

FROM AUTOCRACY TO DEMOCRACY TO TECHNOCRACY

An Evolution of Human Polity

Victor N. Shaw

From Autocracy to Democracy to Technocracy

From Autocracy to Democracy to Technocracy:

An Evolution of Human Polity

By

Victor N. Shaw

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



From Autocracy to Democracy to Technocracy:
An Evolution of Human Polity

By Victor N. Shaw

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Victor N. Shaw

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-5949-1

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-5949-3

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Part I. Human Agent.....	3
1. Individuals and Individuality.....	4
2. Wills and Governability	13
3. Utterances and Controllability.....	22
4. Acts and Activity.....	31
Part II. Autocracy	41
5. Form	42
6. Content	52
7. Operation.....	63
8. Impact.....	73
Part III. Democracy	83
9. Form	84
10. Content	95
11. Operation.....	106
12. Impact.....	117
Part IV. Technocracy.....	129
13. Form	130
14. Content	142
15. Operation.....	154
16. Impact.....	166
Part V. Human Agency.....	179
17. Collectives and Collectivity	180
18. Potentials and Potentiality	191
19. Rationales and Rationality.....	201
20. Actions and Consequentiality.....	212
Conclusion.....	223
References	228
Index.....	245

INTRODUCTION

Humans are gregarious. They live in groups, organizations, communities, and nation-states. As they interact with one another in groupings, humans develop rules, codes, procedures, and mechanisms to regulate behavior, conduct business, and maintain order. Along with directions, regulations, laws, measures, and protocols, there emerge networks, structures, and hierarchies that divide but organize, categorize nonetheless unite, and specialize yet generalize individuals for differential access to resources, opportunities, and privileges in work and life.

This book explores human polity with respect to its nature, context, and evolution. Specifically, it examines how individual wills translate into political beliefs, visions, and ideologies; investigates what social forces converge to shape and reshape political arrangements, configurations, and institutions; and probes whether human polity necessarily progresses from autocracy to democracy to technocracy. Five general hypotheses are entertained throughout the volume. The first is commonsensical: Where there are people there is politics. The second is analogous: Humans govern themselves socially in a way that is comparable to how a body regulates itself physically. The third is rational: Humans set rules, organize activities, and establish institutions on the basis of facts and reasons as well as for the purpose of effectiveness and efficiency. The fourth is random: Human affairs take place haphazardly with respect to specific time, place, person, and thing while overall they exhibit some general pattern, certainty, trend, or predictability. The last is inevitable: Human polity evolves from autocracy to democracy to technocracy.

In content, this book consists of five parts. Part I touches upon the human agent, analyzing individuality, governability, controllability, and activity inherent in individuals, wills, utterances, and acts. Part II, Part III, and Part IV focus on the three systems of human polity from autocracy to democracy to technocracy, researching each system with respect to its form, content, operation, and impact. Part V delves into human agency, studying collectivity, potentiality, rationality, and consequentiality intrinsic to collectives, potentials, rationales, and actions.

It is hoped that this book will serve as not only a critical reference for human polity and its historical evolution from one form to another, but also an inspirational source in the human pursuit of the best possible practice

in which human agents harness their own agency to the optimum of logic, evidence, and justice.

PART I

HUMAN AGENT

Humans are individual living beings. Each human individual appears and operates in a specific time and place. He or she thinks with ideas, feels in emotions, utters words, and takes actions. To understand how individual human beings aggregate in groups, societies, and cultures, creating human institutions, making human civilizations, and sustaining human species, it is necessary to know what individuals are and what lies under individuality, how wills exhibit themselves and how wills converge in governability, when utterances matter and when utterances coincide with controllability, plus where acts take place and where acts demonstrate activity (Mead 1938; James 1960; Freud 1962; Nietzsche 1966; Bernstein 1971; Martine 1984; Kohli 1990; Bailey and Goodson 2000; Pink and Stone 2003; Kendon 2004; Shaw 2004; Berger and Anderson 2005; Kretchmar 2005; Sorabji 2006; Carston 2008; Stein 2011; Kockelman 2013; Shaw 2013; Manning and Massumi 2014; Herron 2016; Bush 2017; Muller 2017; Rosenthal 2017; Kouba and Došek 2018; Takano and Osaka 2018; Uleman 2018; Bourrat 2019; Kateb 2019; McCole 2019; Shaw 2019; Zavatta 2019; Frogel 2020; Witzel 2020).

CHAPTER 1

INDIVIDUALS AND INDIVIDUALITY

Human polity is about control, discipline, coordination, and integration. On the one hand, each and every individual takes precautions, exercises restraint, and makes an effort at self-organization toward his or her full potentiality and complete actualization. On the other hand, multiple and all individuals race, resonate, and reciprocate with one another in social settings in order to achieve and maintain a system of collective existence at a level of coherence for a state of efficiency (Freud 1962; Martine 1984; Shaw 2004; Sorabji 2006; Kockelman 2013; Wong, Hall, Justice, and Hernandez 2015; Herron 2016; Bush 2017; Takano and Osaka 2018; Uleman 2018; Bourrat 2019; Jäger, Han, and Dingemans 2019; Kateb 2019; Luo 2019; Maduro 2019; McCole 2019; Shaw 2019; Zavatta 2019).

Inevitable Beings

Conceptually it is a chicken-and-egg question as to whether a human species exists in the first place, dictating that human individuals breed in space and multiply over time, or whether there are only individual humans living in particular generations and through specific stages, giving rise to a general collective known as humankind.

Beginning with a dictating human race, individuals obviously become inevitable beings. They appear because the human species occurs unavoidably in the form of individual entities. They continue since the human species persists unstopably by way of individual existences. In the concrete, individuals crawl and jump like monkeys when humans remain undifferentiated from their primate kinfolks. They walk vertically with hands performing productive acts where humans embark on an evolutionary journey distinctive from that of the animal kingdom. Individuals struggle in nature when the human species is set to survive in the world of commonsense. They wrestle with fear and faith as humanity debuts, displays, and demonstrates within a realm of religion featuring heaven, hell, otherworld, and afterlife. Individuals relish self-created material amenities where

humankind explores and exploits facts, rules, and truths through science and technology.

As far as polity is concerned, directions, guidelines, and rules come deductively from the human species being the core construct. Apparatuses of governance inhere in the way that humans organize themselves while political operations take place in the manner in which humans go about living. In other words, the human race as the seed determines which ones come into being as individuals, how they relate to each other, what they do, how far they go, how long they last, and how much they bear in their individual lives. Or the human species as the origin dictates the number of people being in existence, the mode of interaction taking effect from individual to individual, the type of institutions emerging amid social dynamics, and the kind of politics playing out among people. To an extent, autocracy arises when a few are born to be wiser, stronger, and of higher privilege than a great many individuals in society. Democracy spreads where the majority of individuals are assigned to lay claim to rights, interests, and powers as equal, competitive participants across social arenas. Technocracy will prevail as the human species reaches an evolutionary stage at which individual human beings remain educated, informed, and specialized in their respective areas of work and life, including polity, policymaking, and politics.

Random Individuals

From the other point of view, there is no initial, original, or essential human construct or species per the will of a supernatural force or by the truism of nature. Humans appear on the face of the earth simply because the earth happens to be at a place in the universe where water, air, and other substances amenable to life become available. Individuals come into being purely due to the fact that they eat and drink, grow and expand, mate and give birth to offspring. Physically, a particular individual may look short or tall, fat or skinny, pretty or ugly. In the mental dimension, a specific human may think quickly or slowly, feel plainly or richly, and relate to fellow human beings with wisdom or stupidity. Over the course of a life, one may struggle in hunger or thrive on material abundance, endure disease or enjoy health, and live long by success or short in despair. It is totally a matter of randomness that positives converge, negatives reinforce one another, or negatives cancel out around one person, making a king, general, commoner, pauper, drug addict, or prisoner in society.

With regard to polity, codes, policies, and regulations form inductively as people deal with one another in collective settings. Whereas

institutions of power emerge from general needs in defense, enforcement, and order keeping, processes of politics unfold amid specific factions and forces across social arenas. In fact, younger or weaker individuals follow older or stronger ones in day-to-day living. Smaller or looser groups submit to larger or sturdier ones over critical decision-making. Across space, as people expand from mini groups to compound communities to mega societies, they create families, kinships, tribes, states, and empires. Over time, whilst individuals multiply from generation to generation, they produce cultures, ethnicities, races, and generally, humankind. In a sense, autocracy reigns where group feuds, military campaigns, and social movements train certain individuals to become final winners, ultimate commanders, or prime leaders. Democracy takes shape when ideological debates, economic competitions, and political manipulations groom people to act, represent, and play on stages of power or in theaters of control and influence. Technocracy will dominate as individuals grounded in empirical fact, logical reasoning, and knowledge set to be full and complete, acting rationally and dutifully toward optimal collective effectiveness and efficiency.

Surviving Beings

Whether they arrive accidentally by the principle of randomness or come inexorably upon the inevitability of an original force, human beings must survive individually in nature. They eat and drink in order to stay alive. They must hereto find, gather, produce, store, and process foods and water from their surroundings. There are scorching heat, piercing cold, barraging rains, blitzing snows, sweeping tornadoes, overwhelming hurricanes, erupting volcanoes, trembling earthquakes, and other natural harshness or destruction. Individuals must hence find, build, and maintain homes and shelters for safety, rest, and comfort. During task performance, farmers, porters, craftspeople, and workers may suffer acute injuries and acquire chronic conditions. They then need to find drugs and make devices for the treatment of wounds or the maintenance of bodily functions. In everyday life, children and elderlies, wives and husbands, brothers and sisters can fall ill, feel distressful, or face a terminal disease. They therefore need to take medications or go through procedures just to keep pain, suffering, and fear under control.

In view of governance, surviving calls for joint efforts. One finds, collects, produces, and stores a larger variety of foods for a longer period of use where one works with neighbors in communities. One explores more territory and travels a longer distance when one embarks on a journey with

partners in groups. One develops better strategies and takes more effective actions as one joins fellow human beings in facing and tackling problems, emergencies, and crises at work and in everyday life. Collaboration and partnership obviously necessitate the control of impulses, the discipline of acts, and the surrender of rights on the part of individuals. On the part of collectives, contracts, policies, and laws emerge to regulate individuals and individual behaviors just as bodies of enforcement, adjudication, and arbitration arise to impose order and maintain peace. If autocracy is an expression of individual wills and wants in collective settings, from kinships to tribes to kingdoms, democracy is a demonstration of collective plays and performances through individual participation, such as voting, venting, and vying. Synthesis lies eventually in technocracy wherein individuals rise above and beyond survivals in societies integrated on the basis of fact, logic, and reason.

Needing Individuals

Besides surviving or meeting basic living challenges, individuals find and feel a need for affection, power, and achievement as they compare and compete with each other in social settings. Indeed, with no exception, one is born to one's parents. Almost universally, one is raised along with one's siblings or relatives. In all likelihood, one is survived by one's known or unknown kinfolk. Namely, individuals arrive, grow, act, react, and leave in relation to one another through family, kinship, and other groupings.

In social life, surviving creatures turn into needful beings. Individuals begin creating needs, developing expectations, and making demands for things not necessarily essential to living. One is affection. People care about how they see and treat each other, specifically whether they embrace neighbors, workmates, and even strangers as fellow humans, whether they identify with a group, organization, or community for a sense of belonging, and whether they follow a crowd, fashion, or way of life toward a share of commonality. Another is power. People observe the division of labor, experience the distribution of wealth, and witness the hierarchization of social life. They know what a difference there is between making and following rules, taking and giving orders, gaining and losing power. Still another is achievement. People strive to create things, change states of affairs, and leave something behind. They understand how deep they might plow into a culture with individual doings, how long they could endure over a tradition through individual deeds, and how much they would contribute to human civilizations, humanity, and humankind by way of individual actualization.

As far as control is concerned, fulfilling needs involves collective strategizing, planning, and organizing. One creates a network of friends when one just extends one's hands. One fashions an atmosphere of apathy or empathy, love or hatred, respect or contempt when one builds a group around an interest, cause, or goal. But within a group, one needs to institute rule and control to attain particular results, either affective or non-affective. One exerts a degree of power where one merely plays one's natural role as a parent or child, brother or sister, and teacher or student. One spreads a spirit of conscience, loyalty, and submission or evil, betrayal, and defiance where one establishes an organization with an agenda, task, or mission. Across an organization, however, one needs to implement policies and regulations to achieve specific outcomes, whether it is power-enhancing or power-lessening. One reaches a level of accomplishment as one simply lives one's life. One sets in motion a culture of unity, solidarity, and prosperity or division, subversion, and decline as one rises above a crowd to lead a society. Throughout a society, nonetheless, one must resort to law, lawmaking, and law enforcement to maintain order for individual livelihoods and collective wellbeing. In one word, groups, organizations, and social entities as large as nation-states provide needful individuals with critical institutional vehicles in their striving for affection, power, and achievement once they are managed through such mechanisms as persuasion, manipulation, reward, and punishment.

Natural Ego

Individuals are built around with predispositions ranging from self-service, self-preservation, and self-gratification to self-perpetuation. Coming with id at the time of birth, they instinctually avoid pain, seek pleasure, and do things just in response to basic needs and drives including hunger, thirst, sex, and sleep. Developing in ego over the course of growth, individuals habitually compare choices, weigh options, and calculate gains or losses between self-interests and external conditions. Transcending by way of the superego through the process of expansion, they intentionally establish standards, set goals, and impose rewards or punishments in terms of compliance or violation, fulfillment or disappointment, success or failure.

With a mind evolving naturally from id to ego to superego, individuals first know that they need to conquer hunger, quench thirst, gratify sex, and secure shelter. They may meet these needs by invasion and domination or surrender and submission in relation to fellow humans, which apparently sets the stage for autocratic practices. Gradually people realize that they each are born or created equal, with similar rights to assert

autonomy and comparable abilities to maintain sufficiency. They can choose surrogates, delegate power, vote over candidates, vie for offices, and empower representatives to manage political affairs, which obviously usher in an era of democratic governance. Eventually individuals will understand that social control is as natural as automated bodily regulation, which in its maturity shall neither cave inward to impulsive, ego-centric autocracy nor roam afield to spectacular, ego-surreal democracy, but rather fall back in rational, ego-neutral technocracy.

Social Identity

Individuals live in social settings, from family, kinship, tribe, work organization, interest group, and professional association to nation-state. Arriving as an infant is to land a place or fall into a framework for individual identity among a collective. Growing up as a child is to cultivate a character and develop a personality relating to who one is in comparison to fellow members of society. Taking on a job or task is to translate natural talents into social deeds and impacts. The latter apparently defines where one stands from place to place as well as from time to time. Pursuing an interest or cause is to expand one's sphere of activity and influence above and beyond adaptation and survival. The former evidently determines what profile and position one holds across a group, culture, or era. Overall, living by way of doing and saying not only sustains individuals but also supports collectives. Life by measure of experience and legacy demonstrates both the realization of individuality and the creation of social identity.

Identity is perceived inside by individuals and projected outside upon social units. It can be small or large, intense or loose, close or remote, positive or negative. Small, loose, and remote identities are likely to be owned by the crowd of commoners in submission under autocracy, the mass of ordinaries through participation in democracy, and the army of civil servants in the effect of function and functionality beneath technocracy. For example, one stays negligible and naught as one is repressed openly or even removed secretly in a country of dictatorship. Large, intense, and close identities, in contrast, are typically in the possession of autocratic rulers, democratically elected officials, and technocrats who move up or down a career ladder by virtue of education, performance, and experience. For instance, a mayor, governor, or president thrown into office by public votes may represent a city, embody a province, or symbolize a nation in the time of crisis or normalcy and in the matter of war or diplomacy. As far as sentiment is concerned, one feels positive about one's identity in a group or organization when one commands due respect, receives fair treatment, and

maintains a sense of comfort, fulfillment, and satisfaction. Otherwise, one may embrace negativity toward society, culture, and humanity, especially in situations where one faces manmade barriers, suffers from unjust persecutions, or struggles so often with irrational odds or hostile currents.

Potentiality at Birth

Individuals are born with potentials and potentialities. From a commonsensical point of view, a newborn is bound to grow by nature. In terms of religion, a creature is initiated to charter a journey, reveal a message, or fulfill a purpose under the will of Allah, Buddha, God, or a supernatural force. On the basis of science, a human being carrying the genetics of its species is programmed to live in the chain of cause and effect across the universe of material existence. With concrete potentials, individuals develop in physique from small to large and through consciousness from simplicity to sophistication. They pass through stages of infancy, childhood, adolescence, adulthood, and senility. They utter words, sing songs, express feelings, and create meanings. They act out, gathering wood, opening trails, growing crops, making goods, killing animals, cutting trees, contaminating water, and in general producing things, destroying objects, and leaving marks all over their surroundings. Down to potentiality, individuals have first and foremost the capacity of thought. They perceive the world, explore nature, gather information about the environment, seek truth on reality, and build a knowledge enterprise for the control and conquest of existence and the universe. They reflect upon experience, contemplate the future from past to present, meditate the otherworld or afterlife against the earthly or secular, and create a belief system toward purpose and permanency over phenomena and the cosmos.

In relation to one another in society, individuals seem to come with three dictates. One is to develop self, build ego, and nurture individuality. On this front, a few people are somehow able to go as far as forcing many individual egos or self-identities into naught only for themselves to exercise will and extend individuality as disciplinarians, despots, or dictators. Autocracy hence arrives on the scene, featuring an imposition of self-centered individuality in the sphere of will and control. Another is to join groups or networks, form partnerships or alliances, and cultivate civility or sociability. In this arena, a majority of people often gather to voice opinions, debate issues, and cast votes to not only lay claim to personal rights but also to fulfill obligations for social responsibility. Democracy therefore comes into play, exhibiting a spectacular of mutually reciprocated sociability in the theater of power and politics. Still another is to delve into intellectual

faculty, act upon facts and with reasons, and foster a spirit of rationality. Toward this direction, all individuals will always assume positions, play roles, and serve duties in systems built upon neutral knowledge and objective truth. Technocracy will then take shape, demonstrating the effect of naturally synchronized functionality within the framework of institutional decision-making and policy execution.

Actualization toward Death

Living is to actualize one and one's individuality. Physically, one needs to grow into a complete being with all bodily parts, features, and functions relating to where they belong, when they display, and how they operate. There are apparently both ascribed defects and acquired deficiencies that could leave an impact upon one's actualization in the corporal aspect. Mentally, one needs to mature into a full subject with all inner feelings, reasoning, and thoughts appropriate to the places, times, and ways in which they occur, exist, and last. There are obviously not only born disorders but also learned maladies that might cause a disturbance to one's actualization over the subjective dimension. In terms of social development and expansion, one expects to pass through all the main stages from infancy to childhood to adolescence to adulthood to senior age as a healthy baby, a charming kid, a promising juvenile, a fulfilling member of the community, and a beloved elder of society. Or throughout the course of life, is one summarily a failure or success by power, wealth, fame, or a combination thereof in comparison to other people, particularly within one's circumstance or era and generally over human history?

In view of socialization and social interaction, individual actualization is first about discipline and control. One develops and obtains a habit of reconciling submission, pain, humility, and altruism with repression, pleasure, arrogance, and egoism. One remains docile and obedient at the bottom or appears commanding and domineering at the top as in the social institution of patriarchy, authoritarianism, dictatorship, or autocracy. Individual actualization is also about comparison and competition. One embraces and upholds a spirit of approaching fellow humans with attitudes and behaviors ranging from apathy to empathy, accommodation to competition, or compassion to conquest. One participates, votes, and cheers with the majority or fights, protests, and suffers in the minority, such as over the polity of democracy, across the marketplace of laissez faire economics, or throughout the social arena of public debate, mass opinionating, interest grouping, power representation, and media supervision. Furthermore, individual actualization is about contribution and integration. One enters

and endures in a state of synchronization with society as a member of a collective, part of a system, or force of a process. Indeed, technocracy serves well in making policy, implementing decisions, and keeping order when it incorporates different factors and interests on the basis of fact and where it integrates diverse functions and contributions by way of logic.

CHAPTER 2

WILLS AND GOVERNABILITY

Individuals possess wills and tend to translate their wills into what they say and do in everyday life. Within oneself, one experiences and oversees change in desires and drives, needs and wants, ideas and thoughts, emotions and sentiments from time to time as one attempts to remain calm, stable, and functional as a person. In relation to fellow human beings, one witnesses and manages the flow of pushes and pulls, supports and sabotages, gains and losses, rises and falls from place to place while one struggles to be part of a crowd as a follower or leader (James 1960; Nietzsche 1966; Crozier, Huntington, and Watanuki 1975; Kohli 1990; Bailey and Goodson 2000; Pink and Stone 2003; Ho 2011; Gómez Bruera 2013; Shaw 2013; Knott 2014; Wright 2015; Huddleston 2016; Rayman 2016; Vigoda-Gadot 2016; Muller 2017; Rosenthal 2017; Kouba and Došek 2018; Ernst and Haar 2019; Frogel 2020).

Inner Wills

Inner wills spring out of the body and bodily existence. They pose secure ways and means for the satisfaction of the fundamental needs of survival. One is the innate need to eat or the will to find, gather, produce, store, prepare, and consume foods to maintain the existence of a body. Another is the instinct to drink or the will to discover, make, transport, and take in water to maintain the function of a body. Still another is the drive to engage in sex or the will to love, reproduce, and care for fellow human beings to continue the presence of the whole species. Inner wills operate on the principle of pleasure and gratification. They are self-centered, self-serving, and self-fulfilling. Furthermore, inner wills stand to expand and express themselves, through positive demonstrations from competency, proficiency, and sufficiency to persistency as well as in negative exhibitions such as greed, indulgence, extravagance, and recklessness.

Inner wills change over the course of life. They tend to be autocratic at the beginning, democratic toward the middle, and technocratic through a considerable part of an individual's journey. Specifically, infants,

children, and teenagers are preoccupied with their own desires, wants, and needs. They crave attention, seek pleasure, and enjoy material gratification. Toward parents, teachers, and other adults, they are submissive, passive, and reactive, which not only cultivate autocratic mindsets for themselves, but also foster dictatorial spirits out of authorities and authority figures. Then come late adolescence and early adulthood when individuals venture forth to explore, entertain, and conquer the world. Adults play roles, make promises, execute contracts, and fulfill responsibilities in relation to a group, community, and society. They know they must take the initiative, make policies, and lead the way sometimes. They also understand they need to compromise, give up, or cooperate with one another on issues oftentimes critical to their fundamental interests. Maturing adults are thus trained and habituated for democratic participation in social settings. However, as they give and take through exchange, competition, and manipulation, adults realize they can find better rules, procedures, and mechanisms to tame personal impulses, institute social practices, and regulate political operations. Individuals may hence become equitably involved in social affairs either by a feeling of desire or a sense of duty. Society may therefore stay in a state of peace and order naturally through both institutional means and historical momentums. In other words, individuals march toward being technocrats with regard to their role in polity and society equilibrates toward technocracy over its function in governance.

Outer Wills

Outer wills develop, grow, and expand as individuals socialize in groups, interact with each other in collective settings, play social roles, and fulfill communal obligations. They are about who one is, what image one holds in public, what goal one sets for life, and what standards one sticks to in day-to-day behavior. Identity inheres in both the sense of belonging and the feeling of identification. One perceives oneself to be part of a group, community, culture, ethnicity, or race whilst one follows its beliefs, norms, values, sentiments, and lifestyles. Image builds on public impression and reputation. One leaves a favorable impression in a community and wants to keep it as long as one stays around. One earns a positive reputation among one's relatives, friends, colleagues, and business partners and wishes to own it for the rest of one's life. A goal regards mission and task, deed and duty, aspiration and actualization relating to work and career as well as living and survival. One aspires to be a leader in one's profession and has indeed founded a school of thought or established a way of practice. One strives to make remarkable contributions to a particular cause or organization and has

actually donated a large amount of money or put in a long time of service. Finally, standards concern morality, principles, and qualities. One adheres to a set of moralities, such as honesty and fairness, in business dealings. One follows a series of principles, including evidence and objectivity, in professional pursuits. One maintains a measure of standard, be it material amenity or nonmaterial pleasantness, in everyday life. One does not just survive or stay alive. One lives a life of decency, with dignity, and up to a certain level of quality.

Outer wills radiate from where one sits to be oneself to where one acts and impacts as the member of a society. In the beginning and close to oneself, one tends to be egocentric. One follows an innate interest and takes impulsive action as one exercises wills, expresses feelings, and exerts influences. Autocracy arises as a few overwhelm a great many individuals with power, control, and order in collective settings. Then and away from oneself, one sees a community of fellow human beings on an equal footing, individually making valid claims for rights and fulfillment. One joins groups, plays roles, and finds platforms as effective and efficient ways to put one's wills into action. Democracy figures in social dynamics while individuals expand and spread their outer wills from one arena to another through participation, comparison, and competition. Later and further away from oneself, one realizes a system larger than one's society and a process longer than one's era. On a new horizon, one discovers the thrust of human wills and actions in the logic of social creation and existence. In a different worldview, one understands the essence of social function and functionality amid the fact and factuality of individual life. Technocracy will eventually reign in human polity and social order maintenance when people act out of personal wills and society builds upon individual actions by way of evidence, reason, and science.

Wills to Command

Wills to command are first and foremost to take control of one's inner world. There are selfish versus altruistic desires, noble versus evil spirits, good versus bad feelings, bodily versus mental gratifications, joyful versus painful moments, so on and so forth. In one situation, individuals hope to withhold, contain, or eliminate one kind of need, want, disposition, mentality, or sentiment whereas in another circumstance they wish to release, facilitate, or amplify the other. Overall, most people just attempt to keep a balance, feel at peace, and steel themselves toward control. Beyond oneself, one aspires to demonstrate wills in things that one does, share wills with fellow humans to whom one relates, and realize wills in the times and places

through which one passes in one's journey of life. In plain terms, one tends to feel one's own wills best or better reflect an era, represent a society, embody the essence of humanity, or convey the message of an almighty entity or a supernatural force. As a result, a few impose their wills upon many, oftentimes creating patriarchy, authoritarianism, or dictatorship; a minority implement their wills at the expense of a majority, sometimes even maintaining a public impression of legitimacy as in the form of democracy.

Over the course of life, infants, children, and teens learn to find, develop, and claim their wills. To caregivers, parents, and teachers, they act out of wills, drawing attention, concern, care, and support. Adolescents and adults mature to express, exercise, and control their wills. To neighbors, workmates, and partners, they play in accordance with wills, advancing interest, position, visibility, and influence. Adults and seniors march to solidify, protect, and continue their wills. To juniors, followers, and successors, they work with a focus on wills, securing functionality, peace, stability, and legacy. As far as a group and grouping are concerned, wills to command tend to create autocrats in small organizations and close-knit communities where individuals are bound by strong ties and frequent interactions. In large institutions and open societies, however, wills to command are likely to produce democratic participants when individuals are made aware of both personal rights and social obligations. With the contrast of autocratic occurrence and democratic practice, technocratic operation will debut and become fashionable where people entertain their wills to command in the spirit of fact and logic and society moves toward an equilibrium of function and sustainability by the principle of science and technology.

Wills to Follow

Wills to follow are the other side of the coin on which sit wills to command. Internally, one builds upon one's innate quality and draws from one's instinctual force as to what desires, needs, or feelings one explores, pursues, or keeps for oneself in everyday life. It is a simple logic that one must follow what comes out of one's body or nature before one can decide whether one needs to exert wills to command and what one shall contain and control or facilitate and fulfill within one's mind. Externally, one aspires to be gregarious and strives for recognition, acceptance, and belonging. Being in isolation causes fear. Wandering outside of a crowd leads to despair. Indeed, one needs to be part of a group, community, and society not just as a follower, but even as a commander. That is, wills to follow are more original, basic, and essential than wills to command.

From a developmental point of view, one is born to follow one's body as a living system as well as one's nature as an object evolving in subjectivity and a subject surviving through objectivity. One grows when one eats and drinks. One is hungry where one is deprived of foods. One feels satisfactory when one enjoys a delicious meal. During infancy, childhood, and adolescence, one is reared to follow parents, teachers, elders, and figures in power. One heeds warnings, takes orders, observes rules, and acts on commands. Following is part of growing up and socialization. Even during adulthood and senior age, one is still cultivated or coopted to follow relatives, friends, workmates, and neighbors in maintaining kinships, friendships, partnerships, or just relationships. One gives up needs, compromises on interests, defers to authorities, and carries out duties. Following is essential for living in conformity as a member who fits or is practicing good citizenship in relation to other members in a group, community, or country. With regard to wills to follow, following oneself too closely, too frequently, or too much can make one autocratic while following oneself too loosely, too sporadically, or too little may prompt one to become democratic as one surrenders one's rights to someone else, a representative or representative entity. In between, one turns technocratic when one follows oneself as equally, objectively, and rationally as one would follow other people in collective settings, whether they are kinships, tribes, congregations, interest clubs, business corporations, professional associations, or nation-states.

Weak Wills

Weak wills are not just about the quantity of wills. Inner wills are weak when they fall under a certain level or wills to follow become weak where they fail to bring about expected results. Weak wills are also about the quality of wills. In other words, they represent kinds of wills that reveal human apathy, passivity, susceptibility, submission, and inertia. With apathy, one shows a lack of affection and concern for fellow humans. Under passivity, one has little motivation and courage to act upon environments toward better living. Out of susceptibility, one takes things at face value and makes no effort to seek the truth beneath a phenomenal occurrence. In submission, one takes whatever comes from life and flows wherever one is pushed or pulled by factors and forces in existence. By inertia, one does neither dare to think above one's experience nor bother to move beyond one's reality. One embraces comfort, likes easiness, feels laziness, cares nothing, and stays in purposelessness. Specific instances include: roaming or vagrancy from place to place, disowning or homelessness from time to

time, surrendering to or claiming disability to be out of work, and escaping or lying about illness to be away from action in life. A more illustrative example is this: One uses a substance, following the effect of it to addiction, self-harm, and self-destruction.

Weak wills by measurement may seem easy to manage, being pushed back, contained, or suppressed for the good of peace and order. For example, when one possesses weak wills to command, one is likely to make concessions, accept compromises, and admit control. However, a challenge can arise to governance, both law enforcement and policy implementation, where members of a society or sovereign entity remain weak in their wills to follow. The same holds true for weak wills as a category. On the one hand, a culture, society, or country can run naturally as a social system without a strong center of power, a clear sense of purpose, and a common target of achievement when individuals act or remain inactive upon their weak wills to follow or command in work, governance, and everyday life. On the other hand, a few may emerge to become either autocratic heads or democratic representatives with a total disregard for or just lip service to a mass of people who, out of their weak wills, care little and do not bother to do much about one another and their collective wellbeing.

Strong Wills

Strong wills feature self-discipline, self-control, and self-esteem within oneself. One knows what one wants, cultivating, channeling, and protecting it. One understands where one stands, explaining, defending, or changing it. One accepts who one is, expressing, respecting, and celebrating oneself. Without oneself, strong wills reveal concern and care for fellow humans, an obligation and duty to human collectives, hopes and wishes for humankind, and a connective urge and protective drive toward phenomenal existence. Specifically, one embraces other people as relatives, friends, neighbors, workmates, and partners with a conscience, acting honestly, fairly, and empathetically. One contributes to society as a parent, educator, organizational stakeholder, community leader, media personality, social luminary, and/or head of government with dedication, acting collegially, dutifully, and responsibly. One relates to the human species with a feeling of humbleness as a negligible element of a large unit, an entire generation, and a whole era; yet through a sense of belonging one exercises good wishes for human progress, prosperity, and permanency. One remains enmeshed in the cosmic occurrence so that one can follow one's instinct to love nature, protect the environment, and facilitate existence.

Like weak wills, strong wills can be realized as either a reading of measurement or quality over typology. In a measurement of strength, inner wills may appear too strong while wills to command can be excessive in intensity. As a category, strong wills may center on oneself early in life whereas during adulthood they can shift outwardly to one's relationship with society or one's standing across a larger space or over a longer time frame. An interesting observation nonetheless is of possible developments when strong wills measure improper strength or around likely consequences when strong wills fall below average in strength. For example, one becomes a loner with an autocratic personality when one is obsessed with self-discipline and inner order. One changes into an antagonist with democratic impulsivity when one is overtaken by competition in sharing interests in social settings. One serves as a conformist in a technocratic functionality if one keeps a balance between inner and outer wills, wills to follow and wills to command, weak wills and strong wills, as well as their respective quantity and contrasting intensity.

Wills Here and Now

Wills here and now are about taking care of oneself, participating in collective affairs, and practicing good citizenship. For oneself, one attends to one's need for food and water, one's desire of sex and love, as well as feelings toward sufficiency and happiness. One takes time to heal from illness or injury. One works to achieve material wellbeing against natural and humanmade hurdles. In one's groups, one seeks to play a role, perform a duty, build a reputation, and make an impact. One teaches values and skills as a parent, pastor, or educator. One fulfills obligations and responsibilities by civil agreements, business contracts, or legal codes. In good citizenship, one expresses concern, offers care, commits time, and contributes resources for or to people in a group, organization, community, and country of which one is a member. Institutionally, one pays fees and taxes so that aid can be rendered to people who are in need. In specific incidents, one participates in a rescue or campaign through which lives are saved from a natural disaster or a system failure.

Wills here and now follow people in a trajectory that features growth, expansion, and maturation. In the phase of growth, individuals work on their own necessities and sentiments. Wills are to assert themselves, demand recognition, and secure resources toward survival and sufficiency. During expansion, individuals attend to their contacts and contrasts with groups. Wills are to protect themselves, claim rights, and advance interests for impact and influence. At maturation, individuals serve in their roles and

positions within a social system. Wills are to express themselves, maintain a presence, and endure in function and functionality. In a different view, wills here and now can bring about autocratic practice, creating autocrats, when they revolve excessively around individuals and individuals themselves. They may lead to democratic institutionalization, making demagogues, while they hover unduly over groupings and group competitions. Wills here and now will result in societal integration, producing technocrats, as they sink properly in the humanities and human functions.

Wills Then and There

Wills then and there manifest in three spheres. In the world of commonsense, people want to pass on ideas, push through agendas, and continue legacies even after they function or live as members of a society or era. Indeed, each individual is unique, with an innate drive to permeate and perpetuate, by personal deeds and traits, human society, culture, civilization, and species. Across the realm of religion, believers aspire to search for general spirits and reach the state of spirituality with an almighty entity or supernatural force in the universe. Without doubt, humans are religious, with instinctual penchants to transcend secularity and worldliness toward consummation and eternity. In the arena of scientific inquiry, explorers, experimentalists, and researchers strive to gather evidences, find universal laws, and attain truths underpinning a phenomenal occurrence and existence throughout the cosmos. As a matter of fact, humans are curious, with natural genes to delve into what they experience by way of their five senses for knowledge and understanding about what they can possibly reach within their intellectual capacities.

People become concerned with connections and consequences as soon as they achieve active consciousness. One holds some ideas, visualizing how those ideas may translate into actions. One does something, envisioning how these deeds may impact one's standing in the future. Wills then and there are inherent in the natural setup of mind and subjectivity. They crystalize over the course of life into personal wills to influence descendants in an insistent striving toward longevity, reflecting the autocratic nature of human individuals and individuality. They mature through the collectivization of human fear, belief, and religiosity into popular wills to reach general spirits in a persistent pursuit of spirituality, revealing the democratic quality of human groupings and sociability. They progress through the systemization of human intelligence, knowledge, and reasoning into common wills to discover universal laws in a consistent

search for truth, demonstrating the technocratic attribute of human functions and functionality.

CHAPTER 3

UTTERANCES AND CONTROLLABILITY

Humans utter words. Words are units of language to express feelings, describe situations, exchange ideas, and record experiences. Given the fact that humans think in words, feel with words, and act out of words, language as a collection of words constitutes the entire world of human consciousness and subjectivity. In view of the datum that thoughts, actions, and all human experiences can be documented in words, language as a system of words equals the whole repertoire of human existence and objectivity. With regard to control, words mirror states of mind, reflect conditions of life, and signify order, stability, or controllability in human experiences (Kendon 2004; Shaw 2004; Berger and Anderson 2005; Carston 2008; Nabi-Abdolyousefi 2014; Jeffrey 2019; Balcerak Jackson 2019; Peng and Li 2019; Notebaert, Georgiades, Herbert, Grafton, Parsons, Fox, and MacLeod 2020; Tian, Guan, and Wang 2020).

Words in Private

In private, one may engage in self-dialogue, seek connection to a supernatural force, or share thoughts with people whom one deems to be close and trustworthy. Through self-dialogue, one clarifies thoughts, solidifies feelings, and organizes experiences, keeping peace and order in mind. Between “I” and “Me,” the former gives order, command, and direction when the latter offers information, advice, and response. The latter extends understanding, comfort, and confirmation where the former expresses desires, emotions, and sentiments. In fear and awe of nature or an almighty entity, one prays for forgiveness, protection, and blessings. Words uttered can be descriptions of sins or wrongdoings, pleas for clemency, and pledges of actions. To people who care, love, and trust, one spreads joy or pain, gain or loss, success or failure. There are voices of concern, gestures of care, expressions of affection, and moves of compassion all in audible words or through flows of consciousness yet recordable by words.

