

Reflections on Democracy.

Anon - 10/2/2015

To understand Democracy, people must understand and explore the origins of the ideology, as well as attain knowledge and examples to identify the corresponding individual that perpetrates it.

In the pursuit of economic freedom, many deem the ruling class to interact on evil intent in regards to the government, with a connection to the itinerantly 'rich', or more so, better off. The same crowd of people believe that an oligarchy unwillingly owe their power to the citizen/workers class, profoundly, they believe the wealthy class prevent them from obtaining large sums of money; unless it is through loans, property sales and consumerism – only to increase their own wealth and influence.

However, it should be quite clear, even to the common people of a democratic society, that love for money and adequate self-discipline cannot coexist in such a society; It's either on or the other. The neglect of this divides classes even further, and sets the poverty line for men born for extraordinary services.

Once a person has fallen prey to debt, disinterest of finances, they will prompt to settle down, too much debt installs hate in the heart, and causes these subjects to plot against the rest of society for a revolution. Meanwhile, the, investors, bankers, and the wealthy, are hell-bent on business they don't appear to notice the common people's struggle; but continue to give loans and produce self-inflicted amounts of debt, raising interests rates with the sum lent. As a result, the politicians take action to either prevent or approve of their citizens disposing of property as they like. Then again, if respect and acceptable behaviour is seen by common people, good can come about. If loans were made by law under lenders risk, there would be less shameless money-grabbing schemes, and it would certainly show an equal or better, mutual trust.

For the ones who care nothing about money making, unfortunately lose their ability of resistance to not only pleasure, but pain. In such luxury and idleness, there is no struggle for survival. Unfortunately, this leaves individuals to speculate on nihilistic like traits, where they have no concern for the poor whom depend on the deliverance of work, and materials for there own survival.

Such is life of a state in which rulers and the ruled. What will these two characters do when they meet in a 'face-to-face' moment involving a certain danger? The most likely case, is that the rich man who's life is full of luxury and softness will squander and be unable to despise the Poor man, the unsheltered life has hardened the poor man. The same Poor man, in that moment will relies that the rich they are fighting for are mere cowards, and have grown soft. The man will concluded that he has no reason to follow what is ill-hearted, corrupt, and weak.

When an individual has adjusted to a life of luxury, ill-heartedness, they will be deemed as unhealthy, as it takes no more than an insult to disrupt his pretensions thoughts that send him back to his mansion to weep; this shows an internal cause for disorder. A disorder that is also true for an unhealthy society - will fall into a sickness at the slightest external provocation.

With this, it is safe to conclude that Democracy arises when the poor man wins both an external battle, and a mental battle against their opponents. He will then give the rest of his people equal civil rights, and justified opportunities for economic freedom.

Furthermore, what kind of nation would run like this? And more so, how free would the people actually be? In modern time, liberty exists in the form of freedom of speech, every individual should be free to say and do as they like. Granted that freedom, shouldn't everyone arrange their lifestyle in such a manor that pleases themselves?

Daringly, I will accept Democracy as one of the most attractive starting of a society, this is due to the diversity of it's characters. It contains every possible type of person. Perhaps that's what many people look for as well, as it helps establish a ruling body many agree with. When considering principles in the foundation of a state, common law and amendments should be thought and enforced strictly. Not one individual should disobey common law as it separates the people of a democracy. Saying that, if the common law is followed, there ought to be no compulsion either to exercise authority if you don't need to; you needn't fight if there's no war.

In conclusion, Democracy is not a sustainable form of government as it is agreeably an anarchic form of society, as it's nature is bound to the common people adhere to adapt to certain situations and laws, all in all, that is not the destructive part, for it is the manipulation and deceit of the of others whom treats all men as equal, whether they are equal or not.