

Chapter 1 : Against Democracy – Reformed Libertarian

"Democracy Reformed is a thoroughly researched, well-structured and well-written study that is, essentially, a narrative biography of one of America's great political reformers.

Municipal and provincial government[edit] The party had some representatives in the provincial legislatures of Gelderland , Utrecht and South Holland , which form part of the Dutch Bible belt it also held some representation in Groningen. It never cooperated in any provincial executives. The party had several mayors in small municipalities in the Dutch Bible belt. In the same region the party cooperated in local executives. These were concentrated in Gelderland, Utrecht and South Holland, which form part of the Dutch Bible belt, and Groningen

Organisational structure[edit] The highest organ of the GPV was the congress, it is formed by delegates from the municipal branches. It convenes once every year. It appoints the party board and decides the order of candidates on electoral lists for the Senate, House of Representatives and European Parliament, and has the last word on the party program. The party secretariat was located in Dordrecht and later in Amersfoort.

Linked organisations[edit] The party published *Ons Politeuma* "Our citizenship". Pillarised organisations[edit] The party had a small liberated Reformed pillar around, consisting out of like minded organisations. Most prominent was the Reformed Churches in the Netherlands Liberated. The paper *Nederlands Dagblad* was closely linked to the GPV, until Pieter Jongeling, who also led the parliamentary party, led the paper.

Relationships to other parties[edit] Before the party was very isolated, this was caused by their own dogmatic position on non-liberated Christians. Nonetheless the knowledge and conscience of its MPs was respected throughout parliament. In the GPV allowed municipal branches to cooperate with branches of other parties, this led to the formation of several combined lists with either the SGP or RPF or both. It won only one seat. In they were more successful and won two seats, one of which was taken by the GPV. In the party allowed non-liberated to become member of the party, this started a slow cooperation process with the RPF which resulted in the fusion in the Christian Union in . The party has never been in a government coalition however, instead it has chosen to voice its concerns with government policy, while acknowledging that they are not big enough to force their opinion upon others.

Literature[edit] Klei, E. *Een geschiedenis van het GPV*, Amsterdam This includes conservative branches of the Dutch Reformed Church and the Reformed Churches of the Netherlands now united in the Protestant Church of the Netherlands , but also to independent forms of Reformed Protestantism, such as the Reformed Churches Liberated or other more conservative forms of Protestantism such as the certain branches of Baptism.

Chapter 2 : Reformed Political League - Wikipedia

Match each Athenian leader with the description of his reign. 1. Peisistratus Cleisthenes advanced democracy, reformed the Assembly 3. Solon.

Electoral Commission This combination of a majoritarian first-past-the-post electoral system for national elections running alongside a funding system dominated by wealthy individuals and trade unions is unusual within a European context. The majority of European national democracies operate a system of proportional representation while providing public funding for political parties IDEA Democracies should ensure the interests of all people bound by the decisions of a political community are considered in collective decision-making processes; if certain groups, individuals or classes dominate the process, or others are not effectively considered, democracy is undermined. While voters in class occupations AB are fairly evenly split between whether democracy in Britain addresses well or badly the interests of people like them, by significant majorities individuals in occupation classes C2 and DE think democracy serves their interests poorly. Indeed, only one in four DE individuals believes democracy addresses their interests well, a 20 point difference to AB individuals. A striking 63 per cent think it serves their interests badly. Even if all categories have a negative overall view of how effectively democracy serves their interests, the striking differentials between classes suggest a widespread sense that some people or classes have more influence than others and that democracy serves some interests far better than others. Indeed, our polling suggests that for many, democracy appears a game rigged in favour of the powerful and the well connected. Meanwhile, as figure 1. In the general election for instance, only 53 per cent of those within the lowest income quintile voted, compared to 75 per cent of those in the highest income quintile Birch et al Importantly, as figure 1. Turnout among all income quintiles was above 80 per cent in the s. Yet by the poorest quintile turnout rate was This meant someone in the richest quintile was 43 per cent more likely to vote in than someone in the lowest income quintile, with clear inequalities of influence between rich and poor at the ballot box as a result. Birch et al For example, in , turnout rates for those aged 18 to 24 slumped to just 44 per cent in compared to 76 per cent of those aged 65 or over. By contrast the age differential in between those groups was 18 per cent Birch et al Moreover, age-based inequality is set to continue, with only 37 per cent of 18-year-old voters stating they are certain to vote at the next general election, compared to 70 per cent of year-old voters and older Ashcroft Democracy on current trends risks becoming a quasi-gerontocracy. As a result, electoral inequality based on a distinctive non-voting population "generally younger and poorer" heightens political inequality by giving some groups far greater influence at the ballot box as a whole. Furthermore, as figures 1. While across almost all of Europe the rich and the old vote in higher numbers than younger and poorer voters, Britain is striking in the size of the gap, with a larger difference in the electoral power of the respective demographic and class groups as a consequence. We are clear outliers among European democracies, with starker inequalities in participation by class and age-group in terms of who votes. Birch et al from European Social Survey "wave 5 Note: Inequalities by class in electoral participation and the perceived responsiveness of the political system are also reflected in perceptions of influence. An even larger number of AB voters " 66 per cent " have taken some form of activity to influence political decision-making, laws or policies in the last year 3 and 92 per cent say they would if they felt strong enough. For C1s, it is 53 per cent and 85 per cent respectively; for C2s, 37 per cent and 70 per cent; and for DEs, 32 per cent and 68 per cent *ibid*. Clearly then, despite procedural equality in our democracy in terms of a universal franchise, who participates in political life and who feels they have influence is sharply structured along class and demographic lines. We are politically unequal as a society as groups and individuals with greater economic and social resources participate more, have greater belief in, and have greater influence over the political process and government decision-making. Moreover, this input-based inequality in the political process can lead to inequalities in the outcome of political decision-making, reinforcing patterns of political and economic inequality. Many of the institutions and political cultures that helped legitimate and sustain representative parliamentary democracy in the latter half of the 20th century are fragmenting and breaking down in the 21st. A political system with an effective

