Principles in Brief

Using my vast knowledge of “googling” and plagiarism, I’ve compiled a short summary of major principles applicable to debates. This serves as a 70 page summary of the following:

Ethics

Source: http://www.bio.davidson.edu/people/kabernd/indep/carainbow/Theories.htm

Created by Catherine Rainbow for Biology 372 at Davidson College

Ethical theories and principles are the foundations of ethical analysis because they are the viewpoints from which guidance can be obtained along the pathway to a decision. Each theory emphasizes different points such as predicting the outcome and following one's duties to others in order to reach an ethically correct decision. However, in order for an ethical theory to be useful, the theory must be directed towards a common set of goals. Ethical principles are the common goals that each theory tries to achieve in order to be successful. These goals include beneficence, least harm, respect for autonomy and justice.

Ethical Principles

Beneficence

The principle of beneficence guides the ethical theory to do what is good. This priority to "do good" makes an ethical perspective and possible solution to an ethical dilemma acceptable. This principle is also related to the principle of utility, which states that we should attempt generate the largest ratio of good over evil possible in the world. This principle stipulates that ethical theories should strive to achieve the greatest amount of good because people benefit from the most good. This principle is mainly associated with the utilitarian ethical theory found in the following section of this paper. An example of "doing good" is found in the practice of medicine in which the health of an individual is bettered by treatment from a physician.

Least Harm

This is similar to beneficence, but deals with situations in which neither choice is beneficial. In this case, a person should choose to do the least harm possible and to do harm to the fewest people. For instance, in the Hippocratic oath, a physician is first charged with the responsibility to "do no harm" to the patient since the physician's primary duty is to provide helpful treatment to the patient rather than to inflict more suffering upon the patient.

One could also reasonably argue that people have a greater responsibility to "do no harm" than to take steps to benefit others. For example, a person has a larger responsibility to simply walk past a person rather than to punch a person as they walk past with no justified reason.

Respect for Autonomy

This principle states that an ethical theory should allow people to reign over themselves and to be able to make decisions that apply to their lives. This means that people should have control over their lives as much as possible because they are the only

people who completely understand their chosen type of lifestyle. Each man deserves respect because only he has had those exact life experiences and understands his emotions, motivations and body in such an intimate manner. In essence, this ethical principle is an extension of the ethical principle of beneficence because a person who is independent usually prefers to have control over his life experiences in order to obtain the lifestyle that he enjoys.

There are, however, two ways of looking at the respect for autonomy. In the paternalistic viewpoint, an authority prioritizes a dependent person's best interests over the dependent person's wishes (1). For example, a patient with terminal cancer may prefer to live the rest of her life without the medication that makes her constantly ill. The physician, on the other hand, may convince the patient and her family members to make the patient continue taking her medication because the medication will prolong her life. In this situation, the physician uses his or her authority to manipulate the patient to choose the treatment that will benefit him or her best medically. As noted in this example, one drawback of this principle is that the paternalistic figure may not have the same ideals as the dependent person and will deny the patient's autonomy and ability to choose her treatment. This, in turn, leads to a decreased amount of beneficence.

A second way in which to view the respect for autonomy is the libertarian view. This standpoint prioritizes the patient's wishes over their best interests. This means that the patient has control over her life and should be content with her quality of life because she has chosen the path of life with the greatest amount of personal beneficence. Although this viewpoint is more mindful of the patient's desires, it does not prevent the patient from making decisions that may be more harmful than beneficial.

Justice

The justice ethical principle states that ethical theories should prescribe actions that are fair to those involved. This means that ethical decisions should be consistent with the ethical theory unless extenuating circumstances that can be justified exist in the case. This also means that cases with extenuating circumstances must contain a significant and vital difference from similar cases that justify the inconsistent decision. An ethical decision that contains justice within it has a consistent logical basis that supports the decision. For example a policeman is allowed to speed on the highway if he must arrive at the scene of a crime as quickly as possible in order to prevent a person from getting hurt. Although the policeman would normally have to obey the speed limit, he is allowed to speed in this unique situation because it is a justified under the extenuating circumstances.

Ethical Theories

Ethical theories are based on the previously explained ethical principles. They each emphasize different aspects of an ethical dilemma and lead to the most ethically correct resolution according to the guidelines within the ethical theory itself. People usually base their individual choice of ethical theory upon their life experiences.

Deontology

The deontological theory states that people should adhere to their obligations and duties when analyzing an ethical dilemma. This means that a person will follow his or her obligations to another individual or society because upholding one's duty is what is considered ethically correct (1,2). For instance, a deontologist will always keep his promises to a friend and will follow the law. A person who follows this theory will produce very consistent decisions since they will be based on the individual's set duties.

Deontology provides a basis for special duties and obligations to specific people, such as those within one's family. For example, an older brother may have an obligation to protect his little sister when they cross a busy road together. This theory also praises those deontologists who exceed their duties and obligations, which is called "supererogation". For example, if a person hijacked a train full of students and stated that one person would have to die in order for the rest to live, the person who volunteers to die is exceeding his or her duty to the other students and performs an act of supererogation.

Although deontology contains many positive attributes, it also contains its fair number of flaws. One weakness of this theory is that there is no rationale or logical basis for deciding an individual's duties. For instance, businessman may decide that it is his duty to always be on time to meetings. Although this appears to be a noble duty we do not know why the person chose to make this his duty. Perhaps the reason that he has to be at the meeting on time is that he always has to sit in the same chair. A similar scenario unearths two other faults of deontology including the fact that sometimes a person's duties conflict, and that deontology is not concerned with the welfare of others. For instance, if the deontologist who must be on time to meetings is running late, how is he supposed to drive? Is the deontologist supposed to speed, breaking his duty to society to uphold the law, or is the deontologist supposed to arrive at his meeting late, breaking his duty to be on time? This scenario of conflicting obligations does not lead us to a clear ethically correct resolution nor does it protect the welfare of others from the deontologist's decision. Since deontology is not based on the context of each situation, it does not provide any guidance when one enters a complex situation in which there are conflicting obligations.

Utilitarianism

The utilitarian ethical theory is founded on the ability to predict the consequences of an action. To a utilitarian, the choice that yields the greatest benefit to the most people is the choice that is ethically correct. One benefit of this ethical theory is that the utilitarian can compare similar predicted solutions and use a point system to determine which choice is more beneficial for more people. This point system provides a logical and rationale argument for each decision and allows a person to use it on a case-by-case context.

There are two types of utilitarianism, act utilitarianism and rule utilitarianism. Act utilitarianism adheres exactly to the definition of utilitarianism as described in the above section. In act utilitarianism, a person performs the acts that benefit the most people, regardless of personal feelings or the societal constraints such as laws. Rule utilitarianism, however, takes into account the law and is concerned with fairness. A rule utilitarian seeks to benefit the most people but through the fairest and most just means available. Therefore, added benefits of rule utilitarianism are that it values justice and includes beneficence at the same time.

As with all ethical theories, however, both act and rule utilitarianism contain numerous flaws. Inherent in both are the flaws associated with predicting the future. Although people can use their life experiences to attempt to predict outcomes, no human being can be certain that his predictions will be true. This uncertainty can lead to unexpected results making the utilitarian look unethical as time passes because his choice did not benefit the most people as he predicted. For example, if a person lights a fire in a fireplace in order to warm his friends, and then the fire burns down the house because the soot in the chimney caught on fire, then the utilitarian now seems to have chosen an unethical decision. The unexpected house fire is judged as unethical because it did not benefit his friends.

Another assumption that a utilitarian must make is that he has the ability to compare the various types of consequences against each other on a similar scale. However, comparing material gains such as money against intangible gains such as happiness is impossible since their qualities differ to such a large extent.

A third failing found in utilitarianism is that it does not allow for the existence of supererogation or heroes. In other words, people are obligated to constantly behave so that the most people benefit regardless of the danger associated with an act. For instance, a utilitarian who sacrifices her life to save a train full of people is actually fulfilling an obligation to society rather than performing a selfless and laudable act.

As explained above, act utilitarianism is solely concerned with achieving the maximum good. According to this theory an individual's rights may be infringed upon in order to benefit a greater population. In other words, act utilitarianism is not always concerned with justice, beneficence or autonomy for an individual if oppressing the individual leads to the solution that benefits a majority of people. Another source of instability within act utilitarianism is apparent when a utilitarian faces one set of variable conditions and then suddenly experiences a change in those variables that causes her to change her original

decision. This means that an act utilitarian could be nice to you one moment and then dislike you the next moment because the variables have changed, and you are no longer beneficial to the most people.

Rule utilitarianism also contains a source of instability that inhibits its usefulness. In rule utilitarianism, there is the possibility of conflicting rules. Let us revisit the example of a person running late for his meeting. While a rule utilitarian who just happens to be a state governor may believe that it is ethically correct to arrive at important meetings on time because the members of the state government will benefit from this decision, he may encounter conflicting ideas about what is ethically correct if he is running late. As a rule utilitarian, he believes that he should follow the law because this benefits an entire society, but at the same time, he believes that it is ethically correct to be on time for his meeting because it is a state government meeting that also benefits the society. There appears to be no ethically correct answer for this scenario.

Rights

In the rights ethical theory the rights set forth by a society are protected and given the highest priority. Rights are considered to be ethically correct and valid since a large or ruling population endorses them. Individuals may also bestow rights upon others if they have the ability and resources to do so. For example, a person may say that her friend may borrow the car for the afternoon. The friend who was given the ability to borrow the car now has a right to the car in the afternoon.

A major complication of this theory on a larger scale, however, is that one must decipher what the characteristics of a right are in a society. The society has to determine what rights it wants to uphold and give to its citizens. In order for a society to determine what rights it wants to enact, it must decide what the society's goals and ethical priorities are. Therefore, in order for the rights theory to be useful, it must be used in conjunction with another ethical theory that will consistently explain the goals of the society. For example in America people have the right to choose their religion because this right is upheld in the Constitution. One of the goals of the founding fathers' of America was to uphold this right to freedom of religion. However, under Hitler's reign in Germany, the Jews were persecuted for their religion because Hitler decided that Jews were detrimental to Germany's future success. The American government upholds freedom of religion while the Nazi government did not uphold it and, instead, chose to eradicate the Jewish religion and those who practiced it.

Casuist

The casuist ethical theory is one that compares a current ethical dilemma with examples of similar ethical dilemmas and their outcomes. This allows one to determine the severity of the situation and to create the best possible solution according to others' experiences. Usually one will find paradigms that represent the extremes of the situation so that a compromise can be reached that will hopefully include the wisdom gained from the previous examples.

One drawback to this ethical theory is that there may not be a set of similar examples for a given ethical dilemma. Perhaps that which is controversial and ethically questionable is new and unexpected. Along the same line of thinking, a casuistical theory also assumes that the results of the current ethical dilemma will be similar to results in the examples. This may not be necessarily true and would greatly hinder the effectiveness of applying this ethical theory.

Virtue

The virtue ethical theory judges a person by his character rather than by an action that may deviate from his normal behavior. It takes the person's morals, reputation and motivation into account when rating an unusual and irregular behavior that is considered unethical. For instance, if a person plagiarized a passage that was later detected by a peer, the peer who knows the person well will understand the person's character and will be able to judge the friend. If the plagiarizer normally follows the rules and has good standing amongst his colleagues, the peer who encounters the plagiarized passage may be able to judge his friend more leniently. Perhaps the researcher had a late night and simply forgot to credit his or her source appropriately.

Conversely, a person who has a reputation for scientific misconduct is more likely to be judged harshly for plagiarizing because of his consistent past of unethical behavior.

One weakness of this ethical theory is that it does not take into consideration a person's change in moral character. For example, a scientist who may have made mistakes in the past may honestly have the same late night story as the scientist in good standing. Neither of these scientists intentionally plagiarized, but the act was still committed. On the other hand, a researcher may have a sudden change from moral to immoral character may go unnoticed until a significant amount of evidence mounts up against him or her.

Conclusion

Ethical theories and principles bring significant characteristics to the decision-making process. Although all of the ethical theories attempt to follow the ethical principles in order to be applicable and valid by themselves, each theory falls short with complex flaws and failings. However, these ethical theories can be used in combination in order to obtain the most ethically correct answer possible for each scenario. For example, a utilitarian may use the casuistic theory and compare similar situations to his real life situation in order to determine the choice that will benefit the most people. The deontologist and the rule utilitarian governor who are running late for their meeting may use the rights ethical theory when deciding whether or not to speed to make it to the meeting on time. Instead of speeding, they would slow down because the law in the rights theory is given the highest priority, even if it means that the most people may not benefit from the decision to drive the speed limit. By using ethical theories in combination, one is able to use a variety of ways to analyze a situation in order to reach the most ethically correct decision possible

We are fortunate to have a variety of ethical theories that provide a substantial framework when trying to make ethically correct answers. Each ethical theory attempts to adhere to the ethical principles that lead to success when trying to reach the best decision. When one understands each individual theory, including its strengths and weaknesses, one can make the most informed decision when trying to achieve an ethically correct answer to a dilemma.

Democracy

Source: http://asmarino.com/articles/1442-principles-of-democracy

Source: MAD Training Handbook 2010

Principles of Democracy

by the State Department's Bureau of International Information Programs

Introduction

This page contains 21 pieces in a new series of one-page primers on the fundamentals of democracy produced by the State Department's Bureau of International Information Programs. Each of these short papers is available in English, Arabic, Chinese, Dari, French, Korean, Pashto, Persian, Portuguese, Russian, and Spanish versions.

Although the term is ubiquitous in today's world, explaining "democracy" can be challenging. This series provides the reader with an overview paper and then breaks down the specific elements of democratic governance into individual topics. Each paper in the series reflects both the thinking of mainstream theorists and common practices of the many free societies now flourishing under systems of democratic governance.

(1) Overview: What is Democracy?

Democracy comes from the Greek word, "demos," meaning people. In democracies, it is the people who hold sovereign power over legislator and government.

Although nuances apply to the world's various democracies, certain principles and practices distinguish democratic government from other forms of government.

• Democracy is government in which power and civic responsibility are exercised by all citizens, directly or through their freely elected representatives.
• Democracy is a set of principles and practices that protect human freedom; it is the institutionalization of freedom.
• Democracy rests upon the principles of majority rule, coupled with individual and minority rights. All democracies, while respecting the will of the majority, zealously protect the fundamental rights of individuals and minority groups.
• Democracies guard against all-powerful central governments and decentralize government to regional and local levels, understanding that local government must be as accessible and responsive to the people as possible.
• Democracies understand that one of their prime functions is to protect such basic human rights as freedom of speech and religion; the right to equal protection under law; and the opportunity to organize and participate fully in the political, economic, and cultural life of society.
• Democracies conduct regular free and fair elections open to all citizens. Elections in a democracy cannot be facades that dictators or a single party hide behind, but authentic competitions for the support of the people.
• Democracy subjects governments to the rule of law and ensures that all citizens receive equal protection under the law and that their rights are protected by the legal system.
• Democracies are diverse, reflecting each nation's unique political, social, and cultural life. Democracies rest upon fundamental principles, not uniform practices.
• Citizens in a democracy not only have rights, they have the responsibility to participate in the political system that, in turn, protects their rights and freedoms.
• Democratic societies are committed to the values of tolerance, cooperation, and compromise. Democracies recognize that reaching consensus requires compromise and that it may not always be attainable. In the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "intolerance is itself a form of violence and an obstacle to the growth of a true democratic spirit."

(2) Majority Rule, Minority Rights

On the surface, the principles of majority rule and the protection of individual and minority rights would seem contradictory. In fact, however, these principles are twin pillars holding up the very foundation of what we mean by democratic government.

• Majority rule is a means for organizing government and deciding public issues; it is not another road to oppression. Just as no self-appointed group has the right to oppress others, so no majority, even in a democracy, should take away the basic rights and freedoms of a minority group or individual.
• Minorities – whether as a result of ethnic background, religious belief, geographic location, income level, or simply as the losers in elections or political debate – enjoy guaranteed basic human rights that no government, and no majority, elected or not, should remove.
• Minorities need to trust that the government will protect their rights and self-identity. Once this is accomplished, such groups can participate in, and contribute to their country's democratic institutions.
• Among the basic human rights that any democratic government must protect are freedom of speech and expression; freedom of religion and belief; due process and equal protection under the law; and freedom to organize, speak out, dissent, and participate fully in the public life of their society.
• Democracies understand that protecting the rights of minorities to uphold cultural identity, social practices, individual consciences, and religious activities is one of their primary tasks.
• Acceptance of ethnic and cultural groups that seem strange if not alien to the majority can represent one of the greatest challenges that any democratic government can face. But democracies recognize that diversity can be an enormous asset. They treat these differences in identity, culture, and values as a challenge that can strengthen and enrich them, not as a threat.
• There can be no single answer to how minority-group differences in views and values are resolved – only the sure knowledge that only through the democratic process of tolerance, debate, and willingness to compromise can free societies reach agreements that embrace the twin pillars of majority rule and minority rights.

(3) Civil-Military Relations

Issues of war and peace are the most momentous any nation can face, and at times of crisis, many nations turn to their military for leadership.
Not in democracies.
In democracies, questions of peace and war or other threats to national security are the most important issues a society

faces, and thus must be decided by the people, acting through their elected representatives. A democratic military serves its nation rather than leads it. Military leaders advise the elected leaders and carry out their decisions. Only those who are elected by the people have the authority and the responsibility to decide the fate of a nation.
This idea of civilian control and authority over the military is thus, fundamental to democracy.

