create new relationships and make
8   the accomplishment of mutual goals possible. In addition, groups (including business corporations and
9   non-governmental organizations) may construct their own "constitutional" arrangements through the
10   creation of "by-laws" (internally generated rules) which define the purposes, membership, responsibilities,
11   and powers of a formal organization, and which regulate the structure and process of their work.

12   **2.**   **Legal institutions in politics and government.** Law and its processes provide for the formal articulation
13   and application of a community's authoritative rules and enacted policies. In politics and government, law
14   enables citizens to initiate, construct, criticize, and approve a political community's program of action in
15   order to further its well-being and collective purposes.This action takes place at the level of the total polity
16   such as the city, province, region, country or other comprehensive jurisdiction. In this way, law enables
17   citizens to engage in making and controlling the rules that serve their interests, regulate their conduct, and
18   realize their values. For example, citizens may participate in the formulation of legislation; in legal
19   processes such as adjudication, arbitration, mediation, and advocacy; or in the legal profession itself.

20 G.   **What is the relationship between democratic governmental institutions and political parties**? The
21   responsibility of government itself is the well-being of the society as a whole. There are inevitably different
22   opinions regarding how to define social well-being and how to achieve it. These differences give rise to the
23   development of political parties.

24   1.   **Functions of political parties.** Interest groups tend to focus upon particular items on the public agenda.
25   Political parties focus upon the whole range of public policy and present a systematic plan for the general
26   direction of society. Political parties in two party systems typically develop their plans to appeal to large
27   sections of the public. In multiparty systems parties may make narrow appeals designed to gain the support
28   of a small but influential part of the population.

29   Political parties help to organize the operations of the government or branches within it. Especially in
30   multi-party parliamentary systems, coalitions of parties assemble sufficient authority to control
31   governmental institutions with legitimacy derived from their representation of disparate elements of
32   society. Not only do parties organize ruling coalitions, they also organize opposition to the party or parties
33   in power. Opposition parties may also prepare an alternative government to replace the one in power if it
34   falls.

35   In systems with only two dominant parties, each party must appeal to a diverse constituency. Proponents of
36   conflicting views are accordingly required to compromise with each other in order to obtain power, tending
37   to diminish extremism.

38   In some countries, political parties serve to bring together and represent numerous interests. In others, they
39   may serve to promote particular ideologies and programs. In either case, political parties provide a means
40   of linking individuals and groups and their government. They also provide a means for the continuous
41   representation of their constituents in the ongoing operations of government. Political parties serve to
42   formally identify and recruit governmental leaders.

43   Political parties are also a means for representing the pluralism in a country. They are a major device for
44   reflecting a plurality of interests, values, and opinions that exist in a society. Political party systems differ
45   in the way in which they provide for the emergence and accommodation of these interests, values, and
46   opinions. For example, in two-party systems the parties aim to consolidate diverse groups in order to

1 accumulate power. In multi-party systems the parties tend to accentuate differences and sometimes even to
2 multiply them by offering representation to more particularistic groups and providing them a more direct
3 opportunity to influence public policy.

4 There is an inevitable tension between two goals essential for democratic governance: the minimum of
5 political unity necessary for government; and the representation of pluralism necessary for the many
6 interests of a society to be adequately accommodated in public policy. Whereas party systems that
7 accentuate differences may threaten governmental stability, party systems that submerge differences may
8 fail to represent pluralism sufficiently.

9

10   2.   **Political parties and government**. If democratic governance is to survive, parties cannot become so
11 intimately intertwined with government institutions that they seem to merge with the state. In a democracy,
12 governing parties cannot be thought of as "owning" the state or being its "leading force." Without a
13 distinction between political parties and the state, parties cannot be adequately regulated to enable other
14 parties to compete and possibly displace them.

15 In a democracy dedicated to the welfare of the whole people, there will inevitably be disputes over what
16 constitutes the common good. Democracy requires permanent competition and discussion among partisan
17 perspectives and rests on the assumption that no one perspective on the common good can claim a
18 monopoly on truth.

19 H. **How do elections contribute to the working of democracy?** Open, free, fair, and regular elections are
20 indispensable to democracy because the essence of this form of political system is that the people decide.
21 Elections in a democracy serve to articulate the popular will. Elections provide the citizens' ultimate sanction of
22 the use, and against the abuse, of governmental power. Elections—which are themselves an institution—
23 provide a means by which the people can shape the character and influence the operations of the political and
24 governmental institutions that perform the work of democracy.

25 Elections constitute a two-way bridge between the people and their institutions. Not only do the people link
26 with government through elections, but members of government link with the people through the processes of
27 seeking approval and continuance in office. Elections are a crucial means by which democratic institutions
28 represent the will of the people for government action. Elections provide a means by which the people can
29 express their judgment of the work of government. Frequent elections with predictable regularity create an
30 environment which forces elected officials to reflect on the congruence of their actions with the will of the
31 people, and with an understanding that their continued service is subject to popular approval.

32 Elections not only result in the selection of persons to be entrusted with governmental powers. They also
33 provide a means to focus citizens' attention on the public agenda and the goals and purposes of their
34 community. Elections that decide issues focus the people's power directly on the making of policy.

35 Elections, as compared with other forms of participation, provide the simplest means for large numbers of
36 citizens to express their preferences and provide the most comprehensive means of surveying the broadest range
37 of popular opinion. Voting is the quintessential democratic act. Voting brings to a culmination the whole range
38 of political activity--setting the public agenda, debate and discussion of issues, the competition among political
39 parties--that is directed to determining how a political system moves forward. As acts of affirmation of their
40 common enterprise by members of the political system, elections represent a moment when public opinion
41 coalesces and the political stage is set for beginning anew with fresh public approval.

42 Elections are evidence that in a democracy no courses of action are ever permanent; they are always subject to
43 reconsideration. Thus, citizens whose positions win or lose understand that there will be other opportunities for
44 them to express their will and attempt to prevail. The electoral process stimulates debate and channels conflict

91

1   that arises from segments of the people. Elections for governmental officials focus disagreements on the
2   competition about who will hold governmental power and serve as representatives.

3   The way in which elections are organized and voting is institutionalized have profound consequences for the
4   way in which people act politically and for the way in which their representation is achieved. Not only are there
5   variations among democratic systems in how frequently and upon what offices and issues the people may vote,
6   as well as the kinds of elections in which people participate. There are also fundamental differences in
7   "electoral systems" in which the people's votes are counted. The design of an electoral system determines how
8   electoral districts are configured, how votes are aggregated to determine outcomes, and how votes are
9   cumulated. The characteristics of an electoral system may induce certain segments of the society to form
10   coalitions; or it may induce them to divide sharply and/or antagonistically.

11   Elections may seem to incorporate an "aristocratic" element in modern democracies because they produce two
12   "classes" of people, those who hold office and those who do not. The elections that produce this distinction may
13   seem to imply the idea that some people are more "qualified" than others to represent or to rule. In the idea of a
14   pure aristocracy, this qualification is based on a person's intrinsic meritorious qualities, although in practice the
15   distinction is often based on inheritance or social status.

16   In a democracy, the "qualification" to hold elective office when others do not is derived exclusively from the
17   authorization by the people of some persons to hold power in their name. In practice, this authorization takes the
18   form of elections in which citizens make judgments about the merits of prospective candidates through their
19   exercise of the right to vote. This practice can take place only under conditions where all citizens have the right
20   to seek and hold elective office. Moreover to hold public office incurs the obligation to represent the people as a
21   public servant. Thus the division between those who hold and do not hold public office is diminished and the
22   relationship between the two "classes" is transformed by making the governors subordinate to the governed.

23   Different concepts of representation may produce different expectations of how their chosen representatives
24   should act to serve the people.

25   1. **Concept of representation.** There are two main schools of thought regarding the proper role and functions
26   of representatives. In determining the role and functions of representatives, one must begin by asking: how
27   can the people's will and interest be ascertained and carried into effect? To answer this question requires
28   asking two further questions: What are the people's will and interest? What approaches serve best to realize
29   the people's will and interest?

30   a. **Actual versus virtual representation.** In regard to the first question, the alternatives are "actual" and
31   "virtual" approaches to ascertaining the people's will and interest.

32   Actual representation refers to the idea that office holders must be a microcosm or "mirror image" of
33   their constituencies and thus reflect its will and interest. According to this idea, the individual can be
34   represented only by someone who is very much the same as he or she is. Thus a representative must
35   share one or more key attributes with most of his or her constituents.

36   Virtual representation refers to the idea that office holders can represent their constituents and the
37   community as a whole without being the same as their constituents, as long as the representatives
38   conscientiously look to the will and interest of the people. Thus representatives must attempt to resolve
39   differences among their constituencies when they act or speak on behalf of those they represent.

40   Most practical understandings of representation combine these two despite the fact that they remain in
41   tension.

42   b. **Trustee versus delegate models of representation.** In regard to the second question, the alternatives
43   are between understanding representation as based on the "trustee" model as distinct from "delegate"
44   model.

1 The trustee model envisages the representative as obligated to look after the common good of those
2 represented, at times independently of what the constituents actually would say they want.

3 The delegate model requires that the representative convey the specific wishes of their constituents into
4 policy, at times without regard to the office holder's independent judgment of the common good.

5 The trustee model thus envisages a possible contradiction between the constituency's expressed will
6 and true interest, whereas, the delegate model assumes that the people know their own best interest.

7

8 2. **Kinds of elections.** There are different kinds of elections in which the people's choice may be determined.
9 These include

10 a. **general elections** provide the authoritative means for citizens to retain or replace their leadership. A
11 general election is typically one in which large numbers of offices are at stake. They are regularly
12 scheduled elections for the principal offices of government, including those of the legislature, the
13 executive and other administrative officials, and sometimes even the judiciary.

14 b. **special elections** provide the people an opportunity to express their will on matters of importance that
15 may arise between general elections, such as filling offices vacated by resignation or death or by
16 voting for legislation or special expenditures.

17 c. **plebiscites** provide a national electorate with the occasion to determine important constitutional
18 questions.

19 d. **referendums** provide legislatures the opportunity to refer an issue to the electorate for their decision
20 or advice. Referendums also may be used to provide the people with the power to ratify or reject
21 decisions made by legislatures.

22 e. **"initiatives"** provide a means for a number of citizens to propose measures that will become law, if
23 approved by the majority of the electorate.

24 f. **recall elections** provide a corrective means of removing from office those who citizens judge
25 unworthy of their trust.

26 3. **Kinds of electoral systems.** Electoral systems differ in the way they establish electoral districts, and the
27 way in which they aggregate and cumulate (gather and count) votes. These differences have important
28 consequences for the way groups of people are represented and for the impact of the vote of the individual
29 with direct results for the concept of representation itself.

30 a. **Districting.** Electoral districting divides and combines voters by geography or by ethnic, linguistic, or
31 other socio-economic attributes. To the extent that a community is segmented according to these
32 attributes, they will tend to take on greater weight and prominence in governmental decisions.
33 Variations in the size of districts and the number of offices filled from each include single-member
34 districts (where only one representative is elected from a section of the whole community), multi-
35 member districts (where more than one representative is elected from a section of the whole
36 community), and at-large elections (in which office holders are elected to represent the entire
37 community). There are also mixtures of single-member and at-large elections.

38 Depending upon which variation is used, the constituency a representative is responsible to is
39 narrowed or extended. The pattern of districting will affect the responsiveness and accountability that
40 an individual voter may expect from each office holder. And this pattern will affect how the general
41 interest or the minority interests of a community will be represented.

1   b.   **Aggregation.** There are different formulas of aggregating or grouping the wills of individual citizens
2   as expressed through their votes. These formulas are used to determine electoral outcomes. These
3   formulas may be designed to accommodate the relative homogeneity or heterogeneity of interests
4   within a community. These include:

5   • **plurality**. In plurality systems, the choice with the most votes wins whether or not it receives a
6   majority. This formula may be suitable to the most homogeneous community where a
7   preponderant minority might be expected to govern in the interest of the whole..

8   • **majority.** In majority systems, a choice can only prevail if it receives one more than half of the
9   votes. This formula also can serve the needs of a relatively homogeneous community where a
10   more than half of the voters would be required for confidence in electoral outcomes, as long as the
11   rights of the minority are respected.

12   • **proportional.** Proportional systems use a variety of formulas to ensure that outcomes represent
13   the distribution of preferences among constituencies. Constituencies may be defined by party,
14   ethnicity, religion, class, or profession. This formula is most often adapted to a heterogeneous
15   community where interests are difficult to compromise. This approach often replicates the
16   divisions within the community in the operations of government presenting challenges to its
17   stability.

18   c. **Cumulation.** There are different formulas used to cumulate or add together votes to reach final
19   electoral outcomes. These formulas may be designed to deal with the distribution and intensity of
20   interests within a community. These include

21   • **One-person, one-vote.** According to this formula each vote is mathematically equivalent. It
22   underscores a view of each voter as the equal of every other voter. It assumes that adding up the
23   preferences of individuals produces an accurate picture of the will of the community as a whole.
24   This formula treats individual preferences as being of equal worth and the varying intensities of
25   such preferences as being of equal weight.

26   • **Weighted votes.** According to this formula, elections are designed so that the votes of some
27   persons count more than others. It emphasizes a view that the weight of votes should be adjusted
28   to represent ethnic, geographic, or political subdivisions, or variations in ways of life (e.g., rural
29   versus urban). This formula may also treat variations of intensity of preferences as being worthy of
30   differential weight.

