Myths of Democracy
民主迷思

S. Wong & UM Bloggers
May 1, 2014

ABSTRACT

Democracy has replaced communism and socialism as the icon of Utopia in the last two decades since the collapse of Soviet Union. Since then, the democratic advocates is getting bolder and more confident in their conviction.

However, in the writers' opinion, their understanding of democracy is based on a lot of myths without much deliberation. The general public are not well informed of the practical problems arising from a series of internal conflicts including the definition of citizens（boundary problem of political rights），justice and righteousness vs majority rule（tyranny of majority problem ），economic growth vs distribution under democracy（polarization problem/economic rights problem）， political ethic and competence of government officials under universal suffrage（hypocrisy problem），protection of minority interest vs general will （control of self government problem），private rights vs public good （common pool resources problem），administrative efficiency vs balance of power（efficiency problem），hegemony of propaganda vs public surveillance（information problem），quality of people as prerequisite in practicing democracy（morality problem），etc.. In history and modern world, numerous factual evidences have manifested that democracy only brings about endless chaos or even civil wars in a country instead of the promised paradise before the domestic people are well prepared and equipped with proper knowledge in dealing with the aforesaid problems of democracy and in the presence of a favorable international environment.

Though the western democratic countries have somehow developed some theories and practical mechanisms to tackle these problems in the last five centuries, not all of them are solved. However, it seems that they only propagate to the world the most primitive concepts of democracy and apotheosize it as a universal political system applicable to all places in the world regardless of their social, economical and political background. Those pro-democracy activists are motivated to take a tougher stance in fighting for the reform. The writers did not deny their tiredness over the political debate of vague ideological concepts. They provide myth busting evidences as well as rationales to uncover the ridiculousness of this simple but dangerous understanding of democracy and maintain that the ideals of democracy including equality, justice and human right are indeed the common goals shared by most political ideologies. The divergence is most probably the result of different views on method of implementation and/or the containment of corruption of power. When democracy is kidnapped by ambitious politicians or extremists, it can be as dangerous as other radicalisms for various kinds of corruption. Therefore, the writer expects to voice out the aspiration of some ordinary residents for ending the meaningless debate over ideologies.

PREFACE

The writing of this article was inspired by a private discussion on WhatsApp among a social group who are all old university graduates possessing good knowledge and rich social experience. To the astonishment of most people, an overwhelming disappointment to the pan democracy allies and tiredness of the endless political quarrels were uttered. A majority of their views were deviated from the perception of ordinary people which seems to admit that the main stream of public opinion is overwhelmingly biased to the pan democracy alliance. Obviously, it is too heavy for Hong Kong people, especially intellectuals, to discuss politics openly in a rational manner under the current political climate if they have just a little doubt over the viability or rationality of democracy as advocated by those activists who claim themselves democrats. A lot of them appear to be tough and solid; they simply do not accept deviant views. Politics is thus too hot for people who have their own belief to handle. The fear of the blame and accusation of being "fifty cents" (五毛, a nickname for the secret opinion agent of the communist party) makes people feel like bearing an unbearable heaviness when telling their true thinking which involve doubt about democracy. Some people thus choose to remain silent. However, as depicted in a famous dictum: "Power tends to corrupt. Absolute power corrupts absolutely", the law for accusing authoritarian leadership is ironically applicable to all temporal powers including democrats once they becomes a dominant force, no matter whether as a formal and institutional establishment or an informal and non-institutional pressure group.

Pro-Democracy advocates have occupied the moral high ground all over the world since 90s. In addition to the explicit and implicit support from the world's most powerful allies which expressively and explicitly claims themselves democratic countries with their discourse power（話語權）, "democracy" is apotheosized to be an ethical icon gaining unconditional trust of people. Regrettably enough, in light of its dominant position in the grand political debate, pro-democracy advocates have become tougher, more aggressive and tend to be over confident in their belief. The radical faction does not hesitate to use extreme means including violence to achieve their aims. However, it should be noted that the contemporary western culture, before that watershed in timeline, encountered severe confidence crisis in the post war period. On the contrary, socialism gained popular support among youths due to the corruption of the capitalist class. Proletariat dictatorship was not deemed anything evil but a necessary means to curb the exploitation of capitalists over peasants and workers who were equivalent to the current vulnerable social groups. When teaching in CUHK, scholar Mr Mou Zongsan(牟宗三先生) had told his students that "anyone under 30 who did not believe in socialism was not promising yet anyone over 30 who still believed in socialism must be an ignorant." To our best understanding of his dictum, he intended to advise his students not to fall into the trap of radicalism mutated from idealism while upholding their ideal. Now the political climate is totally reversed. "Socialism" as a token of ideal has been replaced by "democracy". As a matter of fact, now there are too many myths about democracy which may convince the activists and their followers to believe in the logic of "ends justify means" and drive them to escalate their fight for justice from mild activities into radical actions.

It seems that the circulation of the myth of democracy is more extensive in those places without democratic culture. In the western democratic countries, people express their concern about the dilemma of democracy more than saying that it is a faultless model because people have long been living with governments claimed to be democratic. They are thus familiar with their political systems and have empirical experience in the inherent defects of the democratic government. Even ordinary people understand that there must be a trade off between the public good and private interest. Some people even query if their regime is still a democratic government or an aristocracy of "neo rich". Certainly, many of them are also convinced that democracy is still better than all other systems in spite of all its

shortcomings due to their ignorance, arrogance or apathy about the outside world.

It is understood that the younger generations, or the so-called Y generation in fashionable terms, who have witnessed the corruption and failures of single party system in practical situations are driven to embrace the other side by their disappointment and resentment to the shortcomings of one side. As to the older generations, i.e. the X generation, except some hardliners who are preoccupied with prejudices or those who are assigned of political mission for their peculiar personal identity,   they are relatively more reserved and skeptical of all ideologies on account of their empirical experience in the corruption of all political systems including democracy in spite of their attractiveness as theoretical models of Utopia. With no doubt,   there are also or even more myths about single party system but its defects have been almost thoroughly exposed and myths busted by a lot of factual evidences in the last few decades. Some of these countries migrate to multi-party system. A few of them remain unchanged. The remaining regimes of single party system have been struggling hard to restore their integrity by undergoing various reforms. Up to this moment, in view of the post-democratization development of those countries choosing "shock therapy", it is still too early and too optimistic for the pro-democracy advocates to claim victory over their rivals who have been proven by history to be their strong competitors for more than two thousands years.

It can be foretold that the arguments revealed in this article may cause some pro-democracy advocates and their "fans" feeling uneasy, unpleasant or even angry. As a matter of fact, we have withhold this article for almost half year and tried to refined our views through iterative deliberations. However, when the losers of elections and their supporters in Egypt, Thailand and Ukraine declared their "nth" victory of democracy again after they successfully forced their government chiefs who took their offices by universal suffrage to step down by means of a series of uprisings and violent confrontations, we feel more certain of our conviction that fanatical belief in democracy without awareness of its inherent defects and preconditions only brings people endless disasters instead of well beings. We hope our myth busting inquiries into the theoretical foundation of democracy can facilitate people with more informations for analyzing its pros and cons so as to enhance the quality of debate and somehow contribute to trigger a more rational and healthy development in the pursuit of democracy in its ideal type.

1. DEFINITIONS AND METHODOLOGY

1.1 Definition:

A few decades ago, Hong Kong was an economic oriented city where most people were apathetic to politics. Now it has rapidly transformed into a political arena occupied by high profile political activists. We have no intention to underestimate or despise the political knowledge of the general public but we have good reasons to suspect if our society has a sophisticated political culture to cope with this sudden change in such a short period of time. It takes more than two thousands years for the western world to perfect its theory of democracy and takes more than five centuries for the western countries to develop their own practical political systems to accomplish the ideas as set forth in this ideology which originated and prevailed for a relatively short period of time in ancient Athens more than two thousand years ago since the French revolution in France and the glory revolution in Britain. It is also well understood that they choose democracy not because they deem it a perfect system but because it is thought to be the less or least harmful political system among all within their scope of knowledge and experience as a historical descendancy in a specific social and cultural context. They call politics the "necessary evil" which implies that the scale of political activity ought to be minimized for its very nature of adversity to individual rights though they do not perform well in reality.

We have done even worse as more and more people are motivated to take part in political movements. Some people including teenagers have become addicted to politics and fanatic to certain ideology without knowing their harms to our society. Singapore has outperformed us in the creation of tangible wealth in the last decade while a group of social leaders successfully shift the focus of our society to the pursuit of political ideal. With a population of 5 million in contrast to the 7 million population of Hong Kong, Singapore has surpassed our city in the last two years in terms of GDP which means a 30% lead in the per capita GDP. Being ordinary residents, we would like to ask if the "enriched" political life has brought us any intangible enjoyment which can offset the setback in economic growth. On account of the endless political debates and incessant propaganda campaigns conducted by political activists, people now seem to be quite familiar with the political terminology. However, we wonder how many people can really understand and differentiate among various political ideologies and all their associated political concepts as tabulated in the following list.

> Anti-intellectualism 反智主義
> Aristocracy 精英政治
> Authoritarianism 威權主義
> Autocracy 獨裁政治
> Check and Balance 權力制衡
> Collectivism 集體主義
> Communism 共　主義
> Constitutional Monarchy 君主立憲
> Democracy 民主
> > -Democracy advocates 民主宣揚者
> > -Democracy Supporters 民主支持者
> > -Pan Democratic Allies 泛民主聯盟
> > -Direct Democracy 直接民主
> > -Representative Democracy 代議民主
> Despotism 獨裁統治
> Dictatorship 專制

Elite 精英

Evolution (vs Revolution) 演進，進化 (vs 革命)

Exclusivism/Exclusionism 排外主義

Extremist/radicalist 極端主義者

Freedom / Liberty 自由

Fundamentalist 原教旨主義者

Hegemony / Hegemonism 霸權/霸權主義

Human Rights 人權

Ideology 意識形態

Individualism 個人主義

Internationalism 國際主義者

International Socialist Movement 國際社會主義運動

Legal positivism and legal realism

Majority Rule
Majority, Tyranny of
Monarchy 皇朝

Monism 單元主義

Nationalism 民族主義

Oligarchy 寡頭政治

Pan-legalism 泛法律主義

People's Democratic Central System 人民民主集中制

People's Democratic Dictatorship 人民民主專政

Political Neutrality 政治中立

Populism 民粹主義

Proletariat Dictatorship 無　階級專政

Pluralism 多元主義

Radicalism 極端主義

Reformism 改良主義

Revolution 革命

Rule by Law 依法而治

Rule by Person /Rule by Decree 人治

Rule of Law 法治

Separation of Power 權力分立

Separatism 分離主義

Shock Therapy 震蕩治療

Socialism 社會主義

Social Contract 社會契約

State of Nature 自然　態

Terrorism 恐怖主義

Totalitarianism 集體主義

Treason 叛國

Unilateralism 單邊主義

Universal Suffrage 普選

Universal_value 普世價值
Utilitarianism 功利主義

People may regard the above list as a preliminary challenge to their political knowledge. Hyper links are inserted in the hypertext version of this article to direct the above terms to Wikipedia for the basic interpretations. Sadly but true, the English literacy and knowledge of a significant portion of local people including some university graduates are not capable of reading the raw materials on political and social issues written in foreign languages and most of them do not have direct experience in the social life of western society but mass are very often flattered by politicians to be smart and righteous especially during the time of election. Perhaps our frankness may provoke a lot of people but we must tell the truth though it is discouraging. Their understanding of the political theories and western countries relies heavily on the "second hand" information provided by the reporters, columnists, commentators, scholars and prominent activity leaders who have strong passion for western civilization but little understanding or recognition of the Chinese culture and history on account of their education background, life experience, social network or else reasons. Based on our personal experience, too many people comprehend political issues or ideologies simply from the literal meaning of textual content and make their judgment too soon before they know the genuine connotation of the concept involved. Some of the terms actually do not really carry a value judgment as people perceived. Such impetuous manner has generated a lot of myths on which their knowledge is founded. For examples, democracy is always thought to carry a positive meaning while autocracy associates with a negative connotation. In fact, both terms are originated from ancient Greek language for describing the power structure of government without value judgment. On the contrary, in Plato's view, philosopher king which was exactly an autocratic system by nature was deemed to be the most optimal form of government. Another example is individualism, which receives high valuation in western culture but is usually associated with selfishness in Chinese society. Instead of chanting empty slogans encompassing numerous vague political concepts, we deem that fair, objective,   sensible, serious and responsible discussion may ehance the general level of knowledge of the general public which will help to develop a stable and democratic political structure. In the following discussion, we will try our best to apply the above mentioned terms to analyze the relevant subject matters strictly according to their genuine meanings.

By and large, pride or prejudice tend to hinder the analytical power of a person regardless of his education and social background. In this sense, we are neither wiser nor richer than our predecessors after the two-decades long turbulent quest for the ideological ideal.

1.2 Methodology

Quoting references is a usual approach in writing serious article or research paper. Pro-democracy advocates are used to resort to the authority of great political thinkers like Plato, Aristotle, Saint Augustine, Locke, Hobbs, Montesquieu, Rousseau, etc. for the theoretical grounds of their proposition and quote western democratic countries as successful practical examples. However, citation can be selective and biased. The discussion on the inherent problems of democracy and its failures in practical environment in the history and modern world are very often intentionally or unintentionally neglected. Maybe they sincerely think that these problems have been resolved or insignificant. However, we deem that it is unethical to provide the public only incomplete information as the knowledge base for making their judgment. Hence, we will employ a more direct and intuitive approach by:

1. pointing out the inconsistency of their logic or ridicule in the reasoning process;
2. providing well-known historical facts and current issues   that refute their views; and

3. giving counter examples that rebut the applicability of democracy based on our personal observation and empirical experience.

