

Jan 21, A· With a classic coup d'État, as in Pinochet's Chile, the death of a democracy is immediate and evident to all. The presidential palace burns. The president is killed, imprisoned or shipped off.

Authored by Alasdair Macleod via GoldMoney. The Deep State is on course to take control of Congress. If this happens, it will be the next step in a global trend of side-lining democracy in the West, driven in large part by American foreign policy. It has led to governments everywhere increasing control over their people, in an inversion of democratic principles. It affects us all. Since the Twin Towers tragedy, American foreign policy has taken the lead in extending personal surveillance to every nation in the formerly free world. Swiss banking confidentiality no longer exists, and over one hundred countries automatically swap financial information on their citizens and their businesses. The Americans routinely spy on their allies, as Mrs Merkel found out in The erosion of democracy in America is a problem that was anticipated in its founding constitution. The rights enshrined in it are there to protect the individual from the Federal Government, yet the Federal Government chips away at those rights, as the founding fathers doubtless feared it would. The right to keep and bear arms in the Second Amendment, always a contentious issue, was framed by James Madison so that a local militia would be able to repel a standing [Federal] army. Few people think of freedom in these terms today, but a further erosion of democracy is an urgent issue facing American voters in November. It appears that a large number of former and current military and intelligence operatives are seeking nomination as Democrats for the mid-term elections. And if the Democrats succeed in getting a majority in the House of Representatives, which is the current prediction, they could comprise as much as half of the new members, in effect controlling Congress by holding the balance of power. Eighty of these seats are vulnerable Republicans, and 22 are seats where the incumbent is retiring. And of those districts, 44 have one of these candidates, 11 have two, and one has three. Furthermore, there are indications that the financial backers of the Democratic Party are supporting this influx of intelligence operatives, and that they are well-funded. Why should we worry? These candidates either represent or have strong links with the military-intelligence complex. This complex, the Deep State, has already regained a high degree of influence over the White House following the last Presidential election, to the point where it now appears to have gained control over foreign policy. It also dictates homeland security. Unsatisfied with the degree of control it has over the White House, the Deep State now appears to be seeking to control Congress as well, by having politicians in its pocket on both sides of the House, thereby holding the balance of votes. Whatever the merits or otherwise of the leading candidates for the Presidency, the CIA appears to have been managing the democratic process for decades, so that their preferred candidate wins. Following Obama, who was little more than a puppet president, Hillary was the anointed one, but then the voters rebelled and elected The Donald instead. It now seems the CIA wants to control the balance of power in Congress. This should be deeply troubling for Americans looking to draw a line under the erosion of their democracy. The US is already on its way to becoming a hidden dictatorship, where even the President is a captive of an unelected secret agency pursuing its own belligerent agenda. Seeking to control Congress is a logical extension of pre-existing Deep State policies. We have gone from the invention of weapons of mass destruction as an excuse to topple Saddam Hussein, to false-flag operations and other wars in the Middle East and Eurasia. The better, more democratic course, would have been to open borders to trade and cultural influence. And who knows, the need for a nationalistic strong man may not have arisen and Putin, if he continued in power in these altered circumstances, might be behaving very differently. Money is the root of this evil For a long time, the senior operators at the top of the CIA must have felt that they are the masters of the human race. To maintain this power, at a time when China and Russia are emerging as the powerhouses of Asia, requires more money, and lots of it. Money to bribe and subsidise foreign states: Money for technology and hardware: Therefore, the Deep State has a looming funding problem if it is to keep up with Russia and China on its accustomed terms. Government military funding is by means of the discretionary spending allocation that is set by Congress through the annual appropriations process. These amounts will have to be increased significantly for , if the Deep State is to pursue its objectives. President Trump is now onside, but

Congress will need to be compliant in order to ensure the funds required will be available. That appears to be the explanation why the Deep State is seeking to take control of Capitol Hill. This will take the geopolitical conflict with China and Russia to a new level. If the US military-intelligence complex manages to pack out Congress, it will be the killer blow for any democracy remaining in America. It will clear the field for a secret state organisation, which has shown little or no regard for human life and the rule of law, to accelerate its warlike agenda. It will have unfettered access to the national finances to accelerate its programme of global aggression, and damn the consequences for anyone else. The stakes could hardly be higher.

Chapter 2 : Jimmy Carter Is Correct That the U.S. Is No Longer a Democracy | HuffPost

Kavanaugh and the Death and Decline of Democracy Today the U.S. Supreme Court starts the first day of its new term, on October 1, , in Washington, D.C. The U.S. Senate is currently embroiled in a fierce battle over the potential confirmation of Brett Kavanaugh, President Trump's pick for the high court.