electoral duopoly that enjoyed high political participation rates has given way to an era of multiparty competition, while mass political parties, once buttressed by settled class structures and institutions of political formation such as broad-based trade unions, have hollowed out and become socially deracinated. The forms of technological, cultural, economic and social change driving this process are only likely to accelerate; globalisation will continue to reshape the capacity of states to act while growing individualisation will reshape traditional forms of collective action and identity. Critically, this dynamic has reduced the efficacy and reach of the institutions and practices of postwar mass democracy, which, however imperfectly, was able to mobilise and advance the political influence of sections of society who our evidence suggests now feel politically excluded and without influence. Yet no equivalent set of political institutions has yet been invented or existing ones sufficiently revitalised that can constrain the advance of political inequality today. Powerful economic and political elites accordingly now face much weaker countervailing forms of democratic power when setting agenda, laws and policies as the long, ongoing transformation of postwar capitalism has seen political power gravitate away from democratic institutions, the electorate and the labour force, and towards institutions and economic actors insulated from popular, democratic pressure see Streeck. In so doing, the old fear of liberal democratic theorists, that democracy would lead to the tyranny of the majority, has increasingly been replaced by a fear of the tyranny of the minority; we have gone from Mill to Piketty, from a fear of the masses to the problem of the 1 per cent as the chief threat to democratic equality. This is not to suggest that in the past the political system did not privilege the interests and choices of particular individuals or classes, whether based on gender, ethnicity, sexuality or economic status. The trajectory of political inequality is not linear and some aspects of our democracy have clearly improved. However, it is to suggest that as older forms of political mobilisation have withered and material inequalities have widened in the past three decades, both in the UK and in other developed democracies, political inequality has increased. Yet those same forces accelerating the fragmentation of the old also offer the possibility of democratic renewal: Though not preordained to do so, new networked technologies increasingly offer the potential for more democratic, responsive forms of politics and organisation, expanding who has voice within society and facilitating new forms of political mobilisation and influence. The challenge is therefore to build up institutions that strengthen new forms of democratic voice and influence while reviving what is necessary – broad-based political parties and other institutions of collective voice; mass political participation in formal and informal politics – of the old democratic order. Discrete constitutional reform of the institutions and practices of representative democracy are therefore necessary but no longer sufficient in sustaining an agenda that must have reducing political inequality as its primary goal. As the political and economic contexts have changed and become more complex and multilayered since the days of Charter 88, so must the modern democratic reform agenda. However, many of its solutions remain too insensitive to class and demographic dimensions in how our political system operates; structural political inequalities in who participate and has voice will not end with a codified constitution and a more proportionate electoral system. If each citizen is to have the ability to exercise and influence political power in the ballot box but also beyond it, reform cannot stop there. Countervailing democratic institutions and practices that are more participatory, deliberative and powerful will also have to be institutionalised and experimented with that can better disperse and democratise political power, both within but also beyond the channels of representative democracy. Prosecuting such an agenda will be difficult but it is not insurmountable. Our political fate is not sealed; the hollowing out of western democracy is not inevitable. For we remain optimistic about British democracy in general, even if the current political order in particular is struggling for popular purchase or legitimacy. From the widescale democratic mobilisation witnessed during and after the Scottish referendum to the grassroots energy of groups such as the New Era estate housing campaign, from the expansion of social media and online campaigning to the rapid growth of traditionally less-established political parties, there is diversity and dynamism in politics across the ideological spectrum and much flux in the political system. Moreover, the general election could still produce dramatic ruptures in the constitutional and political balance of British politics and the polity. The goal is to ensure that, in taking inspiration from these signs of revival, society is able to turn the theory of political equality into the actual ordinary experience of democratic life. To do that, however, we must better

understand the phenomenon of political inequality. Total sample size was 3, adults. Fieldwork was undertaken between 9th–11 September. The survey was carried out online.

