

"Democracy can solve the corruption by getting rid of corrupt government." It is a delusion, actually it makes things lot worse, because new government means a new round of corruption, as the newly elected didnt have chance to be corrupt yet. that.

Definition[edit] In the 20th century, a few states passed, or attempted to pass, nationality laws, through efforts that share certain similarities. All took place in countries with at least one national minority that sought full equality in the state or in a territory that had become part of the state and in which it had lived for generations. Nationality laws were passed in states that were grounded in one ethnic identity, defined in contrast to the identity of the other, leading to persecution of and codified discrimination against minorities. However, they tend to become unstable in the long term, suffering from repeated conflict and crisis, which are resolved by either substantive democratization, partition, or regime devolution into consociational arrangements. Alternatively, ethnocracies that do not resolve their internal conflict may deteriorate into periods of long-term internal strife and the institutionalization of structural discrimination or apartheid. In ethnocratic states the government is typically representative of a particular ethnic group holding a number of posts disproportionately large to the percentage of the total population. The dominant ethnic group or groups represents and use them to advance the position of their particular ethnic groups to the detriment of others. Ethnocracy can also be a political regime which is instituted on the basis of qualified rights to citizenship, and with ethnic affiliation defined in terms of race, descent, religion, or language as the distinguishing principle. All other considerations concerning the distribution of power are ultimately subordinated to this basic intention. The degree of system discrimination will tend to vary greatly from case to case and from situation to situation. Mono-ethnocracy is a type of regime where one ethnic group dominates, which conforms with the traditional understanding of ethnocracy. Poly-ethnocracy is a type of regime where more than one ethnic group governs the state. Both mono- and poly-ethnocracy are types of ethnocracy. Ethnocracy is founded on the assumptions that ethnic groups are primordial, ethnicity is the basis of political identity, and citizens rarely share multiple ethnic identities. Citizens in Belgium exercise political rights found in democracies, such as voting and free speech. However, Belgian politics is increasingly defined by ethnic divisions between the Flemish and Francophone. For example, all the major political parties are formed around either a Flemish or Francophone identity. Furthermore, bilingual education has disappeared from most Francophone schools. Israel has been labeled an ethnocracy by scholars such as: Smooha in particular argues that ethnocracy, allowing a privileged status to a dominant ethnic majority while ensuring that all individuals have equal rights, is defensible. Will Kymlicka regards Estonia as a democracy, stressing the peculiar status of Russian-speakers, stemming from being at once partly transients, partly immigrants and partly natives. Wendy Pullan describes gerrymandering of electoral districts to ensure Unionist domination, and informal policies that led to the police force being overwhelmingly Protestant, as features of the Unionist ethnocracy. Other elements included discriminatory housing and policies designed to encourage Catholic emigration. In his book Power-Sharing in South Africa , [29] Arend Lijphart classifies contemporary constitutional proposals for a solution to the conflict in South Africa into four categories: Along the legal-institutional dimension we can distinguish between singularism power centralised according to membership in a specific group , pluralism power-distribution among defined groups according to relative numerical strength , and universalism power-distribution without any group-specific qualifications. The three main alternatives on the territorial dimension are the unitary state, "intermediate restructuring" within one formal sovereignty , and partition creating separate political entities. Ethnocracy indicates a specific principle of power-distribution in a society.

Chapter 2 : Voting as a Symbolic Act excerpted from the book The Democratic Facade

Democratic facade. A facade means false face or front. A democratic facade would be a country where the elections were rigged or unfairly influenced by fear and intimidation.

Judd Brooks Cole Publishing Company, , paper Rigged Electoral Processes Voting as a Symbolic Act p84

Despite his landslide victory in , for example, President Ronald Reagan received less than 30 percent of the votes of the potential electorate. The largest party in American politics is neither Democratic nor Republican; it is the party of nonvoters. Elections are, in part, an exercise that ties the masses to political leaders by giving ordinary citizens the feeling that they can influence government and its policies. At election time, citizens take part in an elaborately orchestrated pageant that invests officeholders with the aura of legitimacy. By reference to this one means of participation, government officials claim the right to govern and to make policy. Elections give people a chance to express discontents and enthusiasms, to enjoy a sense of involvement. A remarkable feature of the American political system is that elites have managed to retain all the benefits of ritualistic participation despite low voter turnout. Exposed to the ritual, drama, and circus-like panorama of election night returns and interviews, even the potential voters who stayed at home on election day are hard put not to feel that they, too, have participated. Low turnout might seem to make it difficult for a politician or media analyst to read a policy mandate into election results, but election winners nevertheless always claim a mandate. In , 70 percent of the potential electorate did not vote for Ronald Reagan. The nineteen eighty election provided a mandate for change. That mandate was not clearly defined beyond the electorate wanting a strong leader to deal with inflation, but it was a rejection of the New Deal agenda that had dominated American politics since the mid-thirties. For candidates though, it matters little if mandates can be objectively read into election returns. What they seek is the legitimacy to govern. Elections provide this legitimacy, but they are always problematic, because elections can be won, in principle or potentially, by popular majorities that may wish to overturn existing property and social class arrangements. They persuade citizens that elections are meaningful political events, but they also try to make sure that the political choices made in the electoral arena are acceptable to elites. Controlling voter participation has been an important means that elites have used to accomplish two objectives—legitimation and social control. In the nineteenth century, participation rates were high partly because voting was easy to do and the political parties had an interest in mobilizing the electorate. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries turnout rates began to fall when elites made it much more difficult for ordinary citizens to register to vote. New restrictions on the franchise were proposed, in large part because elites became convinced that the electoral process might produce unacceptable results. But the threat of civil turmoil existed elsewhere, too. Debtors rioted in Maryland in ; a year later, farmers in Vermont tried to stop foreclosures. In this atmosphere, the Founders drafted a constitution that established a democratic form of government, a daring step at a time when European nations were still ruled by hereditary monarchies and rumors of rebellion filled the air. But it was a cautious step as well. The Founders established a republic that simultaneously allowed democratic expression and contained effective safeguards against popular majority rule. The Founders were divided on the question of how narrowly the franchise should be restricted. Though he was the principal architect of "checks and balances," James Madison believed that additional safeguards were needed. Convinced that a property qualification should be written into the Constitution, he told delegates to the convention: The entire white male population was armed, a condition that had been indispensable to victory over the British. But many of those who had served in the revolutionary armies were poor and in debt, and capable of turning their fighting experience against the rich and well born. Extension of the right to vote was an important instrument for institutionalizing the Revolution and calming political unrest. In the end, the Founders left the regulation of the vote to the states. Because all the states imposed property qualifications, only about 5 percent of the male population was eligible to vote. The concern that popular majorities might use the vote to threaten property rights remained an issue whenever the states adopted voting regulations, and this concern persisted long after the constitutional period. In Massachusetts, delegates to the state constitutional convention of were warned that they should take