31   • **Multiple votes.** According to this formula, each person is entitled to more than one vote. This
32   formula may include "cluster voting," in which citizens may designate more than one vote to a
33   particular choice, approval voting where citizens indicate the full range of choices that would be
34   acceptable to them, and single-transferable voting where citizens rank order those preferences.
35   This formula is intended to provide a more accurate portrayal of the intensity and order of voter
36   preferences.

37 I. **How does civil society contribute to the performance of political and governmental institutions in a**
38   **democracy?** The more dynamic and diverse a civil society, the greater its impact is on the functioning of
39   political and governmental institutions. The liberal type of democracy is distinguished by a more developed and
40   complex civil society. Because civil society is a less prominent feature of non-liberal democracy, it will play a
41   less important role or no role at all in the functioning of governmental institutions.

42   1. **Relationships between civil society and the institutions of politics and government.**

1   a.   **Civil society** may be defined as the autonomous, self-organized sphere of voluntary individual, social,
2   and economic relationships and organizations that, though limited by law, is separate from
3   governmental institutions.

4   A broad definition of civil society encompasses all of society except government. Civil society
5   includes family, economic enterprises, interest groups, and religious entities. In this view, the
6   autonomous organizations of civil society thus form the foundation for individual liberty.

7   A narrow definition restricts the concept of civil society to refer to those segments of society that are
8   organized for public purposes. For example, this view includes associations organized to promote the
9   interests of the family, but does not include families themselves as a part of civil society. In this view,
10   the public character and activities of civil society are its core.

11   b.   **Functions of civil society.** Associational life within civil society facilitates the functioning of
12   governmental institutions, spurs governmental action, provides checks on the power of institutions, and
13   occasionally impedes their functioning. Civil society provides the potential for:

14   • **Sustaining the autonomy of the people and a consciousness of popular sovereignty** in being
15   able to authorize and control government. Civil society has the effect of separating the people
16   from a dependence on governmental institutions for the conduct of all public affairs, thereby
17   highlighting the status of government as subordinate to the people.

18   • **Limiting and competing with the power of government** by maintaining numerous alternative
19   centers of thought and action in the form of organizations, associations, and individuals acting
20   independently. In so doing, civil society ensures that neither government nor a single dominant
21   group, such as a political party or religious organization, holds a monopoly on sources of
22   information, organized political influence, resources, and ideas considered legitimate.

23   • **Promoting cohesiveness of the community** by providing the opportunity for the individual to
24   take part in a number of organizations and social networks. Such participation may counter
25   individual alienation and social fragmentation.

26   The organizations of civil society can also overcome social fragmentation by providing
27   associational life that transcends "ascriptive" group identities based on unchangeable attributes,
28   such as race, gender, and ethnicity; or changeable ones, such as religion and social class. Civil
29   society accomplishes social integration when those of varied group identities associate together for
30   some common purpose or interest.

31   • **Liberating the individual** from domination by a single social organization that monopolizes the
32   person's social relations. The numerous organizations provided by a civil society can make the
33   individual aware of choices in life and counter an exclusive group orientation that impedes self-
34   direction and creativity.

35   • **Developing the personal and civic potential of citizens** through participation in different kinds
36   of deliberation, by providing practice in governance, and by recruiting political leaders and
37   training all citizens in the skills of political participation. Engagement in associations helps
38   cultivate a citizenry with confidence in its own capacity for self-government and a spirit of
39   activism in solving its own problems.

40   • **Providing intermediate organizations operating between government and the individual** that
41   promote the sense of belonging and efficacy. These organizations may also enhance the impact of
42   the individual by aggregating the efforts of many individuals thus contributing to a general attitude
43   of cooperativeness and fostering interpersonal trust. These organizations may participate directly
44   in the political process by attempting to influence public policy. They may interact with

government officials and institutions on behalf of their members and others. Finally, the influence of these organizations may protect their members and others from the power of government to overwhelm the individual.

- **Enhancing the legitimacy of government** by participating in the political process, thus helping to insure that government does what it is supposed to do. Government responsiveness to this process promotes public confidence in government's honesty that in turn enhances its legitimacy.

- **Connecting individuals and groups with the public arena** by disseminating information, ideas, and critical analysis through communications media, organizing inquiries and reports, and through associational networks .

- **Articulating and aggregating interests and opinion** thereby supplementing political parties and providing individuals alternative access to the public arena through membership in appropriate groups. These organizations provide like-minded individuals and interest groups a means to work together to refine and communicate their ideas and wishes and work collectively to achieve their goals.

- **Enhancing creativity** in public affairs by serving as a laboratory for experimentation with ideas and practices.

- **Supplementing and/or providing substitutes or alternatives** for government programs designed to serve the needs and interests of the people.

- **Promoting innovation and reform in social and public affairs** by identifying unmet needs, criticizing unexamined conventions, and creating alternatives to the status quo.

- **Promoting moderation, tolerance, and compromise** by allowing persons to affiliate with a number of groups that may have differing purposes and interests. These cross-cutting memberships may tend to produce more moderate or nuanced political views as well as increased tolerance and a willingness to compromise. This experience may encourage one's engagement in more broadly representative groups to achieve political purposes. It may also lead one to identify more readily with political parties that encompass diversity.

c. **The relationship between government and civil society.** Civil society must remain insulated from governmental intrusiveness. Because civil society functions best on behalf of democracy when left to itself, governmental regulation of it is necessarily problematic. Government may regulate civil society but only on behalf of constitutional principles, in accordance with fundamental commitments to democracy and liberty. Without such regulation powerful institutions in civil society may undermine the democratic institutions of government. Although civil society may sometimes function best when it competes with government, if it supplants institutions that are accountable to the people, it will result in the transfer of public into private governance.

2. **The relationship between economic institutions of civil society and political institutions of democracy.** Because one of the fundamental purposes of democratic government is to promote the common good and general prosperity, the objective of enhancing and regulating the economy is a priority of governmental policy-making.

a. **Necessity of economic regulation**. The economy in a democracy relies upon a system of publicly provided order and resources including:

- **economic infrastructure** such as currency, legal structure (e.g., charters, contracts), insurance, banking, transportation, education, intellectual and other property rights, patents.

- **economic policies** such as monetary and fiscal policy (including taxation), trade policy, research, wage and labor regulation, environmental, health, and safety policies; equal opportunity and anti-discrimination policies; regulation of equities and financial markets and standards for financial accounting practices to ensure transparency in market structures and transactions.

b. **Economic regulation and the integrity and maintenance of democracy.** The degree and nature of government involvement in economic regulation raises difficult questions for democracy itself. These arise from the tension between systematically different and possibly incompatible views concerning the relationship of political freedom and economic freedom.

- **The view that economic freedom has first priority.** If economic freedom is given first priority, it is because it is understood as a natural right that underlies any legitimate political system. This right provides a person with a basis of independence and power. As such, it sustains the existence of political freedom. As the foundation of personal independence, economic freedom is seen as the most efficient means to free human beings from a preoccupation with fulfilling basic needs, thus providing them the option and capacity to engage in various other activities, including the political process.

  As an indispensable component of personal liberty, economic freedom ensures that government cannot dominate individuals or society. It provides a foundation for personal independence and political empowerment.

  The priority and importance of economic freedom to democracy require that government regulation not undermine those functions of the economy that promote individual liberty and political freedom.

- **The view that political freedom has first priority.** If political freedom is given first priority, it is because it is understood as protecting the individual from inequities of political power and access that may derive from the accumulation of economic power. It is understood also that political freedom may counterbalance overweening economic power over individuals or society. Moreover, political freedom ensures that the common good is not held hostage to the private self-interest of economic enterprise.

  The priority and importance of political freedom to democracy requires that government not allow basic political rights to be undermined by extreme economic inequality.

c. **Economic regulation, democracy, and individual rights**. Government regulation of the economy in a democracy must accommodate the following fundamentally different views:

- **Democratic arrogance regarding social and economic problems.** An enthusiasm for democracy may lead to a false and potentially dangerous belief that democratic government can and should solve any and all social and economic problems. If an entire political system is based on popular rule, there may be a tendency to think that governmental institutions should be able to control all aspects of the community, so long as democratic procedures have been followed and there is political accountability. This belief could subvert democracy's own first principles if public policies undermined an autonomous civil society and a private domain, as well as the maintenance of a market-based economy.

  On the other hand, democracy's commitment to the welfare of its citizens has enabled democratic societies to respond effectively to a variety of economic and social ills. Democracies that forthrightly tackle these ills must address them within a framework that preserves the fundamental rights of all sections of the community.

97

- **Government protection of individual rights.** Governments must regulate the power of economic institutions on behalf of preserving the well-being, freedom, and rights of individuals, thus avoiding economic tyranny. It is essential to protect those personal and economic rights that justify the freedom of markets in the first place.

  A balance must be struck, however, that avoids expansion of the economic rights to compensate for disadvantages of some individuals or groups to the degree that it leads to over-regulation of the market, resulting in diminished economic performance that harms the society as a whole.

  On the other hand, it may be equally essential to avoid an extension of property rights that leads to under-regulation, inadequate protection of labor, and extreme gaps between the rich and poor.

d. **The distribution of economic resources and the integrity and maintenance of democracy.** One of the central purposes of a democratic government is to establish and maintain distributive justice consistent with the principles of a free society. It has long been argued that the well-being and legitimacy of democracy requires that there not be severe disparities of economic condition. In this view, whatever variation in economic strata there may be between rich and poor should be moderated by a substantial range of middle classes in which multiple degrees of prosperity are apparent. In modern democracies where economic inequality translates directly into political inequality, the democratic value of the political equality of citizens is endangered.

e. **Concentrations of economic resources and the integrity and maintenance of democracy.** Great concentrations of wealth and political power may threaten the capacity of governmental institutions and citizens themselves to control their government. They may thus distort or corrupt the democratic process by overwhelming other voices, dominating the public agenda, and denying the people the right to participate effectively in the political process. In such circumstances a democracy in name will not be a democracy in fact.

  The political influence of concentrated wealth also may enable matters to be hidden from public view so they do not come up for democratic consideration. Such influence also may result in the settling of such matters in private on behalf of particular interests. In other instances the intensity of the conflict among centers of concentrated wealth and political power may dominate the public arena. In this way, wider popular participation and broader representation of both the public good and other interests of the population are precluded.

  On the other hand, concentrations of wealth and political power do not necessarily remove issues from the public agenda. The competition among concentrations of wealth and political power may enhance the visibility of issues for the public. And concentrations of economic power can serve as a balance against the power of government. In some instances concentration of economic power may aggregate the interests of the general population by using the resources of these economic institutions to keep their issues on the public agenda. In this way a concentration of wealth and power may enhance discussion and debate concerning the public interest.

  In addition, social expectations that concentrated wealth should contribute to the overall well-being of the community may result in philanthropy that supports the ideas, institutions, and culture of democracy.

3. **The relationship between communications media of civil society and the working of democracy.** Because a democracy requires a knowledgeable and informed people and runs on public opinion, means must be available for communicating a wide range of perceptions of the public domain. In a democratic society the media must provide information to enable the citizen to achieve a picture of the public domain adequate for an identification and an understanding of the problems and possibilities for public action. When media fulfill these functions, they make it possible for citizens to deliberate, make proposals, and to make judgments.

a. **Functions of the media in a democratic political system.** If the media are to contribute adequately to the working of democracy, they must perform the following roles.

- **Communicate information about the affairs of the public domain.** In order to make accurate assessment of issues in the public domain the people require substantial information about a wide range of subjects, e.g., not only the affairs of government, but also international matters, economics, science, technology, culture. To provide substantial information requires more than an exchange of opinions about these subjects, it is necessary to provide facts, knowledge, and expert commentary on them.

- **Serve as a check on power.** In the course of gathering and reporting facts on the use of power by government and other elements of the public domain, the media serve a oversight function. They provide a forum for public participation and a conduit for the voice of the people, aggregate and mobilize public opinion, and provide a means for monitoring and influencing the use of power. They may also serve as agents for change and reform.

- **Educate concerning the values and processes of democracy**. Both through reporting the news and through providing entertainment the media offer models of behavior that may exemplify the values of democracy and demonstrate its operations. They may also portray behaviors and relationships that are incompatible with the values and principles of democracy. They may also serve as a primary source of education about how the political system works.

- **Provide a forum for persuasion.** Most of modern electoral politics takes place in the "virtual arena" of the media rather than in the traditional "public square." This development puts a premium on electoral and governmental politics as theatrical performance. The electronic media have also made it possible for more citizens to be informed about public affairs and to express and disseminate their own views more broadly.

- **Act as a center of power.** By concentrating the means used to provide the information on which the people's opinions, judgments, and actions are based, the communications media assumes a central role in popular self-governance. But there are few means for free media to be held accountable for their use of this power without violating the principles of democracy. Even so, the role of the communications media as an independent center of power within the political system may compete with and constrain the power of government.

b. **Characteristics of the media that contribute to democracy.** If the media are to contribute adequately to the working of democracy, they should exhibit the following characteristics:

- **Independence.** In order for the media to operate as an accurate source of information about public affairs or as a check on power, they must be insulated from control by the objects of their inquiries whether they are, for example, governmental, economic, or religious.

- **Freedom.** Censorship corrupts the system of providing information appropriate for a people to govern themselves, whether or not that censorship is government-sponsored or it arises from any other use of power in the public domain. Even within the news gathering organizations, power can be used in such a way that the effects of censorship occur. Or news organizations may be inducted to perform self-censorship as a result of intimidation or threat of economic penalties. This abuse of power can occur by the choice of what will or will not be reported, as well as by how news is reported.