Democracy and political inequality: At its most basic level, democracy is a system of government in which power is vested in the people, who rule either directly, or more commonly, through freely and competitively elected representatives based on the principle of universal suffrage. This is typically supported by a set of common rights, in particular freedom of association, organisation and expression. Wider material inequalities should not constrain participation nor should the political process entrench privilege by favouring the preferences of elites when they clash with the majority. Each citizen should have the ability to exercise and influence power through a range of routes, directed at institutions of political, social and economic authority. Public policy, meanwhile, should be implemented impartially, such that no individuals or groups are singled out for special treatment under the law or in the benefits they receive from the state. Moreover, democracy, as Walt Whitman captures, should be plural, open, egalitarian, hard-fought, generous and vibrant – with political authority and decision-making based on the consent and participation of all members of society, with the preferences and interests of each person being given consideration in the decision-making process. It should therefore be conceived of as a whole way of life; the contest and consent of the ballot box is the foundational ballast, but on its own cannot support the rich, contested messiness of everyday democracy. As Amartya Sen argues, democracy is public reasoning. Of course there will be winners and losers – equal consideration does not amount to equal sway over political outcomes – but the outcome of this contest should rest on the strength of argument, organisation and democratic mobilisation, not on who can shout the loudest or who has the most resources, be they social, economic or cultural, to dominate the political agenda. Democratic institutions, furthermore, should be potent sources of collective power, capable of re-imagining the institutions and practices that govern social and economic life see Muir and Parker, Gilbert and Fisher. Democracy should be alive to and allow for institutional reinvention, with public democratic endeavour being capable of reimagining our common institutions, with the process open to the influence and consideration of all citizens. The existence of political inequality threatens these democratic ideals. Political inequality is the ability of certain individuals or groups to influence the political decision-making process more than the rest of society, based on the unequal distribution of political, social and economic resources within society. As such, political inequality is enmeshed in other forms of inequality in society, reflecting a form of power inequality within the political process. Formal political and legal equality – universal suffrage, the rule of law and rights to free expression, association and organisation – is consequently necessary for political equality to exist between citizens, but it is not sufficient. This bias is both explicit, in the unequal balance of resources mobilised to affect the political process, and implicit, in how the interests of the powerful define the language, scope and material outcomes of political debate and decision-making. Political equality therefore requires the revival of representative democracy, particularly higher electoral participation across all classes and social groups. However, institutional democratic equality, as represented through free, competitive elections, is not enough. It also needs expanded and deepened forms of citizen participation and deliberation in broader social life to challenge inequalities of influence that arise from concentrations of wealth, access and power. Any legitimate mass democracy must therefore necessarily be organised as a system of competitive representation, but a richer democratic life requires more than simply formal representative democracy if it is to address political inequality. It offends our normative commitment to a democracy where each citizen is able to exercise and influence power – and where political power is not undemocratically and unaccountably controlled. Alongside this primary reason, it also has significant practical impacts and consequences of concern even to those who may not care about the existence of political inequality in and of itself. In particular, it has the potential to harm the integrity of the political process and to affect how society and the economy are subsequently organised. First, political inequality insulates political decision-makers from responding – or being perceived to respond – effectively to the whole public. Arguably partly as a result of this sense of exclusion – whether real or perceived – increasing numbers are removing themselves from participation in electoral politics. Moreover, as we have seen, electoral inequality is a problem that is getting worse: Such differentials in turn create a vicious circle of underrepresentation and disaffection, propelling a sense that the

political system no longer works for ordinary people or is capable of representing their interests. Consequently, the less powerful or effectively represented too often resile themselves to self-disenfranchisement, while their richer peers find government more responsive to their interests. Moreover, extensive political inequality also raises the question of whether elected representatives can claim to be sufficiently representative of the population as a whole when an increasingly narrow section of society elects them. Political inequality, then, reinforces the hollowing out of democracy and reflects clear class inequalities in political participation and the exercise of political power. However, it is an increasingly acute phenomenon, with the party system increasingly seen as detached from the interests and experiences of ordinary voters. British Social Attitudes Note: Moreover, this growing sense of political disenfranchisement does appear to correlate to the rise of parties that repudiate much of the established political order. For example, just 3 per cent of Ukip voters believe that politicians are trying to do their best for the country, a far lower score than other party supporters YouGov Of course, disenchantment does not automatically equate to there being an unequal political process. It does, however, suggest that there is a pervasive sense that it is too exclusive, with a widespread perception that it is not operating for the wider public interest. Moreover, if those with greater wealth and income have greater influence over the political process, public policy is more likely to reflect their interests and underrepresent the interests of non-participating members of society. Political inequality is therefore a problem as it can help exacerbate other socioeconomic inequalities, being both a reflection but also a cause of deepening economic inequality. More starkly, this represented an estimated Of course, there are limits to such case studies:

Chapter 3 : The Development of Athenian Democracy

The Reformed Political League (Dutch: Gereformeerd Politiek Verbond, GPV) was an orthodox Protestant political party in the Netherlands. The GPV is one of the predecessors of the Christian Union. The party was a testimonial party.