Our rationale is simple. At first, logical inconsistency as mentioned in the first approach is a false theory killer. It refutes a proposition or theory without the need of any proof. Secondly, theory without the support of practical example is merely the fantasy of pedants. As to ordinary people, facts speak louder than words, including those revealed by persons of authority. Most of them are convinced to believe in democracy by the power and wealth of western democratic countries more than the intellectual concepts of democracy per se. Therefore, we do not think that resorting to the authority by massively citing the words or sayings of great thinkers or practitioners to dispel the myths is a sound idea. Instead, we provide counter examples to show the boundary of democracy. Except direct experience, well known facts are objective and uncontroversial evidences. They are self-evident or self-explanatory without the need for any endorsement from any person of authority. At least they illustrate that democracy in practice may not be universally applicable under all circumstances but sometimes makes situation worse off.

We must emphasize that we do not repel the citation of references or source information. In most of the cases, citation is able to enhance the reliability and persuasive power of a theory. For example, we recommend to readers the work of Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859), who was a French political thinker in 19th century(Note 1.1). He was neither an anti-American or anti-democracy scholar. Instead, his book "Democracy in America" in two volumes is still widely quoted and referred by Americans in the study of politics and sociology. But his work indirectly reflects that democracy is neither a faultless theory nor a perfect form of government in practice. In his era, democracy as an legendary form of government prevailing in the city state of Athens in ancient Greece had been revitalized to be a competing political system against monarchy after being shelved by all political practitioners and theorists in Europe since the collapse of Greece. Its advocates encountered numerous queries and attacks from the conservative. Tocqueville told the world how American managed to fix these inherent problems in their own way based on his close observation in two trips to America. For sure he believed that American had found the key to success. His judgment was deemed to be rather bold as USA was still at most a remote regional power in comparison with the old European Empires in terms of population, cultural legacy, economic productivity and military power except territory in that era. Furthermore, in 1861, a century after her independence and half century after Tocqueville's high valuation, the social and political conflicts of this new "democracy demo nation" burst into a massive civil war which caused the greatest war casualties of this country in history. Not until twenty century while the two Wars had destroyed the traditional empires in Europe, USA had not grown into an strong power in the arena of global politics as a proof for the advantages of democracy. If we are objective and rational enough, we have reasons to affirm that there is still a long way for democracy pursuers to go even at this very moment of writing.

Note:

1.1 Alexis de Tocqueville(1805-1859) and "Democracy in America"
  – Books: http://www.gutenberg.org/files/815/815-h/815-h.htm
  – Biography: en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Alexis_de_Tocqueville
          www.gradesaver.com/author/alexis-tocqueville/

End of Section 1

2. AIMS OF THE ARTICLE

As stated in previous paragraphs, to bust the myths of democracy is thus intended for the perfection of its real life application.   Democracy has been convicted a "supreme" ideology among all. It seems that pro-democracy advocates have won all the debates in all occasions with its ethical appealingness and theoretical integrity. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the higher education level of pro-democracy advocates relative to their rivals is a double blade sword in the sense that their expressive power is better but perhaps the credit for their dominance in most of the debates should be given to their eloquence rather than truth or logic. In history, there were too many cases which can be quoted for illustrating how eloquent intellectuals failed in the practical environment and ruined the affairs with which they were dealing. We hope this article will achieve the following aims:

1. Illustrating why many people's understanding of democracy is actually based on mythical informations;
2. Giving live or historical examples to show the problems arising from the practice of democracy:
3. Inquiring the prerequisites for the application of democracy;
4. Examining the implications of the above "re-discoveries" of democracy on the development of our society, culture and political system inclusive; and
5. Exposing the absurdity of most political debates or confrontation among extremists on the two utmost ends of the political spectrum.

Nobody can well master a theory and apply it to real life situation if he does not recognize its weaknesses.   We do not mean that the intrinsic value of theoretical democracy should be denied or deem that some other ideologies must be even better. However,   if we believe in the value of democracy in its ideal form, we should also keep our mind open and consistent with the underlying principles of democracy which implies mildness, modesty, tolerance, non-violence and sophistication for realizing its limits and accepting deviant views. If anyone think that those people who do not agree with   their view are thus enemies or folk of enemies advocating a rivalry ideology, it just reflects that he or she is adherent to monism or unitarianism instead of the principle of democracy being claimed.

End of Section 2

3. ADHERENCE TO THE PRINCIPLE OF POLITICAL NEUTRALITY

We must also emphasize that busting the myths of democracy should not be interpreted as the violation of the political neutrality principle we have upheld for years as bloggers and the gesture biased to any anti-democracy camp. On the contrary, we would like to dispatch the aspiration of some ordinary residents of this city for ending the ideology oriented confrontation among people over all social issues with which ideological concepts can do nothing. We do not believe that there is absolute neutrality on account of the limitation of personal knowledge and experience but we are very sure of our objectivity towards various political ideologies as we are old enough to be eye witnesses of the disasters caused by radicalism based solely on fanatic beliefs in certain ideologies. Frankly speaking, we are skeptical of all of them and feel tired of the meaningless debate over vague political concepts. All prevailing political ideologies must have their edges or they should have vanished over time for losing followers. Yet none of them is unequivocally convincing to all people though their "fans" do not think so. Moreover, all ideologies including democracy, as expressively depicted by Alexis de Tocqueville, will fail in real life application without morality and faith.(Note 3.1)

For a certain period of time, some political scholars and commentators had once believed that ideological debate would end in the light that ideologies were dying or converging when Communist China resumed normal diplomatic relation with USA and declared the adoption of open door policy since late 70s. The historical development has proven that they were too optimistic. Since communist countries became more pragmatic under the pressure of sluggish economic performance, democracy has turned to be the new icon of utopia among youths and its advocates become more aggressive towards the followers of other ideologies.

In fact, almost all the myths mentioned in the following discussion can also be found in all political systems other than democracy. The unjust behavior of the corrupted privileged class should definitely be condemned with reasons and evidences regardless of the prevailing political system. However, the deficiency of other political systems is not necessary to mean that both the theory and practice of democracy are faultless. For the same reason, the shortcomings of the prevailing democratic governments should not be singled out as evidences to dispute the political thought as a whole. Double standard should never be justified in making a fair comparison. The current antagonistic political confrontation is most probably regarded as a strategy for pressurizing the establishment to make concession but it has objectively planted the seed of radicalism in the society which will ultimately weaken the rationality basis of a social movement and give a good reason for the rise of radicalism on the counter side, thus invoking a vicious cycle of escalating violence. All people are therefore losers in the end. Throughout the discourse, the principle of political neutrality is still adhered and an appeal for tuning down the passion of political movement is expressed. The pursuit of a world without hostile ideologies is still the ultimate goal in our wish list.

Note:

3.1 Famous quote from Alexis de Tocqueville on Democracy:
   - Original script in English:"The health of a democratic society may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens.
      – Source:

thinkexist.com/quotation/the_health_of_a_democratic_society_may_be/171516.html
www.goodreads.com/quotes/387446-the-health-of-a-democratic-society-may-be-measured-by
en.thinkexist.com/quotation/liberty_cannot_be_established_without_morality/182428.html
www.gutenberg.org/files/815/815-h/815-h.htm

End of Section 3

4. COMMON MYTHS IN DEMOCRACY THEORY

The myths of democracy and the problems connected to them we are going to point out in the following paragraphs are not anything new or firstly discovered by us but thoroughly discussed in the work of famous political thinkers who made valuable contribution to the theorization and practice of democracy. They have attempted to fix the problems with various approaches instead of covering them up before their people. Alexis de Tocqueville had made a very detailed narration about the American way to solve these problems which is now recognized as the universal means to accomplish democracy in his book "Democracy in America". Those people who do not tolerate any query or criticism to democracy should read this work to see how their pioneers strived hard to deal with the inherent problems of this political system. The only difference between his and our views lies only in his over optimistic sentiment regarding the self-perfection capacity of the democratic system in comparison with our relatively more critical manner. Nevertheless, only the simplest meaning of some vague concepts including freedom, liberty, human right and social contract are introduced and propagated to the rest of the world purposely by some politicians despite many factual evidences manifest that the inherent problems of democracy including hypocrisy, utilitarianism, individualism, tyranny of majority (i.e. control of self-government) and definition of qualified citizens(i.e. boundary problem of political rights) are still unresolved. Democracy thus become a fantasy sounding much better than it worth and mistaken to be the Savior of those people living in miserable conditions outside the world of democracy.

4.1 Democracy as a "Multi-Party Political System" Deviced by Universal Suffrage of "One Person One Vote"

Nobody can deny that the collapse of Soviet Union and its aftermath effect on the fall of communist bloc in East Europe is a land-marking victory of capitalism over communism in real life application. However, little people bother to differentiate the difference between autocracy, totalitarianism and oligarchy with dictatorship or despotism. As to many countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, it is controversial to claim that it was the victory of democracy over totalitarianism or oligarchy of which the former is always equated with multi-party system deviced by universal suffrage and the latter the single party political system. They refuse stubbornly to establish the multi-party system as defined and endorsed by the Western Countries but only admit that the victory should be attributed to the superiority of market economy over central planned economy. Hence they started to undergo massive economic reforms. If we assess their performance in terms of income growth as well as living standard improvement, many of them including PRC are rather successful, not to mention that many of them are in strict and harsh conditions arising from the sanctions of the western countries. Nevertheless, it seems that the success of economic development is unable to satisfy those western countries and their folks but their aims are not doubtless.

The rational basis of one person one vote system is the principle of equality and majority rule. Ironically, the wow for equality is more compatible to communism than capitalism pursuant to their underlying philosophy. Once and again, the political reality is joking people because those countries claiming themselves the best democratic practitioners are basically highly developed capitalist countries and are always the toughest members in fighting communism. The way they reconcile the conflict between the equality promised by democracy and the scenario of extreme inequality found under capitalist system is interesting and important but little people are aware of its significance. Usually, pro-capitalism and pro-democracy advocates replace equality with equity in explaining the reality of inequality among people as a result of fair competition. Surely the concept of equity which recognizes disproportionate representation of economic rights and interest on account of difference in capacities and contribution

seems to perfectly solve the inconsistency problem of democracy when combined with capitalism. Equal opportunity is deemed to be the base line for people under democracy. However, if it is equitable for someone to be "more equal" than others for their superiority over others in the sphere of economic and commercial activities provided that they are given the equal opportunity, there comes another question: "Is it equally equitable for someone to have more say in the realm of politics pursuant to the same principle?" The recognition of difference in capacity and contribution with equal political opportunity as the base line, if applied to political activities, should produce the same result in the distribution of political rights as in the realm of economic activities. Obviously, this is not acceptable to most local democratic advocates albeit this is the political reality in many democratic countries （See also 4.6-4.8 ）. They try to enlarge the application of universal suffrage in solving social problems, making it a routine decision making process.

It should be noted that those countries adopting socialism or single party political system actually do not refute the value of democracy but they try to accomplish it in a different way to suit the context of different countries on condition that collective will of majority is well addressed and their well being is prioritized in policy making and execution. Based on this logic, proletariat dictatorship over capitalists is not a violation of democratic principle. Therefore, the dispute over democracy and non-democracy finally falls into the debate of multi-party system vs single party system or universal suffrage vs non-universal suffrage. In light of the asymmetry of "discourse power"（話語權）, the everyday use of the term " democracy" is "monopolized" by the camp who advocate universal suffrage and multi-party system. People are used to call them the democracy alliance and their rivals the non-Democracy alliance. It does not mean that the democracy as defined by them has been universally accepted.

Based on the views of western scholars, democracy in its very native format is referred to the direct democracy practiced by the citizens of Athens in ancient Greece, slave and foreigners exclusive. Historical facts tell us that its content has been re-shaped and enriched over time. The process of development is deemed to continue in the future. Because of the increasing complexity of human society and the huge size of population, direct democracy is not feasible for a big country even in the the ancient world. Its experiment had discontinued after the fall of Greece for almost two thousand years until the enlightenment when the concept of representative democracy was established and put into practice. Nowadays, the application of universal suffrage is still highly restricted to some peculiar issues in special occasions. Indirect representation or representative democracy is now adopted by almost all democratic countries. Universal suffrage as a decision making approach is just a myth. For instance, not to mention the policies regarding trivial matters, the executive heads of western democratic countries such as the US president may even declare war against another countries without the permission of Parliament and consent from the general public through universal suffrage.

Regarding the election of political leaders, which is the core of the dispute and myth, not even the "one person one vote" rule is always applied in democratic countries. The majority rule based on one person one vote principle is merely a pre-occupied misconception for many people who draw their conclusion on the ground of fanatic belief. For instance, the president of US can be elected by minority vote which is in contradiction to most people's belief in the election system of US. Before George Bush was elected the President of USA by minority votes for the disproportionate representation of population by electors in different constituencies, in a discussion, one of our buddies was challenged by a group of youths including some young teachers and students when he told them the possibility of the above mentioned scenario. What frightened him much was that they were unwilling to validate and refused to study the references he quoted simply because they thought that they were absolutely right based on the superficial and incorrect knowledge they attained from the mass media. Actually, none of them had seriously

studied the electoral system of US.

