Announcements:
- Office hours are tight next week, so if you need to go, make an appointment.

Normative Theory- How the world should be. (i.e. Religion- everyone should love each other, but in reality they may not.)
Positive Theory- How the world really is. (i.e. Theory of Gravity and Theory of Supply and Demand, they are not debated as good or bad, they are simply fact.)

Three Stages of Knowledge:
1. the belief in superficial concepts. i.e. idea that a liberty is complete freedom
2. realize that superficial concepts are superficial, i.e. knowing that liberty does not mean complete freedom (This is the level that the professor hopes we will reach in his class, so we can make the decisions ourselves of what step three is.)
3. learn concepts the realistic way

Anarchism: no form of government, people cannot be governed without their consent, critique of all forms of government because all forms of government govern partially without consent of the citizens
- believe all laws are bad, free exchange, if one does not uphold contract, punishment is getting bad reputation, no scheme of regulation, no laws defining property
Libertarian: requires a theory of property, and government regulation in upholding contracts
- believe in some laws such as banning theft, murder and upholding contracts

Guardianship: In an organization, some people have the right to make fundamental decisions without the consent of the group. These decision-makers decide themselves that they are worthy of the power.
Meritocracy: All people in a polity delegate the right to make decisions to a small group of people based on merit.
- there are various standards of merit
- they can take right to make decisions away from the group at any time
- representative democracy can be meritocracy

*Question to think about for discussion: How can you try to use logic to say why age cutoffs are what they are. I.e. If someone’s 18th birthday is the day after the day to vote, and another’s is the day before, what makes the younger one unworthy of voting as opposed to the one who is older by two days??

Coercion: government without consent
- coercion limits individual choices
- not a matter of freedom to choose, the choices determine coercion

Democracy is based on coercion. I.e. drinking laws- government without consent, we agree to be governed under democracy, but since everyone disagrees with something, that makes it government without consent

Coercion depends on controversial notions of liberty and morality. There is no right answer as it has been debated about for thousands of years.

What matters in determining coerciveness?
1. What right do people have to perform a certain action? Coercion implies threatening to do something you have no right to do.
2. What is the situation?
3. Is the person being taken advantage of?
   - Objectively: morally wrong threat of death, or natural liberty
   - Weaknesses: are we morally entitled to take advantage of someone’s weaknesses
   - Coercion would definitely be when someone takes advantage of a special relationship such as professor/student.

Robert Dahl believes that government reduces the amount of coercion in the world.
   I.e. Public Policy Problem: A business employs fifty percent of the town population but they threaten to leave the town if they do not get a break from city taxes. Government prohibits such acts of coercion.
Democracy:
- equality is essential to democracy
- equality in Andrew Jackson’s Bankbill: give protection to all people equally
- want to understand United States, all people in the United States are equal in some fundamental way
- we need equality between races and sexes
- all Dahl’s theories of democracy are equality theories

Intrinsic Equality: all persons are or ought to be considered equal in some important sense

Strong principle of equality: all members are sufficiently well-qualified to participate in making the collective decisions binding on the association that significantly affect their goods or interests, in any case none are so definitely better qualified than the others, that they should be entrusted in making the collective and binding decisions

Interpretations:
- everyone is capable of making democratic decisions
- everyone is equal in that there is nobody so clearly superior that they ought to have the exclusive right to make decisions

Democracy is the form of government that debates about what equality means.

Principle of Equal Consideration Interest:
During the process of collective decision making the interest of every person who is subject to the decision must be accurately interpreted and made known
All person’s interests must be weighed equally
If we assume that people are all equally capable of making decisions, and that all interests should be equal, then everyone is capable of decision making

Questions About Equality:
1. When we talk about equality, who is the subject?
   - individuals in a certain class
   - blocks (groups of people)
2. What’s the domain of equality?
   - give everyone the same means
3. What is the value of equality?
   - give everyone the same thing
   - give one person who wants something what they want, and give someone else something different that they want
Problems with democratic criteria:
- must a democracy include everyone who wants to come?

How powerful are these criteria?
- probably easy to set up equal voting system (1 person, 1 vote)
- however, people have to vote at certain times and places and problems can arise that prevents some people from voting
- education and access to same information
- impossible to achieve perfect enlightened understanding
- impossible to get everyone to participate
- influences inhibit or promote political choices
- some people don’t have resources

Market economy weakens economic equality and it eventually leads to democratic inequality

Majority rule is not a necessary element of democracy.

Constitution:
1. it is unconstitutional to amend the constitution to deny all states equal representation in the state
   - majority cannot amend the constitution
   - constitution is not democratic
2. under what conditions can we say a constitution is properly ratified

Why no majority rule?
1. democracies came from history- people need to compromise to become more democratic
2. people didn’t think majority rule would work
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5 page paper due week of March 1st in discussion

Know Dahl’s 5 criteria for democracy:
1. equal and adequate opportunity to participate
2. equal voting
3. equal opportunity to place matters on agenda
4. enlightened understanding
5. virtually all adult residents participate

Not what is a perfect democracy, but what is a pretty good democracy?

