

Democracy is a political regime in which the possibility of undisturbed public contestation (freedom of speech etc.) guaranteed and in which political rule is ultimately based on the renewable empirical consent of the citizens, considered as political equals and defined in an inclusive way.

MODELS OF DEMOCRACY I: DIRECT DEMOCRACY 1/25/16

Direct Democracy a la Athens

Most Democratic system that ever existed, not sending a congressman, equal right to give speeches and voice opinions, now I don't make decisions, I only have representatives, selected people by lottery, perfect political equality, the people: THE PEOPLE IS COLLECTIVE, idiosyncratic is negative "idiot"

Guiding Principles

Decision-Making by the Citizenry

Once a year they get to choose who gets to be ostracized and forced to exile on pot sherds, this could lead to political inequality

Maximum Political Equality

Selected people by lottery to fill offices, military leaders, etc. no one had huge amount of power so it's ok if it wasn't a perfect person, some one day leadership, rotation short term, p much everyone had the chance to be the ruler for the day

Unlimited Political Authority

Can be kicked out if you get too much power, institutions don't always have the effect their founders intended, for the people by the people they can do what they want to do, popular sovereignty, collective will

Differences from Modern, Representative Democracy

No direct influence, especially on a national level, one person one vote, but not all equality on a democratic level, limited authority, checks and balances, less participation now, elections and protests but that isn't shit, someone else makes decisions that bind you,

The Most Democratic Form of Democracy?

Ancient Athens? small city-states

The Problem of Limited Citizenship

It was a privilege, only a minority were actual citizens, no slaves, immigrants, or women, only male citizens were "the people"

Why is No Large-Scale Modern State a Direct Democracy?

Only worked on a small scale, effective debate only works on small scales, city-states, polis, direct democracy effected by citizens can only be effective on a small scale, excluded immigrants, slaves, women to make it even smaller scale, could it work with millions of people? ha, couldn't have an effective debate, also too many people in the world now, city state was a couple hundred, now were at 7.8 billion

Advanced Information Technology to the Rescue?

Technology frees out time to think about politics, we could use this for debate or voting, life is no longer simple, not simple decisions like taxing goat cheese not nuking Iran, wasn't much to regulate, so common citizens have a good idea of the political issues at the time, life now is too complex

skewed business has more influenced and dominated

Problems of Representative Democracy

Under Capitalism, Politics is Class Dominated

in this system no effective democracy, get to vote and then you take the backseat and business runs the show, run of the business class for the business class by the business class, not a cross section of the population all skewed upwards

Mechanisms of Predominant Business Influence

Interest groups that wine and dine the politicians, loopholes, resources, lobbyists are business, influence pushing and shoving heavily influencing politicians, in a private market economy business investment is what keeps the economy going, they have to participate to keep economy going, raise minimum wage ill fire all my workers, tax me ill move my money to the Bahamas, unemployment will rise, taxing wont work, they influencing the political decisions

Denying Effective Citizenship and Participation to Workers

Not effecting, work hard to make a living getting education come home exhausted cant devote time to politics and have no real resources, can they finance lobbying? vote is unequal, don't exercise political rights because don't have resources, whole working life are subject to authority, doesn't make them feel like they have autonomy, can't develop feeling of participation

The Call for Revolution

Why Revolution is Necessary in Marx's Eyes

Need to get rid of private property, once you have equality then the state can wither away, happily ever after, a little too ambitious need to get rid of this, evamp it, doesn't have to be violent, bring fundamental change

How Revolution Will Come About, in Marx's Eye

Not drawing up Utopia that come out of nowhere, just an extension of trends all we need to do is give this development a qualitative push to step forward, on the course to happening, capitalism is the ground for the new socialist society, don't want to redistribute sacristy, redistribute abundance and wealth, Capitalism I don't like parts of it but there's more wealth to go around, society as a whole was much more affluent, its great to increase affluence but bad at distributing it, redistribute to make everyone well off, its what's going on already were just giving it a push at the end, extension of historical developments that are already on their way
Expected Results of Revolution: A Classless, Conflict-free, and Eventually Stateless Society
Complex structure of social class, goal is to abolish private property inequalities, capitalist competition have driven people into bankruptcy and taken away their private property and become working class citizens, capitalism separates classes to many workers few business people, get rid of business class, its conflict, only conflict is with property owners and non owners, classless you can bring back direct democracy, people on the same wave length, wants to reintroduce democracy in larger nation-states, social reforms to guarantee democracy, don't need high up choice making politically, no coercion, no imposed rules, people will just agree, no need for state, real community

Direct Democracy a la Marx

Council System: Direct Democracy at a Large Scale

wants to introduce pyramid structure, assembled working class makes relative public decisions, regional councils, _____, then one national,

government to defend ourselves

The Challenge of Homeland Security

More Safety, Less Liberty?