Words in private can burst out of control or run smoothly like a singing creek. When one is preoccupied with one’s own survival and inner

experience, one tends to act as an autocrat who may assign blame, spill shame, or cast anger inwardly to oneself or outwardly to someone else. Explosive words yelled in one's sole presence may include: "I am a coward"; "I am ashamed of myself"; and "I hate my parents." Inasmuch as one takes part in collective affairs with enforced comparison and competition, one is bound to perform like a democrat who can make an advance, initiate a campaign, or launch an attack against other people out of a circumstance. Partisan libretti spewed in one's private rehearsal can range from "I am on the right side of history", "I can be a monster", and "I want to beat them all" to "May the Almighty push them off to hell!" Only where one is integrated in a system, may one play one's role as a technocrat who functions in a way that contributes to one's personal wellbeing as well as the system's social existence. Words floated within one's consciousness are therefore these: "I am part of a crowd"; "I suffer when the system breaks down"; and "What can I do to better myself while improving the system and its efficiency?"

Words in Public

Words in public are uttered or recorded in collective settings, oftentimes in the presence of a third party who may be a reporter, lawyer, or witness. Across workplaces, employees talk about task performance. In neighborhoods, residents chat about living matters. On paper, people write contracts, forge agreements, and make laws in formal terms. Individual's voices announce plans, declare initiatives, or pledge actions with expressive words. Through public forums, speakers preach a faith, promote an ideology, and spread a message. Over the mass media, reporters broadcast current news, publishers release content materials, and critiques churn out reactive commentaries. From different sources, words in public gather in various forms from personal wills formalized with the aid of an attorney, folklore passed on from generation to generation in a culture, public speeches recorded on digital devices, judgments handed out by a jury in a court of law, and documents stored in official archives to books or journals collected by college libraries.

In public, one can talk about one's aspirations, determinations, adventures, accomplishments, and life courses, divulging one's autocratic dispositions and actions. In writing, there may be diaries, journals, memoirs, and autobiographies, revealing one's mindsets and behavioral patterns out of autocratic selfness. In another dimension, one may speak about one's interactions with other people, involvement in group activities, competitions for social resources, and contributions to collective welfares,

informing one's democratic spirit and participation. Recorded in words, there can be arguments, debates, policies, and legislations made through partisan manipulation, exploitation, and confrontation, highlighting one's ways of thinking and behavior upon democratic egoism. In yet another dimension, one can comment on one's synchronization with fellow humans, function through the social system, and integration in human civilizations, pointing to one's technocratic personality and moderation. In written language, there can be reports, documents, manuals, and statistics compiled by the principles of logic, fact, and truth, shedding light on one's cooperative tendency and institutional functionality on the basis of technocratic innateness.

Words of Affection

Words of affection spring out of a human need for sex and love, instincts of procreation and care, as well as drives for aggregation and companionship. Sex, along with food and water, derives from the body and bodily existence. As sex involves a couple of individuals, words revolving around it not only address impulses from one side but also attractions between the two sides. Upon sex, there is love that signifies physical intercourse prompting mental synchronization with the latter facilitating the former. Feelings of love are uttered instantly between couples, reinforcing sex from moment to moment. Portrayals of love are presented constantly in novels, poems, and fairytales, creating sensations all over the place. As far as procreation is concerned, it builds upon sex, involves labor, and induces care. Since it emits from the self toward another human, the instinct of parenting carries a spirit of altruism. Care for children hence engenders a natural well of words symbolizing commitment, highlighting dedication, and celebrating sacrifice. With regard to the drive of aggregation, people strive to connect to be one another's witness, reference, and source of inspiration, encouragement, or support. Groups extend and thrive while societies continue and prosper. Words of affection on socializing, companionship, friendship, and grouping therefore proliferate, creating a wealth of vocabularies and expressions in oral and written communications.

Affection fluctuates from time to time. Words of affection reflect control and controllability from place to place. Over the course of life, one begins with one's need for sex, sexual gratification, and sexual feelings. Words uttered feature either masculinity on the part of man and manhood or femininity in the interests of woman and womanhood. Voices take an autocratic tone as one attempts control and order while reaching out to or embracing the opposite force from or within one's own sphere of nature.

Next, one wrestles with one's instinct for procreation, procreative satisfaction, and procreative fascinations. Librettos spread, symbolizing mother, motherhood, and motherland in contrast to father, fatherhood, and fatherland. Expressions carry a democratic overture when one keeps checks and balances among factors and forces across gene, gender, and generational lines. Lastly, one works on one's drive toward socialization, social identification, and sociable sentiments. Lines spoken signify the interaction, incorporation, and integration of man, masculinity, and fatherhood with woman, femininity, and motherhood in humans, humanity, and human species. Language follows a technocratic tenor where one entertains equilibrium and consummation in the subjective experience of one's function and functionality to society, social progress, and human evolution.

Words of Logic

Words of logic speak to the truth of individual experience, the objectivity of phenomenal existence, and the law of universal occurrence. Descriptions of individual observations and experiences are truthful when one feels that one honestly reports what flows through one's subjective world and where a group of people attest to the same thing in their collective consciousness. For example, one talks about seeing a meteorite fly across the sky and everyone mentions witnessing the same incident at the same time and place. Records of existential factors and phenomenal forces are as factual as everyday life when ordinary people tell stories about crops and harvests across seasons of the year, while scientists document an expedition in the Arctic Ocean or an experiment on chemical interactions in a local laboratory. For instance, a professional welder discusses welding a pipeline with a certain level of precision and a scientific discoverer presents a series of findings about animal migration through a land or aerial corridor. Finally, formulations of general laws and universal principles underpinning objects, objective happenings, and objective existences are logical because they connect things by reason and reveal truths through reasoning. In a typical scenario, scientists follow, separate, break down, or combine substances in order to identify the true relations among them, whether a relation is causal or correlational whereas technologists apply known rules about and established relations between things to make innovative products.

Logic inheres in external order and internal control. Words of logic mirror human endeavors at following order in nature and pursuing control within the human sphere. By a measure of connectedness between knowing and logic, there is first an autocratic phase in which humans infer law and order for the outer world on the basis of their own ways of thinking in the

inner world. Utterances about acts of profanity or recklessness toward nature, for instance, may be similar to these declarations: “They shall receive punishment” or “we shall face fate” in the form of an epidemic, disaster, or widespread starvation. Following the phase of autocracy, it is the stage of democracy where humans impose rule and control with confidence that they know enough about the objective existence and that, by calculation they can employ knowledge to their own advantage. Explanations for projects of intervention or innovation, for example, can appear like those predictions: “They will harvest benefits” in everyday life or “we will experience improvements” in our relationships with nature. The next level is technocracy when humans achieve understanding, command, and equilibrium in the world of reality through both subjective synchronization in the spirit of reason and reasoning and objective interaction by way of fact and factual functioning. Language around mechanisms of operation or progress, in a typical case, is to sound like these statements: “They coordinate with one another in operational effectiveness” or “we collaborate in our efforts toward systemic efficiency.”

Words of Offense

Words of offense are uttered to criticize, moderate, or impose control and order elsewhere regarding someone else. In the mode of criticism, one may find issues with a neighbor over the maintenance of a shared roadway, attack a political opponent on a matter of public policy, or shame an ex-partner for his or her betrayal of personal trust. By way of moderation, one may advise a junior coworker to follow certain rules in the performance of tasks, propose to a figure of authority a particular line of action, or persuade a friend not to engage in dealings with a specific group. Through imposition, one can command children to uphold a family tradition, order subordinates to carry out a risky mission, or take over a group in the conduct of its business affairs. Words of offense can thus be suggestive, persuasive, directive, abrasive, abusive, and explosive in tone or agitative, irritating, disturbing, depressing, repressing, and hurting by consequence.

Individuals take and speak about offensive actions in different ways as they advance through life. Societies stage and develop narratives on offensive campaigns in varied ways while they progress over the course of history. The phase of autocracy features what “I” or “We” want as targets. One would say “I am born to pass on this way of life to the newer generation”; “I am determined to assume charge of this organization”; or “I am assigned to change things for this place at this time.” One society might make these flagship statements to another, including “We are missionaries

spreading the messages of God to them”; “We are conquerors keeping order and control there for them”; “We are caretakers handing out benefits to them.” The stage of democracy highlights what “I” or “We” strive to do for others. One would declare “I dealt a final defeat to my enemy in the duel”; “I look forward to debating issues with my opponents on television”; or “I have won this election by a landslide.” One society might entertain such signature expressions to another as “We lead the way of change in science and technology”; “We maintain a higher standard of living through development”; and “We set an example in this area of business.” A state of technocracy will show what “I” or “We” serve to function with others. One may admit “I play a role in this process”; “I participate in specific activities of a group or organization”; or “I make due contributions as part of a system.” One society can embrace this language as a prevailing discourse in relation to another: “We coordinate business dealings for material prosperity”; “We collaborate on environmental protection toward natural sustainability”; and “We coexist to expand human civilizations.”

Words of Defense

Words of defense are spoken to legitimize lines of action, protect current states of affairs, or ward off external attacks. The goal is to maintain order, control, controllability, and comfort. Lines of action are about what one says and does to other people, about things, or in certain areas of business in life. A defense is often mounted in words from revelation of intent, presentation of a rationale, and depiction of a process to the documentation of a consequence. Current states of affairs involve poverty or prosperity, order or chaos, submission or repression, knowledge or ignorance, action or inaction, pleasure or pain, vitality or stagnation, progress or regression, so on and so forth, for individuals, groups, or societies. Legitimization is sometimes fashioned negatively in the form of blame, an excuse, or plea and sometimes framed positively through the content of an accolade, ceremony, or celebration. External attacks are personal, varying from criticism, curses, condemnation, demotion, removal, and expulsion to even confinement. At a social level, they include sabotage, interference, invasion, occupation, prosecution, genocide, and cultural annihilation. Resistance against an external attack is usually staged in terms like “enemy,” “hatred,” and “evil” or by phrases such as “ulterior motives,” “acts of terror,” and “death to infidels.”

Depending upon the role of a human player under a particular mode of social operation as well as the state of a human mind in a specific era of historical progress, words of defense can be autocratic in content, take

a democratic form, or flow with a technocratic overture. An autocrat in an authoritarian society accomplishes the task of defense by keeping his or her distance, saying nothing, or continuing the power of offense. Indeed, an autocrat does not justify actions, explain things, or offer apologies. An autocratic only issues commands, makes declarations, and imposes controls. People obtain some sense of defense by their autocratic leader mostly through the latter's recurrent policies and practices. A democratic participant in a democratic country, in contrast, mounts a line of defense for the sake of defense. As a matter of fact, partisan contestants or politicians in a democracy often call news conferences, utilize spokespersons, and spread tides of information. They rarely remain silent, go off screen, or fall off the public radar. Finally, a technocrat in a technocratic era meets the need of defense by action, through rationalization, and most important, by way of function. In other words, technocratic functionaries do not dodge questions, shirk responsibilities, or pull off functions and functionalities. Instead, they admit mistakes, correct errors, and adapt to changing situations in both words and actions as they strive for systemic effectiveness and efficiency.

Words of Description

Descriptive words are used to record facts, retain memories, and preserve history. At an individual level, one feels a need to tell stories about one's inner experience and outer observation. In relating experience, one seems to embrace a natural desire to utter words that are truthful to one's consciousness. In describing observation, one tends to act on an ordinary motive to say things that are objective to existence. Collectively, a group, organization, or society strives to foster a morality, establish a culture, and continue a tradition with recollections of what it has gone through, what it faces, and how it manages in a concrete environment. The facts are basic as stories vary from person to person. Factuality is essential because only factual accounts and narratives converge toward a common version of reality. Objects are ultimate tests while subjects change from time to time. Objectivity is critical since only objective depictions and portrayals lead to a collective sense of identity, purpose, and meaningfulness.

Storytelling does not fall to an individual automatically. Nor does history keeping take place in society as purely a matter of nature. In a time of autocracy when telling a story becomes a privileged right for a few, a majority of commoners have only forced obligations to hear stories. History is written by appointed nobles to sanctify a selective description of selected things favored by the authority. In a place of democracy where people vie

for a stage or a turn to tell stories, it is still a minority of representatives who hold a monopoly over ways and means for public presentation. History is kept in the hands of motivated individuals to demonstrate a contestable documentation of contested happenings through competition. Only under technocracy may people expect to take their turn in a natural sequence to convey and spread their individual observations and experiences. History can then be recorded by trained experts to preserve a complete description of facts and factual occurrences true to all in society.

Words of Explanation

Explanatory words are provided to clarify a train of thought, defend a line of action, and legitimize a state of affairs. Individually, one needs to forge an agreement, gain an understanding, and secure support from one's peers and partners. Speaking about what one stands for and why one sticks to something in consistency, one can win trust, build friendships, and extend collaboration. Collectively, a group has to defuse tension, manage conflict, and rally membership to attain certain goals. By making and interpreting rules, it can operate with order, productivity, and constructiveness. By establishing and presenting procedures, it may run with smoothness, effectiveness, and efficiency. A society needs to deal with its neighbors relating to trade and people-to-people exchange. Through diplomacy, it conveys and elucidates what it does in policy and practice. By way of civil transactions, it reveals and illuminates how it educates youths, informs the populace, and manipulates the masses in the pursuit of either material prosperity or austerity, either spiritual unity or diversity, or just something either unique to its culture or particular to its environmental conditions.

Words of explanation mirror individual mindsets, in particular, the manner in which people think about each other and their interrelations. They also reflect social climates, especially, the way in which interest groups politick with one another in society. In a time of autocracy, individuals are either forced or feel coerced to accept one explanation over another regarding specific issues in life. An authority tends to stick to one version of reality with or without explanation to the subordinates under its supervision or control. Then, as democracy takes center stage, people set to exercise their skills of appealing, persuading, and convincing each other through arguments, debates, and competitive demonstrations. A government, while managing to hover above different visions, agendas, and programs, is likely to follow a prevailing party in its presentation or explanation of what works and what does not work in the real world. Further, when technocracy rules, and seemingly only when such a thing arrives on the scene, people

can entertain their own minds to feel what they feel, think what they think, do what they do, and say what they say about everyday interactions. An administrative apparatus may thus function naturally without much explanation in coordination, synchronization, and integration as individuals and individual parts or units participate in collective affairs by their due weights and contribute to social wellbeing through their fair shares.

CHAPTER 4

ACTS AND ACTIVITY

Humans act out their very physical existence. Babies cry for attention, adolescents rebel against control, adults perform their duty, and seniors relish retirement. Acts display human agents. When they converge in activity, they create practices, professions, institutions, communities, cultures, societies, history, civilizations, and human phenomena, all of which demonstrate human agency. With respect to order, it is apparently the human act that establishes, maintains, or destroys it. Inasmuch as governance is concerned, it is obviously human activity that informs, signifies, and symbolizes it (Mead 1938; Bernstein 1971; Kretchmar 2005; Stein 2011; Manning and Massumi 2014; Barlow and Akbarzadeh 2018; Roets, Bostyn, De keersmaecker, Van Assche, and Van Hiel 2019; LeComte, Sofis, and Jarmolowicz 2020; Ryde, Atkinson, Stead, Gorely, and Evans 2020; Vu, Bui, Nguyen, and Hoang 2020; Witzel 2020).

Internal Acts

Internal acts are things one does within one's personal sphere. In one's own mind, one may engage in self-dialogue to clarify thoughts, embark on inner stimulation to muster enthusiasm, or perform meditation to attain peace. In one's immediate surroundings, one can wash one's hair to maintain a favored feeling of freshness, clean a bed to achieve a desired state of rest, or manage an office to realize a preferred level of productivity. The same holds true to a group or society. Acting internally, a group spends time on socializing young members, training newcomers, and passing on ideas, moralities, or practices from generation to generation whereas a society makes efforts in coordinating behaviors, managing conflicts, producing goods, and delivering services to the benefit of its overall wellbeing. Internal acts act inwardly on a person him or herself or a group itself. They fall under one's inner space or a society's internal realm. As far as a purpose or goal is concerned, internal acts aim for self-effectiveness, control, order, and efficiency.

In one's lifelong journey, there are times when one forces things upon oneself, when one negotiates with oneself over actions, and when one acts out of the natural rhythms of one's body and mind. One conducts oneself like an autocrat as one abducts one's mind for spiritual purification or hijacks one's body for material abstinence. One performs like a democratic player when one persuades oneself to accept a particular ideology or corners oneself through either implicit manipulation or explicit competition into some kinds of practices. One lives naturally in life as if one were a technocrat where one follows laws about the mind as well as truth about the body to do things in oneself and for oneself. Similarly, a group features autocracy as it maintains surveillance, submits members to unusual punishments, or institutes a state of fear and scare in day-to-day activities. A community showcases democracy while it engages residents in public debates on issues and involves constituents in open competitions for access to resources or representation in governance. A society enters technocracy when it operates logically with inputs due from each unit of its membership and functions scientifically through outputs that are fair to every segment of its population.

External Acts

External acts are what one does in one's surroundings. In human relationships, one makes promises, enters contracts, collaborates on jobs, engages in disputes, or prevails in fights. Herein comes marriage, kinship, friendship, partnership, competition, rivalry, alliance, or coalition. In material activities, one gathers products, grows crops, raises cattle, creates crafts, invents tools, builds shelters, produces goods, or provides services. Therefore, there is craftsmanship, horticulture, husbandry, agriculture, manufacturing, industry, commerce, or transportation. The same applies to a group, community, or nation-state. By external actions, one group may interfere with another group's internal affairs, push another group into failure, or take over another group. One community may release toxic materials to, harbor rebellious dissidents from, or spread negative rumors about another community. One country may establish trade with, declare war against, or annex territory from another country. There are then national defenses, state-to-state diplomacies, bilateral treaties, multilateral pacts, military campaigns, trade wars, international arbitrations, transnational missions on peace, so on and so forth.

One obviously tends to force things upon one's relatives, followers, and subordinates as a patriarch or matriarch, clan head, tribal chief, king or queen, emperor, or supreme leader of an autocratic authority.

While forcible acts serve and satisfy an autocratic personality's purpose and will, they often cause stress, suffering, sacrifice, and even loss of life on the part of the unprivileged, ruled, or repressed. As a democratic player, one may attack political opponents openly on campaign trails and make policies on behalf of one's constituents in the name of representation. Although competitive actions stem from motivated participants, they are bound to lead to biased, twisted, and flawed practices to the benefit of a prevailing side. Apparently only in the role of a technocratic functionary, can one relate to other individuals equally, fairly, and factually over a group or across a system. Indeed, only collaborative acts and functional actions may converge on system operation and continuation, contributing piece by piece to group solidarity, social progress, and human evolution. At a societal level, autocratic groups seem to be built with a tendency toward aggression. From time to time they are seen to prey upon one another in crusades, conquests, and annihilation. Democratic groupings, on the other hand, appear to be programmed for competition. From place to place they are observed to engage each other in political confrontation, manipulation, and polarization. Hope is in the future when entities formed and integrated in the spirit of technocracy coordinate logically and pragmatically with one another toward mutual effectiveness as well as system efficiency.

Acts on Nature

The most primitive acts on nature include gathering, hunting, trailing, tilling, burning, and watering. Living alone on a remote island, one picks fruits, catches fishes, grows crops, and waters plants to obtain food. Traveling solo through a wilderness, one opens up a path, makes fires, hunts animals, finds edibles, and sleeps in caves to stay alive. In the contemporary era, individual acts on nature vary from maintaining a garden at the back of a home, fetching water from a spring, picking garbage on a beach, and hiking to the top of a mountain to seeking retreat in a lakeside cabin. Acts on nature at the individual level are normally limited by consequence, except in cases where an arsonist sets fire to a forest and a person equipped with knowledge or entrusted with power pulls triggers to break a water dam, spread an infectious virus, or explode a nuclear bomb. Collectively, human acts on nature begin with farming, animal domestication, housing construction, irrigation, road building, and transportation. They now manifest saliently in the ongoing process of industrialization, urbanization, and modernization. The scale is tremendous, featuring massive mining grounds and oilfields, vast production lines and transportation networks, as well as mega settlements and metropolises. The scope is far-reaching,

leading to not only a systematic buildup of infrastructure on the surface of the earth but also a schematic installation of satellite devices in outer space. The intensity is beyond comprehension, creating such catchwords as constant operation, optimal speed, and maximum output. The impact is unprecedented, resulting in deforestation, land erosion, soil saltation, water contamination, air pollution, and even global warming.

On nature, humans act in different modes while they evolve as a species. In the beginning, they clear fields to grow crops, cut trees to build houses, alter waterways to establish irrigation networks, level grounds to open roads, set fires to kill enemies, and do various other things to earn a living or secure survival. Acts are self-centered, revolving around need, adaptation, and existence. Actions amount to autocratic practices, leaving specific, though limited, impacts on environments. For example, wars launched by one group against another not only destroy a community of humans living but also devastate a habitat for plants and animals. In a democratic mode, humans approach nature as an enemy to fight against, a competitor to prevail over, or a source to take advantage of. They research nature, gather information about nature, seek truth on nature, and use all they know of nature to declare war against nature. The goal is to contain and counter natural forces, deter and defy natural elements, forecast and forge natural movements, gather and gorge natural resources, secure and safeguard human ways of life, so on and so forth. The impact is enormous, from the sprawl of urban settlements, the expansion of infrastructures, the rise of oceans, loss of lands, extinction of species, the onset of a global greenhouse, and a change of climates to the installation of manmade devices in outer space. It is now upon a technocratic era to repair damages, repeal predatory practices, and restore harmony between humans and nature. A change of attitudes is in order so that nature is a human home and homeland to admire, love, care for, beautify, protect, and treasure. So is the transformation of practices that knowledge is accumulated to better know nature, truth is sought to better understand nature, and action is taken to more broadly and deeply realize human immersion in nature, natural existence, and natural evolution.

Acts in Society

Acts in society are essentially about human relations. Individuals take care of family members and relatives, perpetuating kin and kinship. They befriend each other, cultivating and continuing friendships. They work together on tasks or job duties, attaining and maintaining professional collegiality. They enter contracts or collaborate on business enterprises,

forging and strengthening partnerships. Groups direct members, coordinate activities, manage conflicts, and build inner coherence. Outside, they align with allies by fundamental interests, vie over critical resources with competitors, and fight for control and dominance against enemies. Nation-states regulate citizens and citizen behaviors, set political goals and agendas, make economic plans and policies, maintain moral spirits and standards, keep national unification and unity, etc. Externally, they enter trade, open communication, maintain exchange, engage in diplomacy, build alliances, spread hostility, or declare war with or against one another. Overall, acts in society define individuals in terms of personality and actualization whereas actions by individuals determine societies with respect to productive forces and relations of production.

Human relations correlate with power, wealth, and knowledge. People of power force people of no power to take orders, face punishments, or die on the battlefield. Persons of more wealth make persons of less wealth carry loads on roads, grow crops on farms, or manufacture goods on production lines. Individuals of higher knowledge prompt individuals of lower knowledge to take lessons, hear advice, or follow instructions. These general occurrences typify over periods of time when society features autocracy or in places where a country pursues democracy. Indeed, in the time of autocracy, autocratic leaders often waste no time in imposing wills, exercising powers, and spreading controls. Persons in subordination act acquiescently, serve assiduously, and live fearfully as slaves, servants, or the negligible. In a place of democracy, democratic participants frequently spare no space in highlighting interests, leveraging capital, and augmenting material gains. People under representation follow the crowd, rally around dominant players, and groupthink with one another as fans, followers, or the masses. Hope is now for a time of technocracy when technocratic functionaries build on ascribed assets, act out of acquired skills, and play within assigned roles. Optimism hereafter lies in a place of technocratic practice where people relate to each other on an equal footing as partners, contributors, and fellow human beings.

Acts out of Habits

Habit forms upon a pattern of behavior. It generates momentum toward the continuation of like behaviors. Individuals follow a daily routine from sunrise to sunset. Such a fixed flow of activities provides both a structure and a thrust for moving forward from day to day. Individuals say comparable words and do parallel things under similar situations. Such a set chain of actions offers not only a feeling of comfort and contentedness but

also a sense of certainty and control. For groups, there are norms and conventions. The former usually refers to expectable codes of conduct while the latter may inform shared ways of life across the membership. For example, one group upholds as a rule of norm that one excuses oneself from a process where one needs to render judgment on another member with whom one owns a conflict of interest. Another group follows as a convention that rituals are performed for fortune and/or ceremonies of gratitude are held before and/or after a critical event, be it building a house, opening a road, planting a crop, collecting a harvest, or launching a project. In society, there are customs generalized across the population as well as traditions passing from generation to generation. For example, customary practices can vary from cutting off fingers for stealing, shaming by association, observing a rite of passage, and fasting in observance of a religious holiday to getting married during adulthood whereas traditions often include both codified doctrines and sanctified practices such as polygamy, monogamy, kinship, patriarchy, matriarchy, tribalism, monarchy, oligarchy, elitism, autocracy, democracy, modernism, and meritocracy.

Habits speak of a person and his or her character just as norms, conventions, customs, and traditions reveal a group, culture, or society and its nature. Autocrats own habits to bully, threaten, intimidate, command, and control other people. Autocratic groups resort to subordination, repression, and retribution to keep order and control. A clear distinction among people is the powerful, ruthless, or reckless versus the powerless, oppressed, or fearful. Democrats, on the other hand, develop habits to argue, debate, duel, negotiate, and fight with one another. Democratic institutions appeal to representation, competition, and restitution to maintain peace and equilibrium. A salient division across the populace is between the majority, active, or rich and the minority, disfranchised, or poor. Technocrats, in all contrasts, embrace habits to coincide, collaborate, coordinate, resonate, and fit in with each other. Technocratic societies build and operate upon incorporation, synchronization, and integration to achieve effectiveness and efficiency. A signature feature about people and their interrelations is equity, mutuality, and reciprocity. In other words, people stand on an equal footing, work individually for maximum self-actualization, and reciprocate collectively toward the optimum of social functionality.

Acts toward Goals

Goals are material or nonmaterial, explicit or implicit, short-term or long-term. Explicit, short-term, and material goals include immediate assistance in a difficult situation, a fast payback from investment, and a quick change

of action on the part of a partner. Implicit, long-term, and nonmaterial goals, in comparison, range from the reversal of a discourse, the improvement of a relationship, and the maintenance of a state of affairs to the advancement of a way of life. Acts of habits, inasmuch as they establish routines, stabilize institutions, and universalize practices, are also acts toward goals. Specifically, acts toward goals connect intent and intentionality, through a chain of actions, to effect and effectiveness. One begins with a desire, idea, purpose, or ambition. One develops a plan, strategy, tactic, or approach. One performs acts, takes actions, and establishes an individual pattern of behavior toward one's aim. One sees results, faces effects, and bears consequences over one's course of life. Similarly, a group, culture, or society embraces an ideal, dream, scheme, or vision. It cultivates a spirit, policy, program, or agenda. It mobilizes resources, rallies people, takes initiatives, and embarks on a collective journey toward its goals. It meets success or failure, harvests gain or loss, and marches on in positivity or negativity along its path of history.

Acts toward goals take place voluntarily or involuntarily. When goals come down from autocrats or persons of autocratic personality, goal-dictated acts are likely to be forced upon those who serve as subordinates. Where goals arise among goal-setters themselves, goal-attaining actions are likely to be assigned to those who function as technocrats. In the middle, goals are negotiated between competing interests while acts are staged in response to an equilibrium reached through an interface of diverse elements and different forces. There are likely democrats or people of democratic spirit who tend to make claims about rights and hence remain duty-bound with obligations. At a societal level, autocratic groups exploit wills and goals to elicit acts just as democratic institutions manipulate actions and facts to achieve goals. It is upon a culture of technocracy to form goals on the basis of collective experiences, take actions in the service of common goals, adjust goals over the course of actions, and fine-tune acts throughout the journey toward goals.

Acts in Effect

In an absolute sense, every act leads to some effect, intended or unintended. Relatively, only acts with intended consequences are recorded and regarded as acts in effect. From an ethnocentric point of view, nonetheless, acts in effect include any actions that either increase or decrease individual living, group survival, and human evolution. One builds a house, which improves one's living conditions. One sinks a boat, which leaves one struggling in open water toward the shore. Building a house and sinking a boat are obviously acts in effect to one's life. A group migrates from season to

season in search of means of living. A group engages in internal conflicts for members in domination to bully, exploit, and prosecute members in subordination. Migration and infighting are apparently acts in effect to a group's continuation. Humans learn about nature and the natural environment for knowhow to coexist with nature. Humans divide and battle over sex, race, religion, and way of life, creating and perpetuating patriarchy, supremacy, elitism, fundamentalism, slavery, feudalism, imperialism, so on and so forth. Learning, adapting, division, and self-annihilation are clearly acts of effect to humankind progressing as civilizations and humans evolving as a species in the universe.

Acts in effect change from person to person. Autocrats give orders to be carried out by subordinates. Issuing orders is an act in effect, not only for the order giver to benefit from what is in the order but also to see how much authority or privilege he or she has over a recipient of his or her order. Democrats compete with one another over vital interests. Vying for tangible gains is an act in effect, not just for the competitor to obtain what is at stake in the competition but also to compare how much advantage or leverage he or she holds over other parties. Technocrats serve collaboratively with each other in a system. Playing a role is an act in effect, not only for the functionary to understand what is in the system but also to appreciate how much value or worth he or she owns with his or her individual contributions. At the societal level, acts in effect vary from polity to polity. Autocracy revolves around a supreme leader of will and a supercenter of power. Acts in effect include both pledges of commitment, loyalty, or service in private settings and declarations of punishment, expulsion, or eradication on public occasions. Democracy showcases a dynamic representative of interest and a competitive battleground for domination. Acts in effect involve both manipulations of grass-root opinions or mass media on the backstage and exploitations of tangible opportunities or material resources across the front stage. Technocracy features both a dutiful holder of office or a responsible player of a role and an organizational mechanism of function or a systematic setup for functionality. Acts in effect range from day-to-day performances by individuals, event-by-event activities through groups, and piece-by-piece contributions from institutional components to occasion-by-occasion maneuverings at the level of a whole societal system.

Acts of Futility

There is no futile act in the sense that every act leads to some effect. In relative terms, however, an act remains futile if it neither contributes to what it aims at nor advances its actor over his or her interest, position, or

wellbeing. One loves someone with only a feeling of love within one's own consciousness. Embracing such a love becomes useless because it does not bring one any closer to one's subject of love in life. A group honors a godly entity or force by conducting series of activities from place to place or performing strings of rituals from time to time. Such actions taken toward a perceived supernatural being or element are futile if the perceived does not exist at all in reality. There are then situations of law and inevitability. By the law of gravity, it does not matter whether one screams or stays silent when one falls off a cliff. In the rage of a wildfire, it is just a waste of effort by firefighters to attempt to save a house that is doomed to change into a total ruin. Similarly, nothing helps for a reversal or slowdown when one is set to get older, more senile, and closer to death. Whether humans do good things or leave bad deeds, the Earth will eventually turn inhabitable as the Sun burns out of energy and the solar system collapses into undifferentiated masses over the universe. Futility thus goes to the level of absolutism in the form of aimless movement amid phenomenal existence.

Acts of futility take different shapes with different people, institutions, and societies. An autocrat does not see much utility in talking to subordinates and learning what they think, want, and like just as many democratic players waste time, money, and energy only to see the failure to win public office at the end of political campaigns. An authoritarian institution throws away vital resources by placing all regular members under surveillance while democratic organizations spend critical assets and capital on personnel searches, vetting, voting, and replacement, one cycle after another. A polity of autocracy spares nothing in maintaining a vast machine of propaganda to glorify its supreme leader whereas various democratic forms of government remain ready to dispense everything just to keep legislative bickering, court battling, media criticizing, public debating, and all other democratic fighting on the scene. Technocrats also act in futility when they assume positions as a matter of position or play roles for the sake of roles. Technocratic entities, whether they are corporate or governmental bureaucracies, engage in useless, nonproductive, or futile actions as well when they keep an office open just to show its existence or keep an operation running and operative just to demonstrate its function and functionality.

PART II

AUTOCRACY

Human governance begins with autocracy. Autocracy features a central figure of authority who commands a collective out of personal interests, through secured powers, and without credible challenges. Although, by and large, it is past its heyday in human evolution, autocracy still remains operationally visible in forms, by contents, and with impacts varying from place to place (Bell 1963; Haber 1964; Huang 1974; Yanov 1981; Kaminski 1992; Olson 1993; Blattberg 2000; Roller 2001; Mosley 2003; Mitchell 2004; Magaloni 2006; Davenport 2007; Lee 2011; Gehlbach and Keefer 2012; Köllner and Kailitz 2013; Shaw 2013; Kendall-Taylor and Frantz 2014; Truex 2016; Chou, Pan, and Poole 2017; Ríos-Figueroa and Aguilar 2018; Song and Wright 2018; Shaw 2019; Yakouchyk 2019; Gessen 2020; Kroenig 2020; Miller 2020).

CHAPTER 5

FORM

Autocracy takes different forms. Individually, an autocratic ruler can grow out of personal charisma or social experience. At an institutional level, an autocratic form of government may build upon economic elites or political parties. In space, a state of autocracy can hold by way of isolation or expansion. Over time, a rule of autocracy may continue through blood-based lineage or constitution-dictated succession (Bell 1963; Kaminski 1992; Everdell 2003; Magaloni 2006; Gehlbach and Keefer 2012; Kendall-Taylor and Frantz 2014; Dukalskis and Gerschewski 2017; Luo and Przeworski 2019; Kosec and Mogues 2020).

Autocrats by Birth

Power comes from people. Power belongs to people. Autocracy arises when managing an institution, running a state, or governing a society becomes a family affair. Autocrats take the stage by birth from generation to generation where autocracy sustains itself within a family or a blood-related kinship.

Autocrats by birth begin with a system of power whose founder establishes an empire, kingdom, or nation-state through a series of battles or lifelong struggles. Being oneself an autocrat by effort, one (the founder) opens the door for one's offspring to become autocratic rulers through birth. Rules for the assumption of power vary from place to place. They nonetheless naturally favor senior over junior descendants by birth order, children from the first wife over later wives on the basis of marriage, or legitimate over illegitimate progenies through blood linkage. Tension runs high when rules of succession are made problematic, violated in plain terms, or applied with complications. An autocrat by birth usually has to go through protection, tutelage, and mentorship before he or she acts out of his or her will with power. Once he or she secures control, however, he or she often stems potential challengers by way of succession among his or her siblings, clears enemies on policy fronts, and silences dissidents over the court of opinion. There is no lack of stories from imperial court to royal family to ruling dynasty where a young prince is killed to prevent him from

succeeding to power, a baby emperor is installed for his powerful uncle to exercise control, an old guardian is executed to highlight the king's demand for loyalty, or a new policy is implemented to symbolize the new autocratic ruler's assertion of political will. Even in the modern communist movement autocrats by birth appear in the Kim family of North Korea. Just recently, Kim Jong-Un, the second autocrat by birth, watched his uncle executed as a traitor, his brother assassinated with nerve gas, and his countrymen and women suffering materialistically amid his belligerent stance against the rest of the world.

Autocracy by birth evolves through generations. The length of rule of a generation coincides with the life of the autocrat crowned for that generation. One generation stays in power for a long time when its autocrat happens to live in longevity. Another generation has a short-term stay in power if its autocrat dies naturally at a young age or unnaturally because of an accident or attack. In a rare case, an autocrat in a preceding generation lives so long that he or she literally negates any chance for his or her immediately following generation to assume power. As far as the nature of power is concerned, one generation serves to consolidate a system of autocracy while another generation sets out to reform, revolutionize, or terminate it. One generation rises to the apex of an autocracy in terms of territorial control, political stability, economic prosperity, and social affluence, whereas another generation falls into the abyss by all indicative parameters for a system of power to inch toward its ultimate collapse, disrepair, and demise. It is interesting to note that some autocracies secure their lives constitutionally by surrendering power to civilians and their civilian governments. Autocracy in the contemporary era, therefore, takes a new form with the benevolence of a king, queen, emperor, or whole royal family symbolically reciprocated in the civility of an economically, politically, and socially self-sufficient citizenry.

Autocrats by Selection

Beyond a royal family or single surname dynasty, autocracy may exist and be sustained within a tribe, on the basis of a political party, or even through a controlled public election.