• Civilians need to direct their nation's military and decide issues of national defense not because they are necessarily wiser than military professionals, but precisely because they are the people's representatives and as such are charged with the responsibility for making these decisions and remaining accountable for them.
• The military in a democracy exists to protect the nation and the freedoms of its people. It does not represent or support any political viewpoint or ethnic and social group. Its loyalty is to the larger ideals of the nation, to the rule of law, and to the principle of democracy itself.
• Civilian control assures that a country's values, institutions, and policies are the free choices of the people rather than the military. The purpose of a military is to defend society, not define it.
• Any democratic government values the expertise and advice of military professionals in reaching policy decisions about defense and national security. Civilian officials rely upon the military for expert advice on these matters and to carry out the decisions of the government. But only the elected civilian leadership should make ultimate policy decisions – which the military then implements in its sphere.
• Military figures may, of course, participate fully and equally in the political life of their country just like any other citizens – but only as individual voters. Military people must first retire from military service before becoming involved in politics; armed services must remain separate from politics. The military are the neutral servants of the state, and the guardians of society.
• Ultimately, civilian control of the military ensures that defense and national security issues do not compromise the basic democratic values of majority rule, minority rights, and freedom of speech, religion, and due process. It is the responsibility of all political leaders to enforce civilian control and the responsibility of the military to obey the lawful orders of civilian authorities.

(4) Political Parties

To preserve and protect individual rights and freedoms, a democratic people must work together to shape the government of their choosing. And the principal way of doing that is through political parties.

• Political parties are voluntary organizations that link the people and their government. Parties recruit candidates and campaign to elect them to public office, and they mobilize people to participate in selecting government leaders.
• The majority party (or the party elected to control the offices of government) seeks to enact into law a number of different policies and programs. Parties of the opposition are free to criticize the majority party's policy ideas and offer their own proposals.
• Political parties provide a way for citizens to hold elected party officials accountable for their actions in government.
• Democratic political parties have faith in the principles of democracy so that they recognize and respect the authority of the elected government even when their party leaders are not in power.
• Like any democracy, members of various political parties reflect the diversity of the cultures in which they arise. Some are small and built around a set of political beliefs. Others are organized around economic interests, or shared history. Still others are loose alliances of different citizens who may only come together at election time.
• All democratic political parties, whether they are small movements or large national coalitions, share the values of compromise and tolerance. They know that only through broad alliances and cooperation with other political parties and organizations can they provide the leadership and common vision that will win the support of the people of the nation.
• Democratic parties recognize that political views are fluid and changeable, and that consensus can often arise out of the clash of ideas and values in peaceful, free, and public debate.
• The concept of the loyal opposition is central to any democracy. It means that all sides in political debate – however deep their differences – share the fundamental democratic values of freedom of speech and faith, and equal protection under law. Parties that lose elections step into the role of opposition – confident that the political system will continue to protect their right to organize and speak out. In time, their party will have a chance to campaign again for its ideas, and the votes of the people.
• In a democracy, the struggle between political parties is not a fight for survival, but a competition to serve the people.

(5) Citizen Responsibilities

Unlike a dictatorship, a democratic government exists to serve the people, but citizens in democracies must also agree to abide by the rules and obligations by which they are governed. Democracies grant many freedoms to their citizens

including the freedom to dissent and criticize the government.
Citizenship in a democracy requires participation, civility, and even patience.

• Democratic citizens recognize that they not only have rights, they have responsibilities. They recognize that democracy requires an investment of time and hard work – a government of the people demands constant vigilance and support by the people.
• Under some democratic governments, civic participation means that citizens are required to serve on juries, or give mandatory military or civilian national service for a period of time. Other obligations apply to all democracies and are the sole responsibility of the citizen – chief among these is respect for law. Paying one's fair share of taxes, accepting the authority of the elected government, and respecting the rights of those with differing points of view are also examples of citizen responsibility.
• Democratic citizens know that they must bear the burden of responsibility for their society if they are to benefit from its protection of their rights.
• There is a saying in free societies: you get the government you deserve. For democracy to succeed, citizens must be active, not passive, because they know that the success or failure of the government is their responsibility, and no one else's. In turn, government officials understand that all citizens should be treated equally and that bribery has no place in a democratic government.
• In a democratic system, people unhappy with their leaders are free to organize and peacefully make the case for change – or try to vote those leaders out of office at established times for elections.
• Democracies need more than an occasional vote from their citizens to remain healthy. They need the steady attention, time, and commitment of large numbers of their citizens who, in turn, look to the government to protect their rights and freedoms.
• Citizens in a democracy join political parties and campaign for the candidates of their choice. They accept the fact that their party may not always be in power.
-- They are free to run for office or serve as appointed public officials for a time.
-- They utilize a free press to speak out on local and national issues.
-- They join labor unions, community groups, and business associations.
-- They join private voluntary organizations that share their interests – whether devoted to religion, ethnic culture, academic study, sports, the arts, literature, neighborhood improvement, international student exchanges, or a hundred other different activities.
-- All these groups – no matter how close to, or remote from government – contribute to the richness and health of their democracy.

(6) A Free Press

In a democracy the press should operate free from governmental control. Democratic governments do not have ministries of information to regulate content of newspapers or the activities of journalists; requirements that journalists be vetted by the state; or force journalists to join government-controlled unions.
• A free press informs the public, holds leaders accountable, and provides a forum for debate of local and national issues.
• Democracies foster the existence of a free press. An independent judiciary, civil society with rule of law, and free speech all support a free press. A free press must have legal protections.
• In democracies the government is accountable for its actions. Citizens therefore expect to be informed about decisions their governments make on their behalf. The press facilitates this "right to know," by serving as a watchdog over the government, helping citizens to hold government accountable, and questioning its policies. Democratic governments grant journalists access to public meetings and public documents. They do not place prior restraints on what journalists may say or print.
• The press, itself, must act responsibly. Through professional associations, independent press councils, and "ombudsmen," in-house critics who hear public complaints, the press responds to complaints of its own excesses and remains internally accountable.
• Democracy requires the public to make choices and decisions. In order for the public to trust the press, journalists must provide factual reporting based on credible sources and information. Plagiarism and false reporting are counterproductive to a free press.
• Press outlets should establish their own editorial boards, independent of government control, in order to separate information gathering and dissemination from editorial processes.
• Journalists should not be swayed by public opinion, only by the pursuit of truth, as close as they can get to it. A democracy allows the press to go about its business of collecting and reporting the news without fear or favor from the government.
• Democracies foster a never-ending struggle between two rights: The government's obligation to protect national

security; and the people's right to know, based on journalists' ability to access information. Governments sometimes need to limit access to information considered too sensitive for general distribution. But journalists in democracies are fully justified in pursuing such information.

(7) Federalism

When diverse groups of free people – with different languages, religious faiths, or cultural norms – choose to live under an agreed constitutional framework, they expect a degree of local autonomy and equal economic and social opportunities. A federal system of government – power shared at the local, regional, and national levels – empowers elected officials who design and administer policies tailored to local and regional needs. They work in partnership with a national government and with each other to solve the many problems the nation faces.

- Federalism is a system of shared power and decision-making between two or more freely elected governments with authority over the same people and geographical area. It grants and protects decision-making ability where results are most immediately felt – in local communities, as well as at higher levels of government.
- Federalism fosters government accountability to the people and encourages citizen participation and civic responsibility by allowing local governments to design and administer local laws.
- A federal system is strengthened by a written constitution granting authority and outlining the scope of shared responsibilities enjoyed by each level of government.
- While it is generally agreed that local governments should satisfy local needs, some issues are best left to the national government. Defense, international treaties, federal budgets, and postal services are often cited as examples.
- Local ordinances reflect the preferences by which local communities choose to live – police and fire patrols, school administration, and local health and building regulations are often designed and administered locally.
- Intergovernmental relations means that various governments in a federal state (national, regional, and local) work together when issues of statutory authority imply the need to address issues cooperatively. The national government often has authority to mediate disputes between regions.
- In a geographically large and economically diverse nation, disparities in income and social welfare among regions can be addressed by the national government through policies that redistribute tax revenues.
- A federal system is responsive and inclusive. Citizens are free to run for government positions at all levels – local and regional governments offer the most positions and, perhaps, the most opportunity to make a difference in their communities.
- Federalism provides multiple opportunities for political parties to serve their constituents. Even if a particular party does not hold a majority in the national legislature or the executive, it is permitted to participate at the regional and local levels.

(8) Rule of Law

For much of human history, rulers and law were synonymous – law was simply the will of the ruler. A first step away from such tyranny was the notion of rule by law, including the notion that even a ruler is under the law and should rule by virtue of legal means. Democracies went further by establishing the rule of law. Although no society or government system is problem-free, rule of law protects fundamental political, social, and economic rights and reminds us that tyranny and lawlessness are not the only alternatives.

- Rule of law means that no individual, president or private citizen, stands above law. Democratic governments exercise authority by way of law and are themselves subject to law's constraints.
- Laws should express the will of the people, not the whims of kings, dictators, military officials, religious leaders, or self-appointed political parties.
- Citizens in democracies are willing to obey the laws of their society, then, because they are submitting to their own rules and regulations. Justice is best achieved when the laws are established by the very people who must obey them.
- Under the rule of law, a system of strong, independent courts should have the power and authority, resources, and the prestige to hold government officials, even top leaders, accountable to the nation's laws and regulations.
- For this reason, judges should be well trained, professional, independent, and impartial. To serve their necessary role in the legal and political system, judges must be committed to the principles of democracy.
- The laws of a democracy may have many sources: written constitutions; statutes and regulations; religious and ethical teachings; and cultural traditions and practices. Regardless of origin the law should enshrine certain provisions to protect the rights and freedoms of citizens:
- Under the requirement of equal protection under the law, the law may not be uniquely applicable to any single individual or group.
- Citizens must be secure from arbitrary arrest and unreasonable search of their homes or the seizure of their personal

property.
• Citizens charged with crimes are entitled to a speedy and public trial, along with the opportunity to confront and question their accusers. If convicted, they may not be subjected to cruel or unusual punishment.
• Citizens cannot be forced to testify against themselves. This principle protects citizens from coercion, abuse, or torture and greatly reduces the temptation of police to employ such measures.

(9) Human Rights

All human beings are born with inalienable rights. These human rights empower people to pursue lives of dignity – thus, no government can bestow them but all governments should protect them. Freedom, built on a foundation of justice, tolerance, dignity, and respect – regardless of ethnicity, religion, political association, or social standing – allows people to pursue these fundamental rights. Whereas dictatorships deny human rights, free societies continually strive to attain them.
Human rights are interdependent and indivisible; they encompass myriad facets of human existence including social, political, and economic issues. Among the most commonly accepted are:

• All people should have the right to form their own opinions and express them individually or in peaceful assemblies. Free societies create a "marketplace of ideas" where people exchange their views on any number of issues.
• All people should have the right to participate in government. Governments should create laws that protect human rights while justice systems enforce those laws equally among the population.
• Freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention, and torture – whether one is an opponent of the ruling political party, an ethnic minority, or even a common criminal – is a basic human right. A professional police force respects all citizens as it enforces the laws of the nation.
• In ethnically diverse nations, religious and ethnic minorities should be free to use their language and maintain their traditions without fear of recrimination from the majority population. Governments should recognize the rights of minorities while respecting the will of the majority.
• All people should have the opportunity to work, earn a living, and support their families.
• Children deserve special protection. They should receive at least an elementary education, proper nutrition, and healthcare.
• To maintain human rights, citizens in any free society need to be vigilant. Citizen responsibility – through a variety of participatory activities – ensures that government remains accountable to the people. The family of free nations is committed to work toward protection of human rights. They formalize their commitment through a number of international treaties and covenants on human rights.

(10) Executive Power

Leaders of democratic governments govern with the consent of their citizens. Such leaders are powerful not because they command armies or economic wealth, but because they respect the limits placed on them by the electorate in a free and fair election.

• Through free elections, citizens of a democracy confer powers upon their leaders that are defined by law. In a constitutional democracy, power is divided so that the legislature makes the laws, the executive authority enforces and carries them out, and the judiciary operates independently.
• Democratic leaders are neither elected dictators nor "presidents-for-life." They serve fixed terms in office and accept the results of free elections, even if it means losing control of the government.
• In constitutional democracies, executive authority is generally limited in three ways: by a system of checks and balances separating the national government's executive, legislative, and judicial powers; by federalism, which divides power between the national government and the state/local governments; and by constitutional guarantees of fundamental rights.
• At the national level, the executive is limited by the constitutional authority vested in the legislative branch and by an independent judiciary
• Executive authority in modern democracies is generally organized in one of two ways: as a parliamentary or a presidential system.
-- In a parliamentary system, the majority party in the legislature forms the executive branch of the government, headed by a prime minister.
-- In a parliamentary system, the legislative and executive branches are not entirely distinct from one another, since the prime minister and members of the cabinet are drawn from the parliament. In such systems, the political opposition serves as a chief means of limiting, or checking the authority of the executive.

-- In a presidential system, the president is elected separately from the members of the legislature.
-- In a presidential system, both the president and the legislature have their own power bases and political constituencies, which serve to check and balance each other.
• Democracies do not require their governments to be weak, only limited. Consequently, democracies may be slow to reach agreement on national issues; yet when they do, their leaders can act with great authority and confidence.
• At all times, leaders in a constitutional democracy function within the rule of law that defines and restricts their authority.

(11) Legislative Power

Elected representatives in a democracy – whether members of a parliament, assembly, or Congress – are there to serve the people. They perform a number of roles essential to the functioning of a healthy democracy.
• Elected legislatures are the principal forum for deliberating, debating, and passing laws in a representative democracy. They are not so-called rubber stamp parliaments merely approving the decisions of an authoritarian leader.
• Oversight and investigation powers allow legislators to publicly question government officials about their actions and decisions, and otherwise serve as a check on the power of various government ministries – especially in the presidential system of governing where the legislature is separate from the executive.
• Legislators may approve national budgets, conduct hearings on pressing issues, and confirm executive appointees to courts and ministries. In some democracies, legislative committees provide lawmakers a forum for these public examinations of national issues.
• Legislators may support the government in power or they may serve as a loyal political opposition that offers alternative policies and programs.
• Legislators have a responsibility to articulate their views as effectively as possible. But they must work within the democratic ethic of tolerance, respect, and compromise to reach agreements that will benefit the general welfare of all the people – not just their political supporters. Each legislator must alone decide on how to balance the general welfare with the needs of a local constituency.
• Legislators often provide constituents with a sympathetic hearing for their individual complaints and problems – along with help in getting assistance from large government bureaucracies. To do this, they often maintain a staff of trained aides.

• National legislators are usually elected in one of two ways. In plurality elections, sometimes called "first past the post," the candidate with the most votes wins. In the proportional system, often used in parliamentary elections, voters usually cast ballots for parties, not individuals, and representatives are chosen on the basis of their party's percentage of the vote.
• A proportional system tends to encourage multiple, tightly organized smaller parties. Plurality elections encourage a looser, two-party system. Under either system, representatives engage in the debate, negotiation, coalition building, and compromise that are the hallmarks of democratic legislatures.
• Legislatures are often bicameral, with two chambers, and new laws generally require passage by both the upper and lower chambers.

(12)An Independent Judiciary

Independent and professional judges are the foundation of a fair, impartial, and constitutionally guaranteed system of courts of law known as the judiciary. This independence does not imply judges can make decisions based on personal preferences but rather that they are free to make lawful decisions – even if those decisions contradict the government or powerful parties involved in a case.

• In democracies, independence from political pressures of elected officials and legislatures guarantees the impartiality of judges. Judicial rulings should be impartial, based on the facts of a case, individual merits and legal arguments, and relevant laws, without any restrictions or improper influence by interested parties. These principles ensure equal legal protection for all.
• The power of judges to review public laws and declare them in violation of the nation's constitution serves as a fundamental check on potential government abuse of power – even if the government is elected by a popular majority. This power, however, requires that the courts be seen as independent and able to rest their decisions upon the law, not political considerations.
• Whether elected or appointed, judges must have job security or tenure, guaranteed by law, in order that they can make decisions without concern for pressure or attack by those in positions of authority. A civil society recognizes the importance of professional judges by providing them with adequate training and remuneration.

• Trust in the court system's impartiality – in its being seen as the "non-political" branch of government – is a principal source of its strength and legitimacy.
• A nation's courts, however, are no more immune from public commentary, scrutiny, and criticism than other institutions. Freedom of speech belongs to all: judges and their critics alike.
• To ensure their impartiality, judicial ethics require judges to step aside (or "recuse" themselves) from deciding cases in which they have a conflict of interest.
• Judges in a democracy cannot be removed for minor complaints, or in response to political criticism. Instead, they can be removed only for serious crimes or infractions through the lengthy and difficult procedure of impeachment (bringing charges) and trial – either in the legislature or before a separate court panel.
• An independent judiciary assures people that court decisions will be based on the nation's laws and constitution, not on shifting political power or the pressures of a temporary majority. Endowed with this independence, the judicial system in a democracy serves as a safeguard of the people's rights and freedoms.

(13) Constitutionalism

A written constitution contains the most important laws by which a nation's citizens agree to live, and it outlines the basic structure of their government. Thus, democratic constitutionalism – based on ideals of individual freedom, community rights, and limited government power – creates the framework for governing a democracy.
• Constitutionalism recognizes that democratic and accountable government must be coupled with constitutional limits on the power of government.
• A constitution defines the basic purposes and aspirations of a society, including the common welfare of the people.
• All laws must be written in accordance with the constitution. In a democracy, an independent judiciary allows citizens to challenge laws they believe to be illegal or unconstitutional and to seek court-ordered remedies for illegal actions by the government or its officials.
• A constitution provides the framework for government power – its scope of authority, mechanisms for exercising that authority, and the procedures for passage of future laws.
• A constitution defines citizenship and establishes the basis for deciding who shall have the right to vote.
• A constitution establishes the political, administrative, and judicial foundations of the state including the structure of the legislature and courts, requirements for holding elected office, and terms of office for elected officials.
• A constitution lays out responsibilities of government ministries and grants authority to collect taxes and create a national defense force.
• In a federal system, the constitution divides power among the various levels of government.
• Since a constitution is written at a certain point in time, it must be amendable so that it may adapt to the changing needs of the people in the future. Since the flexibility to meet unpredictable and unforeseeable challenges in the future is important, constitutions are usually written to specify general principles of government.
• Constitutions generally contain two different types of rights – negative and affirmative rights.
-- Negative rights tell the government what it cannot do. These rights limit government and prevent it from affecting certain behaviors of its citizens. For example, the government must refrain from limiting free speech and the ability of citizens to peacefully assemble, and from illegal imprisonment.
-- Affirmative rights tell the government what it must do and citizens what they are entitled to. Such "entitlements" may include social, economic, and cultural rights in the form of government guarantees of various social indicators. There may be guarantees of primary and secondary education for all boys and girls, guaranteed "well being" after retirement, or jobs and health care for all citizens.