a lesson from Great Britain, where elites were resisting pressure to extend the right to vote to males who did not own property: If the radicals should succeed in obtaining universal suffrage, they will overturn the whole kingdom, and turn those who have property out of their houses. Such restrictions helped eastern patricians to maintain a stranglehold on national politics for more than forty years after the Constitution was adopted. The more populous eastern states delivered a solid block of Electoral College votes for Adams, ensuring his victory. States that joined the Union after the Revolution did not generally impose property restrictions on voting because social relations in frontier cities and small towns were far more fluid than in the East. As more states joined the Union, it did not take long for voters in the new states to tip the balance of power in the Electoral College. Property or tax-paying restrictions were applied to voting in fourteen states in 1787, but they were dropped rapidly in the next few years. Five states still imposed them in 1790: Connecticut, Louisiana, and New Jersey dropped their restrictions in the 1790s, and Virginia followed suit in 1799. The last state to retain property restrictions, South Carolina, lost its right to impose them at the end of the Civil War. The Old Guard of the revolutionary period finally was forced to give way to a new generation whose fortunes were tied to westward expansion. In 1789, voters participated in selecting the president. Only four years later, turnout more than tripled, to 13 percent, and the "new" Jacksonian Democratic party became the first mass-based political party in the country. Stimulated by keen competition between the parties, turnout levels in the nineteenth century rose well above levels known in Europe, where the right to vote was still tightly restricted or completely denied. In the states outside the South, turnout rates remained high until the turn of the century, then began a steady decline to 55 percent by the election of 1860. Turnout rates in the South were always somewhat lower than elsewhere, and they fell somewhat after the Civil War. Voting participation dropped precipitously after the election of 1860, when 57 percent of the electorate voted. By the election of 1868, only 19 percent of the southern electorate voted. It is not difficult to identify the reasons for the sharp decline in voting participation throughout the southern states. Property-owning southern elites lost their grip on electoral policies for a brief time after the Civil War, but when the northern occupation ended following the election, they quickly began searching for ways to drive blacks and poor whites out of the electoral system. In this effort they were remarkably successful. The political control exercised by propertied southern elites was shattered by the outcome of the Civil War. Backed by military occupation, Reconstruction Republicans flooded into the South and guaranteed an expansion of political power for blacks, and also incidentally for poor whites, by extending the vote to the former slaves. Hundreds of blacks were elected to state and local public offices, and a few were elected to Congress. With the withdrawal of federal troops from the southern states in 1877, however, southern white elites organized to reverse the enfranchisement of black and white voters. By the late 1870s, they had achieved their objective. The poll taxes levied by Georgia and other states required voters to pay one or two dollars annually, a considerable amount for sharecroppers and agricultural workers whose annual income was measured in tens of dollars. This law required voters to place their ballots in separate boxes labeled for each candidate. The intent, and the effect, was to make it impossible for illiterate voters to cast their ballots accurately. But such a complicated system proved to be unnecessary because most states pioneered in more direct methods to disenfranchise their illiterate citizens. Mississippi adopted a poll tax and a literacy test when it revised its state constitution in 1892. The judgment about whether the voter passed the test was left entirely to the registrar. By 1901, overall voter turnout in Mississippi had dropped to 17 percent. Additional insurance against black political influence was secured by instituting the all-white primary. The legal rationalization for this device to remove blacks from the nomination process relied on the argument that political parties were akin to private clubs with a right to make their own rules, and that as a consequence they could not be regulated by the government. White primaries withstood federal court challenges until 1901. Terror was employed to achieve the final destruction of political influence by blacks. The Fourteenth, Fifteenth, and Sixteenth Amendments had been enacted by the post-Civil War Congress to empower blacks politically, but before long the U. S. In 1883, for instance, the Supreme Court dismissed one hundred federal indictments against the perpetrators of sixty political murders of blacks, on the ground that Congress could not make murder a crime prosecutable under federal law. U. S. Cruickshank The many strategies to disenfranchise black voters were effective. Within a few years, the southern black electorate was "expeditiously destroyed. In five other southern states it was halved. Many of the efforts to reduce the

political influence of blacks were aimed at poor whites as well. Proponents of election "reform" understood that restrictions on voting by blacks could be used to undercut whites who might challenge oligarchic control by big landowners and employers. A white politician in Virginia stated: Agrarian populism was on the rise at the same time that the industrial and trade unions were growing in strength. In cities, socialist parties were attracting an increasing number of followers, and the party machines seized power by mobilizing immigrant voters. Such developments prompted elites to seek reform of election p95

The Contemporary Politics of Voter Registration and Turnout

The best testimony to the continuing importance of the politics of turnout is the response when proposals are put forth to relax voter registration requirements. In , the League of Women Voters completed a study of registration laws and practices in counties in various states. After noting a pattern of inefficiency and delay in the system of registration, the league reported an oft-expressed fear by election officials that any easing of registration laws inevitably would lead to voter fraud. For example, in New York City a voter registration drive in bogged down after registration officials built a backlog of 50, registrations. It was estimated that 62, voters were turned away on election day because they were not yet listed on the rolls. Inefficient registration procedures reduce voter participation. The lack of uniformity in electoral laws exerts a similar impact. Registration requirements differ from state to state, or even from county to county within a state. Americans are a mobile population; about one-third of the respondents in a recent election study had lived at their address less than two years. Probably half of voters change addresses in the four years separating presidential elections. After each move they are expected to reregister. A few states and counties still require double registration- once for local and separately for national elections. In some places, voters are expunged from the rolls for failing to vote in a single election. Several Georgia counties require a citizen to drive up to fifty miles to register at a courthouse. In some counties in Alabama, registration offices are open only two to three days a week for limited hours. Across most of the country, offices are rarely open except during working hours. In the last few years, registration by mail has become more common, by twenty-five states allowed it. But the registration forms are not easy to get because they are not available to people outside registration offices.

Best Answer: A facade means a false face or front. A democratic facade would be a country where the elections were rigged or unfairly influenced by fear and intimidation. A democratic facade would be a country where the elections were rigged or unfairly influenced by fear and intimidation.

John Weeks 18 July What is the source of the 21st century tendency to authoritarianism? The central purpose of neoliberal re-regulation is to remove economic policy from control by representative democracy. John Kay engraving, It is difficult to find a major country in which democratic institutions are not under stress, in many cases under aggressive attack. The United States has a profoundly anti-democratic regime. In Europe long-standing authoritarian tendencies have enjoyed a quantum leap under the neoliberal austerity regime fostered by the German government under cover of the European Commission. The draconian austerity measures that were imposed on Greek citizens represent an obvious and shocking example of the mainstream authoritarian trend in Europe. Authoritarian movements and political parties hold power in Austria, Italy, Poland and Hungary. The few developments in major countries supportive of democracy come in Spain where the Socialists hold government and the progressive and participatory Podemos is a strong political force; and the shift of the British Labour Party to social democracy with the imminent possibility of an election victory. Beyond North America and Europe no major country counters the authoritarian trend, not China, where the government oversees a transition from socialist to market authoritarianism. Superficial flowering of democratic participation in Brazil and India proved short-lived, with a rightwing semi-legal coup undermining representative institutions in the former, and the ruling government in India fostering ethnic-religious intolerance. In VietNam where I have worked for 25 years, an authoritarian government has completed a transition from central planning to capitalism only slightly less repressive than in China. The end of WWI, now years past, ushered in authoritarian regimes provoked by the excesses of capitalism. The Great War, as my parents named it, was the most catastrophic conflict in human history. Ten years later came the most devastating economic crisis the world had known. As the Great War ended, revolutionaries in Russia overthrew capitalism and pledged a governance system in the interests of the working-class and peasantry. The regimes proved appallingly successful not only in crushing labor movements but also in rolling back the principles of the Enlightenment. Destruction of these savage regimes required a war even more catastrophic than the conflict. The "inner nature of capital" In the wake of economic depression, fascism, war and the consolidation of the Soviet Union, whose military had borne the major burden of the war against fascism, there developed a near-consensus among mainstream political parties in the United States and Europe. Over thirty years of economic catastrophe, dictatorship and war demonstrated even to major elements of the capitalist class the need to manage capitalism. In the immediate aftermath of WWII this recognition of the excesses of capitalism appeared even in the foremost economics journal of the time, The Economic Journal. In the British economist K. Rothschild , The rise of financial capital since the s has returned us to the capitalist authoritarianism that flourished in the s and s. Market competition is the source of authoritarian rule, and by its nature competition among oligopolies extends to social and political conflict. The current authoritarian tide in European and the United States comes from the excesses generated by capitalist competition, unleashed and justified now not by fascism but by neoliberalism. Reality is quite the contrary. Neoliberal market re-regulation over the last thirty years has destroyed freedom. During the New Deal period, and during the European post-war social democratic and Christian Democratic consensus, governments regulated capital in the specific sense of limiting its freedom of movement. The neoliberal re-regulation does not merely reverse regulation of capital. Neoliberal re-regulation replaces progressive containment of capital with legal rules that actively facilitate the collective power of capital and undermine the collective power of labour. Neoliberal re-regulation is not the negation of restrictions on capital. Rather, it is the implementation of active policies to limit the scope for governments to act and intervene in economic, social and political spheres. Neoliberal re-regulation is the implementation of active policies to limit the scope for governments to act and intervene in economic, social and political spheres. During the New Deal and social democracy in Europe