Autocrats by selection emerge out of a selective process. On record there are different selections. One is by a natural as well as a supernatural force. For example, the Dalai Lama is chosen as the reincarnation of a predecessor under the guidance of a belief, spirit, superstition, or a combination thereof. Another is by a council of elders. A leader or prime representative of a tribe may be selected by an exclusive group of senior

members who have lived in the community, through years of observation of and experience with potential selectees. Still another is out of an institutional dynamic or hierarchical movement. For instance, the Pope is chosen by the College of Cardinals whose members move up to become ordained bishops through a complicated process of entry, service, evaluation, and promotion within the gigantic hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. The fourth is through layers of power struggles within a political party. Mikhail Gorbachev became the General Secretary of the Communist Party and led the Soviet Union as its last leader not only because he worked his way up in a rank and file process through territorial communist leagues but also due to the fact that he survived political shifts and shuffles in the central politburo of the party. The fifth is by controlled public elections. It is typical that an autocrat who seizes power through a coup d'état uses public elections to prove the legitimacy of his or her power and secure more terms of control. One example is the presidential election of 1995 in Iraq.

Autocracy by selection can be more stable than autocracy by birth as it goes through a recognized selection process that incorporates various factors and forces such as earthly experience, heavenly blessing, individual effort, and collective evaluation. It can be less stable as well because it is more likely to invite challenges. Indeed, in any selection, one position, standard, or perspective inevitably suppresses or negates all others in order to be the prevailing one. As time goes on, a previously overwhelmed side is certain to assert its role under new situations. A change of selection, therefore, becomes a recurrent issue. By way of peace, new selections override old ones within the institutional boundary of rules and competitions. Through conflict, an old process of selection is terminated with no regard to existing conventions or protocols. For example, the supreme commander of a national armed force takes hostage the head of state, forcing him or her to relinquish power. The military strongman, hereto, assumes control, becoming a new autocrat out of no selection. Sooner or later, he or she arranges a controlled public election, turning him or herself into a legitimate autocrat through selection.

Autocrats of Charisma

Charisma is more of an ascribed nature. One is born to be handsome, tall, or of an appealing physical build. One is naturally easygoing, funny, or has a charming personality.

An autocrat of charisma may come to power by birth or selection. In his or her position, he or she is likely to demonstrate the kind of physical,

mental, or behavioral features he or she is born with or selected for. From generation to generation, recurring characteristics can crystalize into defining traits, symbolizing a royal family, imperial kingship, or ruling dynasty. Indeed, a royal family may be known for particular types of physiques, characters, sports, recreational activities, diets, and lifestyles. An imperial dynasty can thrive upon benevolence and cooptation or survive by way of brutality and terror. As reputation becomes key, an autocrat may do things for the sake of a perceived or expected public image. Such a choice is justified when he or she knows he or she is communicating a vision, propagandizing a policy, and fashioning a way of life by just acting with a signature mannerism. Such a maneuvering is warranted wherever he or she realizes that exhibiting calm, confidence, and courage is the same as, if not more effective than, maintaining control, providing order, and keeping power.

Autocracy of charisma revolves around a charismatic figure. Officials carry out orders because they know the consequence of failure. They remain loyal as they see what ensues upon betrayal. Among the populace, there are not only awe and fear, but also admiration and worship. People break down in tears when they hear their leader speaking eloquently or in solemnity on the stage. People cheer with emotional outputs when they see their leader performing some deeds or demonstrating some qualities on the battlefield or within the political arena. People even kneel to their leader as he or she walks in a parade or appears at a rally. On the policy front, charismatic autocracy features a supreme leader's ideas, visions, dreams, likes, wants, and personality. A state flies high and joyful if its leader's ideas coincide with reality, catching massive followings across the population. A system falls or ends up in disaster if its leader's pursuits run against people and their fundamental interests or needs. As autocracy of charisma builds critically upon an individual and his or her personal traits, it naturally collapses when the individual dies. For a kingdom or dynasty that continues for generations on the basis of charismatic personality, an extraordinary heir can take it to the pinnacle of its rule just as an unusual inheritor may bury it in the abyss of public condemnation.

Autocrats of Experience

Experience is achieved, acquired, and accumulated. One leads a guerilla force in years of resistance against a brutal regime or foreign occupational force. One struggles in exile or under confinement with a spirit of courage, faith, hope, forbearance, persistence, and endurance.

An autocrat of experience rises to power by serious efforts. He or she is usually the founder of an empire or kingdom. Even if he or she first leaves and then comes back to power in the middle of a dynasty, he or she can still be quite different from all other dynastic rulers due to a time of no power in prison, through exile, or on the battlefield. Experience brews ideas and cultivates visions. An autocrat of experience may pursue and practice a flagship ideology or signature ism, such as Marxism, economic reform, or national renaissance, when he or she runs a state. Experience molds characters and shapes personalities. An autocrat of experience may exhibit and exemplify certain personal traits or habitual behaviors, when he or she appears on a public stage, whether it be wearing a green military cap or making a long-winded speech. Experience deepens faith and solidifies ways of life. An autocrat of experience may follow and foster a specific type of morality, fashion, and lifestyle, including atheism, abstinence, or austerity, when he or she takes the helm of a country. Knowing what works and what does not, however, an autocrat of experience is more likely to operate by reality than idealism, deliverables than thinkables, evidence than assumption.

Autocracy of experience builds upon doings and deeds. If the founder emerges from years of battlefield experience, succeeding autocrats may take military service as part of their training before their assumption of power. At a time when he or she finds his or her control becoming shaky, an autocrat may even resort to military campaigns to prove his or her worth and legitimacy. If a country comes into being following independence from the colonial rule, it is likely to appeal to indigenous spirits and heritages for self-reliance and development. Leaders are honored as national heroes and people's representatives. History is written to highlight material creations and nonmaterial achievements by native people on local soils before and after independence. If a nation rises to the status of sovereignty out of the pursuit of a motto such as the unification of a divided territory, the actualization of people's welfare, and the liberation of humankind under communism, it is likely to follow certain general principles as standards and idealistic versions of reality as goals. Programs are designed and implemented according to national goals. Officials, official behaviors, and official performances are evaluated against state standards. For example, a communist government declares that all people produce, consume, and live collectively with no private properties, no individual claims, and no self-pursuits.

Autocracy upon Social Elites

Social elites arrive on the scene by way of wealth, power, or knowledge. They keep their privileges and influences over time through custom, law, or practice in the form of kinship, caste, or class. For example, individuals with a specific surname gain status as fighters on the battleground. They dominate armed forces from generation to generation over a dynastic rule.

Autocracy upon social elites features elitism. Whether actual or perceived, people of elite spirit view themselves as superior to commoners in intelligence, courage, vision, and everything else. They think they hold the core values of a country and represent the best of a citizenry. As such, they feel they have the right to decide what is good for a nation and can force what they deem good upon a population. Social elites supply autocratic rulers either through birth within a specific royal family or by a selective process across their collective whole. They monopolize officialdom, dominate the military, and penetrate critical lines of business from education, production, and trade to services. In the sense that they advise an autocrat on policies, social elites decide what direction an autocracy takes from the past to the present to the future. To the extent that they support an autocrat in all major areas of practice, social elites determine whether an autocracy succeeds or fails in front of its people and in the community of nations. Indeed, an autocrat may just serve as a representative out on the political front and can be pulled back to the rear when he or she is deemed to be failing in his or her role of representation by the elites.

Autocracy upon social elites operates out of social elites' fundamental interests. Laws are made, enforced, and interpreted by elitists and elitist followers to advance their economic benefits, solidify their political dominations, and secure their social privileges. When social elites are exclusively composed of only those who carry certain surnames, remain close to a royal family, or hold some ascribed traits, they may embrace interests, pursue things, and live a life in styles remote from the populace. To follow their agendas, they may automatically go against the wills and wishes of ordinary people. Extraordinary measures such as dictatorship and the rule of terror can take effect just to keep control. On the other hand, where social elites become gradually inclusive by way of education, service, and experience, they are likely to represent more diverse backgrounds, formulate more balanced policies, and take more measured approaches to issues in everyday life. As public wants, desires, and sentiments are better reflected in the political arena, ruling, governing, and maintaining order, in an autocratic form though, may incorporate more elements of negotiation, cooptation, and integration. An interesting observation is in dynastic China

where social elites are kept current not only pertaining to the era but also relating to the population by a state administered examination that systematically screens and recruits officials and ultimately elites from the common public.

Autocracy upon Political Parties

Political parties are usually founded on partisan beliefs, values, and views. Compared to social elites whose instincts are more or less to advance interests and safeguard statuses, partisan ideologues may vehemently defend party principles, fervently pursue party ideals, and meticulously execute party agendas.

Autocracy upon political parties revolves around partisanship, partisan ideologies and partisan dealings. Officials are party members, trained and versed in party argots, codes of conduct, and mannerisms. Leaders emerge from the party rank and file, speaking a partisan language, reflecting a partisan spirit, and symbolizing a partisan identity. Organizationally, a party may follow the government to every unit at each level in its structure and operation. Wherever there is a governmental agency, there is a party cell. Whenever there is a governmental operation, there is a party task force. The supreme leader of the party becomes the head of government or the autocrat of a country, turning a whole nation-state into a one-party dictatorship. Leadership succession may follow different rules, by birth or blood, through selection or competition, and on the basis of charisma or experience. For example, an immediate member of the party founder's family naturally assumes the position, the next most senior official of the party automatically rises to power, or a prevailing faction of the party in pursuit of pragmatism triumphantly takes control.

Autocracy upon political parties tends to wrestle between party ideologies and national needs. Party ideologies often relate to religious faiths, historical heritages, moral standards, humanistic ideals, or social movements. National needs, on the other hand, usually inhere in reality, involving practical issues such as reconciliation between groups in conflict, the unification of divided territories, the development of an economy, improvement of infrastructure, or reentry to the world community. At inception, a political party is fresh with its founding spirit. Party members remain committed to the pursuit of party ideas and ideals. A whole country can be hijacked into a reform, rebellion, or revolution at the expense of people's welfare or in total disregard of national interests. Later, as the party establishes itself with more and more members joining social elites, it may then swing back to pragmatism, looking after party members over tangible

benefits, winning people for lasting and substantive support, and securing the country on the basis of material strengths. Indeed, autocracy upon political parties can become indistinguishable from autocracy upon social elites when party members secularize ways of life with elitist concerns over material interests or where social elites ideologize modes of thinking by partisan dogmas for idealistic pursuits.

Autocracy through Isolation

Isolation is to turn inward for inner cultivation, growth, and buildup. It helps to resist outside influence, keep heritage, maintain character, and survive waves of change for a social system.

Autocracy through isolation entails individual control and discipline. Citizens bear hardships and make sacrifices. Officials face scrutiny and demonstrate loyalty. The autocrat can be coldhearted, harsh, and ruthless. A cult of personality is likely to develop in relation to his or her charisma, ideology, practice, or a combination thereof. He or she hears from immediate family members, relies upon close aides, and uses direct disciples or confidants for the collection of information, the formulation of policies, and the execution of orders. As individuals around him or her gain influence and take control, the autocratic leader may gradually lose touch with people and reality. Without proper recognition and efforts at correction, he or she can eventually fall into isolation and the emptiness of power, resulting in an ultimate implosion of the system. With excessive awareness and concern, he or she may nonetheless stage a series of shuffles and reshuffles or maintain constant surveillance and supervision to ensure that the court of officials practices and the mass of people follows his or her policy tenets of isolation, self-reliance, and inner strength.

Autocracy through isolation exists by choice or force. By choice, an autocratic state through isolation is likely to pursue extreme policies that place extraordinary restrictions on individual movements, create excessive pressures on citizens' livelihoods, and make exorbitant demands upon social institutions. For example, the idolization of a leader or ruling family, the prohibition of certain acts, abstinence from some lifestyles, economic austerity, and intolerance of deviance can happen altogether under an isolated regime, causing spiritual deprivation and material hardship across the population. Out of force, an autocratic nation in isolation is likely to tighten the reins in its striving for survival. Under foreign embargoes, for example, it may be cut short of basic supplies such as foods, water, heating oils, and medicines. People suffer, markets decline, and the economy contracts. Hatred develops, tension arises, and morale faces challenges. The

regime can exploit the situation to the benefit of control when it directs hatred toward foreign adversaries, turns hardship into discipline, and channels tension through a moral campaign, ideological propaganda, or political cooptation. However, as isolation is prolonged, the entire system can run out of fuel at some point of time and implode in its ultimate demise.

Autocracy through Expansion

Expansion is to go outward for a larger scale of operation, influence, and existence. It aids in the mobilization of manpower, the procurement of resources, the propagation of ideologies, and the sustenance of an autocratic regime.

Autocracy through expansion begins with inner strength. Citizens live well, sharing sentiments that they are superior to foreign neighbors and peoples elsewhere. Social elites possess knowledge and skills, seeing benefits from trade, exchange, and overall dealings with the outside. The military is trained in readiness. The economy is run with productivity. The leader embraces a vision to spread an idea, holds a dream to become a historical icon, or pursues a goal to unite a territory or population. He or she is able to cultivate in the minds of court officials as well as mass followers a set of beliefs, values, norms, and feelings reflective of his or her vision, dream, and goal. For example, colonialism flies because autocratic figures act on beliefs that certain indigenous cultures need to be replaced with better ways of life. Similarly, imperialism goes due to the fact that autocratic personalities practice ideologies that some universal ideals must be imposed upon all human societies toward a greater sameness in humankind. To an extent, autocratic leaders, personalities, and citizens reproduce, represent, and reassert themselves from country to country and from generation to generation as autocracy expands in form and extends by substance.

Autocracy through expansion thrives upon momentum. Expansion enlarges the territory, broadening the natural base of material resources. It increases the population, diversifying the human pool of skills and talents. Expansion exercises military force, stimulates the economy, and lifts the public morale. As he or she gains confidence and strength, an autocratic leader, along with his or her officials and followers, tends to plan and pursue further expansion. However, the inclusion of new elements through expansion can change the very nature of an autocratic regime toward continual expansion. For instance, a rebellion by a conquered segment overrides the apparent benefits of conquest just as a difficulty in consolidating an annexed territory outweighs the obvious harvests from occupation. An autocratic leader gives a second thought to his or her

expansionist agenda. An autocratic state takes a turn from outer aggression toward inner maintenance and self-sufficiency. Indeed, it is quite common that a lack of territorial or population integration substantively weakens a country, preventing it from continuing any expansion. It is even probable that expansion plants seeds for the eventual breakdown of an autocratic political system in the pursuit of an expansionist ideal and policy.

CHAPTER 6

CONTENT

In content, autocracy gives specific meanings to power, rulers, and ruling. It provides governing, government, and order maintenance with unique substances. Most importantly, autocracy grants an empire, kingdom, or dynasty a distinctive identity that it becomes known for in an era and across a region (Haber 1964; Olson 1993; Mosley 2003; Davenport 2007; Bader, Grävingsholt, and Kästner 2010; Shaw 2013; Melville, Stukal, and Mironiuk 2014; Ríos-Figueroa and Aguilar 2018; Shaw 2019; Yakouchyk 2019; Kroenig 2020).

Absolutism

Autocracy carries a strong sense of absolutism with regard to power and powerholders. Power is absolute. It is equal to access to resources and opportunities, the control of people and groupings, and the imposition of wills and wishes. One either has power or does not own any power. Without power, one can only live in total submission, constant fear, and sheer passivity.

Power pushes one into powerfulness. In an absolute sense, powerfulness means complete command, total control, and/or full authority. An emperor holds absolute power over his court officials who then stand as unquestionable authorities in front of ordinary people. When he issues commands with neither reason nor challenge, an emperor sooner or later turns into a tyrant. In the same spirit, officials carry out imperial orders without explanation or question within their respective spheres of influence. Tyranny hereto emerges, creating peculiar contents for autocracy. A king remains in ultimate powerfulness compared to his serving officers who in turn exercise unchallengeable controls above commoners. When he gives orders without any justification and limit, a king eventually becomes a dictator. With a similar temperament, officers implement royal policies ruthlessly across their individual jurisdictions. A dictatorship therefore takes shape, giving specific substance to autocracy. In other words, absolute

power makes emperors or kings, sustains empires or kingdoms, and engenders the spectacle or terror of tyranny, despotism, and dictatorship.

Lack of power pulls people under powerlessness. By its fullest magnitude, powerlessness reduces a person to no rights, no will, and nothing. Without rights, one remains silent about one's feelings and experiences. Without will, one appears blind to one's desires, hopes, and wants. With nothing, one can only follow others, submit to others' demands, and surrender to others' needs. Indeed, servants live to serve subjects, fulfilling the latter's wishes and requests. Officials assume positions to summon ordinary citizens who follow the former to entertain the former's likes and dislikes. Nobles take pride in commanding commoners who look up to the former to satisfy the former's curiosity and interests. In front of the king, however, nobles become submissive, to the degree that they often kneel without self and selfhood in the royal garden, just as they expect commoners to yield to their mastery and mastership. Before the emperor, nonetheless, officials turn subservient, to the extent that they from time to time kowtow with little decency and dignity around the imperial court, much as they require ordinary citizens to succumb to their domination and dominance.

Ruler as God

Autocracy mystifies itself. It sustains by way of myth. As power is polarized in the spirit of absolutism, a ruler becomes deified as the most powerful entity in nature in the same manner that a heavenly authority over the supernatural realm falls, humanized as the living king or emperor.

Deification of an autocratic leader varies in function such as rainwater to save people from a devastating drought, a star to guide a country through turmoil to order, or the Sun to shine a nation out of the darkness of foreign aggression. Reasons often inhere in reality. One is a battleground fighter to win one's national independence from colonial rule or imperial repression. One is an inbred reformer to pull one's government out of political corruption, economic depression, social stagnation, or a combination thereof. One is an ultra-era visionary to inspire one's fellow countrymen and countrywomen, leading them from ignorance, bigotry, and prejudice to reconciliation, understanding, and unity. Once deified, the leader invokes a public image in the minds of people as caring of the masses and the mass livelihood or defiant of foreigners and foreign influence. People admire or fear the leader. Out of admiration, they cheer on the leader, embracing his or her ideas, following his or her orders, carrying out his or her policies, and living with whatever outcomes these ideas, orders, and

policies bring about, with enthusiasm, dedication, and sacrifice. In fear, people submit to the leader, accepting his or her thoughts, taking his or her commands, implementing his or her programs, and putting up with whatever consequences those thoughts, commands, and programs lead to, without complaint, challenge, or resistance.

The humanization of a heavenly figure as the ruling emperor or living king grants the latter role as a messenger of Allah, a practitioner of Buddha's will, or a surveyor of God's work. A conceived or contrived connection stems from aimed or attempted action. An autocratic emperor intends to take his country to war. An ideology is hereto formed to claim that he is the angel of the battlefield, acting out God's wishes to unite peoples, expand territories, and build a large empire. A despotic king wants to balance his rule of oppression with some deeds of benevolence. Propaganda is therefore launched to declare that he is the god of parenthood, exemplifying Buddha's care for people and their material welfare while exhibiting Buddha's expectations of followers and their moral discipline. The elevation of an earthly person to the heavenly status in the supernatural realm negates the need to justify his or her plans and actions with secular facts and reasons. Legitimization is avoided here and now as legitimacy is granted there and then by the ultimate authority, Allah, Buddha, or God, in heaven or over the otherworld. The masses are only then left to dutifully follow their leader, practicing his or her sacred doctrines, contributing to his or her grandiose schemes, and celebrating his or her victorious achievements. The equalization of a leader to the fate of life from a commonsensical point of view or the law of phenomenal existence in terms of science works to the same effect in times and places of atheism, irreligion, primitiveness, superstition, reason, or modernity.

Ruling as Revelation of Truth and Wisdom

With a deified human at the helm, a country can sufficiently pursue interests by ways that speak the truth of nature. Having a humanized angel in charge, a nation may necessarily embrace developments in directions that demonstrate the wisdom of humanity.

In terms of human wisdom, commoners normally do not know what is good for themselves individually, much less understand what is right for their country as a whole collective. Ordinary citizens usually think only about immediate results of specific acts and actions in everyday life but rarely recognize essential effects of widespread incidents and recurrent happenings at the national level. It is hence upon the emperor, king, or generally the leader in autocracy to feel what people need, find out what the

nation deserves, and fetch what the era necessitates. Indeed, the autocratic head as a humanized figure from heaven or the otherworld represents the apex of human intelligence, exhibits the depth of human intellectuality, and highlights the synthesis of human wisdom. He or she recognizes what time calls on his or her people and appreciates what history demands of his or her country. He or she speaks words that inspire the populace, makes policies that work in reality, and implements programs that benefit the country.

With regard to truth, there is first a basic belief that the autocratic leader is the choice of nature. His or her ideas, thoughts, words, and acts reflect both the state of natural existence and the force of natural evolution. There is then a fundamental conviction that the automatic state is the inevitability of time. Its goals, policies, agendas, and actions represent not only the mandate of history but also the outcome of progress. There is further an essential assumption that autocracy is the necessity of reality. Censorship is needed to achieve a united voice. Surveillance is wanted to ensure general compliance. Control is a demand of order. Law is a requirement for peace. Unity inheres in united coordination. Regulation undergirds sustained prosperity. Worship of the leader purifies public spirits. Celebration of the state keeps positive mass sentiments. Ruling, on the part of the king or emperor, the kingdom or empire, officials, and officialdom, is hence to speak the truth of unity, practice the truth of command, and reveal the truth of stability. Living by commoners or ordinary citizens, on the other hand, is to embrace the truth of the emperor or king as their majesty or highness, commit to the truth of the empire, kingdom, or autocratic regime as their way of life, and celebrate the truth of submission as their ultimate fate.

Following as Embodiment of Existence and Evolution

By the logic of autocracy, following is not just an obligation of commoners. It embodies existence. Out of the reasoning of an autocratic rule, subservience is not merely a duty upon ordinary people. It reflects the essence of phenomenal change and existential evolution.

Existence features the world of commonsense. The Sun rises and sets, bringing about days and nights. Water flows from high to low latitudes, creating rivers and lakes. Plants flourish with sufficient sunlight and rainwater, spreading in the form of a tropical forest. Animals thrive with the necessary conditions and resources, expanding from village to town to city to metropolis. By the same logic, living is to enter existence, accept reality, and follow experience. Specifically, there are autocratic agencies, autocratic

offices, and an autocratic state in existence. Commoners survive when they meet official demands. They suffer when they ignore, challenge, and resist state orders. There are autocratic personalities, autocratic officers, and an autocratic head of state in reality. Ordinary citizens gain when they please commanding officials with flattering words and humble acts. They lose when they go against ruling autocrats with harsh criticisms and rebellious actions. Indeed, following embodies existence. It is through following that life flows, autocracy becomes legitimized, and existence sustains itself.

Highlighted in phenomenal change and existential evolution are births and deaths, ups and downs, expansions and contractions. Individuals endure through the whole expanse of life given that they face reality, acting on the rhythm of nature, playing the rules of society, and attending to their inner needs. Businesses expand when they engage in the market dynamics, building on consumer needs, observing public regulations, and streamlining their own operations. Communities rise provided they remain down to earth, addressing the concerns of residents, upholding common social norms, and keeping their internal coherence. In a similar line of reasoning, surviving is to find opportunities, secure resources, and avoid or overcome barriers, difficulties, or deaths. Prevailing is to cultivate relationships, beat adversaries, and solidify positions. In particular, juniors listen to seniors, making the most of the latter's advice. Servants obey masters, securing a job and a life under the latter's shadow. Officials kowtow to a supreme leader, serving his or her will while receiving his or her patronage. As a matter of fact, things flow when they coincide with the existing order. People live where they cheer on officials and official agendas. To the extent that autocracy inheres in compliance and submission, following speaks to the essence of change and evolution in the autocratic society.

Things Taken for Granted

Masters, officials, a supreme leader, and their privileges of making rules, giving orders, and living a high life are taken as much for granted as the Sun shining in, thunder rolling, or rain falling from the sky. Servants, commoners, ordinary people, and their experiences of observing rules, carrying out orders, and living a low life are admitted to be as natural as water flowing from mountaintops to valley floors, sharks eating fishes, and humans hunting animals.

Emperors, kings, or heads of state are special figures. They are supposed to be served and surrounded by special people, including servants ranging from chefs, tailors, stylists, drivers, and florists to gardeners and subjects such as advisers, disciples, and officials. They should eat special

foods, drink special liquids, wear special clothes, move in special vehicles, sleep on special beds, and reside in special places. For example, the throne is for an emperor to sit on in front of an imperial court of officials, the crown is for a king to wear as a symbol of authority, and the palace is for a head of state to live in as a high style of power and privilege. In a material aspect, a throne can be made of gold or precious metals. A crown may be decorated with diamonds or rare stones. A royal palace could expand over a large plot of land with spectacular squares, manicured gardens, grandiose reception halls, lavish banqueting rooms, extravagant entertainment lounges, so on and so forth. No matter how much it costs to build, operate, and maintain a palace, it is taken as what it is, the way it ought to be. Also, as words from emperors are thought to reflect wisdom, imperial words are unquestionably recorded, posted, remembered, and practiced. Since acts by kings are regarded as representing truth, kingly acts are undoubtedly documented, publicized, celebrated, and followed. Indeed, it is natural to see the works of national leaders published, statues of state founders erected, royal memorial halls built, and presidential libraries or museums established from place to place and from time to time.

Servants, commoners, and the masses are ordinary people. They are born to serve, cheer on, and rally behind nobles, officials, and the emperor, king, or prime leader. Where loyalty and life are concerned, a bodyguard protects his or her subject around the clock. Where bravery and sacrifice are required, troops mass along a border or on the frontline to defend their empire, kingdom, or motherland. With suffering and endurance, the masses work across the territory tilling with diligence and bear whatever comes into their life. In terms of spirit, there is a permeation of selfless dedication, absolute obedience, complete contribution, and total subservience. By the measure of emotion, there is a widespread and deep admiration for founding fathers and national heritages, a bottomless love for the emperor, king, or supreme leader, a constant fear of domestic sabotage and foreign invasion, as well as an out-and-out hatred toward state enemies. From a material point of view, it is commonly expected that servants live in rundown quarters, soldiers fight under harsh conditions including inadequate firepower and a shortage of food or medical supplies, office clerks struggle to make ends meet, and ordinary citizens bear hardship and even hunger, just as it is naturally accepted that subjects lavish money on rare collectibles, nobles indulge in conspicuous extravagance, officials show off status and privilege through material possessions, and the autocratic leader takes every possible enjoyment in the grand palace.

States of Affairs Assumed as Sanctified

Propaganda, surveillance, and personal worship are considered to be normal and sanctimonious because they are in active and constant use. Corruption, nepotism, brutality, oppression, stagnation, austerity, prosperity, or extravagance is seen as ordinary and practical due to the fact that it happens over time and exists in reality.

By propaganda, people are brainwashed with one idea and ideology, one sentiment and sentimentality, as well as one dimension and dimensionality of reality. When they think similar thoughts, they feel similar feelings. Where they see similar views of a phenomenon, they take similar approaches to existence. The country is thus uniformed and unified in thought and word. Through surveillance, friends attend friends, workmates observe workmates, neighbors watch neighbors, officials check officials, and governmental agents spy on common citizens. Compliance is enforced and reinforced while deviance is deterred and discouraged. The nation is hence systemized and synchronized in act and action. With regard to personal worship, it is exclusively reserved for the autocratic leader. On the one hand, he or she has a mystique that is above human, beyond reality, godlike, or godly. His or her thoughts are followed as guiding principles. His or her words are observed as working commands. On the other hand, the leader is glorified in grandiose material, wearing a royal garment, holding a state seal, bearing an imperial sword, sitting on a golden throne, residing in an opulent palace, or a combination thereof. His or her appearances on public occasions cause sensation and excitement. His or her deeds on the policy front invoke awe and shock. To the extent that propaganda, surveillance, and personal worship coincide top with bottom and vice versa, they are assumed to be sanctified states of affairs in phenomenal existence.

Corruption and nepotism can spread. As a consequence of autocracy, they are deemed as inevitable and unchallengeable. Discipline and prohibition may take root. Inherent in authoritarian rule, they are considered necessary and epitomical. Brutality and oppression can become routine. Coincident with totalitarian practice, they are accepted as a correct way in which government means to operate. Benevolence and forgiveness may gain fashion. As part of patriarchic leadership, they are embraced as the right manner which exemplifies how a willful yet beloved autocratic head lives. Stagnation and depression can creep upon production and economy. Resultant from autocratic control and central planning, they are seen as natural conditions toward self-reliance and sufficiency. Prosperity and affluence may hover over people's life and livelihood. Derivable from

strong government and state programming, they are viewed as automatic exhibitions of independence and self-sustenance. Indeed, whether they take place in processes under an autocratic regime or they arrive as outcomes from autocratic control, things are either assumed as sanctified states of affairs in phenomenal existence or sanctified as assumed matters of facts in an existential phenomenon.

The Wonder of Power

Autocracy collects and concentrates power. Power means resources and controls. With resources, large-scale projects can be planned and executed. Through control, massive labor forces may be mobilized and dispensed to accomplish great things.

In history, an empire expands across a region, creating a flagship civilization. A mighty military force is established and maintained. It defeats enemies, conquers lands, stabilizes situations, and keeps order, demonstrating the crafts of strategies and tactics from battlefields to political arenas to communal grounds. A systematic administrative apparatus is created and sustained. It recruits talent, makes policies, implements programs, and manages civil affairs, exhibiting the necessities of rules and institutions in the social sphere of human life. Castles are built, palaces are constructed, monuments are erected, and public works are undertaken, leaving myriads of material creations from the Ziggurat of Dur-Kurigalzu near the confluence of the Tigris and Diyala rivers to Mohenjo-daro in the Indus Valley to the Great Pyramid of Giza to the Grand Canal of China. A kingdom extends over an era, engendering a landmark polity, social system, or way of life. A leisure class appears and begins to play a significant role on different social fronts. There are artists aspiring to create timeless masterpieces, architects striving to build monumental works, scientists seeking to explore natural environments, and philosophers aiming to pursue universal truths. A civil society takes shape and starts to assert its leverage through trade, wealth, negotiation, sponsorship, fame, and public opinion. There are various interest groups making specific claims and holding on to specific grounds from production to consumption, from industry to commerce, from religion to education, and from transport to the media. Yet, it is all within the purview of an enduring kingdom, spreading empire, or lasting autocratic regime that human capital and material resources are marshalled for the initiation and continuation of a literary experimentation, social movement, religious mission, scientific expedition, or imperialist invasion, leading to such historical incidents as the Renaissance, the

Reformation, the Enlightenment, the Industrial Revolution, and the Discovery of the New World.

Across the world, a single-party state takes control of a country. It unites peoples, unifies territories, eliminates vices, treats diseases, builds infrastructures, develops economies, controls borders, and resists foreign interference. Manpower is pooled for large initiatives. Material resources are concentrated on scaled projects. The entire population is engaged to survive a devastating event. The whole country is involved to pursue an ambitious goal. The former Soviet Union kept fifteen different republics across two continents under one flag. The effect of a gigantic nation-state in terms of talents, assets, and means of production kept it a super player on the world stage for decades on almost every front, from industrial production to military operation, from scientific discovery to technological innovation, and from earth reclamation to space exploration. In Cuba, a healthcare system is put in place to provide comprehensive medical services for all citizens. North Korea, given its size, economy, and physical limitations, is able to conduct nuclear tests amid natural disasters, policy mishaps, and international sanctions. A one-person or family regime remains at the helm of a nation. It balances different interests through manipulative strategies, coopts various factions and sections by preferential practices, or suppresses specific groups and segments with oppressive measures. Yet, it keeps peoples living historically together with tensions across a territory from constant fighting and bloodshed. It prevents a land shared for generations by inhabitants of diverse racial, ethnic, religious, and cultural backgrounds from breaking instantly into warring pieces. Commonsense can tell immediately which is better between two bad situations, hundreds of thousands perishing in open confrontations in a chaotic country of anarchy or a minority living under discrimination in a controlled state of autocracy. History will reveal sooner or later if Iraq, Libya, or Syria has or would have actually taken a progressive step forward after its respective dictator Saddam Hussein, Muammar Gaddafi, or Bashar al-Assad.

The Evil of Power

Power corrupts people. A state head with unchecked power can change into a ruthless dictator, assassinating political opponents, exiling potential challengers, and terrorizing public figures with different opinions. Power destroys material creations. A national government with unlimited power may turn into a dangerous apparatus, mustering resources for disastrous programs, mobilizing citizens over devastating missions, or marshalling a whole country along a destructive path.

On the human side, power changes people. The powerful dominate on the political stage. The autocratic leader decides who gets power, how, and in what amount so that power is kept within one family, group, or social class. The powerless may only listen, take orders, and follow official policies. There is then a blatant abuse of power, with instances ranging from a disregard of basic human rights, the worship of supreme leaders, and the suppression of private interests to the instigation of unusual punishments. The powerful discriminate in the economic arena. Autocratic officialdom plans the economy, regulates businesses, makes rules on trade, and implements policies over production or consumption in a way that favors the rich, penalizes the poor, and, most noticeably, facilitates their own material gains. The powerless may only take what comes their way and live with what exists in reality. There is hence rampant corruption, with such examples as bribes for business approvals, tips for transactional intelligence, and contributions for preferential treatment. The powerful manipulate over the civil sphere. Autocratic propaganda presents one version of reality, entertains one source of information, and maintains one voice of explanation or interpretation across society. The powerless can only admit, agree, and accept what they hear from the top, above, and officially. There are then widespread surveillance, flagrant violations of privacy, and systematic brainwashing. A rule of terror may ensue, leading to an epidemic incidence of spiritual depression, mental disorders, and suicide. In the extreme, racial discrimination, ethnic atrocities, or genocide occurs, spreads, and sustains as power become centralized from time to time and from place to place.

On the material side, an emperor and members of his imperial family like eating something, wearing something, playing something, or pursuing some idiosyncratic interests, each of which can put a team of cooks, porters, soldiers, farmers, hunters, or servants under stress, prone to hardship, or at risk. In the extreme, an emperor may embezzle funds from the military to build a summer palace just to please one of his favorite concubines. A king aims at expanding the territory, uniting the population, unifying the country, consolidating power across the region, and glorifying his rule in history, all of which may necessitate the construction of large-scale civil projects at the expense of people's livelihoods or the installation of massive military facilities to the detriment of civilian welfare. Hundreds die when a military outpost or defense facility is built. Thousands struggle in hunger where a canal waterway, road system, or irrigational network is engineered. A party state operates under a partisan ideology. It may stage a revolution under which people surrender their private properties and forgo their individual ways of life. On communes or collectives, citizens bear

material scarcities and suffer from the austerity inherent in productive inefficiency. The party state may launch a program toward economic development. Driven by partisan enthusiasms, short-term gains are achieved with long-term harms to nature and the environment. Finally, suppose an autocratic regime that exists with no regard for commonsense, convention, or science. In defiance of commonsense, it forces people away from their natural homes in droves. Out of rebellion against custom, tradition, and history, it burns records, destroys monuments, and wipes out artifacts. Upon ignorance in science, it builds, creates, or grows things that might endanger the safety of a community, threaten the subsistence of a generation, or jeopardize the dynamics of a natural environment.

CHAPTER 7

OPERATION

Autocracy operates by the unification of thoughts across the population and the synchronization of actions throughout the territory. To unify thoughts, propaganda is kept constant in cultivating a cult of personality around the leader. To synchronize actions, surveillance is strongly maintained for monitoring individual compliances to state rules and programs (Huang 1974; Blattberg 2000; Collins and Collins 2004; Shaw 2004; Davenport 2007; Hariri 2012; Melville, Stukal, and Mironiuk 2014; Dukalskis and Gerschewski. 2017; Stanley 2018; Kendall-Taylor, Frantz, and Wright 2020; Miller 2020).

A Cult of Personality

If democracy is the popularization of politics, autocracy is the personalization of governance. Ruling a country boils down to one person's prerogative. Running a state sums up one family's privilege.

A cult of personality naturally becomes part of an autocratic operation. On the one hand, it points to a distinctive process in which ideas originate, policies develop, thoughts spread, and wills dictate. Where do ideas come from? They are emitted from one origin, the autocratic leader. How do policies develop? They are inspired, informed, and enthused by one source, the autocratic leader. What thoughts dominate in the civil domain? There are individuals. They think and have thoughts. However, when they all think the same, they spread the uniform thoughts of one individual, the autocratic leader. Whose wills matter here? There are collectives. They exist and demonstrate inclinations. Yet, where they collectivize toward sameness, they reflect universal wills from one authority, the autocratic leader. Indeed, this is exactly why a cult of personality forms around an emperor, king or queen, national founder, or state president, and most importantly, how a cult of personality operationalizes itself in the sphere of ideas, ideology, spirits, spirituality, policies, policy doctrinism, thoughts, wills, instincts, and intellectuality.