Multi party system as a precondition of democracy is also a myth in logical and historical sense. Political party was a newbie in the history of human society. It was first invented and emerged in 1790 in America according to reliable documentary, 14 years after the independence of USA. Therefore, it was also a newbie with reference to the development of democracy which emerged prior to multi party system early in ancient Greece more than two thousands years ago. Multi party system, being a successive development of democracy, is in no way a precondition (a sufficient condition in logical terms) for its predecessor. Some theorists are clear about the logical deficiency of multi-party theory and try to claim it the necessary condition of democracy, or in simple terms, the inevitable result of democratization instead. Yet the proposition implicitly admit that the multi-party system is not a prerequisite of democratization.

With reference to the practical environment, those prominent western democratic countries which exhibit higher political stability are usually dominated by only a few political parties composing of members having similar background, eg. more than half of the Parliament members of USA are law professionals or possessing a law degree. In all those western democratic countries, most of the prominent political elites come from a few universities such as Yale and Harvard in US and Cambridge and Oxford in UK. The divergence in policy issue among these parties is actually very trivial and insignificant though they try all their might to make themselves looking different especially at the time of election. On the contrary, those newly established democratic governments after various color revolutions all suffer from problem of governance for the struggle among tens or even up to hundred of rivalry political parties of which none can obtain wide and continuous public support to run the government. Multi-party politics becomes a curse for those new members joining the club of democracy.

Theoretically speaking, democracy and single party system is not totally repellant to each other proven by history while multi-party system does not totally exclude the possibility of the emergency of aristocracy or oligarchy. The debate over the merits and demerits of various ideologies without considering the social, cultural and historicist background is thus meaningless. It can be foreseen that the practical mode of democracy will keep evolving over time in the future.

4.2 Assurance of Justice Via the Rule of Law by Democracy

During the writing of this article, one of our buddies was busy chatting with a friend on another thread discussing the possible resolution of a management problem concerning both the staff and clients who keep pursuing inappropriate privileges and arbitrarily crossing the red line defined by both the law and ethics with their own will. To adhere to the confidentiality protocol, he was not provided too much detailed information of the issue but we can be sure that democratic approach was definitely not one of the considerations as all the behaviors were deemed to be delinquent or even against the law. They were just a group of selfish persons who trespassing the forbidden area beyond the border of sentiment and rationality at the sacrifice of other people for the attainment of self interest.

We did not know to what extent his opinion could help but at least he could show his spiritual support to comfort a desperate manager. From the issue, obviously, we are illustrated that popularity cannot and should not replace rationality. An embarrassing enough fact is that truth is always held in the hand of a few wise persons who are worth their fame for their insight, competence and contribution to human society instead of the mass or those traditional blue blood elites who inherit the power and privileges from their family by order of succession and consanguinity. The majority rule may fail in arriving at a

righteous decision or judgment.（See also section 6.2.2）.

The absolutization of the principle of rule of law is thus another myth bundled with democracy. People are being hypnotized of the unequivocal advantages of rule of law by the modern theorist of "pan-legalism". However, even an ordinary person can see that human law can never be bestowed the same status of natural law. Being ordinary people as well as members of SME, we have good reasons and sufficient evidences to affirm that not all people are fair before law as claimed under the prevailing legal system which is glorified by pro-west and pro-democracy advocates, and neither nor the prevailing legal system adopted in the western democratic countries. Analogous to the limit of democracy, the limit of law is a serious topic worth consideration. Socrates was sentenced to death in a law court under a democratic system in ancient Greece. The "red Indian" was slaughtered legally by the army of democratic governments. The black African were captured, trafficked and enslaved by the white citizens of democratic countries pursuant to the prevailing law. The majority of these democratic countries also supported their governments to launch invasion or colonization wars against the developing and under-developed countries in the last five centuries. Conclusively speaking, Justice is not assured to be common to all people under the law made by the legislature in democratic countries especially when democracy is simply equated with majority rule or the meaning of citizens excludes those people under their invasion or exploitation. The former is referred to the "self-control problem" and the later the "boundary problem" for the practitioner of democracy. A famous social phenomenon called the "tragedy of commons" is deemed to be an unresolved problem that perplexes a lot of management theorists and practitioners in managing common pool resources. If the problems are not handled properly, democracy corrupts into the "tyranny of majority" or the "tyranny of dominant class" under which the interst of minority or vulnerable is undermined.

An equally annoying problem that corrupts the rule of law is the tyranny of the "noisy and visible minority" under which the mild and silent majority is suffering. It is usually associated with the hijack of hypocrites who take advantages of the bitter experience of some victims of injustice and advocate high sounding ethical concepts which make little practical sense. Usually their demand is packaged with the pursuit for humanity such as the protection of minority or vulnerable but truth is distorted by the act of prototyping. The identification of victim and vitimizer is over simplified into the judgment based solely on their natural or social identities such as race, sex or class instead of real behavior proven by factual evidence. The line that divides protection and aggression is also deliberately obscured so that the rights of common people are severely infringed. For example, to be fair, the fight against discrimination should be limited to the attainment of legitimate freedom from any injury or threat of injury done on any person for his harmless personal deviant behavior or special characteristics. Yet, in many cases, the movement tends to evolve into the unjust demand for the deprivation of the rights of normal people such as freedom of opinion by demonizing and criminalizing their expression of disagreement in any form. This kind of quest does cross the line of protection and is by nature an active aggression as well as reverse discrimination against all people who just passively refuse to share the view of anomaly. As a matter of fact, when being overdone, the good virtue of benevolence, endurance or tolerance corrupts into the "tyranny of hypocrite" which is equally evil as the harsh manner towards the anomaly in the light that a lot more innocent normal people are deprived of their right to express their objection opinion and subject to the punishment for their impotent insistence on normalcy.

Furthermore, the prevailing judicial system in democratic countries per se is an counter evidence that disputes the universality of majority rule in achieving just and righteous judgment. Judges are not elected directly by universal suffrage. Instead, they are nominated and appointed by a small group of people. Certainly, there are a lot of rationales accounting for the current recruitment system such as the

requirement for the literacy of professional knowledge in law, assurance of the continuity of the interpretation of law and endurance to resist the influence of erratic public opinions on jurisdiction. Frankly speaking, we accept all these explanations but it is hard to tell why they are applicable exclusively to the branch of judiciary while administration and legislature are inappropriate. To take it objectively, this is nonetheless a logical inconsistency. In some cases, for example, the abuse of judicial review, the judiciary may be deemed to jeopardize the authority of administrative branch which is a violation of the principle of separation of power. (See also Section 4.8)

The excessive reliance on the judgment of judges who do not take their office through any real democratic election rather than the government officials under an elected administrative head on the policy issues or even routine operations is indeed a serious internal conflict of the democratic system. If the judges' can be trustworthy under the appointment system, likewise, an appointed administration chief can be reliable too. It is also not scientific because the judge may not have better knowledge than the government officials in the administrative branch in dealing with technical matters requiring professional expertise other than law. When the domestic pro-democracy advocates copy the action of those people using JR as weapon to fight for their rights in Western countries, they are "hoisted by their own petard" （自相矛盾）. To inquire deeper into the idea, JR in western countries is not indefinite. It is confined to some matters and the court may not have enforcement power. The wiki.answer.com gives a very brief and concise illustration of these limitations in USA:

1. The Supreme Court does not have enforcement power; it must rely on the Executive (and Legislative) Branch to ensure its decisions are carried out.
2. The Court can only consider cases that fall under its original or appellate jurisdiction; Congress has the ability to strip the Supreme Court's appellate jurisdiction over certain classes of cases.
3. The Court can't hear cases that don't involve a proper federal question (involve federal or constitutional law or US treaties), placing many state laws off-limits.
4. The Court can only consider matters that represent genuine cases or controversies; it can't (isn't supposed to) consider hypothetical or moot issues.
5. The Court can only review laws or Executive Orders relevant to a case before them. Most laws are never invoked or challenged in this way, so the Court can't review them.
6. The Supreme Court does not have the right to rule on pending legislation.

（Source: http://wiki.Answer.com）

Whether too easy or too difficult for people to initialize JR proceedings are equally annoying to the society. There is an increasing voice vowing for restricting the standing （i.e. legal capacity）of JR applicants to those persons who have direct interest in the issue so as to avoid the abuse in western countries.   In some countries, there is a constitutional court sit by panel of judges specialized in hearing cases related to constitution which can only be triggered when some prerequisites are fulfilled. More thorough discussions on JR are available in law or political science journals and reference books. The pro-democracy advocates always cite western practice as the model for imitation. However, we have reasons to query to what extent the local JRs are normalized and formalized as the counter part in Western countries? Moreover, we are aware of the huge litigation cost for launching JR proceeding which may either be paid by the applicant himself or all tax payers under the legal aid scheme （subject to eligibility test）. The abuse of JR contains all the elements of lawsuit abuse in which only the law professional is the sure winner. If the lawyer is ethical, the applicant should be informed of all the informations about the litigation including the worst outcome and its implications in terms of tangible and intangible cost at the very beginning. To what extent is this ethical principle observed?

It can been seen that neither democracy nor the rule of law can assure that justice is to be done in due course no matter whether the government and the enforced law is established in the interest of the ruling class, majority or any party in the absence of morality (See also Section 6.2.1). As a matter of fact, logic, ethics, convention, tradition, conscience, common sense, professional knowledge and/or well established institutional rules which constitute the philosophical foundation of the spirit of law are more adequate or applicable in many occasions. The application of law is not unlimited but ought to be confined to some rather extreme cases. The apotheosis of man made law by the modern theorist of pan-legalism are dangerous and naive for its implications of equating human law with the law of nature or the sacred law of god. To the extreme, it causes more injury to innocent people than imposing just penalty to the delinquent.

4.3 Democracy as both the Ends and the Means to Achieve Itself

During the cold war period, the great debate over ideologies mainly focused on the means more than the ends. Both camps claim the pursuit of people's well being the ultimate goal of their political philosophy. Generally speaking , capitalism emphasizes more on freedom and growth while socialism on equality and distribution. Well being or in modern term, public good, is a very general concept which carries a lot of messages. In brief, there are two aspects of well being, namely the material life and the spiritual life which are correspondent to the economic system and cultural context of the society respectively (or sub-structure and super structure in Marxian terms) . To attain affluent material life, both the economic production and distribution must be maintained at a balancing point so that the incentive to work is not adversely discouraged and the poorest people are given the reasonable reward for their contribution so as to live a dignified and meaningful life. In the seek for affluent spiritual life, except cultural activities, justice which include equality, freedom and other critical human rights are all inevitable. However, too many people now regard democracy as both the ends and the means to achieve all the objectives including justice, economic affluence and itself. In simple words, pro-democracy advocates believe that a country which adopts democracy will end up with the fulfillment of democracy and all the desired goals associated with the formation of a utopia.

However, the real world is not so simple. What happen in many countries including China a century ago, the middle east countries since the post WWII and Thailand in the midst of and post Thaksin Shinawatra (他信) period have only proved that democracy without a favorable natural social context may ends up with disorder, riots or civil war in the extremest case. Theoretically speaking, there is no causal relationship between democracy and many of the elements of well being, let alone multi-party system and universal suffrage. (See also Section 4.4) We should admit that democracy as a political system enhances the sense of belonging and eases the social conflict in the presence of consensus. Thus it may be regarded as one of the many ends for spiritual life. Yet it is doubtful to name it the inevitable and all mighty means for the fulfillment of a utopia.

4.4 Economic Affluence Promised by Democracy

Pro-Democracy advocates say that democracy will bring us better life including economic prosperity and refute the need for any kind of prerequisites. Yet it appears that few of them has really studied the correlation between democracy and economic affluence. As discussed in section 4.2, there is not an absolute relation between democracy and well beings. Apparently, what coming into our mind are prominent and shinning examples like those countries in western Europe and north America which they always cited as proof for their theory. However, they are actually the only few lucky countries. Frankly

speaking, even these countries have their dark side and a lot of social problems. In terms of absolute figures, there are a lot more unsuccessful examples. People probably reverse the causal relationship between democracy and economic affluence. On the contrary, more evidences show that the free market economy and the resulting economic affluence is a prerequisite or stimulant for the rise of democracy. Pro-democracy advocates tend to bundle free market economy with democracy just because they try to shift the contribution of free market economy to democracy.   In history, free market economy has been working properly with either democratic or non-democratic political system without notable differences.

Many pro-democracy advocates stubbornly refuse to envisage the troubles   which   those developing and under-developed countries in Africa, Asia, middle East and Latin America   encounter in practicing democracy. The success of some cited examples found in South East Asia   like Japan, South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore   is not simply the result of practicing democracy. On the one hand they have long been benefited by the favorable economic assistance or trading terms from western countries, mainly US, as part of the global political encirclement strategy   against the communist bloc during the cold war period.   On the other hand, these countries had attained the fastest economic growth before they had gone through the primary democratization process.   Since their survival rely heavily on their loyalty   to the big brother of their ally, their systems can hardly be said to be self-initiative and self-sustaining. At last, despite their political body resemble some of the features of the prototyped democracy, they do not really meet the standard of democracy as defined by Western countries. Ironically, these countries suffer from sluggish economic growth and even problem in governance after they have finally established a democratic political system meeting most of the standards recognized by the western world.

In terms of statistical data, failures in boosting the economic growth with democratization are at least as frequent as successful cases. A question is thus raised: " Does it mean that there exist some kinds of critical factors which prevent the western mode of development from being copied or repeated in other countries, for instance, the positive effect of sizable resources seized from   colonization(i.e. the exploitation bonus),   invasion war(i.e. the war bonus), financial technology (i.e. the financial hegemony bonus) or else?