(14) Freedom of Speech

Freedom of speech and expression, especially about political and other public issues, is the lifeblood of any democracy. Democratic governments do not control the content of most written and verbal speech. Thus democracies are usually filled with many voices expressing different or even contrary ideas and opinions.

According to democratic theorists, a free and open debate will usually lead to the best option being considered and will be more likely to avoid serious mistakes.
• Democracy depends upon a literate, knowledgeable citizenry whose access to information enables it to participate as fully as possible in the public life of their society and to criticize unwise or tyrannical government officials or policies. Citizens and their elected representatives recognize that democracy depends upon the widest possible access to uncensored ideas, data, and opinions.
• For a free people to govern themselves, they must be free to express themselves – openly, publicly, and repeatedly; in speech and in writing.

• The principle of free speech should be protected by a democracy's constitution, preventing the legislative or executive branches of government from imposing censorship.
• The protection of free speech is a so-called negative right, simply requiring that government refrain from limiting speech, unlike the direct action required of other so-called affirmative rights. For the most part, the authorities in a democracy are uninvolved in the content of written and verbal speech in the society.
• Protests serve as a testing ground for any democracy – thus the right to peaceful assembly is essential and plays an integral part in facilitating the use of free speech. A civil society allows for spirited debate among those in deep disagreement over the issues.
• Freedom of speech is a fundamental right, but it is not absolute, and cannot be used to justify violence, slander, libel, subversion, or obscenity. Consolidated democracies generally require a high degree of threat in order to justify banning speech which may incite violence, untruthfully harm the reputation of others, overthrow a constitutional government, or promote lewd behavior. Most democracies also forbid speech that incites racial or ethnic violence.
• The challenge for a democracy is one of balance: to defend freedom of speech and assembly while countering speech which truly encourages violence, intimidation, or subversion.

(15) Government Accountability

Government accountability means that public officials – elected and un-elected – have an obligation to explain their decisions and actions to the citizens. Government accountability is achieved through the use of a variety of mechanisms – political, legal, and administrative – designed to prevent corruption and ensure that public officials remain answerable and accessible to the people they serve. In the absence of such mechanisms, corruption may thrive.
• The primary political accountability mechanism is free and fair elections. Fixed-terms of office and elections force elected officials to account for their performance and provide opportunities for challengers to offer citizens alternative policy choices. If voters are not satisfied with the performance of an official, they may vote them out of office when their terms expire.
• The degree to which public officials are politically accountable is a function of whether they occupy an elected versus appointed position, how often they are up for reelection, and how many terms they can serve.
• Legal accountability mechanisms include constitutions, legislative acts, decrees, rules, codes, and other legal instruments that proscribe actions that public officials can and cannot take and how citizens may take action against those officials whose conduct is considered unsatisfactory.
• An independent judiciary is an essential requirement for the success of legal accountability, serving as a venue where citizens bring claims against the government.
• Legal accountability mechanisms include:
-- Ethics statutes and codes of conduct for public officials, outlining unacceptable practices;
-- Conflict of interest and financial disclosure laws, requiring public officials to divulge the source of their income and assets so that citizens may judge whether the actions of those officials are likely to be influenced improperly by financial interests;
-- "Sunshine" laws, providing the press and the public access to government records and meetings;
-- Citizen participation requirements, dictating that certain government decisions must include input from the public; and
-- Judicial review, providing courts the power to review the decisions and actions of public officials and agencies.
• Administrative accountability mechanisms include offices within agencies or ministries and practices within administrative processes designed to ensure that the decisions and actions of public officials account for the interest of the citizens.
• Administrative accountability mechanisms include:
-- Agency ombudsmen, responsible for hearing and addressing citizen complaints;
-- Independent auditors who scrutinize the use of public funds for signs of misuse;
-- Administrative courts, that hear citizens' complaints about agency decisions;
-- Ethics rules protecting so-called whistleblowers – those within government who speak out about corruption or abuse of official authority – from reprisals.

(16) Free and Fair Elections

Free and fair elections allow people living in a representative democracy to determine the political makeup and future policy direction of their nation's government.

• Free and fair elections increase the likelihood of a peaceful transfer of power. They help to ensure that losing candidates will accept the validity of the election's results and cede power to the new government.

• Elections alone do not assure democracy since dictators can use the resources of the state to tamper with the election process.
• Free and fair elections require:
-- Universal suffrage for all eligible men and women to vote – democracies do not restrict this right from minorities, the disabled, or give it only to those who are literate or who own property.
-- Freedom to register as a voter or run for public office.
-- Freedom of speech for candidates and political parties – democracies do not restrict candidates or political parties from criticizing the performance of the incumbent.
-- Numerous opportunities for the electorate to receive objective information from a free press.
-- Freedom to assemble for political rallies and campaigns.
-- Rules that require party representatives to maintain a distance from polling places on election day – election officials, volunteer poll workers, and international monitors may assist voters with the voting process but not the voting choice.
-- An impartial or balanced system of conducting elections and verifying election results – trained election officials must either be politically independent or those overseeing elections should be representative of the parties in the election.
-- Accessible polling places, private voting space, secure ballot boxes, and transparent ballot counting.
-- Secret ballots – voting by secret ballot ensures that an individual's choice of party or candidate cannot be used against him or her.
-- Legal prohibitions against election fraud – enforceable laws must exist to prevent vote tampering (e.g. double counting, ghost voting).
-- Recount and contestation procedures – legal mechanisms and processes to review election processes must be established to ensure that elections were conducted properly.
• Voting methods – varying by country and even within countries – include:
-- Paper ballots – votes are marked on or punched through paper.
-- Ballots with pictures of candidates or party symbols so that illiterate citizens may cast the correct vote.
-- Electronic systems – voters use touch-screen or push-button machines.
-- Absentee ballots – allowing those who will not be able to vote on election day to cast their ballots prior to the election.

(17) Freedom of Religion

All citizens should be free to follow their conscience in matters of religious faith. Freedom of religion includes the right to worship alone or with others, in public or private, and to participate in religious observance, practice, and teaching without fear of persecution from government or other groups in society.

• All people have the right to worship or assemble in connection with a religion or belief, and to establish and maintain places for these purposes.
• Like other fundamental human rights, religious freedom is not created or granted by the state, but all states should protect it. Democracies include language pertaining to protection of religious freedom in their constitutions.
• Although many democracies may choose to recognize an official separation of church and state, the values of government and religion are not in fundamental conflict.
• Democracies generally do not create governmental agencies or other official bodies to regulate religious affairs, although they may require houses of worship and religious groups to register for administrative or tax purposes.
• Governments that protect religious freedom for all their citizens are more likely to protect other rights necessary for religious freedom, such as free speech and assembly.
• Genuine democracies recognize that individual religious differences must be respected and that a key role of government is to protect religious choice, even in cases where the state sanctions a particular religious faith. Democracies also:
-- Do not determine the content of religious publications, education, or sermons.
-- Respect the right of parents to direct the religious education of their children.
-- Prohibit incitement of religious-based violence against others.
-- Protect members of ethnic, religious, or linguistic minorities.
-- Allow people to observe days of rest associated with their faith and to celebrate holy days in accordance with their beliefs.
-- Allow interfaith movements to flourish, as members of different faiths seek common ground on various issues and cooperate to solve challenges facing the entire population.
-- Provide the freedom for government and religious officials, nongovernmental organizations, and journalists to investigate reports of religious persecution.
-- Respect the right of religious organizations to freely participate and contribute to civil society – to operate faith-based

schools, run hospitals and care for the aged, and create other programs and activities that benefit the society.

(18) The Rights of Women and Girls

Discrimination against women means that specific laws or practices create a distinction, exclusion, or restriction on the basis of gender.

• Democracies should strive to protect women's rights, encourage women's participation in all aspects of society and government, and create places for women to associate freely and express their views openly.
• Legal rights for women include equal representation under the law and access to legal resources.
-- Women's rights must be clearly stated – ambiguity of women's legal status remains a leading cause of poverty worldwide.
-- Women should have rights to ownership and inheritance.
-- Women should have the opportunity to take part in the drafting and implementation of constitutions and legislation.
• Women's political rights include the right to vote in elections, to run for public office, to participate in government, and to organize politically.
-- Democracies should support civil society initiatives – public and nongovernmental – that teach women how to vote and train them in political campaign techniques and the legislative process.
-- Women's activism at all levels of civil society and government strengthens democracies.
• Women and girls should have access to primary education. They should not be barred from attending or teaching in secondary schools and universities.
• Economic rights give women control over their economic assets and help them avoid risky sexual and abusive relationships. These rights include:
-- The same employment opportunities and criteria as men.
-- Protection from job termination because of pregnancy or marriage.
-- Participation in programs, such as microenterprise lending and vocational training, that enable women to generate income.
-- The right to equal pay and to equal treatment and respect at work.
• Democracies should strive to ensure the health and well-being of women and girls and provide equal access to programs such as:
-- General health care, disease prevention, and prenatal care.
-- Preventing HIV/AIDS, improving health care delivery to those infected, and reducing mother-to-child transmission of the disease.
-- Combating traffickers who lure women and girls into forced prostitution or domestic servitude through deception, fraud, or coercion.
-- Fighting so-called sex tourism that often exploits women and children.
-- Educating families about the social and health consequences of early marriage.
-- Supporting victims' organizations, including domestic violence and rape crisis centers.
-- Training police, lawyers, judges, and medical personnel to reduce domestic violence.

(19) Governing by Coalitions and Compromise

Every society has (or includes) groups of people with differing views on subjects of importance to all citizens. A liberal democracy recognizes this as a benefit to the nation and thus supports tolerance for and expression of different points of view.

• Democratic governments succeed when politicians and officials understand that complex issues rarely present solutions that are clearly "right" or "wrong" and that differing interpretations of democratic principles and social priorities exist.
• Freedom of assembly and the press foster open debate and exchange of ideas. This openness allows a government to identify problems and permits groups to meet and resolve differences. (In the private sector, this same "marketplace of ideas" offers opportunities for innovation and investment that are the engines of economic growth.)
• Coalitions are formed when interest groups or political parties join together on issues of common interest, even if they strongly disagree on other issues. Compromise on important decisions allows the government to go about the business of governing.
• Legislative bodies in democracies rely on coalition-building to pass laws:
-- In a parliamentary system, political groups form partnerships with other groups to promote their own interests and

form governments.
-- In a presidential system, lawmakers sometimes cross party boundaries to vote on issues they and their constituents care deeply about.
-- Coalitions often require that a political party be willing to put aside certain differences with other groups in order to achieve more important parts of their agendas.
-- Because coalition governments are made up from parties representing sometimes-opposing viewpoints, there does exist the potential for dissolution of the government. In some democracies, it is common for ruling coalitions to form and disband several times, even in a single year.

(20) Role of Nongovernmental Organizations

In democracies, ordinary citizens may organize independent groups that serve the needs of the community or nation they live in and complement, supplement, or even challenge the work of the government. Such organizations are often called nongovernmental organizations, or NGOs, because they are not an extension of the government's offices.

• NGOs allow citizens to improve their society by advocating, educating, and mobilizing attention around major public issues and monitoring the conduct of government and private enterprise.
• NGOs enable citizens from different backgrounds to learn to work together and build the skills, relationships, and trust necessary for good government.
• NGOs serve a great variety of citizen interests. They may act as social service providers, advocates for the environment or for living standards, work standards, or as the catalysts for democratic change.
• NGOs often represent the interests of those citizens who might otherwise be left out of national policy debates. They open the public discourse to people of all economic and social classes and to women and minorities.
• Funding for NGOs may come from individual private donations, private trusts and philanthropies, corporations, religious institutions, international institutions, other NGOs, sales of goods and services, and even governments.
• Governments and NGOs frequently work as partners. NGOs may provide local and regional expertise and personnel on the ground for implementation of government-funded projects. NGOs may be politically unaffiliated, or they may be based on partisan ideals and seek to advance a particular cause or set of causes in the public interest. In either model the key point is that NGOs should operate under minimal political control of states.
• NGOs develop local and international programs in virtually all areas that contribute to the promotion of the principles of democracy, including:
-- Human rights – by promoting international standards and monitoring for violations and abuses.
-- Rule of law – through low-cost or free legal aid, educating all citizens regarding their rights, and advocating for legal reforms.
-- Women's participation – by preparing them for political participation and protecting them from socioeconomic discrimination.
-- Civic education – through education programs focusing on the role of the citizen in a democratic and diverse society.
-- A free press – by promoting independent media, training journalists, and setting standards for ethical journalism.
-- Political party development – through election monitoring by trained domestic observers and nonpartisan voter registration drives.
-- Government accountability – by conducting policy analysis and serving as watchdogs over governmental actions.

(21) Education and Democracy

Education is a universal human right. It also is a means of achieving other human rights and it is an empowering social and economic tool. Through the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the world's nations have agreed that everyone has the right to education.

• Every society transmits its habits of mind, social norms, culture, and ideals from one generation to the next. There is a direct connection between education and democratic values: in democratic societies, educational content and practice support habits of democratic governance.
• This educational transmission process is vital in a democracy because effective democracies are dynamic, evolving forms of government that demand independent thinking by the citizenry. The opportunity for positive social and political change rests in citizens' hands. Governments should not view the education system as a means to control information and to indoctrinate students.
• Governments should value and devote resources to education just as they strive to defend their citizens.
• Literacy enables people to stay informed through newspapers and books. Informed citizens are in a better position to improve their democracy.

• Education systems in democracies do not preclude study of other political doctrines or systems of government. Democracies encourage students to develop reasonable arguments based on careful research and a clear understanding of history.
• Private and religious groups should be free to create schools or parents may choose to teach their children at home.
• Government-run schooling must be equally accessible to all citizens regardless of their ethnic or religious backgrounds, gender, or physical disabilities.
• Democratic norms and practices should be taught in order for people to understand and appreciate their opportunities and responsibilities as free citizens.
• Education for democratic citizenship includes knowledge of national and world history and of basic democratic principles.
• School curricula in democracies include history, geography, economics, literature, philosophy, law, the arts, social studies, mathematics, and science courses available to all students – girls and boys.
• Students should also be free to organize clubs and activities where democratic norms can be put into practice. For example,
-- Student government gives pupils experience in the democratic process.
-- Mock elections teach students about citizen participation and encourage in them lifelong voting habits.
-- School newspapers educate students about the role of a free media and responsible journalism.

Defining Democracy
There are many debates, ranging from Australian politics to third world development priorities, which require you to have an understanding and definition of democracy. Please avoid the temptation to wax lyrical about the ancient Greeks - or anything else you have learned in any course that includes the words "introduction to..." and instead simply say that democracy is a system of governance that seeks to maximise:
Accountability
Representation
Participation.

"**Accountability**" means that at every level there is some sort of oversight and everyone is answerable to someone. Basically it's what people mean when they talk about 'checks and balances'. So the lower Houses of both State and Federal Parliament, (the government at least), are held accountable to their upper Houses (houses of review), and the whole parliament is answerable to the people every 3-6 years when there are elections.
Plus the decisions of parliament can be scrutinised by the court system, in accordance with the Constitution - which is enforced by the High Court and the Governor General. But the courts themselves are also accountable. Firstly the judges are picked by the parliament and can be sacked by them too. Plus the Constitution can be changed by the people via a referendum (or in some jurisdictions by a simple act of parliament) and the courts can usually only interpret laws, not create them, which again come from the parliament. In short it's what called:

"**Representation**" refers to the fact that democracy is a system where leaders derive their credibility, their 'mandate', directly from the people. I'll talk about mandates in more detail later, but the principle of representation means that all citizens and have a right to be heard in their political system. This is problematic though because democracy is also about voting and that's a process that inherently benefits 'majorities' over 'minorities,' so how can minorities be assured of proper representation? That's the question that leads to many debates, but there are a number of structural responses built into most democracies. For one there are different levels or 'tiers' of government (local, state and federal) which give people multiple opportunities to be heard (it's worth learning more about the concept of *subsidiarity*, which is another first principle).
Secondly remember that the minority is not excluded from the system - that's what the Opposition is for, and it has many powers. Additionally there the rights and restrictions built in to the Constitution to protect minorities.
And finally there are different voting systems in use that attempt to compensate for the tendency of majorities to dominate the system. The simplest example is "Proportional Voting" which is used in the federal upper house (Senate), which means that political parties receive a percentage of the available seats, equal to the percentage of the overall votes they received. So if a party represents the views of 10% of Australians, assuming all 10% voted for that party at an election, the party would then control 10% of the Senate seats. Whereas in the lower house, which uses a different voting system ("Preferential") that same party, with the same number of voters, would be unlikely to win any seats at all. This is why the Senate is considered a 'house of review' - because it includes a far greater spectrum of views than are represented in the lower house, and so it modifies potential laws to be inclusive of the minority views that they represent.

But it's obviously not perfect. Many minority groups are not officially represented in the Senate (eg there are no parties specifically representing the views of minority religions, sexualities or ethnicities - which can sometimes be a problem). That's why you need to debate these issues and why I'm writing this article.

Finally, "**Participation**" is the most basic and arguably the most important principle of democracy. It's so crucial because it underpins the other two principles and because it is the fundamental basis for democracy - government 'by' the people, 'for' the people... blah, blah, blah. So simply put, participation means that; unless there is a very good reason, everyone deserves a vote and all votes should have equal weight.
Clearly there are exceptions to this – for example we don't let mentally ill people vote, or children (but there was a finals debate at 2004 Worlds on the topic that we should give children voting rights), or hard-core criminals (but round one of Australs 2003 was on the topic of prisoners voting rights) - so you need to think very carefully about this issue. Denying people the right to vote is one of the most serious things a government can do in a democracy, and something that has been thoroughly abused in the past 100 years.