On the other hand, a cult of personality shows a critical aspect of control and governance under autocracy. The portrait of a state head is displayed in government offices, in individual homes, and at important occasions. The words of a national leader are quoted in official speeches, recited at mass gatherings, and signposted in public places. The deeds of a founding figure or supreme authority are dramatized, celebrated, and recorded in the form of a show in the theater, a book off the press, a movie series on television, a monument in the city center, or a grand exhibit at the state museum. Specifically, the leader's speeches and writings are broadcast at the top of the news, printed in pamphlets, and circulated through official channels as guiding principles. The aim is to show that the leader has a strong will, a clear vision, a system of thought, and a series of policy plans for the nation. It attests that governing is to rule with ideas. The leader's acts and activities are arranged under settings of magnificence, described with languages of celebration, and recorded in documents of sanctity. The purpose is to demonstrate that the leader is strong, powerful, inspirational, special, and one of a kind. It affirms that ruling is to instill awe and fear. The leader as a whole is removed from officialdom, elevated to somewhere like heaven, and equated with something like a heavenly figure. The goal is to prove that the leader is a different being, high above the mundane, far beyond the secular. It asserts that control is to create myths and mysteries.

Propaganda

All possible means of communication are explored to inform individuals of their workplace, community, society, culture, and heritage. Every available media channel is utilized to educate people about their country and its land, history, government, law, political economy, and leadership.

In content, propaganda involves the celebration of national heritages, the sanctification of state offices, the propagation of laws and policies, the promotion of moral standards, the cultivation of patriotic sentiments, and the worship of leaders and heroes. To celebrate heritages, official holidays are observed to mark the creation of the nation, the launch of the ruling party, or the birth of the founding father. Textbooks and screenplays present history in glowing words. Archives and museums record events with shining exhibits. To sanctify offices, golden seals are held inside, grand squares are built on the front, and giant flags are flown on top of the government building. Guards stand on duty. Ceremonies take place to greet leaders and welcome foreign dignitaries. To propagate laws and policies, educational campaigns are staged to introduce highlights, address concerns, and mobilize support. Classes and discussion groups

teach and spread laws. Institutions and communities serve as battlegrounds for policies. Promoting moralities, heroes are honored for emulation, evildoers are condemned to damnation, and contrasts are sharpened between good and bad. People watch each other. Surveillance is maintained, keeping everyone from deviation and deviance. To cultivate patriotism, threats are identified, enemies are targeted, and attacks are framed as constant or imminent. Shame and sorrow stem from foreign invasion, manipulation, and exploitation. Pride and hope correlate with the military and its strength, readiness, and victory. Finally, worshipping leaders manifests in kneeling in front of the emperor, bowing to a superior, reciting a leader's words on important occasions, hanging a president's portrait in significant places, erecting a national hero's statue in a public square, and building a state founder's memorial hall in the capital city. A whole body of literature can develop to record and recognize a national leader's words and deeds. An entire chain of material creations from a statue, monument, and library to a museum may extend to celebrate and commemorate a head of state all over the country.

On method, schools are taken as battlefields to cultivate in young people a life-long identification with the authority and its ideology, policies, and programs. Textbooks present an official version of history and reality, whether it is true or not. Public places are utilized as natural settings to inform individual citizens of their government and its leaders, agendas, and achievements. Portrayals, bulletin boards, flags, slogans, statues, and monuments proliferate at crossroads, in public squares, and on top of office buildings all over the country. Official occasions are employed to instill awe and fear across the populace for the head of state and his or her charm, charisma, and supremacy. Applause, cheers, eulogies, salutes, guards of honor, and parades serve to show mass deference, submission, and commitment. Most important, all media channels, from the press, radio, and television to any other possible form, are explored to spread messages by, promote the goals of, and mobilize support for the nation and its ruling authority. Books, magazines, talk shows, primetime news, feature programs, and social media revolve around the state and its announcements, rituals, and doings. Inherent in propaganda through all these fronts are simplification of content, standardization of delivery, repetition of message, and reinforcement of memory. For example, a message is simplified in the form of a slogan or image, presented conspicuously across public places, and repeated on multiple occasions so that it clicks for people at once and sticks to their consciousness ever after.

Surveillance

Surveillance is a way of life under autocracy. Not only are servants, civilians, and those at the bottom monitored by subjects, officials, and those at the top, but also each party is watched by another. Not only are acts, behaviors, and doings observed, but minds, thoughts, and sayings are also scrutinized.

Generally, regardless of one's standing, one is subject to observation, evaluation, supervision, and reportage by those who are up, down, and around. As a civilian, one is under surveillance by one's workmates, neighbors, peers, relatives, friends, and even family members. Inappropriate words, such as complaints against authority, cause problems. Improper actions, even in the form of passive resistance, bring trouble. As an official, one is to be loyal or unreliable, collegial or tricky, corrupt or unreasonable in the eyes of one's superior, colleagues, and supervisees. Saying too much, one becomes a subject of investigation. Not doing enough, one turns a target of discipline. In a party state, the ruling party extends its elementary units to every cell, corner, or segment of society, no matter how tiny, remote, or negligible it is, with the sole purpose of monitoring, educating, and organizing people with party ideas and ideals or for party agendas and aims. Under a dictatorial regime, secret police such as the Gestapo and KGB, may be installed at the will of the supreme leader to follow officialdom, survey the military, and watch the whole population for comprehensive compliance, complete commitment, and absolute loyalty.

Both mind and body fall into the purview of surveillance. In a sense, it is the mind that is the target even though the body is watched. Indeed, acts are indicators of intent, words are reflectors of thought, and controlling acts or moderating words essentially disciplines the mind. When individual minds think and express in the way the authority desires and expects, words scrutinized as well as acts under observation can automatically turn out to be in official compliance. Censorship is known to be in long, wide, and various use from place to place. Under autocratic rule, saliently, it becomes a routine practice. Content creators, from painters, musicians, and novelists to playwrights, check their own products to ensure they meet official requirements, neither challenging authority nor inciting civil disobedience. Content distributors, including publishers, radio stations, and televisions, monitor their own releases to avoid controversy and, better yet, to contribute to official propaganda. Content consumers, whether they are readers, viewers, or listeners, screen their own intake so they can identify, abandon, and report any negatives. Most importantly, the autocratic regime maintains an overarching operation to weed out any books, magazines,

films, shows, arts, and other cultural products that are not in tune or synchrony with the official stance. Creations with a slight deviation can be banned. Authors of a minor violation may be ostracized. In the extreme, a sculpture that does not present the dictator as taller than other officials is destroyed, a film that implies a positive foreign influence in the national movement toward independence is held at bay, or an author who writes about the aftermath of a failed state policy is sent into exile.

The Rule of Terror

Order calls for extraordinary acts and measures, such as tribunal trials and severe justice. Stability justifies extreme means and procedures, including the use of violence and a rule of terror.

Adopted in response to an emergency or crisis, a rule of terror expands and extends to crush rebellion, stem resistance, control chaos, and maintain order. Basic elements are severe punishments, speedy yet spectacular executions, and certain hence inflexible justice. For example, a revolutionary leader is hanged in a public square soon after he or she is caught. Specifically, rebels and their affiliates are not only killed without question on the battlefield but also executed in the absence of due process through the criminal procedure. Workers or farmers are threatened with arrest, imprisonment, layoffs, and material loss when they attend street demonstrations. Students and intellectuals are met with tear gas, water cannon, beatings, jail, expulsion, house arrest, or exile when they stage protests physically or on spiritual terms. Friends become suspects. Friendship takes the stain. Relatives are implicated. Family faces curse while kinship bears shame.

Institutionalized as a mechanism of control, the rule of terror deepens and permeates to create fear, spread surveillance, strengthen supervision, and perpetuate stability. Secret police are installed to follow and persecute individual citizens, both officials and civilians, for any possible deviation in thoughts and acts. People exercise care when saying words because of fear. They take precautions when doing things due to punishments. An omnipresent party machine is operated to advise and supervise members of society toward complete compliance with official rules and total commitment to governmental policies. Resistance, whether it is active or passive, is nipped in the bud through coercive shaming. Contribution, materially or on nonmaterial terms, is celebrated with conspicuous honor. In particular, political opponents are harassed, thrown into prison, or even assassinated, creating a public feeling of intolerance for opposition. Civil critics are bullied, threatened with physical harm, or exiled

to remote places, spreading a general sentiment of abhorrence against difference. Workers keep their eyes on other workers. A workplace changes into a bastion of dread and distress. Neighbors remain guarded about neighbors. A community turns into a breeding ground of suspicion and suppression.

Centralization of Power

If the rule of terror is more of an atmosphere about what to feel, the centralization of power is pointedly an arrangement by which to live. As power gravitates toward the center, individual citizens lose their basic rights to choose things that are essential for education, employment, entertainment, and almost every other aspect of life.

In the process, a supreme leader commands absolute authority over his or her officials whose higher levels assert complete control over lower levels, and the lowest echelon of officialdom exercises wide-ranging power over civilians. Oppositely, people are forced to surrender to officials in rights and choices, lower levels of officials are made to give in to higher levels on powers and decisions, and all officials are habituated to defer to their autocratic leader on wills and privileges. Generally, the emperor, king, or head of state owns the country and all its means, resources, and opportunities. Officials manage the nation and all its affairs, from diplomacy, defense, security, education, economy, and trade to culture. Civilians serve the autocratic leader with full devotion and work for the officials in complete compliance. On specific terms, commoners or ordinary citizens must gain approval from officials as to where they may live, when they move, what they do, and how they behave. For instance, they obtain permits to operate businesses, pay taxes in sharing productive gains, and register themselves to gain protection or supervision. Officials need to follow a chain of command, fulfilling their particular duties while demonstrating universal loyalty to autocracy and its autocratic head. For example, they make regular reports to their superiors to secure recognition, guidance, and support. They recite the words of higher officials and salute to portraits of the highest authority to express obedience, commitment, and dedication.

By impact, there are decision delays, mismatches, and even disasters. Ideally, individuals own wills and powers to decide what they think, say, and do in their natural settings over the course of their life. As they lose their original rights and due powers to a third party, they have to wait for that external authority to act on their behalf in a place and time remote from their specific circumstances. Decision delays happen when

neither critical individual needs are met nor urgent local issues are addressed in a timely manner. Decision mismatches occur when either the approaches adopted bypass root problems for a resolution or the measures marshalled mistarget troubles toward a settlement. Decision disasters take place from time to time, resulting in dire situations varying from massive material waste, irreversible natural damage, and widespread civil disturbance to serious humanitarian crisis. For example, a large-scale reclamation project taken by a central government causes a systematic loss of natural habitats for many living beings. A decade-long economic program orchestrated by an authoritarian regime leads to a widening gap between the rich and the poor. Hostility instilled by a dictatorial authority against an ethnic group results in the fleeing, dislocation, and suffering of many members of the group across a region. The most significant symptom of centralization, of course, is abuse of power in which powerholders use the power mustered to benefit themselves, a few, or one segment of the population to the disadvantage or even harm of all those who give power.

Policymaking by Top-Design

As power is concentrated at the top, lower levels customarily follow higher levels in laws and policies. As control is exercised from the center, people habitually look up to officials for choices and actions. Indeed, the essence of autocracy is this: An autocrat expresses his or her will and wishes, officials translate his or her will and wishes into rules and programs, people follow official rules in their everyday life, and the country practices governmental programs as part of the construction of social reality.

The keyword is policymaking by top-design. It means that a few create rules for many and a minority plan or program ways of life for the majority. There are obviously two sides to this. On the one hand, a supreme leader is special, unique, or godlike, with access to the law of nature, the inevitability of history, or the will of a supernatural authority. The advisers and officials around the autocrat are intelligent, informed, and exceptional, with systematic knowledge about the country, its land, people, history, current states of affair, and future challenges. Also, the top commands a superb view of the nation, issue by issue from production to consumption, from national defense to international diplomacy, from morality to spirituality, from inspiration to regulation, from the education of the young to the care of the old. The center maintains an excellent understanding of the society, piece by piece from individuals to individual relations, from groups to group dynamics, from communities to community solidarities, from sectors to sector productivities, from segments to segment efficiencies.

In other words, the autocrat knows what people want. The rules he or she dictates are exactly what people wish for the world. Officials understand what the country needs. The policies they design are precisely what the country demands of the era.

On the other hand, commoners are specific to locales, with different needs and wants. They normally know what is good to their local community but rarely understand what is good for their country. Ordinary people are particular to the times, with diverse desires and demands. They often worry about how life goes on in their era yet seldom care about how the nation in which they live manages the present upon reflection of the past and in view of the future. Moreover, the people at the bottom can by no means see the country as a whole, what it does in integrating its individual parts, how it relates to other countries, and where it stands in the community of nations. The periphery may in no way see the nation as a totality, what challenges it faces in reality, how it meets internal needs while averting external attacks, and when it gains strengths or loses momentum as it sails through time. Put differently, individuals at the bottom do not have much in common and hence are not able to contribute much to what it means by universality as law and lawmaking to all citizens, the citizenry. People on the periphery do not share much in general and therefore are not capable of offering much to what it means in commonality as policy and policymaking by sheer officials, officialdom. Indeed, commoners at the bottom can only follow the rules deemed necessary to them by an autocratic leader at the top, just as ordinary people on the periphery may only carry out the orders imposed upon them by officials from the center.

Enforcement through a Built-In Mechanism

Autocracy operates under a basic assumption that citizens live to demonstrate a collective will epitomizing the mind of an autocrat leader. It runs upon a fundamental principle that government exists to serve a joint purpose featured in the mission of an autocratic regime.

A mechanism is built in the system. On the human side, individuals are active agents to perform duties. They do not have much in rights and choices but owe a lot by way of contribution or sacrifice. People are functional forces to fulfill obligations. They cannot make much of a claim for individual will or wishes yet must take a sufficient part in the collective drive and goal of their country. Specifically, there are military services. On the battlefield, soldiers take orders and remain ready to die at any moment for their nation and its commander in chief. There are business operations. Out of the enterprising effort, businesspeople pay taxes and stand prepared

to offer their gains on any occasion to their government and its prime head. There are official campaigns and movements. Civilians answer calls, pushing state initiatives through barriers toward success. There are state policies and programs. Citizens take actions, carrying government agendas over hurdles to completion. Ideally, people are expected to live without their own ideas, thoughts, desires, and wants. In the extreme, citizens are made to serve their nation, support their government, and sacrifice themselves for their emperor, king, or supreme leader.

On the material side, there are raw materials and natural resources. These are offerings from nature or blessings by a supernatural source to serve the purpose of the country. There are means of production and tools of work. These are vehicles for officials to employ in the implementation of their favored rules and embraced policies. There are products and business profits or individual incomes. These are creations or contributions for an autocratic head of state to utilize in the fulfillment of his or her will. Moreover, institutions are installed to make plans, develop programs, and manage processes. Communities are deployed to follow commands, carry out orders, and translate programs into practices. Governmental agencies are operated to survey civilians, monitor officials, exercise control, and maintain order. In the sense that all materials and material factors belong to the state, they exist to accomplish the mission of the nation or to achieve national goals. To the degree that all institutions and institutional forces fall under the purview of government, they stand to execute the will of a supreme leader or to fulfill the wish of a loyal officialdom in the service of the leader. As a matter of fact, the whole country is built as a material mechanism to act on what the autocratic head wills through his or her reign and to react to how the autocratic regime fares in reality, domestically and around the world.

Succession

Succession is part of the operation in the sense that any specific regime exists as a particular unit or episode in the continuation of an autocratic rule. It affects not only how autocracy operates here and now, but also how autocracy extends there and then.

Succession creates shadows. Whether it follows a long-established rule or lies in a sitting autocrat's mind, succession initiates preparation, fuels speculation, and gives feedback on the existing operation. When the rule states that the oldest son is the first in line to inherit the throne, that special son will sooner or later muster followers and material forces under the current emperor or king. Where the ruling autocrat has his or her favorite

successor in mind, that heir apparent will step by step gain powers and influence within the existing regime. To the degree that a chosen, groomed, and rehearsing successor may explicitly or implicitly affect the way in which a sitting autocrat behaves and a ruling autocratic government operates, succession produces shadows. As a matter of fact, any autocrat and his or her autocratic apparatus or operation in the chain of succession has to bear some back-shadowing of momentum or residual influence from his or her predecessor as well as to face some foreshadowing of emergent or tidal challenge out of his or her successor.

In a broader scope, succession is a process to ensure the stability of an autocratic regime, the continuation of an autocratic practice, and the production of an autocratic reign featuring a family, a party, or any identifiable human trait. Stability is the way of life for autocracy. The fact that one is chosen by rule or will to succeed a sitting emperor, king, or head of state not only clears the danger of any possible power struggle or power vacuum, but also affirms the prospect of control and order under the existing government. The autocratic practice involves national ideology, mass propaganda, a founding philosophy, governing principles, rules and regulations, policies and programs, defense and diplomacy, so on and so forth. A successor is selected and prepared to obviously continue what has developed, sustain what works, and perpetuate what prevails within the current system. A family dynasty arises when a succession endures by blood from father to son to grandson to great grandson. A party dictatorship emerges as succession persists through party affiliation from leadership to leadership. Indeed, any system of domination forms when succession permeates time one generation after another by way of commonsense and convention, faith and religion, evidence and science.

CHAPTER 8

IMPACT

As a political system, autocracy has general impacts upon society, social change, human civilizations, and human history. To any particular country that practices it, autocracy leaves specific consequences for people, institutions, and communities within the country, as well as for other nations as immediate neighbors, in the region, and across the world stage (Yanov 1981; Roller 2001; Mitchell 2004; Lee 2011; Köllner and Kailitz 2013; Shaw 2013; Frantz and Kendall-Taylor 2014; Truex 2016; Chou, Pan, and Poole 2017; Song and Wright 2018; Yakouchyk 2019; Gessen 2020; Lynn 2020).

Cost

In the beginning, it seems not only convenient to run an entity by using a simple autocratic apparatus, but also cost-effective to govern a place with the rules made, programs devised, and practices implemented in a top-down, uniform fashion. Once it is in place, however, an autocratic system often incurs various costs that are not necessarily due to governance, in the form of abuse, corruption, and misjudgment or for the sake of self-gratification, maintenance, and perpetuation.

Savings may be assumed under autocracy where one center exhibits the simplicity of the political process, one program demonstrates the controllability of economic production, and one voice illustrates the uniformity of social life. Power is in the hands of an autocratic emperor, king, or president. Everyone listens to the center, cheers on the supreme leader, and prepares to take orders from the top. There is no struggle as to how power distributes throughout the political system. Resources flow into and out of the government. Businesses produce according to official directives and assignments. People consume based on formal allowances and quotas. There is no negotiation as to how goods fare in the market of demand and supply. Public opinions form around the will of the head of state. Patriotic terms fly, fueling enchantment with the country and its historical heritage, current states of affairs, and future prospects. Celebratory

words spread, feeding worship of the leader and his or her unique vision, extraordinary wisdom, and magnificent accomplishment. There is no dispute as to what is right and wrong, good and bad with regard to government, national leadership, and state policy. Imagine the time spent, materials dispensed, labor performed, and energy lost in a non-autocratic system where struggles over power remain constant, forces inherent in the market run wild, and debates on issues become helplessly aimless.

Waste can be real and tremendous due to abuse of power, dereliction of duty, policy failure, the implementation of unchallenged programs, and the pursuit of unattainable goals. Abuse of power usually happens throughout the government from the autocratic head to an entry-level officer. For the pleasure of his beloved concubine, the emperor could pool funds to build a luxury summer palace, even jeopardizing logistical support for the military on the battlefield. Dereliction of duty typically occurs in those officials who face neither the necessary supervision by those at the top nor sufficient accountability to those at the bottom. With specific authority over an area or in a jurisdiction, an official might put hundreds of businesses at risk or make thousands of individuals suffer when he or she does not perform his or her due duty adequately. Policy failure obviously takes on different meanings. In the sense that a country fails to protect its citizens from the harm of crime, policy failure may manifest from misinformed lawmaking, misguided law enforcement, and mistaken law interpretation to mismanaged agencies in social order maintenance. To the extent that a nation does not live up to its basic mission of providing people with a minimal level of wellbeing, policy failure can result in austerity, famine, emigration, and social disorganization. Indeed, an authoritarian state very probably implements policy programs unchallenged by the general populace. Unchallenged, they are likely to be unsubstantiated by evidence and logic, be it a massive relocation of a group, a large-scale reclamation of land, or a long-term undertaking of a project. It is highly possible that an autocratic leader pursues unattainable goals. Being unattainable, they are almost certainly unrealistic and irrational, whether it is building a regional empire to glorify his or her ancestry, forming a global alliance to satisfy his or her ego, or realizing a revolutionary ideal to extend his or her legacy. However, because unchallenged programs are implemented anyway, material resources and human capital are often wasted in countless amounts. Since unattainable goals are pursued nonetheless, people from time to time suffer incalculably.

Rulers

Autocracy is not just for an autocratic leader or a line of authoritarians, dictators, and tyrants to act out, translating personal wills into political realities. It impacts rulers as well, casting ruling individuals in the light of particular characters with specific characteristics.

One is owner identity. Wearing the crown, an emperor feels that he owns the crown, seal, palace, imperial court, community, city, and country, everything he sees and can imagine. Sitting on the throne, a king senses that he possesses the throne and its power, the nation and its resources, the servants and their bodies, the officials and their minds, the people and their belongings, everyone he comes in touch with and may think of. In the position of an owner, a head of state does whatever he or she desires, wants, and likes for a country simply because it is his or her land, plus materials, products, and all other things therein. With the mind of an owner, a leader of sovereignty treats people at his or her pleasure, wish, and gratification plainly as if they are his or her beings, admirers, followers, or servants. There is no evaluation, consequence, or accountability when something goes wrong. Nor is there regret, empathy, or repentance when someone gets hurt. In other words, owner identity causes a ruler to lose his or her due humanity, making him or her a robotic figure.

The other is ruler supremacy. Seeing servants serve him over living matters in the imperial palace, an emperor can automatically develop a belief, outlook, or practice that he is higher than everyone around, not just by position but essentially in terms of birth, body, mind, and their very existence as human beings. Watching officials take orders, make reports, and explain situations in submission, a king may naturally form an attitude, habit, or mannerism that he is better than all below, not just in terms of power but fundamentally with reference to intelligence, intellectuality, nobility, and their very humanity accorded to humankind. Ruler supremacy builds on authority or power yet it takes authority and power to be granted for the degree that a persistent feeling of being better than anyone else becomes the cause as to how a leader holds authority and keeps power, forcing his or her wills and wants onto officialdom. Similarly, ruler supremacy dwells on position or status, and, nonetheless, views position and status as ascribed, to the extent that a pervasive thought of being higher than everyone else turns out to be the reason why a ruler owns position and possesses status, imposing his or her ideas and policies upon the population.

Commoners

Autocracy does not fall into a country from heaven. It emerges among a population due to some general as well as specific features inherent in the population. Once it is in place, autocracy leaves tangible impacts upon citizens, their thoughts, behaviors, and ways of life.

Mirroring the emperor, king, or president at the top, people under autocracy are disposed to act by means of an autocratic personality. At an individual level, one views the world as divided between the top in the sky and the bottom on the ground. Parents, masters, or elders issue commands and take charge whereas children, servants, or juniors carry out orders and serve in conformity. Specifically, one feels like a parent, holding an unchallengeable authority to design and dictate how one's children lead their personal lives. One senses in the role of a master that one owns an unquestionable right to demand and direct what one's apprentices, servants, or followers do in a job or over a work career. One thinks in the status of seniority that one possesses an inalienable duty to exemplify virtue, demonstrate conscience, or embody what is right, good, or noble in front of one's future generation. In terms of societal significance, autocratic personality provides soil and sows the seeds for autocracy, its genesis, maintenance, and continuation. The supply of personnel remains steady for officialdom, even the top leadership, as new generations grow up with an autocratic personality. The practice of beliefs and policies stays strong throughout the government, because people not only think in one autocratic train of thought but also behave with one autocratic manner and mannerism.

Deepening their own submissive state of affairs, commoners in an empire, kingdom, or autocratic system are inclined to operate with a slave mentality. At the system level, a slave mentality feeds a culture of submission and forbearance. Belief is in the status quo under which the poor work for the rich, the powerless bow to the powerful, and the illiterate hear from the knowledgeable. The norm is to accept, obey, and observe what is imposed from or prohibited by the top as right or wrong, good or bad, lawful or unlawful, commendable or condemnable. Value is about compliance, endurance, and servitude yet with awe, appreciation, and gratitude. A slave mentality fuels a polity of repression and fear. The citizenry is a mass to manipulate, exploit, and utilize rather than a population to feed, care for, and cherish. Government issues commands, extracts contributions, and maintains control often with no due regard for what commoners think and want, how they fare and feel, and where they stand and stay. Individually, as a slave one does not feel one owns oneself and hence needs to take initiative in one's life. Instead, one waits for orders, permissions, and

allowances from one's master. One with a slave mentality does not think one possesses any agency over one's fate or destiny and therefore must act to charter one's individual journey through this world. To the contrary, one habitually looks up to the top and customarily counts on the outside for one's living and existence. However, to the extreme when one's basic instinct for survival is threatened or one's total tolerance of sufferance is exhausted, one may only implode in self-destruction or explode by way of rebellion.

Groups

Autocracy affects how people form groups, how groups operate, and whether groups sustain. In other words, grouping takes place in ways characteristic of a specific autocratic polity. Groups appear and disappear amid dynamics reflective of a general autocratic atmosphere.

Groupings under autocracy are scarcely voluntary. People may form clubs out of their interest in art, sport, and other nonpolitical matters on a voluntary basis. However, since the government remains typically wary of any interest-based mass groupings, such voluntary groups may have to involuntarily make some political declarations or nonpolitical gestures just to stay viable. In the meantime, an involuntary grouping often falls upon the population due to political contingency or in the service of an active governmental agenda. By the degree of involuntariness, this kind of autocratic grouping usually begins with regime-coerced, goes through to government-sponsored or supported, and ends up in officially coopted. As an example of the coerced grouping, each neighborhood is required to establish a residential committee to spread official policies among people who settle or sojourn in the community. For the sponsored or supported grouping, a professional association receives government funding to ensure that all its members practice within the policy premises of the regime. An organizational alliance around faith, ethnicity, or cultural heritage holds an official endorsement so that it appears legitimate in the sphere of law and public administration. Overall, it is common that groupings are coopted happenings under autocracy to the extent that groups exist and continue simply because they serve some purpose of the government.

There is then understandably a phenomenal lack of type or variety of groups in an autocratic society. Groups are either political or nonpolitical. Political groups serve the regime in propagandizing official policies, eulogizing national leaders, rallying grass roots interest, and implementing governmental programs. Nonpolitical groups revolve around civilian needs in everyday life, from individual survival, workplace matters, and business

issues to communal affairs. In terms of numbers, political groups can proliferate under official sponsorship, especially in the time of a national crisis or in the middle of a political campaign. For instance, various nationalist groups appear in the political arena to maintain a general spirit of antagonism toward and resistance against foreign countries when the regime is faced with an international embargo. Nonpolitical groups, on the other hand, may never thrive even within the sphere of a basic societal necessity. The reason is simple. That is, the government embraces an instinctual suspicion that any group is a latent pool of dissidence and hence holds a habitual fear that any grouping is a potential vehicle of rebellion. It is thus always better just to keep at the minimum the number of nonpolitical groups in the mere service of basic civilian needs and essential commoner interests.

Institutions

What institutions are here to come and continue? What practices are there to go and disappear? Autocracy obviously leaves its marks on institutions and their social processes.

Institutionalization revolves around power. It originates from power. With the blessings of an autocratic leader, patriarchal actions, discrimination against women or ethnic minorities, and the persecution of dissidents stay strong as social customs. It serves power. Patriotic sentiments, hero veneration, and leader worship flare into fashion. Institutionalization fluctuates with power. When centralization happens, it intensifies as if it blew like a tailwind behind the regime. Where decentralization occurs, it loosens as if it flowed like a spring out of the mass. For example, a law is made, enforced, and interpreted without much tolerance for deviance and deviation when power gravitates toward the center. Finally, institutionalization reflects power. It is because of power that some acts, actions, and exercises converge and strengthen, becoming routines, rituals, habits, norms, conventions, and traditions. Or it is due to a lack of power that some behaviors, practices, and deeds decline and vanish, becoming trivial, unimportant, insignificant, inconsequential, negligible, and irrelevant from social currency and historical heritage.

Institutions in existence thus spread along with the governmental apparatus. Countrywide organizations correspond to the central state. Regional or local groups correlate with lower levels of government. Those in line with the regime and its policy receive support, operate in smoothness, gain by influence, and thrive as an enterprise or practice. Some may even act as official surrogates, dominating a field of expertise or a line of

business. For example, a radio, television, magazine, newspaper, or media agency, while registering as an independent entity, can serve as a mouthpiece of state propaganda. Those in observance of neutrality struggle to survive, without the explicit blessings of the government yet perhaps with the implicit encouragement of the civil society. Some may weather waves of political movements or storms, becoming a kind of institution of independence by themselves. For instance, a private university exercises its motto of objectivity, truth, justice, and integrity despite constant pressures to incorporate current political affairs in its curricula or open its doors to official initiatives in higher education. Those in opposition to the regime go underground or face annihilation. With extraordinary words and acts, some may exert influence upon the populace or instill fear through officialdom. One extreme is terrorism. Political leaders are assassinated to sabotage certain programs. Mass casualties are inflicted just to create public panic and social disturbance.

Neighbors

Externally, an autocratic state is likely to seek alliance with entities of a similar nature. To sovereignties of difference, it can be either of no contact or in open conflict. Polarity typifies relationships to the outside, especially neighbors with borders on land or over water.

With a strong neighbor of like polity, an autocratic country is likely to embrace the former as a source of inspiration for ideas and ideologies and a role model in action and practice. Students are sent there to study different subjects for a general way of thinking that is reflective of autocracy. Officials are dispatched there to receive training in specific ways of acting that are facilitative to autocratic governance. The autocrat himself or herself may make secret or open visits there to hear words of advice closely from his or her dominant counterpart or witness actions directly by his or her strong neighbor. On the other hand, when facing a strong neighbor that operates under a different type of government, an autocratic nation may have to struggle hard to resist the former's influence that is bound to threaten its own existence. Extreme measures can be instituted, ranging from the erection of a border wall, the closure of all ports of entry, and the breakup of a formal diplomatic relationship to the freezing of all civil contacts, to stem both inbound and outbound flows of information, materials, and peoples. Besides concrete acts and actions, ideological rhetoric often fires up in the official media, exposing the adversary and its ills on all fronts while eulogizing the autocratic leader for his or her courage, wisdom, and

persistence in maintaining the country's independent character and unique position throughout the region and around the world.

Toward weak neighbors, an autocratic state may take a range of actions asserting its control and influence. The first is dictating. The autocrat remains heavy-handed as to what his or her counterparts in other countries do, telling, if not commanding, them to do things of his or her liking or not to do things of his or her disliking. Formally or informally, he or she calls them little brothers or sisters. The second is exportation. The autocratic power engages in schemes of exporting some, if not all, of its institutions and practices to neighboring territories. The purpose is clear: to explicitly extend autocracy and implicitly secure justification for its way of governance. The third is interference. The autocratic regime keeps an active eye on what its neighbors do on all possible fronts, from politics, economy, and cultural practice to social affairs. It stands ready to intervene whenever there is a chance. In the extreme, a powerful government of autocracy may meddle in the political dynamics of a weak country, nurturing some forces while stemming other factors in the latter. The former may even send troops to the latter, supporting one faction while suppressing all other sections. One step further is that the latter falls directly into the hands of the former, becoming a coerced satellite state or an annexed territory.

Society

A society is larger than a government. However, since a government leads, it shapes society as to how the latter organizes, operates, and sustains. Autocracy, as it makes a government generally salient in the life of people, tends to leave specifically significant impacts upon society, its morality, climate, and way of existence.

An autocratic society is likely to take a binary approach toward issues of morality. Words are either good or bad. Acts are either right or wrong. People are either friends or enemies. Things are either blessings or curses. There seem to be neither go-betweens nor middle ground. Inherent in the political climate is a taken-for-granted spirit of conservatism. One lives in acceptance when one looks up to the government for information, direction, and recognition. One survives under normality where one follows the populace, saying what everyone else says and doing what everyone else does. On the contrary, one would face rejection when challenging the regime over its policy, program, and rule. One could struggle in deviance where one goes against the crowd, expressing one's inner thoughts, exercising one's own wills, or pursuing one's individual dreams. Tolerance for variation is kept at a minimum. Different opinions are discouraged.

Outright criticisms draw direct sanctions. Noncompliant acts are stemmed. Open rebellions invite immediate crackdowns. Treason, traitors, sabotage, haters, and various other alarming labels are commonly circulated in the official propaganda so that people of the general public share a maximum level of alert against deviations in their everyday thoughts and behaviors.

The civil society remains weak. Segments in support of the regime cheer on governmental policies, actions, and achievements. They seem to be active, powerful, and thriving. Yet, since they are so coopted to the political establishment, they hardly qualify as a legitimate part of the civil society. In the sense that they are for, with, and even in the state and state operation, they only serve to expose how civilians and civilian interests can become negligible. Segments with political neutrality exist along with essential needs and necessities in everyday work and life. Be there illness and healthcare, there are doctors, nurses, pharmacists, and their respective professional associations. Be there leisure and entertainment, there are artists, athletes, performers, and their corresponding fans or interest clubs. These groupings in the service of specific groups and group needs represent part of the civil society. However, as they are emptied of their political wills, they barely stay as complete entities full of their individual characters and characteristics. Segments in opposition to the autocratic apparatus are open targets for suppression and elimination. Ideas are banned. Voices are silenced. Acts are criminated. Actors are prosecuted. In cases where dissidents connect to spread messages of resistance underground, they sow the seeds of hope and promise in the civil society for a different approach to governance. In situations where rebels organize the staging of acts of opposition outside the political beltway, they secure the ground for reform and revolution in the civil society toward a new form of polity and political practice.

History

Autocracy is part of human history. It debuts at a certain point of time, prevails for some duration, and fades away when it is out of life. To specific societies, autocracy can stay longer or shorter than its due time because of its distinctive nature. It may leave a larger or smaller impact than a due influence owing to its unique performance in the political arena.

In the history of human civilizations, autocracy comes as an early presentation of power, an initial stage of governance, and an opening form of polity. Power in the time of autocracy conveys will, reflects personality, and demonstrates a personal penchant for control, influence, and difference. In a collective perspective, power is pillaged from individuals, imposed

upon the masses, and made a spectacle across the populace. Autocratic governance hence features coercion, repression, and exclusion. Establishing rules, making policies, and giving orders are exclusively in the hands of rulers and their designated representatives or trusted officials. Civilians are forced to respond to the regime and its commands in a humanmade state of awe and fear. Noncompliance invites attention, resistance draws intervention, and rebellion triggers crackdown, all with force at the back, in the front, or throughout the process. Indeed, polity in the form of autocracy exists to showcase the supremacy of one single person or family in relation to the submissiveness of one large mass of commoners or crowd of ordinary people. Dialectically, nonetheless, it is autocracy that sows the historical seeds for new kinds of political ideals and ideologies, inclusion, participation, and representation. It is autocratic dynamics, especially when and where power turns abusive, ruling becomes unjust, and control runs brutal, that prepare the historical soil for new types of governing mechanisms and practices, the institutional check and balance, media surveillance and exposure, public transparency and accountability.

From society to society, autocracy fares differently with various intensities, durations, and consequences. In one society, it appears early, grows deep roots, assumes a strong presence, stays late, and creates an enduring heritage. Autocratic residues remain on the social scene with substance or at least ceremonially even when a new form of government gains dominance across the political arena. In another society, autocracy comes quickly, lasts for a diminutive period of time, fades away quietly, and leaves only a minimum amount of influence. Noticeable remnants rarely continue in the subsequent era as testimony to a past autocratic way of political life. Of course, as long as it exists once in history, autocracy keeps its traces, exhibits its creation, and demonstrates its existentiality forever over reality. In the absolutist sense that autocracy stays in the shared memory of a society or sinks in the collectivized consciousness of humankind simply because it occurs in history, autocracy can still figure in a society where a different kind of polity dominates, giving it an autocratic leader for a particular term of office or in an epoch when an opposite type of politics plays, leading to a series of autocratic incidents amid a generally unautocratic mode of governmental practice.

PART III

DEMOCRACY

Democracy arrives on the political scene when and where people become sufficiently conscious of themselves being independent agents, their interrelations being voluntary in nature, and their collective governance being participatory by practice. At the core of democracy are participation and representation. The former entails a civil duty to share concerns, report problems, raise issues, express opinions, cast votes, check on offices, and evaluate officials on the part of citizens. The latter necessitates that government be run by elected public officials, tested civil servants, and registered political parties representative of various individuals, diverse groups, and different interests across the whole spectrum of the general population (Lipset 1959; Riker 1962; Thompson 1970; Macpherson 1977; Köchler 1987; Morgan 1989; Weatherford 1990; Hansen 1991; Appleby 1992; Birch 1993; Diamond and Plattner 1996; Weingast 1997; Lijphart 1999; Tocqueville 2000; Putnam 2001; Gutmann and Thompson 2002; Khan 2003; Shaw 2004; Wilentz 2005; Held 2006; Raaflaub, Ober, and Wallace 2007; Bartels 2008; Isakhan and Stockwell 2011; Mosley 2013; Fukuyama 2014; Wright 2015; Way 2016; Moore 2017; Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018; Brennan 2019; Shaw 2019; Taylor 2019; Eckersley 2020; Krasner 2020; Wolkenstein 2020).