The above queries are not groundless doubts but solid evidences can be found in history and the modern world. All these Western countries had once established vast colonies in Asia, Africa and America with their cannons and warships. In the last five centuries, the factual evidences are proofs beyond all reasonable doubts for the strict adherence of these western democratic countries to the principle laid down by On Bismarck, "Truth lies in the artillery range." Their affluence is to a great extent established on the ground of bonus from war, colonization or exploitation. The positive effect of industrial revolution on the surpass of western economy to the rest of the world is more or less another myth. At least it was not so significant as stated in the orthodox theory. Based on reliable data, not until the end of 19th century, China and India were still the world's top two largest economies. The collapse of these two countries were the result of both the internal chaos and external influence such as colonization, invasion wars and foreign   exploitation. In fact, the industrial revolution contributed more to the enhancement of military power of the western countries and made them the invincible troops in most of the war fares against other less industrialized countries outside Europe in the last two centuries featured by imperialism and colonization.

4.5 Universal Value and Applicability of Democracy

The recent riots arising from dissatisfaction over welfare cut due to the national debt crisis in some

western countries is a strong signal suggesting that democracy cannot sustain without economic affluence. The western countries have maintained their immense welfare expenses by borrowing from future generations when they lost most of their colonies in the post war period upon the rise of nationalism. Now the merry-go-round is going to stop because this financial resource is also exhausted. Their young generations must take steps to pay off the national debt they inherit from their older generation. To be frank, they have a better chance to overcome the temporary drawback for their edge in competitive power precipitated for centuries. Even the problem is solved, the glory should attribute more to the high general education level, well established industrial foundation and the excellent infra structure more than the democracy which on the contrary very often hinders timely and adequate adjustment policy.

Some smart heads have tried to explain the growing national debt with paradoxical arguments like credibility or financial leverage. The fallacy of these explanations is easy to be recognized. Raising fund by borrowing incurs cost. According to the principle of financial management, the borrowing is only justified when the expected internal rate of return （yield rate） is larger than the interest rate. However, credibility is based on the ability to repay instead of yielding rate. A bankrupted credit card holder can easily tell the difference between earning power and ability to repay. A person may be granted the credit regardless of his income until his net asset value is in red. Analogously, the western countries have accumulated a great deal of wealth in the last 5 centuries with their predominant political and military power. They still possess the most powerful military forces in the world which secure them against any military attack by other countries. Hence they are still the best debtors in terms of assets holding and national security. To explain the national debt of rich democratic countries, the financial leverage of open market operation for regulating the economic cycle is therefore the only argument seeming to be convincing. Surely it seems to be a very professional explanation which can stop the query from economics novice. Again, the ever increasing national debt relative to GDP growth only manifests the argument is also false. The debts for some of these rich countries even keep growing during the time of economic boom. In other words, they use the borrowing to finance their recurring expenses more than use it as a financial vehicle to adjust the economic trend. Pursuant to the logic of financial leverage, the borrowing should be channeled to the non-recurring capital investment projects to offset the economic fluctuations(i.e. against the wind in technical jargon) as the Keynesian theory depicts. The bankruptcy of Detroit and the close-to--bankruptcy situation of some western countries like Greece, Italy, Norway, Spain, Scotland, Ireland and Iceland are proof for the reality.

To explain the situation with a metaphor, if the first bucket of gold of a rich clan is obtained from illegal activities or even their wealth is kept generated from exploitation of the weak with their privileges and power, how can other people copy their mode of success without acquiring   the necessary strength and committing similar offence? Once they lose their dominant power, their clan will also decline as the the traditional noble class of knight and feudal land lord in the post industrial revolution period.

As illustrated in former paragraphs, too many people regard democracy as an all mighty means being capable of solving all economic, political and social problems,   thinking that it is also applicable to all human societies   in the world regardless of their sociology-economic context. In   fact, even the pro-democracy advocates do not believe and act in contradiction to their words. The western democratic countries are actually exercising unilateral policy and arbitrarily exert their influence on other countries of which the people are not friendly (or loyal) to the western world. Using the psychology of peer bully as analogy, a normal person who is docile, gentle, moderate and reasonable may go mad after suffering from lengthened discrimination and bully by other peers. Therefore, the failure of those countries adopting different political systems other than western style democracy may not be purely the result of

defects of their systems but a compound effects of internal problems and external intervention such as trade embargo, economic sanction, technology blockade, etc. In the presence of an unfair competition between democratic camp and the remaining countries in the world from the very beginning on account of the asymmetrical powers between them, the claim of victory for the winning side should not be glorified. Instead of prosperity and stability, in the absence of some critical preconditions, democracy probably only gives rise to endless chaos in   many under-developed or developing countries.

4.6 Immunity of Democracy to Power Corruption

Democracy enable mass surveillance. Thus it should has a relatively higher immunity to corruption by default. However, nothing can be absolute. A system alone cannot function without executor. The quality of people including both the government officials(the governing) and ordinary people (the governed) are the key factors for the success. Unfortunately, factual evidences available manifest that corruption can be equally rampant in democratic countries or countries claiming to be democratic. The western countries seem to successfully curbed the bribery activities to a minimum level but actually it takes a more sophisticated and subtle form. The interest transportation is made legal under the prevailing law because it has already been tactfully incorporated into the institutional process. The privileged class may arbitrarily capture the benefits at the sacrifice of ordinary people in a lawful way without the need of receiving secret bribe. As a result, The problem of polarization is deepened over time. Polarization arising from divergence of capacity is different to that caused by unequal opportunity among people. Those people living at the bottom of social hierarchy are unable to enjoy the economic wealth they create. The abuse of power by those privileged class on the vulnerable social groups can be identified as a kind   of corruption in broad sense. The activists of the "Occupying Wall Street" movement complain that they are the 99% people who live on just 5% of resources in their country. On the other hand, in order to please the general public, politicians tend to provide generous welfare to the lowest class at the sacrifice of long term goals, for example, making transfer payment from middle class to the lowest class. Such arrangement can be regarded as bribing the voters with precious scarce national resources. Ironically, in the western world, those miserable social groups regard socialism as the remedy of their corrupting society while our social activists promise to all people a beautiful world with the western political system. Yet, do they really recognize the inherent defects of the system they appreciate and have a very good plan to tackle them?

4.7 Promise of Competent and Ethical Leaders under Majority Rule

The rationale of majority rule seems to be self-evident and very attractive to the mass though it is actually a false proposition (See also Section 4.2, 6.2.1 and 6.2.2). To take its extremest meaning, people do not need any leader under democracy.   All decision are jointly made by all people. To put it in a mild way, the mass are clear enough to elect competent and ethical leaders for themselves. However, the views on the righteousness of majority opinion are confusing and inconsistent. For instance, a famous dictum by Lincoln says,   "You may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all of the people all the time." Its meaning is indeed ambiguous and may lead to two contradictory outcomes. On the one hand, it means that nobody can fool all the people forever. On the other hand, it also implies that it is practically possible for politicians to take benefits by fooling most of the people some of the time or some people all the time if a significant portion of people have never learnt from past experience. In the later case, the resulting damages can be enormous, irrevocable and far reaching. Either judgment or decision based on majority's view constitutes an environment for the rise of eloquent politicians.   In the worst case,   "political prostitutes" may have very good chances to seize power through election with their expertise in telling lies.   Stability is not

attainable if incompetent and unethical leaders are just repeatedly replaced by unreliable "political prostitutes". For this reason, the government chief of some countries including Britain is not directly elected by universal suffrage. The rationale behind these rather complicated mechanisms stems from the fact that the protection of minority interest and the view of social elites very often supersede simple majority rule in the election of a good leader. Once and again, there are numerous practical counter examples disputing the righteousness and applicability of majority rule. In Egypt and Thailand, the minority refused to accept the voting result in the previous elections. Majority rule fails when the view of general public is highly divided. Ironically, heroic leaders always rise in the most chaotic period and are elected to be leaders by a small group of loyal followers with their precious lives as votes.

What disappointing the public including our folk here is that the local democratic alliance have made little materialistic contribution for the enhancement of civic sense and the political knowledge of the general public but commit the same mistakes like what they blame their foe, i.e. fooling people around with untrue information (愚民). They attribute all the current social problems to the defects of the prevailing political system which may give the public a misconception that democracy is a total solution to these problems for our society. They are pleasing the general public by making a lot of unrealistic promises, flattering the "intelligence of mass" and exaggerate the relative number of moral population. In terms of expectation management, they have promised too much to the general public with a beautiful picture of democracy which in turn causes people to have unreasonable expectations over democracy. Many pro-democracy advocates behave like an unethical lawyer who persuades his client to start a law suit at the beginning with a lot of reasons making him believe that he will surely win, then telling him to be prepared to scarify more for defeating his rival amid the litigation, and ultimately informs him that he will have no chance to win but consider surrender or seeking resolution off the court room. Frankly speaking, we doubt if these people are qualified to be the head of our government? Without a set of sensible policies, once they are in power, it can be foreseen that there will be disasters. For example, they reject any project including the expansion of dumping area or building incinerator but they have never revealed any solid and feasible idea for tackling the problem.

4.8 Facilitation of Check and Balance of Power

This myth can be further divided into two folds, namely the myth about the unequivocal advantages of the check and balance of power and the myth about the positive effect of democracy on achieving balance of power.

4.8.1 Check and Balance of Power as a Mean to Prevent Power Abuse

Just like democracy, the check and balance of as a mechanism to prevent power abuse has become an unchallenged or self-evident axiom in the last few decades. Many people accept and cite this concept without critical and independent thinking. An embarrassing enough fact is that the politicians who advocate the advancement of this concept on the one hand actually act in contradiction to their words on the other hand. They have never observed the principle of the check and balance of power but always try all their might to grab more power, maintain overwhelming predominance over all other competitors and do everything to weaken the power of their rivals without check. Logically, once again, they are "hoisted by their own petard"(自相矛盾) for their contradictory acts and words. At first, these politicians, mainly the political leaders of western democratic countries, who arbitrarily coerce their will over other countries in dealing with international affairs and take every means to forbid other countries to own powerful weapons of massive destruction comparable to the armaments in their arsenal are merely a group of hypocrites for their de facto hegemony behavior. Secondly, in response to the queries against

their unilateral violent intervention into other countries' internal affairs, they argue that their actions are justified for the pursuit of justice or humanity. Yet it is not easy to explain why their offensive/military assault resulting in severe damages of tangible assets and casualties of human lives in the territories of other sovereign countries is more justified than the resistance of local people against their intervention. They set the standard and make the judgment without check with their predominant   power. Albeit their offensives or interventions are justified as they tell,   it manifests that balance of power is not an self-evident axiom; it falls short in some practical situations under which some representatives of justice may violate it for ethical reasons. In either case, they do not   observe the "check & balance principle.

4.8.2   facilitation of the check and balance of power by democracy

The facilitation of the check and balance of power by democracy is also a mythical proposition for its internal inconsistency in dealing with internal affairs because democracy should enforce the will of majority over the minority pursuant to the majority rule. No government can entertain all the people simultaneously.   Even a genuine democratic government is practically governing the country in accordance with the will and in the interest of the majority, the power is thus biased to the majority but unavoidably in disfavor of some minorities. In other words, democracy facilitates the dominance of majority over minority by default instead of check and balance of power. Moreover, all politicians intend to change the status quo or current order and make it evolve in the direction they favor. Both in their mind and words, their dominance in the political arena represent the ideal state while the dominance of other competitors is deemed to be the state of imbalance. Therefore, the real world is always in the state of imbalance.

Another internal conflict arises from the abusive use of judicial review. As mentioned in Section 4.2, the abuse of judicial review somehow jeopardizes part of the function and authority of the administrative branch, thus violating the principle of separation of power. In the absence of any suitability test prior to the application of JR and institutional constraints for limiting its applicability, it is too easy for people to trigger the JR proceedings and change the government policy. The government official are indeed deprived of their original discretionary power in making and executing their decisions under normal situation. Especially in cases regarding controversial issues which can be connected to ideology or social conflicts, to avoid being challenged and humiliated by JR initiated or supported by pressure groups which claim to represent public opinions, government officials tend to surrender their discretionary power to the judiciary. Some recent cases such as the prosecution of a taxi driver for keeping fifty cents of change albeit the prima facie evidence was not sufficient to prove him possessing any criminal intent (mens rea) in the whole course （a critical element for establishing the charge）. Sadly enough, though the mass media and even some law professionals admitted that the allegation seemed to be idiotic, they only focused on the trivial amount but not the lack of evidence beyond all reasonable doubts and the inability of the   law execution departments on account of their fear of being accused of violating the principle of the rule of law in exercising their statutory power and performing their due responsibilities. The commentator also did not investigate the reasons behind such timidity of the prosecutor towards the invisible monster of pan-legalism but so harsh to a pathetic humble person. They were not well aware of the fact that their satirical manner is one of the major cause for these frivolous prosecutions.   These cases soon became international news spreading on internet for their nonsensical nature. For example, the BBC news, a news agency financed by public fund in UK, which was both the mentor and founder of the Hong Kong's   legal system, gave neither praise nor endorsement to the so-called core value of or city, i.e. the adherence to the principle of rule of law. The Soth China Morning Post, a local English newspaper, was more direct. It preceded the news with the following introduction: "Hong Kong prides itself on its rule of law, but the law can sometimes be a harsh mistress."