Inspired by the antics of a Big Man with a Big Mouth, think just for a moment about the important subject of how democracies treat their elected leaders. When they function well, democracies are irreverently harsh on those who take decisions on behalf of others. In no small measure because democracy has the effect of destroying the fiction that there is, or could be, a unified body politic symbolised and held together by a Great Leader. The coming of democracy ensures that political communities are permanently fractured. Differences of opinion and ways of life flourish. Compromise, consensus and working agreements to disagree happen, of course. But typically there are chronic tensions between civil societies and governments, and conflicts as well within civil societies and governments themselves. Whatever unity the polity enjoys is permanently questionable and continually up for grabs, simply because the exercise of power over others is always publicly scrutinised, contested, divided, constrained. Think for a few seconds about how monarchies once symbolically represented the power they wielded over their subjects. The physical body of kings like Charles I - and Peter the Great - was conceived both in the figure of God the Father and Christ the Son. It was therefore considered immortal and unbreakable. It could not be admitted that kings died. Their bodies symbolised infinite perfection. Like God and his Son, kings could do no wrong. That was why the violation of their bodies - through un-Godly acts ranging from unsolicited touching by their subjects through to attempted regicide - were harshly punishable. Like God, kings were omnipresent and their bodies coterminous with the polity itself. Monarchs were God-given givers of laws. But they also resembled God the Son. Just like the persons of the Trinity, the two bodies plus the authority they radiated were one, inseparable and indivisible. It more than resembles the royal tombs reserved for the Sons of Heaven who were at once elevated persons and divine persons, in whose bodies time figuratively stood still, forever. The Tiananmen edifice preserves this custom for a revolutionary saint. Democracies, understood as forms of government and ways of life in which no body rules, dispense with the fetish of rulers. They of course need leaders, respect them, follow them, learn from them - but they do not worship them as Leaders blessed with metaphysical powers. The bodies of leaders like George W. Executive power is disembodied. Representatives are not the same as the roles they play. And that is why, when they function properly, democracies like the United States regularly poke fun publicly at the bodies of politicians, with impunity. I remember this dollop of dark humour from the darkest moments of the first-term presidency of George W. Halted by a traffic snarl on a freeway leading into Washington D. She wound down her window, to be greeted by an excited citizen carrying a jerry can and bearing breaking news. The government says citizens should contribute, so the situation can be resolved fast. Trump is on his first state visit to Israel, where red tie around his neck he travels to Jerusalem, to open the brand new United States Embassy. There without warning he suffers a massive heart attack. Medical people spoke of acute coronary thrombosis and myocardial infarction. But truth was the Leader was dead. As the news broke, pandemonium spread through the country, all the way back to Washington. Waiting for instructions, federal agents nervously guarded the body. An enterprising local undertaker quickly came forward with a funeral plan. Three days later, he was back on his feet again. The project aims to stimulate fresh thinking about the many challenges facing democracies in the 21st century.

Chapter 3 : The Death Of Democracy | Zero Hedge

This article is part of a weeklong series on President Trump's first year in office. Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt are professors of government at Harvard University who had the fun idea of.

Licenses given up to today cease to be of any value and those who possess the above articles are obliged, within two days from today, to hand over same to the nearest police authorities. All licenses granted up to now are canceled. Of a series of eighteen proclamations, two ran as follows. Greek men and women! For many years Greece has been undermined. And for a considerable time she breathed in agony. She was on the verge of catastrophe. And she deeply felt the need to be saved by whatever means, even strong ones. Then she acted through the National Army. And Greece now lives again. We shall leave behind us all the bad past. And we shall enter upon a period of new prosperity and glory. Stability is the wish of all Greeks. And the Army took over the governing of the country exactly for this reason. To restore, to stabilize, and to safeguard stability. Political, governmental, social, economic, and currency stability. This it will say: No more partisan dissension, partisan passion; no governmental crises; no spirit of the pavement, marches and clashes; no scandals, no getting salaries without working, no excess profits for the few and misery for the many. All these "nos" make up stability. And they thus constitute a big Yes: The yes to progress. Because without stability in all sectors, there is no progress. Neither economic development, nor work, nor prosperity. No country progressed by every day changing its prime Minister. No nation advanced by making marches and demonstrations. Only stability brings prosperity and stability is brought by the Armed Forces with a national government which we have given to the country. Article 18 of the Greek Constitution was suspended and the death penalty for political offenses was thus reintroduced into Greek political life. Systematically, and in order to "safeguard stability," all political opponents were hunted down. The leadership of the Center Union party was arrested along with those Center Union deputies known to be supporters of Andreas Papandreou. The deputies of the United Democratic Left were rounded up, as well as many other members of that party. One of the first casualties in this initial wave of mass arrests was Nikiforos Mandilaras, the brilliant Athenian lawyer who had served as the principal defense attorney in the politically inspired Aspida Shield trial involving twenty-eight army officers accused of high treason. He exposed their fraudulent base and he paid for this humiliation of the army with his life. His body was found washed ashore on the island of Rhodes. Andreas Papandreou was accused of being the political leader behind the plot. Details of the Aspida controversy will be covered in subsequent chapters. The Junta had expected some resistance to the coup, and, indeed, would have welcomed it as proof of a communist conspiracy to take over the country. Instead, it was greeted with a stony silence. It was caught unprepared in that it had no consistent or well-conceived social program other than the promotion of stability and public order. It began by banning all local elections. Henceforth, local officials would be appointed. Then, through the talkative Brigadier Patakos, it announced the beginning of a puritan orgy of comic-opera proportions. A ban was announced on beards and long hair for men, and mini-skirts for women, tourists included. Church attendance at Sunday Mass was made mandatory for all students. Students were soon instructed to turn in their old history books and to purchase new ones, containing a section devoted exclusively to Greek kings with a full-page picture of King Constantine toward the end. One teacher announced to his class that he had been "asked" by the Education Minister to announce that he would deliver two lectures the following week on the reasons for the coup. He then told his class that as soon as the lectures were sent to him, he would give them. The need to maintain the racial purity of the Greek race was proclaimed, and some members of the University of Athens biology department began to revise the theories of Darwin and de Vries. To protect Christianity and public order, it announced the revival of a law, passed during the Nazi occupation, requiring all legitimate theaters to submit scripts to a "Theatrical Plays-Control Board" for approval. The board not only was given the right to order deletions from any script, it was further empowered to rewrite parts of any play submitted to it for approval. Any theater faced with two rejections would be shut down, and any actor deviating in any way from an approved script would be severely punished. All plays of antiquity, by Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, were to be similarly censored.