governments regulated capital. In the neoliberal era capital regulates government. This requires not only economic re-regulation but also social and political re-regulation. The current German government has spent over a decade successfully inducing other EU governments to legislate limits on their legal scope to design and implement economic policy. Examples of the ordoliberalism approach in the United States are the legislation setting the public debt ceiling and central bank inflation targeting. Media control The most odious re-regulation in the interests of capital has been legal measures to weaken trade unions and other popular organizations and movements. This control of the means of communication is central to the re-regulation process that liberates capital. Media control facilitates the propaganda to minimize and deflect criticism, even recognition, of the criminal excesses of capitalism. Imposing legal and extra-legal limits to personal freedom in the neoliberal era derives both ideologically and in practice from the dogma of market freedom. Democratic facade Imposing legal and extra-legal limits to personal freedom in the neoliberal era derives both ideologically and in practice from the dogma of market freedom. So-called free markets must be enforced, enforcement achieved by re-regulation by capital. Over the last forty years this re-regulation involved a decommissioning of representative government while maintaining it as a rhetorical facade. The active regulation of market processes in the United States in the s and Western Europe after WWII suppressed the authoritarian tendency inherent in capitalism. The re-regulation by capital, especially financial capital, unleashed that authoritarianism. The emergence of finance capital, so-called financialization, brings to full expression the anti-democratic nature of market processes. At the outset of the twenty first century the great oligopolies and powerful industrial corporations about which Rothschild wrote no longer drive the destructive force of capitalist competition. Finance capital not the huge industrial predators of the twentieth century drive competition in this the globalized twenty-first century. The hegemony of finance capital brings forth overtly authoritarian political dictatorship undisguised by democratic trappings.

Chapter 4 : Facade of democracy | Socialist Review

Must Democracy in America Be a Facade? excerpted from the book The Democratic Facade by Daniel Hellinger and Dennis R. Judd Brooks Cole Publishing Company, , paper.

Thein Sein has attempted to move towards democratization or a democratic transition, by establishing a dialogue with pro-democracy leader Daw Aung San Suu Kyi and allowed her party, the National League for Democracy NLD, to participate in the general elections. In order to show a positive change, the government also released a small number of political prisoners. However, the Burmese Army still operates military offensives against ethnic rebel groups in Karen State, Shan State and Kachin State whilst the government has conducted ceasefire talks. Human rights violations have continued in these areas and thousands of ethnic civilians continue to suffer from abuses committed by troops of the Burmese Army. Subsequently, the changes that have been applied are not appreciated by those affected by them. The fact-findings in this report show that those residents from the villages mentioned above experience various human rights abuses: Furthermore, it reveals that 10 years after the gas pipeline construction between Kanbaw and Myaing Kalay, villagers residing along the highway of Ye Township to Thanbyuzayat Township are still demanded to provide security fees for the gas pipeline, its sentry and duties of village security. Villagers have also had their lands seized and marked to be confiscated recently. Additionally our information unveils that the villagers are forced to give information of ethnic insurgency groups to local government officers and required to report every day even though no such groups travel by, or enter the villages. Consequently, these villagers have to leave their work behind as they have to report, and because they are unable to go to work, they face difficulties for their survival. In addition, the villagers living on Kywe Thone Nyi Ma Island not only have their land seized, but also have to provide the local based Navy Army with allowances for them to work on their own rubber and betel nut plantations and other long-term crops plantations. In addition, the villagers on the Kywe Thone Nyi Ma Island and its surrounding villages have to provide woods and other materials for buildings of local based Burmese Army offices and barracks; yet those villagers are also charged to pay a large amount of money if they could not provide the woods. Mon State, Karen State, and the Tenasserim Division, to promote human rights and lessen the chance of future violations. In fact, the villagers are facing human rights abuses more frequently by the government troops of the government that was inaugurated in, , than during the time the government was led by Senior General Than Shwe. Introduction In Burma, to show the signs of heading toward reforms, President Thein Sein has conducted many rounds of dialogues with pro-democracy leader, Daw Aung San Suu Kyi, in addition to allowing her party the National League for Democracy NLD to take part in the upcoming by-elections and releasing a small number of political detainees. People in the country hoped that the meeting would bring about changes and prominent development in political spheres. Suu Kyi and the president reportedly enjoyed a cordial conversation, though no details of the meeting were released by either site. Burmese state newspaper "The New Light of Myanmar" reported the meeting from a different angle: During her talks with the liaison minister, she revealed her widespread concerns about the recent conflicts in Kachin State, Shan State and Karen State. Suu Kyi still believes that the regime will continue to exclude ethnic groups from the dialogue. Combined with the significant increase in human rights abuses by the Burmese Army, including the use of gang-rape against ethnic minority women and children, the outlook for genuine reform in Burma remains bleak. This is a reality check; change has not come to Burma yet. As the result of the civil-war in the Kachin territory, an estimated 40, locals have been displaced in war-torn areas of Kachin State, but until Tuesday the Burmese government authorities had only allowed the UN World Food Program to distribute foods to the nearly 6, refugees in the government-controlled areas of Kachin State. Fighting in the region continues despite the reports that President Thein Sein, issued a written statement signed on Dec. The statement has not yet been publicly announced, but its existence was revealed to local journalists by the Kachin State chief minister at a fund-raising ceremony for Kachin war refugees. On the other hand, the regime continues building dams which will adversely affect not only ethnic minority farmers, but farmers throughout the land. However, many of these people rural areas said there have been no changes