The abusive use of JR only exposes how the rule of law and separation of power are misconceived by many Hong Kong people especially those pro-democratic advocates. On the one hand the abuse of judicial proceeding violate the principle of separation of power in the sense that the court judges become the informal but de facto supreme heads of administration departments who have the final say on all policy issues which cause the government policy to be unstable, inconsistent and unpredictable. On the other hand, it also violate the principle of justice as illustrated in Section 4.2.   Innocent people may be tortured and even convicted guilty by the unjustified prosecution for frivolous reason due to the immense legal cost accrued in litigation or lack of the necessary professional knowledge for self-defense.

4.8.3   The Fallacy of Check and Balance of Power Theory

In short, the saddest truth is that there is indeed no such things as balance of power both in static or dynamic sense in the real world. Otherwise, in the best case, a stagnation or deadlock of development should be observed because no body has the "excessive political thrust" to initialize a change. In the worst case, the struggle between hostile rivals with matching power may evolve into riots or even civil war. Thailand and Ukraine and many countries are live examples. Both in theory and reality, the political context, either domestic or international, is always in a dynamic state of imbalance and moving towards an theoretical state of balance based on the current conditions. Nevertheless, just a very trivial issue may induce a change of the socio-political context and in turn trigger a distraction of the current course of development. These phenomena are now explained by some scholars with the theory of   "Butterfly Effect".

The current system of separation of power prevails in western democratic countries is in fact a formal system of division of labor rather   than a check and balance system as they propagate. Three branches of the government share specific subsets of the power of a state machine, namely the legislature, administration and judiciary. Again, it only works well on condition that there exists an "interset"   of interest（i.e. common interest）   among members of ruling class which includes a set of common goals, norms and conventions or they will fall into the trap of power struggle among political parties or "buck passing" as a result of bureaucracy originating from the low morale   of civil servants who are always pursued of the liabilities under the "fault finding" atmosphere associated with populism.

Moreover, power abuse, no matter how clearly the domain of power and responsibilities of the three branches of government are defined, is not easy to avoid for the following reasons:

1. The bureaucrats and politicians in administrative branch can easily abuse their power under whatever system. It may appears in the form of making and executing discriminative policy against some specific social groups. In extremest cases, they may even abuse their prosecution power to carry out selective prosecution. The nuisances and damages thus created is irrevocable and by nature a power abuse on the victims.
2. The legislation and judiciary may be   severely influenced or even dominated by bureaucratic technocrats（技術官僚）and law professionals in the light that the technical elements including the jargon and procedure entailed in the course of legislation and litigation require their expertise. The legal framework is thus inevitably biased to the privileged class represented by these people.
3. The immense cost accrued in the litigation process is another adverse factor that allows the privileged class to abuse their power over the ordinary people in the name of the rule of law. It also prevents the mistake of discriminatory policy or selective prosecution from being rectified by means of judicial review.

4. The majority rule turn out to be materialistic actions harming the interest of some minorities in the name of adherence to the principle of democracy.
5. Some pressure groups, though representing only very little people, have great political momentum with which they can exert immense influence on the policy making with "louder voice" and "higher visibility". These pressure groups include:

- the organizations possessing strong profile for their profession, foreign support or social status, eg. guilds, commercial chambers, statutory professional bodies, prominent NGOs, etc.;
- the organizations representing some social groups who are at present or have once been the victims of discrimination or violence in a specific social context in history, eg. ethnic minority groups, women rights organizations, sex orientation minority organizations, etc. ; and
- the radical activists who intend to accomplish their belief   through radical behavior.

Under such circumstances, the check for the power abuse is unavoidably back to the most primitive form of public surveillance including protest, marching or demonstration. When all mild forms of resistance fail, riot,   uprising or civil war will follow but the consequence is unpredictable in the absence of consensus, good organization and competent leadership. Facts speak louder than words. The chaotic situation and the resulting disaster arising from the application of democracy in many countries all over the world since the beginning of 20th century explain that democracy does not always work or perhaps it never works for some cultures. The self-rectification mechanism for power abuse promised by democracy is merely one of its many myths.

4.9 Democracy as the Best among All

After all, a very typical view upheld by pro-democracy advocates is something like:

"Well, democracy is not perfect but it it the best among all" or
"Alright, democracy is not the best but it is still better than others".

The best rhetoric expression of this argument is a famous dictum cited from a speech by Winston Churchill in the House of Commons in 1947 which says, "Democracy is the worst form of government in the world, except for all those   others that have been tried from time to time." Being a genius speaker as well as an intelligent politician possessing all the necessary wit and eloquence for subduing his rivals in a debate, Churchill's argument is unbeatable. However, the   Achilles ankle of his argument lies in the definition of democracy. He tactfully equated the theoretical concept of democracy with the practical forms of government claimed to be democratic in western countries. Albeit this proposition is true for its literal meaning, we must note two important points:

1. The genuine democratic system must be truly enforced as what it is claimed to be; and
2. The system must be feasible and working properly with respect to all the objective conditions in the real world. It is absolutely ridiculous to name something the best or better among all if the resulting situation is better off without it or worse off for its existence.

Therefor, when we evaluate the real life application of democracy, we have reasons to put those political regimes claimed to be democracy under strict examination to see whether these two criteria are fulfilled or not at first.

End of Section 4

5. ENVISAGE OF MYTH BUSTING FACTS IN PRACTICE

In exploring how far the democratic countries have gone on the way towards the ideal type of democracy, we have reasons to remain pessimistic. The following are the most common myths busting facts found in the prevailing democratic systems.

5.1 Entrance Barrier

In real world politics, free choices are indeed just limited to a few varieties preset by a group of political elites in all regimes including democratic countries. Apparently, elections are open to all people today in western democratic countries after ethnic minorities and females are granted the equal voting right. However, in light of the massive use of "political engineering", ordinary people without wealth or resources for running massive election campaigns at the cost of millions or even billions dollars do not enjoy as much political rights and freedom as political elites. Nomination is confined to a small group of political figures pre-selected by the parties they belong. With no doubt, all the arrangements are skillfully made and stuck to some implicit political norms which may be either pro or against the will of electors. People felt good in the election because they feel that they really have the say in choosing the government officials. The psychological power of appealingness promised by the politicians in those "good days " when the socio-economic environment being on the up trend is obviously the merit of democracy. In reality, these people representatives cannot deviate too far away from the hidden agenda. Any elected member who breaches the implicit mutual agreement among political elites topping the hierarchy of the society for the fulfillment of the aspiration of general public may cause some kind of extraordinary counter actions like defamation, impeachment, prosecution and motion of non confidence, or to the extreme, assassination. The prevailing democratic systems in most western countries is far more complicated and sophisticated than what the local democrats describe. In strict sense, they are still de facto aristocracy rather than the democracy as described in political theory by nature. In the last five hundred years, the practice of this kind of political system in western world has created a unique cultural environment in which political elites and electors are actually the aristocracy and ordinary people in modern context. Some kinds of compromise among all social groups are inevitable so as to reach a state of peace. They are also playing the roles of performers and audiences respectively. If material conditions are favorable, descent and cooperative audience may join good performers to create a great show of democracy in an elegant manner. Otherwise, for example, when welfare is cut for the tight national budget, impatient and angry mob will go to the street and fight for their interest with violence. If the interest of the general pubic is really prioritized and promised under democracy and it is working properly without any precondition, street violence should have never happened in these countries.

5.2 Populism Hijack

Back to our reality today, are we really ready for democracy? If all people in Hong Kong behave in a rational and civilized manner like the folk in the discussion mentioned at the beginning of this article, they deserve the form of democracy for which the pan-democratic alliance ask. If they behave like those people with whom the friend of our buddy was dealing, they deserve legal sanction instead of democracy. The local pro- democracy advocates disappoint us for their over emphasis on the pursuit of maximum civil rights and freedom but talking little about the responsibility of a sensible and responsible citizen which is the rational foundation for a stable democratic system. Pursuant to the simple logic derived from the "one person one vote" rule perceived by the general public, popularity can replace reasoning or rationality. The appeal for democracy may be hijacked by the populism and

probably corrupts into the "tyranny of democracy" which is definitely anti-intellectual and unscientific. A democratic leader is under test when the voters opt for an unjust decision or action undermining the development of democracy. Whether acting for or against the will of majority in such situation is a renowned moral dilemma for political leaders in practicing democracy. In either case, the leader is violating the underlying principle of democracy. The riots in western democratic countries manifest that the western democratic governments may choose to protect the interest of privileged class or refuse to entertain the unjust demand of the general public at the sacrifice of long term goals. In short, the western democratic leaders do not always prioritize the "public interest" as speculated and demanded by the general public. They fail to be a qualified player if they only please the majority without independent thinking. Alex Tocqueville was one of the many political thinker who managed to handle the dilemmas of democracy. In his 1st Volume of "Democracy of America", which he wrote after making a close observation in a trip to United States, he felt that American seemed to find their own way to fix the inherent problems of democracy. Nevertheless, though still having faith in the US democracy, in the 2nd Volume, he became less optimistic when he understood America more.

Many democracy advocates and activists are scholars or intellectuals. They are knowledgeable and have lofty aims but their life circle limits their knowledge and experience with the mass. At most they maintain some kind of working relationship with the grassroots and bourgeoisie in servicing them or mobilizing them to take part in social movements but perhaps they have little chance to confront with a group of selfish and barbaric mob who think that their unreasonable collective opinions may override well established law or moral rules in their position as opposition parties. When this situation really occur, for instance, in dealing with the abusive use of either the miniature common area within a small building or the massive common pool resources in the global environment, many democracy advocates lose their patience and react drastically to the selfish abusers like a tyranny. The tragedy of the commons is a strong proof illustrating that the control of self-government is always an unresolvable problem for democratic system.

Some local politicians seem to have over estimated their ability in the "manipulation" of mass movement (or in a mild tone, influence on the movement). In reality, as to all politicians, it is politically incorrect in their position to express any doubt about the righteousness of the collective behavior of mass even it is wrong. Once the mass is motivated to take part in a massive campaign intended for a certain political goal, situation may go out of the control of the initiator. The irrational behavior of individuals will probably be amplified by each other including folks and rivals. Radical actions and violent confrontation will then gradually dominate the movement and anti-movement. Chaos will follow and may probably last for decades or century in the end.

5.3 Localism/Separationism Hijack

Localism and separationism are always a symbiosis of populism when the short term and narrow minded interest of a distinctive locality is over emphasized and surpasses the interest of a country as a unity. The idealistic form of city state is always cited as example for the explanation of benefits of localism or separationism. The most practical and pragmatic problem of survival is always deliberately neglected by the advocates. In most of the cases, the wow for independence is just a gesture of localists intended for raising their bargaining power in negotiating with the central government. In history, the advanced city states of ancient Greece were destroyed for their inability to protect their homeland and citizens against the raids of less civilized "barbarians" around them while China as one of the oldest civilizations has endured to survive all challenges and keep growing to be a unified big country in most

of the time for thousands years. The sense of solidarity as a national member of China has played an important role. Supposing that China just composed of a number of independent city states like ancient Greece and people in different provinces did not unite together to fight against invaders during the aftermath of Ching Dynasty in early 20th century, the whole territory would have continued to be the colony or sub-colony under the occupation of foreign countries and all the Chinese people an inferior race under the governance of invaders like the black African in Africa, red Indian in America and Arabian in Middle East. Let alone the glory, dignity, liberty and prosperity, the survival of the citizens in a densely populated independent city amid the center of geopolitics among political giants without any natural resources for sustaining the livelihood of its people   is just a surrealistic fantasy of some simple and naive separationists (See also Section 6.2.5)

Singapore is always cited as a successful live example of city state in the present world but it is almost the only example.   Its high emigration rate, as an indicator of "vote by feet", has manifested that their citizens lack the sense of security. Its stability and apparent independence are founded on a very delicate and fragile foundation overshadowed by the political wrestle of super powers in the region. The presence of UK (before 1990) and US military force (after 1990) in Sembawang is a clear notion to show how her national defense is secured. For the sake of national security, her citizens as well as the city state as a whole are forfeited of a lot of rights and freedoms.   To be frank, none of us has heard a Singaporean claims that he/she sincerely feel that they are in a better position than Hong Kong people in terms of personal freedom and human rights. During all the meaningful time of independence, in addition to the presence of foreign military force, this city state is actually under the governance of one party in exchange for administration efficiency and political stability. We have no intention to despise the current system of this city state. On the contrary, we admit that their politicians have the necessary wisdom and skill to attain maximum benefits for their people under the constraints of their specific historical context.

Free will or free choice in absolute sense is not available for any person in the real world. There is not even any convincing argument to affirm that the citizens of an "independent" city state or small country must enjoy more rights and freedom than any dependent territory of a big sovereign country. If military force is an extension of politics, diplomacy is an extension of military forces. In other words, a weak country without sufficient combating force is not able to maintain its independence and safety. Separationism is almost a suicidal behavior for a city like Hong Kong.

5.4 Radicalism Hijack

It should be noted that the corruption of the weak or vulnerable is different to the corruption of the strong. When people who identify themselves the victims of suppression, they   tend to believe whatever they do in fighting back including demand for preferential rights or launching violent actions against "out-groups" are morally justified. Such view may further corrupt into the tyranny of violence founded on   the false principle of "ends justify means". In certain extreme cases, it is true if the violent resistance is inevitable for the preservation of basic human rights like self defense for survival. However, in fighting for "secondary" benefits, the principle of non-violence should always be observed. Regrettably, when people's judgment is impaired by fanatic belief founded on the ground of myths, they probably fall into the trap of prejudice and double standard. The shortcomings of their folks and the merits of their rivals are ignored. Their rivals are thus   demonized and prototyped as devil whereas this logic may further developed into a simple and radical "friends or enemies" principle (非敵即友) which regards the enemies of rival to be friends   (敵人的敵人便是朋友), thus causing irrevocable disasters for forming coalition with more dangerous enemies (與敵為友). During the early 20th century, many Chinese

became traitors on account of their anger and dissatisfaction with the corrupted   Ching Dynasty, war lords or the ROC Government Officials in power. Among them, those who cooperated with the Japanese war criminals and joined the puppet regime they formed were the most distinctive examples. They committed   unforgivable guilt of treason and war crime including suppressing, exploiting, torturing, imprisoning and killing the resistant army or people.