Polyarchy- what is a reasonable approximation of democracy, given that a perfect approximation of democracy is impossible?

Dahl’s seven conditions for a decent society:
1. elected officials- ultimately make policy, every non-elected official is subject to the will of elected officials, and non-elected officials should not make policy
2. free, fair, and frequent elections- in polyarchy “can vote bums out”
3. inclusive suffrage- vast majority of adults got to vote
4. right to run for office
5. freedom of expression- no official punishment for commenting on politics or public concern which is vague
   - people can talk without jeopardizing freedom

6. Alternative information sources-
   - world where government and others have information services
   - important that most views be stated and available
   - 1800’s information resources were independently owned, now are fewer info sources owned by larger companies

7. Associated autonomy- polyarchies for large governments, organizations help get things done, must have wide variety of interest groups
How should elected officials behave?

1. delegate theory of representation - elections occur because all can’t be in congress, representative votes exactly how electors would have voted, despite personal opinion
2. trustee theory of representation - electors trust elected official to vote their own opinion
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5 page paper due week of March 1\textsuperscript{st} in discussion
- stated simply
- clearly state paper topic in intro.
- have a thesis
- state opinion simply and boringly
- go into reasons why in body
- make arguments with premises that lead to conclusions

Differences between polyarchy and democracy:
- Representation:
  - Polyarchy uses delegates for representatives who votes as the people would in their district
  - Democracies use trustees who are trusted to use their own beliefs to make the decisions
- Unlimited Extension: in polyarchy, if they have representation, society can expand, and if a group for one representative grows then it cannot be represented as well
- Pluralism:
  - No common good easily identifiable by all
  - As expand, diversity greatens
- Individual Rights:
  - Polyarchy- no agreement on common good, makes a “do your own thing” mentality, freedom of religion (public life)
  - Democracy- because we are related to groups, polity best helps society grow by allowing us to join these groups (private life)

- in every large organization, a small number of people do the actual ruling, and make decisions for the avid members, not the average members
- average member of labor union makes less than leader, issue comes about redistribution of salaries, they have different interests
5 page paper due week of March 1\textsuperscript{st} in discussion
- stated simply
- clearly state paper topic in intro.
- have a thesis
- state opinion simply and boringly
- go into reasons why in body
- make arguments with premises that lead to conclusions

Types and Consequences of Power:
- people in power may have different views and ideals than people at the bottom
- how would we recognize majority domination?

Three Faces of Power (used to recognize most powerful):
1. First face- who wins in political conflict, only look at conflict
2. Second face- who gets to determine what we fight about, powerful ones may be the ones to keep things off the “fight agenda” so as not to address it at all, people have power to the extent they can determine what the political agenda is or the agenda of the group
- Do people not fight because they agree with it, or because they know they are going to lose?
- When people know they are going to lose, they back down before the conflict which is called anticipated reactions
3. Third face- who gets to determine people’s beliefs, the people who brainwash, hardest to measure when something is suspected
- How to tell the difference between our true interests and those affected by the power system
- False consciousness- when you believe things are in your best interest when they are not

Minority Domination:
1. How much diversity is there among the elite?
- number of issues elite is interested in

2. Who do elites have to appeal to?
- the more they appeal to the mass population, the more they have to take the mass population’s views into account
- elites involve masses because it is the only way they can get more votes

3. How easy is it to get into the group?
Erosion by water

Chemical weathering:
- hydrolysis- chemical process by which water is involved
- hydration- weak acids strip cations out of minerals

Depositional Environment: a set of physical or biological, and chemical processes acting where sediment accumulates.

Silicate Clastic Rocks: particles in motion
- carbonates- born, not made, non-silicate rocks

Evaporites:
- basin (closed) evaporates, sediment gets transferred in
- forma layers on bottom and eventually turns into dry lakes
- can be mined as salt mines

Sedimentary Structures- provide significant clues to the sediment transportation

Clastic:
- angle of repose- how high and steep can you pile up the sediment
- cross-bedding- formed by the migration of sand waves (ripple marks and dunes) by sand particles traveling up the windward face and depositing down the leeward face
- ripples- cross-bedding or cross-lamination
- erosional- flutes are erosional scour made by current turbulence. tool marks are made where rocks and twigs damage the base of the channel
- graded bedding- forms when rapidly flowing turbid slurry of water and clastic sediments slows down and the largest clasts settle first, an upward package of clastic sediment
- physical- mudcracks, normal grading, soft sediment deformation, slumped deposits

Sedimentary:
- fossils
  - body fossils- shells or bones
  - trace fossils- footprints or burrows
- biologic- stromatolites, algal structures built one layer at a time, blue-green algae
- hoodoos- rocks on stocks, boulders of white rock sitting on top of red rock, red rock eroded faster to make stock
- Rhythmic layering - depositional processes can influence the form of clastic sediments
  - Varves - pair of rhythmic layers of sediments deposited in still water over the course of one year
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5 page paper due week of March 1st in discussion
- stated simply
- clearly state paper topic in intro.
- have a thesis
- state opinion simply and boringly
- go into reasons why in body
- make arguments with premises that lead to conclusions

Hypothetical Example for Discussion: the conditions are:
1. all election things must be certified within seven days
2. when elections are close, must have recount
Question: if the recount takes more than seven days, what do you do as a judge?