The music of Tchaikovsky, Prokofiev, and all other Russian composers was banned. In the name of stability and order, new stop signs and traffic lights were installed and other enforcement measures were taken to bring the traditional chaos of Athenian traffic under control. It was announced, moreover, that any employee of a state-owned or -controlled public utility company who was late for work or otherwise not prompt, courteous, and attentive, would be fired. Within nine months he lost his short-lived taste for democracy and on August 4, 1936, installed one of his generals as dictator. General Metaxas died in 1941 as the Germans were invading Greece. King George then fled to London and finally to Cairo with a government-in-exile made up of royalist and conservative ministers. George II was openly involved in the coup of 1936. The role of King Constantine in the coup of 1936 is a bit less apparent. But one thing which will become clear, as the story of April 21 unfolds, is that Constantine was neither as innocent nor as reluctant as the American press had made him out to be. We shall be concerned throughout this book with the intrigues and the political ineptitude of this very non-constitutional monarch and his American advisers. II The coup of April 21 had as its primary objective the prevention of the elections scheduled for May. It was a virtual certainty that the Center Union party would repeat its landslide victory of 1934. In the short span of two years, Andreas Papandreu had emerged as the most prominent politician in Greece and, on the basis of his program for social and economic reform, he had earned the almost pathological hostility of the Palace, the Greek army, and the U. State Department, along with the U. With this powerful array of forces against Andreas Papandreu and his Center Union party, the coup of April 21, 1936, was a foregone conclusion. In the thirty-one years since the dictatorship of 1936, Greek politics has been firmly in the hands of the Palace and its right-wing supporters. Despite the volatility of Greek politics and its frequent excesses, this control never wavered and had never been seriously challenged. It is important to understand that Greece is a land where politics is the preoccupation of practically everyone. With the exception of the extreme communist Left, political parties have traditionally lacked any hard-and-fast ideological base. In this ideological vacuum, Greek politics emerged as a very fluid business, with parties tending to swirl around a few dominant personalities, and with the highly individualistic politicians quick to switch their allegiances as they alone saw fit. Party structure and party discipline have always been concepts apparently alien to the Greek mind. New alignments and grand coalitions were frequent phenomena on the Greek political scene. Greek politics had become a very personal game of shells and peas with more peas than shells to hide under. But even if it were an accurate picture, it would have been more relevant for the past than for the future had not the coup taken place. A "new" politics had emerged in Greece. It threatened the old game of surface politics which never disturbed the underlying and controlling power relationships. Since the constitutional crisis of July 1936, which will be described in the next chapter, Andreas Papandreu had become a positive and major political force in Greece. He represented the "new" politics and soon became the nucleus around which a strong party was being formed with a meaningful program for reform and change. This in itself constituted a major threat to the existing economic and political oligarchies which had for so long ruled Greece unchallenged and undisturbed. The "old" game of politics had never threatened the traditional distribution of power. It lacked depth or commitment. In its very shallowness it had become a game of musical chairs, of vying charismatic leaders filled more with pomp than with achievements. This was all changed by a former U. Andreas Papandreu was born in Greece in 1918 and was educated at the University of Athens during the Metaxas dictatorship. During his student days at the university he joined a left-wing student organization resisting the dictatorship. He was soon caught, imprisoned, and then exiled. He came to the United States and enrolled as a graduate student in economics at Harvard, where he taught and earned his Ph. He became a U. After the war, he became a professor of economics at the University of Minnesota, went briefly to Northwestern University, and finally settled at the University of California Berkeley where he served as chairman of one of the most distinguished departments of economics in the United States. During his twenty-year stay in the United States, he was very active as a liberal Democrat. In Minnesota he worked for Hubert Humphrey in his Senatorial campaigns and later for Adlai Stevenson in the Presidential campaign of 1956. His first contact with Greek politics came in when he returned to Athens on sabbatical from Berkeley and as the holder of a Guggenheim Fellowship. While there he also served as economic adviser to the Bank of Greece. It was at his office in the bank that he first became aware of the extent of U. He visited Andreas at the

bank and asked him to arrange a meeting with his father, George Papandreou, who at the time was one of the leaders of a nucleus of parties in the process of forming what eventually came to be the Center Union. The stated purpose of the meeting was to discuss the adoption of the "kindred party system" for Greece. In the course of the discussion, it became clear that the real purpose of the visit was not to arrange a meeting with George Papandreou which did not need the services of Andreas, but to get Andreas, as a U. Under the kindred party system each political party was to be listed under one of two classifications--nationalist and non-nationalist.