CHAPTER 9

FORM

Democracy evolves over time and exists around the world in forms varying from constitutional monarchy, democratic socialism, participatory politics, republicanism, sortition, anarchist democracy, consensus democracy, consociational democracy, cosmopolitan democracy, creative democracy, guided democracy, inclusive democracy, and liberal democracy to supranational democracy. While these specific types inform it in a direct light, democracy can be examined critically in forms with analytical input (Haldane 1918; Macpherson 1977; Hansen 1991; Copp, Hampton, and Roemer 1993; Willard 1996; Dahl 2000; Tocqueville 2000; Becker, Heideking, and Henretta 2002; Mosley 2003; Held 2006; Tannsjo 2008; Shaw 2013; Volk 2014; Moore 2017; Joshi, Maloy, and Peterson 2019; Ceka and Magalhaes 2020; Corbett 2020; Hu 2020; Maboudi 2020).

Democrats by Association

Association is a key factor in social relations. People relate to one another by association. People judge each other in terms of association. Through voting, one can be pushed into office as a democratic leader by the populace simply because one is associated with a family, institution, ideology, or movement.

Association with a family or institution plays out in democratic dynamics when people place trust in a candidate who comes from a recognized family or has an affiliation with an established institution. One is favored over other competitors to fill a vacancy left by one's spouse, parent, or relative. One is preferred to other candidates to prevail in a race upon the mere fact that one's husband or wife, father or mother, brother or sister, grandfather or grandmother holds a major office currently or held one some time ago. Around a city, one family becomes a powerhouse as it dispatches its members to serve on the city council and assume the office of mayor from generation to generation upon certain characteristic manners of public dealings. In a regional government, one clan keeps a major stake when it sends its members to function in the provincial legislature and

command a governorship across generational lines on the basis of some flagship modes of political maneuvering. In a nation-state, one family weighs in with tangible clout while it supplies winning candidates to key offices including the presidency and the premiership from parents to children out of some signature name recognitions or partisan brandings. All these democratic manifestations are seemingly evident in the United States where people the voters see, trace, and talk about political lineages and influences in major cities like Chicago and Los Angeles, over large states such as California and New York, as well as at the national level by the Taft and Kennedy clans and even through the Adams, Harrison, Roosevelt, and Bush dynasties.

Association with an ideology or movement figures in the process of democracy where voters react, emotionally hence irrationally, to candidates who spearhead particular ideas and ideologies or emerge from specific moves and movements. One advances in opinion polls as one builds upon one's background and experience in partisan propaganda and political action. One prevails in voting booths because one aptly simplifies ideas into political slogans, skillfully operationalizes ideals in terms of action agendas, and manipulatively galvanizes constituents around everyday-life fears, desirables, or tangibles. A local incident is dramatized into fuel for political campaigns. A regional division is exploited as sources for misunderstanding, distrust, and even hatred across gender, race, or class lines. A national loss in wars, trades, or diplomacies on the international stage is even channeled through expressed animosity toward aliens or declared revenge against foreign interests or entities. Indeed, as a government of radical ideas, extreme ideals, and ultra left or right ideologies comes into play from a so-fired-up population, it often turns a region into a battlefield and sometimes even throws the whole world into decades of cold or hot war, as witnessed vividly over the twentieth century and beyond.

Democrats by Representation

It is assumed that leaders are voted into office to represent people and their fundamental interests in a democratic system. Here then comes a critical question: Can democrats as elected representatives work in fairness at a higher level of government while acting faithfully on behalf of their constituents?

A constituency selects its representatives. All constituents expect their elected officials to speak their language, expressing their concerns, advancing their interests, and consolidating their influences. A group that is not able to send a representative to the higher level is often left out of power.

People who are not represented in the government may only see their desires ignored, needs neglected, and wants overridden. By default, democratic representatives are supposed to work loyally, diligently, and productively for people in their constituency. They have no legal obligation to look after individuals and individual welfares outside the sphere of their due representation. As they represent their constituents and constituencies, democratic politicians are likely territorial, versed in a local sentiment, embedded in a regional political climate, or entrenched in some land-specific partisan dynamics. They tend to be sided, reflecting one perspective, state of affairs, or pursuit with no consideration of, attention to, and involvement in any other. They can be selfish, securing their constituents' gains or attaining their constituency's goals at the expense of all others. They may even become radical, irrational, and unnecessarily combative when they act upon local agendas and special interests or where they are hijacked by outlying ideologies and wayward propagandas.

At a higher level, whether it is a regional authority or a national government, officials elected from different constituencies work collectively to make, enforce, and interpret laws and policies. Can democratic representatives find common grounds in identifying issues general to a county, province, or country, larger than various locales, groups, or pursuits? Logically, it calls for integrative reasoning from parts to a whole, components to a system, segments to a population, or incremental deeds to an evolution. One not only sees parts connect to form a whole or components function to sustain a system, but one also understands how group needs are met only when a general population and its interests are served or how step-by-step progress is made only where an overall evolution and its destinies are realized. Practically, it requires check and balance, negotiation and compromise, conflict and collaboration by democratic agents to reconcile inner pushes with outer pulls, self-motives with objective demands, local wants with national interests, short-term quests with long-term goals, time-specific contingencies with historical missions. One exercises moderation in one's immediate gratifications or direct pleasures as one knows that check, compromise, and collaboration are likely to bring about greater, longer-lasting, and more meaningful benefits. Emotionally, it takes personal care, human sympathy, and ethical commitment to empathize with those who are underrepresented, unrepresented, and disfranchised in the democratic process for a genuine understanding of their concerns, aspirations, and needs. One reaches out to groups outside one's due constituency because one recognizes that people thrive when they are in unity, harmony, and peace among themselves, not

where they are in conflict, experience hostility, and have hatred for one another.

Democrats of Ascribed Traits

Democracy revolves around public presentation. Candidates who appear handsome or beautiful, look neat or nice, seem approachable or relatable are more likely to pass the test of likeability, popularity, and electability applied implicitly or explicitly by voters in a jurisdiction. Inherent in one's popularity are, first, if not foremost, features ascribed to one by birth.

Appearance by a large degree comes out of nature. Everyone probably wishes to be good-looking with an attractive physical build. Yet not everyone is blessed to grow into a striking man or stunning woman of ideal skin, flesh, texture, height, weight, and body mass. Intelligence to a certain extent originates from genes. With a higher capacity of thought, one is more sensitive to feelings in reality, sharper to identify issues, and quicker to develop ideas. Having better communication skills, one holds the keys to inspire, motivate, and rally more people in larger crowds behind one's agendas, causes, or goals. Even character, disposition, and mannerisms owe much to DNA in comparison to nurture. Being sociable, one tends to make friends, find supporters, and cultivate sympathizers in one's endeavors. By an inquisitive or aggressive personality, one is likely to venture into something new and big for information, knowledge, material gains, or control throughout one's journey of life. With regard to democracy, although it is difficult to measure how much physique plays out in a particular race, it is obvious that appearance, character, intelligence, and all born features add to a candidate's mass appeal and acceptance toward victory or just the finish line. Albeit it is no easy task to delineate body politics from place to place, it is without doubt that a candidate needs to look at least right and comfortable to the populace as a person in his or her ascribed traits in order to prevail in or just survive a public election.

Another birth-determinative factor or force is association with a family, clan, or tribe, more generally a gender, ethnicity, and race. Descendants of a family take priority to become candidates not just because of proximity: They are active on the political stage. Relatives of a clan hold an advantage to win a race not only due to name recognition: They are widely known to the populace. Members of a tribe keep momentum to assume public offices not solely out of experience: They are skilled in governmental dealings. To some degree, people tend to embrace, follow, and act upon an unraveled myth that political genes stay, transmit, and multiply within a kin or kinship, making its members natural players in

political processes. The same is true for gender, ethnicity, and race. Traditionally, affairs of government are seen as men's things. Women have long been kept out of political arenas as racers, voters, and even spectators. Individuals of one ethnicity dominate legal, administrative, and managerial landscapes, overseeing an institution or social system wherein those of other ethnicities become disfranchised, ridiculed, and mistreated. People of one race rule as a majority of the population or a minority of elites, advancing their interests, amplifying their voices, and expanding their influence at the expense of all others, especially those of different racial groups. Indeed, even in some self-claimed free and open democracies of the contemporary era, racial supremacy or inferiority still runs deep and strong in both pockets of place and brackets of time. Things pushed away by underrepresented racial groups in political fields often come back with a vengeance through either orchestrated efforts or uncoordinated actions by the dominant race.

Democrats of Achieved Deeds

Democracy involves competition. Competition is a battle of strength. Compared to ascribed traits, achieved deeds, from the power concentrated, wealth accumulated, and knowledge collected to the fame garnered, serve more convincingly and effectively as personal assets to make one a candidate, winner, representative, or official in the democratic game.

Tangible achievements are usually measurable things one has created or obtained. One starts politicking or becoming involved in democratic activities early in life. Aiding in elections, lobbying on behalf of some recognized causes, and clerking for politicians lay a foundation for election to local office. Service in minor roles at lower levels of government, such as the mayor of a small city and a member of the regional legislature, paves the way for winning major office in higher echelons of power. In number, one has years of service to boast about as a city council member, mayor, county supervisor, state representative, provincial senator, governor, or national legislator throughout one's political career. In business, one grows and expands from family undertaking to corporate operation, small firm to large enterprise, manager to executive, or regular employee to major shareholder. One makes it to the list of most notables by wealth with one's business on the roster of the most recognizable in terms of size, revenue, or profit in a jurisdiction or across the country. One touts one's business savvy as a political asset and potentiality for revamping an economy, streamlining a bureaucracy, or pulling a government out of difficulty toward vibrancy. In professional pursuits, one follows rules, climbs the ladder, and advances along a career pathway. One becomes a prominent physician, award-winning

journalist, famous entertainer, pioneer scholar, or renowned lawyer. One dwells on one's professional discipline, success, and integrity as personal capital and trustworthiness to prevail in a race for public office.

Intangible assets are often not so immediate or obvious to categorization and quantification. Yet, from time to time they prove to be as functional and facilitative, if not more so, as tangible achievements. The knowledge mustered informs a candidate to develop the best possible campaign strategies and tactics. The fame spread aids a nominee in communicating political agendas with the highest expectable effectiveness and efficiency. The reputation earned can clear one from areas of common suspicion, setting the tone for predictable responses from the populace over one's dealings with sensitive matters. The impression left may steer one away from issues of controversy, preparing the stage for one's smooth performance on safe tasks in front of the general public. Indeed, public image works like something becoming real because it is assumed as real when it first appears to be positive for a candidate. Political influence overcomes barriers, opens roads, and gathers momentum so much as something taken for granted by an incumbent through a constituency once it is established. Business clout creeps upon a mass of constituents, anesthetizing their cultural instincts, galvanizing their public enthusiasms, or radicalizing their socioeconomic views, as long as it takes place naturally through the hidden hands of a skillfully manipulative mind, political or otherwise.

Democracy upon Powerful Interests

Government becomes a stage to present, a vehicle to advance, and a mechanism to protect individuals, groups, social classes, and their respective interests under democracy. Individuals, groups, and social classes take the stage, drive the vehicle, and activate the mechanism when they are resourceful, lucky, and strategic. Interests advance, thrive, and dominate where they are powerful, appealing, and insurmountable.

Naturally, groups waste no time to establish their scale of presence once they win an election. Interests spare no effort to expand their scope of influence as soon as they assume the helm of government. In specific terms, winning groups turn on propaganda machines to spread their ideas, ideals, and ideologies. Leading interests make, enforce, and interpret laws in favor of their business undertakings, professional pursuits, and private lifestyles. Prevailing groups formulate policies, build programs, and carry out agendas on different fronts in a manner that appears to push a city, province, or country into certain directions. Ruling interests reform government,

streamline operations, and improve efficiency over various aspects in a way that seems to give a jurisdiction, state, or federal union some characteristic outlooks. Groups of dominance reach out to other population segments, broadening their mass support. Interests in command coopt other political wings, consolidating their power base. All these efforts by groups during their control of government serve to strengthen the groups themselves, prolonging their life across the political landscape. They may literally keep their power term after term if there is no term limit. All those labors by interests over their charge of office work to boost the interests themselves, perpetuate their legacy throughout the democratic arena. They can meaningfully continue their influence even though they have to go on a hiatus from time to time due to term limits.

Dialectically, domination by one group or block of groups motivates challenge, resistance, or rebellion. Other groups join hands, pool resources, and align with one another on a collective vision, plan, and agenda. The so-formed alliance grows in strength, expands by influence, and takes shape as a new force in local or national politics. Sooner or later, it stands firm to fight against the dominant group for control of government. Rule by one interest or constellation of interests leads to the marginalization, neglect, or suppression of other interests. A city, county, province, or country loses balance as it moves too far in one direction. Adverse feelings develop, negative sentiments spread, and harmful reactions gather force in the form of formal complaint, open criticism, and public protest. These sow the seeds of change at the grass-roots level. As other interests converge to form common ideas, goals, and actions, they become democratic tides and waves to push the ruling interest off the political stage. A coalition of other interests assumes office thereafter, opening a new road in a new direction for a local jurisdiction or national sovereignty. In all, democracy features powerful groups or interests. A powerful group or interest tends to push its interest or position to the maximum or climax when it takes charge of government. This ironically yet inevitably creates conditions for its ultimate demise, namely, to be replaced by another emergent yet would-be powerful interest.

Democracy upon Prevailing Parities

Democracy rides over competing groups and interests. Political parties form when different groups seek alignment or alliance in ideology, policy, and action. Partisanship plays out where parties compare and contrast with one another by way of dealing, manipulative maneuvering, compromise, cooperation, conflict, or confrontation.

Prevailing parties assume office, run government, and become ruling parties. Besides working for itself, its members, groups, and their fundamental interests, a ruling party carries the duty to govern a whole country, its people, institutions, and their material wellbeing. In addition to embodying all under its own umbrella, a party in power holds the responsibility to represent an entire state, its values, ideals, and pursuits. Obviously, the ruling party that balances itself with government is in an advantageous position to win another selection for another tenure of office. The party in charge that reconciles its party agendas with national interests maintains momentum for the control of government from term to term. Specifically, a party in command reaches out to other groups and interests, listening to their concerns, addressing their issues, and ensuring their benefits. It coopts other elements and forces in governance, allowing for the limited presence of difference and the controlled presentation of challenge in national politics. Of course, a ruling party may become extreme as well. In one scenario, it capitalizes on a solid majority to hijack the state for its own ideology, policy, and program, no matter how impractical, radical, utopian, or even harmful many of its specific ideas, goals, and practices turn out to be in reality. In another scenario, it brazenly manipulates mass opinions and unscrupulously abuses governmental power so as to exploit a whole population for its own gains, materially and nonmaterially.

Out-parties stay on the political sideline. They join the ruling party to form a government, keeping some share of power. They allow or send their individual members to hold key positions in the executive branch, maintaining some presence in the process of governance. Or they boycott the ruling party and its government, taking no part in official policy formulations and implementations. By themselves, out-parties dwell on their partisan ideologies, criticizing other beliefs, moralities, and world outlooks. They advocate their partisan agendas, challenging the ruling party and its policies, practices, and influence. They appeal to their partisan bases, building their mass foundations, material resources, and social supports. Among each other, out-parties compete, striving for their respective scopes of influence. They shun one another, with each advancing its own individual interests with no regard for others. Or they seek alliance, pooling human capital and physical properties for the strongest possible resistance to the ruling party and its government. Indeed, when it uses the non-ruling status as an opportunity to expand its population bases, grow its tangible assets, and strengthen its competitive muscles, an out-party best prepares itself for the next round of public election. Where it takes advantage of being off stage in politics to observe ongoing policies and practices, learn from current failures and successes, and accumulate positive experiences, an out-

party best positions itself for winning a new selection, organizing a new government, and executing a new policy agenda for a city, province, or country.

Democracy through Inner Sufficiency

When democracy functions as a forum for presentation and comparison by different beliefs, ideas, and worldviews, it generates vitality and vibrancy for existence and endurance. Where democracy serves as a stage for performance and competition by diverse interests, schemes, and practices, it produces dynamism and vigor for survival and sustainability.

In one scenario, democracy keeps a balance among different groups and their often-conflicting interests. There are instantaneous expressions of attitudes, opinions, and voices in the public sphere through mass media. There is also the simultaneous exercise of claims, rights, and privileges over the open arena via social means. For example, a conservative radio company churns out harsh criticisms of liberals and their lifestyles. A nonprofit organization organizes a street protest against the government and some of its policies. While constituents and constituencies remain active and persistent in their respective pursuit of material gains and nonmaterial goals, the government rises above and beyond individual factors and forces to be an all-people representation and a whole-country operation. In other words, it revolves around a consensus-based constitution, creating amenities of life for citizens at home at the same time as safeguarding national interests around the world. Specifically, the government exists as a nonpartisan entity although it falls into the hands of a prevailing party upon selection. Within the country, it allows for freedom of expression, freedom of association, and freedom of enterprise. People feel free to speak their minds, pursue their interests, and practice their ways of life. With regard to other sovereignties in the community of nations, the country as an entire system stays sufficient, viable, and sustainable, economically, politically, culturally, and socially.

In another scenario, democracy alternates between opposing ideologies, policies, and practices. For one time when one party wins an election by a landslide, it takes a city, province, or country in a particular direction toward a particular state of affairs. The prevailing party reckons that it owns both political momentum and economic capital to spread its messages, advance its interests, and expand its influence. With power, it may even harass critics, manipulate the media, and suppress voters. Over one period where one party takes office with a commanding majority, it runs the government under a partisan flag in pursuit of a partisan agenda. The

ruling party calculates that it holds historical opportunities as well as material resources to build things, dismantle objective existences, and realize versions of reality in alignment with its own ideas, ideals, and ideologies. In control, it can go as far and extreme as abolishing treaties, amending the constitution, and reversing the common core discourse. Partisan acts and actions obviously engender resentment, resistance, and rebellion. Out-parties, marginal groups, and minority segments join hands to unseat the ruling bloc in future selections. Sided doings and deeds seemingly produce factors and forces for their own removals and replacements. Ignored, neglected, and oppressed sides find fuel to grow and expand in mounting realistic challenges to the government. Sooner or later, the other side gains strength, wins power, and takes control. A jurisdiction or nation-state hence swings to another, oftentimes the opposite mode of morality, rationality, activity, and practicality for another span or stretch of time.

Democracy through Outer Alliance

Democracy does not necessarily grow out of local or native soil. When a country adopts democracy through certain colonialist or imperialist connections, it naturally keeps its historical links as external pulls toward a functional and enduring democratic form of government. Where a nation falls in democracy via some reformatory or revolutionary shockwaves, it normally follows its foreign influences as outer sources of support for a working and sustainable governmental mechanism of democracy.

Historically, lands after colonization by European colonizers receive ideas about democracy and begin to institutionalize democratic practices, such as free debates over policies, open elections of powerholders, and public votes on performance by officials in business enterprises, professional organizations, and governmental agencies. When those lands become independent, they continue the democratic spirit throughout the civil society and in many cases maintain democracy as their way of government. In a similar manner, territories upon exploitation by Western powers learn about issues around democracy and start to apply democratic thoughts to areas or sectors from production to service, business to government, and work to life. By the time these territories overcome imperialist controls or foreign influences, they have to some extent internalized democratic ways of thinking in the public consciousness and under various situations tend to retain democracy as part of their governmental operation. Of course, countries whose democratic form of government is so imported or grafted often have to remain connected to their

initial importers or grafters for continuing inspiration, reinforcement, and refinement. Nations whose election system for public office is so implanted or installed usually need to stay in tune with their original planters or installers for ongoing encouragement, support, and improvement. To a small or large degree, they exist and last owing to a historical alliance that they inherit and cultivate with their former democratic colonizers, exploiters, or rulers.

Currently, Western powers embark on an adventure to expand democracy around the world. By specific measures, international agencies created and operated by leading countries in the West, including the United Nations and many of its affiliates, make rules, design programs, and implement plans in reference to democratic ideas and practices. Global transactions spearheaded and monitored by dominant nations in the West, from trade, diplomacy, and disease control to disaster relief, follow protocols and procedures reflective of democratic principles and exercises. Worldwide mass media directed and sponsored by major states in the West, such as films, television, games, and popular cultures, promote and proliferate creations and products symbolizing democratic spirits and actions. With explicit examples and implicit pressures, directly from Western powers and indirectly out of Western-style fashions, nonwestern countries across the globe are inspired, encouraged, or forced to adopt, pursue, or mimic democracy as a way of politics or a form of government. In a parallel fashion, rich economies embrace a mission to spread democracy throughout the community of nations. In particular steps, they charter and support nonprofit organizations to educate voters and monitor elections in foreign countries. They establish and administer development aids to improve infrastructures and train officials in other nations. They cultivate and follow capital and corporations to exercise influence and maintain control over local politics in faraway lands. In need of investment, technology, and management, developing and undeveloped societies often scramble to meet the conditions, demands, and even mandates made by developed economies for open markets, fair elections, and free enterprise. These big three, while undergirding a rich nation's original rise to wealth, can ironically keep a poor country in political indecision, economic incapacitation, and social paralysis, without much hope for change, development, and prosperity. Indeed, there is no lack of countries in the world that claim democracy only because they remain nominally in a democratic alliance or block.

CHAPTER 10

CONTENT

Democracy comes with its unique beliefs, norms, and values. In operation, it follows its distinctive principles, rules, and mechanisms. As a result, it generates its characteristic residues, meanings, and consequences. Indeed, democracy unfolds a political landscape that by nature remains markedly different from any other form of power, government, and social order (Lipset 1959; Köchler 1987; Wood 1991; Benhabib 1996; Weingast 1997; Plattner and Smolar 2000; Gutmann and Thompson 2002; Diamond, Plattner, and Costopoulos 2005; Raaflaub, Ober, and Wallace 2007; Isakhan and Stockwell 2011; Shaw 2013; Wright 2015; Moss 2017; Feldmann, Merke, and Stuenkel 2019; Isenberg and Burstein 2019; Taylor 2019; Curato 2020; De Cleen, Moffitt, Panayotu, and Stavrakakis 2020; Jones 2020; Qvortrup, O’Leary, and Wintrobe 2020).

Individualism

Democracy revolves around individualism. Power originates from individuals and individual rights. It converges with government when individuals surrender some of their rights for living gregariously in society. Government is necessary only because it serves to enforce social contracts and maintain collective order to the benefit of all living individuals.

Individuals have rights. Rights derive from the sheer fact that individuals are independent entities entitled to grow and expand out of their natural potentials and potentialities. With rights, one chooses to live alone in solitude or collectively in a village, township, or city. One makes use of natural resources from air, water, and soil to plant for foods, clothes, and shelters. One creates amenities, opens roads, and makes products. One sets up stages, participates in activities, and turns out artifacts. In collective living, individuals enter relationships, sharing feelings, spirits, and experiences. People establish contracts, involving the production, distribution, and trade of material goods. People build communities, binding one another in religious fellowships, work unions, and professional associations. Individuals make rules, governing interpersonal relations,

business contracts, and communal dealings. Over social settings, group participants assert rights as they fulfill obligations. Organizational associates exercise privileges while performing duties. Business partners claim benefits while assuming responsibilities. Communal members gain power, wealth, knowledge, influence, or a combination thereof as they commit labor, invest time, and spend resources. In all, everything originates from, unfolds upon, and ends up with individuals and individual rights.

Rights make power. Power drives government. Government serves individuals and individual needs. In the sense that individuals give up some of their original rights for collective living, they hold authorities to demand paybacks that are equal or comparable to what they surrender. Paybacks vary in form as well as content from communality, the civic sphere, welfare, emergency assistance, disaster relief, public health, and national defense to social order. By the degree that government symbolizes individual wills, it owns power to make, enforce, and interpret rules indicative or reflective of what people want, expect, and need. Specifically, government recruits civil servants, selects officials, and maintains troops for its own operation. It collects taxes, levies tariffs, and mobilizes resources for its various functions. To the extent that individuals shoulder government in the same way that water carries a boat, they have abilities to make it rise or fall, expand or shrink, function or malfunction. In particular, one group of individuals can exploit government as an instrument to advance its self-interest at the expense of the general population. Another group of individuals may take advantage of government, draining its resources until it plunges into bankruptcy. Overall, it is individualism that finds in government the will of individuals and in individuals the power of government.

Leaders as Volunteers

Individuals surrender some of their personal rights to collective life and its public governance so that they feel free and safe to go about their private pursuits. Although governing and government turn into an area of individual pursuits once they become standard business affairs in established institutions, leading and serving as leaders are originally as well as essentially volunteering and working as volunteers.

Volunteering means offering. It is based on self-willingness. First, individuals secure their own means of life, operating a type of business, specializing in a professional field, or providing a line of service. Materially, they have sufficient food, drink, medicine, clothes, shelter, and all other living amenities. In the nonmaterial dimension, they hold a belief in the

necessity of social order, embrace an ideal for public good, and feel an obligation of service to fellow citizens. On the other hand, volunteering implies that governance is a public affair, open to each willing member in a political collective. It suggests that government is a public arena, accessible by every voluntary participant across an administrative unit. Of course, whenever there is a line of volunteers waiting for ordinary service, there are terms imposed to limit the time spent by each person in order to ensure an opportunity for everyone. Wherever there appears to be a competition for extraordinary service, there are procedures instituted to set specific requirements in education, qualifications, and experience by candidates just to maintain general standards of equity, fairness, and transparency for all aspiring individuals.

As government expands in scale, the meaning of voluntarism becomes lost in a gigantic bureaucracy and a hyperactive operation. On the one hand, governance calls for sophisticated skills in communication, public relations, and leadership. Government counts on seasoned expertise by civil servants upon special training, policymakers with specific knowledge, and officials of particular experience. It is not possible for any willing citizen to be able to perform the duties of a given office, or all voluntary constituents to be capable of defining, executing, and evaluating routine business affairs in government. As selection for service becomes necessary, some individuals fashion their thoughts and behaviors in ways that enhance self-competitiveness in institutional recruitment or public election. They sharpen skills, manage lifestyles, and improve public impressions. They build upon personal assets, take advantage of bureaucratic practices, and advance along professional pathways. There then appear political careers and career politicians who deal power and politics or broker policies and governmental deals as a way of life. Similarly, some families prepare their members and heirs for active engagement in political processes. They develop and cultivate relationships with sources of power. They create and entertain an expansive network throughout the political machinery. They craft and keep a signature reputation of character, commitment, effectiveness, trustworthiness, or fairness in the courting of public opinions. There hence exist power families and political clans that dominate or remain instrumental in the government of a city, province, or even state from generation to generation.

Leading as a Representation of Collective Wills and Wishes

In the democratic arena, leading is essentially a public undertaking. It is logistics rather than politics that only a number of leaders, officials, and

civil servants take positions in government. If it works, all constituents ought to literally be in office, pondering, saying, and doing things about the governance of their constituency.

As all-people governance appears to be logistically infeasible, representation becomes a vital practicality. Individually, representation is voluntary, whether one volunteers or is pushed to serve as a representative in government. Stepping forward, one usually shares strongly in collective wills and wishes. Being selected, one normally is known for one's commitment to public interest and wellbeing. Once in office, a representative leader understands that he or she thinks, speaks, and acts on behalf of people and their shared ideals, needs, and goals. Even in one's regular leadership role one feels one does things out of one's own mind, one succeeds in things because one aligns so well with the public mentality. An official in representation recognizes that he or she plays, performs, and functions for the sake of a jurisdiction and its common faith, welfare, and existence. Although amid one's routine official capacity one senses that one makes choices from one's own experience, one accomplishes things, for one remains so naturally enmeshed in collective sentiments. The same holds true, to a lesser degree though, for civil servants who on various tasks in different positions throughout the governmental bureaucracy have to weigh up and wrestle between individual likes or dislikes and public gains or losses, personal comforts or discomforts and communal advances or declines, private satisfactions or dissatisfactions and common prosperities or miseries.

On the side of the populace, representation can never be precise, prompt, and perfect. There are gaps. Leaders act out of their individual beliefs, ideas, wants, and experiences that often do not fully correspond to those of the groups for which they volunteer or are selected to represent. Even though it is possible that group interests and pursuits are essentially realized through leaders' words and acts, it is common that they do not completely coincide with those of the general population. There are then delays. Leaders react to matters, emergencies, and challenges under their specific circumstances. By the time they initiate their individual reactions, a constituency has long borne the full brunt of a disaster, epidemic, or system debacle. Or when leaders' policies and programs start to take effect in response to old problems, a jurisdiction has already entered a new world of need, necessity, and exigency. There are overall dissatisfactions. Predecessors create traps, erect barriers, and leave burdens. Successors seek revenge, reverse course, and undo history. Current leaders work on superficial, fashionable, or even fake issues, tasks, and projects for quick results, easy recognition, and tangible benefits. Underlying questions,

critical concerns, and fundamental variables are ubiquitously left unanswered, unattended, and unaddressed from leader to leader, office to office, term to term, and generation to generation.

Following as an Exercise of Individual Rights and Obligations

Following is not merely passive under democracy. Just as active as leading, it involves advocating, promoting, contributing, voting, monitoring, commenting, implementing, defending, and various other acts or activities. A catchword for democratic following is participation.

Followers see voting as their signature right. Electing candidates into office through open ballots, they feel they decide whom they want to be their representatives in government. Removing officials from office by public votes, they feel they judge what kind of performance meets their standards for governance. Along with voting come monitoring, evaluating, criticizing, and suggesting as important rights. Monitoring is to keep eyes on officials and their thoughts, words, and behaviors in relation to the positions they hold. Evaluating is to assess leaders and their doings, deeds, and impacts within the premises of power. Suggesting is to present constructive ideas, plans, and programs to government with regard to its organization, operation, effectiveness, and efficiency. Criticizing is to expose leaders and abuse of power, officials and dereliction of duty, or bureaucracies and waste of resources throughout the process of governance. Inherent in rights, there are obligations. Among obligatory responsibilities by following individuals, contributing is a flagship one. Followers donate funds to political campaigns, spend time on elections, and pay taxes to keep government afloat. After contribution are observing rules, executing orders, implementing policies, practicing lines of business, and living ways of life. For example, observing rules is to follow collective wishes of which one's individual will is a part. Implementing policies is to carry out agreed-upon decisions to the benefit of a constituency in which one operates. Living ways of life is to lead one's personal life in tune with the political climate, economic conditions, communal atmosphere, cultural sentiments, and social ambiance under which one develops, adapts, and survives.

In the minds of leaders, following is not submission to power and powerholders by fellow citizens. It is rather support for policies and policymakers from the general populace. Recognizing individual rights and initiatives, leaders see the masses following the precision, quality, and effectiveness of their representation. Understanding citizen interests and needs, they feel the public following the tangibility, essence, and efficiency

of their service. Indeed, following is critical. Without following, leading turns empty in existence. It is a goal to reach. With following, representation achieves its meaning and purpose. It is a task to tackle. Around following, service unfolds in form and content. It is a challenge to meet. Toward following, leading overcomes barriers and hurdles. Specifically, leaders have to face followers and individual followings. When followers demand explanations concerning an issue, they must provide information, detailing all in terms of background, rationale, process, outcome, and impact. When followers call for change, they need to prepare an agenda, delineating everything from plan, option, method, and step to consequence. Leaders keep in touch with followers to feel their feelings, sense their sentiments, act on their acts, and react to their reactions. They stay in tune with following so they can make all necessary adjustments to maintain the legitimacy of their office, service, and representation in government.

Things in the Making

Nothing is taken for granted under democracy. Everything is created, open to growth and decline, success and failure, life and death. With regard to power in particular, it is neither given nor guaranteed by any original or established source. Instead, it is acquired, exercised, and maintained by active agents and their collective agencies.

Leaders, officials, and civil servants are ordinary individuals. They are not born to be whom they become. They are not much distinguished from other social roles because of their ascribed traits but mainly due to their achieved characteristics. Leaders do not have to come from distinguished backgrounds. They are elected leaders today but may fall back into the undifferentiated mass tomorrow. Officials do not have to emerge out of celebrated careers. They hold powerful positions on the front stage yet can push mowers in their backyards. Similarly, office is not predefined. It is in the making for new forms and fresh contents. Power is not trapped in office. It is negotiated, contested, checked, and balanced over the political arena. Leadership is neither built in government nor personated by a live figure. It is demonstrated through specific performances of particular leaders as well as the general process of governance. There are both evolving forces and ongoing dynamics. There are not only factors from an era of human civilization but also calls by a system of political economy. Systemic pulls and personal pushes coexist just as historical mandates and individual pursuits coincide. Characters work hand in hand with positions while duties go side by side along opportunities. An ordinary person turns into a monumental leader amid the convergence of socioeconomic positives

and negatives whereas a brilliant leader becomes tragically sacrificed in the middle of geopolitical waves and counter-waves. Indeed, things in the making are anything but certain, everything nonetheless inevitable, or all of randomness, unpredictability, and uncertainty.

Voters, citizens, or members of society are holders of rights hence sources of power. Casting ballots, voters push leaders into or out of office. They approve or reject policies. Pooling resources, citizens carry government initiatives to failure or success. They introduce new practices or bring old ways of life to an end. Joining hands, members of society exert pressure on officials or lend support to government. They keep heritages from history or leave impacts upon the future. In relation to leaders, officials, and civil servants, voters are not only viewers, followers, and evaluators, but also applicants, candidates, and performers. With regard to rules, regulations, and official programs, citizens are both benefactors who put them into application and beneficiaries who harvest fruits from their implementation. As far as government is concerned, members of society contribute to keep it afloat in routine functionality while drawing upon it against natural disasters, human tragedies, and foreign invasions. Overall, individuals create leaders as the latter come from and go back to the former. People make leaderships when the latter attend, respond, and react to the former and their interests, needs, and wishes. Society molds government and shapes governance because the latter sits and remains enmeshed in the former and its cultural milieu.

States of Affairs upon Creation

Change is a rule of norm. At one time, liberals and their views, ideas, and approaches gain force and fashion. Over another time, conservatives and their outlooks, visions, and methods dominate the scene and scenery. Lack of certainty is anything but abnormal. In this place, air blows eastward, pushing individuals and spirits away from the west. Around that place, winds travel westward, pulling peoples and materials out of the east.

When one group prevails on the political stage, it presents its own points of view, proposes its characteristic policies, pursues its specific interests, and imposes upon the society its unique version of reality. Previous practices can be partially continued or totally abandoned. Past creations may be selectively preserved or wholly removed. People talk about new things. The world unfolds in a fresh chain of events. Present words, narratives, and propagandas uncover and reveal one side and its experiences while banning and sealing the other side and its stories. Ongoing acts, actions, and agencies fuel and expand one party and its

agendas while limiting and starving another party and its programs. Individuals follow one way of life. They are so used to it that they do things inadvertently to prevent some alternatives from even coming up on their territory. The country takes shape in one portrayal. It is so fixed in the portrayal that it maintains a state of affairs to keep other options from ever appearing over their horizon. Despite the fact that the same reinforces itself, difference still breaks out, opening yet another phase of creativities and creations.

Where one interest takes control of government, it secures grounds, mobilizes resources, seizes opportunities, and leaves marks on every possible aspect of life. An economy reorganizes, making ways for the dominant interest to lead, expand, and solidify in production, services, and trade. Culture rearranges, clearing roads for the major party to express, perform, and manipulate the media, grapevines, and courts of opinion. Individuals make profits as they chase the market and gain benefits while they follow the trend. Life flows and thrives upon a new set of logics, rules, and practices. The past is buried in the present, which in turn dictates what is about to come up, become strong, turn weak, or go down in the future. People react to reality, doing what is allowed, promising, and rewarding. The nation moves on a set track, prospering because of positive planning, initiatives, and actions or stagnating due to negative thinking, policies, and interferences. Although similarities tend to duplicate one another, change always occurs with surprises, shocks, and wonders, one of which is to unseat the existent government featuring the current pursuit for the arrival of a different administration serving a new interest. In one word, things are constantly in the making. There is rarely a fixed state of affairs under democracy.

The Randomness of Selection

Democracy centers on selection. Selection is everything but certain. Voters look for guidance. Supporters want to influence outcomes. Commentators attempt to identify patterns. Polls aim at prediction. Results, however, often surprise or upset in defiance of experts and their expertise, with little regard for insiders and their experience, or at the total dismay of wishers and their wishful thinking.