Deeper Analysis

Ok, now you have the basics of democratic theory, how can you build on it and develop it into more sophisticated analysis - since that's the stuff that wins debates against strong teams. There are many ways to develop democratic theory, but here's one example - mandate theory. As I said before, a mandate is the authority politicians have to make decisions that derives from the fact that you voted for them. That's a 'direct' mandate. There are also indirect mandates, for say appointed officials (judges, public servants, etc.) They have a mandate (or authority) because they were given power by people who you voted for, or the law/constitution empowers them to act on behalf of other people.
So how is it used? Well the clearest example of a direct mandate is when a government tries to implement polices they ran as an election platform. Basically political party X campaigns before an election saying "vote for us and we'll do A, B and C". Then they win the election and claim a 'mandate' to do A, B and C - because you voted for them knowing it would mean those policies would be enacted. That"s the way that mandates are traditionally conceived.
Simple right? Sometimes. But the deeper analysis stems from the understanding that elections are far more complicated than that. If would be fine if every political party only had a couple of policies - but in fact they scores (for example, in the 2006 Victorian election, the then Bracks Government put out almost 50 policy documents including over 400 specific promises). And this is compounded by the fact that there are so few viable political parties (there are over a hundred registered parties but very few have the cash, the brains or the organisational capacity to seriously campaign) that people almost never vote for a party they entirely agree with - they vote for a party they mostly agree with.
So to use my previous hypothetical - the majority of people might have wanted policies A and B, but not C. But they liked even less of the policies advocated by the other parties, so still voted for party X. Does that mean party X has a mandate for all their policies? Most people would say no. Plus what about spontaneous policies - not everything a government does was part of their election platform. What about in emergencies (like September 11?) The government didn't campaign on specific policies relating to events that no one imagined would happen - so they have no mandate. Or do they?
Well strictly speaking, no they don't have a direct mandate but they do have a lot of legitimacy that comes from the fact that the majority of people voted for them. You see political parties don't just campaign on policies - they campaign on philosophy, and people know that. Voters know that electing the Liberal Party in Australia means
4 years of philosophically "conservative" policy and knowing that, if they still vote for the Liberals, then surely they are delivering a mandate for conservative policies in general, and the election platform more specifically?
You could argue that. But as usual, there are problems. You see most democracies are bi-cameral (two houses of parliament) and the weird thing is that very, very few political parties in Australia, Britain and everywhere except America, get a majority of seats in both houses. It happens sometimes (think of the Kennett years, the second term of the Bracks government, or the fourth terms of the Howard government) but it's increasingly rare as more and more minority parties gain prominence. So what does that mean? Well it could be that voters are just a bunch of stupid monkeys OR it might be that they are in fact highly intelligent monkeys who purposefully split their vote between the two Houses to deliberately create conflicting mandates. "Whoa, slow down egghead", I hear you say. Let's look at that more closely.
For the first three terms of the Howard government the majority of Australians clearly wanted the Liberal Party to be the government. But if that same majority had wanted all of the Liberals' policies and 4 years of totally conservative policies, why didn't they give the Libs a majority of seats in the upper house so they wouldn't have tree-huggers and communists modifying and blocking their legislation? Well maybe they wanted it that way. Take the GST for example. Howard made it pretty clear that if he was elected to a second term, he'd introduce a GST on almost everything. And the people voted him in, so I guess they were ok with that. BUT they also gave the Democrats the balance of power (the deciding votes) in the Senate - and they had made it pretty clear that although they would support the GST, they would want to modify it in certain ways. So if we assume people aren't stupid, then it means they wanted a GST, but not the exact GST being offered by the Libs, so they split their vote (voted Lib in the lower and Democrat in the upper) and got what they

wanted. In that case the Libs had every right to claim a 'mandate' to pass the GST, but the Democracts also had mandate to modify it... complex stuff, eh?

What about the fact that politicians often hate each other & won‟t compromise?
That's another problem. The previous example shows that "conflicting mandates" can sometimes be resolved fairly easily through a degree of compromise. But there are times when compromise is impossible. The US political system provides generates this sort of situation virtually on purpose, which seems sort of odd, but they‟re the leaders of the free world so who am I to judge?
The problem in America is of course the fact that the Executive and Legislative branches of government are entirely separate, so it is easy for conflicting mandates to arise. Former Democratic President Bill Clinton experienced this problem follow the Congressional election in 1994 when the Republicans gained the majority in both Houses. This meant that there was a socially progressive President and a socially conservative Congress. Trouble was unavoidable.
The obvious issue was abortion. While Clinton was elected on an explicit „pro-choice‟ platform, the Republicans campaigned hard on „pro-life‟ policies. In 1996 the Congress passed H.R. 1833, a bill that would have imposed a nationwide ban on the type of abortion known as dilation and extraction (sometimes controversially referred to as „partial birth abortion‟). Both sides could claim a mandate (and both did) so what should happen?
1. The legislation should be enacted. Congress should prevail because they are the legislators and they have a direct mandate from the people. Clinton might not like it but he doesn‟t have the right to block it.
2. President should veto it – he has a clear mandate and on an issue this divisive you have to ensure that people‟s rights are protected.
3. Whoever has the 'fresher' mandate - i.e. whoever was elected more recently, since that reflects the most recent desires of the people.
4. No one does - it's fucked, call elections or toss a coin...

If you‟re interested, the outcome in 1996 was that Clinton vetoed the bill, as well as several others that the Republican controlled Congress put up over the remainder of his term in office. But that doesn‟t the resolve the question of what he *should* have done, which is certainly a matter of considerable debate today in the US where the situation is reversed – a Republican President facing a newly elected Democrat-majority Congress. In March 2008 President Bush vetoed H.R. 2082, the Intelligence Authorization bill, which would prevent the CIA and other agencies from using techniques widely considered to be torture during interrogations. The use of torture by the US military was a key issue in the previous Congressional elections, but equally President Bush could claim a conflicting mandate on „homeland security‟ issues as a result of his re-election.

Forms of Governance

Source: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Government

Descriptions of governments can be based on the following attributes:

By elements of where decision-making power is held
Aristarchic attributes

Governments with *aristarchy* attributes are traditionally controlled and organised by a small group of the most-qualified people, with no intervention from the most part of society; this small group usually shares some common trait. The opposite of an aristarchic government is kakistocracy.

Term	Definition
Aristocracy	Rule by elite citizens. It has come to mean rule by "the aristocracy" who are people of noble birth. An aristocracy is a government by the "best" people. A person who rules in an aristocracy is an aristocrat. Aristocracy is different from nobility, in that nobility means that one bloodline would rule; an aristocracy would mean that a few or many bloodlines would rule, or that rulers be chosen in a different manner.
Geniocracy	Rule by the intelligent; a system of governance where creativity, innovation, intelligence and wisdom are required for those who wish to govern. See Aristocracy of the wise.
Kratocracy	Rule by the strong; a system of governance where those who are strong enough seize power through physical force, social maneuvering or political cunning. The process can mimic Darwinian selection.
Meritocracy	Rule by the meritorious; a system of governance where groups are selected on the basis of people's ability, knowledge in a given area, and contributions to society.
Timocracy	Rule by honour; a system of governance ruled by honorable citizens and property owners. Socratesdefines a timocracy as a government ruled by people who love honour and are selected according to the degree of honour they hold in society. This form of timocracy is very similar to meritocracy, in the sense that individuals of outstanding character or faculty are placed in the seat of power. European feudalism and post-Revolutionary America are historical examples of this type; the city-state of Sparta provided another real-world model for this form of government.
Technocracy	Rule by the educated or technical experts; a system of governance where people who are skilled or proficient govern in their respective areas of expertise in technology would be in control of all decision making. Doctors, engineers, scientists, professionals and technologists who have knowledge, expertise, or

	skills, would compose the governing body, instead of politicians, businessmen, and economists.[10] In a technocracy, decision makers would be selected based upon how knowledgeable and skillful they are in their field.

Autocratic attributes

Governments with *autocratic* attributes are dominated by one person who has all the power over the people in a country. The Roman Republic made *dictators* to lead during times of war; the Roman dictators only held power for a small time. In modern times, an autocrat's rule is not stopped by any rules of law, constitutions, or other social and political institutions. After World War II, many governments in Latin America, Asia, and Africa were ruled by autocratic governments. Examples of autocrats include Idi Amin,Muammar Gaddafi, Adolf Hitler and Gamal Abdul Nasser.

Term	Definition
Autocracy	Rule by one individual, whose decisions are subject to neither external legal restraints nor regular mechanisms of popular control (except perhaps for implicit threat). An autocrat needs servants while a despot needs slaves.
Despotism	Rule by a single entity with absolute power. That entity may be an individual, as in an autocracy, or it may be a group, as in an oligarchy. The word despotism means to "rule in the fashion of a despot" and does not necessarily require a single, or individual, "despot". A despot needs slaves while an autocrat needs servants.
Dictatorship	Rule by an individual who has full power over the country. The term may refer to a system where the dictator came to power, and holds it, purely by force; but it also includes systems where the dictator first came to power legitimately but then was able to amend the constitution so as to, in effect, gather all power for themselves.[11] In a military dictatorship, the army is in control. Usually, there is little or no attention to public opinion or individual rights. See also Autocracy andStratocracy.
Fascism	Rule by leader base only. Focuses heavily on patriotismand national identity. The leader(s) has the power to make things illegal that do not relate to nationalism, or increase belief in national pride. They believe their nation is based on commitment to an organic national community where its citizens are united together as one people through a national identity. It exalts nation and race above the individual and stands for severe economic and social regimentation, and forcible suppression of opposition.

Monarchic attributes

Governments with *monarchic* attributes are ruled by a king/emperor or a queen/empress who usually holds their position for life. There are two types of monarchies: absolute monarchies and constitutional monarchies. In an absolute monarchy, the ruler has no limits on their wishes or powers. In a constitutional monarchy a ruler's powers are limited by a document called a constitution. The constitution was put in place to put a check to these powers.

Term	Definition

Absolute monarchy	Variant of monarchy; a system of governance in which a monarch exercises ultimate governing authority ashead of state and head of government.
Constitutional monarchy	Variant of monarchy; a system of governance that has a monarch, but one whose powers are limited by law or by a formal constitution, such as that in the United Kingdom.[12][13]
Diarchy	Variant of monarchy; a system of government in which two individuals, the *diarchs*, are the heads of state. In most diarchies, the diarchs hold their position for life and pass the responsibilities and power of the position to their children or family when they die. Diarchy is one of the oldest forms of government. In modern usage diarchy means a system of dual rule, whether this be of a government or of an organisation. Such 'diarchies' are not hereditary.
Elective monarchy	Variant of monarchy; a system of governance that has an elected monarch, in contrast to a *hereditary monarchy* in which the office is automatically passed down as a family inheritance. The democratic manner of election, the nature of candidate qualifications, and the electors vary from case to case.
Emirate	Similar to a monarchy or **sultanate**; a system of governance in which the supreme power is in the hands of an emir (the ruler of a Muslim state); the emir may be an absolute overlord or a sovereign with constitutionally limited authority.[14]
Federal monarchy	Variant of monarchy; a system of governance where a federation of states with a single monarch as overall head of the federation, but retaining different monarchs, or a non-monarchical system of government, in the various states joined to the federation.
Monarchy	Rule by royalty; a system of governance where an individual who has inherited the role and expects to bequeath it to their heir.[15]

Pejorative attributes

Regardless of the form of government, the actual governance may be influenced by sectors with political power which are not part of the formal government. Certain actions of the governors, such ascorruption, demagoguery, or fear mongering, may disrupt the intended way of working of the government if they are widespread enough.

Term	Definition
Bankocracy	Rule by banks;[16] a system of governance with excessive power or influence of banks and other financial authorities on public policy-making. It can also refer to a form of government where financial institutions rule society.
Corporatocracy	Rule by corporations; a system of governance where an economic and political system is controlled by corporations or corporate interests.[17] Its use is generally pejorative. Examples include company rule in India and business voters for the City of London Corporation.

Nepotocracy	Rule by nephews; favouritism granted to relativesregardless of merit; a system of governance in which importance is given to the relatives of those already in power, like a *nephew* (where the word comes from). In such governments even if the relatives aren't qualified they are given positions of authority just because they know someone who already has authority. Pope Alexander VI (Borgia) was accused of this.
Kakistocracy	Rule by the stupid; a system of governance where the worst or least-qualified citizens govern or dictate policies. Due to human nature being inherently flawed, it has been suggested that every government which has ever existed has been a prime example of kakistocracy. See Idiocracy.
Kleptocracy(Mafia state)	Rule by thieves; a system of governance where its officials and the ruling class in general pursue personal wealth and political power at the expense of the wider population. In strict terms kleptocracy is not a form of government but a *characteristic* of a government engaged in such behavior. Examples include Mexico as being considered a*narcokleptocracy*, since its democratic government is perceived to be corrupted by those who profit from trade in illegal drugs smuggled into the United States.
Ochlocracy	Rule by the general populace; a system of governance where **mob rule** is government by mob or a mass of people, or the intimidation of legitimate authorities. As a pejorative for majoritarianism, it is akin to the Latin phrase ***mobile vulgus*** meaning "the fickle crowd", from which the English term "mob" was originally derived in the 1680s. Ochlocratic governments are often a democracy spoiled bydemagoguery, "tyranny of the majority" and the rule of passion over reason; such governments can be as oppressive as autocratic tyrants. Ochlocracy is synonymous in meaning and usage to the modern, informal term "mobocracy."

By elements of who elects the empowered

Authoritarian attributes

This section requires expansion.*(December 2012)*

Term	Definition
Authoritarian	Rule by authoritarian governments is identified in societies where a specific set of people possess the authority of the state in a republic or union. It is apolitical system controlled by unelected rulers who usually permit some degree of individual freedom.
Totalitarian	Rule by a totalitarian government is characterised by a highly centralised and coercive authority that regulates nearly every aspect of public and private life.

Democratic attributes

Further information: Outline of democracy

Governments with *democratic* attributes are most common in the Western world and in some countries of the east that have been influenced by western society, often by being colonised by western powers over the course of history. In democracies, large proportions of the population may vote, either to make decisions or to choose representatives to

make decisions. Commonly significant in democracies are political parties, which are groups of people with similar ideas about how a country or region should be governed. Different political parties have different ideas about how the government should handle different problems.

Term	Definition
Demarchy	Variant of democracy; government in which the stateis governed by randomly selected decision makers who have been selected by sortition (lot) from a broadly inclusive pool of eligible citizens. These groups, sometimes termed "policy juries", "citizens' juries", or "consensus conferences", deliberately make decisions about public policies in much the same way that juries decide criminal cases. Demarchy, in theory, could overcome some of the functional problems of conventional representative democracy, which is widely subject to manipulation byspecial interests and a division between professional policymakers (politicians and lobbyists) vs. a largely passive, uninvolved and often uninformed electorate. According to Australian philosopher John Burnheim, random selection of policymakers would make it easier for everyday citizens to meaningfully participate, and harder for special interests to corrupt the process. More generally, random selection of decision makers from a larger group is known as sortition (from the Latin base for lottery). The Athenian democracymade much use of sortition, with nearly all government offices filled by lottery (of full citizens) rather than by election. Candidates were almost always male, Greek, educated citizens holding a minimum of wealth and status.
Democracy	Rule by a government chosen by election where most of the populace are enfranchised. The key distinction between a democracy and other forms of constitutional government is usually taken to be that the right to vote is not limited by a person's wealth or race (the main qualification for enfranchisement is usually having reached a certain age). A democratic government is, therefore, one supported (at least at the time of the election) by a majority of the populace (provided the election was held fairly). A "majority" may be defined in different ways. There are many "power-sharing" (usually in countries where people mainly identify themselves by race or religion) or "electoral-college" or "constituency" systems where the government is not chosen by a simple one-vote-per-person headcount.
Direct democracy	Variant of democracy; government in which the people represent themselves and vote directly for new laws and public policy
Liberal democracy	Variant of democracy; a form of government in whichrepresentative democracy operates under the principles of liberalism. It is characterised by fair, free, and competitive elections between multiple distinct political parties, a separation of powers into different branches of government, the rule of law in everyday life as part of an open society, and the protection of human rights and civil liberties for all persons. To define the system in practice, liberal democracies often draw upon a constitution, either formally written or uncodified, to delineate the powers of government and enshrine the social contract. After a period of sustained expansion throughout the 20th century, liberal democracy became the predominant political system in the world. A liberal democracy may take various constitutional forms: it may be a constitutional republic, such as France, Germany,India, Ireland, Italy, or the United States; or aconstitutional monarchy, such as Japan, Spain, or theUnited Kingdom. It may have a presidential system(Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, or the United States), asemi-presidential

	system (France or Taiwan), or aparliamentary system (Australia, Canada, India, New Zealand, Poland, or the United Kingdom).
Representative democracy	Variant of democracy; wherein the people or citizens of a country elect representatives to create and implement public policy in place of active participation by the people.
Social democracy	Variant of democracy; social democracy rejects the "either/or" phobiocratic/polarisation interpretation of capitalism versus socialism. It claims that fostering a progressive evolution of capitalism will gradually result in the evolution of capitalist economy into socialist economy. Social democracy argues that all citizens should be legally entitled to certain social rights. These are made up of universal access to public services such as: education, health care, workers' compensation, public transportation, and other services including child care and care for the elderly. Social democracy is connected with the trade union labour movement and supports collective bargaining rights for workers. Contemporary social democracy advocates freedom from discrimination based on differences of: ability/disability, age, ethnicity, sex, gender, language, race, religion, sexual orientation, and social class.
Totalitarian democracy	Variant of democracy; refers to a system of government in which lawfully elected representatives maintain the integrity of a nation state whose citizens, while granted the right to vote, have little or no participation in the decision-making process of the government.

Oligarchic attributes

Governments with *oligarchic* attributes are ruled by a small group of segregated, powerful and/or influential people, who usually share similar interests and/or family relations. These people may spread power and elect candidates equally or not equally. An oligarchy is different from a true democracy because very few people are given the chance to change things. An oligarchy does not have to be hereditary or monarchic. An oligarchy does not have one clear ruler, but several rulers.