in administrative system because the people still suffer from paying taxes, and the authorities are still corrupt. Many types of human rights violations such as illegal taxation, extortion, forced labor and land confiscation have continued. Many people in conflict zones and those that did not have the right to vote during the last election feel the situation remains the same. People are still displaced due to fighting and human rights violations. Still many face problems in terms of getting food and trying to find stable sources of livelihood. Its human rights workers in the field have traveled to various parts of Mon State, Karen State and the Tenasserim Division and interviewed local people to document human rights violations. In many parts of Mon State and Karen State, the Burmese Army is still deploying their battalions close to villages and the local villagers are suffering from abuses by Burmese Army soldiers. While the agreement to a ceasefire between the New Mon State Party NMSPP in officially ended the hostilities with the Burmese military junta, the ceasefire failed to guarantee the well-being of communities on the periphery of Mon territory. These battalions have the capacity to field between 80 to soldiers each at any one time. The regions of focus in this report, southern Mon State and Northern Tenasserim Division, are geographically mostly comprised of mountainous and hilly terrain. This difficult terrain is a natural gift to armed insurgent groups desiring to hide from their enemies. According to analyses of the military movement in this area regarding the excessive positioning of military bases, issues surrounding pipeline security are the key causes behind the continuous commitment of human rights violations. The industries of local rubber and betel-nut plantations, paddy fields and perennial fruit-orchards that employ local residents have been hit hard by the abuses documented in this report. In order to collect the evidence, five field reporters in two teams interviewed 38 subjects in 22 villages; these include 11 interviews from villages in Thanbyuzayat Township, 10 interviews from villages in Ye Township, and 7 interviews from Kywe Thone Nyi Ma Island, northern Yebyu Township, Tenasserim Division, southern Burma. This report also includes 4 interviews collected by telephone from farmers who were recently violated by money extortion regarding their owned land. Due to area restrictions and security toll-gates set up by local government battalions, gathering data and directly asking questions to local farmers in the targeted areas were intensely difficult and in some cases members from local based Community Based Organization CBO assisted with important information that HURFOM felt added to the strength of this report. HURFOM also drew extensively on the knowledge of three local residents who helped with gathering information from individual incidents, background information, and confirmation on facts in the interviews as well as invaluable context and assistance in replying to targeted follow-up questions. Recorded Voices of Local residents on the Political Change The people of southern Burma continue to live under a highly authoritarian military regime that is widely condemned for its serious human rights abuses. HURFOM field reporters have conducted interviews with villagers residing in the villages located between Ye and Thanbyuzayat townships. The following findings are voice files recorded from the villagers who are the witnesses and victims of human rights abuses committed in their areas. The majority of those who committed human rights abuses are local based battalion officers and their fellows. These voice-recorded files below are gathered from males and females from 14 villages. Lives for the villagers living in Ye and Thanbyuzayat townships do not seem to have changed, even though signs of change have been cried out across the country under the administration of this new government. Quoted below, a Karen person, 28, from Bae La-mu village, Ye Township, remarked what kind of changes are taking place in his region: But, now the year is almost over and nothing changed in our region that shows reform. And, from the same battalion, two groups are formed and one group comes to collect the fees while another group orders the villagers to go on sentry. There are 10 villages in total lying nearby Wae Ka-mee, Ah-nin, and Kyaung Ywae villages situated between the high-way of Ye-Thanbyuzayat. Those villages are located right along the Kanbaw to Myaing Kalay gas pipeline. Sometimes, we have to be guards while we also have to pay fees for pipeline security. There is one group giving orders to us to go on sentry, and there is another group collecting money for pipeline security. So, two groups were made from IB No. What I meant here is that we as villagers who have no power are affected for two reasons. We cannot go to our work but we are used as free laborers for them. And, we have to take our saved money to pay them as they demanded. U Htun Hla is 52 years old and he is working on rubber plantation. Local Area Security and Abuses That is not only what villagers have faced as a result of the constructed the gas pipeline, but they also

have faced many other abuses committed by government troops guarding the gas pipeline. The following is an incomplete list of what the Burmese Army has demanded of villagers: They [Burmese Army] order villagers to go on sentry for the security of gas pipeline. They order villagers to patrol the villages in addition to guarding the gas pipeline. They demanded villagers to pay security fees to those who ordered them to pay. And if these villagers cannot guard designated areas themselves, they have to compromise by paying fees. They demanded villagers to support village militia troops and to provide the troops with rations. They use villagers guides if they get informed about the insurgency groups while sometimes these villagers are used as guides, sometimes this task implies being a human shield for Burma Army troops. They steal fruit, vegetables, and livestock of villagers. They ask villagers about insurgent groups and ask whether these villagers have contacts with insurgent groups when they are on the front line heading into jungle eastern of Ye Township. If the villagers do not know about that or do not have any contact with, they are asked by them whatever they want and then blamed. Those local people are the young girls and married women from the families of Mon, Karen, and other ethnic people. Sometimes, they are questioned about rebels, and they are even asked questions concerned with sexuality, causing shyness. They told off those local people who cannot speak Burmese well, and they look down and discriminate them. They beat up and torture local people. Those abuses continue to be committed by government troops just like before and those are the ongoing abuses. Human Rights Abuses in Bal La-muu and Ka-nin Ka-maw villages, Ye Township The interviews conducted with two villagers as shown below reveal that although the new civilian-led government has been installed and steps of changes have started in the country, the villagers do not see any signs of change in their region. While doing this, they abused villagers by using these villagers as porters and as human shields. They would also order villagers around to inform them about rebel groups. If people did not know anything about rebel groups, they would be charged by paying bags of rice, bottles of cooking oil and livestock. That is what has changed; people are still charged with crimes they did not commit. There have not been any changes. In reality, like before, we are still oppressed. And then, our life which has been stamped gets torn apart. That is how the government troops have oppressed us. If the army does not suppress or cause us to suffer, we would not suffer. We do not want to see our people abandon their homes and lands and go aboard to work as slaves. Human Rights Abuses that the local residents in Ah-nin village and nearby Thanbyuzayat Township Faces Ma Hla Than [not real name], 30, who is a Mon villager living in Ah-Nin village, Thanbyuzayat Township, Mon State, remarked the human rights violations that are taking place in his village and its neighboring village: This started last August. This land is divided into plots and sold by the company to local residents. We saw that the company managers and staff came with their cars to do surveys and measured the land from end of August to the second week of September. The government staff from Land Measurement and Survey Department came to measure the land. How can there be uncultivated lands and virgin soils here? We have lived our whole lives farming these lands and plantations. Those lands have just been left about 3 to 4 years without cultivating them as the owners face difficulties for their survival. And, since they do not have enough money to invest, they cannot afford cultivating their lands. To keep working on the land, the owners have to hire labors and buy fertilizers. Yet, they invest more money on the products they need to cultivate their land than the profit they get from their land. Additionally, as landowners, we get extorted by Burmese Army troops, so that is why we just leave our lands without cultivating.

Chapter 5 : Must Democracy in America Be a Facade? excerpted from the book The Democratic Facade

The Democratic Facade [this piece is not finished!] DEMOCRATIC deficit is a phrase which is often used to describe the lack of completeness in our democracy. We have.