- **Diversity.** The right of self-government requires not only the choice of what policies to pursue, but also the ability to select which perspectives and ideas seem most valid to individual citizens. For this to occur, there must be a range of options from which to obtain information and opinion

1   regarding the public domain. Thus, the number of sources and outlets of information must be
2   many and varied. They must also present a diversity of perspectives.

3   • **Quality.** For citizens to be able to decide wisely, the information and knowledge presented to
4   them by media must be of sufficient scope, depth, and accuracy to provide a adequate foundation
5   for their deliberation.

6   • **Integrity.** The function of the media is to do more than transfer information given to them. Often
7   the information most relevant to public deliberation can be obtained only as a result of persistent
8   and even courageous investigation into the activities of those in power. This role is often
9   undertaken not only by professionals but also, with great effectiveness, by citizens themselves
10 who may refuse to rely on standardized sources of information.

11 • **Accessibility.** The media cannot be closed to public participation. Citizens must be able to
12 communicate directly with other citizens and to those in power through the media. In addition,
13 publications of the best information will be of little consequence for self-governance if it is not
14 readily available to the people. Unless the people develop the knowledge and skills required to
15 obtain and evaluate public information, their participation in the public domain may be limited in
16 its effectiveness.

17 c. **Characteristics of media that detract from democracy.** When the media exhibit the following
18 characteristics, they may undermine or subvert democracy.

19 • **Concentration of ownership.** The ownership and control of the media may be so concentrated
20 either by government or among private corporations that the type and range of information, issues,
21 and perspectives is restricted. Thus the scope of information available to the public is so narrowed
22 that the people cannot become aware of the alternatives available for choice. Even when they are
23 aware of the issues, they may not have sufficient facts and perspectives to make decisions that best
24 serve their own interests.

25 • **Distortion.** Distortion in the media can take many forms other than the most obvious
26 misrepresentation of the facts. These include:

27 • selective inclusion of some facts and the deliberate to the exclusion of others

28 • the framing of information in such a way that one perspective dominates and obscures other
29 ways of looking at the same facts

30 • over-generalizing where a few accurate details are given such emphasis that they lead to a
31 false portrayal or substitute for a complete picture

32 • the use of "loaded" (emotion- or value-laden) language that prompt conclusions not based on
33 careful reasoning

34 • using and perpetuating stereotypes that prompt people to draw unexamined and possibly
35 unfounded conclusions or unwarranted expectations based on highly visible traits

36 • **Imbalance.** Even when some issues are worthy of media focus, the media may concentrate so
37 much attention on them that other important issues are eclipsed. Or arguments on one side of an
38 issue may be well presented while opposing arguments may not be presented at all or may be
39 poorly presented. In addition, a predominant focus on personal, local, regional, national, or
40 international issues to the detriment of the other levels creates an imbalance that makes it difficult
41 for a democratic people to attend to all of the levels of governance that affect them.

- **Negative portrayal of human beings.** When the media focus predominantly on human shortcomings and misdeeds such as scandal, corruption, crime, and depravity, they distort people's perceptions of society and their fellow citizens. This undermines confidence in their institutions, replacing it with mutual distrust and doubtfulness about the human capacity for self-government. When information itself almost exclusively takes the form of entertainment, the media have defaulted on their obligation to keep the public informed. In extreme cases they can become so preoccupied with entertaining a mass audience by providing titillation and evoking strong emotions that may portray human nature as so depraved, violent, or unreasoning that democracy is impossible.

- **Trivialization.** The media may raise insignificant matters to such a high level of public awareness that they preclude or preempt attention to matters of substance and lower the level of public discourse. Moreover by allowing trivial matters to dominate their attention, the media displace public attention away from matters of consequence. And the media can so condition the public by its preoccupation with the insignificant in their portrayal of public affairs that the people are led to conclude that the public arena is not a place where serious problems are addressed. This may lead people to feel that their real concerns can only attended to in the private realm.

- **Lack of expertise.** The quality of the media is dependent upon both professional standards of journalism and expertise in the areas that it addresses. Performance by its practitioners that fails to meet adequate professional standards results in inaccurate and unreliable information, or misleading and ill-considered commentary. Inadequate access to expertise or a lack of adequate knowledge about its subject matter may also lead both description and analysis to be of poor quality. Without a sufficient base of knowledge and adequate exposure to exemplary reasoning, the citizen is handicapped in making judgments about public affairs.

- **Inaccessibility.** The media often characterize themselves as standing in the place of the people. They purport to be "the eyes and ears" of the public and to fulfill the public's "right to know." And yet, although there may be a great variety of sources of information, many media organizations deny access for participation or contribution by members of the public. The people may have little influence on one of the most important sets of institutions for determining what knowledge and perspectives are available to them to use in making judgments about public affairs. Thus important issues may be neglected or differing perspectives may be selectively excluded from the public domain.

101

1   **VI. How do democracies emerge, develop, survive, and improve?**

2   A.   Patterns of democracy in time.

3   B.   The dynamic of democracy

4   C.   Transitions to democracy

5   D.   Characteristics of developed democracies.

6   E.   Overcoming obstacles to the preservation and improvement of existing democracies

7

8   **Placement?** *In addition, the maturity of a democratic system is enhanced when individuals affiliate with a number*
9   *of groups that may have differing purposes and interests. These cross-cutting memberships tend to produce more*
10 *moderate or nuanced political views as well as increased tolerance and a willingness to compromise. This*
11 *experience may encourage one's engagement in more broadly representative groups to achieve political purposes. It*
12 *may also lead one to identify more readily with political parties that encompass diversity.*

1 **VI. How do democracies emerge, develop, survive, and improve?**

2 Democracy is not utopia, which is by definition perfect. But democracies do work to lessen the gap between
3 democratic ideals and reality. Inherent in every democracy is a commitment to the possibility of improvement,
4 however successful a particular democracy may seem at the moment. Democracies encourage criticism,
5 competition, and change, even celebrating the vitality of diversity and dissonance itself.

6 Democracies cannot be finished or perfected. Even the most developed democracies are imperfect and continue to
7 evolve. This should not be surprising since democracy can have no expectation of achieving a perfect society. Even
8 if achieving a perfect society were possible, it would be antithetical to democracy because it would stop the process
9 of criticism, innovation, and progress. This process suggests that democracy is established and advanced over time.

10 The creation of a model describing how democracy develops over time may facilitate a more holistic understanding
11 of democracy different from a portrayal of its characteristics, an analysis of its functions, and an appreciation of the
12 reasons for choosing democracy. Such a model may provide a framework for understanding the course of formative
13 events and the status of a democracy at any given point in its history.

14 A. **Alternative conceptions of democracy over time.** The following five models have been used to observe and
15   explain democracy's emergence and/or destiny over time. These models may be mixed or overlapping.

16   1. **Life cycle.** Democracies, like other forms of political systems, may be conceived as having life-cycles;
17   that is, they are born, grow to maturity, and die. Under this model even the best forms of any political
18   system must inevitably pass out of existence after a period of decay. But even under this model, it may be
19   possible for the life span of a democracy to be extended or perpetuated indefinitely, if it is embodied in
20   durable institutions and if its principles are recreated in the minds and hearts of future generations.

21   2. **Ideal type. D**emocracy may be conceived as an "ideal type" of polity that can be approximated but never
22   fully realized. As such, democracy can be rigorously articulated and refined in thought, but in practice all
23   democracies will necessarily fall short of complete conformity with the theoretical ideal ("ideal type")
24   due to the unpredictable and unstable nature of human beings, history, and the material world.
25   Nevertheless, the "ideal type" can be used as an analytical device to understand essential characteristics
26   of democracy and to serve as a standard against which any extant example of democracy can be judged.

27   In another sense, democracy may be conceived of as the ideal or best state of civic life and political order.
28   In this conception, democracy exemplifies all of the most desirable attributes of organized human
29   community. As such, democracy conceived as the ideal state may set forth attributes against which
30   existing democratic political systems can be assessed. Setting forth ideal attributes as if they are fully
31   achievable, however, creates unrealistic and potentially destructive expectations. The pursuit of an ideal
32   may lead the people to undervalue real achievements. Thus the "best" becomes the enemy of the "good."

33   Moreover, no extant version of democracy can fully embody this ideal because a perfectly realized polity
34   would be unassailable against criticisms and the reform proposals of its citizens. Thus a "perfect
35   democracy" in this sense would be undemocratic. Superimposing a "perfect government" upon imperfect
36   and imperfectable beings is to deny human nature and make human beings seem contemptible.

37   3. **End state.** Democracy is the end-state in the progress of human history according to this model. Within
38   this conception human history is a process of continual advance towards an apex of development, a
39   preordained destiny. This destiny represents the inevitable conclusion of human aspirations and the
40   struggle for liberty and happiness achieved through the self-government of a people. Once substantially
41   reached or "consolidated," democracy as a final stage of history contains the resources for perpetuating
42   itself. Either the principles and practices of democracy are so deeply embedded in human experience that
43   they are unshakeable, or the institutions of democracy have within them the capacity of self-regeneration.

4. **Evolution.** As an alternative to the models of democracy as an inevitable life-cycle, an unreachable destiny, or the ultimate goal of history, democracy over time may be portrayed as open-ended, evolving in new and unforeseen ways. With the model of evolution, not only do forms of life develop into more sophisticated versions through adaptation, but also new forms of life can emerge over time. Just as a community is a form of civic life, so a community can learn from its experience with popular self-governance and its political system may more fully realize democratic principles in ways that cannot be anticipated from the time of its inception. It is even possible that new principles of good governance might be discovered. This model incorporates much of the process of inquiry that marks the scientific method where principles and practices are tested and revised. Under this model, democracy itself might evolve into an unforeseen new form of government.

5. **Revolution**. Revolution produces sudden and complete change in the most basic character of political arrangements. Revolution may enable democracy to be implemented immediately following the overturning of a previous regime. In this model, there may be a preexisting democratic movement behind the revolution with the capacity to establish democratic institutions upon the overturning of the prior system of government. In other cases, the destruction of the old regime may be followed a period of confusion and chaos from which democracy begins to emerge. The period of transition between the end of the old regime and the emergence of democracy may be short or extensive, and other types of political systems may intervene.

The prospect that revolution can create a completely new political order may lead advocates of democracy to favor a destructive approach to the establishment of a new political system. Even so, what passes for a new political order may in fact be little more than a change in leadership. Also, the revolutionary impulse—the strategy of creating by destruction—may unleash anti-democratic forces that thwart the establishment of the conditions conducive to stable democracy.

B. **The dynamic of democracy.** Whichever model or models might be used to describe the character and development of democracy over time, the dynamic of democracy entails active inquiry into fundamental ideas and their application to political life. The reflection upon democratic values and principles, together with their progressive incorporation in practice, constitute a dynamic for creating and maintaining a democratic polity. This dynamic is embedded in the process of transition to democracy. And it is one of the major animating forces of the life of democracy over time.

1. The **principles of democracy**. To thrive, a democracy must live ultimately in the minds and hearts of the people. Democracy's fundamental principles should guide the people's perceptions of public affairs and their behavior. But there is a tendency over time to forget these principles or even to distort them. An understanding of these principles, therefore, must be not only be passed on from one generation to the next but must also be reexamined and reinterpreted in the light of their circumstances and experiences.

Inquiry into the meaning and interpretation of fundamental principles may be guided by one of several positions regarding them. Principles may be seen as unchangeable, subject to refinement, or subject to reexamination. From any of these perspectives, fundamental principles should not be understood as fully realized or subject to dogmatic endorsement.

a. **Principles as unchangeable.** Citizens and political systems must constantly recur to fundamental principles, critically reflect upon their meaning, and recover and adhere to them as understood in their original sense. In this view, fundamental principles are immutable and constitutive—that is, they have been clearly and correctly enunciated in the past and they constitute the very essence of the meaning of democracy. These principles cannot be fully understood and vindicated without reference to their core meaning. To lose sight of the core meaning of these principles is to forfeit crucial aspects of democracy. Therefore, the essence of citizenship in a democracy is knowledge of the core meaning of these principles and a commitment to live by them.

b. **Principles as subject to refinement.** Citizens and political systems must be able to refine democratic principles through active reflection upon their intrinsic meaning and their relationship to experience. In this view, democratic principles are not fixed in their meaning according to any previous enunciation. They represent a foundational starting point for further development as a consequence of investigation into their meaning and the experience of applying them. From this perspective, these principles are not static in their meaning or their expression. Therefore, the essence of citizenship in a democracy is the pragmatic examination and application of fundamental principles, with a view toward improving upon them, strengthening adherence to them, and enhancing their utility.

c. **Principles as subject to reexamination.** Citizens and political systems must be able to reconsider and reevaluate democratic principles in terms of their current application to the political system. In this view, democratic principles are subject to fundamental reconsideration and potential rejection on behalf of principles that are believed to provide a superior foundation for such ends as good government, human happiness, liberty, equality, or order and security. Extant democratic principles are regarded as provisional and, as such, are seen as an impetus for the generation of principles that undergird what is considered to be a new and improved order of civic life. Therefore, the essence of citizenship in a democracy is the revolutionary examination of fundamental principles whose transformation or replacement can upturn settled ways of understanding the proper arrangement of a political community.