Change values, US gets hit 9/11 changes the value system of security and safety against internal homeland hit, big shock, redefinition of American values, maybe too much individual liberty, rebalance and strengthen, institutional changes to more safety less liberty

Strengthening Presidential and Government Powers?

Creation of Dep. of Homeland Security, justified need to create more safety for society, entrenching republican party, airport control, patriot act, NSA, temporary political effect, strengthened Bush for a while, longest stretch of unified government under bush, if you get congress you have to get presidency, bush managed to have both his party and activists win congress, national security made people support their president

Trend Reversal? The Obama Presidency

Crisis — Increasing State Intervention in Economy?

Big economic crisis when Obama came in, 2008 economic crash from deregulation and free market capitalism, started moving in a social democracy direction, had more ambitious long term plans with bailout tried to use this to give the government a more important longer lasting role in the economy

Completing the US Welfare State? Health Care

Make a move towards health care reform, Obama Care, a step towards universal coverage, 83% coverage wanted to push it to 94%, got through congress but a lot of challenges in the courts, when law was passed Supreme Court has to review it, hard to enact change in any direction

More Checks than Balances?

Hard to enact change with Judicial Branch final say even if you get the president and congress

A March toward Social Democracy (LeWorthy)

Social Democracy in Sweden 2/24/16

Underlying Values

Taking away disposable income, Sweden looks up to PAR, 80-90% participate in elections, don't care about personal lives of politicians, assess by political goals, accountability more focused on political goals, responsiveness not lower than in liberal democracy, committed to social solidarity, fight for democracy was popular mobilization was easier, got people on board, poor working class doesn't have money but has numbers, need universal suffrage, one person one vote, business is only 10% of the population, blue collar working class was 40% of the population, less privileged 80%, need to extend the suffrage to make the vote, counterbalance the big money with a big vote, social democracy emphasizes cohesion into one program, offer social protection, more political influence, etc. makes them all go one way; one party, all must be organized, built trade unions, old people homes, kindergartens, cartel to grave social democratic organizations are your life, offers you

Similarities and Differences to Liberal Democracy

Social Democracy as Full Democracy

The Driving Forces of Social Democracy in Sweden

The Importance of Universal Suffrage

The Importance of Collective Organization

Universal health care, social protection, free day care, redistributive property, egalitarian, everyone entitled to same thing, high taxes, people can't afford some things, gas and beer really high because government taxes high, less individual disposable income more solidarity, economic sufficiency, economic dynamism

RECAP: Sweden for a few decades eliminated poverty, they took care of people, how was that done? Most distinctive mechanism in which they achieved this: they combined economic efficiency and social justice by solidaristic wage bargaining (pushing for highest wage demands) make demands people doing the same job making low wages in bad performing sectors not fair social justice so equal pay for equal work, in same boat for same work, janitor in a school makes as much as janitor in Google. Liberal economy says this is crazy, making low performing sectors pay high wages for their employees (like very competitive sectors) let them go by making them pay such high wages, lose their job, retrain them into jobs that have more of a future: better for you and the economy of Sweden makes it more competitive, get rid of low performing sectors by making them pay a lot of wages but not getting enough profit to do that so they get weeded out, good performing sectors become even more dynamic, Sweden lets go of sectors without giving them protection but invest more human capital in the well performing sector. Money goes back into those businesses through taxes—gets even better and more dynamic market and global competitiveness

Social Democracy in Sweden III: Pressure from the Left then the Right 2/29

3. The Radicalization of Swedish Social Democracy in the 1960s and 1970s

There was state class compromise, but more mobilization and push for social change in the 1960s, world wide movement, US civil rights movement, Sweden wanted revitalization of social forms, strengthening the left, more radical demands, emphasis on collective organization

a. Demands for Economic Democracy

Wanted to expand social democracy into economy, trade unions and workers wanted more participation in the way work is organized, wanted to demarketize the work place, labor needs a voice, team of workers decides how things roll, introduce democratic principles in the workplace

b. The Debate over Wage-Earner Funds

Went too far, employee investment funds, Handcock covers this, this was too radical, labor union wanted a share of profits to be turned into the capital of the company but owned by the labor union, if you keep going by 30-40 years about half the capital in the firm will be owned by labor, business private vs collective labor property, labor will get more and more influence at the table because they'll own more, get more director positions until its even, 50/50 representation, this shouldn't be a problem because ultimately the underlining idea is that property should be controlled by everyone, Marxism inspired proposal, not taking away property, moving it slowly, not sooo radical, not moving into state control