Chapter 4 : The Death of President Trump

Upon the death of a President, the Vice President assumes the powers and duties of the presidency, but technically does not become President. False The secretary of state is the first Cabinet officer in the line of succession.

China University of Political Science and Law Death of Hu Yaobang[edit] When Hu Yaobang suddenly died of a heart attack on 15 April , students reacted strongly, most of them believing that his death was related to his forced resignation. Within days, most posters were writing about broader political issues, such as freedom of the press, democracy, and corruption. Its laying-party was on 17 April and a larger-than-expected crowd assembled. The gathering featured speakers from various backgrounds giving public orations commemorating Hu and discussing social problems. However, it was soon deemed obstructive to the operation of the Great Hall, so police tried to persuade the students to disperse. Starting on the night of 17 April, three thousand PKU students marched from the campus towards Tiananmen Square, and soon nearly a thousand students from Tsinghua joined. Upon arrival, they soon joined forces with those already gathered at the Square. As its size grew, the gathering gradually evolved into a protest, as students began to draft a list of pleas and suggestions Seven Demands for the government: Admit that the campaigns against spiritual pollution and bourgeois liberalization had been wrong. Publish information on the income of state leaders and their family members. Allow privately run newspapers and stop press censorship. End restrictions on demonstrations in Beijing. Provide objective coverage of students in official media. Meanwhile, a few thousand students gathered at Xinhua Gate , the entrance to Zhongnanhai , the seat of the party leadership, where they demanded dialogue with the leadership. Police restrained the students from entering the compound. Students then staged a sit-in. On 20 April, most students had been persuaded to leave Xinhua Gate. To disperse about students that remained, police used batons; minor clashes were reported. Many students felt abused by the police, and rumours about police brutality spread quickly. This incident angered students on campus, where those who were not politically active decided to join the protests. On the evening of 21 April, some , students marched on Tiananmen Square, ignoring orders from Beijing municipal authorities that the Square was to be closed off for the funeral. The funeral, which took place inside the Great Hall and attended by the leadership, was broadcast live to the students. General secretary Zhao Ziyang delivered the eulogy. The funeral seemed rushed, and only lasted 40 minutes, as emotions ran high in the Square. Three of these students knelt on the steps of the Great Hall to present a petition and demanded to see Premier Li Peng. From this vantage point, the Union called for a general class boycott at all Beijing universities. Such an independent organization operating outside of party jurisdiction alarmed the leadership. In Changsha, 38 stores were ransacked by looters. Over people were arrested in both cities. In Wuhan, university students organized protests against the provincial government. Zhao stressed three points: Despite calls for him to remain in Beijing, Zhao left for a scheduled state visit to North Korea on 23 April. Instead of scaring students into submission, it squarely antagonized the students against the government. While the talks discussed a wide range of issues, including the editorial, the Xinhua Gate incident and freedom of the press, they achieved few substantive results. Independent student leaders such as Wuer Kaixi refused to attend. Subsequently, the majority of students began to lose interest in the movement.

Chapter 5 : Jacksonian Democracy - HISTORY

A poster of Cambodia's Prime Minister and Cambodian People's Party (CPP) President Hun Sen is seen along a street in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, July 30, 'Death of democracy'.