Another extreme behavior of the suppressed is terrorist attack. Its evil and danger are self-explaining for the resulting harms on innocent people. Even the radical act does not target on innocent third persons but takes the form of self-destruction, it is still an extreme violence. Suicide terrorism is the extremest form of revenge behavior exhibited by the weak because the terrorist is convinced that killing himself/herself along with others is the only way for his/her social group to deny the suppression from the strong. This "dying to win" strategy is founded on the compound feeling of disappointment and hatred. (See also Section 6.1) People are too easy to confuse losers in a fair competition with the vulnerable social groups under the oppression and exploitation of the evil privileged class. To avoid moral corruption of any kind to take place, it is of equal importance for the opposition alliance to keep their mind clear, open and cautious.

5.4 False Democracy Hijack

Another important common mistake is the confusion of democracy as an ideal type of political system at conceptual level with a nominal political system bearing the name of democracy that prevails in the real world at the practical level. In the worst case, excluding the extreme case of Hitler who seized the power in the election under a nominal democracy, hypocritical but eloquent politicians may rise to seize the power by means of universal suffrage.

According to history, British chose to spend 500 years to reform an authoritarian monarchy into the current constitutional monarchy government led by cabinet and Parliament in which the prime minister and his cabinet is still indirectly elected. Meanwhile, French chose to invoke a violent revolution to overthrow the corrupted royal government and sent all the former ruling class to the Guillotine(斷頭臺). Their dramatic and romantic resistance was followed by a series of chaos, riots and wars for a decades before the establishment of a stable government. United States started from a platform of higher contour but still has taken mire than 200 years to achieve only   nominally the race and gender equality but few Americans admit that they should overthrow the prevailing government for its inability or reluctance to realize the real equality prior to the reforms.   Once upon a time, it was the socialism that beat the capitalism and democracy with high sounding moral appeal. Then democracy took advantage of the collapse of economy under the governance of communist governments to re-occupy the moral high ground since 1990s. Now in some Eastern European Countries, the polarization of wealth and sluggish economic development have generated graved dissatisfaction among ordinary people towards democracy and market economy again. The appeal for socialist policy and termination of political disputes among political parties has gained increasing dynamics over time. It is a sad but true fact that every theory may go wrong when putting into practical environment as the practitioners are human beings who may err or corrupt as all human beings do. Belief in the absolute superiority of an ideology for its "par value" is ridiculous especially for a society where people are highly divided and lacking the necessary cultural tradition for is implementation.

5.5   Hypocrisy Hijack and Double Standard Problem

As mentioned in section 3.3, justice is not assured by democracy. In fact. Fairly speaking, justice is not

assured by any ideology at practical level. We may even presume that only hypocrisy is a universal phenomenon regarding the behavior of all politicians. However, people are always persuaded by politicians and their loyal followers to believe that justice is by default the core element of a certain ideology they propagate. In such case, the ideology corrupts into the "tyranny of hypocrite". Apparently, it is not difficult to check if a person, a party, or a country is hypocritical by putting side by side the standards applied in making judgment regarding similar behavior of different entities including allies and enemies. When double standard is adopted, all the words expressively revealed and gestures openly exhibited are just hypocritical actions intended for fooling people around. Unfortunately, the truth is not easy to be uncovered or discovered at practical level as facts can be covered, twisted or distorted with strong propaganda machine, at least for "all the people some of the time or some of the people all the time".

It should be noted that the "tyranny of hypocrite" can even override the majority rule. In the movements organized by the radical faction of social activists claiming for fighting for the equality and human rights of minority groups or vulnerable social groups, they openly demand preferential rights for the compensation of their "suffering" by prototyping themselves unanimously the victims of suppression, exploitation or discrimination. Actually, they are by nature a sub-category of extremists but they take advantages of the tragic and miserable history of their members in the past and some separate and independent current issues as supporting evidences to underlie their stereotyping theory which simply defines victims and victimizers by their social identity such as race, sex, religion, social class, sex orientation and so on. With the endorsement of politicians and hypocrites, they occupy the moral high ground and thus be able to make open vow for unjust privileges, in the extremest case, at the sacrifice of the interest of majority. Though they only represent very few people but they form the noisiest and most visible pressure groups in the society, Sometimes the tyranny of hypocrite is more dangerous than the tyranny of other kinds for their apparent image of the weak and suppressed vulnerable social group.

End of Section 5

6. PREREQUISITES FOR DEMOCRACY

Some democracy hardliners refuse to accept that there are prerequisites for democracy but the the numerous failures are self-explaining. Impetuousness is very often the   main reason accounting for the failure of democracy. Too many rivalry political parties competing with each other in the name of fighting for democracy spring up in a short period of time for the realization of genuine democracy always give rise to chaos or civil war. The western world had once gave a very high evaluation and expectations to the Arabic Spring but now becomes more reserved and hesitated when the anti-west factions rise to power under the voting system pursuant to majority rule in the election. In brief, in the absence of some critical favorable external and internal factors, the success of democracy in a place is unimaginable.

6.1 External Factors

From the pragmatic point of view, it does not make any logical sense for a government to adopt a "helping you to defeat us" foreign policy.   If democracy has all those merits as propagated, helping a foreign country to undergo the democratization process will definitely create a strong rival being capable of changing the status quo (i.e. current political order) and threatening the interest of the helper in the future. As a matter of fact, the paradoxical strategy of "we come to help you by bombing you" is more often employed by the super power in modern history. Otherwise, "helping you to fight against my enemy" is another.

Moreover, a civil government cannot function properly when it is under the intervention, invasion or occupation by external force. There is no exception even though the external force comes from a democratic country. Foreign intervention in any form is only regarded as intrusion by domestic people and give rise to nationalism and terrorism. Chicago University scholar Robert Pape has made an analysis of suicide terrorism from a strategic, social, and psychological point of view in his book- "Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism" based on data compiled from 315 suicide terrorism attacks around the world from 1980 through 2003. Except 14 incidents, all the attacks in 18 categories shared two elements in common: (1) a foreign occupation, and (2) by a democracy. Only one of the 10 groups shared a religion with the occupiers: the Kurdistan Workers' Party in Turkey. "The bottom line, then, is that suicide terrorism is mainly a response to foreign occupation ". He thus drew a conclusion: "Religion plays a role in suicide terrorism, but mainly in the context of national resistance" and not Islam per se but "the dynamics of   of religious difference" are what matter" .

In the light that resistance is an inevitable phenomenon in response to foreign intervention, we may further infer that a country under strong foreign intervention must be in war state or pseudo war state under which democracy as a form of civil government is unable to develop. Alexis de Tocqueville said: "All those who seek to destroy the liberties of a democratic nation ought to know that war is the surest and shortest means to accomplish it." As to an ethical political leader, war is only justified when it is proven to be the indispensable means to end a miserable state even worse than war such as genocide. Nevertheless, war is always abused by the strong in bullying the weak for whatever reason. Humanitarian action including the termination of massacre or genocide is the best alibi. A Belgian journalist and historian Michel Collon has outlined five principles driving war propaganda in his book "

1. Obscure one's economic interests;
2. Appear humanitarian in work and motivations;
3. Obscure history;

4. Demonize the enemy; and
5. Monopolize the flow of information.

His discovery is in line with the underlying principles of   Machiavelli's   power politics which presume that there can never be a benevolent politician, especially those from foreign countries. Even an ordinary person who is mature enough should understand that there is no free lunch in the world. Apart from launching military attack or direct occupation, there are various kinds of intervention of different degree for an external power to impose its influence into the domestic affairs of a country but we have reasons to assume that foreign aid for domestic democracy movement is most likely to be a sweet poison as a mean of   "destroying you by helping you" policy for politicians.

Perhaps there are really philanthropists in the world, but in no way they are politicians or top executives of government funded bodies. Furthermore, good intention alone without necessary wisdom and sophistication may result in   unforeseen bad consequence. This old wisdom is summed up in a frequently quoted idiom: "The road to hell is paved with good intentions". Even though some foreign white knights represented by journalist, commentators, and members of NGOs are sincere and faithful to their belief in democracy, their involvement always create more disasters to domestic people for their sense of supremacy and ignorance of the local history and social background.

In all senses, it is absolutely a ridiculous fantasy for anyone to assume foreign aid a favorable external factor for the development of democracy.

6.2 Internal Factors

6.2.1 Morality and Faith As the Core Value for Democracy

Former US President John Kennedy in a famous speech said, "Don't ask what your country can do for you ask what you can do for your country" . His integrity or sincerity is not our concern but the saying should be valued for what it is worth and his guts did out perform those politicians who only please the majority by giving them irredeemable promises of rights and benefits.

Factual evidences manifest that   both the knowledge in democracy and civic sense of the general public is deteriorating in the last decade. The radical   faction of pan-democracy alliance should be responsible for it. They emphasize only on the rights but mention little about responsibilities. They promise too much for and on behalf of a "one person one vote" system to the public but actually sensible persons do not see any solid and constructive ideas from them for solving the current socioeconomic problems which they blame and attribute to the evil of the current political system.   Certainly, the behavior of some privileged class should be condemned and contained, but their wrong doings should be clearly identified based on factual evidence with good reasons. Wrong doings should never be rectified by another kind of wrong doing such as the tyranny of majority or the tyranny of the radical. The rights and interest of the mass, majority or even vulnerable is not unlimited. Without Self-restrain and self-awareness, a member of the society cannot be a sensible and responsible citizen. Pursuant to the fundamental principles of democracy, endurance and concession are parts of its core value. The following are two famous quote from Alex Tocqueville:

1. "The health of a democratic society may be measured by the quality of functions performed by private citizens." and

2. "Liberty cannot be established without morality, nor morality without faith."

His concept was nothing new to the practice of democracy. In all classical work on liberty and human right by St Augustine, Hobbs, Lockes, Montesquieu, Rousseau, etc. from the Renaissance through the enlightenment until now, the extent and limit of personal right and liberty in contrast to the general will reflected in the rule of government had been thoroughly discussed. The pursuit of boundless freedom only bring about endless confrontations and ultimately a chaotic state in which all people enjoy less liberty in consequence.

It should also be noted that education level is not necessarily to be positively related to the good virtue of citizens. When emphasis is put on the acquirement of knowledge and skill for the pursuit of personal interest while ethical principles are neglected, we only have more and more high caliber citizens competing for wealth and power at the sacrifice of losers. Their philosophy is summed up in an unforgettable statement made by a character Gordon Gekko created based mainly on the biography of a security trader Michael Melken in a Hollywood film in 1987: "Greed is good" . The dramatic challenge to the traditional ethics was temporarily curbed after the collapse of junk bond market in 1989 and the subsequent conviction and imprisonment of Melken. However, in the following 20 years, the open challenge to traditional ethics evolved into "Greed is legal", which emphasizes on the compliance of law in the pursuit of unrestrained greed by getting around the loopholes of law. "Legal greed" is thus used as the alibi for their unethical behavior.

In practical sense, law written in technical jargon is difficult for people to comprehend, interpret, follow and execute. On the one hand, it is the precipitation of the wisdom of many intelligent persons but on the other hand it also comprises of many conflicted ideas from various contributors. It is only suitable for dealing with rather extreme delinquent behaviors which can be easily identified for crossing the red line set under general consensus beyond all reasonable doubts. The everyday behavior of most western people is actually governed by their personal ethics shaped by their religious faith. Without ethical value being the core of justice serving as the foundation of law, "rule of law" is just an empty concept or tautological in philosophical terms. The "rule of law", in correct sense, is just the implementation of the "rule of righteousness" or "rule of justice" with the authority of temporal power. Being a secondary value coerced and secured by power, it is not a self evident axiom. Hence, law can be unjust and its rule may be failing.(See 4.3) if the power corrupts. In such cases, the "rule of law" may corrupt into the "rule of hypocrisy", "rule of law professionals" or "rule of the tyranny of majority". If the "rule of law" can be equated with the "rule of justice", the advocate of civic disobedience(公民抗命) by some people, mainly the pro-democracy and pro-west people, should have lost their grounds. Nevertheless, at the same time, they praise the "rule of law" and flatter this derived principle to be the core value of a civilized society while denounce and connect morality to the "rule by person"(人治) or "rule of righteousness (禮治). Their ulterior motive is obvious. China, especially in the past, is known to be the "land of righteousness " (禮義之邦). The "rule of righteousness" is also misspelled as the "rule of ceremony and ritualism", which is a corrupted implementation of the "rule of righteousness" (comparable to the "rule of the tyranny of majority" as a corrupted implementation of the "rule of democracy" or the "rule of hypocrisy" as to the "rule of law". The highly diverged evaluation to the two different mode of governance is obviously a propaganda to praise the advancement of the western civilization.(See also Section 4.3）and belittle the Chinese culture so as to outstand the supremacy of their views and profile as the social elite as well.