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. I want to turn to Bernie Sanders. It was a wonderful dialogue. I spoke to him Monday night at the Free Library. We played it Tuesday. He spoke about how he hopes to reform the Democratic Party as the new chair. This is Bernie Sanders. The new approach, I think, is to, A, create a state strategy. That means we start playing ball in states that the Democrats have conceded decades ago. But more importantly, we create a kind of grassroots party, where the most important people in the party are not just wealthy campaign contributors, but working people, young people, people in the middle class, who are going to come in and going to start telling us what their needs are and give us some ideas as to how we go forward. And I accept this responsibility as outreach chair with a lot of trepidation, but also with excitement. So, a lot of questions here, and I encourage people to watch the full hour at [democracynow](#). You were a big supporter of Bernie Sanders. You served on the Democratic platform committee on behalf of Bernie Sanders. He is leading a movement called Our Revolution. He has said we have to work with Donald Trump in different ways, he says to the people who supported him. But what are your thoughts on all of this, the inside-outside strategy? I have a deep love and respect for Brother Bernie Sanders. I think it still has a kind of allegiance to a neoliberal orientation. It still has allegiance to Wall Street. The very victory of Nancy Pelosi is a sign that neoliberalism is still hegemonic in the party. I hope that Keith Ellison is able to present a challenge to it. As head ofâ€”if he makes it as head of the Democratic National Committee. But my hunch is the Democratic Party has simply run out of gas. Exactly, exactly, and right there in the debates. They got the word from the White House. What about the poor and working people who are dealing with the suffering? Is that less important than embarrassing the president? And they were very clear about that. And I pushed and pushed and pushed. So that when you have those kinds of restraints on you, these albatrosses around your neck, how are you going to be a party for the people? How are you going to be a party for working people, poor people? How are you going to be a party for those brothers and sisters in Yemen who are dealing with U. How are you going to deal with the Palestinians, deal with the Israeli occupation? There has to be some integrity and moral consistency. And unfortunately, the Democratic Party just strikes me as not being able to meet that challenge. What does that mean? Cornel West, professor emeritus at Princeton University, he endorsed Bernie Sanders and served on the Democratic platform committee. This is Democracy Now! Please attribute legal copies of this work to [democracynow](#). Some of the work s that this program incorporates, however, may be separately licensed. For further information or additional permissions, contact us. Next story from this daily show.

Chapter 4 : Why we Need Reform - Democracy Matters

calendrierdelascience.com Hungary under Prime Minister Viktor Orban has brought in a new constitution in spite of strong criticism from the opposition at home.

Covenant theology Reformed theologians use the concept of covenant to describe the way God enters fellowship with people in history. Because Adam and Eve broke the covenant by eating the forbidden fruit , they became subject to death and were banished from the garden. This sin was passed down to all mankind because all people are said to be in Adam as a covenantal or "federal" head. Federal theologians usually infer that Adam and Eve would have gained immortality had they obeyed perfectly. In it, God graciously offers salvation from death on condition of faith in God. This covenant is administered in different ways throughout the Old and New Testaments, but retains the substance of being free of a requirement of perfect obedience. Barth saw the covenant of works as disconnected from Christ and the gospel, and rejected the idea that God works with people in this way. Instead, Barth argued that God always interacts with people under the covenant of grace, and that the covenant of grace is free of all conditions whatsoever. Michael Horton , however, has defended the covenant of works as combining principles of law and love. God in Christianity and Trinity For the most part, the Reformed tradition did not modify the medieval consensus on the doctrine of God. God is affirmed to be one God in three persons: Father , Son , and Holy Spirit. Drawing on the Eastern tradition, these Reformed theologians have proposed a " social trinitarianism " where the persons of the Trinity only exist in their life together as persons-in-relationship. According to Russell, thinking this way encourages Christians to interact in terms of fellowship rather than reciprocity. Christ , Hypostatic union , Extra calvinisticum , Substitutionary atonement , and Threefold office Reformed theologians affirm the historic Christian belief that Christ is eternally one person with a divine and a human nature. Reformed Christians have especially emphasized that Christ truly became human so that people could be saved. Because Lutherans believe that Christ is bodily present in the Eucharist , they hold that Christ is bodily present in many locations simultaneously. For Reformed Christians, such a belief denies that Christ actually became human. Faith is personified as a woman to the right of a naked man on the ground asking Christ the way of salvation. They have, however, often reinterpreted the meaning of each of the offices. Christ is believed to have died in place of the believer, who is accounted righteous as a result of this sacrificial payment. Christian views on sin and Total depravity In Christian theology, people are created good and in the image of God but have become corrupted by sin , which causes them to be imperfect and overly self-interested. This view, that sin so dominates people that they are unable to avoid sin, has been called total depravity. These theologians have sought to bring attention to issues of environmental, economic, and political justice as areas of human life that have been affected by sin.

Chapter 5 : Calvinism - Wikipedia

democracy reformed Download *democracy reformed* or read online here in PDF or EPUB. Please click button to get *democracy reformed* book now. All books are in clear copy here, and all files are secure so don't worry about it.