Visit Website Not everyone benefited equally from the market revolution, least of all those nonwhites for whom it was an unmitigated disaster. Jacksonianism, however, would grow directly from the tensions it generated within white society. Mortgaged farmers and an emerging proletariat in the Northeast, nonslaveholders in the South, tenants and would-be yeomen in the West—all had reasons to think that the spread of commerce and capitalism would bring not boundless opportunities but new forms of dependence. And in all sections of the country, some of the rising entrepreneurs of the market revolution suspected that older elites would block their way and shape economic development to suit themselves. By the s, these tensions fed into a many-sided crisis of political faith. To the frustration of both self-made men and plebeians, certain eighteenth-century elitist republican assumptions remained strong, especially in the seaboard states, mandating that government be left to a natural aristocracy of virtuous, propertied gentlemen. Simultaneously, some of the looming shapes of nineteenth-century capitalism—chartered corporations, commercial banks, and other private institutions—presaged the consolidation of a new kind of moneyed aristocracy. And increasingly after the War of , government policy seemed to combine the worst of both old and new, favoring the kinds of centralized, broad constructionist, top-down forms of economic development that many thought would aid men of established means while deepening inequalities among whites. Proposed cures for this sickness included more democracy and a redirection of economic policy. In the older states, reformers fought to lower or abolish property requirements for voting and officeholding, and to equalize representation. A new generation of politicians broke with the old republican animus against mass political parties. Urban workers formed labor movements and demanded political reforms. Westerners clamored for more and cheaper land and for relief from creditors, speculators, and bankers above all, the hated Second Bank of the United States. It has confounded some scholars that so much of this ferment eventually coalesced behind Andrew Jackson—a one-time land speculator, opponent of debtor relief, and fervent wartime nationalist. His career as an Indian fighter and conqueror of the British made him a popular hero, especially among land-hungry settlers. His enthusiasm for nationalist programs had diminished after , as foreign threats receded and economic difficulties multiplied. Above all, Jackson, with his own hardscrabble origins, epitomized contempt for the old republican elitism, with its hierarchical deference and its wariness of popular democracy. Only after taking power did the Jacksonian Democracy refine its politics and ideology. Out of that self-definition came a fundamental shift in the terms of national political debate. Under the Jacksonians, government-sponsored internal improvements generally fell into disfavor, on the grounds that they were unnecessary expansions of centralized power, beneficial mainly to men with connections. The Jacksonians defended rotation in office as a solvent to entrenched elitism. Around these policies, Jacksonian leaders built a democratic ideology aimed primarily at voters who felt injured by or cut off from the market revolution. Updating the more democratic pieces of the republican legacy, they posited that no republic could long survive without a citizenry of economically independent men. Unfortunately, they claimed, that state of republican independence was exceedingly fragile. According to the Jacksonians, all of human history had involved a struggle between the few and the many, instigated by a greedy minority of wealth and privilege that hoped to exploit the vast majority. More broadly, the Jacksonians proclaimed a political culture predicated on white male equality, contrasting themselves with other self-styled reform movements. Nativism, for example, struck them as a hateful manifestation of elitist puritanism. Sabbatarians, temperance advocates, and other would-be moral uplifters, they insisted, should not impose righteousness on others. Beyond position-taking, the Jacksonians propounded a social vision in which any white man would have the chance to secure his economic independence, would be free to live as he saw fit, under a system of laws and representative government utterly cleansed of privilege. As Jacksonian leaders developed these arguments, they roused a noisy opposition—some of it coming from elements of the coalition that originally elected Jackson president. The oppositionist core, however, came from a cross-class

coalition, strongest in rapidly commercializing areas, that viewed the market revolution as the embodiment of civilized progress. Far from pitting the few against the many, oppositionists argued, carefully guided economic growth would provide more for everyone. Government encouragement—in the form of tariffs, internal improvements, a strong national bank, and aid to a wide range of benevolent institutions—was essential to that growth. Powerfully influenced by the evangelical Second Great Awakening, core oppositionists saw in moral reform not a threat to individual independence but an idealistic cooperative effort to relieve human degradation and further expand the store of national wealth. Eager to build up the country as it already existed, they were cool to territorial expansion. The Jacksonians, with their spurious class rhetoric, menaced that natural harmony of interests between rich and poor which, if only left alone, would eventually bring widespread prosperity. By , both the Jacksonian Democracy and its opposite now organized as the Whig party had built formidable national followings and had turned politics into a debate over the market revolution itself. Yet less than a decade later, sectional contests linked to slavery promised to drown out that debate and fracture both major parties. The Jacksonian mainstream, so insistent on the equality of white men, took racism for granted. North and South, the democratic reforms achieved by plebeian whites—especially those respecting voting and representation—came at the direct expense of free blacks. Although informed by constitutional principles and genuine paternalist concern, the Jacksonian rationale for territorial expansion assumed that Indians and, in some areas, Hispanics were lesser peoples. As for slavery, the Jacksonians were determined, on both practical and ideological grounds, to keep the issue out of national affairs. Few mainstream Jacksonians had moral qualms about black enslavement or any desire to meddle with it where it existed. Through the s and s, the mainstream Jacksonian leadership, correctly confident that their views matched those of the white majority, fought to keep the United States a democracy free from the slavery question—condemning abolitionists as fomenters of rebellion, curtailing abolitionist mail campaigns, enforcing the congressional gag rule that squelched debate on abolitionist petitions, while fending off the more extremist proslavery southerners. In all of this fighting, however, the Jacksonians also began to run afoul of their professions about white egalitarianism. Slaveholders, quite naturally, thought they were entitled to see as much new territory as legally possible opened up to slavery. But that prospect appalled northern whites who had hoped to settle in lily white areas, untroubled by that peculiar institution whose presence they believed would degrade the status of white free labor. It would take until the s before these contradictions fully unraveled the Jacksonian coalition. But as early as the mids, during the debates over Texas annexation, the Mexican War, and the Wilmot Proviso , sectional cleavages had grown ominous. The presidential candidacy of Martin Van Buren on the Free-Soil ticket in —a protest against growing southern power within the Democracy—amply symbolized northern Democratic alienation. In the middle remained a battered Jacksonian mainstream, ever hopeful that by raising the old issues, avoiding slavery, and resorting to the language of popular sovereignty, the party and the nation might be held together. Led by men like Stephen A. Douglas , these mainstream compromisers held sway into the mids, but at the cost of constant appeasement of southern concerns, further exacerbating sectional turmoil. Jacksonian Democracy was buried at Fort Sumter , but it had died many years earlier. Having tapped into the disaffection of the s and s and molded it into an effective national party, they advanced the democratization of American politics. By denouncing the moneyed aristocracy and proclaiming the common man, they also helped politicize American life, broadening electoral participation to include an overwhelming majority of the electorate. Once the slavery issue entered the concerns of even a small portion of the electorate, it proved impossible to remove without trampling on some of the very egalitarian principles the Jacksonians were pledged to uphold. None of this, however, should be a source of self-satisfaction to modern Americans. Although the Jacksonian Democracy died in the s, it left a powerful legacy, entwining egalitarian aspirations and class justice with the presumptions of white supremacy. Over the decades after the Civil War , that legacy remained a bulwark of a new Democratic party, allying debt-ridden farmers and immigrant workers with the Solid South. And at the close of the twentieth century, the tragic mix of egalitarianism and racial prejudice so central to the Jacksonian Democracy still infected American politics, poisoning some of its best impulses with some of its worst.