Candidates are sources of randomness. There are known players. There are also strangers who join a race impulsively, casually, or even jokingly. Among familiar faces, some are career politicians with a wealth of experience while others are political novices whose stories of success are made elsewhere. Regardless of background or preparation, one runs on a

platform of liberalism, globalism, or radicalism whereas another embraces a policy of conservatism, isolationism, or pacifism. Under different program agendas, candidates demonstrate similar levels of determination, energy, strength, and promise. With similar action plans, contenders display different characters, life courses, emotional profiles, and senses of pride, conscience, or responsibility. In the middle of a campaign, some falter or stumble upon current affairs, emergent incidents, or large-scale crises just as others ride or shine over ongoing matters, accidental situations, or widespread emergencies. At the height of a race, one falls because of an unexpected disclosure of infidelity, corruption, or other wrongdoings at the same time that another takes off due to an uneventful revelation of bravery, unselfishness, or other noble deeds. Indeed, it is a wild, random, and anything-goes game as to who appears on ballots, who perseveres over campaigns, and who prevails as an ultimate winner.

Voters are amplifiers of randomness. First, they differ in political alertness. Some are keen on power and government whereas others remain aloof from political process. Second, they vary by political involvement or readiness. There are those who advocate a particular philosophy of governance, promote a precise partisan agenda, and support a specific political candidate through volunteering, financing, front stage campaigning, or backstage maneuvering. There are also those who hold little understanding of political engagement, possess no knowledge about candidates and their platforms, or even suffer from a lack of information or an excess of misinformation over voting and its procedures. Third, voters are susceptible to influences by news and media coverage. News, whether it is real or fake, acts on the collective feelings of voters. Media coverage, be it positive or negative, impacts upon the public sentiments among electorates. Fourth, voters tend to groupthink. By the force of history and heritage, they pay attention only to certain issues while staying blind, apathetic, and negligent on various other matters. In the manipulation of power and politics, they look up to one point of view, model of practice, or way of life while embracing abhorrence for another. Fifth, voters follow the crowd, fashion, and trend. One does not care to examine its details when everyone else approves a seemingly appealing policy. One does not bother to look into his or her whole profile where each of one's relatives, workmates, and neighbors votes for an apparently popular candidate. All these phenomenally natural behaviors by the mass of voters obviously make elections uncertain, unpredictable, or just full of randomness.

The Uncertainty of Governance

Governance is bound to be shifting, problematic, and at times even precarious under democracy. From government to government, there are changes in the party, the partisan approach to governance, the leader, and the leadership response to the constituency, society, and international environment. With any particular government, there are fluctuations over the transition from the predecessor, the preparation for initiatives, the implementation of policies, refueling or reinforcement, the consolidation of achievements, and the handover to the successor.

Case by case, a government is first in the hands of a political party. It is staffed with party enthusiasts who shine a light on partisan ideals and ideologies. Although political agendas and policies evolve over time, party philosophies and spirits often remain constant from generation to generation. Namely, when Party A takes office, it can run the government in a drastically different way to Party B, as if it served a different population in a special era. A government is then at the helm led by a specific individual. This person is shaped and reshaped by his or her physical characteristics, personality traits, family background, rearing, education, work, professional association, party commitment, and various other experiences. He or she can be a success in business but a novice around the political arena, an avid performer in ideological debates nonetheless an awkward player over the bureaucratic operation, or a sensitive reader of collective sentiments and public opinions yet a ruthless enforcer of personal ideals, partisan ideologies, or coldblooded legal codes without any regard for people and their feelings. In other words, where Leader C assumes the head of state, he or she may play a version of governance that is radically different from that of Leader D, as if he or she faced a different country in a unique territory.

Institutionally or mechanically, it takes time for a governmental bureaucracy to move from one mode of operation to another. Wherever a new administration is thrown at the helm, it needs time to know, fill, and manage individual offices, making each of them not only perform its normal functions but also fulfill some of the goals intended by the leader. As the new administration settles into its own way of governance, it sets rules, establishes procedures, and builds infrastructures appropriate to and facilitative of its core missions, goals, and agendas. A government characteristic of a specific party, leader, and leadership hence takes shape, implementing a particular set of policies toward nature, people, and everything in between from the physical environment to cultural solidarity. Soon after settlement, political campaigns for reelection kick off. Existing policies and practices become fine-tuned amid old commitments and new

pledges. While success in reelection is likely to add reinforcements to current governing and modes of operation, failure definitely sends everything into a state of uncertainty, if not shambles, about the wrap-up, legacy-leaving, and farewell from the outgoing as well as the takeover, overturning, or precedence-setting by the incoming. Indeed, if democracy is about letting society display itself in a kaleidoscopic way, governing and government in a democratic society can be anything but certain, stable, and even predictable.

CHAPTER 11

OPERATION

Democracy operates like a stage. People compete for their term to show off on stage. When they command the stage, they take full advantage of the opportunity to speak their minds, practice their ideas, pursue their dreams, advance their interests, and actualize their potential. Since each term of performance is peculiar and nothing particular can be generally good to all, change becomes key to achieving system equilibrium, diversity, health, functionality, and sustainability (Riker 1962; Morgan 1989; Appleby 1992; Diamond and Plattner 1996; Weingast 1997; Sen 1999; Plattner and Espada 2000; Diamond and Gunther 2001; Putnam 2001; Whitehead 2002; Halperin, Siegle, and Weinstein 2005; Archibugi 2008; Mosley 2013; Shaw 2013; Achen and Bartels 2016; Levitsky and Ziblatt 2018; Carothers and O'Donohue 2019; Przeworski 2019; Zohny 2019; Gross and Wilson 2020; Kmezić 2020; Stasavage 2020).

Individual Initiatives

Democracy features individuals and individual initiatives. As citizens, they participate in public affairs while specializing in a line of business, excelling in a professional field, and pursuing a way of life. Becoming leaders, they organize communal efforts, represent group interests, and implement collective decisions while persevering in their own character, faith, and commitment.

Democratic citizens are active participants. They feel so they know whether they are better or worse off in business and professional pursuits from government to government. They think so they understand if participation in political affairs makes any difference in their ways of life. They say to ensure that concerns over official policies and issues in governmental operation are raised, debated, and resolved as part of an open social discourse. They do to bring about changes in personal experience, communal wellbeing, and social welfare. They express to heighten public attention to people and their satisfaction or dissatisfaction with leaders and leadership performances in government as a critical indicator of democracy.

Compared to people under autocracy who submit to the top, democratic citizens speak of things to inform policymakers. They take actions to cease or launch, resist or facilitate, reverse or continue formal processes by, within, or from government. Indeed, democracy works only if people become involved. It is people who choose and dispatch their representatives to the government in leadership positions. Only with people and their follow-up supervision, can democratic leaders stay on the track of representation. Otherwise, they may wander far afield into a state that is out of touch with the populace, and even a self-appropriated practice of authoritarianism.

Democratic leaders are dynamic players. They observe to find problems, identify issues, frame narratives, and develop agendas. They dream to tap, test, and sharpen their own instincts, determinations, and ideals as well as explore, exploit, and mold people's inspirations, expectations, and wishes. They preach to make sure that messages are clearly formulated, plainly worded, and attractively uttered through a standard delivery of formality, rituality, and sanctity to reach a large audience. They act so that rumors are stopped, grapevines are stemmed, ideas are crystallized in policies, rules are enforced as norms of behavior, and plans are translated into tangible outcomes. They improvise so they keep their space of maneuvering between intent and action, constituency and jurisdiction, representation and governance, back and front stages. In contrast to emperors, kings, or any typical autocrats who stand at the top yet hide from the public, democratic leaders come from the populace, live among the masses, and perform on the media radar. They have to motivate people, mobilize resources, and create opportunities before action. In the process, they need to explain things, solve problems, and overcome hurdles. Upon completion, they are often required to file reports to different stakeholders, detailing the progress, milestones, costs, and benefits of what they do in government. In essence, democratic leaders are speakers of individual ideas, representatives of group interests, exercisers of public powers, or performers of social forces in particular eras under specific circumstances.

Group Interests

Democracy rides on group interests. It is essential that citizens gather in groups, groups flex muscles with common interests, and interests expand or contract from one group to another. It is indeed basic that each group stretches its muscle to the extreme, advances its interests to the maximum,

and gives a full performance in order to term out toward a new term for other groups, group interests, and group displays.

Groups thrive upon active individuals. Once in a group, however, individuals demonstrate their activity and activism in the form of a collective. As a matter of fact, groups exist and operate as social factors and forces. First, groups align with each other to form a social class, the building block in a political economy. The social class owns under its umbrella a specific worldview, relationship to property, approach to production, and way of life. Second, groups join hands to launch a social movement, the driving force behind social change. The social movement pulls in front a particular agenda, destiny, direction, and state of being. Third, groups act to form the fashion of a time or the vogue of an era. The fashion or vogue pushes across its wave or tide a unique purpose, interest, mode of appreciation, and style of action. Fourth, groups play to create the morality of a state. The morality exhibits under its cloak a distinctive public morale, social sentiment, judgment of behavior, and assessment of reality. Finally, groups interact with one another to generate the culture of a society. The culture involves within its atmosphere a characteristic faith, norm, value, and pursuit of meaningfulness. As far as democracy is concerned, groups, group interests, and group pursuits, in the variety of class, movement, fashion, morality, and culture, are original elements and energies that make it work.

Most importantly, each group carries a gene of self-development, growth, and expansion to the exclusion of others. One group dares to assert what it is, confidently revealing its origin, identity, and destiny. It admits what it is not, showing the difference it has from its neighbors, competitors, or enemies. Another group aspires to actualize itself, working steadily toward its goal, dream, and ideal state of being. It concedes what it is not capable of doing, what it attempts to avoid, and what it is fearful of. Still another group remains determined to beat its competitors, defeat its enemies, and conquer any of its resistors toward victory. It compromises on situational issues, temporal matters, and marginal benefits toward long-term, strategic, and systematic gains. Every group strives to go beyond its existence, expanding territory, extending control, and perpetuating influence. Overall, democracy becomes viable, dynamic, and vibrant when groups compete out of their respective self-interests, where one group prevails over all other groups to gain dominance in the main spheres of human affairs, when dominance naturally draws resistance, where resistance pools institutionally in dominance, and in a system of government under which dominance fuels resistance, resistance mushrooms into dominance, and one serves as the other's necessary as well as sufficient conditions.

Partisan Doctrines

Groups come and go. Group interests move and shift. In a democratic operation, it is often parties that stay on stage to characterize and represent groups that coalesce over common interests. Through a democratic existence, it is usually partisan doctrines that remain on the scene to feature and heighten interests shared by comparable groups.

Parties are operational parts of a democracy. Parties rally people. Under a party flag, individuals contribute to political campaigns, cast votes in public elections, fill positions in the government, formulate official policies, and implement governmental programs. Parties mold groups. Within a party machine, groups join forces or disperse in strategic clusters, assert rights or surrender powers, spread influence or remain in tactical silence. Parties lead the government, a nation state, a regional jurisdiction, or a local constituency. For example, a ruling party sends its most representative, capable, and effective member to serve as the head of state, who then chooses his or her party's talented, experienced, and dedicated members to fill the cabinet and hold other key positions across the state bureaucracy. Parties check on the government. Non-ruling parties keep their eye on the leaders, criticize policies, and expose abuse, waste, or corruption throughout the governmental operation. Parties shake up power. When one party is in power, it has to fight all other parties to keep control of the government. Where a party is out of power, it needs to attend all other interests to get back into office. Parties shape governance. As the government becomes a partisan battlefield, governance turns into a ritual of party affairs such as how to reward party loyalists, execute party agendas, fulfill party dreams, and realize party ideals.

Partisan doctrines are working spirits of democracy. Partisan doctrines shape interests. Individuals and groups react to established parties and their founding principles. Interests shift and gather around party ideologies. Partisan doctrines inform policies. The ruling party develops its policy agendas in accordance with its political philosophy, just as an opposition party fashions resistance on the basis of its fundamental faith. Partisan doctrines rally constituents. People are sensitive to slogans, crystallized words or phrases of partisan teachings. A slogan as simple as "less regulation" can draw large crowds to election campaigns whereas a slogan of "healthcare for all" may invite serious opposition from diehard conservatives who believe in individual self-sufficiency and hence reject any governmental meddling in citizens' private life. Partisan doctrines keep records and heritages. While party members and groupings change from generation to generation, party spirits remain consistent over time. For

example, a party lasts due to its continual adherence to individual initiatives, a smaller government, and less regulation. Partisan doctrines symbolize the government. A government in power, in the mass media as well as around the court of public opinions, is not just labeled by the name of the party that leads it, but rather by the doctrine it actually practices in a partisan manner, such as a doctrinal propaganda for consumer protection, public welfare, and social justice. Partisan doctrines spiritualize governance. Governance lies in the way that a party operates a government through specific steps from filling positions, formulating policies, enforcing rules, and implementing agendas to evaluating programs. For instance, a government in the spirit of elites and elitisms is likely to take a top-down approach to governance as leaders feel they see and sense broader, farther, and better than the masses for a community, region, or country and its ultimate well-being.

Public Opinions

Public opinion is an important element in any functional democracy. It serves as not only a source of inspiration and influence for elected representatives but also a force for checks and controls on governmental officials. In the information age, public opinions can spread constantly through the traditional grapevines as well as instantly over the emergent social media.

Public opinions signify what people think, how they feel, which road they hope to take, and where they wish to reach. They first of all exist as general social backgrounds for political parties and their candidates to develop campaign ideas, platforms, and plans. They then feed elected officials with critical information as to what issues they address, what problems they tackle, what policies they formulate, what programs they implement, and what goals they pursue. Moreover, public opinions inform representatives in office of how they do their jobs with effectiveness and efficiency, from following daily routines, managing regular office affairs, running specific projects to dealing with breaking crises. Most importantly, public opinions speak for themselves formally in opinion polls. The latter often make one candidate withdraw from a competition, encourage one party to further its established agenda, or aid one political force in moderating its election campaign. Also, public opinions multiply in intensity, power, and influence when they find their way of distribution, diffusion, or dispersion through social media. Social media sometimes make issues, manufacture news, create panics, and spread fears in such a rapid, strong, and overwhelming manner that they end a candidacy, terminate a practice,

kill a program, or even paralyze a government in a matter of hours or days, if not instantly.

Public opinions reflect how the masses react to reality, embracing it, living with it, rejecting it, or retreating from it. Through public opinion, the masses show how much enthusiasm they have for an ideal, vision, or ideology, how much support they throw behind a policy, program, or practice, and how long they endure in austerity, an endeavor, or an ordeal. In the positive direction, public opinions can encourage a candidate to challenge the status quo, inspire a party to overcome historical barriers, and motivate a government to implement an unprecedented new deal. On the other hand, public opinions may stem a political agenda and its spreading influence, defame a social movement and its lifting spirit, or derail a governmental initiative and its alleviating effect. Indeed, officials have to attend to public opinions as they experiment with new ways of thinking and doing on the political front. Establishments need to heed public opinions when they adhere to age-old practices even over their existing territory of power and privilege. Entering the era of mass media, public opinions often quickly and widely mushroom into social influence, in the form of fascination or fear, enchantment or panic, enlightenment or distress, hope or despair, optimism or pessimism, so on and so forth.

Mass Media

Mass media do not just serve as mouthpieces of propaganda for leaders and ruling parties to spread agendas, publicize policies, report progress, and explain actions. They also act as channels of communication for individuals and the populace to express feelings, voice opinions, make suggestions, and offer criticisms. As a matter of fact, the mass medium in all its forms from radio, film, and television to print is even touted as one of the pillars of power due to its critical importance in the functioning of democracy.

Mass media shape public opinions. Mass media tell stories. As there are so many stories going on among peoples, stories told in the media become highlighted, leading civilian narratives in everyday life. Mass media report events. Because there are multiple events happening from place to place, events reported in the media become headlined, molding civil records about run-of-the-mill occurrences. Mass media spread news. As there is a variety of news in the making from time to time, news exposed by the media becomes underscored, shaping civic reactions to routine activities. Furthermore, mass media dramatize doings and deeds. Since just a percentage of doings and deeds are so treated by the media, they change into examples and models. Mass media convey messages and meanings.

While not all messages and meanings are so communicated through the media, they become informative, substantive, and suggestive. Mass media stimulate actions and reactions. Due to the fact that only a portion of actions and reactions are so instigated from the media, they turn resourceful, powerful, and impactful. Indeed, being selective and organized in nature, mass media prove to be essential in channeling and pooling peoples and the various opinions and sentiments thereof for or against social movements and political initiatives in the general dynamics of democracy. Being spontaneous and widespread in effect, mass media pose as monumental in shaping and trending grass roots and numerous factors and forces therein toward or away from public policies and governmental programs in the overall democratic equilibria.

Mass media check on leaders and the government. Mass media follow leaders. They spread news as to where leaders are, what they do, and even how they think. Mass media ask leaders. They pose questions as deep as touching inner feelings, as subtle as pertaining to critical maneuvering, or as sharp as piercing painful experiences. Mass media criticize leaders. They raise concerns over leaders' health conditions, financial dealings, and personal characters. They express doubts about leaders' knowledge, judgment, and experience. They even make an issue out of a leader's normal action as lacking creativity, an ordinary reaction as shirking responsibility, or a regular performance as featuring mediocrity. With regard to the government, mass media investigate it. Investigation can focus on an agency, program, and practice, target an official, group, and party, or scrutinize a whole branch, jurisdiction, and level of government. It is so skilled, strategized, specialized, and systemized that it gives rise to investigative journalism. The latter may pursue a case like a detective, document an investigation like a novelist, and spread a report like a storyteller. Mass media keep records about the government. Records place a government in a comparative chart, showing how good or bad it is in contrast to its predecessors and successors. Mass media control historical narratives. Once written into history by mass media, historical narratives suggest lines of action. Looking back, a government tends to move on at the thrust of historical momenta. History moderates existing patterns of behavior. Seeing this, a ruling party is likely to exercise caution and restraint out of a natural concern over its heritage and legacy.

Compromise

Compromise is not just a matter of strategy and tactics across the political arena. It is a guiding spirit in the soul of any operating democracy. On the

one hand, each player makes his or her best efforts to voice opinions, pursue interests, and express feelings. On the other, they all observe rules, admit limits, and accept defeats or failures.

Within the ruling party, one individual becomes the head of government through a competitive process. Other individuals with similar backgrounds, abilities, efforts, and experiences yield to the prime leader with their respective ideas, agendas, and aspirations. One interest group dominates the government, advancing its material gains as well as its nonmaterial influences through policy formulation and implementation. Other interest groups retreat under the political shadow with concessions made on different fronts from tangible benefits to intangible matters. Inside the government, the executive branch takes the lead yet has to negotiate its way with other branches. The legislature, especially when it is in the hands of other parties that hold no executive power, may challenge the administration on every policy initiative that the latter attempts to launch during its term of office. Nonetheless, the former still needs to concede to the executive branch over various governmental programs just to keep things moving along for itself and the whole jurisdiction. There are obviously both a frontline and a backdrop in the game of compromise. On the frontline flies a banner that says: "Let the winning person or party play to the full extent of his or her term in office." Against the backdrop hangs a poster that states: "Wait for my term as I always have a chance of winning."

Between ruling and non-ruling parties, compromise takes shape on the basis of the stake that one holds in the matter at issue as well as the influence that another wields in the field of concern. Only when the ruling party needs critical votes, can it soften some of its positions so that the issues faced by those who own critical votes are essentially addressed. Only where a non-ruling party proves to be indispensable to the passage of an act or agenda, may it harden some of its demands on solving problems pertaining to its fundamental interests. Between political establishments and the general population, compromise features the former's fear for social repercussions in the barbarian form of revenge and the latter's awareness of public power through the democratic process of election. An act or law sponsored by a representative in the legislature, as it restricts individual liberty for the sake of state control, can draw widespread resistance from the masses. Sooner or later, people act together at the voting booths to deal a devastating blow to that representative and his or her political career. A policy or program embraced by the government, if it advances the interests of a few from the upper class at the expense of a majority in the middle class, may brew deep resentment across the populace. Here and there, people join hands through public votes to push leaders out of office and their

political party out of power. Just as lessons from possible political fallouts are so often immediate, brutal, and real, compromise is always timely, substantive, and common in the existing partisan and governmental maneuverings.

Balance of Power

Institutionally, power is neither concentrated in the hands of one person nor in the courtyards of one place. Instead, it is spread between the government and civil society. Even within the government, there are checks and balances among agencies, branches, and levels.

A powerful civil society serves as a general background for democracy to operate, function, and sustain as a social convention and practice. Citizens are conscious of their rights and obligations. They voice opinions, express feelings, make choices, take actions, and participate in democratic processes not only by voting for particular candidates but also through volunteering, donating, and campaigning around specific causes. Groups and organizations are conscientious about their roles and duties. They rally people, pool resources, propagandize ideals, spearhead initiatives, and engage in social movements toward both special and general interests, common and partisan agendas, collective and sectional wellbeing. Most importantly, a marketplace establishes and expands for common citizens to trade products, exchange services, and live lives in self-sufficiency. A labor union or professional association forms and extends for working individuals to develop codes of conduct, train newcomers, secure fields of expertise, and demonstrate the spirit of self-regulation, autonomy, and independence. A public court of opinion opens and spreads for ordinary civilians to ask questions, voice concerns, share feelings, debate issues, tell stories, and exercise freedom of expression. The mass media hence become institutionalized to report civil activities, channel civilian activisms, and feature civic engagements on the one hand, and to follow official actions, expose governmental maneuverings, and showcase political operations on the other.

A clear and clean division of labor within the government provides an institutional mechanism through which power differentiates by areas of function and remains overall in balance when one area checks upon another. In one prototype, there are divisions of power or government from legislative to executive to adjudicative. The legislature gathers people's representatives to make laws, authorize resources, evaluate governmental performances, declare wars, and ratify treaties. The administration operates under an elected head of government, be it a president, governor, or mayor,

to enforce laws, implement policies, perform critical governmental tasks, maintain social order, and engage in diplomatic or external relations. The judiciary musters well-educated, fair-minded, and legally experienced career professionals to interpret laws, hear cases, adjudicate disputes, make judgments, and set precedents. Since the executive branch holds an obviously high amount of power, it naturally stays in the limelight as to how the balance of power plays out over its relationships with other branches of government. From the legislative branch, the administration needs to seek approvals of officials in high positions, authorizations of budgets for governmental expenditures, and ratifications of treaties with foreign entities. In relation to the adjudicative branch, the administration must defend itself on specific cases, defer to judges over judicial rulings, and execute orders handed out by courts.

Change of Government

Democracy sustains as a political system to a large degree because it does not allow any particular leader, leadership, party, partisan doctrine, government, and philosophy of governance to sustain beyond its due term of office, rule, influence, or life. A bad leader falls off stage quickly with his or her own doings. A good government still has to face an official limit on terms of service. Indeed, it is the change of leaders in government that makes democracy a viable exercise of power in the political arena.

Change is the key. Change means chance. Every citizen, group, and party has a chance to vote and to be voted in, to serve and to be served, to direct and to be directed. Change carries hope. If it is an incompetent leader in power now, the hope is for an able, effective, and efficient party to assume the helm then. If it is a corrupt government today, the wish is for a clean, conscientious, and dutiful leadership to be in place tomorrow. Generally, as bad goes, good comes. When good leaves, better may arrive. Even where better performs, best could yet make its debut. Change signifies difference. From time to time, things do not simply distinguish between good and bad, good and better, better and best. People just want to see differences among leaders and leadership styles, feel differences in parties and partisan fights, and experience differences over governments and governmental performances. Change generates excitement. Before change, there are campaigns, elections, and ritual presentations of winners. In the moment of change, there are farewells, swearings-in, and ceremonial celebrations for new leaderships. After change, there are honeymoons, expected achievements, and unexpected surprises. Finally, change keeps democracy alive as an open field of interest brawls in and out of the status

quo, a public play of power struggles inside and outside the political theater, and a conspicuous force of social progress on and off human evolution.

Change is a state of being. People are used to change. They go about life essentially with ups and downs either when they thrive with one government or where they struggle in the hands of another. Leaders are accustomed to change. On the political stage they perform as leaders whereas off stage they run businesses, pursue professional careers, and live life just like any of their civilian coworkers or neighbors. Parties are adapted to change. They engage in partisan propaganda, political maneuvering, and social movement anytime and all the time whether they are in control or out of power. Even the government is versed by alteration, fine-tuned with change, and immersed in motion. First is a bureaucracy that is designed to execute the functions of government in different areas for various walks of life. Second is an institution that is programmed to operate by rules and regulations. Third is an organization that is set to run with educated, trained, and experienced civil servants deployed in roles and positions neutral to or independent from political dynamics. Fourth is a system that is automated to work with different leaders at the top or even without anyone in the upmost position in the whole chain of command. In one word, the government is, by default, adjusted to a transition from one leader, leadership, party, or party rule to another. Of course, the underlying matter of fact is this: People are self-sufficient, with only a limited reliance upon the government and its assistance, protection, regulation, or intervention; the government is automated to function by itself, to a considerable degree of transcendence above political contrasts and confrontations; and society is poised to move on its own, without a significant fanfare unduly appropriated to government, partisanship, and political affairs.

CHAPTER 12

IMPACT

Democracy is in vogue. Many prosperous countries around the world adopt democracy in the organization of government. Democratic nations are more likely to witness a vibrant market economy, a transparent administrative apparatus, free mass media, all-inclusive education, scientific progress, technological innovation, multicultural vivacity, and a thriving civil society. As democratic states boast their democratic form of government as advanced, disciplined, and fashionable, even essentially nondemocratic societies begin to emulate democracy in some of its signature practices, such as voting, selection, and representation, to prove their relevancy, currency, or legitimacy (Weatherford 1990; Birch 1993; Gutmann and Thompson 1996; Lijphart 1999; Gabardi 2001; Khan 2003; Shaw 2004; Wilentz 2005; Bartels 2008; Fukuyama 2014; Way 2016; Brennan 2019; Feldmann, Merke, and Stuenkel 2019; Przeworski 2019; Shaw 2019; Taylor 2019; Eckersley 2020; Graham and Svobik 2020; Krasner 2020; Wolkenstein 2020).

Individuals and Individuality

Democracy places individuals at the center of politics. Individuals become aware of their rights and obligations. They engage in political games, advancing their interests, voting for their representatives, defending their deeds, and securing their legacies. Individuality hence takes on a unique perspective, featuring not only self-autonomy and sufficiency but also self-expansion and actualization.

There are active individuals as participative citizens under democracy. People act to present ideas, plans, and agendas, which then channel, organize, and rally people by interest groups, political parties, and partisan alliances. People act to express desires, feelings, and sentiments, which further activate, mobilize, and unify people around collective causes, group initiatives, and social movements. Individuals react to political institutions and establishments, making complaints, staging protests, and exercising objections. They react to political plays and practices, pushing

one nonetheless pulling another legislative act, facilitating one while sabotaging another executive program, welcoming one yet condemning another judicial order. Through action, individuals no longer remain confined to themselves as they used to be under submission within an autocratic kingdom. By way of reaction, people do not stay silent by themselves anymore as they once were in servitude of an autocratic authority. In fact, with both action and reaction, democratic citizens not only experience for themselves when they find chances and opportunities to voice opinions and vent anxieties, but also feel for themselves where they use ways and means to make choices and shape realities.

Here comes a self-driven yet socially fulfilling individuality as part of the democratic polity. Individuals know that they are endowed with fundamental human rights, that individual rights exist as original sources of power, and that power undergirds government, public policies, and politics. People also understand that they must pool their rights through grouping, organizing, and aligning, that they need to exercise their rights by way of participating, monitoring or supervising, and serving, and that they ought to claim their rights in the form of public order, social stability, national security, and citizen livelihood. In terms of individual characteristics, a democratic personality features self-awareness, confidence, initiative, drive, development, growth, expansion, and actualization. With regard to social involvement, democratic characters demonstrate themselves over matters from public obligation, social responsibility, communal union, professional unity, partisan alliance, group solidarity, and collective wellbeing to countrywide prosperity. Individuality hence unfolds itself from the origin of self-drive, with the engine of self-striving, and by the outcome of self-appreciation. Democratic polity therefore fulfills itself through individual interest, aspiration, motivation, commitment, creativity, involvement, cooperation, and gratification.

Groups and Groupings

Democracy pools people in groups with similar ideas, interests, and pursuits. Grouping becomes an active scene or scenery in social life. Democratic politics divide a population into groups by different ideologies, policy initiatives, and action modalities. Regrouping turns hyper, even manic sometimes, as part of political dynamics.

There are obviously more groups under democracy than any other form of polity. Groups do not just speak separate ideas. They form communal or cultural ideologies. Groups do not merely perform individual acts. They take collective actions. Groups do not only make independent

moves. They stage social movements. Groups do not simply voice sporadic opinions. They present systematic reactions. Groups do not usually vent isolated feelings. They express constituency or countrywide sentiments. More important, there are higher group activities. Groups assemble upon distinctive initiatives, unique challenges, or fresh adventures. They reassemble due to a change of interests, ideologies, or policy programs. They disassemble because of conflict, exhaustion, or completion of a specific task or general mission. Internally, groups mature by structural differentiation, operational complexity, and functional variety. Externally, groups expand in the form of alliance, coalition, or consortium. It is no exaggeration that democracy makes groups appear, multiply, and thrive in society. As a matter of fact, groups are landmark units of any democratic system. It is no fantasy that democracy triggers, fuels, and perpetuates group activities in terms of frequency, intensity, duration, and impact. Indeed, group activities are signature occurrences in all democratic polities.

There is grouping or regrouping as the essential force of democracy. Grouping is about organizing, organizing individuals into a cheering crowd or battling army. It is about teamwork, teaming up people on a collective task or political mission. It is about pooling, pooling individual resources into group forces or societal strengths. It is about expanding, expanding individual moves into a social movement or peoples' advances toward some historical progress. As a matter of fact, grouping undergirds the spread of civil ideas, the formulation of official policies, and the indoctrination of partisan ideologies. It hovers over the gathering of peoples, the mobilization of material resources, and the execution of political agendas. In a similar manner, regrouping is about breaking, breaking away from tradition, the establishment, or the status quo. It is about dividing, dividing one factor or faction for the sake of something nonetheless larger on the horizon. It is about combining, combining multiple forces or fortunes with an eye on something yet smaller in development. It is about aligning, aligning individuals, individual acts, and individual groupings with one another to form higher potent human capital as well as more powerful material forces toward grander socioeconomic goals. Indeed, regrouping may witness the thriving of political parties, the success of economic programs, or the triumph of social reforms. It can also bear testimony to the decline of a civic community, the failure of a social movement, and the demise of a multidimensional nation-state.

Ideas and Ideology

Democracy thrives on ideas and ideological debates. Likewise, ideas, points of view, and world outlooks flourish and flow under democratic forms of government. Ideological formations, solidifications, contrasts, and confrontations spring up and spread in democratic societies.

Democracy feeds ideas. Citizens own viewpoints and would like to express them. Groups take positions and tend to show them. Organizations hold beliefs or values and need to demonstrate them. The civil society carries spirits or sentiments and wants to spread them. Democracy not only allows citizens, groups, organizations, and the civil society to develop, formulate, and display their ideas, but also provides all these entities with tangible institutional mechanisms for expression and exchange. Representatives represent and are obliged to report to their constituencies. Leaders lead and are required to explain to the general populace what they do, why they pursue certain causes, and how they fulfill their responsibilities. Officials perform and are mandated to be faithful, dutiful, and respectful to their offices. Democracy exposes representatives, leaders, and officials in the public eye, and offers all these public roles specific communicative forums for explanation, clarification, and justification as well. Reporters, investigative journalists in particular, report and follow the subjects of news from place to place. Scholars, especially public policy researchers, study and delve into sources of data from time to time. The mass media, whether in print, by radio, via television, or over the internet, spread information and hover over the court of civil opinions in terms of ratings, readership, or viewership. Democracy motivates the media to be part of the political process on the one hand, and enables all those forms of mass and social media with official amenities and avenues, such as briefing rooms, press corps, meeting the press, and news conferences, toward a timely, accurate, and effective delivery of news on the other.

Democracy fuels ideological debates. Ideology forms around identity and social status. There are stereotypes about individuals and individual identities with respect to family, kinship, tribe, ethnicity, race, gender, and citizenship. Over a democratic court of opinions, different attitudes and treatments often lead to intense ideological contrasts and exchanges. Ideology arises from life and lifestyle. There are customary views on people and their lifestyles in terms of residence, community, wealth, consumption, leisure, quality, autonomy, and happiness. In a democratic social environment, the rich go spiraling in conspicuous waste just as the poor sit exposed to poverty, neglect, and suffering, triggering keen ideological argumentations and altercations. Ideology emerges out of

order and order maintenance. There are conventions over control, prevention, and punishment against deviance, crime, and rebellion. Under a democratic legal system, offenders, perpetrators, or rule-violators meet with defenders, victims, or law enforcers as complete adversaries or enemies, adding fuel to serious ideological attacks and counterattacks. Ideology takes shape over policy and governance. There are models surrounding civil service, officialdom, bureaucracy, policymaking, legislation, program implementation, and administration. With a democratic form of government in place, pushes for tax cuts, welfare reductions, budget conservatisms, and a minimal government alternate, coincide, or clash with pulls toward spending, regulation, public assistance, social engineering, and an omnipresent government, keeping alive ideological discussions, comparisons, and confrontations.

Time and Terms

Democracy changes the way that time is perceived, managed, and experienced. Unlike an autocratic rule that lasts as a dynasty for generations, a democratic government serves in terms of a specific length of a limited number of months or years. A uniform ruling routine in autocracy hence breaks down into periods of political dramas. Different from technocratic administrations that stay in considerable consistency from time to time, democratic leaderships come and go with apparent shifts in party, ideology, and policy. A would-be smooth flow of time under technocracy therefore differentiates by phases of partisan plays.

Time divides by terms. With a focus on time itself, democracy makes it easy to be viewed, handled, and passed. Time is no longer a continuous flow. It is a term of limited duration. Within a given tenure, someone can become unreasonable, irrational, or utterly evil. One is nonetheless gone when one reaches the end of one's tenure. During a fixed term, something may turn uncontrollable, turbulent, or simply ugly. However it is over once it runs out of its time. Metaphysically, democracy seems to follow the rhythm of time in a natural way although on the surface it compartmentalizes time into discrete blocks or separate terms. The matter of fact is this: As each block is set, it inspires politicians to delve into it, making the most out of it for power, profit, or fame; when every term is limited, it motivates leaders to plunge into it, taking full advantage of it toward public fulfillment, private gratification, or personal actualization. Indeed, it is through compartmentalization that time is utilized in effectiveness and efficiency toward productivity, meaningfulness, and

consummation. In particular, it is in each block that time feeds substance by form just as it is over every term that substance fills time with meaning.

Terms feature partisan plays and political dramas. Winning a term of office, the ruling party attempts the best it can in translating its partisan ideas, policies, and ideals into practical actions, programs, and gains. With tangible achievements, it even wants to build momentum for yet another term. Losing control of government, parties out of power try the best they can in building an alliance, challenging the ruling party, and mounting an effective opposition to the administration in charge. There are partisan offenses and defenses on domestic and foreign fronts over ideological issues and material matters. There are also political actions and reactions at national and international levels with regard to procedural protocols and substantive contents. People say and act whether they rule or are ruled. Parties fight for power regardless of whether they have it or not. Time never stands in idleness or silence. Each term is always filled with actions and counteractions. Witnessed over every political period are with no exception measures and countermeasures. In a sense, democracy inspires individuals to civic accomplishments, motivates interest groups toward material influences, and mobilizes political parties around program controls and policy gains. To a degree, it is through democracy, a democratic form of government in particular, that individual consciousness is sharpened to appreciate the dramatization of life into partisan plays and that social mentality is fine-tuned to enjoy the agitation or fascination of time by way of political dramas.

Place and Situations

Place takes a unique meaning under democracy. A united territory may not necessarily endure in the political landscape where individual communities of specific character and drive compete for existence. A unified sovereignty does not always hang over the social consciousness when citizens seem to engage in pockets of spectacular incidents from one government to another.

Space rarely unfolds over a coordinated expanse but oftentimes through brackets of eventful happenings. Indeed, democracy specifies space. It creates places, fills scenes, and empowers communities. The reasoning is logical. People hold rights and obligations. Rights produce powers. Namely, people decide what they do and how they relate to each other in their places. Obligations lead to activities. That is, people do things and maintain relationships under their circumstances. The outcome is natural. Place takes shape in form as people convene in their localities. It turns substantive by content when things occur within a place. It gains status

where place materializes in both form and content. Democracy specializes in space as well. Leading is locational. The more leaders know about a location, the better they make policies, manage issues, and maintain order for people living in the place. Ruling is situational. The more officials understand a situation, the better they take actions, implement measures, and take care of business for things happening across the space. Dialectically, just individual brackets filled by eventful incidents can add up to generate a meaningful all-dimensional expanse for a jurisdictional constituency. In a similar line, only independent pockets substantiated with spectacular happenings may combine to produce a purposeful spatial existence for a political entity.