Antidote to the Liberal Principles Antidote to the Liberal Principles The evil that Guizot was speaking of at the time was none other than Democratic idolatry; revolutionary liberty and equality were destroying every social relation. We thought we were stronger than we really are; we have not simply miscalculated the limits of our strength, but the rights of that sovereign power that governs both us and our world. It is regrettable that, even today, many Christians, disillusioned by the promises of liberalism, nevertheless believe that they can take on board its principles, in whole or in part, to serve the cause of religion and freedom. Herein lies the peculiar character of our time. Indeed, what we are witnessing is one of the most terrible phases of that perpetual and mysterious war of which Scripture alone gives us the key. The Bible, which contains the history of the past and the future, recounts and reveals the complete destiny of humanity. The plan of a just and good God for restoring fallen man unfolds majestically down through the ages. Under His Almighty hand events are shaped and molded to a single end: The Revolution is simply the systematic undermining of the church of Jesus Christ; and a genuinely anti-revolutionary resistance to it is simply a perpetual witness to the Faith, in a form dictated by our time. It is the Christian principle and its lawful, necessary and timely application. So they end up in atheism or deism, both of which are abhorrent to Christianity, and equally so. In Jesus Christ we find all our happiness, all our virtue, all our life, all our light, and all our hope. Apart from Him, there is nothing but vice, misery, darkness, and despair; and we can see nothing but darkness and confusion in the nature of God and in our own nature. If we follow the way of unbelieving philosophy, we can expect to find nothing but destruction and chaos at the end of the road. Back in I had already said: Do you want the ideas of ? Very well; but you must bring them in connection with the gospel principle. Do you think democracy is irresistible and should be embraced not opposed? Christianity can work with democracy as with any other form of government. The reign of this democracy will always incur the consequences of society described in the chapter wherein de Tocqueville criticizes democracy devastatingly so, according to Vinet for having sanitized despotism through the creation of the moral tyranny of the majority. Standing in the great Reformed and conservative heritage of thinkers like Edmund Burke and Abraham Kuyper, we humbly seek to inject civility into an informed conversation, one article at a time, bringing clarity out of chaos.

Chapter 6 : Antidote to the Liberal Principles - The Reformed Conservative

CORNEL WEST: That means that he is a "well, a Democratic socialist is a radical who's critical of the system. A New Deal liberal works within the system and doesn't want to bring massive.

By Joan Mandle I. The lifeblood of our democracy is under threat. Democracy is above all a process of citizen participation, with government accountable to the people. But it is precisely that necessary participation and accountability that have been weakened and eroded by big contributors who dominate the private financing of campaigns. Voter turnout for elections is far lower than in most other democracies. Cynicism about politics and government is rampant as people see: The cost of running for office continues to escalate. Few citizens can afford the huge cost of running for office at any level of government. Incumbents regularly out-spend challengers by margins of 4 to 1. In , the Supreme Court reversed a year-old ban on corporate and union expenditures on political speech, unleashing unlimited spending from these sources. The Supreme Court has declared war on campaign finance reform and exponentially raised the power of individuals and corporations to control our elections, laws and democracy. The number of bright young people who want to spend their lives in politics or government service has declined as the price of participation has risen. National polling has consistently shown that large majorities of the American people distrust the government because they believe that wealthy special interests have more influence in Washington and in state capitols than do voters. What can we do? In response there has emerged a pro-democracy movement, committed to deepening the democratic process in the United States. Fundamental to this movement is the struggle to change the way election campaigns are financed, especially by ensuring public financing for serious candidates. Fundamentally a democracy can only be as strong as its elections – elections in which many ideas are heard and where citizens actively engage by running for office, participating in debate, and voting. Private money in elections undermines a truly democratic political process. Changing the way elections are financed is the first and most important step in resolving this shameful situation. If private money continues to dominate American politics, the desires of the affluent will control legislation and the rest of us will be ignored. If we change campaign finance laws, we will help create the real democracy most of us want – one in which laws and policy reflect the will of the majority of the American people. What is wrong with the present system? Politicians, who depend on huge sums of money to run their campaigns, respond more to the concerns of wealthy donors and special interests than they do to the concerns of voters. Affordable health care policy has been held hostage to big contributors who fight reform. Protecting the environment is a low priority for legislators who take big campaign contributions from oil and energy companies. Providing more affordable college loans and grants is fought by banks and college-loan companies. Our foreign policy is too often influenced by the economic interests of big donors rather than by welfare of our country. Huge contributions by banks and the financial industry have ensured that real regulation of Wall Street has been blocked, while our economy has suffered. The safety of our food supply takes second place to the interests of companies that contribute millions to politicians every year. Funding for research and for higher education lags as college tuitions rise and legislators vote for tax breaks for big campaign contributors. Lobbyists representing wealthy contributors gain privileged access to elected officials, while ordinary citizens have to stand in line or rely on sending emails. Precious tax dollars are wasted in the form of pay-backs to wealthy special interests who have filled campaign coffers. You name the issue, and it has a link back to political decisions made by elected officials who are indebted for campaign contributions to a small group of wealthy special interests. Everyone knows there is something wrong – that the system is broken – but they think there is nothing we can do. For specific information on federal campaign contributions who gives how much to whom as well as reports and commentary on outrageous money and politics happenings go to the Center for Responsive Politics www.crp.org. Is there a solution? It is obvious that to sustain a democracy and solve the many problems we face as a country, we need to reform the way private money dominates our elections. The system is voluntary, and only candidates who show support from their districts can qualify. These reforms have proven to be both constitutional the courts have ruled it does not harm free speech and costs only a reasonable amount. Victories

for public campaign financing have been won in cities, counties and states for over 35 years. Earlier reforms, like those for municipal races in New York City were passed in the mids, while public financing option for state offices was won in Connecticut in and Maine in They are building the movement to create the democracy we deserve “ one that is truly of, by, and for the people. Fair Elections Ordinary citizens can run for office without depending on wealthy special interests. The influence of lobbyists and special interests on legislation is reduced. Previously underfunded candidates can afford to participate. Ordinary people, previously unrepresented, can run for office and win, especially young people, low income citizens, and members of minority communities. Because more people can afford to run for office there are more competitive and fewer uncontested elections; more diverse candidates; more challengers; more choice for voters; more participation in politics. Everyday citizens “ not just lobbyists “ have access to their elected officials because politicians will no longer depend on big donors for their campaign funding. People will regain trust in the electoral system and in elected officials who will hear their voices.