Chapter 6 : The Illegitimate President: Donald Trump and the Faking of Democracy - Areo

Anthony Kennedy Says He's Worried About the "Death and Decline of Democracy." That's Rich. By Jamelle Bouie. Oct 02, PM. Tweet; Gore tarnished both the new president, who.

Or was it actually lots more than that? It was lots more than that. Among other topics, Carter discussed his new book, "A Call to Action: Women, Religion, Violence, and Power. President Jimmy Carter, and, at the very end of his show as if this massive question were merely an afterthought, asked him his opinion of the Citizens United decision and the McCutcheon decision, both decisions by the five Republican judges on the U. These two historic decisions enable unlimited secret money including foreign money now to pour into U. It violates the essence of what made America a great country in its political system. And the same thing applies to governors, and U. Senators and congress members. At the present time the incumbents, Democrats and Republicans, look upon this unlimited money as a great benefit to themselves. Somebody that is already in Congress has a great deal more to sell. I had summarized it earlier, on April 14, , while the article was still awaiting its publication. The headline of my summary-article was "U. The clear finding is that the U. The rich rule the U. The study period, , covered the wake of the landmark U. Supreme Court decision, Buckley v. Valeo, which had started the aristocratic assault on American democracy, and which seminal and bipartisan pro-aristocratic court decision is described as follows by wikipedia: The most prominent portions of the case struck down limits on spending in campaigns, but upheld the provision limiting the size of individual contributions to campaigns. Basically, the Buckley decision, and subsequent increasingly partisan Republican Supreme Court decisions, have allowed aristocrats to buy and control politicians. But, now, in the post-Buckley-v. Supreme Court decisions ever which are Citizens United in , and McCutcheon in , American democracy is really only past tense, not present tense at all -- no longer a reality. He is saying, in effect, that, no matter how much the U. Apparently, Carter is correct: A New York Times analysis of Federal Election Commission reports and Internal Revenue Service records shows that the fund-raising arms race has made most of the presidential hopefuls deeply dependent on a small pool of the richest Americans. The concentration of donors is greatest on the Republican side, according to the Times analysis, where consultants and lawyers have pushed more aggressively to exploit the looser fund-raising rules that have fueled the rise of super PACs. Just or so families and their businesses provided more than half the money raised through June by Republican candidates and their super PACs. And, the Times study shows: Grass-roots politics could be vestigial, or even dead, in the new America. The question has become whether the unrestrained power of the aristocracy is locked in this time even more permanently than it was in that earlier era. Or is a president like that any longer even possible in America? And, then, they retire to become, themselves, new members of the aristocracy, such as the Clintons have done, and such as the Obamas will do. Of course, the Bushes have been aristocrats since early in the last century. Furthermore, the new age of aristocratic control is not merely national but international in scope ; so, the global aristocracy have probably found the formula that will keep them in control until they destroy the entire world.

Chapter 7 : Tiananmen Square protests - Wikipedia

Jun 14, Â· *THE DEATH OF DEMOCRACY Hitler's Rise to Power and the Downfall of the Weimar Republic* By Benjamin Carter Hett Illustrated. pp. Henry Holt & Company. \$ We ask about the rise of the Nazis.