Will we recall the wealth and prosperity brought to us by free markets and private investment? The freedom and democracy we enjoyed under our neoliberal governments? Or the ways in which we bravely protected our cultural and natural heritage, safeguarding it for future generations? When we think of the s, we will remember the protesters in the streets, the wars ravaging the Middle East, causing entire populations to leave home and hearth behind, and the millions of people across the globe risking their lives just to make a living somewhere else. We will remember the xenophobic attacks, the racist politicians, the gag orders and the crackdowns. But perhaps most of all, we will look back in disbelief, unable to understand how we could idly stand by and witness the slow but steady destruction of our planet – blindly burning, digging and slashing our way beyond the point of no return. The economic recession, the popular uprisings and the increasing political instability of recent years encouraged neoliberal governments around the globe to discard their democratic pretenses and let their authoritarian nature to come to the fore. These developments have been particularly acute in Turkey, whose anti-democratic turn in recent years provides one of the most striking examples of authoritarian neoliberalism. What it had failed to recognize was that more and more people felt like their neighborhood, city and society was no longer theirs; they had become strangers, outsiders in their own lives, victims of the structural violence that had bulldozed their homes, taken away their jobs, destroyed their theaters, cut their trees and killed their hopes. Faced with a significant share of the population that refused to buy into the neoliberal myth of progress and prosperity the government responded in the only way it knew how: More and more people felt like their neighborhood, city and society was no longer theirs; they had become strangers, outsiders in their own lives, victims of the structural violence that had bulldozed their homes, taken away their jobs, destroyed their theaters, cut their trees and killed their hopes. After a very violent police crackdown on the street protests – in which hundreds were arrested, thousands were injured and over a dozen protesters were killed, including the year-old Berkin Elvan – the state then continued its repression in less overt but no less authoritarian ways. Activists, artists and academics who had expressed support for the protests were accused of supporting terrorism, and in many cases charged as such. The post-Gezi crackdown and subsequent political repression did not constitute a breaking point with the past, but a boiling point – the culmination of many years of structural violence and oppression, which have long been so characteristic of neoliberal regimes across the globe. Even as the Turkish state massacred its own people in the predominantly Kurdish southeast, NATO jets continued to take off from Turkish airbases to launch bombing campaigns against the so-called Islamic State in Syria. The two events were intricately linked. Rather, its rapprochement with the Kurds stemmed from a belief that the only thing required to solve the Kurdish question was to turn them into model citizens in the neoliberal sense of the word – indebted, enslaved and forever precariously employed. In the post context, however, the AKP came to realize that it had more to gain politically from appealing to its nationalist constituency and attacking the Kurds, than by continuing to try to resolve the Kurdish issue. Ever since this shift in political strategy and the escalation of the war with the PKK, the Turkish state has shifted its authoritarian drive into second gear. The failed coup attempt in the summer of has provided the AKP with the necessary pretext to purge tens of thousands of civil servants, judges, lawyers, teachers and security personnel from its ranks. Over a hundred media outlets have been closed down, and in its December report the Committee to Protect Journalists claims that 81 journalists are currently in jail in Turkey – a number local activists claim is even higher. The neoliberal state turns into an ever more controlling entity at the command of its ruling elite. If these elites then happen to be xenophobic populists with an authoritarian streak, it will not be long before the country finds itself staring into the abyss. Sign up for our Newsletter The latest content in your inbox.

Chapter 6 : Free markets and the decline of democracy | openDemocracy

Noam Chomsky Interview: The Democratic Facade Iraq is to be what the British, when they ran the region, called an "Arab facade," with British power in the background if the country seeks too much independence.

The Democratic Facade Iraq is to be what the British, when they ran the region, called an "Arab facade," with British power in the background if the country seeks too much independence. That is a familiar part of the history of the region for the past century. Zmag If you mean Democrat or Republican, the answer is: It has often been pointed out by political scientists that the US is basically a one-party state -- the business party. Most of the population seems to agree. I tend to agree with the majority of the population on these matters, and believe there is a significant task ahead to create a more democratic culture, in which elections are far more meaningful and there is also meaningful ongoing political participation by the general population. More serious political scientists in the mainstream describe the US not as a "democracy" but as a "polyarchy": There is surely much truth to the conclusion of the leading American social philosopher of the 20th century, John Dewey, whose main work was on democracy, that until there is democratic control of the primary economic institutions, politics will be "the shadow cast on society by big business. The primary goal, uncontroversially, is to control the immense energy reserves of the Persian Gulf region, Iraq included. That has been a prime concern of the Western industrial powers since the time when Iraq was created by the British, to ensure that Iraqi oil reserves would be in British hands and the newly-created state of Iraq would be barred from free access to the Gulf. At that time the US was not a leading actor in world affairs. But after World War II, the US was by far the dominant world power, and control of Middle East energy reserves became a leading foreign policy goal, as it had been for its predecessors. In the s, US planners recognized that in their words Gulf energy resources are "a stupendous source of strategic power" and "one of the greatest material prizes in world history. Quite apart from yielding "profits beyond the dreams of avarice," as one leading history of the oil industry puts the matter, the region still remains "a stupendous source of strategic power," a lever of world control. Control over Gulf energy reserves provides "veto power" over the actions of rivals, as the leading planner George Kennan pointed out half a century ago. Europe and Asia understand very well, and have long been seeking independent access to energy resources. Much of the jockeying for power in the Middle East and Central Asia has to do with these issues. The populations of the region are regarded as incidental, as long as they are passive and obedient. Few know this as well as the Kurds, at least if they remember their own history. US planners surely intend to establish a client state in Iraq, with democratic forms if that is possible, if only for propaganda purposes. But Iraq is to be what the British, when they ran the region, called an "Arab facade," with British power in the background if the country seeks too much independence. There is no indication whatsoever of any miraculous change. The US occupying forces have imposed on Iraq an economic program that no sovereign country would ever accept: There is, of course, always a domestic sector that enriches itself by collaborating in running the "facade. But it is likely to follow, when attention turns elsewhere. You know better than I the famous Kurdish saying about putting trust in anyone. It holds for others as well, but Kurds familiar with their own history need no reminders of how they were sold out by the US in , left to be massacred by the US client state in Iran, and how the people who are now in charge in Washington fully supported Saddam Hussein right through his worst atrocities and long after the war with Iran was over, for reasons that the Bush I administration declared quite openly: They now pretend to be outraged by the mass graves in the South and the Halabja atrocities, but that is pure and transparent fraud, as we can see by looking at how they acted when the atrocities occurred. Of course they knew all about them, but did not care. And with all the later pretense about the Halabja massacre, how much medical aid have they provided for the victims over the past decade? Furthermore, this has nothing particular to do with the United States. That is, unfortunately, the standard way in which power systems operate, secure in the knowledge that the intellectual classes at home will construct a suitable cover of high ideals. That has even been true of the worst mass murderers: Hitler, the Japanese fascists, and for that matter Saddam Hussein. For the weak to put their trust in systems of power is simply to ask for catastrophe. They may choose to cooperate with powerful states, but if