Chapter 7 : Who advanced democracy reformed the Assembly

Calvinism (also called the Reformed tradition, Reformed Christianity, Reformed Protestantism, or the Reformed faith) is a major branch of Protestantism that follows the theological tradition and forms of Christian practice set down by John Calvin and other Reformation-era theologians.

Jay Engel In Philosophy , Politics The glamorized system of democracy, while despised by those radical limited-government theorists among the founders of the United States, is commonly misunderstood and praised by the majority of the public today. Although it seems cliché to point out the fact that the Constitution established a Republican form of government, it is not only necessary to understand this, it is also likely the most important distinction to be had in the continual transition to an outright collectivist system. Competition in the production of goods is good, but competition in the production of bads is not. Free competition in killing, stealing, counterfeiting, or swindling, for instance, is not good; it is worse than bad. Yet this is precisely what is instituted by open political competition, i. Despite the preference that I, along with many others, have in seeing a fully free and voluntary system of law and property rather than a well-intentioned Constitutional Republic, it can hardly be stressed enough that our transition away from Republicanism toward Democracy has been the most detrimental move since our founding. Democracy is, by its nature, a collectivist system in which either the majority rules the minority, or the majority elects the leaders to rule the populous at large. The disregard for full property rights and individual liberty is astounding and dangerous. The monarch, based on the fact that he or she or more commonly, the royal family owns the state, has the self-interested motivation to preserve the culture, society, and economy. Therefore, the self-interest of the democratic leader motivates him, not to preserve the nation to be passed on, but to wring it dry of its resources, take it to war, inflate the currency, and tax the population to an extent much higher than the monarch. The process to destruction is much slower under a monarchy than a democracy. Competition for a democratically elected position is to make the most popular and attractive promises, thereby effectually aiming to ever increase spending, welfare, wealth distribution, and political favors. Democracy and socialism go hand in hand. Further, under democracy, those subjected to the State have a long-running assumption that, because they are the ones voting their rulers into office, they have both a voice in government, as well a vocal consent. Notice those statistics which run rampant in the media and higher education, which point to a given topic in which more than half agree or disagree on a given issue. When most hear these usually manipulated statistics, they are so often left without words. Well, the majority does want free healthcare. So I guess that is what we ought to do. After all, we live in a democracy. But of course the real answer is that majority agreement in no way makes something morally or practically right. Democracy is the dangerous means toward illusion. I think the Articles of Confederation were better albeit not perfect, because they too gave too much power to the Federal Government after all.

The Resource Democracy reformed: Richard Spencer Childs and his fight for better government, Bernard Hirschhorn ; foreword by William N. Cassella, Jr.

How successful have they been in showing the way for more modern electoral systems to work well under British political conditions? Ideally single office holders should enjoy clear majority support, so as to enhance their legitimacy. If possible, the system should have beneficial effects for the good governance of the country. If possible, the voting system should enhance the social representativeness of the legislature, and encourage high levels of voting across all types of citizens. Since voting systems in the UK have diversified. In its early years the first Blair government, acting with Liberal Democrat co-operation, created proportional additional member systems AMS for new devolved government institutions in Scotland, Wales and London. These had their fifth round of elections in May. However, in June the Conservative election manifesto proposed to replace all SV elections with plurality rule first-past-the-post voting. When the Tories failed to get a Commons majority, this proposal seemed to lapse. Additional member systems in Scotland, Wales and London Used for: Voters cast two ballots: In Scotland and Wales the top-up areas are sub-regions. For the small London Assembly the top-up area is the whole of London. In Wales, the proportion of top-up representatives at sub-regional level is just a third of seats. This is sometimes too small to ensure proportional outcomes, if one party so far always Labour is heavily over-represented in winning constituency seats. The proportion of constituency and top-up seats under AMS in British institutions Voters get two ballot papers, one for party candidates for their local constituency and one for party slates of candidates for the wider regional contest. They mark one X vote on each paper. In the local constituencies, whoever gets the largest pile of votes a plurality is the winner with no need to get a majority. In AMS voters also have a second vote for their regional top-up members. The election officials look at how many local seats a party already has within region A from the local contests, and what share of the list votes it has in the A region. If a given party already has its full share of seats, it gets none of the top-up members. But if the party does not have enough seats already it is assigned additional members, taken from its list of regional candidates, so as to bring each party as closely as possible to having equal percentages of seats and votes for the top-up area stage. The order that parties place candidates in their lists is crucial, since it determines who of their people are elected at any given level of support. However, it may over-represent larger parties if a lot of the list vote is split across multiple smaller parties, which tends to happen quite a lot in British AMS elections. Recent developments A key rationale for the three AMS systems is to offer proportional representation for each of the bodies involved. Compared with the historic Westminster outcome Figure 2 below shows that the Scottish AMS system has performed twice as well in terms of matching party seats shares with their vote shares, and the London system has fared almost as well. In Wales DV scores are higher, because there have been too few top-up seats, especially in. But still, on average, DV scores were routinely two-thirds of historic UK general election scores " until , when the Westminster result was more than comparable for the first time. Proportional voting systems tend to produce coalition or minority governments, unless a single party can command a clear majority of seats on its own. Figure 3 shows that the AMS systems have only delivered one single-party government outcome: This was preceded by a period when the SNP ran a minority government "11 , a situation that returned from May onwards. In Wales Labour has been continuously in government since , but has never had an outright majority. The Edinburgh system was defined by a constitutional convention and the GLA system by political scientist consultants. We noted above the shortage of top-up seats in Wales, which explains higher DV scores here, especially in strong Labour years. It is simple for citizens to vote for a local representative. Some critics predicted that citizens would see constituency voting under AMS as more important than top-up votes. However, by , and more people voted in the top-up election than in the constituency stage. Election results for all three bodies have historically been more proportional than for Westminster elections see above. AMS is easy to count, and it is straightforward for voters to understand how the overall result happened at both the constituency and list elections. All outcomes have had high levels of public acceptance and legitimacy. A