Situations or turfs showcase partisan actions and political activisms. Controlling government in a jurisdiction, a ruling party wastes no time in taking actions characteristic of its political beliefs, norms, and values from community to community. It makes full use of its speaking term for a new prevailing version of reality in favor of what it does in public policy and social programming. Parties out of power, on the other hand, strive to build a coalition so they can keep an active criticism of governmental initiatives as well as an effective opposition to official undertakings. Political activisms run high from different sides. The constituency remains a battlefield for debates on issues, conflicts over interests, and confrontations through forces. There might be no united front when each district or jurisdiction engages in partisan fights on matters from strategic plans to daily choices. Nor would there be any unified constituency where every township, city, county, or province commits to its individual expression of civil opinions, pursuit of material interests, and attainment of political goals. The same holds true for a country or nation-state. There could be no sweeping empire as a central government features democratic contrasts and comparisons over national interests, civilian benefits, and historical gains. Nor would there be any overarching kingdom while a national regime focuses on its own ideological propaganda, program implementation, and political survival. Democracy, in this sense, is an antithesis to the unification of space or territory toward united control or power.

Politicking and Politics

Democracy is about politicking. Individuals make claims about their rights. Rights are contested on the political stage of power. Groups push for their interests. Interests are pursued through the political process of policy planning, making, and implementing. In a strict sense, there is no politicking when an autocrat decides what a country does from the top down. Nor is

there politics where technocrats serve in their positions for a government on job routines.

Politicking becomes salient and significant under democracy. Citizens vote. They need to make their desires and wants known to those they vote for as their representatives in office. As one is just one, one has to politick with one's relatives, friends, neighbors, and fellow workers to signify one's existence. Since one's need, interest, or vote only counts as one, one must politick with many others to magnify one's intentionality. Here then, come grassroots moves and movements for specific individuals and individual goals, groups and group agendas, ideas and ideologies, practices and pragmatisms. In forms ranging from joining hands, pooling resources, and clarifying objectives to coordinating actions, politicking gets substantial when it draws the attention of the populace, media, and political establishment. It turns substantive where it harvests tangible benefits such as the election of a favorable candidate, the passage of a desirable legislation, and the implementation of a preferable policy. Political representatives or officeholders, on the other hand, look for votes. They must present their positions and plans to constituents in a way that motivates and mobilizes the latter not only in voting booths but also for active social roles toward material support. Each vote counts. Every act matters. There are therefore campaigns and rallies to spread messages, propagandize ideologies, criticize the status quo, attack opponents, engage constituents, and fire up political bases. With contents varying from false accusations, fake news, and manipulated crises to manufactured urgencies, politicking assumes form as it commands influence in the court of public opinion. It takes shape while it equates with reality on and off the political stage, from economic affairs to governmental undertakings, and among both civilians and officials.

Politics permeates almost every sphere in democratic society. Yet, it is neither like autocracy when politics is simplified to repression by the top and submission from the bottom. Nor is it comparable to technocracy where politics is routinized to the function and functionality of bureaucracy by the division of labor. Democracy features acts, actions, activity, and activism. In other words, politics is activated, agitated, and amplified to individual acts, group actions, civil activities, and social activisms. At any time that individuals communicate with each other to raise questions, voice concerns, exercise rights, and take actions, they make things happen around their communities. In any place that groups coordinate with one another to spread ideas, create agendas, make plans, and tackle tasks, they see changes occur in their jurisdictions. Every time that citizens organize themselves, they expose problems, heighten attentions, fuel enthusiasms, and pool resources for wider-ranging collective initiatives. In every place that a

whole society commits itself to a cause or pursuit, it encourages individuals, motivates groups, energizes communities, and fires up all grass-roots forces toward longer-lasting social adventures and advances. In all, democracy inheres in politicking. Politics becomes common, routine, and standard through individual life, group behavior, and social dynamics under the democratic polity.

Society and Social Movements

Democracy makes society more or less a stage for partisan plays or a theater of political performances. There are grassroots moves and movements in village courtyards, town squares, and city streets. There are nationwide campaigns and propaganda through the mass media, across the court of public opinion, or on the occasion of a rally, ceremony, or ritual.

In spatial terms, society breaks down into groups of individuals with partisan affiliations, ideologies, and pursuits. Villagers are alarmed about their interests. Dwellers in towns are alerted on their rights. City residents are reminded of their obligations. The populace is made conscious of the importance to remain connected, informed, and organized as well as the significance of staying vocal, active, and political. Whether they can explicitly claim their belonging and loyalty to a party, constituents know that they gain or lose in wealth, power, and influence implicitly by way of political dynamics. Whether they may directly state their involvement in party maneuverings or their contribution to partisan initiatives, citizens understand that they indirectly benefit or bear harm from political alignment, confrontation, or reconciliation as far as material and nonmaterial interests are concerned. In general, individuals interact with each other as social agents. They join hands as comrades when they find commonality in political beliefs and agendas. They fight like enemies where they differ on party affiliation and commitment. Groups deal with one another as political forces. They form alliances as they work toward joint gains over fundamental interests. They break up in conflict while they head in opposite directions either by the way they think about reality or over the manner they act upon the world. Society hence operates on a high political state of partisanship with individual members activated by political activism, groups or communities charged by political particularism, and established institutions or practices saturated by political universalism.

From a temporal point of view, society is divided by periods of party-based control or leader-specific governance. Legally, there are defined terms of office, four years, five years, or certain other fixed lengths of time. Another term of rule is earned and won upon the completion of one

term of service. There are then limits on terms. Nobody may be allowed to serve in office continuously for more than two, three, or some other set number of times. Because of this arrangement, a party in charge tends to race through time to ensure that it quickly delves into its partisan world as much as possible, spreading ideas massively, advancing interests substantively, implementing programs effectively, and leaving impacts widely. Due to this restriction, a leader with power is inclined to work against the clock so that he or she can take full advantage of their office to make laws reflecting his or her partisan ideology, pursue policies representing his or her commitment to group interests, and impose versions of reality symbolizing his or her political outlook. As a result, each term is characteristically filled with party acts and activities. Individuals and groups move along party lines, protesting, objecting, or rebelling against one thing at one moment while mobilizing force, rallying support, or pooling resources behind another thing at another moment. Every administration is symptomatically marked by partisan maneuverings and manipulations. Established institutions and practices revolve around partisanship, featuring accommodation, liberalism, or diversity for social issues in one time while highlighting intolerance, conservatism, or the monopoly on political matters in another time. An era therefore runs on elevated political alerts, making individual acts appear confrontational, historical events look disruptive, and institutional routines seem divisive, at any time and all the time.

Waste and Excitement

Democracy is a show. Show expresses sentiments around things. It brings excitement, making people entertained, gratified, or impressed. Show is nevertheless not a necessity. It consumes time unproductively as people strive for survival. It wastes resources without tangible benefits while society struggles to remain viable.

Life is essentially instrumental. It is necessary for an authority to keep social order. However, because there are many avenues to fill and refill an authority of order maintenance, it is not necessarily critical to dwell on democracy for choosing officials through open ballots. As a matter of fact, a regime can arise by traditional factors, foreign arrangements, institutional forces, or a combination thereof. In terms of effectiveness, a government emergent from democratic dynamics does not always fare better although democracy demands that time and money be spent by absolute enormity on political campaigns and competitions every few years. It is necessary for an administration to manage public affairs. Nonetheless, since there are multiple ways to staff and re-staff an administration of civil service, it is not

necessarily imperative to rely upon democracy for selecting leaders via public votes. Indeed, a government may sustain itself through its own evolutionary processes, such as recruitment, evaluation, and promotion. With regard to efficiency, an administrative apparatus resultant from democratic politics does not often function better even though democracy requires that resources and personnel be dispensed in massive amounts over voter mobilizations and all-constituent elections in the beginning of each term. In other words, time and resources are basically squandered as other modes and models are available for the transition of power and the exercise of control.

Life is inevitably expressive. Living is not just about surviving, doing things only for the sake of survival. Feeling, channeling, entertaining, or confirming feelings, is part of life as well. Farming is hard labor. Farmers dance and hold ceremonies before planting. They feast and conduct rituals upon harvesting. Although they have specific purposes for material benefits, dancing and feasting take time and consume resources. While they carry definite meanings toward tangible gains, ceremonies and rituals take space and expend foodstuffs. However, by the event, children enjoy foods and performances as elders exercise control and receive respect. Through the occasion, men demonstrate courage and endurance in farming, hunting, or sportsmanship whereas women show knowledge and skills in crafts, house decoration, and food preparation. Life hereto becomes colorful, interesting, and rich. A village therefore turns into a living community of excitement, hope, and vitality. In a similar line, power is danger. Isn't it creative to place power in the center of people for them to see how it plays out in shaping their everyday thoughts and acts? Governance is duty. Isn't it constructive to put governance on an open stage so that constituents can watch how officials carry out their duty of governance from office to office, term to term, and party to party? Government is bureaucracy. Isn't it productive to operate government with shifts of bureaucrats so that no operators take ownership of government for their own advantage? Politics is performance. Isn't it fascinating to spread politics across the civil society so that all civilians may participate in, cheer on, and reflect upon it as part of their commonsense life? Certainly, changing shifts, replacing bureaucrats, and transitioning between policies take time. Campaigns, rallies, and elections burn energy. Media debates, power maneuverings, and political skirmishes devour resources. Yet, democracy fires up constituents. Democratic processes mobilize, motivate, and stimulate constituencies. Indeed, when people remain alert and active, society stays vivid and vital, which makes life interesting and invigorating.

PART IV

TECHNOCRACY

If autocracy requires submission from the masses, technocracy calls for the normal functioning of a living community. If democracy offers expression to the populace, technocracy reverts to the routine operation of a thriving society. On the part of individuals, technocracy neither imposes restricting conditions nor engenders agitating situations. With regard to groups and institutional operations, technocracy provides both stability and productivity, effectiveness and efficiency, manageability and sustainability (Bell 1973; Akin 1977; Nelson 1978; Stabile 1986; Smith 1988; Fischer 1990; Tilman 1992; Graham 1993; Andrews 1995; Loeb 1996; McKenna and Graham 2000; Shaw 2004; North 2005; Williams 2006; Kenneally 2009; Ginty 2012; Ackerman 2014; Habermas 2015; Liu 2016; Johnston 2017; Wood 2018; Friedman 2019; Shaw 2019; Meyer 2020).

CHAPTER 13

FORM

Different from autocracy that dominates the past and still entertains the present in power, control, and social order, technocracy needs to wait for the time when it will fully blossom across the landscape of human polity. Dissimilar to democracy that is currently in fashion and vogue around the world, technocracy has yet to evolve, emerge, and establish as a prevailing mechanism of governance in human civilizations. It is hence premature to imagine what specific forms technocracy will take when it arrives, develops, and peaks on the scene (Bell 1973; Smith 1988; Burris 1993; Jones 1996; Shaw 2004; North 2005; Ackerman 2014; Picciotto 2015; Zhu and Olson 2017; Palombella 2019; Shaw 2019; Meyer 2020).

Technocrats by Training

Technocracy inheres in institutionalization, by a simple comparison with democracy that features staging and stage performance. Technocrats come in by education, training, and preparation, in stark contrast to autocrats who are born, handpicked, or wishfully willed.

There are accredited schools that follow established curricula to coach and drill prospective technocrats, level by level. K-12 schools lay broad foundations in knowledge about social order and civil service. They issue diplomas, the main evidence of preparation toward higher education rather than the direct proof of individual qualifications for a job placement in government. Colleges and universities differentiate by academic disciplines. They offer focused studies of politics and organizational behaviors with degrees conferred in political science, business management, or public administration. Graduate institutes or seminaries delve into specific fields. They provide specialized training on government and public policy, granting credentials for professional jobs or job functioning as working professionals in bureaucratic settings. Spatially, schools in terms of knowledge face different age groups, deliver different levels of education, and meet different social demands upon and various population needs from governmental agencies and bureaucratic practices. Timewise,

schools with respect to training address similar issues, tackle similar tasks, and produce similar results. Namely, they revolve around students, cultivating beliefs in order and order maintenance, values on service and service competency, norms for government and governmental efficacy, as well as etiquettes to technocracy and technocratic professionalism.

There are standardized contents that would-be technocrats need to acquire and command year after year. First is basic information about population, territory, internal setups, external relations, historical issues, current affairs, and future challenges in regard to a constituency or sovereignty. Second is foundation knowledge on government with respect to its structure and process, input and output, function and impact. Third are general theories over power, rule, control, order, and social integration. Fourth are specific skills in setting rules, making policies, implementing laws, instituting programs, tackling issues, solving problems, negotiating benefits, managing conflicts, navigating political waterways, gaining power, leaving an impact, so on and so forth. Fifth are attitudinal directions and behavioral guidelines such as how awe ought to be kept toward government, care should be taken over people's business, and duty should be performed in the spirit of honesty, transparency, and accountability. Across space span organized systems of teaching and training. Students attend classes, conduct experiments, take tests, engage in debates, make presentations, and prepare papers. Over time spread staged curricula and instructions. Prospective technocrats muster information, accumulate knowledge, practice skills, and embrace technocracy as a field of study, a guild of craftsmanship, and a life of workmanship.

Technocrats by Practice

Education opens the door to role-playing in technocracy. But it is years of experience that nurture a proficient officer. Training presents a pass to office in government. Yet it is experiences of practice that produce a successful technocrat.

Experience is to observe, in general, how technocracy operates as an institution of polity, how government serves the interests of a constituency, and how technocrats relate to constituents in the capacity of office holders, and, in particular, what one does in one's technocratic position, what one's fellow technocrats do at the same level, and what one's upper or lower level does in the chain of command. Experience is to do what a job dictates, what an office entails, or what a position grants, specifically, to follow commands from above, assign tasks to below, and coordinate actions with technocrats in parallel positions. Upon observation is description

as part of experience. That is, one describes an office as to how it sits in relation to other offices in government, an act as to what it is over a technocratic context, or a series of events as to how they take place one after another. In the aftermath of doing or action is explanation. In the form of explanation, experience is to rationalize a line of actions or legitimize a state of inaction, and, in detail, to present backgrounds as to why actions are prompted, state reasons as to how policies are formulated, or offer excuses as to why programs are left unimplemented. Lastly, experience is to feel anxiety or excitement in performing one's technocratic duty, bear disappointment or joy in reviewing one's technocratic performance, and have regret or pride in reflecting upon one's technocratic career.

Practice is to tackle it as a job. One comes on time, stays over a required duration, and leaves only when a day of work is over. One does specific things in a particular working environment, whether one's job is easy or difficult, boring or challenging, routine or dynamic. Practice is to perform it as a service. Government in the spirit of technocracy is to serve people, addressing their concerns, advancing their interests, and improving their welfare. Technocrats, in this sense, are in public service, working as civil servants. Practice is to honor it as a profession. A profession dwells on a systemized body of knowledge, an organized collection of skills, and an institutionalized code of conduct. For example, a legislator commands ample knowledge about laws, knowing how they are made, enforced, and interpreted. A diplomatic technocrat has sophisticated skills in diplomatic maneuvering, specializing in how international crises are managed, multilateral treaties are negotiated, or bilateral relations are maintained. A communications officer embraces certain codes of conduct with respect to honesty, transparency, and professionalism, understanding why a briefing is offered, truth is told, and access to government is kept open to the populace. Practice is to follow it as a career. Technocrats have lengthy stays in jobs in their professions not just because of the ladder that they want to climb from junior to senior steps, but also due to the mechanism that they hope to entertain in the technocratic operation of government. That is, higher levels of technocratic leaders emerge institutionally from lower levels of technocratic functionaries. Finally, practice is to take it as a lifetime commitment. Obviously, only by way of lifelong learning and service can a technocratic operative accumulate knowledge, sharpen skills, and achieve the proficiency necessary for his or her performance in the business of governance. Only through longtime experience and practice by competent technocrats may a technocratic apparatus find momentum, gain operability, and attain stability sufficient for its functionality across the system of government.

Technocrats of Civility

Technocrat is not just a job title. It represents an attitude, sentiment, and train of thought. A technocrat does not only hold a working position. He or she symbolizes an approach, pursuit, and way of behavior.

With systematic education about government, technocrats hold firm beliefs in people as both the beginning and end of power, control, and social order. Power originates from people. It must serve people, their interests, wishes, and welfare. Technocrats as they hold power in technocracy need to exercise power in maximum civility on behalf of people. In particular, the civil application of power entails fairness, transparency, sensitivity to public reactions, acceptance of media exposure, and readiness for social scrutiny. Fairness means treating people equally regardless of who they are, what they want, where they come from, how they conduct themselves, and when they present their needs. No political consideration is entered in the calculus. Everything is handled as a matter of business in accordance with established rules and procedures. Transparency necessitates process monitoring, information sharing, public briefings, and record keeping. There are no secret meetings, under-the-table dealing, or backdoor maneuvering. Sensitivity to public reactions exhibits itself in such timely actions as addressing concerns, answering questions, solving problems, offering explanations, and managing conflicts. Technocrats relate to people as neighbors, coworkers, friends, or even relatives, thinking in the latter's perspectives and walking in the latter's shoes. Acceptance of media exposure requires respect for media inquiry, investigation, and coverage. Technocrats welcome reporters to their offices, allowing their day-to-day dealings to be related to the populace constantly as well as instantly. Finally, readiness for social scrutiny lies in the general mentality of technocrats as people's agents, representatives, and servants, not as officials, politicians, or stakeholders. Technocrats assume office, making rules, formulating policies, designing programs, managing projects, distributing resources, and dispensing benefits. All these official undertakings are for people, the public good, and social wellbeing, and therefore they remain amenable to public scrutiny and stay tenable to mass supervision.

Through concrete experience in technocratic bureaucracy, technocrats take an objective approach to their work. They face, respect, and follow facts. They assess situations, develop programs, and make policies on the basis of evidence. When they handle issues involving multiple sides, technocrats listen to different voices, take different perspectives, and attend to different interests. Settlements hereto are balanced. Where they deal with evolving problems, critical emergencies, or eruptive crises of

serious challenges, technocrats show a similar calm, demonstrate similar resolves, and command similar public appeals by way of knowledge, expertise, and leadership. Solutions are therefore measured. There are no political calculations. Through their civil service, technocrats make government an apparatus of neutrality for all, each and every member of a constituency. There are no partisan fights or skirmishes. With civility, technocrats turn the business of governance into an operation of rationality to all, each and every participant within a sovereign entity.

Technocrats of Service

Service is at the center of technocracy. Different from rulers who issue orders from above in autocracy, technocrats fulfill job duties among people for the good of a constituency or sovereignty. Service is in the soul of technocrats. Unlike officials who engage in partisan politicking in the political arena under democracy, technocrats perform work functions in the governmental bureaucracy toward order, peace, and prosperity of a city, province, or country.

Inherent in service are respect for government, care about people, promotion of the common good, attainment of joint prosperity, and commitment to social justice. With respect for government, technocrats observe rules, follow procedures, and fulfill duties in their positions. They do not play at power for their own gains. Nor do they use government as a vehicle to benefit one group or sector at the expense of another. Caring about people, technocrats address their concerns, answer their questions, and look after their interests. They neither treat people as subordinates who can only carry out governmental orders nor face a constituency as a competing force that may gain at the expense of state control. Instead, they relate to citizens as neighbors, relatives, and friends whose needs, just like their own, should be met in a timely manner. Technocrats believe in the common good, joint prosperity, and social justice. They work in government because they want to run it as a neutral agency in the service of people, all people, their common needs, shared interests, and collective dreams. Indeed, government belongs to all members of a city, state, or country. No group can hijack it for its own purpose. No interest may operate it for its own benefit. In promoting the common good, technocrats work to bridge gaps, overcome difference, and manage conflict toward social order, coexistence, and harmony. In striving for joint prosperity, technocrats till to find resources, identify opportunities, and provide platforms so that individuals can translate their personal potentials into social achievements. Society hereto becomes a joint ground for thriving individuality, prospering

community, and vitalizing nationality. With an eye on social justice, technocrats labor to ensure not only that the common good is enjoyed by each social member without anyone holding an advantage over another, but also that joint prosperity is spread to every common citizen with no one taking an unwarranted share against another.

Intrinsic to service are an understanding of bureaucracy, specialization to the degree of craftsmanship, dedication through performance, excellence by measure of contribution, and professionalism. Government is a bureaucracy that builds upon a rational division of labor, operates by a logical set of rules, and sustains through a staff of professionals. With an understanding of bureaucracy, technocrats take time to do their jobs, exercise patience to reciprocate with other role players, and demonstrate persistence to appreciate overall efficiency. Technocrats dwell on a field of specialty, whether it is lawmaking, programming, or recordkeeping. They gather information, update knowledge, sharpen skills, follow current developments, and remain connected to the educational system for continual learning, unlearning, and relearning. A job is a craft. Working on job-related tasks becomes a show of craftsmanship. Technocrats are identified with their position, job, and duty. Dedication is neither a slogan nor a mindset. It is illustrated through day-to-day performance in the particular role of a specific office. The same holds true for excellence. It is not about lip service, window dressing, an incidental showing, or fleeting superficiality. It is exhibited by concrete contributions to office with tangible impacts on constituents and their life routines. Lastly, technocrats follow a professional code of conduct in their approach or relation to office, official responsibility, coworkers, and members of the general public. As working professionals, they assume office with loyalty, perform duty in honesty, relate to each other by collegiality, and serve people through proficiency, competency, and efficacy.

Technocracy upon Civilian Maturity

Civilians are air, water, and soil for the sustenance of technocracy. Civilian wisdom, understanding, and support constitute the cornerstones of any functional technocratic government.

Although technocracy has no bearing on civil obedience which lies under autocracy, it needs citizen cooperation, collaboration, and compliance. Members of the society focus on evidence, follow logic, and respect truth. They act on objective information, scientific knowledge, and technical skills. Residents of a community believe in shared interests, common goals, and the public good. They join hands to build, maintain, and entertain

consensus with regard to law, order, quality of life, economic prosperity, and social harmony. Constituents of a jurisdiction place trust in civil servants to make, enforce, and interpret policies on the basis of research, fact, and analysis. They observe rules, conduct businesses, and live lives in consideration of collective welfare, communal solidarity, and jurisdictional integrity. Citizens of a country share assessments of where the nation stands, approaches to how it runs, and visions of what it aims for. They pool resources, find opportunities, and coordinate efforts on routine matters as well as in times of challenge, crisis, and extremity. Obviously, each of these seemingly civil individual thoughts and attitudes can only derive from proper rearing, cultivation, and education. Every one of those essentially civil examples of personal conduct and behaviors may only arrive with adequate training, acculturation, and socialization. All of these, and those plainly civil citizen ideas, actions, and sentiments, must automatically coincide with a naturally cultured, widely shared, and deeply rooted individual sense of duty, obligation, and responsibility. Pertaining to service for technocracy in particular, there are always civilians who are willing to enter the governmental bureaucracy, working diligently as competent technocrats, practicing technocracy faithfully in the spirit of professionalism, and serving people wholeheartedly with political neutrality.

While technocracy does not operate on civil activism that undergirds democracy, it requires constituent involvement, participation, and supervision. Individuals are aware of their fundamental rights within the order of a city government or under the sovereignty of a nation state. They present ideas, voice opinions, raise concerns, ask questions, seek business interests, pursue professional careers, strive for personal actualizations, make complaints, and fight injustices. Individuals are also conscious of their basic obligations to public order, civil affairs, social welfare, and human wellbeing. They follow laws, observe rules, pay taxes, meet service requirements, perform civil duties, offer voluntary contributions, and fulfill citizens' responsibilities toward the common good. People know enough coworkers, business partners, professional colleagues, neighbors, community members, fellow constituents, and their specific as well as general interests, needs, and wishes. They make efforts to coordinate with one another in thought and behavior, action and reaction, planning and reflection so they address worries of others while working on troubles of their own, tackle civil issues facing a community while pursuing personal matters affecting themselves, and take care of needs common to the society while solving private problems. People adequately understand family, kinship, neighborhood, association, union, constituency, city, province, country, and their immediate as well as long-term affairs, challenges, and

developments. They strive to take charge, not only individually to keep the bottom line of self-diligence, self-reliance, and self-sufficiency, but also collectively to maintain an optimal state of communal affluence, citywide prosperity, or national vibrancy. With regard to governance and government especially, citizens follow official initiatives but keep asking questions or making criticisms through process monitoring, support government policies nonetheless exercise caution or vigilance by way of civil supervision, and cheer on technocratic functionaries yet hold them accountable with standards of morality and performance.

Technocracy upon Institutional Stability

Technocracy is institutional governance. Lawmaking, policy implementation, and program evaluation take place procedurally with technocrats who are institutionally educated, trained, and cultivated. Technocracy is institutionalized government. Units, departments, and agencies expand and contract logically in response to realistic needs. Interagency checks and balances happen automatically upon the division of labor. Levels, positions, and roles come and go rationally on the basis of world affairs and changes. Intersectional exchange and movement occur naturally in terms of performance, merit, experience, seniority, and a combination thereof.

Science guides the setup of a technocratic bureaucracy across government. Science focuses on facts. Two basic facts affect government with regard to its outer size and inner differentiation. One is territory, although no specific locale, region, or constituency can gain more than its fair share of influence in government as it usually so transpires under democracy. The other is population, even though no individual figure, personality, or role may wield more power than his or her due part of authority inherent in a position as it often so appears within autocracy. Science follows logic. Agency opens only when it becomes a necessity. Recruitment for personnel ends straight away wherever it reaches the level of sufficiency. There are scientific criteria of effectiveness. Rules made, policies implemented, and actions taken bring about expected outcomes to targeted issues regarding concerned groups. There are also scientific standards of efficiency. Results harvested, goals attained, and missions accomplished correlate with resources dispensed, efforts expended, and manpower mobilized. Overall, offices are established to tackle issues, officials are installed to manage office affairs, and the division of labor is observed to optimize the technocratic setup for both structural simplicity and operational efficacy.

Technicality threads the progression of technocrats through the ranks. Technocracy sustains itself with a natural mechanism of recruitment, evaluation, and progression for technocrats. Technocrats are recruited primarily at the entry level on the basis of education, experience, and performance on substantive examinations tailored to technocratic service. For example, applicants hold a bachelor's or master's degree, possess formal or volunteer experience of one or more years in government or a public agency, and pass all related technocratic examinations. Once in service, technocrats move up the ranks in terms of merit, experience, and seniority. There are professional ladders to climb, just as members of the faculty advance from assistant to associate to full professor in colleges and universities upon contributions to scholarship, performance on teaching, and service for the community. There are also administrative tracks to ride through or official titles to strive for. However, different from any autocratic rule, technocrats are not forced onto the administrative path because they are not appointed to official positions by upper authorities. Unlike any democratic practice, technocrats are not coopted or drawn to the administrative track since they are not agitated to vie for official roles through open competitions. In fact, all technocrats are set to march meticulously on a professional path from junior to senior levels as well as randomly on an administrative track in leadership from unit to division to the whole government of a city, province, or state. For instance, all technocrats in a unit are eligible to become a unit leader. Without interference from the outside, one serves as a unit leader in one or two terms per unit rules such as a random drawing selection procedure and a term limit clause. All unit-level officials are qualified candidates for division leaders. With no internal politicking and competition, one assumes a divisional leadership role in accordance with division protocols including the swearing-in and service-out of a term. The same applies to the choosing of governmental leaders, whether it is the mayor of a city, governor of a province, and even premier or president of a country, from among division, cabinet, or lower governmental officials.

Technocracy through Operational Excellence

Technocracy stays because it works. It works, for as a bureaucratic apparatus it is designed, equipped, and fine-tuned to tackle issues facing a constituency, to meet needs presented by members of a jurisdiction, and to solve problems arising from the routine life of a city, province, or country.

Operational excellence takes root in the way that technocracy is set up institutionally as well as with the manner that technocrats are cultured as

working professionals. Technocracy rises upon democracy that to an extent evolves out of autocracy. In the historical sequence, technocracy incorporates lessons from all its preceding systems of polity. At the core of governance, if there are essential elements of lawmaking, policy implementation, and conflict resolution, technocracy would not only install corresponding branches of government to specialize in each of these elements, but would also institute working mechanisms to ensure that the different branches check and balance one another for the good of a whole constituency. In the business of government, if meeting civilian needs, managing business affairs, and keeping social order are basic tasks, technocracy would establish appropriate agencies with a rational division of labor to handle respective matters to the benefit of an entire constituent population. On the part of technocrats, they are well trained with scientific knowledge, independent from group interests, and autonomous by their own professional codes of conduct. As the backbone of government, technocrats take specific positions, play particular roles, and perform definite tasks. In their positions, they follow rules rather than authorities. In their roles, they face ordinary people in the community rather than upper officials within the bureaucracy. During their tasks, they focus on the facts of issues rather than the wishes of certain stakeholder figures.

Operational excellence manifests in objective indicators that can be measured, compared, and analyzed scientifically. In general terms, there are effectiveness, efficiency, rating or index, and public impression. Specifically, effectiveness gauges if policies bear fruit, programs tackle issues, actions lead to results, or measures solves problems. It also examines how quickly a technocratic government mobilizes manpower and material resources to achieve a resolution or reach a settlement when challenges, emergencies, or crises arise as well as how decisively technocrats address civilian concerns, act on constituency fundamentals, and manage routine business matters. Efficiency keeps an eye on cost and benefit. With efficiency, technocracy strives to streamline the governmental bureaucracy, adopt a rational division of labor, and follow conscientious rules of conduct for the business of governance in a constituency. It aims at saving constituents' time, money, and energy while delivering to them the highest possible tangibles such as profits, amenities, and quality of life. Rating or index goes categorically to aspects like official corruption and governmental transparency or systematically to composites like economic affluence, citizen happiness, and social harmony. Different from autocracy that operates away from the public view, technocracy exposes officials and official actions to the scrutiny of the masses and the mass media. Unlike democratic politicians who act out of special partisan interests, technocrats

work to advance the welfare of a general constituent population and the wellbeing of an overall constituency. Finally, a public impression forms and spreads upon technocratic performance. In the meantime, it shapes how government structures itself, molds the mannerisms with which technocrats behave, and determines what technocracy does in relation to citizens and technocratic bureaucrats over substantive matters from organizational rules, public policies, and social outcomes to cultural impacts.

Technocracy through Evolutionary Progressivity

Technocracy sustains for it evolves with time. From the past, it keeps heritages that aid its functions and functionalities. Out of the present, it develops traits that serve its tasks and task performances. Into the future, it carries assets that add to its adaptations and adaptive advantages.

Technocracy dwells on learning for contributive inputs. As an open system, it welcomes, embraces, and incorporates recent developments or current advances from science, technology, mass media, public opinion, and social reality. Learning from science, technocracy practices sophisticated theories and methodologies as to what is law, governance, or order, how bureaucracy, division of labor, and institutional balance work, and why government revolves around constituents as its ultimate center or authority. Innovating out of technology, technocracy utilizes advanced tools and models to manage resources and material flows, motivate individuals and personnel processes, as well as moderate conflicts and conflict resolutions. Correlating with mass media, technocracy follows events, investigates incidents, explores issues, introduces programs, explains policies, and reports states of affairs. Paralleling public opinions, technocracy gathers civic information, assesses mass sentiments, tastes public reactions, develops empathetic strategies, and mounts propaganda campaigns. In tune with social reality, technocracy feels the impulses of common citizens, following their dreams, addressing their concerns, meeting their needs, advancing their interests, and attaining their goals. In one word, technocracy avails itself of different sources for practical information, knowledge, and skills, draws upon different resources for inspirational ideas, initiatives, and policies, and connects to different references for useful feedback, comparisons, and suggestions. With contributive inputs, technocracy remains inherently ready for self-enhancement, improvement, and progress.

Technocracy lives on reform toward productive outputs. In the spirit of self-betterment, technocracy follows its inbuilt mechanism of adaptation to embrace reality, meet challenge, and cope with change. Inherent in its adaptive mechanism are routine adjustment, periodic reform,

and strategic revolution. Through routine adjustment, technocracy constantly improves the way in which it relates to constituents, hearing their voices, processing their requests, solving their problems, facilitating their business or professional pursuits, and improving their life experiences. Inside, it habitually finds and adopts better transactional procedures so that organizational tasks can be carried out with higher effectiveness. It also regularly searches for and installs more functional structures so that institutional coordination can be achieved toward greater efficiency. By periodic reform, technocracy reformulates rules, overhauls policy processes, revamps program executions, and undertakes new courses of action on one or multiple fronts. It may also eliminate offices, add agencies, realign departments, rearrange divisions of labor, shuffle personnel, or transpose assignments. The purpose is often to both streamline bureaucracy and expand service within the purview of governance. The goal is sometimes to either minimize organizational friction and reduce operational cost or sharpen policy response and optimize service delivery as part of governmental business. Being a mature system of polity, technocracy is even able to undergo revolutionary measures in response to critical events, including acts of terror, foreign invasions, natural disasters, and economic depressions. Revolution may take a drastic outlook, varying manifestly from the relocation of office, the shutdown of government, the layoff of technocrats, economic austerity, the concentration of authority, a sharing of power, and a restriction on civil activities to the implementation of a comprehensive deal. Over the domain of technocracy, however, it still folds and unfolds on the basis of facts, under the principle of science, and out of the doings of well-trained, tempered, and experienced technocrats on behalf of the general populace of a metropolis, province, or country. Indeed, by nature, technocracy progresses with time and circumstance for its individual existence, through its own sustenance, and toward its self-betterment.

CHAPTER 14

CONTENT

Technocracy holds its unique substance as a system of polity. Power takes different meanings to what it demonstrates under autocracy. Governing acquires distinctive contents dissimilar to what it reveals through democracy. Government becomes a neutral operation above and beyond diverse social factors and forces. Technocrats serve in their official positions as business professionals whereas people go about their everyday work and life in a matter of fact way (Akin 1977; Cheng and White 1990; Graham 1993; Loeb 1996; Shaw 2004; Williams 2006; McDonnell and Valbruzzi 2014; Liu 2016; Wood 2018; Raco and Savini 2019; Shaw 2019; Esmark 2020).

Institutionalism

Technocracy embodies the spirit of institutionalism. The basic tenets of institutionalism at issue are: Government functions and stabilizes through institutions; institutions evolve and progress by their own forces; and neither autocratic will nor democratic election is necessary for a technocratic system of government to exist, operate, and sustain with service effectiveness and efficiency.

Institutionalism is in the faith of technocracy. Believing firmly in institutionalism, technocracy holds that technocratic institutions are self-sufficient. It objects to the traditional notion that a governmental bureaucracy needs autocratic wills or leadership directions to gain its agency, energy, or drive for existential operation and evolutionary movement. A governing bureaucracy as an institution, once in place, can instead develop and maintain its own rules, purposes, goals, and procedures for existence and evolution. Autocratic wills imposed upon it, either from the top or outside, may only interfere with its normal functionality and interrupt its inner mechanism of adaptation. With a deep faith in institutionalism, technocracy posits that technocratic institutions are self-sustainable. It rejects the prevalent perception that a governmental apparatus needs democratic campaigns and periodic leadership changes to not only overcome its own

inertia toward ineffectiveness and inefficiency but also stem a natural likelihood of falling into inaction, abuse, or corruption. An institution of governance, by its nature, can nonetheless generate and keep its distinctive structures and processes to stay viable, vital, and vibrant. Democratic elections, with the simple aim of a blood change in the top leadership, may only shake and shock civil servants and technocratic officials in their routine execution of job duties and regular performance of work tasks. Indeed, technocratic institutionalism places total trust in institutional technocracy for its ability of self-learning, innovation, reform, revolution, and betterment in conducting the business of service, fulfilling the function of governance, and staying in pace with social change.

Institutionalism is in the practice of technocracy. Technocracy involves institutions, which build upon, operate by, and sustain with institutional divisions of labor, institutional rules, institutional procedures, and institutional mechanisms. The government as an institutional bureaucracy differentiates internally so that specific tasks mandated by a general mission are taken care of by technocrats specialized by way of training and experience. It branches out externally so that all possible areas of people's business are dealt with by offices slated for establishment through the principle of science and technology. Divisions of labor stipulate that units and departments exist to handle substantive matters in response to constituent needs. So do roles and positions set to perform substantial duties resultant from institutional demands. Institutional rules regulate individual behaviors as well as organizational relationships, including how technocrats play roles, what technocratic offices do to one another, and why lower levels hold obligations to execute orders by higher levels. Organizational procedures lay out the process as to how information is released from source to target, policy is approached from making to implementation, or a record is kept from beginning to end. Institutional mechanisms include the checks that one technocratic agency holds on another or the balances that all governmental units, departments, and branches have with each other. Moreover, technocracy depends upon educational institutions to prepare and train technocrats. It relies upon research organizations for advice and consultation over governmental issues. It appeals to media channels in assessing civil sentiments, collecting public opinions, and spreading official information. It calls for interest groups, professional associations, and trade unions to join forces behind major policy initiatives, critical dealings with foreign adversaries, or extraordinary undertakings such as austerity and reform.