so, they should do so without illusions. And again, no one knows this better than the Kurds, not just those in Iraq but in Turkey and elsewhere. Having failed to discover weapons of mass destruction, Washington shifted its propaganda to "establishing democracy. But with a sufficiently obedient intellectual class, and loyal media, the farce can proceed untroubled. To evaluate the new propaganda claim, a rational person would ask how those who know proclaim their "yearning for democracy" have in fact acted, and act today, when their interests are at stake. I will not run through the record, but those who are interested in evaluating these claims should certainly do so. They will discover that "democracy" is tolerated, but only when it is a "top-down form of democracy" in which elites who collaborate with US business and state interests retain control -- I happen to be quoting from one of the leading authorities on Latin American democracy, who writes as an insider, having served in the "democracy enhancement" programs of the Reagan administration, which devastated Central America, and left a trail of horror in the Middle East and southern Africa as well. Furthermore, the same policies are pursued today, without the slightest change. Is the US bringing democracy to Uzbekistan? Or to Equatorial Guinea, also ruled by a monster comparable to Saddam Hussein, but warmly welcomed by the Bush White House because he sits on a very large pool of oil. Take Paul Wolfowitz, described by the propaganda system as the leading "visionary" seeking democracy, whose "heart bleeds" for the suffering of poor Muslims. Presumably that explains why he was one of the leading apologists for General Suharto of Indonesia, one of the great mass murderers and torturers of the modern era, and continued to praise him well into , just before he was overthrown by an internal revolt. It is all too easy to continue. For the rich and powerful, illusions about themselves are satisfying and convenient. Many find it quite pleasant to lavish praise on themselves, a major role of intellectuals, throughout history. For the weak and defenseless, faith in illusions is not a wise course -- as the victims of centuries of imperial practice should certainly understand. How do you consider USA national security? US national security is threatened only by terror and weapons of mass destruction WMD -- which, sooner or later, are likely to be combined, perhaps with horrifying consequences. US and other intelligence agencies, and independent foreign policy analysts, predicted that the invasion of Iraq would lead to an increase in terror and proliferation of WMD, and their predictions have already been verified. The reasons are obvious. The world dominant power announced its intention to attack anyone it wishes, without credible pretext or international authorization, in the National Security Strategy of September It then moved at once to undertake an "exemplary action" to demonstrate to the world that it means exactly what it said, invading an important country that it knew of course to be virtually defenseless. Watching this, potential targets do not say: No one can compete in military force with the US, which spends about as much as the rest of the world combined. But the weak do have weapons: That is the reason for the near-universal predictions on the part of experts that terror and WMD would be stimulated by the declaration of the National Security Strategy, and by the Iraq invasion. The Bush administration understands this as well as intelligence agencies and independent analysts. They do not prefer to harm US national security and subject the population to severe threats. It is simply not a high priority for them, as compared with others: They also want a very powerful state: But the powerful state they want to nourish is to serve the interests of the rich and privileged, not the general population. And the international and domestic goals, in their eyes, are far more important than security, or even survival. There is nothing novel about that. Again, those who know some history will recognize that political leaders quite often choose the risk of catastrophe in pursuit of power, domination, and wealth. For a long time the US has shown disdain for the Security Council, the World Court, and international law and institutions generally. That is not in the least controversial. But this administration is so extreme in its contempt for international law and institutions that it has even been subjected to unprecedented condemnation by the foreign policy elite. Furthermore, it is all so open and brazen that there is really no need to discuss the topic. The Bush administration informed the UN a year ago that it could be "relevant" by following US orders, or it could be a debating society as Colin Powell put it. That continued, and continues today, not just in the case of Iraq. Keeping only to the Middle East, the US has continued its practice of the past 30 years of protecting its client state of Israel by vetoing Security Council resolutions and blocking General Assembly resolutions, and of course by providing military aid and economic support for its client state to continue its programs of integrating the valuable parts of the West Bank within Israel. That is one of the reasons why the

US has been far in the lead in vetoing Security Council resolutions UK second, no one else even close, since the 1950s, when the UN was beginning to be somewhat independent of US domination as a result of decolonization and the recovery of the industrial powers from the war. It is not of course the only reason. The US also vetoes Security Council resolutions on a host of other issues, including even a call for all states to observe international law -- not mentioning the US, though everyone understood to whom it was directed. I have not called the US "a leader of the terrorists," but I have documented in detail the long and horrendous record of US terrorist acts and crucial support for the terrorism of its clients. In reviewing this record, I use the official US government definition of the term "terrorism. If you are not convinced, look at the ample documentation -- including the history of the Kurds, running right to the present, though the crucial US support for state terror against the Kurds was primarily in Turkey in the 1970s, when Turkey became the leading recipient of US military aid aside from Israel and Egypt as it was driving millions of Kurds from the devastated countryside, killing tens of thousands, and carrying out every imaginable kind of barbarism, some of the worst crimes of the terrible 1970s, right near you. I have personally seen some of the results, in the miserable slums of Istanbul to which refugees were driven, in the city walls of Diyarbakir where they attempt to survive, and elsewhere. But surely you must know all of that, right next door. And that is only a very small part of the story, and omits the direct implementation of terrorist atrocities. About that there is a long and ugly record. In fact, the US is alone in having been condemned by the World Court for what amounts to international terrorism, in its attack against Nicaragua. The Court ordered the Reagan administration -- those now in power again in Washington -- to terminate its terrorist war against Nicaragua. Of course the administration disregarded the Court order, at once escalating the terrorist war, and vetoing Security Council resolutions supporting the Court judgment. The US is not alone in these practices, by any means. Rather generally, such practices run roughly in parallel with the power to commit the crimes. Again, that is familiar to the victims over the centuries, or at least should be. Can systems of power protect human values? Certainly they can, and sometimes they do, the US included. This happens when protecting human values serves power interests, or when an aroused citizenry demands it. Both of those factors were responsible for US protection of Iraqi Kurds in the 1990s, while at the same time the US was providing the decisive military and diplomatic support for the atrocious repression of the Kurds across the border -- though the population of the US was and remains unaware of these crimes; the massive evidence was suppressed by the media and the intellectual classes, as is commonly the case. Does that mean that the American model will not be successful? I never say that. There is great hope for a better future, and to create it should be a primary commitment for people in the US, the West generally, and the rest of the world.

Chapter 7 : What is the definition for democratic facade? | Yahoo Answers

Start studying sociology ch. 10 extra class IDs. Learn vocabulary, terms, and more with flashcards, games, and other study tools.

Years from now, when we look back at the s, what will be the images that come to mind? Will we recall the wealth and prosperity brought to us by free markets and private investment? The freedom and democracy we enjoyed under our neoliberal governments? Or the ways in which we bravely protected our cultural and natural heritage, safeguarding it for future generations? When we think of the s, we will remember the protesters in the streets, the wars ravaging the Middle East, causing entire populations to leave home and hearth behind, and the millions of people across the globe risking their lives just to make a living somewhere else. We will remember the xenophobic attacks, the racist politicians, the gag orders and the crackdowns. But perhaps most of all, we will look back in disbelief, unable to understand how we could idly stand by and witness the slow but steady destruction of our planet “ blindly burning, digging and slashing our way beyond the point of no return. The economic recession, the popular uprisings and the increasing political instability of recent years encouraged neoliberal governments around the globe to discard their democratic pretenses and let their authoritarian nature to come to the fore. These developments have been particularly acute in Turkey, whose anti-democratic turn in recent years provides one of the most striking examples of authoritarian neoliberalism. What it had failed to recognize was that more and more people felt like their neighborhood, city and society was no longer theirs; they had become strangers, outsiders in their own lives, victims of the structural violence that had bulldozed their homes, taken away their jobs, destroyed their theaters, cut their trees and killed their hopes. Faced with a significant share of the population that refused to buy into the neoliberal myth of progress and prosperity the government responded in the only way it knew how: More and more people felt like their neighborhood, city and society was no longer theirs; they had become strangers, outsiders in their own lives, victims of the structural violence that had bulldozed their homes, taken away their jobs, destroyed their theaters, cut their trees and killed their hopes. After a very violent police crackdown on the street protests “ in which hundreds were arrested, thousands were injured and over a dozen protesters were killed, including the year-old Berkin Elvan “ the state then continued its repression in less overt but no less authoritarian ways. Activists, artists and academics who had expressed support for the protests were accused of supporting terrorism, and in many cases charged as such. The post-Gezi crackdown and subsequent political repression did not constitute a breaking point with the past, but a boiling point “ the culmination of many years of structural violence and oppression, which have long been so characteristic of neoliberal regimes across the globe. Even as the Turkish state massacred its own people in the predominantly Kurdish southeast, NATO jets continued to take off from Turkish airbases to launch bombing campaigns against the so-called Islamic State in Syria. The two events were intricately linked. Rather, its rapprochement with the Kurds stemmed from a belief that the only thing required to solve the Kurdish question was to turn them into model citizens in the neoliberal sense of the word “ indebted, enslaved and forever precariously employed. In the post context, however, the AKP came to realize that it had more to gain politically from appealing to its nationalist constituency and attacking the Kurds, than by continuing to try to resolve the Kurdish issue. Ever since this shift in political strategy and the escalation of the war with the PKK, the Turkish state has shifted its authoritarian drive into second gear. The failed coup attempt in the summer of has provided the AKP with the necessary pretext to purge tens of thousands of civil servants, judges, lawyers, teachers and security personnel from its ranks. Over a hundred media outlets have been closed down, and in its December report the Committee to Protect Journalists claims that 81 journalists are currently in jail in Turkey “ a number local activists claim is even higher. The neoliberal state turns into an ever more controlling entity at the command of its ruling elite. If these elites then happen to be xenophobic populists with an authoritarian streak, it will not be long before the country finds itself staring into the abyss. This means that freedom of speech is more or less wiped out now in America. If you protest and have a grievance, you can be arrested for terrorism and jailed, indefinitely under the NDAA and Patriot Acts. That