Portrait by Ralph E. Formal hostilities with Spain or France never materialized, but tensions with Britain increased for a number of reasons. Remini claims that Jackson saw the apparent slight as payback by the Madison administration for his support of Burr and Monroe. Meanwhile, the United States military repeatedly suffered devastating defeats on the battlefield. Lacking adequate provisions, Wilkinson ordered Jackson to halt in Natchez, then part of the Mississippi Territory, and await further orders. He also promised, instead of dismissing the troops without provisions in Natchez, to march them back to Nashville. Many of the men had fallen ill. Jackson and his officers turned over their horses to the sick. In September, Jackson and his top cavalry officer, Brigadier General John Coffee, were involved in a street brawl with the Benton brothers. Jackson was severely wounded by Jesse with a gunshot to the shoulder. During the massacre, hundreds of white American settlers and non-Red Stick Creeks were slaughtered. The resulting conflict became known as the Creek War. Jackson, with 2, men, was ordered to crush the hostile Indians. On October 10, he set out on the expedition, his arm still in a sling from fighting the Bentons. Jackson established Fort Strother as a supply base. He sent Coffee with the cavalry which abandoned him back to Tennessee to secure more enlistments. Jackson decided to combine his force with that of the Georgia militia, and marched to meet the Georgia troops. From January 22â€”24, , while on their way, the Tennessee militia and allied Muscogee were attacked by the Red Sticks at the Battles of Emuckfaw and Enotachopo Creek. On March 27, enjoying an advantage of more than 2 to 1, he engaged them at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend. An initial artillery barrage did little damage to the well-constructed fort. The treaty required the Muscogee, including those who had not joined the Red Sticks, to surrender 23 million acres 8,, ha of land to the United States. Jackson accused the Spanish of arming the Red Sticks and of violating the terms of their neutrality by allowing British soldiers into the Floridas. The Spanish surrendered and the British fled. Weeks later, he learned that the British were planning an attack on New Orleans, which sat on the mouth of the Mississippi River and held immense strategic and commercial value. Jackson abandoned Pensacola to the Spanish, placed a force in Mobile, Alabama to guard against a possible invasion there, and rushed the rest of his force west to defend the city. General Andrew Jackson stands on the parapet of his defenses as his troops repulse attacking Highlanders, by painter Edward Percy Moran in Jackson received some criticism for paying white and non-white volunteers the same salary. The approaching British force, led by Admiral Alexander Cochrane and later General Edward Pakenham, consisted of over 10, soldiers, many of whom had served in the Napoleonic Wars. That evening, Jackson attacked the British and temporarily drove them back. An initial artillery barrage by the British did little damage to the well-constructed American defenses. Once the morning fog had cleared, the British launched a frontal assault, and their troops made easy targets for the Americans protected by their parapets. Despite managing to temporarily drive back the American right flank, the overall attack ended in disaster. Of these, 13 men were killed, 39 wounded, and 19 missing or captured. The British admitted 2, casualties. Of these, men were killed including Pakenham, 1, wounded, and missing or captured. If the British defeated Jackson at New Orleans, they might have held on to the territory or returned it to Spain. In March, after U. District Court Judge Dominic A. He too was put in jail. Their deaths were not well publicized until the Coffin Handbills were circulated during his presidential campaign. First Seminole War Following the war, Jackson remained in command of troops on the southern border of the U. He conducted business from the Hermitage. Ambrister was one of two British subjects executed by General Jackson. The Seminole, in alliance with escaped slaves, frequently raided Georgia settlements before retreating back into Florida. These skirmishes continually escalated, and the conflict is now known as the First Seminole War. Jackson was also charged with preventing Florida from becoming a refuge for runaway slaves, after Spain promised freedom to fugitive slaves. Critics later alleged that Jackson exceeded orders in his Florida actions. His orders from President Monroe were to "terminate the conflict. Before departing, Jackson wrote to Monroe, "Let it be signified to me through any

channel He crushed Seminole and Spanish resistance in the region and captured two British agents, Robert Ambrister and Alexander Arbuthnot , who had been working with the Seminole. After a brief trial, Jackson executed both of the men, causing a diplomatic incident with the British. A congressional investigation exonerated Jackson, but he was deeply angered by the criticism he received, particularly from Speaker of the House Henry Clay. United States presidential election, In the spring of , Jackson suffered a physical breakdown. His body had two bullets lodged in it, and he had grown exhausted from years of hard military campaigning. He regularly coughed up blood, and his entire body shook. Jackson feared that he was on the brink of death. After several months of rest, he recovered. He obsessed over rampant corruption in the Monroe administration and grew to detest the Second Bank of the United States , blaming it for causing the Panic of by contracting credit. The Panic of had devastated the fortunes of many, and banks and politicians seen as supportive of banks were particularly unpopular. With his growing political viability, Jackson emerged as one of the five major presidential candidates, along with Crawford, Adams, Clay, and Secretary of War John C. During the Era of Good Feelings.

Following Obama, who was little more than a puppet president, Hillary was the anointed one, but then the voters rebelled and elected The Donald instead. There can be no doubt that the chaos in the White House since Trump's victory has reflected a fight behind the scenes for control of foreign policy, homeland security and military spending.

A common definition of "republic" is, to quote the American Heritage Dictionary, "A political order in which the supreme power lies in a body of citizens who are entitled to vote for officers and representatives responsible to them" — we are that. A common definition of "democracy" is, "Government by the people, exercised either directly or through elected representatives" — we are that, too. The United States is not a direct democracy, in the sense of a country in which laws and other government decisions are made predominantly by majority vote. But we are a representative democracy, which is a form of democracy. Some framing-era commentators made arguments that distinguished "democracy" and "republic"; see, for instance, the Federalist No. 10. But even in that era, "representative democracy" was understood as a form of democracy, alongside "pure democracy": John Adams used the term "representative democracy" in 1787; so did Noah Webster in 1789; so did St. George Tucker in his edition of Blackstone in 1793; so did Thomas Jefferson in 1794. Likewise, James Wilson, one of the main drafters of the Constitution and one of the first Supreme Court justices, defended the Constitution in 1787 by speaking of the three forms of government being the "monarchical, aristocratical, and democratical," and said that in a democracy the sovereign power is "inherent in the people, and is either exercised by themselves or by their representatives. Constitution" — likewise defended the Constitution in that convention by describing it as implementing "democracy" as opposed to "despotism", and without the need to even add the qualifier "representative. With regard therefore to England, whose government is compounded of both species, it may still be a dubious question, how far private luxury is a public evil —. America is not a democracy in the sense of being a direct democracy. One way to get at this is to ask: What is the first nation that you think about when you hear the word "Republic" today, and that the Framers likely thought about? What is the most famous historical Republic, indeed the one that gave us the word "Republic"? Why, the Roman Republic, of course, which The Federalist and many others discussed as a republic. And yet in the Roman Republic, there was no representative legislature. But the laws themselves were made by direct vote of the citizens or just by the plebeians, in the comitia centuriata, the comitia tributa or the concilium plebis. Roman lawmaking was thus direct lawmaking, though with a voting system that heavily favored the rich, not representative lawmaking. You can think of it as something between the modern American referendum and the modern American initiative. But it was direct popular lawmaking, not representative lawmaking. And the Framers routinely called Rome a republic — indeed, they labeled Athens a republic, even though Golden Age Athens famously involved direct democracy. Hamilton in Federalist No. 10. Akhil Amar and Rob Natelson have written more extensively on this. To be sure, in addition to being a representative democracy, the United States is also a constitutional democracy, in which courts restrain in some measure the democratic will. And the United States is therefore also a constitutional republic. Indeed, the United States might be labeled a constitutional federal representative democracy. But where one word is used, with all the oversimplification that this necessary entails, "democracy" and "republic" both work. Eugene Volokh is the Gary T.