Some historical examples of oligarchy are the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Some critics of representative democracy think ofthe United States as an oligarchy. The Athenian democracy usedsortition to elect candidates, almost always male, white, Greek, educated citizens holding a minimum of land, wealth and status.

Term	Definition
Ergatocracy	Rule by the proletariat, the workers, or the working class. Examples of ergatocracy include communist revolutionaries and rebels which control most of society and create an alternative economy for people and workers. See Dictatorship of the proletariat.[clarification needed]
Kritarchy	Rule by judges; a system of governance composed of law enforcement institutions in which the state and thelegal systems are traditionally and/or constitutionally the same entity. Kritarchic judges, magistrates and other adjudicators have the legal power to legislate and administrate the enforcement of government laws, in addition to the interposition of laws and the resolution of disputes. (Not to be confused with *"judiciary"* or *"judicial system"*.) Somalia, ruled by judges with the tradition ofxeer,[18] as well as the Islamic Courts Union, is a historical example.[citation needed]
Netocracy	Rule by social connections; a term invented by the editorial board of the American technology magazine*Wired* in the early 1990s. A portmanteau of Internet and aristocracy, netocracy refers to a perceived global upper-class that bases its power on a technological advantage and networking skills, in comparison to what is portrayed as a bourgeoisie of a gradually diminishing importance. The netocracy

	concept has been compared with Richard Florida's concept of the creative class. Bard and Söderqvist have also defined an under-class in opposition to the netocracy, which they refer to as the consumtariat.
Oligarchy	Rule by a system of governance with small group of people who share similar interests or family relations.[19]
Plutocracy	Rule by the rich; a system of governance composed of the wealthy class. Any of the forms of government listed here can be plutocracy. For instance, if all of the elected representatives in a republic are wealthy, then it is a republic and a plutocracy.[20]
Stratocracy	Rule by military service; a system of governance composed of military government in which the state and the military are traditionally and/or constitutionally the same entity. Citizens with mandatory or voluntary active military service, or who have been honorably discharged, have the right to govern. (Not to be confused with *"military junta"* or *"military dictatorship"*.) The Spartan city-state is a historical example; its social system and constitution, were completely focused on military training and excellence. Stratocratic ideology often attaches to the honor-oriented timocracy.
Theocracy	Rule by a religious elite; a system of governance composed of religious institutions in which the state and the church are traditionally and/or constitutionally the same entity. Citizens who are clergy have the right to govern.[21] The Vatican's (see Pope), the Tibetan government's (see Dalai Lama) and Islamic states are historically considered *theocracies*.

Other attributes

Term	Definition
Anarchy	**Anarchy** has more than one definition. In the United States, the term "anarchy" typically is used to refer to a society without a publicly enforced government or violently enforced political authority.[22][23] When used in this sense, anarchy may[24] or may not[25] be intended to imply political disorder or lawlessness within a society. Outside of the U.S., and by most individuals that self-identify as anarchists, it implies a system of governance, mostly theoretical at a nation state level. There are also other forms of anarchy that attempt to avoid the use of coercion, violence, force and authority, while still producing a productive and desirable society.[26][27]
Anocracy	An **anocracy** is a regime type where power is not vested in public institutions (as in a normal democracy) but spread amongst elite groups who are constantly competing with each other for power. Examples of anocracies in Africa include the warlords of Somalia and the shared governments in Kenya and Zimbabwe. Anocracies are situated midway between an autocracy and ademocracy.[28] The Polity IV dataset[*clarification needed*] recognised anocracy as a category. In that dataset, anocracies are exactly in the middle between autocracies and democracies. Often the word is defined more broadly. For example a 2010 International Alert publication defined anocracies as "countries that are neither autocratic nor democratic, most of which are making the risky transition between autocracy and democracy".[29] Alert noted that the number of anocracies had increased substantially since the end of the Cold War. Anocracy is not surprisingly the least resilient political system to

	short-term shocks: it creates the promise but not yet the actuality of an inclusive and effective political economy, and threatens members of the established elite; and is therefore very vulnerable to disruption and armed violence.
Banana republic	A **banana republic** is a politically unstable kleptocratic government that economically depends upon the exports of a limited resource (fruits, minerals), and usually features a society composed of stratified social classes, such as a great, impoverished ergatocracy and a ruling plutocracy, composed of the aristocracy of business, politics, and the military.[30] In political science, the term *banana republic*denotes a country dependent upon limited primary-sector productions, which is ruled by a plutocracy who exploit the national economy by means of a politico-economicoligarchy.[31] In American literature, the term *banana republic* originally denoted the fictional *Republic of Anchuria*, a servile dictatorship that abetted, or supported for kickbacks, the exploitation of large-scale plantation agriculture, especially banana cultivation.[31] In U.S. politics, the term *banana republic* is a pejorative political descriptor coined by the American writer O. Henry in *Cabbages and Kings* (1904), a book of thematically related short stories derived from his 1896–97 residence in Honduras, where he was hiding from U.S. law for bank embezzlement.[32]
Maoism	The theory and practice of Marxism-Leninism developed in China by Mao Zedong (Mao Tse-tung), which states that a continuous revolution is necessary if the leaders of a communist state are to keep in touch with the people.

By elements of how power distribution is structured

Republican attributes

A republic is a form of government in which the country is considered a "public matter" (Latin: res publica), not the private concern or property of the rulers, and where offices of states are subsequently directly or indirectly elected or appointed rather than inherited.

Term	Definition
Republic	Rule by a form of government in which the people, or some significant portion of them, have supreme control over the government and where offices of state are elected or chosen by elected people.[33][34] A common simplified definition of a republic is a government where the head of state is not a monarch.[35][36]Montesquieu included both democracies, where all the people have a share in rule, and aristocracies oroligarchies, where only some of the people rule, as republican forms of government.[37]
Constitutional republic	Rule by a government whose powers are limited by law or a formal constitution, and chosen by a vote amongst at least some sections of the populace (Ancient Sparta was in its own terms a republic, though most inhabitants were disenfranchised). Republics that exclude sections of the populace from participation will typically claim to represent all citizens (by defining people without the vote as "non-citizens"). Examples include the United States, South Africa, India, etc.
Democratic republic	A republic form of government where the country is considered a "public matter" (Latin: res publica), not a private concern or property of rulers/3rd world, and where offices of states are subsequently, directly or indirectly, elected or appointed – rather than inherited – where all eligible citizens have an equal say in the local and national decisions that affect their lives.

Parliamentary republic	A republic, like India, Singapore and Poland, with an elected head of state, but where the head of state and head of government are kept separate with the head of government retaining most executive powers, or a head of state akin to a head of government, elected by a parliament.
Federal republic	A federal union of states or provinces with a republican form of government. Examples include Argentina,Austria, Brazil, Germany, India, Russia, andSwitzerland.
Islamic Republic	Republics governed in accordance with Islamic law. Examples include Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Iran.
Socialist republic	Countries like China and Vietnam are meant to be governed for and by the people, but with no direct elections. The term *People's Republic* is used to differentiate themselves from the earlier republic of their countries before the people's revolution, like the Republic of China and Republic of Korea.

Federalism attributes

This section requires expansion.*(January 2013)*

Federalism is a political concept in which a *group* of members are bound together by covenant (Latin: *foedus*, covenant) with a governing representative head. The term "federalism" is also used to describe a system of government in which sovereignty isconstitutionally divided between a central governing authority and constituent political units (such as states or provinces). Federalism is a system based upon democratic rules and institutions in which the power to govern is shared between national and provincial/state governments, creating what is often called a **federation**. Proponents are often called federalists.

Term	Definition
Federalism	Rule by a form of government in which the people, or some significant portion of them, have supreme control over the government and where offices of state are elected or chosen by elected people.[33][34] Montesquieuincluded both democracies, where all the people have a share in rule, and aristocracies or oligarchies, where only some of the people rule, as republican forms of government.[37]
Federal monarchy	A federal monarchy is a federation of states with a single monarch as overall head of the federation, but retaining different monarchs, or a non-monarchical system of government, in the various states joined to the federation.
Federal republic	A federal union of states or provinces with a republican form of government. Examples include Argentina, Austria,Brazil, Germany, India, Russia, and Switzerland.

Other power structure attributes

Term	Definition
Adhocracy	Rule by a government based on relatively disorganised principles and institutions as compared to a bureaucracy, its exact opposite.

Anarchism	Sometimes said to be non-governance; it is a structure which strives for non-hierarchical voluntary associations among agents. Anarchy is a situation where there is no government. This can happen after a civil war in a country, when a government has been destroyed and rival groups are fighting to take its place. There are also people called anarchists. They believe that any government is a bad thing – this belief is called anarchism. Anarchists think governments stop people organising their own lives. Instead they think people would be better off if they ruled their own lives and worked together to create a society in any form they choose.
Band society	Rule by a government based on small (usually family) unit with a semi-informal hierarchy, with strongest (either physical strength or strength of character) as leader. Very much like a pack seen in other animals, such as wolves.
Bureaucracy	Rule by a system of governance with many bureaus, administrators, and petty officials
Chiefdom(Tribal)	Rule by a government based on small complex society of varying degrees of centralisation that is led by an individual known as a chief.
Cybersynacy	Ruled by a data fed group of secluded individuals that regulates aspects of public and private life using data feeds and technology having no interactivity with the citizens but using "facts only" to decide direction.
Parliamentary system	A system of democratic government in which the ministers of the executive branch derive their legitimacy from and are accountable to a legislature or parliament; the executive and legislative branches are interconnected. It is a political system in which the supreme power lies in a body of citizens who can elect people to represent them.
Presidential system	A system of government where an executive branch is led by a president who serves as both head of state and head of government. In such a system, this branch exists separately from the legislature, to which it is not responsible and which it cannot, in normal circumstances, dismiss.
Nomocracy	Rule by a government under the sovereignty of rational laws and civic right as opposed to one under theocratic systems of government. In a nomocracy, ultimate and final authority (sovereignty) exists in the law.

Forms of government by other characteristic attributes

By socio-economic system attributes

Further information: Economic system

Historically, most political systems originated as socioeconomicideologies; experience with those movements in power, and the strong ties they may have to particular forms of government, can cause them to be considered as forms of government in themselves.

Term	Definition
Capitalism	In a capitalist or free-market economy, people own their own businesses and property and must buy services for private use.
Communism	A form of socialism, a stateless, classless, moneyless society, based on common ownership of industry,

Feudalism	A system of land ownership and duties. Under feudalism, all the land in a kingdom was the king's. However, the king would give some of the land to the lords or nobles who fought for him. These presents of land were called manors. Then the nobles gave some of their land to vassals. The vassals then had to do duties for the nobles. The lands of vassals were called fiefs.
Socialism	In a socialist society, workers democratically through cooperatives own all industry, public services may be commonly or state owned, such as healthcare and education.
Welfare state	Concept of government in which the state plays a key role in the protection and promotion of the economic and social well-being of its citizens. It is based on the principles of equality of opportunity, equitabledistribution of wealth, and public responsibility for those unable to avail themselves of the minimal provisions for a good life.

By significant constitutional attributes

Certain major characteristics are defining of certain types; others are historically associated with certain types of government.

- Rule according to higher law (unwritten ethical principles) vs. written constitutionalism
- Separation of church and state vs. state religion
- Civilian control of the military vs. stratocracy
- Totalitarianism/authoritarianism vs. libertarianism
    - Police state
- Majority rule or parliamentary sovereignty vs. constitution or bill of rights with separation of powers and supermajority rules to preventtyranny of the majority and protect minority rights
- Androcracy (patriarchy) or gynarchy (matriarchy), gender quotas,gender equality provision, or silence on the matter

By approach to regional autonomy

This list focuses on differing approaches that political systems take to the distribution of sovereignty, and the autonomy of regions within the state.

- Sovereignty located exclusively at the centre of political jurisdiction.
    - Empire
    - Unitary state
- Sovereignty located at the centre and in peripheral areas.
    - Hegemony
    - Federation and federal republic
    - Confederation
    - Federal monarchy
- Diverging degrees of sovereignty.
    - Asymmetrical federalism

- Federacy
- Associated state
- Protectorate
- Colonial dependency
- Thalassocracy
- League
- Commonwealth
- Decentralisation and devolution (powers redistributed from central to regional or local governments)

Theoretical and speculative attributes

These currently have no citable real-world examples outside of fiction.

Term	Definition
Corporate republic	Theoretical form of government occasionally hypothesised in works of science fiction, though some historical nations such as medieval Florence might be said to have been governed as corporate republics. The colonial megacorporations such as the Dutch East India Company should possibly be considered corporate states, being semi-sovereign with the power to wage war and establish colonies. While retaining some semblance of republicangovernment, a corporate republic would be run primarily like a business, involving a board of directors andexecutives. Utilities, including hospitals, schools, themilitary, and the police force, would be privatised. Thesocial welfare function carried out by the state is instead carried out by corporations in the form of benefits to employees. Although corporate republics do not exist officially in the modern world, they are often used in works of fiction or political commentary as a warning of the perceived dangers of unbridled capitalism. In such works, they usually arise when a single, vastly powerful corporation deposes a weak government, over time or in a coup d'état. Some political scientists have also considered state socialist nations to be forms of corporate republics, with the state assuming full control of all economic and political life and establishing a monopoly on everything within national boundaries – effectively making the state itself amount to a giant corporation.
Magocracy	Rule by a government with the highest and main authority being either a magician, sage, sorcerer, wizard or witch. This is often similar to a theocratic structured regime and is largely portrayed in fiction and fantasy genre categories.
Uniocracy	Ruled by a singularity of all human minds connected via some form of technical or non-technical telepathy acting as a form of super computer to make decisions based on shared patterned experiences to deliver fair and accurate decisions to problems as they arrive. Also known as the "Hive Mind" principle, it differs from voting in that each person would make a decision while in the "hive" the synapses of all minds work together following a longer path of memories to make "one" decision.

International Relations

Source: http://www.joshuagoldstein.com/jgcore.htm

Source: MAD Training Handbook 2010

by Joshua S. Goldstein

From pp.4-9 of Goldstein and Pevehouse, International Relations, 8th edition, 2008 (available July 2007), ISBN 978-0-205-57317-2.

The field of IR reflects the world's complexity, and IR scholars use many theories, concepts, and buzzwords in trying to describe and explain it. Underneath this complexity, however, lie a few basic principles that shape the field.

IR revolves around one key problem: How can a group-such as two or more nations-serve its collective interests when doing so requires its members to forgo their individual interests? For example, every country has an interest in stopping global warming, a goal that can be achieved only by many countries acting together. Yet each country also has an individual interest in burning fossil fuels to keep its economy going. Similarly, all members of a military alliance benefit from the strength of the alliance, but each member separately has an interest in minimizing its own contributions in troops and money. Individual nations can advance their own short-term interests by seizing territory militarily, cheating on trade agreements, and refusing to contribute to international efforts such as peacekeeping or vaccination campaigns. But if all nations acted this way, they would find themselves worse off, in a chaotic and vicious environment where mutual gains from security and trade would disappear.

This problem of shared interests versus conflicting interests among members of a group goes by various names in various contexts-the problem of "collective action," "free riding," "burden sharing," the "tragedy of the commons," a "mixed interest game," or the "prisoner's dilemma," to name a few that we will encounter in the coming chapters. We will refer to the general case as the collective goods problem, that is, the problem of how to provide something that benefits all members of a group regardless of what each member contributes to it.

In general, collective goods are easier to provide in small groups than in large ones. In a small group, the defection (free riding) of one member is harder to conceal, has a greater impact on the overall collective good, and is easier to punish. The advantage of small groups helps explain the importance of the great-power system in international security affairs and of the G7 (Group of Seven) industrialized countries in economic matters.

The collective goods problem occurs in all groups and societies, but is particularly acute in international affairs because each nation is sovereign, with no central authority such as a world government to enforce on individual nations the necessary measures to provide for the common good. By contrast, in domestic politics within countries, a government can force individuals to contribute in ways that do not serve their individual self-interest, such as by paying taxes or paying to install antipollution equipment on vehicles and factories. If individuals do not comply, the government can arrest and punish them or seize their assets. Although this solution is far from perfect-cheaters and criminals sometimes are not caught, and governments sometimes abuse their power-it mostly works well enough to keep societies going.

Three basic principles-which we call dominance, reciprocity, and identity-offer possible solutions to this core problem of getting individuals to cooperate for the common good without a central authority to make them do so (see Table 1.1). These three principles are fundamental across the social sciences and recur in such disciplines as the study of animal societies, child development, social psychology, anthropology, and economics, as well as political science. To explain each principle, we will apply the three principles to a small-scale human example and an IR example.

Core Principles for Solving Collective Goods Problems

Principle	Advantages	Drawbacks

Dominance	Order, Stability, Predictability	Oppression, Resentment
Reciprocity	Incentives for Mutual Cooperation	Downward Spirals; Complex Accounting
Identity	Sacrifice for Group, Redefine Interests	Demonizing an Out-Group

Dominance

The principle of dominance solves the collective goods problem by establishing a power hierarchy in which those at the top control those below–a bit like a government but without an actual government. Instead of fighting constantly over who gets scarce resources, the members of a group can just fight occasionally over position in the "status hierarchy." Then social conflicts such as over who gets resources are resolved automatically in favor of the higher-ranking actor. Fights over dominance position have scripted rules that minimize, to some extent, the harm inflicted on the group members. Symbolic acts of submission and dominance reinforce an ever-present status hierarchy. Staying on top of a status hierarchy does not depend on strength alone, though it helps. Rather, the top actor may be the one most adept at forming and maintaining alliances among the group's more capable members. Dominance is complex, and not just a matter of brute force.

In international relations, the principle of dominance underlies the great-power system, in which a handful of countries dictate the rules for all the others. Sometimes a so-called hegemon or superpower stands atop the great powers as the dominant nation. The UN Security Council, in which the world's five strongest military powers hold a veto, reflects the dominance principle.

The advantage of the dominance solution to the collective goods problem is that, like a government, it forces members of a group to contribute to the common good. It minimizes open conflict within the group. However, the disadvantage is that this stability comes at a cost of constant oppression of, and resentment by, the lower-ranking members in the status hierarchy. Also, conflicts over position in the hierarchy can occasionally harm the group's stability and well-being, such as when challenges to the top position lead to serious fights. In the case of international relations, the great-power system and the hegemony of a superpower can provide relative peace and stability for decades on end but then can break down into terribly costly wars among the great powers.