machinery we call corporations; and they are still funneling ever more wealth into the hands of the rich, but they are also destroying the Earth, creating hundreds of millions of refugees, and will soon inevitably bring on famine and the plagues that conflict and famine generate. The Four Horsemen are saddling up now, and when they come galloping through our land, even the rich will not be spared. But eventually, there is no place with a climate reliable enough to grow food; diseases leap the walls of their redoubts and affect the soft rich at the same rates as the rest of us. Not that this obvious prospect will stop them from doubling down on their stupidity. DHFabian Yes, and our political leadership has since Reagan stressed what all good Americans must do. Why does our economy continue to sink? No signs, keep it quiet, stay in the designated protest zone, rarely any media coverage. DHFabian Yes, but the rich and powerful have no interest in what happens in the long run. For now, they know that Americans will continue to complain about corporate powers while still driving their cars, consuming massive amounts of fuel, and will remain useful consumers until the nation collapses. Because US corporations are now international entities, they are no longer dependent on US workers or consumers. Everyone knows that whatever the Supreme Court said, corporations are not people. Completely incapable of caring about anything, but programmed to pursue profits, and armed with tremendous power. Draining the last of the wealth out of the US and the rest of the world and moving on to where, Mars? Our ecosystems are being rapidly destroyed, not just in the US. I do get the feeling they see the US as a collapsing nag they can flog for a little more—draining out the oil and gas, and using the last decades of a marginally viable economy to create the garrison. Bernie proved it, by beating Hillary in the primaries until it was stolen from us. The corporate power structure seeks to control every aspect of our lives, just as the fusion of church and state did in the Middle ages. It is nothing of the kind. It is literally unsustainable, meaning it will end. How is largely up to us, The People. She said so directly in my presence. Yet Dems represent, as a party, a corpse. A single dose of one sievert is enough to cause radiation sickness and nausea; 5 sieverts would kill half those exposed to it within a month, and a single dose of 10 sieverts would prove fatal within weeks. Poor people in the US are already dying in the streets for lack of food, shelter and medical care. Daily movement news and resources. Popular Resistance provides a daily stream of resistance news from across the United States and around the world. We also organize campaigns and participate in coalitions on a broad range of issues. We do not use advertising or underwriting to support our work. Instead, we rely on you. Please consider making a tax deductible donation if you find our website of value.

Chapter 8 : Venezuela has lost its democratic facade

The decision to invalidate the democratic choice of a quarter million people undermines the already low trust in the democratic process and electionsâ€”a concern universally shared by Moldova's international partners.

Nevertheless, these "electoral autocracies" exist, and there are many of them: Which political function do these parliaments exercise in autocracies? Might they even pave the way for real democratisation in the country? She will evaluate parliamentary debates and conduct surveys among the Members of Parliament in seven African countries - five autocracies and two democracies. Many former dictatorships set up, at least formally, a multi-party system" Anja Osei says. They have remained rather stable autocracies", says Osei. The resulting question for democracy research is which effect the introduction of a multi-party system, elections and parliaments has on these countries. Do they stabilize and legitimize authoritarian rule, or do they contribute to more democracy at least in the long run? These questions have so far not been sufficiently answered:- Who are the persons who have a seat in these parliaments? Are legislatures in authoritarian demographically representative and to what extent do legislators act in the interest of their constituents? Which policy decisions are taken, and in which areas does the opposition have a say in decision-making? Her research project aims to gather exactly such data and create a basis for further research on electoral autocracies. How do government and opposition interact? How do they view their role? In order to gain access to the parliaments, she will collaborate with scientific and institutional partners in each of these African states. The political researcher from Konstanz can draw on her previous experience: During the project for her post-doctoral qualification Habilitation she conducted research on networks of the political elite in Africa. ERC Starting Grants are designed to support excellent junior researchers at the career stage in which they are starting their own independent research team or programme two to seven years after completing their doctorate. Starting Grants can amount to up to 1.

Chapter 9 : what is the democratic facade? | Yahoo Answers

here is a short article (web site below) summarising the basic ideas in this text ' 'Must Democracy in America Be a Facade?' The Democratic Facade.

Must Democracy in America Be a Facade? Three Sources of Crisis for American Democracy Electoral processes and institutions in America have always been put in the service of maintaining the political authority and class privilege of elites. Even so, elections have been arenas for important and sometimes crucial political struggles. Though they were never useful in energizing populist movements for long, competing elite factions sometimes used elections as opportunities for mobilizing mass publics behind political agendas; on these occasions political discourse and electoral competition was enlivened, though these political openings occurred within strict ideological limits. By the s, however, elections had become little more than opportunities for elites to manipulate mass opinion; elites use them as occasions for passion-play entertainment and symbolic proof of their right to govern. Though campaigns offer a mirage of competition and political debate, it is an illusion artfully maintained by the professionals who run them as a lucrative new service industry of the postindustrial age. Educational institutions recognize the growing economic importance of campaigns, and as a consequence programs are springing up to train people for careers in the politics industry. The Graduate School of Political Management in New York City, for example, offers "advanced certificate programs consistent with its stated objectives of providing students with the knowledge and skill base for professional work in political management. Benjamin Ginsberg, echoing this view in a recent popular book, argues that mass opinion promotes state power; indeed, he illuminates how during the present century modern communications technology has put public "opinion," a phenomenon constantly measured and reported, at the service of power. But public opinion does not exist as some objective phenomenon, waiting to be measured and amplified by the media. The media, the education system, the campaign industry, and government leaders constantly shape it. It should be understood that the campaign "industry," like other industries, is dominated by corporations, it runs on money, and the participants expect to make a profit. Money and politics always have been intimately entwined in American politics. In the age of electronic mass media, the relationship between money brokers and politicians is tighter, possibly, than at any previous period in our national history. High-tech campaigns are extraordinarily expensive, so that the ability to raise money substantially decides who realistically can win public office. The nature of this system has become so obvious that even some incumbents worry that the legitimacy of the political system may become broadly questioned. In this spirit the Senate minority leader, Robert Dole, called for campaign reform in to reduce the 7-to-1 advantage in PAC contributions that incumbents enjoy. Claiming to be troubled by the 99 percent success rate of congressional incumbents in the elections, he said, "Republicans are determined to bring grass-roots politics back to the campaign scene. The reforms he proposes would reduce the upper limit on individual and PAC contributions. Such reforms would certainly not restore "grassroots politics," but the entrepreneurs who bundle small contributions together would have more to do, presumably. In any case, does anyone believe that reform is a priority for the beneficiaries of the present system? Promises of reform, like most statements politicians make in the electronic age, are offered up for their public relations impact. The first crisis of American democracy, the privatization of electoral politics, has led to the second crisis: The Defense Department and military contractors constitute perhaps the most well-known and thoroughly insulated policy subgovernment. But these subgovernments are numerous: The National Forest Service and the lumber industry are engaged in a constant, complicated dance, together with key senators and representatives who receive appropriate campaign contributions. The oil industry does its dance in a subgovernment composed of oil-state politicians, their committees, and the Energy, Interior, and Commerce Departments. What passes for political "debate" in the United States skirts around the margins of these systems does not impact them significantly, and therefore does not affect policy to any substantial degree. Such a tight relationship between politicians and business in the making of policy has probably not existed in the United States since the time of the "robber barons" in the late nineteenth century. Most policies that matter to Americans are now for the most part put up for sale. Like