Elite organizations: How democratic?
- How diverse?
- Represent general population?
- How easy is it to become an elite?
- Who do elites have to appeal to?
- When elites govern, do they govern by law?
- Four ways elites might govern?
  o Govern in a way so they or those they like, win in political conflict
  o Get smart- sometimes let others win to give facade of fairness
  o Play by rules because believe in rules. rules are biased towards them, but rules still explain results, but not elite power
  o Leave a paper trail, can be used to challenge

Democracy:
- in a democracy, people get to vote for whatever economic system they want
- democracy depends on participation kind of economic system- ensure people have access to information and ability to participate as equals in the political system
- in attempting to preserve conditions for democracy, we may have nothing to vote on
- in allowing people to vote for economic conditions, will undermine
Cumulative inequalities: superior in many or all dimensions
- in society without cumulative inequalities, people which have some good qualities, don’t have others
- dispersed influence- some people are more powerful than others in each subgroup, if our economic system distributes inequalities equally will have good polyarchy
- cumulative inequalities do not exist when different groups dominate different resources and different ones dominate political debates

Why might the market system produce democratic law?
- may be good at preventing cumulative inequalities
- about competition, choice, equal opportunities, like democracy
- independent consumer

Why capitalism is good:
- prevents cumulative inequalities
- promotes independence
- promotes competitive equal choice and opportunity

Why capitalism is bad:
- may promote cumulative inequalities since those with more money can get more, therefore may promote buying votes
- denial of public spirit, define selves as consumers and producers, rather than citizens
- promotes dependence- most will work for others, choices made by others, get accustomed to being ruled and begin to lack capacity to make own decisions as citizens
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Law in a democracy:
- legal judgments not made democratically
- why don’t we vote on trials
- we vote on other people to make these decisions
- law is not very democratic
- things that democracies cannot vote for
  - to change democracy
  - not to have elections
  - to change things that are necessary to democracy
- equality under law condition of democracy (cannot vote to abolish it)
  - political equality (basic)
  - legal equality means that people are governed by general laws, which are rules that apply to everyone

1. Democracy recognizes that people are equal
   - that people have the right to equal autonomy
   - people have a right to equality

2. General laws is best way of protecting rights
   - everyone has same incentive to recognize if rights should be limited
   - only vote to limit liberty when they are willing to have their own liberty limited

Problems with General Laws
- abortion cannot make general law that will effect everyone equally
  - men don’t get pregnant
  - victims are unborn
- safety and health in work place
  - miners need safety regulations more so than professors
- rules don’t effect people equally

Democracy requires equality under law, but all laws make distinctions

Maybe democracies require law, not general law.

Rule by law exists when we have rules that people can understand and are capable of obeying.
Legal system has rules which tell citizens in advance what will be the official consequences of their actions.

- government only acts in ways that are consistent with, or authorized by those rules
- government fails to achieve inequality if laws don’t have generality

Rules of Law:
1. laws must have generality
2. laws must be public
3. no retroactive or ex post facto laws
   a. ex post facto- laws that punish conduct that was innocent at the time it was done
4. people must be capable of understanding the rules
5. laws must be consistent
6. the law must be reasonably stable
7. the law must give you a legal choice human beings are capable of doing
8. the application of the law must be consistent with the letter of the law

Ideal, yet impossible legal system:
- In an ideal system, people can understand and conform their conduct to every law. People only suffer official sanction of they fail to obey known laws that they are capable of obeying. All government actors only act in ways authorized by and consistent with known laws.
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Things to know for test:
   1. Rule by law
   2. law and discretion- always be necessary
   3. common and civil law system

Rule by Law:
   - governed by established rules that citizens can understand and are capable of obeying
   - rules must be general
   - rules must be public
   - rules must govern future conduct only
   - people must be able to understand language
   - rules must be consistent, cant be legal and illegal
   - rules must not require conduct that people are incapable of doing
   - must be reasonably stable, cant keep changing so much that people cant keep up
   - rules must describe what people do in practice

Democratic authorities can’t violate these principles- must obey rule by law
They can only govern by making general rules that people can understand and are capable of obeying.

Ideal democratic universe:
   - general rules
   - easy to apply
   - any person can understand rules and how they apply

Law and Discretion: Complete Codification- clear rules for all situations so justices and administrators
wouldn’t have to use discretion, just mechanically apply facts to the law

Ideal of Codification- we know and find facts, and can apply them to law because it is clear

Problems:
   - codification is impossible in practice
     i. people don’t want it- want courts/ interpretation
   - judicial review is really undemocratic, we still want it
   - in practice, we are unwilling to pay to have laws enforced according to the letter
we want police officers to use discretions to determine whether or not to prosecute laws, we want discretion

Discretion comes at 2 democratic costs:
1. policy making is being delegated to someone less than the legislature
2. the more discretions and inequalities can appear in the law; has a cost (racial profiling)

We cannot write laws that are perfectly clear, and where generality is a legal ideal, the more general the law, the more likely the confusion.