Reciprocity

The principle of reciprocity solves the collective goods problem by rewarding behavior that contributes to the group and punishing behavior that pursues self-interest at the expense of the group. In human societies, the behavior of one individual toward another very often mirrors the kind of behavior that individual has received recently from the other. Reciprocity is very easy to understand and can be "enforced" without any central authority, making it a robust way to get individuals to cooperate for the common good.

But reciprocity operates in both the positive realm ("You scratch my back and I'll scratch yours") and the negative ("An eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth"). The disadvantage of reciprocity as a solution to the collective goods problem is that it can lead to a downward spiral as each side punishes what it believes to be negative acts by the other. Psychologically, most people overestimate their own good intentions and underestimate the value of the actions of their opponents or rivals. To avoid tit-for-tat escalations of conflict, one or both parties must act generously to get the relationship moving in a good direction.

In international relations, reciprocity forms the basis of most of the norms (habits; expectations) and institutions in the international system. Many central arrangements in IR, such as the World Trade Organization agreements, explicitly recognize reciprocity as the linchpin of cooperation. For instance, if one country opens its markets to another's goods, the other opens its markets in return. On the negative side, if one country expels a certain number of diplomats from another country for spying, the other country always responds within days by expelling the same number of diplomats from the first country. Reciprocity fuels arms races as each side responds to the other's buildup of weapons. But it also allows arms control agreements and other step-by-step conflict-resolution measures, as two sides match each other's actions in backing away from the brink.

Identity

A third potential solution to the collective goods problem lies in the identities of participants as members of a community. Although the dominance and reciprocity principles act on the idea of achieving individual self-interest (by taking what you can, or by mutually beneficial arrangements), the identity principle does not rely on self-interest. On the contrary, members of an identity community care about the interests of others in the community enough to sacrifice their own interests to benefit others. The roots of this principle lie in the family, the extended family, and the kinship group. But this potential does not appear limited to the close family but rather can be generalized to any identity community that one feels a part of. Members of a family care about each other, but so do members of an ethnic group, a gender group, a nation, or the world's scientists. In each case, individual members will accept solutions to collective goods problems that do not give them the best deal as individuals, because the benefits are "all in the family," so to speak. A biologist retiring at a rich American university may give away lab equipment to a biologist in a poor country because they share an identity as scientists. A European Jew may give money to Israel because of a shared Jewish identity, or a computer scientist from India may return home to work for lower pay after receiving training in Canada, in order to help the community he or she cares about. Millions of Americans contributed to relief for Asian tsunami victims because of a shared identity as members of the community of human beings.

In IR, identity communities play important roles in overcoming difficult collective goods problems, including the issue of who contributes to development assistance, world health, or UN peacekeeping missions. The relatively large foreign aid contributions of Scandinavian countries, or the high Canadian participation in peacekeeping, cannot be explained well by self-interest, but arise from these countries' self-defined identities as members of the international community. Even in the interactions of military forces or diplomats (where dominance and reciprocity, respectively, rule the day), the shared identities of military professionals and of diplomats-each with shared traditions and expectations-can take the edge off conflicts. And military alliances also mix identity politics with raw self-interest, as shown by the unusual strength of the U.S.-British alliance, which shared interests alone cannot explain as well as shared identity does.

Nonstate actors, such as nongovernmental organizations or terrorist networks, also rely on identity politics to a great extent. The increasing roles of these actors-feminist organizations, churches, jihadists, and multinational corporations, for example-have brought the identity principle to greater prominence in IR theory in recent years.

An Everyday Example

To sum up the three core principles, imagine that you have two good friends, a man and a woman, who are in a romantic relationship. They love each other and enjoy the other's company, but they come to you for help because they have a problem. When they go out together, the man likes to go to the opera, whereas the woman enjoys going to boxing matches. Because of your training in international relations, you quickly recognize this as a collective goods problem, in which the shared interest is spending time together and the conflicting individual interests are watching opera and watching boxing. (Of course, you know that the behavior of states is more complicated than individuals, but put that aside for a moment.) You might approach this problem in any of three ways.

First, you could say, "Traditionally, relationships work best when the man wears the pants. For thousands of years the man has made the decision and the woman has followed it. I suggest you do the same, and buy season tickets to the opera." This would be a dominance solution. It could be a very stable solution, if the woman cares more about spending time with her true love than she cares about opera or boxing. It would be a simple solution that would settle all future conflicts. It would give one party everything he wants, and the other party some of what she wants (love, company, a stable relationship). This might be better for both of them than spending all their evenings arguing about where to go out. On the other hand, this solution might leave the woman permanently resentful at the manifestly unequal nature of the outcome. She might feel her love for her partner diminish, over time, by a longing for respect and a nostalgia for boxing. She might even meet another man who likes her and likes boxing.

Second, you could say, "Look, instead of fighting all the time, why don't you establish a pattern and trade off going to boxing one time and opera the next." This would be a reciprocity solution. You could set up agreements, accounting systems, and shared expectations to govern the implementation of this seemingly simple solution. For example, they could go to boxing on Friday nights and opera on Saturday nights. But what if opera season is shorter than boxing season? Then perhaps they would go to opera more often during its season and boxing more often when opera is out of season. What if one of them is out of town on Friday night? Does that night count anyway or does it earn a credit for later? Or does the one who is in town go out alone? What if the man hates boxing but the woman only mildly dislikes opera? Do you set up a schedule of two operas for each boxing match to keep each side equally happy or unhappy? Clearly, reciprocity solutions can become very complicated (just look at the world trade rules, for example), and they require constant monitoring to see if obligations are being met and cheating is being avoided. Your friends might find it an irritant in their relationship to keep close track of who owes whom a night at the opera or the boxing match.

Third, you could say, "Who cares about opera or boxing? The point is that you love each other and want to be together. Get past the superficial issues and strengthen the core feelings that brought you together. Then it won't matter where you go or what you're watching." This would be an identity solution. This approach could powerfully resolve your friends' conflict and leave them both much happier. Over time, one partner might actually begin to prefer the other's favorite activity after more exposure–leading to a change in identity. On the other hand, after a while self-interest could creep back in, because that loving feeling might seem even happier with a boxing match (or opera) to watch. Indeed, one partner can subtly exploit the other's commitment to get past the superficial conflicts. "What's it matter as long as we're together," she says, "and oh, look, there's a good boxing match tonight!" Sometimes the identity principle operates more powerfully in the short term than the long term: the soldier who volunteers to defend the homeland might begin to feel taken advantage of after months or years on the front line, and the American college student who gives money once to tsunami victims may not keep giving year after year to malaria victims.

An IR Example

Now consider the problem of nuclear proliferation. All countries share an interest in the collective good of peace and stability, which is hard to achieve in a world where more and more countries make more and more nuclear weapons. Within a society, if individuals acquire dangerous weapons, the government can take them away to keep everyone safe. But in the society of nations, no such central authority exists. In 2006, North Korea tested its first nuclear bomb and Iran continued uranium enrichment that could lead to a nuclear bomb–defying UN resolutions in both cases.

One approach to nuclear proliferation legitimizes their ownership by just the few most powerful countries. The "big five" with the largest nuclear arsenals hold veto power on the UN Security Council. Through agreements like the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and the Proliferation Security Initiative, the existing nuclear powers actively try to keep their exclusive hold on these weapons and prevent smaller nations from getting them. This is a dominance approach. In 2003, when the United States thought Iraq's Saddam Hussein might have an active nuclear weapons program, as he had a decade earlier, it invaded Iraq and overthrew its government. Similarly, in 1982 when Iraq had begun working toward a nuclear bomb, Israel sent jets to bomb Iraq's nuclear facility, setting back the program by years. One drawback to these dominance solutions is the resentment they create among the smaller countries. They point to an unenforced provision of the NPT stating that existing nuclear powers should get rid of their own bombs as other countries refrain from making new ones. And they ask what gives Israel the right to bomb another country, or the United States the right to invade one. They speak of a "double standard" for the powerful and the weak.

Reciprocity offers a different avenue for preventing proliferation. It is the basis of the provision in the NPT about the existing nuclear powers' obligation to disarm in exchange for smaller countries' agreement to stay nonnuclear. Reciprocity also underlies arms control agreements, used extensively in the Cold War to manage the buildup of nuclear bombs by the superpowers, and used currently to manage the mutual reduction of their arsenals. Deterrence also relies on reciprocity. The United States warned North Korea in 2006 against selling its bombs (an action that would be in North Korea's short-term self-interest), threatening to retaliate against North Korea if any other actor used such a bomb against the United States. And when Libya gave up its nuclear weapons program in 2003, the international community gave it various rewards, including the ending of economic sanctions, in exchange.

The identity principle has proven equally effective against nuclear proliferation, if less newsworthy. Many nations that have the technical ability to make nuclear weapons have chosen not to do so. They have constructed their national identities in ways that shape their self-interests so as to make nuclear bombs undesirable. Some, like Sweden, do not intend to fight wars. Others, like Germany, belong to alliances in which they come under another nation's nuclear "umbrella" and do not need their own bomb. South Africa actually developed nuclear weapons in secret but then dismantled the program before apartheid ended, keeping the bomb out of the hands of the new majority-rule government. Nobody forced South Africa to do this (as in dominance), nor did it respond to rewards and punishments (reciprocity). Rather, South Africa's identity shifted. Similarly, Japan's experience of the catastrophic results of militarism, culminating in the destruction of two of its cities by nuclear bombs in 1945, continues generations later to shape Japan's identity as a country that does not want nuclear weapons, even though it has the know-how and even the stockpile of plutonium to make them.

Key Terms

Sovereignty: when a country has independent and absolute authority over territory.
The Treaty of Westphalia (1648) codified the basic principles of territorial integrity, border inviolability, and supremacy of the state (rather than the Church).
Basically, whatever happens within a country"s borders, stays within those borders.
Application in debates: often an issue in debates about invasion – on what terms can we sacrifice sovereignty and intervene? How high should that threshold be? Genocide? Absence of political rights?

Sanctions: a method for attempting to influence the behaviour of others. Can take a variety of forms:
Economic sanctions - typically a ban on trade, possibly limited to certain sectors such as armaments, or with certain exceptions (such as food and medicine)
International sanctions - coercive measures adopted by a country or group of countries against another state or individiual(s) in order to elicit a change in their behavior
Trade sanctions - economic sanctions applied for non-political reasons (WTO disputes for example)

Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD): prominent school of thought during the Cold War, belief that if both parties have nuclear weapons, and are aware that the other could blow them up, then they won"t attack each other because their destruction. Perhaps relevant during the Cold War (although questionable – think Cuban Missile Crisis) but less so now because assumes a) bipolar world or at the very least, b) rational actors (think terrorists, not always about the long term….that is if you"re a suicide bomber who thinks they"ll soon meet their bevy of virgins in heaven).

Schools of Thought

Academics and politicians have spent hundreds of years developing political theory – here is a brief snap shot of the concepts which most commonly arise in debates.

Neoconservatism: a political philosophy that emerged in America which supports using American economic and military power to bring liberalism, democracy, and human rights to other countries.
Really popular term during the presidency of George W. Bush given the perceived neoconservative influence on American foreign policy, as part of the Bush Doctrine.

Just war theory: a doctrine of military ethics which says that a conflict can and ought to meet the criteria of philosophical, religious or political justice, provided it follows certain conditions
Just War Theory has two sets of criteria. The first establishing jus ad bellum, the right to go to war; the second establishing jus in bello, right conduct within war.
Jus ad bellum - just cause - the reason for going to war needs to be just and cannot therefore be solely for recapturing things taken or punishing people who have done wrong; innocent life must be in imminent danger and intervention must be to protect life.
Jus in bello - Once war has begun, just war theory also directs how combatants are to act. (Think Geneva conventions, ottowa convention on land mines, POW"s etc)

Democratic peace theory (or liberal democratic theory): democracies rarely go to war with one another.
The original theory and research on wars has been followed by many similar theories and related research on the relationship between democracy and peace, including that lesser conflicts than wars are also rare between democracies, and that systematic violence is in general less common within democracies.

„Golden Arches" peace theory: theory is that no two countries with a McDonald's franchise have ever gone to war with one another (it"s a version of the democratic peace theory).
The argument goes that when a country has reached an economic development where it has a middle class strong enough to support a McDonalds network, it will not be interested in fighting wars anymore.

Clashes

„Soft Power" vs. „Hard Power: broadly describes different ends of the „influence" spectrum.
Soft Power is just that – soft and almost the warm and fuzzy bits of IR. Includes things like diplomatic negotiations, aid, engagement etc. and seeks to influence behaviour of other states subtly and positively.
If Soft Power is the carrot, Hard Power is the badass stick – often associated with things like invasion, economic sanctions and diplomatic isolation. Seeks to send a strong message to other actors and often also attempts to undermine/disempower said actors.
Application in debates: what"s better, the carrot or the stick? Most likely the answer lays somewhere in the middle. It"s always useful to be able to point to a progression in actions – i.e. we"ve tried soft power, it hasn"t worked, we need to therefore progress to hard power.
Also relevant to consider issues of proportionality – are you sanctioning a country for a minor offence?

Unilateral vs. multilateral war: big issue in recent years – is it legitimate for and should countries intervene internationally on their own? Is there a certain mandate and legitimacy that comes with collective intervention?
Application in debates: aside from the obvious example of Iraq II, which was latterly unilateral, it often arises where it"s claimed that „we can"t wait for things to get any worse".

Consider issues of precedent, slippery slope, role of the UN etc.

Rational vs irrational actors: also a big issue of late – important to consider the nature of actors – are they logical, rational actors i.e. will respond to conventional threats like economic sanctions? Or are they nut jobs with too much power who won"t be swayed by normal tactics? Think Kim Jong Il.
Application in debates: often relevant in debates about dictators and terrorists – generally speaking, the least rational. Aren't influenced by normal means.

Economics

Source: http://www.csun.edu/~dgw61315/aboutecon.html

Source: MAD Training Handbook 2010

Ten Things Debaters Should Know About Economics

This is a list of ten things that debaters should know about economics. The purpose of this page is not to provide a full education in economics, but to provide ammunition for debate rounds. I have written the items in broad terms, so that the breadth of their applicability is apparent. As many of the examples indicate, economic ideas can be used in a variety of contexts (legal, political, moral, etc.) where you might not expect to find them. Even when a debate is not about economics per se, the concepts here may add an extra dimension to your argumentation.

1. Incentives
   a. Rewards
   b. Punishments
2. Substitution Effects
3. Prices and Price Controls
4. The Third Party Buyer Effect
5. Moral Hazard
6. Restricting the Choice Set
7. Prisoners' Dilemma
8. Debts and Deficits
9. Keynes Is Dead
10. What Is Seen and What Is Not Seen

1. Incentives

There is one basic law of economics that is the foundation for all the others: People respond to incentives. Though the law is simple, its applications are nearly unlimited.

A. People do more of something when the reward increases. When you subsidize something, you get more of it.

Examples:

- Pharmaceutical companies invest more in research and development if patents allow them to make higher profits from new drugs.
- According to an old story, a small town in Italy was having a problem with vipers. So the town council established a "viper bounty" to pay people for bringing in dead vipers. The result was that people started breeding vipers in their basements. (Think about the implications of this story for gun buy-back programs.)

- Americans who wanted to fight modern-day slavery in Africa founded a non-profit organization that collects money to buy children out of slavery. The result was that kidnappers started stealing even more children from their homes, because the increased demand drove up the sale price of slaves.
- Women may have more children when welfare payments are pegged to the number of children they have.

This last example, which is very controversial, illustrates an important fact about incentives. While there is little doubt about the *direction* in which rewards push behavior, the *magnitude* of the effect may be very small or very large, depending on the situation. Some defenders of state welfare programs have argued that the welfare payments for additional children are too small to induce any measurable increase in child-bearing. And indeed, studies have had a difficult time finding any such an effect -- although one study, which looked at the effects of a New Jersey law curtailing benefits for additional children, alleged to show that abortions increased under the new policy. So the jury is out on whether welfare policy has a *significant* impact on child-bearing.

B. People do less of something when the penalty or cost increases.

Examples:

- When insurance policies cost more, people buy fewer of them.
- If prison terms are increased for a crime, people are less likely to commit the crime.
- If employment law requires employers to provide paid family leave, day care, etc. for their employees, employers may respond by hiring fewer of the workers most likely to make use of these benefits: women.
- When people perceive sex as more dangerous (e.g., because AIDS is discovered), they engage in less risky sexual behavior.

This last example raises, again, the issue of magnitude. If an activity becomes more costly or dangerous, people will do less of it -- but how much less? Obviously, the emergence of AIDS did not end all promiscuity. It did, however, greatly increase the demand for condoms, and having multiple sex partners waned in popularity. The incentive effect was present, but perhaps not as large as some think it should have been.

2. Substitution Effects

Although increasing the cost of an activity will generally cause people to decrease how much they do it, they may simultaneously increase how much they do something else. For example:

- Increasing the criminal penalties for the use of one drug (say, cocaine) may induce people to switch to other drugs (like heroin).
- In Japan, pornography laws prohibit photos that show pubic hair. Although the intent of the laws was to ban hard-core photographs of human genitalia, the result was that pornographers started producing more pornography with shaved pubic areas.
- Restricting access to one method of committing suicide may cause some people to switch to other methods.

The tendency of people to substitute one activity for another is a major source of unintended consequences, which can prove especially useful in debate rounds. If you need to find potential harms of a new policy proposal that penalizes some behavior, it is a good idea to ask how people may respond by doing more of another, possibly less desirable, behavior.

3. Prices and Price Controls

In a market economy, prices act as signals of scarcity. When the price of something is high, that means it's more scarce -- that is, demand for it is high relative to the supply. When the price of something is low, then it's less scarce. By observing prices, consumers and producers can choose their behavior to respond to scarcity. High prices induce producers to switch from more scarce to less scarce resources, and they induce consumers to switch from products and services that require more scarce resources to products and services that require fewer.