2. **Tension among democratic principles.** Whichever position one takes on the fundamental status of democratic principles—that is, whether they are to be recovered, refined, or transformed—there is not one, but a number of principles which lie at the base of this form of political system. These principles are inherently in tension, e.g., freedom and equality, individual rights and the common good, majority rule and minority rights. This tension arises of necessity when human beings live together—the basic combination of individual and collectivity, the autonomy of the person and the sovereignty of the community.

When human beings live together to secure order and liberty, inevitable tensions arise from the desire to realize these ends. Because of the persistent origin and dynamic character of these tensions, they cannot be resolved or transcended. Moreover the principles in tension do not remain static in their relationship. Therefore these tensions and their changing relationship must be accommodated in a democratic political system. Such accommodation may involve such considerations and strategies as the following.

a. **Balancing fundamental principles.** Fundamental principles must be balanced appropriately among themselves both in the overall organization of the political system and in their application to the ordinary affairs of political life, e.g., the need to balance liberty and order or the public's right to know and privacy.

b. **Varying the balance of fundamental principles.** Democracies vary in the balance they strike among fundamental principles, e.g., democracies that emphasize social welfare versus those that emphasize individual self-reliance. There is no single best version of a balance among fundamental principles. Because of the dynamic character of the principles themselves and the dynamic character of the conditions in which they must be implemented, the overall composition of any balance established will change in different places and circumstances. Thus some principles in tension may be preferred or accorded greater weight than others, so long as all are adequately protected. Democracy must always accommodate the full set of its fundamental principles, never abolishing one for the sake of others.

c. **Respecting the tension among fundamental principles.** Fundamental principles are inherently in tension, e.g., liberty and equality. In fact, this tension undergirds the foundation of democracy itself and is a driving force for its vitality. To attempt to eliminate this tension is to destabilize democracy

1   itself. The meaning of democratic principles is highlighted when they are set in opposition to each
2   other. Establishing a balance among principles, therefore, does not eliminate this tension; it only
3   accommodates the conflict among principles. Conflict is derived from the nature of the fundamental
4   principles themselves, arguments about their relative weight and importance, and deliberation about
5   their application to particular cases or situations.

6   d.   **Preserving a balance of fundamental principles.** In the overall scheme of fundamental principles
7   in any democratic political system, none of these principles can be exalted in a way that
8   substantially damages or excludes others. If imbalance occurs as a result of one or more of these
9   principles being held as absolute, then democracy itself is threatened by the overshadowing of its
10   other first principles.

11   3.   **Hierarchy among democratic principles.** Even though fundamental principles must remain in tension,
12   it may be possible to organize them in such a way that one or more principles can be ranked sequentially
13   higher than others, which are considered to be derivative of the higher principles or simply of preferred
14   value. Thus a single principle like liberty or happiness might be accorded the highest rank with an
15   understanding that all other valued principles can be arrayed sequentially beneath it. Under one approach,
16   this hierarchy could be established on the basis that the lower-ranked principles are derived from those
17   above them. For example, the protection of private property might be conceived as derived from the
18   principle of liberty. Under an alternative approach, the hierarchy might be established on the basis of a
19   preference-ordering of independently derived principles. For example, a belief that the protection of
20   religious liberty is more important than social solidarity.

21 C.   **Transitions to democracy.** Democracies do not appear in the world fully developed. Nor are they merely the
22   product of good ideas reflected upon and applied. Democracy is too multifaceted and complex to be installed
23   as an entire system as an immediate response to a people's desire or choice. In some instances, societies or
24   their leaders may attempt to superimpose or graft a democratic political system or democratic institutions upon
25   a previously existing political system incompatible with democracy. But the breadth of commitment and
26   participation required to create and sustain democracy needs time to develop. In addition, the achievement of
27   democracy requires a set of conditions on which it can be built and sustained. There is, however, no one set of
28   antecedent conditions that makes democracy possible.

29   Achieving democracy may require passing through a set of stages. But there is no pre-established sequence of
30   stages that culminates in mature democracy. Democratic political systems may arise through a process of
31   transition from ill-defined or poorly formed polities or from other developed forms of government. Transition
32   can be abrupt or gradual. But, even if the end-state of democracy might be known, it would not be possible to
33   arrive there without going through a set of collective experiences and preliminary stages required to develop
34   the social, economic, and political conditions necessary for that state to occur. The achievement of some stages
35   may be prerequisite to subsequent stages. The sequencing of stages, however, has not been consistent across
36   historical cases where democracy has developed. But, without stages occurring in some order, progress toward
37   democracy may be hampered, halted, or diverted.

38   Transitions to democracy are often painful passages. Human costs may include loss of life, liberty, and
39   property for advocates as well as opponents of democracy. The people themselves may have to endure
40   economic and other forms of personal deprivation as well as the loss of national stature. Because democracy
41   accentuates popular opinion and involvement, moving toward democracy may offer occasion for
42   demagoguery. It also may lead to a rise in ethnic bigotry and ultra-nationalism. But in some cases these
43   passages may serve formative and informative purposes in the development and maturation of democracy. The
44   political accomplishments of transition periods carry over and shape the character of developing and mature
45   democracies. The lessons learned in this period provide a fund of knowledge and experience about political
46   practices necessary to establish and sustain democratic life.

1. **Antecedent conditions.** Ill-defined or poorly formed polities or other developed forms of government may possess certain factors that may predispose a society to become democratic or enhance the possibility of achieving democracy. These conditions include:

   a. A consciousness that one's future might be influenced by one's abilities and actions, as contrasted with a fatalistic acceptance of a pre-ordained destiny

   b. A dissatisfaction with the status quo that results from an increasing awareness of the shortcomings of the existing state of political life

   c. The dissemination of democratic ideas through the media, education, and other means that make possible challenges to the existing order

   d. A distinguishing of persons as "individuals with rights" rather than as "parts of a social organism"

   e. The spread of literacy and "mind-opening" education, which enables ideas and information to be made widely available and generally understood, and which increases awareness of alternatives to the status quo

   f. a state of economic development that enables a substantial portion of the population to survive beyond the subsistence level and allows them to attend to matters beyond themselves and beyond the present, eventually leading to the expansion of a middle class

   g. The capacity of persons to gather in associations for their own purposes

2. **Forces and processes that may prompt fundamental political change.** A variety of internal and external forces, or catalytic or formative events, can foment fundamental political change. Sometimes these changes result in movement toward democracy through:

   a. **Internal and external forces that may prompt change**

      - popular dissatisfaction arising from experience with non-democratic political systems

      - demands for participation, accountability, and improvements in the quality of their lives

      - education distributed both geographically and socially

      - economic development, modernization, and internationalization

      - mass media

      - migration

      - international norms and pressures

      - international civil society, including pressure of international norms and organizations on the emergence and development of democracy

   b. **Catalytic or formative events that may prompt change**

      - revolution

      - regime collapse

      - democratic mass movements

1 • opposition movements focusing upon changing prevailing social norms

2 • negotiated regime change

3 3. **Factors that contribute to the development of democracy.** Some factors in a society may promote
4 progress towards democracy. These factors include the level of development and direction of the
5 economy, the legal system, civil society, and education. The level of development of these factors
6 influences other aspects of society and may serve as catalysts for the emergence or enhancement of
7 conditions conducive to the development of democracy.

8 a. **Economic performance.** The level of a country's economic development plays a key role in
9 establishing the social conditions in which democracy can take root. Society must be lifted from levels
10 of poverty that demand constant attention to survival itself. The economy must also have attained a
11 degree of complexity and prosperity in which citizens have consciousness of social interdependence and
12 of being stakeholders in the system.

13 • **Leisure time.** The capacity of the economic system to sustain life beyond the subsistence level
14 provides the opportunity for large numbers of people to devote their attention and energy to
15 public affairs among other activities and to participate effectively in the political process.

16 • **Interdependence.** Advanced economic development is marked by interdependence among
17 persons or groups, resulting in collaborative efforts toward a common enterprise. Such
18 economic development tends to break down rigid boundaries between economically
19 autonomous localities and promotes cooperation, joint ventures, and wider social
20 interrelationships.

21 • **Ownership.** Advanced economic development may lead persons to perceive that they have a
22 stake in the community as a whole. Each person may thus claim standing as one of the
23 "owners" of the public realm. People also may see their personal prosperity as intertwined with
24 the economic success of the community. This leads to an interest in the regulation of the results
25 of economic activity through the political process.

26 b. **Economic versus political development.** Because of the importance of economic performance as a
27 factor in the development of democracy, different views have arisen as to whether economic or
28 political development should be encouraged at the expense or delay of the other. Alternative views
29 are that

30 • establishment of democratic political institutions must be delayed or even reversed to facilitate
31 the economic development on which democratic practices may depend.

32 • democratic political institutions provide the social practices and political stability fundamental
33 to economic development and to protecting the accomplishments of the economy. Thus they
34 should take precedence.

35 • establishment of democratic political and economic institutions may in some cases proceed
36 together when they are mutually reinforcing or their phases of development are interlocking.

37 c. **System of law.** The reliable operation of social, economic, and political processes requires the
38 establishment of a rule of law that provides a framework and structure that facilitates these
39 processes. Thus the legal system establishes a basis for stability and predictability that promotes
40 enterprise and progress. The contributions of such a system include the

1   • predictability regarding the application and enforcement of "rules of the game" or the basic
2   rules of social interaction

3   • use of objective standards for the making of legal decisions rather than arbitrary and transient
4   decisions by courts

5   • ordering of social, economic, and political relationships and transactions

6   • security of arrangements among persons and organizations such as contracts, respect for
7   property rights

8   • settled means for the arbitration of disputes among parties

9   d.   **Civil society.** The existence of civil society creates a public space separate from government that
10 allows for the independent initiative of citizens and a locus of activity that prevents government
11 from having a monopoly on public action. In this respect, civil society provides for the dispersion of
12 power in a community and acts as a counterbalance to the power of government. The following are
13 attributes or components of civil society that serve these functions:

14 • a public, non-governmental arena where individuals can endeavor to achieve their own goals

15 • dissemination and exchange of knowledge and ideas regarding alternatives and solutions to
16 matters of public concern which may culminate in substantive proposals for democratic reform

17 • association of individuals in relationships that allow them to expand their perspectives and that
18 facilitate cooperation, compromise, and creativity to accomplish mutual purposes

19 • networks of association, communication, competition, and cooperation among groups which
20 energize civic life and create the possibility of competing and cooperating centers of power
21 outside of government

22 • groups that cut across social and/or ideological cleavages to include members of other
23 divergent groups thus encouraging cooperation and moderating existing divisions

24 • organizations or coalitions of non-governmental organizations which debate and act on public
25 affairs

26 e.   **Educational system.** Widespread education of all members of the society in the arts and sciences
27 may lead to the full cultivation of the intellect, broadened perspectives, awareness of alternatives,
28 the disposition to question, and a belief that problems can be addressed by thoughtful and informed
29 action. Such an education should be provided not only by schools and universities but also by other
30 institutions, organizations, the media, and civic experience which offer opportunities for the
31 development of civic competence and responsibility. Education should be provided on an equal
32 basis across lines of gender, class, ethnic, and other divisions among the people. In such an
33 enhanced scheme of education, a further focus on civic education may cultivate and sustain a sense
34 of civic competence, responsibility, and commitment by

35 • promoting the acquisition of a political vocabulary so that citizens understand that the maxims
36 of political discourse have a deeper meaning and can be applied to the practice of politics

37 • developing conceptual frames of reference such that fundamental concepts, values, and
38 principles guide one's understanding and actions in regard to the public domain

39 • developing skills in analyzing and evaluating political discourse and argument

- distinguishing itself from education conducted in an authoritarian manner by avoiding indoctrination and dogmatism and encouraging skills of thoughtful inquiry and deliberation

- developing and relying upon teaching methods that cultivate the knowledge, skills, and democratic civic dispositions or traits of public and private character that facilitate democracy

- cultivating intellectual pursuit as a process that enhances individual autonomy, the development of the capabilities of the person, and the capacity for independent thought

- cultivating intellectual pursuit as a common enterprise where students cooperate to attain shared goals as an alternative to an exclusive preoccupation with learning as a solitary pursuit

- providing a democratic culture within the schools so that such fundamental democratic methods as open inquiry and debate, reflective deliberation, and due process are fostered.

- encouraging a common civic identity that transcends particular ethnic, religious, or other social or cultural identities

f. **Leadership and elites.** A democracy needs leaders. In the early phases of a transition, leaders may come from pre-existing institutions of other forms of government or from opposition groups. If these leaders can cultivate or exhibit skills of compromise, coalition building, and public persuasion, they can become catalysts for the broader and more stable development of democratic institutions and practices across a society. Gradually, initial leaders may be replaced by new leaders whose experience in a nascent democracy establishes them as a new elite possessed of skills more directly related to leading a democratic society.

4. **Indicators of progress towards democracy.** Certain observable signs in a non-democratic political system provide evidence of its transition to democracy. Elements of democracy that may evolve in a non-democratic state include free elections, a free press, non-governmental organizations, a system of law. Such elements may develop to different levels of sophistication and may be mutually reinforcing. The achievement of a democratic political system is not inevitable at any stage; but when a critical mass of mutually reinforcing democratic elements accumulates, there is a momentum toward democracy.