Two problems likely to affect legal codes:
1. all concepts are “fuzzy” at the edges, hard to define- ambiguity or vagueness
2. unforeseen circumstances- letter of law says one thing, spirit of law says another

Common vs. Civil Laws
- How can we make laws that people will understand
- Common law and civil law approach
- Common law- found wherever English is spoken (England, US, Canada, Australia)
- Civil law- countries in Europe, European continent and places where English is not the primary language

Common law has 3 features:
1. adversary system- judges are passive, facts brought by 2 adversary lawyers
2. juries
3. judicial decisions are sources of law. stare decisis- set precedent for future decisions “let the decision stand”
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Things to know for test:
1. Rule by law
2. law and discretion- always be necessary
3. common and civil law system

Differences Between Common and Civil Law System:
1. judicial decisions are law
2. juries
3. adversarial system

Legal Hierarchy
- legislature fails to prepare for new situations
- fact finding

civil law- facts decided by jurors

civil law- conflicts between people, statutes are sources of law, no juries, reliance on inquisitorial

judicial decisions are sources of law

juries decide facts and trials involve adversarial system

Adversarial System vs. Inquisitorial System:
- in adversarial, judge is passive, jury decides cases
- in inquisitorial, judge orders witnesses and asks questions
- adversarial system, decisions made entirely on what is presented

Common Law Jury:
1. juries are now people who don’t know
2. juries used to be to show dislike of laws, not whether people were guilty- jury nullification- in theory jury only finds facts
3. juries were final, word on not guilty is final unless can show reasonable jury would never rule that way
   - present evidence that says didn’t do it, jury convicts, judge can overturn
   - only appeal judges rulings of law- not way jury decided facts
4. judicial decisions in common law are sources of law
   - common law- court must explain decision
   - civil law- similar cases start over despite previous similar decisions
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Things to know for test on Wed, March 14:
1. Rule by law
2. law and discretion- always be necessary
3. common and civil law system

Common law:
- precedents- judicial decisions are sources of law
- stare decisis
- juries
- adversary system

Civil Law:
- statutes are any source of law
- no juries
- inquisitorial system (judges participate)

Hierarchy:
1. constitution
2. statutes
3. judicial decisions
   - congress has the power to pass a statute to change or modify any judicial decisions they don’t like, judicial decisions are no longer “good laws”
   - can have judicial interpretations of statutes
   - supreme court can rule a statute unconstitutional
   - can amend the constitution

Interpretation of Laws:
- what does the legislature, who passed the law mean?
- Scalia- when we engage in stat. Interpretation we are not trying to get into the head of individual legislators, only ask at time statute was passed, would it be understood by a native person
Dynamic Stat. Interpretation:
- NOT what did the statute mean at time, but what is the best meaning of that statute today?
- Uses today’s standards

What does democratic theory say about these ways of interpretation?
- Scalia- people vote on text of statute, not what is in the heads of other legislators
- The best expression of a legislator’s intent is what they said
- People don’t always mean exactly what they say, presumptions can be overcome by strong evidence that it is law
- When a court is engaged in stat. Interpretation they can pass another statute
- Democratic principles can give congress the ability to be more aggressive
- 2/3 of both houses and ¾ of all states are needed to amend the constitution
- judicial decisions about constitution have a huge democratic cost

How do we interpret the constitution?
- Scalia- originalism- constitution should be interpreted with the original understanding of constitutional provisions at the time they were ratified
- What did their words mean?
- Rule by the dead, don’t care about what today’s majorities think, but what dead majorities thought
- Rule by law- central to democracy

Ronald Dworken and Lawrence Tribe (opposers of Scalia):
- constitution means what is the best understanding of constitutional languages

Dworkin:
- originalist
- sometimes the constitution speaks very specifically, sometimes it doesn’t
- reason for this is that is 1 case, the framers wanted a very specific conception
- in other cases, they wanted to leave interpretation to further generations
- our job is to interpret abstract language

Tribe:
- democrat
- who knew if when abstract language was used, we should base it on framers or us
- made for future generations
- if constitution is democratic, we should not be governed by dead people’s ideas, but what we think today
- rule by dead - not democratic
- judges get to decide interpretations of law
- judges not as democratic as legislators
  i. legislators are concerned to respond to present (judges have time to reflect)
  ii. while judges are not re-elected, they are appointed, people like judicial decisions so we give them the power to do so
Federalist Paper History:
- Federalist Papers written for primarily NY to vote for Constitution
- Written for history and to convince about the constitution
- Intended for mass audiences
- Authors assumed much political knowledge of white male men of that time

Federalist Paper #1:
- Themes-
  - U.S. is an example for the world (everyone looks at us because everyone should imitate us)
  - American exceptionalism- America says the rest of the world should use us as an example, and there are distinctive features of the U.S. that make the U.S. unavailable as example for others, political and social institutions will not work abroad
- U.S. will not admit that we borrow from other countries

- highlight distinction between government by reflection of choice and government by action or force
  - government by reflection:
  - choices, agreement
  - John Locke’s social contract theory
  - America- best place to test social contract theory
    - government by force
  - 1/3 of pop. for the revolution, 1/3 indifferent, 1/3 against it and deported (settled much of Canada)
  - slavery, native Americans

ask: To what extent are we truly seeing government by choice?