To take a step back, assuming that they are sincere, they are only aware of the governmental control which is the formal structure of human society but neglect the role of religion which entails an informal

social structure regulating the social behavior of people in western countries. An overwhelming majority of their people pray several times a day and go to church on Sunday. Religious activities form a major part of their private and social life. The influence of the ethical value of the religion they worship, mainly Christianity, on their behavior is even more far reaching than Confucianism, Buddhism and Daoism on Chinese. When talking about morality, faith and good virtue, in fact, we see that western and orient culture converge on the advocate of all the good qualities of human beings including temperance (restraint 克己） and justice (return to righteousness 復禮) for the regulation of desires. The evolution of "Greed is good" into "Greed is legal" illustrate that the rule of law can be nullified by high caliber persons and the textual content of law can even be used to rationalize their unjust benefits if morality and faith is no longer recognized and held as the core value. Anyone who sees and advocates that rule of law should be the core value of Hong Kong is either telling a big lie intended for fooling people or ignorant about the western civilization because they do not realize the importance of Christianity and morality which are the two critical elements that constitute the core value of western society.(Note 6.1)

Note:

6.1 Christianity and Morality: In the Catholic catechism , the Seven Christian Virtues （七樞德） refers to the union of two sets of virtues. The four Cardinal virtues , from ancient Greek philosophy, are Prudence , Justice, Temperance (or Restraint), and Courage (or Fortitude). The three Theological virtues , from the letters of St. Paul of Tarsus , are Faith , Hope, and Charity (or Love). These were adopted by the Church Fathers as the Seven Virtues.

6.2.2 Protection of Minority Interest

Without the sense of self-restrain for the regulation of personal rights and freedom, democracy is nothing more than the tyranny of majority which arbitrarily trespasses the interest of minority in the name of majority rule. In turn it invokes the resistance or revenge from the minority. The tyranny of majority will finally end up with rivalry parties confronting each other with violence in a "state of nature" where only jungle rule governs as described in the literature by Hobbes, Locke and Montesquieu, then falling into the infinite loop of "wow for democracy", lengthened chaos, rise of strong man, restoration of momentary order under strict and harsh governance. In brief, it is a vicious cycle of the "tyranny of dictator" and the "tyranny of majority".

In the Middle East, Africa, South East Asia and Latin America, typical examples of this vicious cycle can be found easily. A century ago, similar chaos took place in China, which ended up with a nation wide civil war. Among all outcomes, one thing is absolutely certain. When in chaos or civil war, let alone the betterment of people's livelihood, people's lives are not even assured. Not to mention rising up as a reputable and respectful country in the world, a splitting country and its people can hardly maintain its dignity and independence before invading counties. The older generation are the eye witnesses for that miserable period while they lost many family members, relatives and friends on account of endless chaos and wars. Based on official figures, more than 30 million people or about 10% of the population died during the Sino-Japanese War. Every old person of their generation share more or less same bitter experience. Perhaps it was too remote to the younger generations but we have the responsibility to remind them of the risk of political struggle and the danger of radicalism. In history, domestic chaos and civil wars caused much more casualties than invasion wars. In the famous Three Kingdoms period, china lost more than 90% of its population. There is no exception for western countries, during the Civil War

of United States, the casualties in absolute terms far exceeds those caused by other wars including WWII albeit the then population was much smaller.

6.2.3 Presence of Eligible Political Leaders

The domination of popularity doctrine in organizing political movements only reflects the deterioration of the quality of political leaders. Let alone statesman, not even politician can be found in the current environment because most of the activists lack vision or political wisdom that can unite the people of Hong Kong and lead them to get out of the severe split due to fanatic sentiment towards every issue. Struggle for power seems to be the core of the action plan of the democracy alliance. Nevertheless, it should be noted that in the absence of right candidates for heading the government, the democratic electoral system alone is unable to be working properly. Without Moses, the Israelites would have all been drowned in the Red Sea or killed by the Egyptian army even they had an advanced democratic system. Take South Africa as example, they are relatively luckier than other African countries because they have a great charismatic political leader at the most critical moment when the ethnic majority regained political power from their former white colonists. Mr Mandela stopped massive revenge on the white people who were identified unanimously to be guilty of racial discrimination and exploitation by both the domestic and international society. In spite of the peaceful handover for the great wisdom of Mr Mandela, the socio-economic context as well as the political environment have been going down in terms of economic growth, employment, public order, etc. The lack of successors having the vision and wisdom as their former leader is the instant cause while the lack of mature political culture is the root cause.

An excellent political leader is neither a salesperson nor a street fighter. He can only be met without resort（可遇不可求）. Both the nature and nurture are equally important for the emergency of a great leader. Only all the objective conditions constitute a suitable environment for the breeding of political leaders and there is a pool of high caliber candidates, the right person may have the chance to prove himself the good leader after surviving all the challenges and overcoming all the hardships in the course of competition. Ironically, easy, safe and comfortable environment tend to erode the will and courage of a person. It also fails to provide an effective mechanism for screening away the unqualified players. In history, political leaders like Gandhi and Mandela were great because they not only endured incredible suffering including unfair trial and imprisonment, but also exhibited their guts, vision and wisdom in striving for their political ideal. In Hong Kong, up to this moment, all the prominent political figures, including those appear to be very radical are only playing safe political games relying on the favorable domestic and international political climate. It seems that few of them are prepared to be a martyr like Gandhi or Mandela. In this sense, frankly speaking, they are political actors/actress rather than political leaders. On the other hand, some immature or ignorant people are motivated by their opinions to take really radical actions including violence that harms themselves and other people.

6.2.4 Effective, Efficient but Sensible Public Surveillance

Apparently, democracy facilitates public surveillance. While public surveillance relies heavily on the traditional mass media for the collection and reporting of true, accurate, objective and impartial information, the independence and professional ethics of journalists are therefore important. However, after years of bankruptcy, merging and taking-over for keen competition, the ownership of mass media have been centralized in the hands of a few tycoons of communication industry, especially for the multinational news agencies. Though journalists always claim to the public that they are strictly abiding by the code of ethics for their profession, the precondition for its realization of separation of management

and ownership is not guaranteed because of the following reasons:
1. The adherence to the code is basically a voluntary behavior and the organizations which lay down the protocols usually do   not have the statutory power to enforce them.
2. The development of communication industry has driven small mass media firms away from the market. Once and again, the quality of readers or audience is the ultimate cause accounting for the death of small but responsible independent mass media.
3. It is unrealistic to expect the principles of truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, impartiality, fairness and public accountability can supersede the profit making motive of shareholders and free from the influence of those tycoons who hold controlling equity of the mass media under the framework of gigantic corporation.
4. We also cannot expect an employee bites the hand that feeds him, and so does a journalist. Even a journalist is insisting a view different to the stance of the consortium behind a mass medium, he rather chooses an employer sharing views more in common with him than staying with a fierce boss. The iteration process entails a natural selection in the long run. Hence, the political stance of mass media is in fact not a secret.

Some reputable news agencies which either owned by consortium having less political inclination or financed by public fund claim that they are neutral and objective. This may be true in treating domestic news of their home base countries but hardly to be valid for issues involving foreign countries. Ignorance about the background and cultural divergences are always the adverse factors that prevent foreign journalists from making a fair observation and narration without bias. The prejudice arising from sense of superiority and national interest are inevitable for western journalists. In light of the domination of west media firms in the communication industry in the last century, the western countries have established the hegemony of discourse as well as the hegemony of culture in the modern world. The western value has eroded the tradition and culture of the rest of the world. Under such macro-environment, public opinion is shaped or even manipulated either intentionally or unintentionally by the western propaganda in favor of the western culture.

It seems that the internet has changed the world by ending the domination of traditional media firms in communication industry and giving all individuals a platform to air their views but the emergence of cyber world is indeed a double blade sword to freedom of opinion. In a context where internet goers and commentators are granted unprecedented degree of freedom, the Tocqueville's concern about the quality of functions performed by private citizens has never be so real and imminent. False and prejudiced information has diluted, neutralized or overshadowed the true, fair and just information. Again, the deregulated freedom on internet bring us back to the very basic problem of democracy, i.e. the control of self government. Freedom of speech and press on internet only facilitates public surveillance but does not guarantee its quality. Without a substantial fraction of sensible and responsible citizens in the society, both in the real and cyber world, effective mass surveillance is not possible but only cause an even more chaotic state.

6.2.5   Comprehensive Civic Education

It is   beyond all reasonable doubts to say that the cultivation of good virtue is the mission of education and good citizenship as a good quality of human beings as social animals is a prerequisite of democracy as we mentioned in Section 6.2.1. However, when two concepts are put together, controversy arises. The massive objection（at least it appeared to be very massive in visibility and loudness）to the launch of moral and national education is an example but also obscure in logical sense.   During the time of British governance, there was occasionally similar subjects like civic or moral education taught at primary and

junior secondary level. Being an invader and conqueror by default, the British colonial government knew very well that they could not mention anything about national identity which surely caused the resentment among the indigenous people. And, even in the western countries, their governments avoid using explicit terms which may be directly connected to nationalism which was one of the major cause for the two wars and the resistance to their disgraceful invasion in the last five centuries of the rest of the world. National education simply means the education for the citizen of a country rather than a specific subject comprising of designated content and missions. However, indeed they are launching nationalistic education in a rather subtle way, eg. teaching the subject matter under the name of civic education, which is a less controversial caption. In addition, glorification of the history, culture, people and achievements of their nation is always permeated skillfully and deliberately in all kinds of activities of which some are done by enthusiastic citizens voluntarily while some by government aided organizations. With no doubt the icons of national glory deliberately appear in news report, commercial and economic activities, academic awards, international humanity projects, and also entertainment programs. Frankly speaking, all these behaviors are natural and understandable. Perhaps some ordinary people are apathetic to these informations or unable to perceive the strong passion therein on account of their language illiteracy. To our astonishment, the leaders of opposition movement who are well versed of foreign language hold double standard regarding this issue. They ignore or hide the fact that civic education which aims at enhancing the nationalistic sentiment of youth is included in the school curriculum and also propagated to the general public through various channels in various forms in the western Democratic countries. There is also an increasing vow for launching "intentional programs" catering for school goers. The following is cited from Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy:

"From the 1960s until the 1980s, empirical questions concerning civic education were relatively neglected, mainly because of a prevailing assumption that intentional programs would not have significant and durable effects, given the more powerful influences of social class and ideology (Cook, 1985). Since then, many research studies and program evaluations have found substantial effects, and most social scientists who study the topic now believe that educational practices, such as discussion of controversial issues, hands-on action, and reflection, can influence students (Sherrod, Torney-Purta & Flanagan, 2010).

The philosophical questions have been less explored, but they are essential. For example:

1. Who has the full rights and obligations of a citizen? This question is especially contested with regard to children, immigrant aliens, and individuals who have been convicted of felonies.
2. In what communities ought we see ourselves as citizens? The nation-state is not the only candidate; some people see themselves as citizens of local geographical communities, organizations, movements, loosely-defined groups, or even the world as a whole.
3. What responsibilities does a citizen of each kind of community have? Do all members of each community have the same responsibilities, or ought there be significant differences, for example, between elders and children, or between leaders and other members?
4. What is the relationship between a good regime and good citizenship? Aristotle held that there were several acceptable types of regimes, and each needed different kinds of citizens. That makes the question of good citizenship relative to the regime-type. But other theorists have argued for particular combinations of regime and citizen competence. For example, classical liberals endorsed regimes that would make relatively modest demands on citizens, both because they were skeptical that people could rise to higher demands and because they wanted to safeguard individual liberty against the state. Civic republicans

have seen a certain kind of citizenship--highly active and deliberative--as constitutive of a good life, and therefore recommend a republican regime because it permits good citizenship.

5. Who may decide what constitutes good citizenship? If we consider, for example, students enrolled in public schools in the United States, should the decision about what values, habits, and capabilities they should learn belong to their parents, their teachers, the children themselves, the local community, the local or state government, or the nation-state? We may reach different conclusions when thinking about 5-year-olds and adult college students. As Sheldon Wolin warned: "…[T]he inherent danger…is that the identity given to the collectivity by those who exercise power will reflect the needs of power rather than the political possibilities of a complex collectivity" (1989, 13). For some regimes—fascist or communist, for example—this is not perceived as a danger at all but, instead, the very purpose of their forms of civic education. In democracies, the question is more complex because public institutions may have to teach people to be good democratic citizens, but they can decide to do so in ways that reinforce the power of the state and reduce freedom.

6. What means of civic education are ethically appropriate? It might, for example, be effective to punish students who fail to memorize patriotic statements, or to pay students for community service, but the ethics of those approaches would be controversial. An educator might engage students in open discussions of current events because of a commitment to treating them as autonomous agents, regardless of the consequences. As with other topics, the proper relationship between means and ends is contested.

These questions are rarely treated together as part of comprehensive theories of civic education; instead, they arise in passing in works about politics or education. Some of these questions have never been much explored by professional philosophers, but they arise frequently in public debates about citizenship."

The above discussion manifests that civic education in USA touches the same topics including politics and patriotism which the proposed curriculum of "moral and national education" covers. Similar debates do take place in other western democratic countries. However, the domestic government has tried to use the most controversial approach to launch the civic education program under a controversial subject title without thorough discussion   beforehand. In the end, it gave rise to an opposition movement which was used and hijacked by the separationist and localists. The issue may be regarded as one of the best example for the worst public relation disaster.