Indicators of movement toward democracy include progress toward:

a. personal, political, and economic liberty

b. a rising sense that the people are entitled to power over their own government and are capable of conducting public affairs together

c. inclusion of formerly excluded or marginalized groups on equal terms in the social and political life of the community

d. entrenchment of democratic principles and practices in political institutions, e.g., opportunity for regular exchanges of governmental power among competing parties and individuals

e. respect for democratic arrangements by the major power centers in the society, including religious, economic, and military power centers

f. removal of constitutional provisions and practices that are anti-democratic

g. a decisive break from a party system in which one party or coalition controls the mechanism of elections so that they can perpetuate themselves in power

h.   establishment of a rule of law including procedural protections of the individual and an independent system of justice

i.   education for democratic citizenship which fosters reasoned consent and commitment to democratic values and principles, as distinguished from indoctrination and propaganda

j.   the capacity to counter the ability of powerful forces in the society to undo or revoke democratic practices, e.g., the military, elites

k.   popular vigilance over government that exposes signs of the erosion of democracy, e.g., the deprivation of individual rights and other violations of constitutional principles, the prevalence of corruption

5. **Legacies of non-democratic rule.** Societies in transition to democracy face a variety of obstacles including problems inherited from prior political systems they are displacing. The challenge to countries in transition to democracy is to deal with these problems in ways that are compatible with or that reinforce democracy. These obstacles may include:

    a.   **Personal patterns of thought and behavior**, such as

- passivity and absence of personal initiative

- personal dependence on government

- lawlessness and predilection to violence as the way of settling disputes

- law viewed as a weapon of the powerful

- incompatibility of religious beliefs and practices with democratic norms and practices

- distrust of authority and of fellow citizens

- gender stereotypes with implications for restricting participation in public affairs

- alienation, cynicism, and lack of pride in citizenship

- lack of political efficacy, civic knowledge, and civic skills

- unwillingness to contribute to or accept responsibility for the general welfare

- hostility to politics and to the political process

    b.   **Social, economic, and political obstacles** such as:

- breakdown of security and order

- ethnic hatred and fragmentation

- gender inequity

- widespread poverty or wide disparities in wealth and income

- absence of a middle class

- centralized command economies

1 • a popular press that is restricted and controlled by government or other interests, with limited
2 alternative sources of information, and with a lack of journalistic professionalism

3 • unwillingness of political parties and leaders to act in accord with the formal ground rules of the
4 political system

5 • constitutional and legal rules that restrict an open political process

6 • political interference by the military

7 • the existence of governmental records about aspects of individuals' public and private lives that
8 may damage reputations, interfere with privacy and autonomy, and contain information that
9 infringe upon a person's capacity for political participation

10 • a heritage of suspicion among citizens arising from mutual surveillance and government spying
11 on the people

12 • propagation of ideological or distorted views of a country's political history

13 • doctrinaire educational systems

14 • lack of democratic traditions and understanding

15 D. **Characteristics of developed democracies.** No democracy is static, even if it is considered mature. Even
16 though mature democracies continue to evolve, they possess certain general characteristics that mark them as
17 stable and developed. These characteristics include:

18 1. **Preservation of popular sovereignty**. The sovereign people have an enduring presence and capacity to
19 exercise their authority in political affairs.

20 2. **Adherence to democratic principles.** Mature democracies adhere to fundamental principles in their day-
21 to-day operation both through the activities of governance and in the lives of the people.

22 3. **Fidelity to legitimizing purposes.** Mature democracies strive to be faithful to the reasons that justify the
23 people's choice of democracy, e.g., the protection of individual rights and promotion of the common
24 good, responsiveness of government to the will of the people.

25 4. **Coherence of democratic elements.** In mature democracies essential democratic elements form a
26 systemic and coherent whole that has enduring stability and acceptance among citizens. This is
27 sometimes called "consolidation."

28 5. **Functioning institutions.** Institutions of mature democracies attempt to work effectively to address
29 changing problems that require attention for the present and future well-being of society.

30 6. **Stability.** Even in the context of continuing evolution, a mature democracy exhibits a predictable
31 character and maintains its integrity as a system of governance and way of life.

32 7. **Status among nation-states.** Mature democracies govern their own internal affairs and take their place
33 as members of the international community.

34 E. **Overcoming obstacles to the preservation and improvement of existing democracies.** Not only is
35 democracy never finished or perfected, it must constantly be safeguarded against conditions that may threaten
36 it. A variety of responses can be used to counter these conditions.

1.   **Conditions that threaten democracy.** Democracies can regress or fail altogether. Some conditions in society or among its institutions may threaten the viability of democracy. These include:

   a.   **Ineffective or systematically inefficient government.** Democratic institutions may fail to provide effective, honest government. Corruption may pervade government, undermining the people's trust in their political institutions, breaking the connection between institutions and popular authority. Extreme conflict among political parties may fragment government to the extent that it prevents the adoption of policies that effectively meet the polity's needs. Democratic institutions may be unwilling to undertake reforms necessary for their effectiveness in policy making and for their responsiveness to the people. In extreme cases, the incapacity of government to achieve its minimum purposes of providing for   order and maintaining the operational integrity of its institutions may result in the breakdown of social, economic, and political functions.

   b.   **Social and religious fragmentation.** Important segments of society may come into conflict with each other on religious, ethnic, economic, or regional grounds. When constraints on the formation and operation of these groups within society are removed, conflict among them may be exacerbated and even erupt into violence. The institutions of democratic governance and civil society may be unable to mediate these conflicts, leaving democracy vulnerable.

   c.   **Economic failure.** The economic system may fail to provide sufficient stability or growth. Hyperinflation, the result of an excessive supply of money by government, may undermine social morale and economic performance. One generation or segment of society may sacrifice others in order to protect its economic status. A middle class may fail to develop or survive. Or an impoverished segment of society may become so frustrated that it becomes alienated from democratic institutions, separates itself from them, and resorts to anti-democratic options.

   d.   **Erosion of democratic ethos**. Erosion of faith in democracy and of belief in its capacity to serve its purposes may take place insidiously, without public awareness. In some circumstances, this erosion may result from a gradual reduction of the power of the people or their abdication of responsibility. Elected leaders may then take advantage of opportunities to advance authoritarianism by degrees, cloaking it in a democratic facade, e.g., calling it "guided democracy."

   e.   **Constitutional crisis.** Democracy may be jeopardized when there is a comprehensive breakdown of constitutional arrangements where institutions no longer function effectively or where a systematic disregard for constitutional principles breaks the trust of the sovereign people in their government.

   f.   **Social pathology.** Even in the most advanced democracies, destructive and seemingly intractable problems may occur. These may include severe social cleavages, violence among groups, widespread substance addiction, intergenerational antagonism, spread of irrationalism and pseudoscientific ideas, extremist political and religious ideas, and extensive criminality. These conditions may be especially threatening if they promote social breakdown, destructive social policy, disrespect for law and the institutions of government, and/or a disinclination of the people to reason together and to address their common political problems.

   g.   **Erosion of a people's sense of distinctiveness in the face of global homogenization.** Because democracy is grounded on a people's sense that they have a distinct identity and a common political destiny, an abdication to external controls and influences (cultural, economic, demographic, or political) may lead to an effective loss of political autonomy and self-determination.

   h.   **Lack of confidence in the future.** Democracy is predicated on hope—the belief that conditions can be improved, notwithstanding the extent of present difficulties. An environment of cynicism, fatalism, and nihilism threatens democracy. This can be especially true when unrealistic expectations of economic well-being do not materialize upon transition to democracy.

113

2. **Responses to anti-democratic trends**. To survive, democracies must identify and deal with anti-democratic trends in their midst. This is both a high-stakes and risky task because it may be necessary to subordinate some fundamental principles to others, resulting in the compromise of basic values of democracy. When it must be done, the task requires close scrutiny achieved through public examination, rigorous debate, and widespread participation in open decision-making. The people themselves need to judge whether limits should be placed on anti-democratic activities and what these limits might be.

a. **Constraints on the means used by anti-democratic groups in a democracy.** It is possible that democratic systems may sometimes need to prohibit groups from using democratic rights and procedures in attempts to destroy democracy. To be true to itself, must a democracy yield to an authoritarian movement that succeeds in gaining control through democratic means, e.g., elections? Or must a democracy yield to dictatorships or unconstitutional policies resulting from the use of democratic procedures? Examples of steps that might be considered include:

- **Limitations on expression, e.g.,** the prohibition of hate speech, of mass meetings for anti-democratic ideologies, and of advocacy of change of a democratic form of government by violent means

- **Restricting or outlawing political organizations, e.g.,** the banning of political organizations judged as posing a threat to democracy; government monitoring of the operations of anti-democratic political parties

b. **Constraints on outcomes achieved by anti-democratic movements that use democratic means.** Does the concept of democracy require allowing the undermining or destruction of a democratic system if this undermining or destruction is achieved through the use of democratic procedures?

Arguments for an affirmative response to this question include:

- Because the people are sovereign, they have the ultimate authority to change their government. Therefore, they have the right to change or abolish whatever government they may have. If they do, democratic principles require respect for the result.

- In a democracy the form of government is always under examination and reconsideration. Because democracy is never complete or perfected, even a commitment to democratic principles may entail enacting other forms of political system that may appear more desirable than democracy.

- Democracy has a fundamental commitment to democratic processes as the highest principle in a hierarchy of values. Therefore whatever results from these processes deserves the democratic imprimatur.

Arguments against an affirmative response to this question include:

- No one is obligated to yield to the destruction of basic rights of oneself or others. Even a super-majority or unanimous decision, honoring democratic procedures, cannot legitimately abrogate the rights of individuals, minorities, or the people as a whole.

- The concept of democracy includes an ongoing commitment to openness to change. The reason for this openness is democracy's commitment to a process of public contestation and openness to challenging currently held ideas. For this reason, a political system that prohibits reflection and choice cannot be a legitimate outcome because it contradicts the conditions that brought it about and undermines the future possibility of reflection and choice.

114

1   • Democracy by its nature is not "totalistic"; that is, loyalty to democracy does not encompass the
2   entire range of a person's values and commitments. Every person, therefore, is free to assume
3   commitments to principles other than those pertaining to a democratic political system. And
4   when a democratic political process produces outcomes that infringe upon these commitments,
5   a citizen's attachment to democracy does not entail an obligation to accept those outcomes.

6   • When a democratic political process produces non-democratic outcomes, the limits of
7   commitment to democracy have been surpassed. At that point supporters of democracy are not
8   obligated to accept the political system's outcomes.

9   • Democracy does not embrace the right of one generation to make decisions that irrevocably
10   bind future generations. This principle that the past cannot bind the present is often used to
11   justify the right to undo democratic institutions. But this principle is distorted if it is used to
12   justify the present binding of the future in such a way that democratic channels for decision-
13   making are closed.

14   3. **The citizen as a key agent in determining democracy's future.** Institutions and leaders have an
15   obligation to preserve and protect the principles of democratic governance. However, the role of the
16   citizen in the renewal, self-correction, evolution of democracy, and ultimate survival is even more
17   important. Democracy can exist only if it lives in the minds and hearts of its citizens. Citizens must do
18   more than profess their commitment to democracy. Not only individually but in concert with others,
19   citizens can demonstrate their commitment to democracy by

20   a. engaging in critical questioning of the polity's basic principles and the extent to which the
21   operations of their democracy are consistent with them

22   b. being alert to the possibility that current practices and policies are fall short of the realization of
23   fundamental democratic principles

24   c. being open to revision of judgments and commitments in light of better reasons and evidence

25   d. reflecting on and participating in public evaluation of the desirability of change in institutions and
26   constitutional arrangements

27   e. evaluating whether fundamental democratic values and principles are atrophying, and acting on that
28   evaluation

29   f. insuring that their civic actions reaffirm and are grounded in fundamental democratic values

30   g. devoting their energies and imagination to new possibilities for furthering the values and principles
31   of democratic self-governance

32   h. acting to accomplish political goals and to address the issues of public affairs with an understanding
33   that together they are to act as agents of the common good

34

35   stopped here

1
2

**VII. How does democracy shape the world
and the world shape democracy?**

3   A.   Are democratic values universal?

4   B.   What changes in the world have been spurred by the idea of democracy?

5   C.   What issues for democracy arise from the need for a nation-state and new developments at sub-national and
6   transnational levels?

7   D.   How do world affairs affect democracy?

8   E.   How do the concept and practices of democracy shape interactions among nation-states?

9   F.   What role should democracies play in encouraging democracy in the world?

VII. How does democracy shape the world and the world shape democracy?

Democracy operates in an international context. This international context affects the character and quality of democratic nation-states just as the existence of democracy in various nation-states affects the broader context of world affairs.

It is one thing to set forth justifications why any particular country should try to achieve or maintain democracy. It is a very different matter to claim that ultimately democracy is the proper standard of governance for all countries and for world politics generally. The process of justifying democracy in the world context poses open-ended and problematic questions such as the following.

A. **Are democratic values universal?** Universality implies that something is applicable across time, place, and culture. Something that is universal may be understood as arising from "the nature of things" or from the observation of regularities in humanity and commonalities across civilizations. Even though non-democratic values may have been prevalent for the greater part of human history, democratic values may still be considered to have existed in some form and therefore to be potentially universal. Or, even if they have not occurred prominently in human history, they might still be understood as constituting the progress towards which humanity has been moving.