4. Pressures on Swedish Social Democracy

a. Political Backlash from Social Democracy's Radicalization

Lenin makes social revolution in Russia, what did it look like at the time? It still looked like poor early capitalism, poor underdeveloped agrarian, 5% of working class people, huge number of people in the countryside people wanted to own the land they tilled, farmer dream was to own their own land and crops, Lenin made revolution at a time when the country was not ready for a revolution according to Marx, here is the first deviation from Marx, Great Britain was ready not Russia, 2017 was when it would be ready, much debate from Russia left wingers, they said Marx said to wait they were determined to wait, not ready for socialist revolution we need to go rep democracy then free market and forward but we aren't even there yet, Lenin saw both sides then a historical accident changed things

2. Lenin's Leadership Role

i. WWI Demise of Tsar, Bolshevik "Coup"

Tsarist regime found Germans, Russian military after 3 years of fighting got knocked on their ass, Russian state collapsed, mass slaughter in WWI many Russian soldiers literally ran away, dissolved, so by accident Feb 1917 the Tsarist regime falls down, German's said hey Lenin go to Russia and caused trouble there and that's exactly what he tried to do, Lenin thought Russia might not be ready but this is their political opportunity, the Tsarist regime is gone they need a new government, opportunity of a lifetime, can grab power use opportunity to move to social revolution, economic and social factors weren't ready but only political opportunity possible for a while, Lenin promised: peace (end WWI), bread (end poverty; satisfy people), and land (appealing to farm people hey you don't have much land so just take it! Police are gone you can take it over and get that dream of yours no one is going to take it), Lenin wanted to take power so became popular made a big promise satisfied the immediate needs of the people but doesn't mean he won't be a communist leader later, Lenin said I won't be tied to this development, in the Marxian scheme where social and economic and political go hand in hand Lenin used opportunistic promises to fast forward past the social and economic preconditions, caused the desolation and conflict of Russia, made socialist revolution in a society that was not ready for that kind of move, too much poverty very unlikely that conflict would just disappear

ii. The Role of the Communist "Vanguard"

Make other people that were not in the working class still for socialism, made the revolution by a small vanguard power using a military kind of assault, grabbed power with military means, large parts of pop were against or at least not in favor of it and anyone that favored it was under a false impression of what they would receive from vanguard rule, didn't respect peoples freedoms, how to gain support: force people into my army, brutal power to survive a civil war, force grain over so that he's the only socialist power, moved into desperatism, Vanguard stayed in power because controlled trade lines but division and civil war all over Russia, many

They can't lose their job, you're again isn't good have a hard time producing? Well you always have the basics, but at same time there is scarcity, some products are just not available, consumer products are not a priority

4. The Political Creation of a New Elite

Abolished Old Elite, allegedly for the sake of equality, soon recreated inequality in a weird way, this vanguard is self appointed leadership group that claim to know the laws of socialism, concentrated political power, used it to get for themselves economic advantages and benefits

5. Capitalist Reward for Socialist Leaders

Have political power which made me manager of this factory and when I manage this factory I get my hand on economic resources I can provide benefits for myself and my family, inequality in political power put vanguard above common citizens could translate to economic advantages lead to concentrated disadvantages, access to concerts and fancy vacations etc. communism through vanguard lead to the recreation of inequality in a much more concentrated way, economic elite shouldn't be political elite, biggest paradox elites have benefits, got access to western consumer goods, imports from the west, communist elites were drinking café lattes and eating mangos not potatoes, didn't want to produce but wanted access to capitalist recourses

RECAP: Covering whole course, theories in US, Sweden and G Britain, Russia, 1930s 40s Soviet system produced higher growth rates Stalin pressure to grow heavy industry, centrally planned economy had a lot of problems

THE DEMISE OF THE SOVIET UNION / 11

A) Gorbachev's Reforms and their Unexpected Consequences

1. Gorbachev's Main Goal and Motive

i. The Challenge from the West

Quality more important in the world than quantity, but Russia not doing that with central planned economy, 1940s 50s were catching up we'll be ahead but not true were falling behind gap was increasing that threatened goals of SU, thought their system would be superior to the west, how can you maintain your ideology when you're falling behind? Threat to SU power, super power status had nuclear power as powerful as the west, Russians produced tanks west produced missiles, my missiles can blow up your tanks, needed to turn around the old people movement, hired Gorbachev young for general secretary

ii. Top-Down Effort to Reinvigorate the Soviet System

Wanted to reinvigorate the communist system, need more contribution from the population, they need rewards, people were being lazy not participating, open up a little, more incentives and latitudes, let people speak their mind that draws their energy people want to contribute to it, make more attractive for people, revive it make it more dynamic with more force, want to do things to strengthen the country but you don't

c. The Victory of Moderate, Reformists Forces

More conservative less radical forces more successful, from north Mexico, wanted to pacify the country