Where is the money?
- those who have money rule
With a group of white males, they are more likely to agree on more than they disagree on.
- is that necessary for government?

Second Federalist Paper:
- says why U.S. should be a country
  - geographic location
  - people are united and similar
- who are Americans?
  - Defined by a creed, set of beliefs and bound by the Constitution and principle that all are created equal
- we are all not descendant form same ancestors or those who spoke the same language
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Reasons Why Americans are Americans:
- geographic location
- similarities in people

Designing a good government according to the Federalist Papers, How do we know a good government?
- four criteria in modern liberal tradition:
  1. secures liberty
     a. people are free to pursue public and private happiness
     b. allows people to make fundamental choices about government
  2. produces material prosperity
     a. creates economy where most make money
     b. G.N.P. goes up, unemployment goes down
  3. promotes civil peace and security
     a. are not constantly being called to Army
     b. can walk out door and feel safe
  4. Promotes Democratic Goods
     a. government by intelligent and free consent
     b. trains citizens to be rational and make intelligent decisions

Three Goods that are not Liberal Goods:
- conquest- does not count empire as Romans did, war is not for fun
- do not regard glory of heaven as individual prosperity
- not interested in project of making people moral- one should not interfere with another’s pursuit of happiness
  o not interested in changing human nature
  o want to make people more intelligent and rational

What are threats to good government?
- Republican government failed for three reasons:
  1. people lose control of the government- people authorized to make decisions make them for personal gains, not for the good of the country
  2. majority tyranny- people don’t lose control, majority use government power to violate rights of minority
  3. majority stupidity- best people to run things because average person will make so many mistakes we will not have material prosperity and will fail

THESE NOTES DO NOT REPRESENT THE PROFESSOR’S LECTURE VERBATIM
How do we combat threats to government?
   1. specific constitutional provisions
      a. set rules and guidelines to prevent losing control, majority tyranny and majority stupidity
      b. the way you maintain good republican government by the structure of society
      c. large society combats threats to government and produces more liberal goods
   2. create government institutions to produce liberal goods
      a. create people who will do right thing
      b. give people incentives to do right thing

Madison claims that “faction” is the main enemy of a republic
     Faction- a majority or minority of the whole who are united and actuated by some comic impulse of passion or advertised to the rights of other citizens or to the permanent and aggregate interest of the community
     - faction can be minority of majority
     - united by common interest
     - advertised to rights for public good
How big republics solve problems of Republican Government

Problems:
- people will lose control of the government
- majority stupidity
- majority tyranny
- these problems may occur by factions, faction- minority or majority accentuated by some common interest, adressed to the rights of other citizens or to the rights of others in the community- interest groups
- writers of Federalist Papers think that interest groups are biggest threat to government
- interest groups govern with their own interests in mind or convince people that their interests are the people’s interests
- interest groups violate rights and threaten a good republic

Remote Causes:
- give everyone the same beliefs- liberty leads to faction, if remove faction, then remove liberty
- have large government with many factions to prevent problems

Control Effects:
- ensure that one minority cannot rule, majority will rule- therefore people will never lose control of the government
- in large republic there is filtration of talent: small governments elect dumb people – nobody to choose from and people have close connections to candidates
- in large republic there is no one real majority- if people cannot have their own beliefs for everyone, then they accept everyone having their own
  - when there is a diverse society, self-interest cannot succeed- the only way to succeed in politics is to advance the common good

Madison is out-of-date:
- money- candidates can spend money on every voter in large districts and many campaigns are buddy campaigns
- communication- easier with internet, does IM refute the Federalist Papers
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THESE NOTES DO NOT REPRESENT THE PROFESSOR’S LECTURE VERBATIM
Large governments promote better government because:
- more to choose from- get better people running the government
- promotes politics of common good, rather than of common interests

Three Constitutional Principles
1. Fed Paper 23- unlimited power for ends
   a. If you give somebody a job, you have to give them the tools to do the job
   b. If we want government to do things, we have to give them the power to do these things
   c. If you don’t know what government will need to do to complete the task, so give
      government unlimited means to complete the task
2. Parchment barriers don’t work
   a. May cause problems if government abuses power
   b. Parchment barrier- laws against government in the Constitution
   c. Framers disagreed with parchment barriers because
      i. They don’t work
      ii. We wouldn’t want them to work
3. Structure of government protects rights
   a. Hold frequent elections, which was the most important right Federalists believe a person
      has- to vote people out of office who are violating our rights
   b. Existence of states- another structural protection of rights