Democratic values may be considered universal…

1. **…to the extent that democratic values reflect human nature.** To conclude that democratic values reflect human nature, one would have to ascertain the degree to which the following propositions are valid:

   a. **Secure existence.** A desire for self-government arises from an innate need for a secure existence.

   b. **Self-determination.** Democracy's commitments to individual and/or collective decision-making reflect a general human need for self-determination. All human beings are equally entitled to aspire to self-direction and to have an equal voice in the affairs of their community.

   c. **Shared decision-making.** In the absence of established political structures, the sharing of decision-making among members of a group arises naturally.

   d. **Opposition to oppressive rule.** Human beings have a natural instinct to be opposed to oppressive rule and an irrepressible inclination to have a voice in determining the affairs that affect their lives.

2. **...to the extent that democratic values are evident in all cultures.** Even if there are doubts that democratic values are a part of "the nature of things," some claim that values that support democracy are evident wherever human beings achieve civilized society. For example, even in societies that have traditions and established practices that may appear to be incompatible with democracy, some personal and political relationships and practices can be found that reflect elemental democratic values.

   a. **Friendship and family relationships.** These relationships are found in all cultures. To the extent that friendship is not a relationship of dictation but of subtle negotiation or that the relationship of family members is one of mutual, not one-sided obligation, the inherent elements of these relationships may reflect pre-political aspects of democracy.

   b. **Democratic elements in non-democracies.** Even non-democratic political systems sometimes exhibit political practices consonant with democracy. Authoritarian regimes may employ some elements of democracy in seeking legitimization, for example by soliciting the expression of popular opinion even when "elections" do not offer meaningful alternatives. They also may resort to

1   democratic procedures to conduct government, for example, consulting with and accommodating
2   important segments of society. If democratic qualities are useful even in systems substantially
3   opposed to democracy, one might conclude from such examples that certain democratic values are
4   inherent in the nature of governance itself.

3. **...to the extent that democratic values have articulated the political aspirations and informed the moral standards of human beings.** The term "democracy" has come to symbolize a hope for a better state of affairs and is widely considered a marker for the right and good in political arrangements. To determine the extent to which this claim is true one would have to assess, for example, the validity of the following propositions:

    a. **Individual aspirations reflect democratic values.** Individuals' aspirations or goals reflect democratic values, e.g., the desire to be treated fairly, to be able to express one's thoughts and feelings, to have a voice in decisions that may affect one, to cooperate with others to achieve common purposes.

    b. **Individuals' recognition of the relationship between their natural longings and democratic values.** The aspirations of individuals in their inner life may resonate profoundly with fundamental values most likely to be realized in a democracy, e.g., the desire to be treated with respect, for a peaceful existence, to be free of fear, and not to be treated arbitrarily.

    c. **Inherent attractiveness.** Democratic values and ideas have an inherent attractiveness, compelling logic, or call to conscience, e.g., political equality, distributive justice.

4. **...to the extent that democratic values and principles are useful for the understanding of political systems.** Like other categories of political analysis (e.g., relationships of political authority, human rights, and justice), democracy may provide guidelines for understanding a particular system of government. Democratic values may thus prompt questions that are effective in understanding any given political system—for example, what the role of the people is and whether those in authority are held accountable to them.

5. **...to the extent that democratic values and principles are useful for evaluating political systems.** Democratic values may serve as standards that can be used to evaluate any existing political system in reference to others. On the other hand, such standards might obscure or distort observations essential to understanding and/or evaluating political systems other than democracy.

6. **...to the extent that international norms and law regarding human rights are animated by values and principles closely associated with democracy.**

    a. **The development of international norms**. The idea of establishing norms for the behavior of polities is of ancient lineage. From Mesopotamian and Greek city-states and ancient China to the present, attempts have been made to establish norms of behavior among countries.

        • Norms among nation-states that originally pertained only to their formal relations to each other as countries have increasingly become focused upon the rights of persons, that is, with how states treat their own subjects or citizens.

        • International norms regarding rights essential to every human being have long included such rights as freedom of expression and dignity of the person. When these rights are translated into their more specific and practical forms (e.g., free speech and due process), it is evident that they are foundational to popular self-government. One might conclude that the concept of universal human rights at least partially encompasses the concept of democracy.

- In the process of establishing international norms, democratic values and principles have become the dominant standard for identifying and promulgating human rights for all people regardless of political borders. These standards are evident in various fundamental documents of nation-states and in international agreements.

- Democratic principles have not only advanced the cause of human rights, they have enriched the very concept of human rights and expanded the number and kinds of rights encompassed by the concept.

- Democratic values and principles have inspired action to spread the idea of human rights throughout the world and pressure governments to comply with international human rights norms.

b. **Human rights norms as international law.** Because norms may serve as moral imperatives and standards of evaluation, there have been transnational attempts to formulate norms of human rights as international law and to establish institutions for their enforcement and adjudication. Examples include conventions and agreements regarding:

- War crimes (Hague agreements, 1899-1907)

- Suppression of Slavery (1926)

- Forced Labor (1930)

- Freedom of Association (1948)

- Genocide (1948)

- Human Rights (1948, 1975)

- Rights of Women (1953)

- Rights of the Child (1989)

7. **...to the extent that democratic values appeal to the world.** Democracy may have an intrinsic appeal to the human spirit that spurs movements toward fundamental change in political systems. It may result in changes beyond political affairs, such as embracing the idea of an open society.

The ethos, achievements, and style of democratic culture have often found a ready audience among those in non-democratic countries, for example, in music, the arts, and consumer goods. One might therefore inquire whether the ethos of the open society and other distinctive aspects of democratic culture have worldwide appeal. If they do, one might also inquire into the extent to which this appeal promotes political democratization.

8. **…to the extent that democratic values promote a peaceable society.** Democracy may achieve a harmony among disparate interests and ideas within a society through its accommodation and moderation of conflict and discord. This domestic tranquility is essential for the flourishing of individual and community well-being.

B. **What changes in the world have been spurred by the idea of democracy?** The idea of democracy has promoted profound changes in political conditions, the concept of society, and the world-view of individuals. The idea of democracy is ancient and has had intermittent historical impact, but its effects have accelerated from the eighteenth to the twenty-first centuries, and have created their own momentum especially since the end of World War II.

The idea of democracy has changed conditions within given countries and in interactions among them. It has also produced changes in previously accepted ideas about how they should be governed.

1. **The nation-state.** The right to have a self-governing political community is used to justify organizing a people as a nation-state. It has impelled the development of the nation-state beyond its original historical status as an autocratically directed principality.

   a. **Democracy and decolonization.** The idea of democracy as involving a defined people choosing its own future has played a powerful role in the break-up of colonial empires and the establishment of nation-states in their place.

   b. **Democracy and "nationalism."** The creation of nation-states with definitive boundaries for self-governing peoples has, however, sometimes resulted in political entities whose internal fragmentation has resulted in political instability. The boundaries of countries and ethnic populations do not always coincide. Ethnic groups are at times involuntarily divided among countries where they are minorities, thwarting their desire for autonomous self-rule.

2. **The status of the individual.** Modern liberal democratic values require that each person be seen as a distinct and unique individual among others. Seeing persons as separate individuals, rather than having an identity derived primarily from membership in a group, leads to individual-to-individual relationships and to the re-conception of many groups as associations of individuals. It also leads to basing the standing of the individual on merit and achievement, not on membership in an inherited social class.

   a. **Individuality and critical questioning.** Democracy's promotion of individuality encourages persons to ask how authority over them can be justified and, where appropriate, challenged. Such questioning subverts traditionalist doctrines that assert an inherent right of one person or group to govern others. Moreover, individuality undercuts traditional patterns of deference in which conventional hierarchy determines governmental relationships.

   b. **Dual relationship of democratic citizens.** In democracy, the citizen is viewed as one among political equals. Each citizen

      • possesses equal rights with other persons as an equal member of the political community.

      • identifies with the whole political community as a member of that community and accepts obligations to protect and preserve it that arise from that membership.

   c. **Democracy and liberalism.** Over time, the democratic view of the person has become closely associated with a separate tradition of political thought that culminates in liberalism. The liberal view

      • asserts and emphasizes an understanding of the person as an independent, autonomous, and free-thinking being—as a unique personality.

      • sees the person both as fundamental to the political system and as transcending it. In the liberal view, the inherent value of the individual is not dependent on the political community even though, practically speaking, it may be secured there.

   d. **Dual foundation for the value of the individual.** Democracy's view of the individual coincides in an important way with liberalism's view of the individual. In both views the value of the individual is a foundation for a system of government. Both liberalism and democracy assume that persons are entitled to act upon their own judgments in individual self-government and to play an equal role in collective self-government.

120

- Democracy's view of persons as separate and equal units ("individuality") reinforces liberalism's view of persons as inherently independent and valuable ("individualism").

- These different underlying conceptions of the person may produce tensions, such as the one that occurs between equality and liberty in advanced liberal democracies.

e. **Emerging view of the individual.** The effect of the affinity of democratic and liberal understandings of the individual is an increasing tendency to conceive of persons as having a common identity owing to their status as equal and independent units regardless of their membership in any political community.

- This common identity has led to the proposition that it is possible to have "world citizenship" based on democratic principles.

- The counter-position is that democratic world citizenship is not possible because democratic citizenship requires membership in a separate self-governing polity. A common human "identity" and political "citizenship" are quite different things. Moreover, this counter-position holds that fundamental rights of individuals can be protected only by the organized political power of nation-states. Without membership in such a nation-state, the rights of individuals lack a practical institutional means of effective protection. In addition, no authoritative political means exist to define the character and extent of those rights.

3. **The world market.** Within the confines of a democratic country, the ideals of liberal democracy embrace the free exchange of political ideas, association, enterprise, and innovation. When democracy is extended to a transnational context, it carries with it the extension of these values not only to the international political sphere but also to the international economic sphere.

   a. **Loss of confidence in command economies.** Among a number of non-democracies, confidence in "command economies" (economies largely directed by a central authority) has been undermined when compared to the performance of the economies of liberal democracies.

   b. **Demands for market reforms.** At the same time, demands for political autonomy among communist states brought with them demands for democratic and market reforms. The spread of information about this process significantly extended democratic ideas to the world stage.

   c. **Political reform and creation of global market.** The process of fundamental political and economic change has aided in the continuing process of creating a global market in international trade and finance that transcends individual nation-states.

   d. **Global markets and the spread of democracy**. If it is true that market economies within a particular society reinforce stable democratic governance, a spread of the global market may prompt the spread of democracy worldwide. It may promote the development of market economies within participating countries and thus move them toward democracy.

4. **Civil society.** Liberal democracy encourages forms of association and cultural activity in which persons organize themselves and work together to achieve goals independent of government. According to this view, there may be no logical need for individuals, associations, or enterprises to be confined within the boundaries of nation-states.

   a. **Spread to international sphere.** When individuals, associations, or enterprises see their interests as extending beyond the nation-state, they organize associations or enterprises on a transnational basis. Elements of transnational civic society have been in the forefront on such issues as human rights, transparency in government, and the protection of the environment.

1   b.   **Democratic accountability.** Transnational organizations may not be democratically accountable,
2   and they may compete with or displace some of the functions of political community.

3   5.   **Science and technology.** Democracy is predicated on open discussion, unimpeded inquiry,
4   experimentalism, and a search for truth based on evidence, as distinguished from dogma and
5   predetermined answers. Therefore, science, technology, and the progress associated with them flourish in
6   a democratic environment where liberal freedoms are respected.

7   a.   **Democracy and communications technology.** Democratic culture, with its emphasis on both
8   creativity and responsiveness to people's wants, increases the pace of scientific inquiry and
9   discovery, which depend upon the dissemination of knowledge. This emphasis has spurred the
10   advance of the technology of communication as a means of promoting discussion, unencumbered
11   inquiry, and broad dissemination of ideas. Dissemination of knowledge not confined by national
12   boundaries is required by science as well as by commerce.

13   b.   **Possible dangers of technology.** Advances in science and technology are not always compatible
14   with democracy. Because technological means can restrict communication, information may be
15   limited in both content and accessibility. In contrast, the privacy of individuals may be threatened by
16   unrestricted access to personal information. Moreover, science and technology themselves may
17   generate a cult of expertise that may be incompatible with democratic decision-making.

18   6.   **Concept of time.** A democratic view of time contrasts with earlier ideas that the past simply repeats itself
19   or that the future involves merely waiting passively for whatever comes next. Democracy has a
20   potentially distinct and activist relationship to the future, present, and past. Democracy is not conceived
21   of as being constrained by the past, limited by the present, or as postponed to the future. Instead,
22   democracy may be understood as actively "making history" rather than merely responding to it or simply
23   accommodating to history's constraints on what can be considered possible. It reconstructs the past,
24   shapes the present, and creates its own future. Each of these temporal orientations, however, carries with
25   it certain dangers.

26   a.   **Democracy's relationship to the future.** Democracy is committed to making a future based on
27   decisions of people acting together to improve their lives and provide for posterity. The image of a
28   better future can be used to goad action to improve the present. But a potential obsession with living
29   in a better future may result in disregarding the problems and possibilities at hand. And it may be
30   used to insulate leaders from the consequences of their inaction or failures to deal adequately with
31   concerns of the present.

32   b.   **Democracy's relationship to the present.** Democracy's eagerness to cope with immediate
33   demands is an essential part of its attractiveness as a political form. Its capacity to respond to
34   impatience on the part of the people for improved conditions provides a practical justification for its
35   existence. Nonetheless, preoccupation with problems of the present may obscure the longer view,
36   preferring short-term to long-term projects, or choosing short term benefits at the expense of longer
37   term costs. At its extreme, the present generation may be catered to at the expense of future
38   generations.The perception of time may thus shift from duration to immediacy (or preoccupation
39   with the present), deeply affecting how persons behave and what they expect of their government.