Again, being residents old enough to experience social and student movements in mid 20 century after world war II in which participants were seeking their national identity against a colonial government, we do not understand why and how patriotism has become a negative quality of citizens in the mindset of some younger generations. Nobody can escape the social identification problem which is one of the renowned three socialization processes according to the social identity theory of Henri Tajfels, namely the social categorification, social identification and social comparison. Some people may acquire a secondary social identity by means of nurture such as education, contribution or achievement but the primary social identity at the core is inherent by descendent upon birth. For example, natural characteristics like race, sex and social class are those default factors determining the primary social identity of a person. Whether the social group to which an entity belong gives glory or shame is not subject to the free choice of the entity per se. Nationality has a dual meaning which is primarily a label of racial origin and can be a legitimated social identity by acquisition. The former is unable to be changed

Ref.: um-blogger/20140501/Myths of Democracy

by the later. It is understood that denying or claiming to be a group member is seeking to enhance one's self-image by getting rid of the negative elements of a certain social group and outstanding the positive elements of another. Nevertheless, it is a quite childish and naive behavior to think that a Chinese speaking person bearing a Chinese face can deny himself a Chinese by simply claiming that he is not especially for those people who possess little knowledge in western civilization and very limited literacy in foreign language. Except those politicians who apparently admit such behavior for untold reasons, nobody take it serious. The psychological state of the claimant is most likely to be irrational and emotional. A frank but sad interpretation of the act of claiming to be "out-group" is the exhibit of "competition phobia" （Anychiphobia in psychological terms）for some domestic people when the myth of the supremacy of Hong Kong people is busted by cruel facts. The economic development of mainland in the last four decades has not only narrowed the general income gap between the two places but the big spending of the foremost neo rich who were formerly the poor neighborers have caused some domestic people feeling uncomfortable. In addition to the deterioration of economic status, the people of Hong Kong are facing all round competition with people coming from northern region in all sectors. The sad but true fact is that Hong Kong people are losing their edge in the keen competition. The non-JUPAS students, mainly composed of mainland students have topped the GPA list of undergraduate studies in the local universities and they account for an ever larger portion of enrollment of the post graduate courses or research programs. Mainlanders also start to take up more middle to senior working posts in the labor market. The influx of mainland entrepreneurs and their capital have changed the stake of the capital market which results in the larger say and influence of market players from the other side of the border. It is too hard for some domestic people to accept that people coming from a less advanced region can perform even better. Therefore, claiming the superiority of institutional establishment originated from the western civilization and the attempt to reinforce the differences by identifying themselves "out-group" may be regarded as the last struggle of some desperate local residents to maintain their self-esteem. When the sentiment goes extreme, it mutates into localism or separationism which does no help to enhance the competibility of domestic people indeed.

Since the decline of Ching Dynasty until 70s, the activists of social and student movements including the domestic youth had faith in the future of China when the situation was even worse. They chose to identify themselves members of Chinese people and determined to contribute to the reinstatement of the glory of their mother country. Their strong passion was pure, natural, voluntary and self-motivated probably because almost all Chinese were identified to be members of an inferior race by "arrogant" Westerners regardless of their ability and education during this period of time. The discrimination of "out-group" cause all Chinese people to identify themselves to be "in-group". As we explained in Section 6.1, it does not make any sense for foreign politicians to help another country to "improve" its internal politics which may make it richer and stronger in the future. Nowadays, under the current international political climate, splitting Chinese people into rivalry groups surely means some kinds of benefits to a lot of countries and produces adverse effect on the "Renaissance of Chinese civilization". The intention of those "benevolent" but arrogant foreign politicians behind the support of domestic social movement is thus not absolutely doubtless.

The opposition activists usually resort their theoretical rationales to the western theories but they probably ignore the existence of contradictory voices in the western societies. Since the 911 terrorist attack, the voice demanding for promoting patriotism has become louder and clearer. Factual evidences have proven that the western governments have made corresponding policies to endorse the appeal, for instance, the enactment of the "USA Patriot Act" (Note 6.2) initialized by the former US president George Bush. Furthermore, time does not dilute the demand for stronger patriotism among people. Based on the official information released by the US Education Department, "as part of President Obama's

education agenda, the Department of Education (ED) envisions a nationwide commitment to preparing all students for citizenship as informed, engaged and responsible members of our society." (source: http://www.ed.gov/civic-learning). Certainly, patriotism as a less rational element of citizenship, still finds its place amid the concepts of liberty and human rights under democracy.

Perhaps the subject matter of the curriculum of moral and national education is deemed to be too biased to the establishment and launched under a bad subject title but we think that it is groundless for any person in the society to denounce the value of citizenship including patriotism in a broader sense and reject the promotion of it through the process of education no matter how clumsy the approach of implementation is.

Notes:

6.2 USA Patriot Act: "Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism Act of 2001" 《美國愛國者法案》was initiated by the Former US President George Bush and enacted by the Congress on Oct 26, 2001

6.3 Civic Education in US:
> source: http://www.ed.gov/civic-learning

End of Section 6

7. IMPLICATIONS OF THE MYTHICAL THOUGHT OF DEMOCRACY TO SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Democracy is not just a system of formalities and ritualities. In the absence of the prerequisites such as a long democratic tradition, comprehensive civic education and considerable quantity of sensible and responsible citizens, a democratic system may corrupt into variants of tyranny as all other regimes. In the worst case, the social and political conflicts burst into violent confrontation or war. Moreover, the strong sentiment of the domestic democracy activists against the Chinese government can be easily associated with the separation insurrections or anti-China league. Though it seems to ordinary people that there is no solid evidence for proving that they have substantial connection with the extremists or terrorists, their behavior may be used for aiding the separation movements which are deemed to be a direct and hostile challenge to the state sovereignty and the well being of ordinary people, thus further undermining the mutual trust between them and the central government. Fairly speaking, some of these activities cross the red line as prescribed in the treason or state security law of a normal country, including the western democratic countries.

Some populists, humanists, feminists and environmentalists have hijacked democracy and the "rule of law" to offer some certain social groups generous benefits or preferential rights, their activities have induced severe resentment among those good, honest and hard working people. In short, when the majority rule overshadows all minority interest, it ends up with the tyranny of majority. When the protection of minority interest or the fight for fairness of the vulnerable corrupt into the pursuit of preferential rights that infringes the interest of the majority, it ends up with the tyranny of hypocrite. When every social groups claim that they represent justice and refuse to recognize and cooperate with the government led by administrative chief belonging to another rivalry party even though he or she is elected via a pre-agreed and legitimated process, it ends up with the tyranny of barbarian. When rivalry parties arbitrarily use radical means including violence to achieve their aims, it ends up with the tyranny of mob. All of these outcomes are featured by the dominance of violence and radicalism.

We aware of the proposition of "true suffrage" and "true democracy" by some aggressive democracy activists who insist to allow popular involvement in the forthcoming election. As we explain in previous paragraphs, much of their believes are just groundless myths. With their radical standard for true democracy, notwithstanding the most outstanding western democratic countries are not qualified to be the genuine practitioners of democracy. Ironically, the systems prevail in some small countries in northern and Eastern Europe are even closer to the true democracy they propagate but most of them are suffering from various kinds of chaos or problems in governance for the existence of unresolvable social conflicts. We have reasons to suspect the viability of the so-called true democracy in the current context.

On the other hand, the conservative mind of the establishment and their indulgence of the rent seeking behavior of the elite class including the rich, blue blood, technical bureaucrats and professional people have created a hotbed for the growth of extremist thought among ordinary people. Rule of law and economic principles are used as the pretexts for rationalizing the unjust seizure of social resources by these privileged classes in the light that the institutional establishment including the legal and economic system are by default biased to them as free and fair competition is actually undermined by policies and legislation in favor of gigantic corporations possessing monopoly power in the market for the reasons of regulation, enhancement of service quality or else. If these "legal greed" are not contained, there will be a even bigger market place for the spreading of radical thought.

By taking advantages of the wide spreading grievances arising from the highly divided society, these rent

seekers including both the privileged class and the visible and noisy social groups are maximizing their unjust interest by picking up and abusing some high sounding social, economic, political or metaphysical concepts like democracy, freedom, human rights, rule of law, free market competition, private ownership and so on arbitrarily for the satisfaction of their unrestrained desires. Our city is gradually transformed into an M-shaped society featured by severe polarization. The various poll tests on the public support of government which did not conform to a binomial distribution but were found unusually high figures on two extremes have provided us a solid proof for the polarization process. Even the benefit maximizing behavior arising from the polarization do not involve any organized political conspiracy, the objective effects on the society is disastrous. People divide into rivalry parties competing for exclusive tangible social resources and conflicted intangible rights in an irrational and unconcessional manner. The gain of one party always means the loss of others. Even worse, the fight is not limited to a zero sum game but a total dead loss of the social well beings. The radical behavior of extremists, doctrinists and fundamentalists on the utmost ends of every social group in turn further incite their rivals to go to the other extreme in retaliation. Finally, the divergence of views and conflicts of interest among different social groups have caused the society to split into pieces resulting in the difficulties of governance which is unable to be resolved simply by a "real democratic system" deviced by "real referendum" as propagated. On the contrary, we are moving closer towards a chaotic state in which the society is suffering from a vicious cycle of "riots against dictatorship for democracy" and "restoration of social order by authoritarian leadership against the tyranny of mob".

In the last few centuries, the western countries have developed some kinds of mechanism to overcome part of the shortcomings of democracy while many problems remain unresolved. However, they reduce the whole system into a "one person one vote" universal suffrage system , export this over-simplified concept to the rest of the world, and tell all people that this system is capable of improving their current situation. Based on this information, pro-democracy advocates tend to believe that everything will be better off once democracy is adopted while evidences found in countries outside Western Europe and North America show that this is not true. The beautiful picture of democracy envisioned by many democratic movement activists is only founded on the ground of myths. As to the followers of this ideology in the rest of the world, a practical problem is that the democracy prevails in Western countries is not just so simple as what they propagate. Their genuineness is also not unquestionable. At most they are by nature some kinds of benevolent aristocracy where privileged class still dominate their societies and enjoy most of the national resources. Democracy in practical mode shares with all temporal political systems the same nature and functions which constitute a formal, nominal and institutional state machine for the facilitation of the governance of the ruling class over the rest of people. Whenever people are divided into the ruling class and the ruled class suppression, exploitation and power abuse will be inevitable. The chaos, genocide, terrorist attacks and civil wars in Africa, middle East, Latin America, South East Asia and Eastern Europe are factual evidences demonstrating the severe consequence of the implementation of such utopian principle in the absence of necessary preconditions for the proper functioning of democracy.

End of Section 7

8. CONCLUSION

In spite of all the myths and shortcomings of democracy, we must admit that there may be currently no better ideologies available in the world which is so promising in the pursuit of personal freedom, dignity and equality. This conviction is best represented by the Winston Churchill's famous dictum with heavy sarcasm cited in Section 4.9 which apparently says that democracy is the worst form of government in the world but actually demeans all other political systems by saying that they are even worse (Democracy is the worst form of government in the world, except for all those others that have been tried from time to time). Albeit only very few democratic countries appear to be successful in practicing democracy, its demonstration effect and influence is magnificent. However, from a pragmatic and practical point of view, people are too brave and over-optimistic to tell that the whole world are ready for the migration to the current political system of a few western countries, let alone the accomplishment of the ideal type of democracy in theory.

Years of our personal experience in dealing with all walks of life is indeed very discouraging. We tend to accept that democracy is an end instead of the means to achieve itself. To our best understanding of democracy, we realize that it may recognize a good leader, endorse a right decision, or remove a bad government head from his office but very often fails to arrive at sensible solutions to practical problems. **The success of democracy relies heavily on the good virtue of almost the entire population or at least a considerable portion of population whereas autocracy or aristocracy can function well with just a small fraction of benevolent and competent ruling elites. Theoretically speaking, the implementation of democracy is more difficult than other political system.**

More than two thousands year ago, by expressing his admiration for the "commonwealth of great unity" (大同之治) which was a hybrid of democracy and socialism prevailing in the protohistory period of China, Confusius revealed his political ideal and explained his concession to the reality in a dialogue with his students after attending a ceremony. In the second part of his discourse, he humbly confessed that his competence was unable to realize the legendary political system. Back to the real world, he chose to accept the prevailing political order of the "peaceful and prosperous society" (小康之治） under the governance of aristocracy led by feudal princes who collectively recognized the supreme position of the king as their co-leader. The chaotic state of those countries pursuing democracy mentioned in previous paragraphs can best reflect the great wisdom of Confusious who envisaged the disaster resulted from aiming too high at an idealistic political system while neglecting the lack of necessary preconditions for accomplishing it including the presence of eligible political leaders and a significant quantity of moral population. We have no intention to advocate a political system back to the time of Confusius but his practical or pragmatic manner towards the political reality should be valued and observed.

With democracy as one of the many goals of the social life of human beings, we should be working hard towards the establishment of democratic culture which should encompass the respect of rationality, protection of the minority interest, belief in peace and toleration of deviant views under the master rule of majority other than boundless freedom and human rights. Nevertheless, **the representativeness of the nominees should be increased along with the enhancement of the morality and civic sense of the general public through an stepwise evolutionary process instead of a radical revolutionary reform.** The understanding and faithful adherence to all the fundamental principles (or the core values) by most of the people supported by factual evidence are the prerequisites for practicing democracy and approaching closer to its theoretical ideal type. All the radical ideas of boundless freedom, unrestrained human rights, great leap forward or shock therapy are highly risky as proven by the failures of many countries in which the democratic movements are hijacked by extremists in the last few decades. On the

other hand, ignoring the public vow for fairness, justice, liberty and all other equitable human rights is stupid as it will add fuel to the radical democratic movement.

End of Article