study showed that top-up area representatives respond less to letters from constituents. But the authors caution that why people write will likely differ. Under AMS, parties have incentives to put equal numbers of men and women on their top-up lists. But in Westminster began to catch up. Outside London, the systems do not seem to have improved the representation of ethnic minorities or of people from manual backgrounds. Future opportunities Future threats There are some reform demands to create more top-up members in the Welsh National Assembly. Such a change is likely to make seats results more proportional to votes cast. Both Scotland and Wales are unicameral legislatures, so there is no upper house to constrain the behaviour of a party that becomes dominant there. Over the 18 years it has been operating, the Scottish Parliament has gained far greater autonomy over more public spending and attracted high levels of public trust. Wales and Greater London are also pressing Whitehall for an increase in powers, and they have broad public support for such a change in their areas. However, saw a revival in the Conservative vote north of the border. No democratic electoral system can ensure a greater diversity of parties than citizens have voted for. The supplementary vote for electing executive mayors and police commissioners Used for: No voting system for a single powerful office such as a mayor, governor or president can operate in a proportional way, because the position involved cannot be divided between several parties. Instead the supplementary vote system tries to involve as many voters as possible in deciding who becomes the winner. Voters have a ballot paper with two columns on it, one for their first choice and one for their second choice see Figure 4. They put an X vote against their chosen candidate in the first preference column, and then if they wish an X also in the second preference column. Initially, only first preference votes are counted. However, if no one has overall majority support, then the top two candidates go into a run-off stage on their own. All other candidates are knocked out of the race at the same time, and the second preference ballot papers of their voters are checked. Second choice votes for one of the two candidates still in the race are added to their piles. Once all relevant second votes are added in, whoever of the two top candidates has the most votes overall is the winner. The person elected can only be one of the initial top two runners unlike the alternative vote system, rejected at the referendum. And yet in practical terms they always have a majority of eligible votes cast. In repeated London elections, the winner has gained nearly three-fifths support. The London mayoral election has shown voters and parties learning how to use the SV system more effectively over time. Figure 5 shows that by nearly nine in ten voters took the opportunity to give both a first and a second preference vote. The number of second choice votes given to the top two candidates has remained steady. London mayoral elections using the supplementary vote, 2016 Source: Computed from Greater London Authority, various dates. Votes shaping the final outcome are defined as the combined total of first and second choice votes for the top two candidates those in the run-off stage. The model has inspired its imitation elsewhere as a key part of English devolution. Further elections may follow if proposals for a whole-of Yorkshire regional mayor progress. Figure 6 shows that turnout levels were lower than with other SV elections, but this is normal the first time a contest is held, before any institutions have started operating or policies have been implemented. Figure 6 also shows that outside London there has been a limited trend for some major cities and some towns to adopt the executive mayor system like Watford, Bristol, Liverpool and Leicester. Elections there have generally operated in far more diverse ways. Figure 6 shows that in 16 out of 36 SV contests in conventional local authorities, one candidate won outright with clear majorities at the first-preference vote stage, so that second votes did not need to be counted. Finally, two rounds of police and crime commissioner PCC elections have also been held using the SV system. There was little publicity about what the 40 new commissioners would do, or who the candidates were. And, of course, most voters outside London were using SV for the first time. In 2012, the PCC elections were held at the same time as conventional local authority elections, and consequently turnout improved significantly. However, the number of voters casting second preference votes increased slightly to just over one in six. Only three areas returned Labour PCCs on the first round alone. Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats SWOT analysis Current strengths Current weaknesses The supplementary vote SV was a novel system when introduced first in London in 2002, following recommendations by political scientist consultants. The system is now well-established and has proved popular with voters. Some critics have argued that the person chosen may not quite have a majority of all the votes cast. This is because some people may give both their first and second choice votes to