Throughout history, governments have attempted to influence the market with price controls, and they have met with almost universal failure. The most common form of price control is a price ceiling, a maximum price set below the market price. In response to a price ceiling, consumers increase the quantity of the good they want to consume, while producers reduce the quantity they are willing to supply. As a result, a shortage emerges. Although the price ceiling may have been intended to benefit the consumers, they will actually end up consuming less of the good in question.

- Rent controls, which place a cap on prices landlords can charge for rental housing, lead to a reduction in the amount of rental housing available.
- Price controls on gasoline in the 1970s resulted in long queues at the gas pumps, as consumers lined up to get their share of the reduced quantity of gasoline available.

Price ceilings also tend to breed corruption and blackmarkets, because consumers are willing to pay much more than the law allows them to pay. In the case of rent controls, potential apartment renters often pay "key fees," rental agency fees, and even outright bribes to get access to the reduced supply of housing units.

The other form of price control is a price floor, a minimum price set above the market price. In response to a price floor, producers will increase the amount they are willing to supply, while consumers will reduce the amount they are willing to buy. As a result, a surplus emerges. Often, the government is then obliged to buy up the extra. Although price floors are less common than price ceilings, they have often been used to prop up prices in agricultural markets. Another example is the minimum wage, which props up the price (wage) of labor, leading to a surplus of labor (a.k.a. unemployment or underemployment).

4. The Third-Party Buyer Effect

"No, thank you, I don't want a cocktail. Oh, they're free? Then I'll have two!" This is the third-party buyer effect. Whenever goods and services are provided at zero cost to the buyer, consumption of that thing is likely to rise dramatically unless limited in some other way. Examples:

- When Canada first socialized its health care system, doctors' offices were flooded with patients seeking treatment for the most minor of illnesses (real and imagined), and doctors sent inflated bills to the government. Eventually, the government sought to limit this practice by placing ceilings on the prices doctors could charge, expecting that doctors would then start limiting the number of patients they saw. Instead, doctors avoided the price controls by decreasing the length of doctor visits and having patients visit more often (because the price controls were set on a per-visit basis).
- Health insurance companies know that customers will consume large quantities of health services if the insurance company covers the full price; this is one reason why many health insurance policies require copayments and deductibles to be paid by patients.
- Enrollment in colleges and universities increased rapidly after the enactment of the G.I. Bill, government-subsidized student loans, and other programs that lowered the price of education to students. (Note that the actual price of education did not fall, only the price perceived by students. The higher demand actually increased the real price of education.)

5. Moral Hazard

Moral hazard refers to the fact that people tend to engage in riskier behavior when they are insured or shielded against the risk. When people have auto insurance, for example, they tend to drive more recklessly. Numerous other examples exist:

- Federal flood insurance encourages people to continue building homes in floodplains.
- In the 1980s, the savings & loan industry was *partially* deregulated. Many of the controls on allowed investments were eliminated, but the Federal Savings & Loan Insurance Corporation (FSLIC) continued to guarantee depositors against losses. As a result, S&L's started investing in more risky projects than normal, as part of a "heads we win, tails we break even" strategy. The taxpayers picked up the tab.
- "Every rental car is an SUV."

6. Restricting the Choice Set

In general, people choose what they perceive as the best option available to them. That's true even if, perhaps especially if, all their options suck. If you take away one of their options (this is known as restricting the choice set), there are two possible outcomes: (1) It wasn't an option they would have chosen anyway, in which case there's no effect. (2) It was an option they would have chosen, in which case they have to choose an option they must have considered worse. So with few exceptions, restricting someone's choice set only makes them worse off. Example: Your opponent says, "Prostitution is a terrible, demoralizing activity for the women who do it." Your response: "Yeah, but apparently they consider it better than the alternatives available to them, which might be starving or being unable to support their families." Their reply:

"So we should make better alternatives available to them." Your rejoinder: "Okay, but that's not mutually exclusive. You can give people more options without taking other options away."

7. The Prisoners' Dilemma

The prisoners' dilemma is a classic story about how individually rational decisions can lead to a socially undesirable outcome.

Here's the original story: There are two partners in crime who get arrested by the police. The DA visits each prisoner and says the following: "If you both stay quiet, we'll convict each of you on a minor offense, and you'll get a year in jail. If both of you confess, you'll both get convicted and get 10 years in jail. If you confess and your buddy stays quiet, then you'll go free, and he'll go to jail for 15 years. And I'm making the very same offer to him." Imagine you're one of the prisoners. It turns out that no matter what you think your partner's going to do, it makes sense for you to confess. Why? Because if he's staying quiet, you can avoid a year in jail by confessing. And if he's confessing, you can reduce your sentence from 15 years to 10 years by confessing. So you decide to confess. Your partner, facing the same incentives, also confesses. So you both go to jail for 10 years, even though you'd both have been better off if you'd both stayed quiet.

There are various situations that can be characterized (more or less accurately) as prisoners' dilemmas. They include:

- Attempted cartel formation. Firms might like to agree to set high prices and make big profits by squeezing the consumers. But if you think the other firm is setting a high price, you can make even bigger profits by undercutting his price and getting a huge market share. And the same goes for him, so you both cheat on your agreement and set low prices. This is good for the consumers, but bad for the firms trying to fix prices.
- Public goods. A public good is a good that (a) you cannot exclude others from using (or enjoying) once it has been provided, and that (b) can provide benefits to additional people at zero cost. An example is national defense. If we tried to provide this service privately, some people might try to "free ride" off the contributions of others, since they would get the benefits whether they payed or not. As a result, the service might not get provided, or it might get provided at an inefficiently low level.
- The "tragedy of the commons." When land and other resources are owned communally, and no one can be excluded from using them, they are almost always abused and destroyed. Why? Because the benefits of using the land are concentrated on the person who uses it, while the costs (from overuse, degradation, etc.) are spread over everyone. So people keep on using the land more, even when the costs are greater than the benefits.

Though there are many situations that are prisoners' dilemmas, there are many more that are not. Debaters will sometimes throw around the term "prisoners' dilemma" whenever they wish to assert that a socially undesirable outcome will occur if people are left on their own. But a prisoners' dilemma has very specific features, to wit: it must be the case that the "bad" action is individually rational *regardless* of the choices of other individuals. (See the original example: It makes sense to confess whether or not the other guy does.)

8. Debts and Deficit

These terms are often misused and confused. With respect to government budgeting, they have the following meanings: The *deficit* is the excess of expenditures over revenues in a single year. The *debt* is the accumulation of all previous deficits not paid off. In other words, the debt is a stock, like all of the water in a bathtub, while a deficit is a flow, like the water currently flowing from the faucet into the bathtub.

This is important because even if deficits are zero (as they've allegedly been in recent years for the federal government), the debt is still there. Typically, the federal government runs a yearly deficit in the tens or hundreds of billions of dollars, whereas the national debt is in the trillions of dollars.

The problem with both debts and deficits is that they tend to drive up interest rates. This is because the government is competing with private borrowers for loans. The result is that government borrowing tends to *crowd out* private borrowing. Much private borrowing is for the purpose of making capital investments, so the long-run result of crowding out is reduced economic growth.

9. Keynes Is Dead

The early-20th- century economist John Maynard Keynes advocated a set of economic policy prescriptions that are now know as "Keynesianism." The basic idea of Keynesianism (shorn of all the bells and whistles) is that government can spend the economy out of a recession. It supposedly works like this: The government spends a bunch of money on who knows what. People receive that money as income. Then they spend a large chunk of that income on other goods and services, and that money is someone else's income. Then they spend it on yet more goods and services, etc., etc. This is known as the multiplier effect.

Although there are still some economists who support Keynesian policies, it's important for debaters to realize that Keynes's theory is mostly dead in the economics profession. The main reason Keynesian policy still gets taught to undergrads is that, well, it's easy to teach and understand. But that doesn't mean it's right. Better macroeconomic models are much more sophisticated, and I can't fully describe them here. But the basic flaw of Keynesianism is this: you have to ask where the government's money comes from in the first place. It can either tax, borrow, or print money. If the government taxes, then that's less money in people's pockets, so every dollar that the government spends is balanced by a dollar not spent somewhere else. (Some Keynesians will say that taxpayers might choose to save the money instead of spending it, which creates a "leakage." But saved money is almost never just stuck in a mattress. Saved money gets lent out by banks and used for investment.) If the government borrows, then it drives up interest rates and crowds out private investment. And if the government prints money, the value of the dollars people have goes down because of inflation, so it's almost identical to a tax.

Even economists who still believe the Keynesian theory (or some modernized form of it) generally regard it as a short-run theory. In the long run, spending by the government cannot increase the wealth of the economy unless government actually spends the money more efficiently than would the private sector. The more important long-run issue is the crowding out of private investment that follows from government deficits.

10. What Is Seen and What Is Not Seen

This phrase was coined by the French journalist-economist Frederic Bastiat. He used it to make the point that economic policies must be judged not just by their obvious effects, but by their less obvious effects. The benefits of a policy are almost always apparent, but the costs are often invisible because they are what *could have been* – they are benefits we might have had but didn't. Some examples will make the point better:

- Defense spending creates jobs for people in defense-related industries. This is "what is seen." But any money spent on defense is money that could have been spent on other programs or spent by taxpayers. They might have used their money for clothes or movies or new housing. In these other areas, jobs are lost or never created in the first place. This is "what is not seen."
- The minimum wage raises wages for the workers who get those jobs. This is "what is seen." But the higher wages cause employers not to hire as many new workers, and so some people go unemployed. This is "what is not seen."
- High tariffs protect the jobs of people in industries that face foreign competition. This is "what is seen." But they also raise the prices of goods to consumers, which means they don't have as much income to spend on other things, and therefore other industries (wherever consumers would have spent their income) don't hire as many people as they would have otherwise.

The reason we so often fail to see "what is not seen" is that it is what *would have happened otherwise*. It's easier to see what is than what might have been. This is what most people, including many policymakers and debaters, fail to consider

The ultimate goal of economics is to try and explain all aspects of human behaviour – to understand why people make the choices they make, and to use that to predict how individuals will then make choices in the future. Choices don"t have to be purely about buying and selling things (though they often are), and even monetary choices can have other, non-monetary factors at play. Analysing the costs and benefits faced by individuals, and how they are likely to react is something that is useful not just in economics debates but in all kinds of debates (and indeed just generally in life).

Margins

The first thing to realise is that economic effects are not black and white; they are often about shades of grey. Any policy, even a blanket one, will affect only some people (seems obvious, but you"d be surprised how often this idea gets lost in debates). Raising taxes on cigarettes by 10% isn"t going to stop everyone smoking, but it will have some effect. Who will

it affect? Well, probably those people for whom the benefits of smoking just outweigh the costs, before the 10% tax rise. For them, a 10% tax rise is just enough to make the costs now outweigh the benefits, leading them to quit. An economist would say they are "at the margin".
Marginal analysis can be quite powerful in debates – it means that you don't prove as wide a benefit, but you end up proving a relatively smaller benefit much more effectively. For example, in a debate about the death penalty, it's hard to prove that the death penalty will deter all murders, but it's relatively easier to argue that for some people, the harsher punishment will alter the way they weigh up the risks and benefits of their crime. Similarly, in the previous example about smoking, it's hard to say any amount of tax rises will deter everyone from smoking, but clearly you can argue that even some addicts will be forced to quit if the price gets too high for them.
Another way of thinking about marginal analysis (which can often allow you to turn the argument around the other way) is to consider the marginal impact as the "extra" impact of the policy. This is just another way of conceiving the same idea as above – given that we already have a certain set of incentives and disincentives in place, we're not interested really in the total effects of incentives or disincentives, we're really interested in the extra impact a given policy will have.
A good example is the death penalty debate – whilst the threat of death may very well be a significant deterrent in its own right, what's really important is if the death penalty is a substantially greater penalty than the existing harshest penalty (life without parole). You might argue that the people deterred by the death penalty would already be deterred by the existing punishment regime; whilst those not deterred at present wouldn't see the death penalty as a substantially greater cost to them, given the alternative is spending their life in prison.

Markets
It's useful to keep in mind marginal analysis when considering markets. Markets are mechanisms through which scarce resources are allocated. Now, people don't consume goods continuously – even when things are very good, people usually have a point at which they stop. Why? Because, eventually, the extra benefit they get from consuming an additional unit of the good is outweighed by the extra cost. Generally, the more of something you consume, the less benefit each extra unit gives you (try eating 10 Cornettos and see if the 10_{th} one is as enjoyable as the first). So, individuals will buy things until they no longer gain benefits. Similarly, producers will sell things as long as they still make a profit (except for a few exceptional circumstances, firms don't sell things at a loss, and even then they have a logic behind it). The specific mechanism through which this happens is the price – it's a signal to people and to firms about how much they should buy or produce. If a product is priced too low, it will run out quickly, and firms can then take this as a signal to raise prices. This then deters some people from buying, till eventually the amount being bought and sold is the same. If the price is too high, fewer people will buy the good, or another producer will come along and find a cheaper way to sell the good, so the price will fall.
The effect is thus that everyone gets what they want – people end up buying things if they are at a price they want, and other people sell them at a price where they make a profit. Things get allocated without waste, and everyone's happy. Or so you'd think.

Market failure and Intervention
The theory behind markets rest on several assumptions, almost none of which turn out to be true in the real world – we get close, or close enough that it doesn't matter in some cases – but by and large there are some gaping holes in the free market's execution. Most debates about economics revolve around some sort of market failure as a result of one of these assumptions failing. They end up being a clash between a side arguing that harms of the market failure necessitate intervention, and a side arguing either that there isn't really a failure (or that the market can more or less fix itself), and that the harms of intervention are worse than the current market failure.
So how do markets fail? Spectacularly, in many cases (I also would have accepted "frequently" and "hilariously"). We'll look at some of the assumptions and how they break down below.

Infinite Buyers and Sellers
If I wanted to get all Freakonomics on you, it's about now that I would ask a question like "How is Telstra similar to the AFL draft?"
The answer is not particularly interesting, and won't come up in debates much – but it's a concept that most people will be familiar with and helps to explain market failures. In the case of Telstra, at least in the past, it used to be a monopoly – that is, it was the only seller in the market. If what Telstra sells was needed by people (and it was), then as the only seller it could charge whatever it wanted and people would still have to buy from it. Prices wouldn't come down because there was nowhere else to get telecommunications services. Of course that's changed now (to an extent), but this is a clear-cut example of market failure, and of justified Government intervention – the Government has all sorts of regulations that force Telstra to provide access to its phone and cable internet infrastructure at competitive prices to other telecommunications providers. Incidentally, the AFL draft is an example of a monopoly – a market with

only one buyer who can charge as little as they like. When a player gets drafted by a club, that club is effectively the only buyer of the player"s labour.
A similar problem is the concept of oligopolies – when instead of one seller, there are a small number of sellers. This is not the same problem as a monopoly, but can still result in elevated prices, as firms may collude both explicitly and implicitly to set an artificially high price. Government policies generally prohibit collusion and cartel-like behaviour (a cartel is an industry group that meets to set high prices – there"s a global cartel of oil producers called OPEC who routinely do this), but they can"t always stop implicit cartel-like behaviour, such as when firms set high prices similar to their competitors.
There"s little argument that the Government should not intervene (except, perhaps, to suggest that the Government should make it easier for competitors to enter the market), so generally we don"t have debates about monopolies or oligopolies, but the principles are useful to consider – issues about market power and relative competitiveness do come up in other debates, particularly when considering labour debates such as minimum wage, labour union or right to strike debates.

No External Effects
One key assumption behind markets is that the transactions that go on are entirely self-contained – that is, no third party is affected in any way by the result of the buyer and seller transacting. When a third-party is affected, it"s considered an externality. Externalities can be positive or negative, and can occur in production or consumption.
The classic example of a negative externality in production is the case of pollution. If a factory produces cars, and then dumps waste into a local river or emits gases into the air without having to pay for it, then it imposes this as a cost on the people who live near the factory. The buyer of the car doesn"t pay for it (and thus doesn"t account for the cost they impose), but the third party is affected nonetheless. This means that a free market will see cars being over consumed, as the economic costs don"t reflect the social costs.
An example of a positive externality in consumption are the economy-wide benefits of education. Being educated has direct benefits to the individual, but an educated society has extra benefits. If all of society can read, then information can simply be printed and widely distributed, reducing costs of doing business and administering the society. A large number of tertiary-educated individuals is attractive to large corporations, encouraging them to set up operations. Individuals consider the benefits to themselves, but don"t necessarily consider the wider benefits to society. So a free market will see a less than socially optimal amount of education consumed.
The usual Government response is to either outlaw or mandate certain things, or tax or subsidise externalities to make the social costs and benefits align more closely with the economic costs and benefits. Hence, some types of pollution are banned entirely and some education is mandatory for all people. Generally, however, taxes and subsidies are used – the Government subsidises tertiary education to ensure that a socially optimal number of people undertake it. Similarly, heavily polluting vehicles are generally taxed at a higher rate to reflect the costs they impose. Note that in both cases the externality is not completely eliminated – it is just brought to efficient levels.
However, these mechanisms can be imperfect – whilst they will create certainty around the costs and benefits for individuals, there is no certainty as to what effect they will have. This is because in order to be effective, we need to know what the socially optimal amount of production or consumption is, and we need to know exactly what everyone is willing to pay (i.e., what the marginal impact of a subsidy or tax will be). So, even if we can determine that a certain amount of education is optimal, or that a certain level of pollution is optimal, we cannot be sure that a 10% subsidy or tax will achieve this. Even if it does, if the preferences or situations of people change, then the subsidy or tax will no longer be as effective.
Another solution that has gained popularity recently is a market-based solution. Here, the rights to pollute (or the rights to clean air) are created and assigned, and are made tradeable. They can then be bought or sold, meaning that the efficient market amount also becomes the efficient social amount (because parties can buy or refuse to sell the rights to pollute beyond which they deem excessive). This of course requires a fair process to distribute the rights, and runs into income inequality problems, but those are separate issues.