40   c.   **Democracy's relationship to the past**. Democracy is not confined to what it inherits from the past.
41   The past, however, is a resource that democratic politics may use to address current problems. It
42   produces conditions that set the stage for defining and dealing with problems. It also provides a
43   repository of memory that can be reinvestigated to elicit new perspectives on current conditions.
44   Nevertheless, as a consequence of its dependence on popular sentiment, a democracy may become
45   fixated on positive or negative experiences or defining moments from its past. The problem is that
46   present and future choices may be constrained by the preoccupation either to recover the positive or

1   transcend negative past events. These obsessions may so dominate public thought and discussion
2   that they disrupt relationships inside or outside of the country and prevent effective responses to
3   current problems.

4   **d.**   **Democracy as the final stage of history.** Because democracy may seem to be the kind of political
5   system that best accords with human nature and has the greatest potential for fulfilling human
6   aspirations, its advocates may claim that it represents the final stage of political community. Thus,
7   progress itself would be conceived of as taking place only within the confines of a democratic ethos.
8   But, if democracy is seen as the "end of history," democratic achievements may themselves stifle
9   the exploration of alternatives that might better comport with human nature and serve human
10   aspirations.

11   7.   **International relations**. Democratic values and principles appear with substantial consistency within
12   existing democratic polities. These values and principles may be recognized as having an integrity and
13   validity that is independent of their origin and existence in a particular political system. The sharing of
14   these values and principles has led to a common identity that has profoundly affected relations in the
15   modern world.

16   a.   **Solidarity among democracies.** Among modern democracies, there may be a natural affinity and a
17   sense of solidarity. This solidarity has led to democracies acting in concert in international affairs to
18   promote democratic values and principles as universal and to expand them beyond their own
19   borders. This was one of the most marked developments of the 20th century.

20   b.   **Democratic imperialism.** There is a tendency to believe that if political principles are universal,
21   they are also uniform and should exist in nearly identical formulations across nation-states. This
22   belief has resulted in arrogance and intrusiveness on the part of some nation-states with regard to
23   others. It also has fueled attempts to impose political uniformity in nation-states, notwithstanding
24   differences in their circumstances.

25   8.   **Global standards for practices and institutions.** Traditionally, international standards have been agreed
26   upon as benchmarks to compare diverse local measures and values. These have included the gold
27   standard and the standard meter. However, until recently there have been no analogous standards that can
28   be applied at the international level to the practices and institutions of political systems.

29   a.   **Democratic ideas as universal standards.** If democracy is committed to such ideas as the equal
30   and independent worth of every human being and the values and principles of popular self-
31   government, then these values and principles can provide standards by which local institutions and
32   practices anywhere may be evaluated.

33   b.   **Democracy as the "gold standard" of political systems.** At present, because of the widespread
34   acceptance of democratic values and principles as touchstones for what is right and good, the
35   concept of democracy has evolved to become the benchmark to evaluate political practices and
36   institutions throughout much of the world. Thus, democracy has become the "gold standard" of
37   political affairs.

38   C.   **What issues for democracy arise from the need for a nation-state and from new developments at sub-**
39   **national and transnational levels?** Political entities include any institutionalized form of governance with
40   authority to make, apply, enforce, and interpret rules. These entities also associate persons into a larger whole.
41   Such entities may be non-governmental or formally governmental, but in either case they offer opportunities
42   and venues for political life. They may also be organized at different levels, e.g., nation-state, sub-national,
43   transnational:

44   1.   **The nation-state.** The sovereignty of the nation-state is universally recognized in international law.

a. **Sovereignty and international law.** Nation-states are conceived of as being "sovereign" according to the "law of nations" that arises from an understanding of the nation-state as an independent actor among other equally independent actors. "Sovereignty" in the context of international relations refers to the autonomy of each nation-state, as opposed to the understanding of the people as sovereign.

- **"State sovereignty" versus the concept of "popular sovereignty."** The preoccupation in theories of international relations and common usage with the "sovereignty" of nation-states may tend to replace the understanding of the term as referring to the people of a democratic nation-state as being the ultimate source of its authority. This may lead to a belief in international affairs that the state is sovereign over its people. But according to democratic theory, it is the sovereignty of the people in an organized political community that gives rise to the principle of nation-state "sovereignty" in the international context.

- **Forces competing with nation-states.** Governmental and non-governmental organizations focusing upon local, regional, or global matters are increasingly challenging the sovereignty of the nation-state. These organizations compete with the nation-state as the primary focus of political attention by citizens and as primary agents in international politics, e.g., devolution of authority to local or regional governments within a nation-state, multi-national corporations.

  Moreover, international law created through international agreements concerning a wide range of policy areas has in some cases eroded the autonomy of nation-states to make policy in these areas. Examples include the environment, economic topics, and human rights, all of which are the subjects of international agreements.

- **Limitations on nation-state sovereignty.** Trends towards localism, regionalism, globalism, and substantive international regulation may limit the sovereignty of the people within a political system. At the same time these trends may also transform the independence and autonomy of political entities in their relationship with each other.

b. **Compatibility of democracy and the nation-state.** There has been a powerful historical connection between democratic forms of government and the emergence of nation-states as the primary means of organizing political life in the world. The use of the term "nation" in the phrase "nation-state" should be distinguished from the use of the term nation to refer to a homogeneous population based on ethnicity, religion, or culture.

- **Need for a bounded entity or a political "vessel" to contain democracy and make it operational.** If democracy is to move beyond the level of theoretical ideas to become operational in practice, it must be realized within some vessel that can serve to demark its boundaries and achieve a substantial degree of self-sufficiency. Such a vessel includes a set of political arrangements (typically outlined in written constitutions) specifying a particular group of citizens, institutions, values, and practices. In modern times the bounded domain for democracy has been almost exclusively the nation-state.

- **Separation of each "political people" from humanity as a whole.** The existence of a democratically self-governing people entails the separation of a particular community from other communities and from the world at large. The characteristics of such a separate community are that it is bounded, self-sustaining, and stable.

- The **nation-state** as a platform for democracy. The nation-state:

124

- includes a particular political people and excludes others as opposed to attempting to incorporate all of humanity. Thus, the citizens may have a sense of attachment to a shared enterprise and a stake in its outcomes.

- is characterized by a level of self-sufficiency which allows it to secure its identity and maintain its independence. Decisions made by its people control this bounded domain.

- establishes political relationships distinct from familial or ethnic affinity which are intended to supersede ascriptive status, i.e., those which are arranged by human choice rather than derived from immutable characteristics such as gender or race. Thus, being a citizen of a nation-state transcends being a member of a particular ethnic group, allowing persons the possibility of moving beyond the confines of characteristics about which they have no choice.

- provides for the expression of the will of the people through institutions that have durability, consistency, and responsiveness.

- **Potential competitors to nation-states.** Some of the functions of nation-states might be performed in whole or in part by other political arrangements, some of which are emerging out of current experimentation and practices. These include demands for devolution such as by regional assemblies and other forms of governance. These arrangements may be transnational or sub-national, or different configurations of nation-states themselves.

c. **Discordance of democracy and the nation-state.** Democracy and the nation-state have developed historically in mutually reinforcing ways to such a degree that they might be considered necessary for each other. Even so, there has also been discordance among the ideas associated with the two. There are twin dangers to democracy from two different models of the nation-state that are in conflict with democracy. They are:

- **Bureaucratic statism.** In Europe the nation-state arose in the form of absolutist monarchies set up in opposition to the universal political regime claimed by the Roman Catholic Church and the Holy Roman Empire. Today, notwithstanding the evolution of democracy in contemporary nation-states, in some cases rigid bureaucracies overshadow democratic processes. Thus, a residue of monarchical authoritarianism may persist as a potential for statism—a concept of the state as absolute and independent of its people.

- **Populistic totalism**. Although the concept of a self-governing people is the essence of democracy, the idea of a people as an undifferentiated, organic mass is incompatible with democracy, especially liberal democracy, when the state is seen as

    - a **homogeneous political unit** with a "totalistic" identity, that is, one that demands that all members conform to a common set of beliefs and behaviors. This "totalism" denies the very idea of individuality. In other words, "peoplehood" trumps "personhood" or collective identity preempts individual identity.

    - an **organic entity** with a life of its own, independent of the individuals that compose it, e.g., the corporatist state where the "state" takes on an identity over and against its people, and the interests of the state supercede the welfare of its people. In other words, "collectivity" supercedes "commonwealth."

d. **The independence and autonomy of the nation-state and the sovereignty of the people.** Popular sovereignty requires an internationally autonomous nation-state because, without this autonomy, the people cannot be sovereign.

- **Necessity for political independence.** If government by the people is to make decisions, those decisions must be conclusive or the sovereignty of the people is compromised.

- **Danger of intervention in sovereign affairs.** Interventions by other nation-states and transnational organizations have often been made in the internal affairs of nation-states to promote democratic practices and values. Such interventions raise serious questions about the respect that countries owe to the sovereignty of member countries of the world community. Even in situations where countries may enter into multilateral agreements to observe democratic values or human rights (e.g., World Court, European Court of Justice), the enforcement of these agreements or of international law may encroach upon the independence of nation-states.

2. **Sub-national and transnational associations.** In addition to the nation-state, there are some forms of political community or relationships of authority that make popular self-government possible. Among these are:

   a. **Sub-national associations.** Within nation-states there may be self-governing sub-divisions of the entire state (e.g., as a result of federalism or decentralization) or special autonomous status accorded to certain groups (e.g., as a result of devolution or the establishment of distinct constitutional entities).

b. **Trans-national associations.**

- **Supra-national political associations.** Some organizations of nation-states have governmental authority in defined areas that transcends the authority of their member countries, e.g., the European Union and the former United Arab Republic. This authority is the result of agreements among member countries. Moreover the membership of these supra-national polity-like organizations is controlled internally by current members. In some cases the internal public policies and/or constitutional structures of potential members may be required to be adjusted or reconstructed to be congruent with the policies and structures of the larger organization. Other supra-national political associations may have jurisdiction over specified governmental functions of member countries such as the adjudication of controversies over human rights, e.g., the World Court, or the adjustment of economic policy, e.g., the World Trade Organization.

- **Governmental associations.** Some organizations that transcend nation-states have their own political structures and processes, e.g., confederations, regional treaty organizations, international entities based on treaty agreements such as the United Nations, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Organization of American States, Organization of African Unity, Association of Southeast Asian Nations, and the Arab League.

- **Non-governmental associations.** Organizations that comprise transnational civil society have a presence in more than one country. These organizations have their own structures and processes of governance that may compete with the governance of nation-states.

  Transnational organizations may have political ramifications and effects that connect various individuals, groups, and activities independent of governmental structures and agencies, e.g., multinational corporations, religious denominations, Amnesty International, the Red Crescent, and the International Red Cross.

  These organizations may also be governed autocratically or bureaucratically, with procedures that violate democratic principles. Thus they may make decisions contrary to the views of most of their members. Although these organizations may be undemocratic in organization and process, they may nevertheless promote outcomes that serve the public good in terms of the policies they advance.

c. **Specially contrived administrative arrangements.** There are numerous administrative arrangements that differ from conventional means of organizing political life. These administrative arrangements sometimes including limited forms of self-governance. They are created as expedient responses to political exigencies and historical circumstances. These arrangements include provisional governments, governments in exile, protectorates, trust territories, confederations, and "special authorities" such as the Palestinian Authority.

d. **Expatriate constituencies.** Some countries accord extraterritorial privileges of participation and/or protection to expatriate citizens of other nation-states.

D. **How do world affairs affect democracy?**

1. **International economics and finance**. It is difficult for many citizens to understand international economics because of its scale, pace, technical nature, and intangibility. Also, it is difficult for citizens and governments to directly influence decisions made by international public or private sector economic institutions and enterprises that may affect them. This situation makes it nearly impossible to hold decision-makers accountable to democratic institutions. In addition, the range of public choices may be reduced or controlled directly by international economic decision-makers or by other actors.

a. **External prescription of domestic policy.** Some international economic institutions and enterprises have the capacity to prescribe government policies on internal matters for nation-states.

- These economic institutions and enterprises may skew and limit the policy choices that can be made by governments. For example, multinational financial institutions may require that nation-states adopt certain policies in order to receive funding. Multinational corporations may require nation-states to adopt certain policies before they will invest in them and may withdraw investments if the countries do not comply with their demands.

- An increase in the scale of economic enterprise may result in operations beyond the scope of effective control by a nation-state. This situation raises an issue about the extent to which a nation-state can hold accountable individuals or organizations outside of that nation-state for actions which are of public consequence to its constituents.

- If multinational organizations require nation-states to establish policies supportive of democracy, they may have democratic effects even though they have been imposed by non-democratic means, e.g., protection of human rights, protection of private property, protection of the rights of labor, respect for contracts, security and order, a rule of law.

b. **Domestic benefits of international economics.** International investment may promote prosperity and enhance employment opportunities, which in turn may promote the development of middle classes—a positive factor for democracy.