campaigns and elections, the everyday policy processes of American government have been privatized. The third crisis of American democracy is the growth of an enormously powerful, autonomous, and secret national security apparatus. The insulation of foreign policy-making from domestic electoral processes came about because civilian and military foreign policy and corporate elites sought shelter from any accountability in the building of an American empire. They needed to conduct their business in secrecy and at a far remove from domestic political processes in direct proportion to the barbarity of their strategies to control the people and governments of other nations. More than any other reason, this is why foreign policies have been papered over so thoroughly by deceit and secrecy. The public is able to exert influence in this realm mainly through protest activities such as mass demonstrations and civil disobedience. It is an exercise in mythology to suppose that "foreign" and "domestic" policy making can be neatly demarcated. The code words "national security" again guided domestic repression of the s and ls. Subsequent events also illuminate the intimate connection between foreign and domestic politics, as represented by an executive power that has moved beyond the Constitution. The Watergate scandal should be understood in this light. At least in that case, the principal perpetrator was driven from office and his party punished at the polls. Several key players were prosecuted for their crimes. But this episode stands in stark contrast to the latest scandal. In the Iran-contra scandal, the Reagan administration was able to prevent full judicial prosecution of Lt. Oliver North and his coconspirators simply by withholding documents from the courts in the name of national security. Congress acquiesced in limiting full disclosure of the conspiracy, fearing that the public reaction might endanger all covert activities, which are essential to the U. Before the television audience, North was able to project himself as the hero and the congressional investigators as the villains. His congressional inquisitors made this outcome more or less inevitable when they so frequently said they agreed with his aims but not with his methods, and when they dutifully added that state secrets were necessary and good. It is hard to imagine what other type of person they would want for the job. They seemed to be harping on extremely minor points-mainly, whether he had kept them informed in secret sessions, of course. With this as their main concern, the lawmakers could not help but seem petty and self-serving. The Iran-contra affair revealed the astonishing size and independence of the national security state. What it failed to show was that the presidency as an institution has grown enormously and that it is able to exert its will in domestic politics as surely as in foreign policy making. The "two presidencies," domestic and foreign, are closely interdependent. Before the Second World War, the White House managed the cabinet departments through the help of a few key aides, most of whom were personal acquaintances of the president. By , the White House staff had mushroomed to more than people. The White House employees are on call to do many duties, and these jobs are not necessarily separated into separate "foreign" and "domestic" spheres. During the presidential campaign, the circle joining domestic politics and the national security agenda was closed. His handlers adroitly exploited racism and fear of crime through the prison furlough ads. The third "issue" linked the other two: The themes of the campaign perfectly illustrated the way in which the national security state has influenced domestic politics. The Culture of Violence Voltaire wrote, "Those who can make you believe absurdities can make you commit atrocities. But the endorsement and practice of human rights abuses and dictatorship overseas and the cynical manipulation of the democratic ideal has profound consequences for American democracy and for American culture. No American in the s can avoid the consequences of living in a culture permeated by ideas and images of violence, war, and conquest. Consider, as an example, the extraordinary prevalence of militaristic themes in movies. Such movies always have been popular, but they became a leading genre of the s. Their motivating energy was a belligerent nationalism and racism. In Cannon Films released *Uncommon Valor*, followed by *Missing in Action* and *Missing in Action 11*, all of which depicted privately organized covert operations in Vietnam to rescue American prisoners of war. ABC television weighed in with a communist takeover of Amerika in early *Delta Force*, a product of the Cannon-Norris team, featured U. Hundreds of Arabs are killed in the film while only one U. As in other films of this type, the action is staged in the Third World, where the American defeat in Vietnam can be rerun with a "happier" ending-we win. This is achieved, notes critic Susan Jeffords, through a "reaffirmation of the American male and the values of the masculine war experience. Pentagon officials understand the value of such films and provide logistical support for their production. For example, the Chuck

Norris films are produced by Israel G. Immediately after constructing new studios just outside of Jerusalem, the team began filming Delta Force. In addition to war films, Golan and Globus produce slasher movies. The chief competition to the "low-intensity warfare" and "peaceful engagement" movies are provided by a multitude of police, detective, and crime flicks. For the summer movie season, Criminal Law added a new twist by tying in a contentious social issue. The crazed killer, who is acquitted through the wiles of a crafty criminal lawyer, stalks women who have had an abortion. He is driven mad by the thought that they have murdered their babies. Television series that debuted in and took the logical next step of depicting "unsolved mysteries," profiling actual criminals on the loose or reconstructing heinous crimes while inviting viewers to phone hot lines with tips for solving the crimes in question. In a society of gaping inequities and a permanent underclass, a high level of crime can scarcely be avoided. But in a political culture addicted to military solutions, crime becomes, like communism was, a frightening enemy that requires a paramilitary readiness to combat. Themes of militarism and violence permeate the culture of childhood in America. By , ten war-theme cartoons were being beamed at children each week, with another eight added in . Most such cartoons were sponsored by the toy industry, which, thanks to such efforts, increased its sales of war toys by percent between and . By , war toys accounted for seven of the leading ten toys. One innovative show Thundercat even provided broadcasters with a 5 percent cut on the profits from the sales of toys. Congress demonstrated its concern about the problem in when it passed legislation to protect the toy industry. In , Congress finally legislated restrictions on advertisements aimed at children, but these were vetoed by President Reagan. By the age of sixteen, the average American child will have watched some 20, hours of TV containing , acts of violence and 50, murders or attempted murders involving 33, guns. In the mids, American citizens owned about 40 million registered handguns and over , registered machine guns, and an estimated , unregistered military-style assault weapons. The Pentagon did its part to build this arsenal by sponsoring a program that distributes surplus Ms to people who pass a certified marksman program. In , one of every white male deaths and an astonishing one of every twenty-one black male deaths almost 5 percent were homicides. Graduates of these schools freelance as anticommunist mercenaries in the Third World; one graduate was arrested in an assassination attempt on the life of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. The proliferation of arms, together with training by right-wing organizations suggests that "covert" violence easily could be turned against American citizens. The problem is likely to become more widespread as propaganda portrays the threat to national security as internal and emanating from groups working for peace and justice or from such organizations as the ACLU. The death squads who operated with such devastation in El Salvador; the terrorists that attacked clinics and schools in Nicaragua and shot down civilian airlines in Afghanistan; the military officers and the police officials who tortured and "disappeared" citizens in Guatemala were all armed and trained by the United States.