Bill of Rights
- parchment barrier can be used by democracy to protect rights because judges honor law
  o Gideon vs. Wainwright- 6th am.
  o Brown vs. B.O.E.
- may help maintain and create a political culture
Announcements:
- quiz on wed
- read to page 184 in Lijphart book
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1. Why study other governments?
   a. To know who to deal with in their government
   b. To know our own better
      i. Great person theory- George Washington chose democracy
      ii. Sociological pre-conditioned theory- presence of middle class, low inequality.
         and wishy/washy pluralism (different but not worth fighting over)
   c. what does U.S. have in common
   d. why is U.S. certain kind of democracy

2. Two forms of democracy:
   a. Majority- goal of democracy is that majority should rule, follows three premise:
      i. People get to vote on all issues
      ii. Everybody’s vote counts the same
      iii. If you favor something, that is a reason for doing it
   b. consensus- maximize number of people who influence government
      i. best decision may not be majority preference- it is a decision that the most people
         can live with
      ii. Class experiment done
Announcements:
- no quiz today, will be some other time

Sincere Voting- vote sincerely when you vote your actual preferences among the other alternatives
Sophisticated/ Strategic Voting- vote not for number one, preference among alternatives, but in such a way that it makes it more likely for a favorable outcome

Majoritarian Democracy- Great Britain, New Zealand, and Australia
1. Voting
   a. have single member districts
   b. elected by majority or plurality
      i. English is plurality- most votes needed
      ii. Most U.S. is majority- 50+ votes needed
   c. when nobody gets majority
      i. run off with top two candidates
      ii. two rounds of balloting, 1 majority, 1 plurality
   d. manufactured majorities and disproportional results
      i. manufactured- don’t have majority of popular vote, but end up with majority control
      ii. disproportional- seats you have in legislature is disproportionate to % of vote

2. Party System
   a. most are two party systems
   b. people start to vote strategically, therefore eliminating minor parties after time
   c. tendency to emphasize socioeconomic issues more
   d. tendency to run to the middle of issues
   e. tend to be fairly centrist

3. No separation of power
   a. designed to insure never any policy dispute between legislature and executive
   b. favor uni-cameral legislatures (one-house)
   c. no judicial review
   d. believe in legislative supremacy (England)
   e. no local check on Parliamentary power
   f. no federalism
   g. local units get $ from parliament
   h. no central bank

THESE NOTES DO NOT REPRESENT THE PROFESSOR’S LECTURE VERBATIM
Announcements:
- quiz next week

Consensus Democracy
1. Who signs on?
   a. Most powerful minorities are ones who really get protected
   b. Other minorities that have attracted support of powerful group in society are protected
   c. Keep interests of all groups who could do something bad to government
   d. Bargaining among elites
2. Methods of Achieving Consensus
   a. Sharing power- control of institutions is shared between different groups
   b. Dividing power- divide power among different groups to maximize consensus
3. Voting System
   a. Proportional representation- in a PR system parties get the same proportion of seats as
      their proportion of votes
   b. Party list- vote for party and top # of people are in
   c. Tends to weaken major parties and foster minorities
   d. Will see with PR:
      i. Many parties, rarely a majority party, govt. likely to be a coalition govt., rules
         guaranteeing that most parties have right to run for executive branch offices
      ii. Different institutions- elected separately, different rules, separations exist,
          branches are separate elections, tends to be bicameral legislature
          1. each house must have independent power
          2. each house must be elected separately
          3. system of elections is different
4. Federalism/ Decentralization
   a. Concentrates power over local government
   b. A way of increasing consent
   c. If local minority- may be bad off
   d. Make as few people minorities as possible
   e. Maximize number of people who win elections
   f. Maximizes living because majorities tend to live together
   g. If not in majority- will suffer more in PR
Announcements:
- There was a quiz today, if you were absent, it results in two points taken off your midterm.
- Readings in the Putnam book:
  - By 4/23- ch 1-3
  - By 4/25- ch 10-11, 13, 15
  - By 4/30- ch 16, 21-22
  - By 5/2- ch 23-24
  - Rest will be posted on class website

What does it matter if we study other democracies?
1. Theory- trying to create or improve democracy
   a. New country, to what extent do you build new institutions
   b. Reform institutions
2. Democratic Designs
   a. Concerned with other countries
      i. Friends
      ii. Defense
      iii. Economic interest and aid
   b. Rebuild our own to assist in foreign relations

Design Questions
1. What institutions fit together?
   a. Certain things usually come together, ex. Constitution= judicial review
2. What institutions fit in our culture?
   a. Keep people happy
   b. Up to date and location
3. Performance and results
   a. Ex. Prevent inflation with a central bank

When complicate statistics, discover that two-party systems are related with majority voting

When say a result is statistically significant, means that odds are very high that result could not happen just by chance

Controlled variable- when second variable is introduces that would change the analysis

Outlier- when one deviant case skews the results
Democratic Fit - fit together along two dimensions:

1. executive party has two-party dimension - if National Government has a 2-party system, it is more likely to have many systems (one institution creates another)
2. which democratic systems fit a society - can't have a U.S. democracy without U.S. people running it, systems mold society and vice versa