Chapter 9 : Andrew Jackson - Wikipedia

Well a democracy can exist in many ways. It can exist in a tribal society. But, democracy can exist under a monarchy as well. A democratic republic is one which is where there is democracy, but the head of state is elected like France and the U.S.

Share via Email Blatant dictatorship “ in the form of fascism, communism, or military rule ” has disappeared across much of the world. Military coups and other violent seizures of power are rare. Most countries hold regular elections. Democracies still die, but by different means. Since the end of the Cold War, most democratic breakdowns have been caused not by generals and soldiers but by elected governments themselves. Democratic backsliding today begins at the ballot box. The electoral road to breakdown is dangerously deceptive. The presidential palace burns. The president is killed, imprisoned or shipped off into exile. The constitution is suspended or scrapped. Corey Robin Read more On the electoral road, none of these things happen. There are no tanks in the streets. Constitutions and other nominally democratic institutions remain in place. Elected autocrats maintain a veneer of democracy while eviscerating its substance. They may even be portrayed as efforts to improve democracy ” making the judiciary more efficient, combating corruption or cleaning up the electoral process. Newspapers still publish but are bought off or bullied into self-censorship. Citizens continue to criticize the government but often find themselves facing tax or other legal troubles. This sows public confusion. People do not immediately realize what is happening. Many continue to believe they are living under a democracy. Those who denounce government abuse may be dismissed as exaggerating or crying wolf. The foundations of our democracy are certainly stronger than those in Venezuela, Turkey or Hungary. But are they strong enough? Answering such a question requires stepping back from daily headlines and breaking news alerts to widen our view, drawing lessons from the experiences of other democracies around the world and throughout history. When fear or miscalculation leads established parties to bring extremists into the mainstream, democracy is imperiled A comparative approach reveals how elected autocrats in different parts of the world employ remarkably similar strategies to subvert democratic institutions. As these patterns become visible, the steps toward breakdown grow less ambiguous ”and easier to combat. Knowing how citizens in other democracies have successfully resisted elected autocrats, or why they tragically failed to do so, is essential to those seeking to defend American democracy today. We know that extremist demagogues emerge from time to time in all societies, even in healthy democracies. An essential test for democracies is not whether such figures emerge but whether political leaders, and especially political parties, work to prevent them from gaining power in the first place ” by keeping them off mainstream party tickets, refusing to endorse or align with them and, when necessary, making common cause with rivals in support of democratic candidates. Isolating popular extremists requires political courage. But when fear, opportunism or miscalculation leads established parties to bring extremists into the mainstream, democracy is imperiled. Once a would-be authoritarian makes it to power, democracies face a second critical test: Institutions alone are not enough to rein in elected autocrats. Constitutions must be defended ” by political parties and organized citizens but also by democratic norms. Without robust norms, constitutional checks and balances do not serve as the bulwarks of democracy we imagine them to be. Institutions become political weapons, wielded forcefully by those who control them against those who do not. By the time Obama became president, many Republicans in particular questioned the legitimacy of their Democratic rivals How serious is the threat now? Many observers take comfort in our constitution, which was designed precisely to thwart and contain demagogues like Trump. Our Madisonian system of checks and balances has endured for more than two centuries. It survived the civil war, the great depression, the Cold War and Watergate. Surely, then, it will be able to survive Trump. We are less certain. Historically, our system of checks and balances has worked pretty well ” but not, or not entirely, because of the constitutional system designed by the founders. Democracies work best ” and survive longer ” where constitutions are reinforced by unwritten democratic norms. These two norms undergirded American democracy for most of the 20th century. Leaders of the two major parties accepted one another as legitimate and resisted the temptation to use their temporary control of

institutions to maximum partisan advantage. Norms of toleration and restraint served as the soft guardrails of American democracy, helping it avoid the kind of partisan fight to the death that has destroyed democracies elsewhere in the world, including Europe in the s and South America in the s and s.