smaller party candidates, who stand no chance of being in the final top two run-off see Figures 5 and 6. The SV system is simple for voters to use. Supporters of smaller parties can express their real feelings with their first vote, but still use their second vote to choose which of the top two candidates they prefer to win. Some critics argue that it is hard for voters to know in advance who the top two candidates are likely to be. But in London and most local areas this should be reasonably clear. SV is straightforward to count, even at large scale – around two million votes are counted overnight in the London-wide mayoral contest, using electronic counting. Voters can easily understand how the count operated and how the result happened. In a few areas executive mayors were elected for a time but then abandoned following local referenda. In a larger number of council areas voters in the s turned down executive mayors in local referenda. All five results have been accepted as accurate, giving incumbents of the office very high levels of public acceptance and legitimacy, both within London and in national and indeed global politics. This pattern has now died out, with partisan candidates prominent in most competitions, but with some conventional independents also, especially in Labour-dominated areas. The Conservative election manifesto in suddenly proposed to scrap SV for all mayoral and police commissioner elections and revert instead to plurality rule first-past-the-post. Turnout for police commissioner elections improved significantly in , when they were run alongside local elections.

Chapter 9 : Political inequality: Why British democracy must be reformed and revitalised | IPPR Reader

A reformed democracy. Listen In a survey conducted by Shaheed Benazir Bhutto Women University, Peshawar on voting patterns, most respondents expressed a lack of trust in politicians and the.

Transcript This is a rush transcript. Copy may not be in its final form. This is Democracy Now! Well, a federal judge has stayed the deportation of immigrant rights leader Ravi Ragbir, after he filed a free-speech lawsuit charging the Trump administration of targeting immigrant rights activists with surveillance and deportation. Maru has always been "I know Maru. We have been in many conferences together. And she has always been outspoken. And to send her a notice to appear, and also that she is in a removal proceeding, is a direction" shows the direction the agency is heading to. Look at the resources they allocated to deport me. You are seeing that this is an intensification against the immigrant community. You know, you heard a quote from the president: Where is the due process in what we are seeing? He was talking "President Trump was talking about for sexual" for domestic violence abusers in his White House. Correct, with "and you have" you know, you have photographic proof of the abuse, but we have seen his support for those abusers, right? But we are not seeing the support for the families who are being destroyed. What due process rights do people, who are in the country, according to ICE, illegally, have? Yeah, they absolutely have due process rights. In these cases, the judges have all blocked the deportation, which is heartening. Why are you rushing them out of the country without even giving them time to file claims? So I think those cases are a subset of this larger problem. And what we anticipate the government saying is: These individuals have lived peaceful lives for decades. Well, last week, a federal judge in Newark, New Jersey, temporarily blocked the removal of dozens of Indonesian Christians, including two fathers who were detained by ICE as they were taking their children to school. He was the Green Party candidate for governor of New Jersey in Welcome to Democracy Now! Thank you so much, Juan and Amy. Could you tell us the latest developments with the folks that were taking refuge in your church? So, with those taking refuge in our church, I can say that after the ACLU lawsuit was filed a week ago Friday and the judge heard it immediately, we felt a great deal of relief. So, we believe that the people who are living in our sanctuary can go home. And they have gone home, and they have been safe since that time. We think it would be very foolish if ICE were to act against them, when a judge has clearly made it clear that this is an exploratory moment. So, one of the things that concerns us is that the two people who were detained two weeks ago Thursday, the same day that one of my church members made it here into sanctuary, they are still detained. We were hoping that maybe they would be released during the time that things are pending. We have, you know, four U. The governor got involved, is that right? The Democratic governor, after he was sworn in, came to your church. Came in here, when a time is "time Indonesia was raping, was killing, was torture. And I escaped and came in this country. I pay my own insurance. I never even claim any penny from the government to give me stand up. You know, we are here. Just leave us alone, you know. And let us raise our children until whatever dream they want. So, that was the wife of one of the Indonesian men that was taken. Pastor Seth Kaper-Dale, the significance of the intervention of the stay of deportation now? Do you see this as part of a trend of federal judges saying no to the Trump administration? And what needs to happen now? Yeah, I do see it as a trend. And I would say that in the case of the Indonesians, my congregation was deeply involved in working with ICE many years ago in creating opportunities for Indonesians who are not a deportation priority to get stays, because ICE recognized the horrible torture and possible danger that awaited folks in Indonesia. And so, we went to court in Boston on behalf of approximately 50 Indonesian Christians, and the judge blocked deportation. But what I am going to do is give them time to go before an immigration court to show that, as Indonesian Christians, they will be persecuted or tortured if sent back. Now the Indonesian Christians of New Jersey are being threatened in the same way, so we went to court and blocked that. How many Iraqis in Detroit are you representing? There are 1., approximately, around the country, not just Detroit. We expanded it to the whole country. The judge has blocked nationwide. And I also wanted to point out two things. It has nothing to do with the actual deportation order itself. And that is what is at stake here, where they are taking away the tools of the court to protect its

own space, its own process. And they are fighting that. And, you know, you see the violence that is coming as a result. This critical pointâ€”and McNulty, the federal judge in Newark, made this point repeatedly on Fridayâ€”this issue of what it means when you have someone before them and then another branch of government deports them. And so, I just want to be clear. When we come back, we remember a great human rights lawyer, humanitarian and activist from Pakistan. The Icelandic musician and producer has died at the age of Please attribute legal copies of this work to democracynow. Some of the work s that this program incorporates, however, may be separately licensed. For further information or additional permissions, contact us. Next story from this daily show.