What do democratic forms accomplish?
- consensus does better:
  - less inflation (has central bank)
  - may have tendency to center left coalitions while majoritarian democracies tend to center right coalitions (could be coincidence or not)
Paper assignment:
- must be 5 pages
- due on May 3 at latest
- Topics:
  - Think about what is best democratic system, pick one feature of a good democratic feature and talk about it
  - Use Lipjhart and Publius to answer one of these two questions:
    - What is dumbest feature of constitution in 1787
    - What is the smartest thing in the constitution in 1787
  - was the government in 1787 more majoritarian or consensus?
  - What was the first wave of democracy?
  - Survey of 20 world people on issues central to Putnam, analyze result, relate findings to his, if there are differences, explain them

Problems in Democratic Culture
Putnam:
Decline of people who have weekly bridge games in their house is a democratic problem
People in organize groups are down, but number of people bowling is up
- should this be a concern to a democratic society
- what are some potential differences between people who bowl alone and people who bowl in leagues?
  - If you bowl on a team, there is responsibility to friends
  - You will bowl against other teams with people who are different than you, and you will talk to them. If you bowl alone, you go with people you choose
- is this part of democracy?

Micro- Politics of Democracy
- what sort of neighborhood life do people in democracies have?
- Democracies create popular culture, P.C. feeds back to democracy
  - Bach, NY best sellers list, slogans
- social capital- key to making democracy work

Capital- a good you can use to make other goods
- whether it is money or property, accumulated or owned by, or employed in business, by an individual or firm
- capital good- a machine/ tool that can be used in production of other goods
- consumer good- a good one consumes so when consumption is done, nothing is left of good, and none other are created during act of using the good (ie. ice cream sundae)
- capital is stored labor
- physical labor
- human capital - skills humans have to produce goods
- social capital - connections among individuals
  - it's not what you know, it's who you know
  - has public and private benefits
  - if you don't trust your neighbor, you have to spend more money and time to protect yourself
Paper assignment:
- must be 5 pages
- due on May 3 at latest
- Topics:
  o Think about what is best democratic system, pick one feature of a good democratic
    feature and talk about it
  o Use Lipjhart and Publius to answer one of these two questions:
    - What is dumbest feature of constitution in 1787
    - What is the smartest thing in the constitution in 1787
  o was the government in 1787 more majoritarian or consensus?
  o What was the first wave of democracy?
  o Survey of 20 world people on issues central to Putnam, analyze result, relate findings to
    his, if there are differences, explain them

- social capital is a good thing if it is applied to good things

2 Forms of Social Capital
- bonding social capital- human relationships that emphasize similarities, groups for people with
  the same interests
- bridging social capital- organizations that reach across differences of people, learn from each other
- all groups are composed of people who are similar or people who are different

Putnam:
- general decline in community activity in the last 30 years
- tells stories of groups that declined
- we are seeing declines, not substitutions
- education is the biggest predictor of how civily engaged you are- but education has skyrocketed
  and civil engagement is way down
- In 1960:
  o Registering to vote is easier
  o Voting is easier for person’s of color
  o Free speech law dramatically liberated
- when legal barriers removed, participation went down
- everybody votes less
- many groups are groups you belong to because you sign a check
- more watching than doing
- less face to face communication

Causes for Decline (Putnam):
1. explanatory factor must be correlated with decline in civil engagement
2. make sure that correlation isn’t explained by something else
3. correlation must change in a relevant way
4. 2 things are associated with each other, but we don’t know what causes what
people are less eager to participate in politics and other activities in general

Explanations
- should correlate and have right relationship with something they are trying to explain
  - explanation shouldn’t be a disguise for some other factor
  - explanatory factor should change in the way we want
  - either a explains b or b explains a

Why a decline in civil participation?
- Welfare? No, as welfare was increasing, so was political participation and the more money states spent, the more political participation
- Race? Maybe when clubs had to become multi-ethnic/racial, people stopped going?
  - No, because every ethnic group has decline in participation
  - No, our generation is most tolerant, still least participatory
- Decline of traditional family? No, married people are more active than single people in youth areas and religious activity
  - Single people are more likely to join clubs
  - If marriages broke up, more single people would lead to more clubs

Real Reasons Why People Aren’t Joining Clubs

Time and Money:
- an hour more of work, is an hour less to do other things
- however, Americans have more leisure time
- as economy rose, people still aren’t participating
- “if you want something done, ask a busy person”
- women went into the workforce