Public Goods
Similar to an externality in some respects, a public good is a good that is non-rivalrous in consumptions and non-excludable. In other words, it doesn"t matter if one person or a thousand people consume the good, it costs the same to provide it (and one person consuming doesn"t interfere with another person consuming the good), and it is not possible to stop people from consuming the good. A good example is free-to-air TV, national defence or a lighthouse.
Let"s take the lighthouse example to explain why they are an important concept. Building a lighthouse obviously has benefits to certain people, but if it"s on for one person then it"s on for everyone – this means that if someone builds a lighthouse, everyone else can access the good without having to pay for it. This is why they are interesting – on their own, most public goods wouldn"t come about because individuals have no incentive to create the good in question, or at least will create it below the optimum level.

Tragedy of the commons
This is a situation where the good in question is non-excludable (so you can"t stop people from accessing it) but it is rivalrous in consumption, meaning that one person"s consumption does affect everyone else"s. The most common example is a communal field, or global fishing grounds.
Take the example of a communal grazing field. The more the land gets grazed, the less productive it is, and there is the possibility that it will eventually be grazed to the point that nobody can use it. However, every individual has the incentive to consume as much as possible – because even if they hold back, that simply means others will use more and deplete the resource. So, they need to maximise consumption to gain benefit before it runs out. Everyone thinking like this leads to the resource running out. Ways to fix it are usually centered around creating a market to trade the rights.
Perfect Information
In order for consumers to be able to make the right decisions, they need to have perfect information about everything (you can hardly choose the product that satisfies your needs the most if you don"t know which one that is). However, this clearly doesn"t happen in the real world. So, Governments intervene to protect individuals by ensuring that products are of a certain standard, and label how they work or what went in to them. However, sometimes there are insurmountable cases of information asymmetry (where one party has information, and the other party doesn"t, and that information is very important to the transaction). The two most interesting cases are moral hazard and adverse selection, and something like health insurance gives a good example of both.

Moral hazard occurs when, by protecting an individual against some bad outcome, it leads to behavior that actually may increase the likelihood of that bad outcome occurring. If you have top notch health insurance, and know you will be covered no matter what happens, then you are likely to be less careful with your health, meaning you may in fact be more likely to get sick (without insurance, the threat of getting sick and having to pay for all your medical bills may make you more careful). There are many other examples, including several that involve the Government, where individuals are protected from some bad outcome in a way that means that their behavior changes.

Adverse selection, on the other hand, describes the fact that the people who are most likely to seek health insurance are the people who are the sickest, or most prone to getting sick (most people in their 20s don"t have health cover, and frankly don"t need it because they don"t get sick much). In other words, when people self-select in a certain way, it is often the least desirable candidates who will present themselves. There aren"t examples of Government intervention, but there are other examples out there that can be explained by adverse selection (like, say, used cars).

Perfect Rationality
The assumption that is the basis for most economic thought (and indeed much of Western thought), is probably the most flawed. People are stupid. Like, incredibly stupid. The new and rapidly growing field of behavioural economics is demonstrating time and time again that people are simply incapable of making the right decision. For example, offer most people $50 now or $100 in a year, and far too many people will take the $50 now (even though that implies discount rate, or effective interest rate, of 100%). People cannot value money across time very well, and they can"t value their future selves very well. That"s why, for example, a lot of people smoke far too much (and end up regretting it later on). This can justify some interesting interventions – probably my favourite of all time is superannuation. The Government actively restricts your right to income by sequestering a portion of it until you are much older, because without it you simply will not save enough.
Of course, you have to ask yourself whether, even if people are stupid, interventions are justified, as once you start arguing the Government can intervene in these places, it is difficult to point to a place where they should stop.

But is Intervention Always the Solution?
Even though the assumptions underlying markets often don"t even come close to holding up, markets often have a way of correcting for this on their own, or acting as if the assumptions do hold up. Take the example of the employment market, especially graduate employment – it"s a classic example of information asymmetry. Employers don"t really know how smart you are, and they especially have a hard time working out more intangible factors like your dedication, motivation and other soft skills. Yet, markets find ways to get around this – education, especially higher education, is basically a market correction. Aside from vocation-focused courses like medicine, and law to an extent, most of what people learn in university isn"t used at all in their later careers. Instead, education acts as a signalling mechanism to employers that shows them how intelligent, capable and motivated a person is (as do, to a lesser extent, extra-curricular activities).
If you"re not convinced, just take a look at the number of people who do honours after their undergraduate degree, but don"t go on to do a PhD/Masters, or academic work. Honours is meant to be a preparation for post-graduate work, yet most people choose to go straight into work after honours, and this trend has been growing in the past couple of

decades especially. This is because an undergraduate degree on its own has lost its relative prestige, so to further separate themselves from the crowd, people are doing an honours degree to signal that they are not just an ordinary graduate.

Even if the market can"t come up with its own solution, intervention has its downsides as well. Governments are notoriously inefficient, and the private sector can often provide the same goods at a much cheaper price. This is because the private sector faces competition and aims to maximise profits, whereas the Government has different priorities. Governments and their bureaucracies aim to maximise accountability, and often have multiple checks and layers to ensure transparency, which adds to costs. Moreover, the very act of collecting taxes and administering the Government generates costs through the employment of bureaucrats.

Even then, however, Governments don"t always achieve their aims. Governments suffer heavily from lobbying, where relatively small interest groups seek to gain advantage through pressuring Governments to bias legislation in their favour. One of the biggest problem with emissions trading schemes around the world has been that they have had their effectiveness consistently eroded by special interest groups who lobby to have permits given away to their sector for free, undermining the effectiveness of putting a cost on carbon.

It is also questionable (or, debatable, in case you didn"t get the hint) as to whether some things that are claimed to be market failures really are market failures; they may in fact be the market correcting itself. A classic case is debates about bailing out failing industries – most economists would argue that if a bank or a company fails, this is not a market failure, this is in fact the market correcting itself by weeding out an inefficient company. Protecting the company only causes further problems (through moral hazard).

Conclusion

Most economics debates will be about whether or not there is some market failure (sometimes there is, sometimes there isn"t) and if there is, whether Government intervention is best. However, remember that economics can be applied to almost all debates in some way – ultimately debates are about analyzing how individuals will respond to incentives that are presented to them, and that"s what economics is all about.

Environment

Source: MAD Training Handbook 2010

1) Nearly every environmental debate can be construed as a clash between three fundamental viewpoints – deep green ecology, sustainable development and technological development. (courtesy of TS) With these principles as a framework, you should be clearly able to identify where you stand on any environmental debate.

	Deep Green	**Sustainable Development**	**Technological Development**
CONCEPTUAL APPROACH TO SOLUTIONS	Enviro damage is caused by over-consumption. Only way to protect earth is to cut consumption. This could be seen as the „hippy" approach.	Development is crucially important, and technology will provide the solutions, but it needs to be guided and bad actions actively regulated away.	The solution to environmental problems is ever more rapid economic development. Development leads to cleaner technology.
HUMANS v NATURE	Nature has intrinsic and equal value	Nature has intrinsic value, but human interests trump them	Nature only matters as it serves human interests
Example action on Climate Change	Outlaw dirty industries, directly intervene in markets	Carbon Trade – Kyoto Protocol	Asia-Pacific Pact for Clean Development (no restrictions, just promises of investment)
- View s on 3rd World/1st World responsibility	All nations must cut	Focus on 1st world – easy steps and weak timetables to get people on board	Let things happen naturally
Efficiency	"efficiency paradox" – While cars today are twice as efficient as 20 years ago, there are three times as many – ergo while efficiency	Essentially these guys are a bit from column A, a bit from column B. It"s about taking the arguments from either side and explaining	"efficiency" – market forces that drive ever cheaper products also drive production to become more and more efficient, and

gains are real, they make things cheaper and more accessible and hence total env impact goes up. "inefficiency paradox" – open free trade might bring prices down but it actually makes things less environmentally efficient – as everything is shipped from further afield	why in particular cases tech solutions are not sufficient, while in others showing they	hence environmentally friendly – because using up resources costs money. **Random point that doesn‟t fit anywhere else:** People care more about the environment when they have enough wealth to be able to go beyond struggling for the fundamentals necessary for life.

2) There are a number of slightly economic principles that are extremely useful to understand in environmental debates.

Tragedy of the Commons

Common goods – air, forests, water. No one necessarily owns them, but everyone uses them. In the historic example, farmers in the UK had shared access to a pasture. Individual farmers tried to get as many cows on it as possible to maximize their profits, but in doing so, overgrazed the fields and hence destroyed them.

Possibly the best contemporary example of a tragedy of the commons is fishing in international waters. While overfishing will cause fish stocks to be depleted unsustainably, individual fishers have an incentive to fish as hard and fast as they can, because if they don‟t get the fish, someone else will.

Solutions to such tragedies involve privatizing commons, or issuing permits for their use. These solutions have their pros and cons, but we‟ll touch on these more in an another article on economics.

Negative Externalities

A related concept is that of Negative Externalities. An externality is something that isn‟t included in the cost of production or of a product. Negative implies it‟s bad. For example, air pollution. It doesn‟t cost you anything to emit waste, or carbon dioxide into the air. But doing so has a profoundly negative impact on the world. But because it‟s cheaper to do it than to not (expensive systems to clean out exhaust, or completely change industry,) people do.

Solutions to this are to either charge for them (either through taxes or through creating permits that *internalize* the cost of the negative externality) or restrict their use. Hard limits were used to significantly cut down Sulphur Dioxide emissions (contribution to Acid Rain.) Adding a price to negative externalities to internalize the costs is the logic behind carbon trading.

3) Enviornmental debates are not that different from any other debate – you need to think carefully through the incentives of various actors, and how particular policies will change their behaviours.

Feminism

Source: http://www.sociology.org.uk/as4i4c4.pdf

Source: http://www.democraticunderground.com/1254529

1. There are four major varieties of Feminism:

a. Liberal.

b. Marxist.

c. Radical.

d. Socialist (sometimes called "dual system" theory).

Other forms of Feminism include Functionalist Feminism and Black Feminism.

2. Liberal Feminism:

a. Gender prejudice is based around individual ignorance. education is seen as a valuable tool in the battle against discrimination based around ignorance.

b. It is possible to legislate (pass laws) against sexual discrimination as a way of changing individual attitudes and behaviour. For example, the Sex Discrimination and Equal Pay Acts in the 1970's in Britain.

c. The general position of women in our society has significantly improved in the past 100 years. woman have legal equality with men, although they still do not have status equality with men (that is, males still tend to have generally higher social status than women).

3. Marxist Feminism.

a. Capitalist class relationships are the root cause of female oppression, exploitation and discrimination. Men are socialised into exploitative relationships in relation to work and they carry this socialisation over into the home and their relationship to women.

b. Patriarchy is an ideology (a set of related beliefs about the world - in this instance, male - female relationships) that stems from male attempts to justify the economic exploitation of women.

c. The "family system" characteristic of modern societies benefits capitalism (and, by extension, the men who tend to dominate positions of power and influence) because women:

- can be forced / socialised into unpaid domestic labour.
- can be forced / socialised into responsibility for child-rearing.

This benefits the Capitalist because they do not have to pay women to perform this role (the "reproduction of labour power" in society).

This benefits men because women perform a "domestic servant" role for all men.

d. Neither Marxist nor socialist Feminists see men as the "enemy" of women. To create a Communist / socialist society men and women have to co-operate in to:

Overthrow the Capitalist system of economic exploitation (Marxist Feminism).

Create a more-equal and equitable form of society (Socialist Feminism).

A summary of some moments in feminist history and "waves"

The terms 1st, 2nd and 3rd waves were created by feminists who thought the feminist movement of the 1960 and 70s left out large portions of the female population, specifically, all of those who weren't white and upper or middle class and straight.

Though critique of this privilege given to (mostly) suburban white female issues began earlier, by the 1990s, with a variety of input from women of color, homosexual and trans women, women in 3rd world nations, and even punk Riot Grrrls with zines - some women thought the focus of feminism was too small - not inclusive enough.

1st wave feminism: voting rights, property rights, birth control (that existed at the time - condoms or sponges and, just as important, education about sexuality and how to prevent conception.)

2nd wave feminism: sexual freedom, legislative work to change sexist law, integration into the workplace, equal funding, integration into the political arena

3rd wave feminism: sexual freedom, inclusion of gendered females, diversity, inclusion of women of color and women from other cultures - plus the issues surrounding both 1st and 2nd wave feminism.

1st wave feminism is generally thought of in terms of the **Suffrage Movement**(gaining the right to vote.) That places it within the 19th and 20th century.

However, even before this, women, such as **Mary Wollstonecraft** (mother of the woman who wrote Frankenstein, fwiw), who came of age during the revolutionary period in America and France, wanted the ideas of the Enlightenment extended to females in society. Back then, a female could not obtain an education beyond things that she could use to run a household, for the most part.

There were exceptions, such as Ida Lovelace (after Wollstonecraft), but the rule was that females were purposely kept ignorant - in the same way that slaves were purposely kept uneducated. She wrote ***A Vindication of the Rights of Woman***, that talked about the sexism (that did not have a name at that time) that controlled the way in which society functioned, just as monarchy and the church controlled all of European society.

Wollstonecraft was British, but she is one of the most influential "mothers" of western feminism because of her writings that recognized women had no place to go in society, except under the control of a male. She argued that women were capable of receiving an education without becoming immoral and that society benefited by educating women as well as men. She ran a school, helped a friend escape from an abusive husband, helped an American lover smuggle stolen goods from French aristocrats to finance the French Revolution, traveled alone with her illegitimate child and wrote about it, viewed and wrote about The Terror first hand, and was a friend of leading intellectuals of the day in GB and the newly founded U.S. - like John Adams, Joseph Priestly, and the founder of anarchism, William Godwin.

There were a lot of parallels between the position of women and slaves - though, of course, the color of a white woman's skin still gave her more options, even tho narrow, than a black man or woman in America. Nevertheless, because of religion, for the most part, women were forced to remain second-class citizens for longer than black men - who gained the right to vote before any woman.

Suffragettes were attacked in the streets for demanding the right to vote. By men. They were vilified by politicians and preachers - just as any social change is attacked today. With the 1920s, women were divided on issues like prohibition, but, in order to exist in "polite society" women could either be "good" or "whores" - i.e. go to speakeasies or sit home. This same sort of division existed long before this time - it's a division put in place by religious views. Even the suffragettes failed to account for their own privilege. They tried to exclude women of color, like **Ida B. Wells**.

(Imo, btw, religion has been one of the chief causes of oppression for women across societies and time. you see it now. you saw it then. you saw it when some asshole was blaming women for opening Pandora's Box or offering Adam an apple. Wollstonecraft, back in the day, recognized this and said that, as a culture we need to get away from the "myths

of Prometheus" and move to rational thought.

Anyway, then, in **1949, Simone de Beauvoir**, a French writer/philosopher, wrote a book called ***The Second Sex***. In that book, she talked about the way in which men viewed women as "objects" rather than "subjects." Women are treated as "creatures" whose lives were not worth examining beyond their roles in relation to men. They were "exoticized" – in the same way that racism works – or, the way that religions dehumanize "the other." (As she had seen with The Holocaust, and as has been done to women in regard to religion for a long time.)

That inhumanity has been extended to women throughout history. Women are considered abnormal because they're not male. Their lives were not as valuable – Their experiences not as important – Their perspective not worth consideration – This, again, is just how racism has played out in American society, as well.

The Second Sex is regarded as the beginning of **2nd wave feminism.**, but the idea, as a movement, did not take hold until the 1960s, with the **1963** publication of **Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique.***

But the foundation for feminism was laid in WWII, when women entered the workplace in massive numbers to make up for the loss of men who were sent to fight. Of course, prior to WWII, a lot of women (and children) worked – in factories, with no protection by law, and some women, like **Jane Addams**, gave focus to the plight of immigrant women in the U.S.

But after WWII, the U.S. embarked on a massive propaganda campaign to tell middle-class white women to get out of the workforce so that men could have jobs. They did – but many of them realized that it was not enough to have a life that only mattered b/c of a husband or children. They wanted some sort of financial independence and interests that were their own – A life apart from their families, as every other member of the family was allowed to have. White middle class privilege was still at work in this recognition, though, as women of color often worked for outside their homes.

In the 1960s, women gained access to more reliable birth control. The state could no longer enforce religious beliefs about women's outcomes based upon their sexual lives. The reason religions hate birth control is because they continue to maintain the same patriarchal attitudes toward females now as they did when they were aligned with monarchies in the 1700s and before.

Now, to the issue that causes contention, often, here:

In the 1970s and 1980s, one group of feminists began a focus on pornography. Other feminists at the time, and now, disagreed with the positions of the anti-porn faction because they viewed porn as a free speech issue as well as an issue of women's objectification. The anti-porn faction developed a line of action that worked to suppress porn as a violation of a woman's civil rights.

One of the most vocal women in the anti-porn movement was **Andrea Dworkin**. She also wrote about right wing women who work to undermine all women – conservative women. We still see them at work today – in the Republican Party. But she also made claims about pornography that said it promoted rape and child abuse. She wrote a book that claimed all heterosexual intercourse degrades women.

She crossed a line with many people with that pov. She claimed she was misunderstood and that, eventually, people would be able to have sex that was not coercive. But for now…

Other feminists responded that they could define their sexuality themselves – and could enjoy porn – whether those

women were homo or hetero-sexual. For some, however, that position would be "false consciousness," i.e. it is impossible to rise above the ideology of sexism and patriarchy in which someone lives.

The "porn wars" on this site stem from the clash of these two povs.

Anyway, back in the 1960s, Democrats, under Kennedy, took up the cause of women's rights and women began their long-time association with the Democratic Party at the same time that African-Americans moved from the party of Lincoln (that was becoming the party of racists and Reagan and religious right wingers) to the party that passed the civil rights act.

In the 1960s and 70s - there were a lot of different people in American society who wanted change - Native Americans, African-Americans, women, homosexuals... and immigrants, esp. Latinos...working people in general became the focus of attack after Democrats lost many states due to their alignment with women and people of color.

And those battles for change are the ones that are still being fought today.