3. The Establishment of Authoritarian Rule

a. Calles: Incorporation of Revolutionary Leaders

Under dictator resources exploited by American companies, wanted Mexican ownership, national demands

b. Cardenas: Incorporation of the Masses

Powerful mediator, make agreements, run your part, then we'll have peace, were about to all die of civil war, elite political party, not mobilizing people

c. State Corporatism in Mexico: Inclusion and Control

How it stayed so stable: incorporated large parts of the citizenry in the political party, unusual combination, large sectors of the citizenry and even kept them under control, a political accident: Calles controls the elite, has a political party, when Mexican revolution went down they fought for no reelection, elected someone to be a puppet, then puppet said he was going to run the country fuck you Calles, he still controls the elite, he was going to be squeezed out by the elite, Cardenas strengthened trade unions and labor wages, Cardenas nationalized the oil industry, Cardenas is the hero. Calles say he has the elites so I'm just gonna go live somewhere else. Cardenas mobilized AND organized people to fight for him and no one else. Incorporated these things in the party Calles had formed, big mass base that was controlled from the top by the party and the government firmly in the saddle now, inclusion and control of the people and institutions controlled by the government which is the party, accidental rise to power

RECAP Nationalized oil industry under Cardenas, mobilized the masses, encouraged them to join government controlled organizations, tricked peasants and workers into being grateful for the regime so government could control them, included but also controlled, the secret to the stability of the Mexican authoritarian regime, Communist Russia vs Authoritarian Mexico the person that controls the path of the country is similar, the big difference is the micro level, Mexico didn't control the people as much didn't want to interfere in the private sector, not in Russia they had spies

MEXICO: AUTHORITARIAN RULE AND ITS SOCIOECONOMIC EFFECTS 4/18

1. Consolidated Authoritarian Rule in Mexico (1940-1985)

a. The Taming of Personalistic Leadership

Institutionalization, in authoritarian regimes you usually end up with personal leadership which isn't secure or predictable, risky to rely on personal relationships, consistency isn't easy, you get tired by yourself

b. An Institutionalized Party as Cornerstone

Institutionalization of authoritarian regime, personal leadership had to be under control, demanded no self perpetuation of power, Mexico is committed to no reelection, important in 1940, Cardenas mobilized millions of workers and gave

them benefits he realized the Mexican dream in state owned oil companies, big bureaucratic apparatus

c. The Institutionalization of the Elite Turnover

Cardenas hugely popular, but promised to step down so no reelection, when the regime wasn't as consolidated yet he set the precedent for presidents, very powerful people, like elected dictators and govern for exactly 6 years, no more or no less, institutionalized change, you don't get the most dynamic people at age 98 if someone stays in office for 50 years the newer younger people don't get their intelligent ideas seen, 2/3 of the top leadership in Mexico also stepped down besides president, with such a high turnover rate new presidents bring new fresh energetic ideas with ambition, important to integrate mechanism people into the authoritarian regime, not stagnant, new leadership all the time its always getting better moves in social or liberal or nationalistic direction every 6 years, many changes and reforms made with this flexibility, not set on one course where you run a country to the ground when that way doesn't work anymore

d. Clientelism: The Distribution of Patronage

Kept masses integrated in the regime, captured the masses through the round of big reforms under Cardenas, join us in government controlled peasant leagues and trade unions, kept distributing little goodies gifts and benefits from the top down through a pyramid structure small scale benefits distributed by discretionary way of distribution not a program for all farmers or peasants, to individuals, state to regional to friends to neighborhoods to individual citizens and voters its discretionary, it's a favor not a right, keeping people loyal to you, conditional, account for the long standing stability of the regime, the oil that greases the wheels

2. The Socioeconomic Impact of Authoritarian Rule

a. Elite Control and Rapid Economic Development

Had a lot of power at the macro level, determined where the country would go, thought Mexico was poor and backwards, general diagnosis was underdevelopment needed industrialization to advance country, industrialization was the key, Russia was the model → backwards to industry in brutal ways but they achieved it, concentrate resources on industry, strengthen business and entrepreneurship, weaken consumer goods, elite control came in handy to push forward rapid economic development, democracy takes a back seat, you want economic growth, invest resources in growth like building factories, wages and freedom get taken care of later on

b. State-Led, Protectionist Industrialization

How do you push it ahead? Stimulate business, keep foreign competition out, powerful American companies will destroy your business, government has to control it, let foreign companies in only on certain conditions like they share their technology and give local jobs and obey tax laws, push them to help national development, not a free market, protect local business, mixed economy because private and state owned, local and foreign, state owned big stuff like