Mobility and Sprawl:
- longer been in community, more participatory you are
- more mobile, the less participatory you are
- big cities aren’t to blame, when there was a rise in urbanization, there was a rise in participation
- suburban life to blame
  - suburbs encourage commuting
    - spend a lot of time in cars
    - every hour you drive is an hour less to participate in something
  - promote social stratification
    - you become identical to your neighbors
    - can’t form bridging social capital
Television (as entertainment):
- people who watch TV as news and participation, participate more
- people who watch entertainment TV are the people who have dropped out of groups
  - does not create demand to do other things
  - four hours a day of TV
  - watch in private
  - habitual viewers
- it's not social loners or dropouts that create a rise in TV watching, it is TV that creates social loners and dropouts
- people without TV have more components of civil participation
- TV causes low civil participation:
  - TV competes for scarce time
  - TV creates passivity
  - TV doesn't require energy, leading to weight gain
  - Causes physical and psychological illnesses- sleep deprivation, depression, drop in participation
- TV alienates people
  - More people are watching different things, no common interests
- TV lets you see things in terms of personality, not what you can do
- TV promotes materialism

Generations:
- older generations didn't have TV, so they joined more clubs
- older generations had WW2
  - produced a civic generation
  - common goals and ideas
- Vietnam divided Americans, WW2 united Americans
Announcements:
- there was a teacher evaluation done in class today

Decline in Participation:
- TV
- Generation

Drop in Civil Participation not always bad:
- people engage in politics when there is something wrong that needs change
- means people are satisfied, but are reflecting more dissatisfaction

1950’s Survey
- people with PhD’s more involved in politics and know more
- thought it was good that average people disengaged
- wanted smarter people engaged anyway
- authoritarian personality

Next Generation thinks decline matters:
- with high participation, resolve collective choice problems
- reduce externalities- those who do not produce goods
- things that effect individuals have ratifications for society, individual benefits that also benefit the society
- social involvement increases business
- people learn from being in groups
  - cooperation
  - leadership
  - political skills
- organization is the only way average people can participate in politics
Putnam:

- optimistic
- fundamentally optimistic person
- yes, problems have communal disengagement problems, but also had at turn of century
  - workplace changed
  - where people lived changed
  - American identity changed
- Progressive Era Organizations
  - Between 1885-1935 began
- if could do it at beginning of century, we can do it now
  - groups become outdated
  - find replacements
- problems:
  - things get cured differently
  - potential collective choice problems
    - for it to work, a lot of people have to engage in an activity of very little payoff for individuals
  - accused of wanting Salem without the witches
    - cannot have everyone love each other and also love diversity
  - Putnam wants a religious revival
    - Utilitarianism
    - People don’t get excited when religion is not definite
  - consumer culture
    - does not just happen
    - had a choice
  - solve collective choice problems:
    - offer benefits to join groups
    - AARP - political organization - get perks
    - Political parties have parties to keep members interested, way to meet people
Democracy and International Relations (IR)
- democracy is un-helpful when studying IR
- anarchy is best method for understanding IR
- democracy does not explain way states behave internationally
  - only explains domestic policy

Realism Theory
- when studying IR, studying behavior of nation states
- nation states pursue national interests (material) in IR
- goals of nation depends on interests, not whether it is a democracy

Theory of Democratic Peace
- main challenge to realism theory
- democracies almost never fight wars against other democracies
- contemporary democracies never fight wars against other contemporary democracies- since WW2
- does not claim that democracies are less warlike than other countries
- with two democracies, even if there was force, does not turn to war
- governments stable or new since WW2 do not fight

2 Problems:
- few democracies and far apart
  - usually fight people who are close, not far
- democracies are not perfect
- requires a world with lots of democracies, that are close, and where the majority of them know the others

Elements:
1. empirical- finding- democracies do not fight each other
2. prudential- democracies typically take a long time to go to war, and the process is public and other types of countries don’t
   a. understanding between democracies
   b. other countries can do whatever, whenever
Announcements:
- review on wed. at 4 in regular lecture room

Realism- one theory that says goals of nations depends on interests

Democratic Peace- regardless of anything else in the countries, democratic countries do not got to war with other democratic countries
  - democracies are as likely to go to war as anyone else
  - are warlike, just not against other democracies
  1. institutional explanations
     a. people like to get first punch in because they are more likely to win
     b. democracy provides two reasons that other side will not strike first
     c. democracies have long, public processes about going to war therefore there is no fear of other striking
  2. normative explanations
     a. democracies believe they shouldn’t fight each other
     b. the way we view other countries explains how we deal with conflicts
     c. the way countries deal with internal conflicts are the way we assume they deal with external conflicts
     d. if a nation resolves internal conflicts peacefully, it will probably resolve external problems peacefully
  3. Exceptions to Democratic Peace
     a. Other democracy is not stable
     b. Misperceptions of not being as democratic as the country really is
  4. Differences
     a. Both have different reasons for thinking
     b. When there are more than one explanations, put in situation with only one explanation and that will tell you which one matters
     c. Both normative and institutional explanations matter but in different ways
        i. Normative- matters across the board, explains lack of threats and escalation
        ii. Institutional- explains why conflicts among democracies don’t escalate

Covert Actions- democracies do engage in covert actions against other democracies
Explanations:
- will always be able to find a small non-democratic aspect of every democracy
- the way the democracy functions may not depend on executive, depend on public support, so all democratic countries can do to one another is covert actions
Peace?
- if democracies don’t fight each other, and more are becoming democracies, then peace will be greater
- how do we get countries to switch to democracies?