Economic investment may also carry with it a propensity to search for knowledge and new ideas to enhance efficiency, productivity, and marketability that may be extended into the social and political realm. As a result of international economic competition, societies may be motivated to improve their educational system to make themselves more productive and competitive.

c. **International economics and democratic citizenship.** International transfer of labor and migration of workers, or transnational distribution of the tasks of production may:

- diminish "social capital" (such as associational networks) because the tasks of production are distributed among different countries, thus diminishing labor's capacity **to** organize, achieve unity, and therefore wield influence

- remove matters of consequence from the effective control of the country of one's citizenship

- relocates individuals from the country in which they are citizens when they work and live in other parts of the world

- provide for employment and national income that would otherwise be absent, moving the country toward sufficient prosperity to support democracy

- promote a more cosmopolitan concept of citizenship through exposure of the citizen to greater ethnic or racial diversity

d. **Economic reinforcement of political participation.** The promotion of economic initiative by international financial organizations may enhance individual capacity to make a difference both economically and politically. This increasing capacity may result from the skills and experience gained through competing in the marketplace.

2. **War, peace, and diplomacy**. Conditions of war and peace and the consequences of diplomacy have significant effects on the operation of democratic polities.

a. **Effects of war on democracy.** A state of war typically results in certain consequences both damaging and helpful to democracy.

- **Destructive consequences of war for democracy** include the following:

    - War emphasizes obedience rather than questioning authority, pressure to conform, extension of the domain of authority, shutting down or suspending aspects of a free society (e.g., the free flow of information or news), the extension of economic control, and a state of crisis resulting in social mobilization.

    - During war, even democracies may perceive authoritarian practices as necessary; the emotional appeal of charismatic authoritarian leaders may capture the imagination of publics haunted by insecurity or inflamed by international rivalries rooted in memories of the past, predicated on present interests, or based on fear for the future.

    - Participation in war may lead to periods of apolitical escapism and alienation once war is concluded, e.g., periods of cynicism that followed World War I in Europe and North America.

- **Productive consequences of war for democracy** include the following:

    - Because war is inherently disruptive it calls into question settled practices and prompts consideration of new possibilities. Even for victorious countries, previously established institutions may be subject to reevaluation. The trauma of war may, therefore, prompt social transformation and have democratizing effects.

    - The transformative experience of military service may foster egalitarianism, cosmopolitanism, a spirit of collective enterprise, self-confidence, efficacy, and identification with democratic values.

    - The war effort may entail a willingness to sacrifice for the welfare of the community and may heighten a sense that one is entitled to the respect of the community in consideration of one's sacrifices.

    - War may also raise expectations of how citizens should be treated by the community commensurate with the sacrifice required of them. New legislative measures suggested by a sense of justice, in this regard, are more likely to be undertaken in democracies, where those who sacrificed for their country have a greater voice.

    - The rationale countries use to justify war may be used in reverse as a standard against which their own actions are measured.

b. **Consequences of peace for democracy.** A state of peace or the absence of substantial crisis may have certain consequences both damaging and helpful to democracy.

- **Destructive consequences of peace for democracy** include the following:

    - Peace may foster complacency or lassitude with regard to the political system.

    - In peacetime social problems may be overlooked because they are deeply embedded in society or taken for granted as inevitable.

129

1
2
- During peacetime, citizens may be inattentive to political life because public issues may not seem to be of great moment.

- **Productive consequences of peace for democracy** include the following: Peace may

  - enable resources to be devoted to domestic matters which may improve the standard of life and allow for expansion of an economy.

  - sustain stable social conditions which allow calculated risks in social policy to generate innovation and progress.

c. **Diplomacy.** Diplomacy can serve as a model for accommodating seemingly intractable interests.

  - **Non-democratic features.** Negotiations may be conducted by executive agencies and commitments may be made, sometimes in secret, without open discussion. Such negotiations may not be able to accommodate the broad range of interests that normally come to the fore in open deliberation about public policy.

  - **Features beneficial to democracy**. Diplomacy may be employed in internal political processes as a standard for solving dispute, reinforcing democracy's commitment to government-by-discussion and resolution by give-and-take.

3. **Critical mass of democracies in the world**. The rapid increase in the number of democratic countries puts pressure on non-democratic countries to reform themselves according to democratic values and principles. As a result, the effects of a critical mass of democratic countries may be the proliferation and implementation of popular self-government on a scale greater than ever before in history. In the absence of attractive competing models of governance, democracy may seem to be "the only game in town."

   a. As popular self-government spreads to countries with different traditions and environments, practices and institutions may be adapted in ways that produce innovations that serve democratic values and enhance the democratic tradition. Instead of a competition between democracy and non-democracy, the world may shift to competition among variants of democracy.

   b. An alternative possibility is that autocracies may attempt to cloak themselves in the appearance of democracy.

E. **How do the concept and practices of democracy shape interactions among nation-states?** Because they coexist in the world, nation-states must necessarily interact with one another. Those interactions follow a process and logic regardless of the forms of government involved. But the principles of democracy may constrain, compel, or conflict with this process.

   1. **"Reason of state."** The term "reason of state" refers to states' tendency to seek their own interest, above all, their security interests. All nation-states, irrespective of their type of regime, act in accordance with overriding priorities in their relations with other nation-states and world affairs. Foremost among them is the necessity of any polity to protect itself. There may also be a natural drive to gain superiority or advantage over other nation-states.

      Nation-states' adherence to the idea of "reason of state" tends to promote a "realist" response to international affairs. The "realist" position emphasizes supposedly realistic appraisals about how nation-states behave empirically—that they seek their own interests above all other considerations.

   2. **"Reason of democracy."** A democratic country's values and principles help to shape its international relations even though they may not advance the country's immediate interests. This adherence to "reason of democracy" tends to promote an "idealist" response to international affairs. The idealist position emphasizes the legitimacy of choices that further values such as respect for human life and dignity, self-determination, and common interests among countries.

3. **Conflict and balance between "reason of state" and "reason of democracy."** Understanding international relations in accordance with the ideas of "reason of state" and "reason of democracy" poses questions about how much the conduct of international affairs is or should be animated by "realist" calculations about maintaining and furthering the security and power of the nation-state as opposed to "idealist" goals of promoting democracy.

4. **Problems in the creation of foreign policy in democracies.**

   a. **The deliberative processes characteristic of democracy**. In dealing with important issues of foreign affairs, democracies require broad consultation and deliberation among institutions and among citizens. Although deliberation may moderate extremes in foreign policy, it also may impede decisive and timely courses of action when they are appropriate.

   b. **Appraisals of comparative opportunity costs.** Public deliberation regarding the allocation of resources includes examination of the desirability of alternative uses of those resources. In the course of this deliberation, the costs of foreign policies may be highlighted and unfavorably compared to other options.

   c. **The influence of interest groups.** Democracies are obligated to consider the points of view of numerous interest groups. Because these interests vary in intensity and resources, some groups may exert a disproportionate impact on outcomes in foreign policy making. Moreover, divisions within a country may allow other countries to exploit loyalties and animosities.

   d. **The influence of public opinion.** Democratic government, sometimes called "government running on public opinion," must persistently attend to public sentiment, which is susceptible to frequent change and which may be the result of inadequate knowledge and understanding of the issues or options. Government thus may be more concerned with public reaction than with sound policy making.

   e. **The voice of democratic conscience.** Democratic values and principles provide moral standards by which pragmatic approaches to foreign affairs are judged. Adherence to such standards may constrain the implementation of policies that are in a country's interest or crucial to its survival. It may impel the pursuit of policies that are not in its interests. Or, democratic conscience may inspire policies that have little to do with a country's immediate interest or security.

5. **Relationship of democracy to war and peace.** The "realist" and "idealist" positions figure prominently in debates about the conduct of world affairs on such matters as waging war and maintaining peace.

   a. **Democracy as conducive to peace.** Democracies place a high value on the peaceful accommodation of conflict through competition, debate, negotiation, and compromise in internal affairs. They tend to favor such accommodation of conflict in external affairs.

   Because democracies place a high value on human life, they may be reluctant to go to war. Democracies have been shown to be less destructive of human life than non-democracies in both their domestic and foreign behavior.

   Because of democracies' aversion to hierarchy and authoritarian ideas of service to the state, militarism does not thrive in democratic societies. Democracies' devotion to liberty and equality leads to unease with the heroic ethos of the "warrior class."

   b. **Democracy as a rationale for war.** Because the first obligation of a democracy is to advance the security and other interests of its people, democratic governments, like other regimes, may choose war as a prudent means to achieve their objectives or even to maintain the power of current leaders.

132

1   Even though a democracy may not benefit from war, it may choose war as a means to promote
2   human rights and/or the right to popular self-government. In some cases, not going to war may be
3   seen as immoral. But in extreme cases democracy, held as a righteous ideology, may provoke
4   aggressive or belligerent crusades to rid the world of repressive regimes or rulers.

5 F.   **What role should democracies play in encouraging democracy in the world?** If democracy is thought of as
6   universally desirable, what actions might or should democratic governments take to encourage or protect it?
7   The imposition of democratic principles from outside a political system raises serious questions about the
8   compatibility of such actions with democracy itself. It also may raise questions about the right of a people to
9   political self-determination.

10   1.   **Why might democracies care about the internal political arrangements of other nation-states?**

11   a.   **Non-democratic political regimes as threats to democracy.** Citizens of a democracy may feel
12   frustrated or angry if regimes based upon principles antagonistic to democracy appear to flourish.
13   They may then feel that the seeming success of such regimes may be contagious and subvert their
14   own system.

15   b.   **Burdens of repressive or dysfunctional regimes on other nation-states.** Failures of repressive
16   political systems to respect the human rights of their people and to meet their basic needs may lead
17   to problems caused by such events as the migration of populations, refugees, demands for relief, and
18   the "export" of environmental and health problems.

19   c.   **Unpredictability and instability**. Although any unstable government may pose a threat to the
20   process of relations among nation-states, unstable non-democracies may pose more serious threats.
21   The absence of democratic legitimacy and constraints tends to foster inconsistency in their
22   leadership and a lack of predictability. The unreliability in their dealings with other countries makes
23   it more difficult for other countries to calculate their own self-interest. In addition, the potential
24   volatility of unstable regimes may extend beyond their own borders, destabilizing relationships
25   among countries.

26   d.   **Threat of aggression.** Regimes that are unsuccessful in their own internal affairs may resort to
27   aggressive behavior against other countries as a means of diverting attention from their own failures,
28   maintaining their own political power, or creating a pretext to repress their people. The inner
29   dynamics of a repressive regime may require a constant state of belligerence to sustain itself. This is
30   just one reason why non-democratic regimes are more likely than democracies to be aggressive.

31   e.   **Identification with fellow human beings.** Because of a natural sympathy for others that is not
32   limited to one's own community, citizens of a democracy may feel strong empathy for individuals
33   who are forced to live under systems of oppression. If individuals in a democracy believe they have
34   a duty to others in their own communities, they may also believe that duty may extend to others
35   beyond their borders. This sympathy may be heightened to the degree that citizens of a democracy
36   feel especially fortunate in the political and economic circumstances they may enjoy. Seeing others
37   in less fortunate circumstances, citizens of a democracy may feel a duty to extend the benefits they
38   enjoy to others.

39   f.   **The democratic conscience**. Democracies may find that the failure of other regimes to protect
40   human rights and serve the needs of their people is morally reprehensible. This may lead to a sense
41   of the rightness of opposing the existence of such political regimes.

42   g.   **Democracy as an exemplar.** There may be an inclination of successful democracies to proselytize
43   on behalf of the principles of popular self-government and human rights. Democracies may express

a sense of pride in what is seen as a superior political system and as the inevitable outcome of the evolution of human government.

2. **What strategies are used to further democracy in the world?** Strategies that might be used to further democracy in the world should be judged in terms of two standards. First, they should be appropriate to the norms of conduct of international relations. Second, the strategies should be efficacious in promoting democracy.

    a. **Direct imposition.** Democracy may be directly instituted in a nation-state after its military defeat, because the nation-state violated international norms to such a degree that it cannot be tolerated as a member of the "community of nations." This strategy may include the restoration of a previously democratic constitution or the imposition of an entirely new political structure devised from the outside or subject to external approval. It might even entail an externally imposed requirement that a country establish its form of government through a direct choice by its people.

    b. **Aggressive intervention.** There may be attempts to develop democracy in a nation-state through coercion short of military imposition. These attempts may include military threats, economic sanctions or boycotts, quarantines on participation in international life, as well as the deployment of troops or monitors to enforce peacekeeping or to supervise the political process. They also may include information disseminated from external sources to counteract state-controlled media.

    c. **Economic incentives or conditions.** Nation-states or international organizations may condition the approval of economic aid and investments on the institution of democratic reforms, e.g., the protection of human rights.

    d. **Political infrastructure and civic culture.** Nation-states or international organizations may adopt or encourage strategies aimed at developing economic, cultural, or educational capacities that they believe will provide an environment conducive to the evolution of democratic political institutions. These may include transfer of expertise; exportation of technology; economic development; communications and media development; educational programs; and exchanges of citizens, scholars, students, and professionals. Direct support of non-governmental organizations by other countries may be designed to develop civic competence and alternative centers of influence that compete with government power.

    e. **Non-interference**. Democracies might be committed to the view that it is better to leave other countries alone. This position may be based on the idea that democratic values and institutions need to or ought to arise naturally in the course of a country's own history and own political experience.

Without embracing this evolutionary idea, democracies may believe that even the best forms of political life should be freely chosen by a people and that only with its consent will democracy have a chance to succeed. Moreover, they may believe that if a people has freely and openly chosen another form of political organization, that choice should be respected.

In the democratic view, every country always has the right to choose its own destiny; in the long run, each country must chart its own course.