Officials as Professionals

Technocrats are working professionals. They are not appointed to hold positions because of their loyalty to an upper authority. Nor are they elected to assume offices due to their appeal to an open electorate. Instead, they enter a technocratic government through a standard procedure of recruitment as they meet basic requirements. They climb the ladder from lower to higher levels in a technocratic bureaucracy by a normal mechanism of movement while they accumulate essential experiences.

As professionals, technocrats rely upon scientific knowledge, technological skills, and practical experiences over their routine performance on a job and continual specialization in an area of governance. Scientific knowledge is learned from school or acquired at the workplace. It enables technocrats to analyze issues, develop solutions, and execute measures with a focus on logic, factuality, and rationality. Technical skills come by formal training and get sharpened in job application. They empower technocrats to carry out orders, implement programs, or settle conflicts by way of swiftness, precision, and smoothness. Practical experiences expand and deepen as service grows year by year. They advance technocrats in matters from sensitivity to constituents and constituent concerns, alertness to exigencies and exigent measures, and proficiency over public communications and communicative processes to maturity toward fellow technocrats and technocratic relationships. Furthermore, technocrats keep their minds open to different ideas, action plans, options, and reactions. They stay free from specific groups and group interests, parties and partisan pursuits, factions and factional disputes. They learn from the past, concentrate on the present, and look forward to the future. In other words, they embrace change while cherishing heritage, undertake reform while tilling in reality, or aim at an ideal goal while tackling the basic task of survival.

Being professionals, technocrats follow institutional rules, procedures, and mechanisms in their daily conduct and career movements. Institutional rules inhere in organizational structure and process. They guide technocrats as to what they do in their job, in their position, or within their role. For example, they report certain incidents immediately after they hear from constituents. Institutional procedures navigate or thread through organizational existence and operation. They point technocrats to regular paths of subject communication, normal roads of material exchange, and suitable ways of task execution. For instance, all initiatives undergo public hearings, scientific investigations, legislative debates, and executive experimentations before adoption or implementation as plans, policies, and programs. Institutional mechanisms undergird organizational division,

cooperation, and integration. They nurture technocrats with a spirit of patience, civility, and professionalism while challenging them to be imaginative, creative, and insistent. Indeed, it often takes time for one thing to emerge and establish just as it is rarely no instance for another thing to decline and decrease over an institutional context. Moreover, technocrats maintain a strong faith in institutions. They abide by regularized rules, follow routinized procedures, and cheer on institutionalized mechanisms. When they experience unfairness or injustice within the bureaucracy, they nonetheless seek institutional channels and means to mitigate or stem it. Where they face difficulty or irrationality, they still turn to institutional avenues and tools to correct or overcome it. For a genuine technocrat, institution is not only a vehicle of public governance but also a pathway toward personal actualization.

Governing as Administration of Civil Affairs

In the era of technocracy, governing is neither an imposition of autocratic wills nor an exercise of democratic rights. It is simply the administration of civil affairs in society or the management of people's businesses amid everyday life.

Humans are independent and self-sufficient individuals. They till in the field, labor in the workshop, and specialize in a line of business or profession. Governing is first and foremost to facilitate individual development, expansion, and actualization. Children grow, in need of knowledge and skills. Governing in this aspect involves the provision of guidelines for curricula and the supervision of school operations in matters from funding, safety, and standards to fairness. Residents mature and age, calling for the treatment of diseases and the maintenance of health. Governing in this regard necessitates rulemaking, policy formulation, and program implementation for labs, clinics, hospitals, pharmacies, and various other health-related agencies. Citizens delve into their individually characteristic trades, specializations, and lifestyles. By conducting one's trade, one may interfere with another's business. In pursuing one's specialization, one could run into trouble with another's professional attainment. While maintaining one's lifestyle, one might affect another's way of survival. Governing in face of all these practical matters requires coordination, conflict management, and the administration of justice. It is obvious that governing and government, either out of individual needs or for the collective good, take time, material resources, and human capital. Yet, as it focuses on evidence and follows science, technocratic governance rarely goes above and beyond the level of necessity. In other words, a

government of technocracy not only exists and expands in a precise response to constituent needs, but also produces and delivers in strict proportion to constituent contributions.

Humans are gregarious and social beings. They act in groups, live in communities, and settle in countries. Governing is basically and essentially to address common concerns, meet collective needs, and maintain public environments. Common concerns involve individual rights versus obligations, personal gives versus takes, self-assertions versus compliances. There are beliefs, norms, values, and their respective formulation, interpretation, and enforcement as part of governance. There are also heritages, conventions, customs, and their corresponding origination, prevalence, and continuation to the benefit of governing. Collective needs range from mass media to share information, infrastructures to move materials, production lines to produce goods, and markets to trade merchandise to public utilities to supply water, provide energy, and take care of trash. Living in villages, towns, and cities, individual necessities converge into collective demands, creating the need for government to build, operate, and manage networks for both productive and nonproductive activities. Leisure, for example, leads to libraries, museums, studios, galleries, theaters, cinemas, sports arenas, zoos, gardens, parks, and other communal spaces where people create with talent and recreate for a renewal of productivity. Public environments refer to living communities such as rural hamlets and urban neighborhoods or administrative entities including townships, cities, counties, provinces, and countries. Inherent in public environments are order and order maintenance. For the sake of order, there are laws and lawmaking. On the matter of order maintenance, there are forces to enforce laws, processes to deal with violations of laws, and institutions to mete out punishments to violators of laws. It is apparent that governing and government, whether arising from collective living or trending toward social wellbeing, evoke systems that are more complex than their elementary parts, processes that are more dynamic than specific procedures, and mechanisms that are more engaging than basic instruments. However, since it is from and for constituents, technocratic governance shall never overwhelm a constituency with an excess of activity or expenditure. Namely, a government in technocracy acts, only by the degree to which constituents propel it to perform. So does it expend, only to the extent to which citizens afford it to spend.

Governed as Maintenance of Social Routines

When a technocratic government performs in full functionality, it keeps its constituency governed. Where a constituency meets the standard of being governed, it ensures its civil affairs are administered, collective needs are taken care of, and public order is maintained. Schools open, businesses run, markets operate, goods flow, life goes on, and society stabilizes.

Governed means flow of individual life. Life unfolds over different aspects. In the nonmaterial dimension, citizens learn things, share information, express opinions, entertain the mind, and gratify the body. As schools teach with curricula monitored by the government for content and quality, learning takes place smoothly. Because media serve as platforms of exchange regulated by the government in terms of objectivity and fairness, the presentation of information goes nicely hand in hand with the expression of views. As cultural enterprises operate under the necessary supervision of the government in accordance with public interests and standards, the entertainment of minds through art, music, and performance happens in an orderly fashion. Since sports facilities are built with sufficient planning by the government in consideration of access and health, the exercise of bodies occurs in a safe manner. In the material dimension, people make products, open roads, transport goods, and construct production lines, service networks, or living communities. By establishing codes, a technocratic government keeps its oversight on the construction of houses, commercial buildings, and production facilities as well as the expansion of collective settlements in the form of villages, towns, or cities. With the issuance of permits, it controls which businesses enter, how services operate, and where markets open with their products safe, prices fair, and dealings transparent to the general public. Through inspection, it finds illegal activities in the marketplace, prevents possible violations by individual actors, or ensures business compliance to official standards. To encourage, facilitate, and reward one person or thing, a government of technocracy can provide grants, offer public recognition, or give formal awards. To deter, subvert, or punish another person or thing, it may impose fines, issue open condemnations, or institute official sanctions.

Governed signifies the maintenance of social routines. Routine occurs on different fronts. First is public order. Individuals feel safe about their properties, belongings, and lifestyles when they trust their technocratic government in enforcing laws, policing places, and settling disputes. Second is mass morale. Satisfaction spreads adequately as residents go smoothly about their business under the existing legal framework provided by a government of technocracy. Confidence runs properly because citizens see

clearly the prospect of reaching their goals or fulfilling their dreams on the basis of reality. Third is cultural fashion. Ideas blow, schools of thought flourish, and exchanges of information are strong under the auspices of a technocratic government. Arts blossom, exhibitions of entertainment prosper, and outputs of creativity run steady in the spirit of free expression, open competition, and voluntary association. Fourth is social custom. Looking forward to the future, technocracy is nonetheless rooted in history, tradition, and cultural heritage. Embracing innovation in the present, a technocratic government is, however, grounded in reality, convention, and social custom. Last is a shared way of life. Technocracy is about institution, institutional functionality, and professionalism on the one hand. It is for integration, social stability, and mass civility on the other. Reflected in governance, it means building civil consensus, advancing collective goods, and facilitating a shared way of life.

Things Approached as Matters of Fact

Laws, rules, and conventions exist as humans live in collective settings. They neither originate from a supernatural force and its will nor evolve out of individuals and their inalienable rights. Law enforcement, governance, and government take place while society spreads from villages, towns, and cities to nation-states. They occur naturally as part of public order, social life, cultural patterns, and human civilizations.

One lives by oneself. One gathers, hunts, or grows for a living. One leads a family. A husband labors in the field, a wife takes care of the home, and children help their parents with family affairs. One keeps a household in a community. Breadwinners specialize in farming, industrial work, crafts, or service, housekeepers frequent markets for daily articles, and all household members participate in communal activities varying from school, church, and interest club to union. Things happen as life unfolds. Whether they are individual acts or collective actions, they occur as things and are hence approached as matters of fact. The same applies to technocrats, technocracy, and a technocratic government. Technocrats assume positions, play roles, and carry out job duties. Matters, as to what they do, how they perform, and even who they are, spread out eventually as things. Technocracy reflects a spirit, denotes a practice, and characterizes a level of efficacy with regard to governance. In action, it generates policy outcomes as things. A technocratic government runs as an administrative apparatus, maintaining a rational division of labor inside while meeting a gamut of needs by constituents outside. In terms of functionality, it turns out executive results

as things. Because they are happenings or things, they are all seen, taken, and dealt with as facts of matter.

Humans speak words. Words express ideas, justify actions, and record events. Humans embrace beliefs. Beliefs connect individuals to supernatural entities and otherworldly forces in ways that shape their thinking and acting in reality. Humans create values. Values moderate how people look up to some doers as noble, righteous, or admirable as well as how they deal with some deeds as damaging, demoralizing, or devastating. Humans establish norms. Norms guide citizens to follow what is right, lawful, and appropriate while rejecting what is wrong, illegal, and improper. Humans hold feelings and sentiments. Sentiments correlate with collective cohesion, public morale, and social solidarity. Though nonmaterial, words once uttered dust down as historical records, beliefs while practiced become religious establishments, values once upheld turn into moral judgments, norms when enforced serve as behavioral guidelines, and sentiments where spread shape public choices or patterns of action. Indeed, all nonmaterial factors and forces eventually crystallize in material happenings and existences, which are ultimately embraced and handled as things or matters of fact. The same holds true for technocratic officialdom, governance, and institutionalism. Technocratic officialdom prides itself on education, experience, and professionalism. Merits are specific doings on a job. Meritocracy is reflected tangibly in daily performances, periodic performance evaluations, and career movements. Technocratic governance excels in terms of service, mass satisfaction, and social vibrancy. Whenever there is propaganda, it is for people to better know their needs and for the government to have a greater understanding of its policies. Wherever there is ideology, it is for governmental actions to become more effective and for technocratic operations to become more efficient. In all, whether in mind or on paper, codes of conduct, rules, ideals, goals, and even spirits of institutionalism are followed and practiced or at least attempted and aimed at as matters of fact or what Vilfredo Pareto called “social residues” within the institutional framework of technocracy.

States of Affairs Assumed as Objectivity

A village, town, city, or country remains in a situation of peace or chaos. Such a state of affairs is not because of the will of a ruler and his or her autocratic governance. It is due to practical factors and forces that exist in the surrounding environment and for ongoing survival. A unit, division, or level of government reaches a goal in economic wellbeing or social vibrancy. Such a state of affairs is not because of the intentionality of a

leader and his or her democratic administration. It is due to realistic structures and processes that take place inside and outside a community, region, or country.

A technocratic government acts upon evidence. Technocrats work as a team in an organized bureaucracy. They receive, review, and react to mass requests via institutional channels. They ascertain, assess, and address public needs through organizational means. There are plans, planning, and preparation. Nonetheless, they are strictly made on the basis of reality rather than human intentionality. There are policies, programs, and projects. Yet, they are precisely executed in response to existing conditions rather than contrived needs. Inputs are objective. So are outputs. Actions are nonpartisan and non-subjective. So are consequences or results. In a sense, it is objective needs presented by objectively acting citizens that objectively mold technocrats and their objective reactions toward objectively effective agendas or measures. To a degree, it is objective reality created within an objectively evolving city, county, province, or other constituency that shapes a technocratic government and its objective undertakings for an objectively efficient operation or administration. In all, objectivity permeates technocracy from beginning to end. Everyone in a technocratic government serves as an agent of objectivity. Everything in, through, from, or around a technocratic government becomes an act or outcome of objectivity.

A technocratic society operates by facts. Individuals believe in science and technology. They focus on actual happenings in reality. In nature, humans explore for more knowledge, better understanding, and greater adaptation. They do not just make assumptions, lay claims, and seek controls. With society, members embrace more participation, better cooperation, and higher integration. They do not merely assign blame, vent complaints, and impose conditions. Relating to fellow workers and neighbors, participants keep an eye on issues, with regard to why something occurs, how it develops, and what it brings about. They rarely jump on persons, criticizing, punishing, or shaming someone as to who he or she is, how he or she acts, and what he or she lives up to. Dealing with technocrats and the government, citizens exercise objectivity, follow rationality, and attempt impartiality. They seldom fire up or burst out with personal likes or dislikes, group favors or disfavors, and partisan tastes or distastes. Indeed, as conscientious players of a technocratic society, everyone knows the importance of expressing one's views while hearing others' concerns, advancing one's interests while respecting others' pursuits, and actualizing oneself while accepting others in the objective context of social interactions. Everyone understands the significance of a technocratic government in making rules, enforcing laws, coordinating actions, and settling conflicts for

the objective management of social affairs. Logic, reason, and rationality hence inhere in the way that people think and act in everyday life. Facts, data, and objectivity therefore undergird what, how, and why a technocratic government plans and performs during a routine operation.

Neutrality of Power

Government in the era of technocracy is no longer a machine of power. It is not set up to demonstrate the will of an emperor, king, or supernatural entity. Government in the world of technocracy is not an operation of power anymore. It is not run to advance the interests of a prevailing group, party, or social segment at the expense of others. If there is still power, it is simply the convergence of individual pursuits toward collective wellbeing.

Certainly, government is bigger than individuals. It draws upon individual wisdoms so that it possesses the vision to view a future that is brighter than anybody could imagine. It pools individual resources so that it holds the material to aim at a goal that is higher than anything one would attempt. It musters individual endeavors so that it owns the potential to accomplish a mission that is greater than anything an individual might complete. Government is larger than groups. It reconciles one group with another on a difference of opinion or ideology so that people can thrive on consensus or a common ground of understanding. It mediates one organization with another over a conflict of interest or materialistic issue so that different groups may join efforts toward shared goals or benefits. It coordinates one community with another in the matter of give and take so that various groups come together to work for collective prosperity, peace, and wellbeing. From a macro point of view, government makes rules, enforces laws, and administers justice. It moderates individuals, affecting their thoughts and behaviors. Government formulates plans, sets policies, and implements programs. It governs society, influencing its structural layouts and operational outcomes.

However, government goes above and beyond individuals. It is not by anybody, whether or not he or she is intelligent, educated, and experienced. It is not for anyone, regardless of how successful, influential, and triumphant he or she is. Instead, it is with everyone as it sets to serve the general citizenship, meet collective needs, and advance public interests. Government transcends groups. It faces each group for what it is in terms of membership, mission, and social contribution. It hears every group with regard to its concerns, needs, and challenges. It serves all groups by the principles of equal access, fair treatment, and due process. Governance is hence open, all-ways, and universal. It is neither comparable with control

under a top-down dictatorship nor parallel to partisanship in a multi-party democracy. The power of government is therefore even, impartial, and neutral. First, it is exercised by trained and fair-minded technocrats, not by appointed or elected politicians. Second, it is instituted in a multidimensional technocratic bureaucracy of professional conduct, not under a one-sided autocratic or democratic apparatus of coercive control. Third, it is applied to each group without obvious discrimination, not to one by another with significant differentials. Fourth, it is used by every individual for the expression of views, the attainment of goals, and the actualization of potentials, not by one against another with an effect of mutual harm. Finally, it is accepted by all citizens, groups, and social segments, as not only necessary to social order but also sufficient for individual action.

Technicality of Governance

Governing in the epoch of technocracy is about gathering, analyzing, spreading, and acting on information. Citizens are to be informed rather than blindsided, educated rather than confounded, inspired rather than brainwashed, convinced rather than manipulated, and motivated rather than coerced in personal thoughts and behaviors as well as over public initiatives and actions.

Governance becomes a matter of science. First, science determines what and how information is collected about a constituency, its peoples and human potentials or resources and material developments. Institutional channels for routine data compiling, reporting, and keeping are scientifically established and entertained. So are mechanical procedures to poll the populace about certain time-sensitive issues or the general state of affairs specific to a locality. Second, science supplies tools for data analysis. When there is correlation or covariance among variables, it is statistics that establishes its existence, measures its strength, and assesses its effect. Third, science guides the way that information is distributed across a constituency. Different from propaganda staged under autocracy, official policies are factually publicized through mass media and communal forums. Unlike campaigns fashioned in democracy, governmental programs are rationally presented for citizen comprehension and constituent understanding. Fourth, science sheds light on how information translates into action. Technocrats weigh benefit and cost when they act on information in the spirit of knowledge. Government strives for effectiveness and efficiency where it sets to address citizen concerns, advance mass interests, and meet public needs by the principle of science. As science resorts to evidence and logic, it naturally steers governance toward factuality, rationality, and technicality.

Government turns into a machine of technology. Inside, government follows technology in managing organizational matters from the division of labor, personnel, finance, and equipment to supply. For example, it explores the best possible mechanisms to motivate technocrats and hold them accountable. Outside, government relies upon technology to collect constituent information, assess mass needs, formulate public policies, and implement social programs. For instance, it uses big data to map out the prevalence of crimes, deviances, diseases, disasters, and other problems. At the micro layer, technology informs technocrats of methods and models for facilitating bureaucratic processes, saving public funds, and improving social conditions. A case can relate to how government contracts are administered through open bidding and communal scrutiny. At the macro level, technology guides governmental agencies in making long-term plans, undertaking large-scale projects, and identifying system-wide patterns. A situation may involve what governmental planning entails for reducing unemployment, stemming poverty, and improving quality of life. Structurally, government draws upon technology to institute check and balance, minimize organizational friction, and maximize bureaucratic efficiency. A demonstration is the installation or institutionalization of an ombudsman, watchdog, journalistic investigation, and civilian criticism. In terms of process, government learns from technology in administering rewards and punishments, eliminating conflicts of interest, and optimizing technocratic operations. An illustration is the inhibition or prohibition of relatives working in the same unit, friends evaluating friends, or subordinates gifting superiors. Finally, on the matter of hardware or material conditions, the government uses technologically advanced equipment to ensure that the military overwhelms enemy forces on the battlefield, the police outmatch criminal elements on the city street, and the civil service embraces the private sector across the business arena. For example, state of the art devices are installed in governmental offices, facilities, and vehicles for constant communication and instant intervention. With regard to software or programing situations, the government adopts technically sophisticated networks so that lawmaking proceeds upon evidence and logic, policy enforcement takes place in precision and effectiveness, and governmental service goes on with care and efficiency. For instance, public health is not only historically tracked but also spatially monitored with both comprehensive information and systematic analysis to inform technocrats in policymaking, guide health professionals in delivery of care, and educate citizens about preventive practice.

CHAPTER 15

OPERATION

Technocracy is a self-sufficient system. Compared to autocracy, it does not involve the superimposition of wills by a religiously, revolutionarily, genealogically, customarily, or otherwise sanctified source. In contrast to democracy, it does not entail the election of leaders from a population of constituents whose rights and obligations serve as the origin of governmental power. Instead, technocracy not only generates its inner agency of governance through an organizational process, but also produces its outer force for evolution via an institutional mechanism (Nelson 1978; Fischer 1990; Andrews 1995; McKenna and Graham 2000; Phongpaichit and Baker 2014; Johnston 2017; Dedon 2019; Scicluna and Auer 2019; Shaw 2019; Meyer 2020).

Union of Technocrats

Technocrats are the soul of technocracy. They staff a technocratic government, fulfilling their roles by positions, through divisions, and from level to level with a knowledge of science, a skillset of technology, a logic of reason, and a conscience of professionalism. Technocrats are the backbone of technocracy. They operate a technocratic government, making it administer civil affairs, meet public needs, and maintain standards of living for all in society.

Technocrats come together by way of association for self-discipline, regulation, and betterment. An association is not part of any technocratic bureaucracy. It is civil, independent, and voluntary. Nonetheless, it establishes codes of conduct for technocrats as to what is right or wrong, how a public charge on the job is reconciled with personal commitment to the profession, and why certain procedures are followed. In this regard, it wields power to shape members in their thoughts and behaviors. An association of technocrats disciplines members for unprofessional words and conduct. Technocrats in government may be found guilty of abuse of power, dereliction of duty, corruption, or violation of professional ethics. A blacklist of wayward technocrats on active duty or out of service is kept for

reference by the mass media, public agencies, and the general populace. While a violator is likely to leave his or her technocratic position immediately upon a finding of guilt, he or she may forever lose legitimacy to step back into professional service in government due to a formal disciplinary action taken by an association of technocrats. To this effect, the latter holds influence to mold members throughout their jobs and career pathways. An association of technocrats celebrates members' performances and achievements. There are famous technocrats who author monumental legislations or policies, invent revolutionary procedures or mechanisms, found critical agencies or services, or lead a government through a once-in-a-lifetime crisis or over an unprecedented period of time. A hall of fame for extraordinary technocrats is maintained for people to admire, emulate, or feel generally inspired. Finally, an association documents events, keeps records, tells stories, promotes technocrats, and represents the profession. It unites practicing technocrats under one flag, with pride in, commitment to, and a standard of quality for public service in human social life.

Technocrats join hands in unions for collective learning, mutual support, and joint progress. A union looks after members' tangible interests, such as compensations and fringe benefits. It also takes care of members' material welfare, including health care and working conditions. Most importantly, however, a union cultivates faith in what members do in a profession, fosters a spirit of how members relate to each other as practicing professionals, and builds solidarity as to why members commit to their joint pursuits, uphold their common codes of conduct, and remain loyal to their collective existence. Inherent in the faith are scientific knowledge, technical skills, and productive abilities to think rationally and act objectively. Beneath the spirit are moral principles, ethical standards, and contributive attitudes to serve fellow citizens and advance public interests. Undergirding the solidarity are mutual understanding, respect, and support for both individual living and social sustainability. Specifically, a union leads the charge of socializing members for entry into a profession. It establishes curricula for different levels of schooling, dictating the content of courses, how they are taught, and the appropriate times for matriculation on the basis of acquisition of knowledge and skills. It guides educational institutions from K-12 to college to graduate school, shaping both material and nonmaterial environments for members to learn, grow, expand, and thrive upon science and technology. A union guards the gate through which educators enter for a career in teaching and out of which students walk to a practice of service in technocracy. At issue are qualifications for career educators and standards of quality for graduates. A union also fashions how working technocrats in government connect to the educational system for

continuing learning. With this connection, technocrats keep pace with scientific progress and technological advance. Indeed, technocracy works when technocrats perform upon education and reeducation credentialed through a union. It shines where technocrats function with training and continuing training certified by unions.

Professional Codes of Conduct

If loyalty is in the heart of an autocratic official, professionalism is in the soul of a technocratic functionary. If exigency is the trademark of democratic politics, business-as-usual is the facade of technocratic governance.

Professional codes of conduct revolve around rules. First, technocrats make rules. To create or establish rules, they must follow rules. For example, they gather objective information from constituents, consult experts on subjective matters, and observe institutional protocols in formulating, testing, and fine-tuning rules or policies. Second, technocrats propagandize rules. For rules or programs to gain publicity, they need to explain the contents, illustrate forms, and uphold communicational logic as to how information is processed, retained, and acted upon. Third, technocrats implement rules. For rules or plans to take effect, they may have to lead with clear examples, embody by concrete efforts, and find organizational means to ease concerns, remove obstacles, and win support. Fourth, technocrats evaluate rules. In order to evaluate rules or programs, they ought to collect critical data, interview stakeholders, and exercise judgmental impartiality in documenting processes, calculating costs, and assessing impacts. Lastly, technocrats interpret rules. To interpret rules or laws, they research precedents, refer to pertinent cases, and stick to court procedures in reviewing evidence, hearing witnesses, and rendering decisions. In all, codes of conduct are rules that guide technocrats as they make, publicize, implement, evaluate, and interpret rules. Rules are ways of life. Technocrats practice rules, care about rules, and remain loyal to rules. Rules constitute a living reality. Technocrats study rules, embrace rules, and hold rules in esteem, as inviolable, and with sanctity.

Professional codes of conduct bring about normalcy. Codes of conduct regulate behavior. Technocrats know the dos and don'ts of specific issues in different circumstances. Codes of conduct mold personality. Technocrats become professional bureaucrats bound by institutional rules as well as civil servants charged with public service duties. They not only remain loyal to the rule of law in terms of governance but also stay in touch with the populace of a constituency from the perspective of service. Codes of conduct stabilize relationships. Technocrats develop and count on

rational expectations of one another at work. They say what they mean and do what they say to colleagues, constituents, and counterparts in other governments. The latter can hence react to and reciprocate with them accordingly, minimizing interpretation, guesswork, and misunderstanding. Codes of conduct lead to uniformity to government and governmental actions. A position and its functions do not alter markedly across space along position-holding bureaucrats in observance of the same codes. A role and its performances do not change noticeably over time with role-playing technocrats under the guidance of the same rules. Finally, codes of conduct bring about normalcy to governance, everyday life, and social order. Rules are clearly written in plain language. Codes are made known to all concerned parties. People go about work and life with regular expectations. Business takes place as usual within the natural range of market ups and downs. There are changes but no surprises. There are excitements but no shocks. Government operates in routineness and stability. Society progresses by ordinariness and normalcy.

Public Conscience

The general population shares the consciousness that governance is neither the privilege of a royal family nor the profession of a political party. It is a right of each citizen as well as an obligation upon every member of a constituency. The mass populace is conscious that government is neither a tool of control for a ruler to keep commoners in line nor a vehicle of manipulation for one party to exploit another. People take ownership of government as both an agency of common service and an institution of general pursuit.

Constituents keep an interest in government. They feel they need to know enough about it: What it is or how it is structured, what it does or how it operates, what it leads to or how it evolves. In the meantime, they realize that technocrats are educated to administer governmental affairs, trained to tackle civil issues, and specialized to manage policy processes. They hence withhold their personal opinions as laymen and place their collective trust in technocrats when things appear to flow normally. Nonetheless, knowing is still necessary as it distinguishes constituents in technocracy from the ruled, controlled, or suppressed under autocracy. Since they know, technocratic constituents can rarely be surprised when things go wrong and the world turns upside down. Knowing also separates constituents in technocracy from the agitated, manipulated, and mobilized under democracy. As they know, technocratic constituents may seldom be shocked where problems continue unabated and the society falls into chaos.

In a nutshell, people in technocracy stay in the know about government yet refrain from meddling in concrete governmental processes because they understand that it takes science, technology, and professionally trained technocrats to administer civil affairs for the good of all members of a constituency.

Constituents maintain an eye on government. They feel they need to participate in it with an obligation of surveys, checks, and supervision. On the one hand, a technocratic government is constituted for individual involvement. There are citizen panels to voice concerns, inform policies, and monitor enforcements. A technocratic government is programmed for public participation. There are volunteer groups to gather data, study options, and test programs. On the other hand, citizens make conscientious efforts toward government, ensuring that it serves public interests effectively and with efficiency. They spend time on issues with the aim of reaching a pragmatic solution. They burn energy for policies in the purpose of legislative formulation. They contribute material resources to programs for the sake of executive implementation. Of course, citizens recognize that technocrats operate governmental agencies with professional knowledge and skills. Standing by with a watchful eye, they step in only when a circumstance calls for citizen input and assistance. Citizens understand that technocrats manage governmental processes out of career experience and expertise. Watching on in a supervisory spirit, they take part only where a situation warrants citizen involvement and intervention. In all, citizens in technocratic society share a public conscience that it is not only their right to know what government is for a constituency but also their obligation to supervise how government runs in the service of constituents.

Social Civility

It takes an educated populace for technocracy to work as a way of governance. Citizens believe in science and technology. They follow facts and strive for rationality in thinking and acting. Constituents have diverse interests and pursuits. They understand both the need to keep social order and the complexity to balance different social forces.

People trust technocrats to carry out the business of government with professional knowledge and skills. They present needs however accept that there is a bureaucratic process for any concrete need to be met. They voice concerns nonetheless admit that there is an institutional protocol for any particular concern to be addressed. They share opinions or points of view yet realize that there is an organizational sequence for any specific opinion or point of view to be adopted. When new laws take effect, civilians

practice those laws to see if they work for the good of social order and prosperity. When new policies arrive on the scene, constituents exercise those policies to sense whether they bring benefits to the majority of the population. When new programs kick in over everyday life, residents follow those programs to experience how they relate to needs in the community. In the same spirit, where problems arise, citizens are not quick in pointing fingers. Instead, they volunteer time, intelligence, and experience for identifying causes and finding solutions. When emergencies occur, civilians are not hasty in laying blame. On the contrary, they contribute ideas, energies, and resources so that mounting challenges are faced squarely and underlying issues are effectively tackled. Where crises strike, members of society are not idle in waiting for rescue and assistance. Quite the contrary, they take actions to assist victims, stage campaigns to raise funds, and make efforts to reconstruct infrastructures. With civilian understanding and support, a technocratic government not only remains ready for administering day-to-day civil affairs but also stays steady for dealing with critical social exigencies.

Technocrats see themselves as part of the civil society. They take on the concerns, interests, and needs of constituents as their own. They work diligently, honestly, and openly on addressing concerns, advancing interests, and meeting needs for members of a constituency. With diligence, they gather information, carry out research, and optimize ways and means toward the best possible outcomes. In honesty, they focus on facts, follow scientific reasoning, and talk about truth, difficulty, or any wishful yet impossible scenario of reality. With openness, they present plans at the beginning, reveal policy actions throughout the process, and share outcomes at the end. Technocrats view themselves as inseparable from social civility. They respect constituents regardless of age, sex, race, family, and other demographic variables. They hear different voices because they do not listen more to those who speak better, louder, or more. They treat constituents fairly with a focus on evidence, reason, and equality. They deliver balanced results for they do not yield to persuasion, threats, or manipulation. They serve constituents wholeheartedly in accordance with a civil standard of quality, kindness, and efficiency. With quality, they keep peace, prosperity, and a maximal standard of living. In kindness, they spread care, empathy, and reciprocity. By efficiency, they optimize ways of life by minimizing input, the exploitation of human relations, and the utilization of environmental resources while maximizing output, human gain, and the sustainability of nature.

Routinization of Governance

In the era of technocracy, government is business. Governance being business as usual is a state of normality over civil affairs or a norm of reality in everyday life. There are no coercion, oppression, and subordination as during an autocratic reign of rule. Nor are there mobilization, manipulation, and politicking while under a democratic form of government.

Citizens are active participants. They raise questions, volunteer ideas, offer suggestions, present initiatives, voice reactions, and provide criticisms, like those in democracy but not through political organizing, mobilizing, campaigning, rallying, or protesting. Constituents are conforming constructionists. They abide by laws, observe rules, pay taxes, respond to governmental calls, carry out official orders, and fulfill citizen obligations, like those under autocracy yet not in the consciousness of silence, suffocation, sacrifice, or suffering. The keywords are precaution, preparation, and procedure. Precaution means that individuals embrace reality, experience what exists as necessary or what occurs as inevitable, and understand the need to keep social order as well as the complexity to effect institutional change. Preparation requires that people research issues with diligence, analyze chains of events by solid data, and present solutions in scientific forms. Most importantly, procedure guides citizens to participate in government and civil affairs constructively, productively, and institutionally through a concrete process or bureaucratic avenue toward a tangible outcome or organizational effect. Slow and piecemeal perhaps, but there is still excitement when an expected change takes place. Although not often expressively apparent throughout the process, there is nonetheless joy where an intended result arrives on the scene.

Technocrats are serious servants. They take ownership of their job duties, official positions, and serving agencies, to a degree comparable to that of autocrats and autocratic officials in government. However, they serve with care, knowledge, and dedication rather than rule through control, oppression, or dictatorship. Technocrats are filial representatives. They relate to constituents, constituency, and civil society as their source of inspiration, purpose of endeavor, and end of service, to an extent analogous to how democrats and democratic politicians perform in office. Nonetheless, they work toward public order, communal prosperity, and social wellbeing rather than represent for the sake of power, influence, fame, and self-actualization. The codes of conduct are patience, professionalism, and persistence. Patience is exhibited in the process through which technocrats listen to constituents with regard to concerns, interests, and needs, research issues in terms of causes, changes, and consequences, and

explore options by means of policymaking legislatively, programming administratively, and evaluating or opinion rendering judicially. Professionalism manifests in the non-discriminative attitude by which technocrats take toward different constituents, the objective-rational approach with which they tackle diverse tasks, and the efficiency-conscious mannerism in which they manage various civil affairs. More critically, persistence keeps technocrats on track with bureaucratic processes, organizational dynamics, or institutional movements. There is no radical revolution, no quick change of government, and no drastic ups or downs in society. Instead, there are only gradual developments with the aid of science and technology, continuing improvements by way of reform and innovation, and natural progress in the form of living vibrancy and social sustainability.

Progression of Technocratic Functionaries

The key part of a workable technocratic government is that technocrats enter, progress through, and exit the bureaucratic system by a natural mechanism, through an automatic process, and without any political consideration. Being automatic, nonpolitical, and natural, technocratic progression reflects presence and experience, randomness and inevitability, service and merit.

Specifically, technocrats enter service in government when they meet the basic requirements, from education to experience to an entry examination, as publicized through open recruitment. They work on certain jobs for exact positions in particular units. After known years of service, they become eligible for a unit leader post by way of random selection. As unit leaders, they qualify to serve as deputy department heads in the close upper department layer. Deputy department heads are candidates for a department head role. All department heads then make suitable recruits for vice division administrators in the immediate top level. Active vice division officials further form a pool of selectees for a division chief. The process continues until the mayor of a city, governor of a province, or president of a country emerges from the rank and file of career technocrats. Top down, when the role of head of state needs filling, all serving ministers in the central government alone, all active governors of provinces across the state only, or both provincial governors and central ministers may join the process of random selection to make the final choice. Random selection can be as simple as how a lottery is conducted in public for a winning number. Obviously, there are term limits, institutional rules about qualifications and eligibilities, and procedural stipulations about when, where, and how selection is carried out free from human interference and open to public

monitoring. For example, a unit leader, department head, division chief, city mayor, provincial governor, or state president may only serve one term of four years. A former leader cannot join a new round of selection for leadership until all other fellow members have taken their chance of service.

In general, the progression of technocrats through a governmental hierarchy features the principles of presence, experience, randomness, inevitability, merit, and service. Presence means that one needs to be in the system, particularly, in a unit, department, or division as part of the membership or a candidate pool in order to catch up with any ongoing rotation of leadership. Experience points to the fact that one needs to meet the established qualifications to enter the system, serve known years in a position to become eligible for a leadership role, and hold office at one lower level as a necessary condition to participate in selection for the next higher rank. Randomness highlights the force of nature in human affairs, specifically over the administration of civil matters. With random selection, politicking is kept out of the process of governance. Technocrats wait for their time of service while constituents embrace what falls upon them in reality. In fact, it does not matter who heads a unit, department, division, or whole government as the latter operates under the thrust of institutional dynamics by a stable army of career bureaucrats. Inevitability demonstrates the effect of human doings and deeds. Technocrats aspire to work in government. They break into the system because they go to school, learn skills, take exams, and become qualified. They stay in their jobs for they work hard, collaborate with fellow technocrats, serve constituents wholeheartedly, and grow experienced. They move up the career ladder or bureaucratic hierarchy since they do not falter in their duty and forever continue in their pursuit of excellence. Merit speaks for great performance in technocratic service, a high standard of the technocratic profession, and the exemplary outlook of the technocratic operation. For any individual technocrat, one falls off the system when one fails to perform one's regular job. One would have to voluntarily excuse oneself or involuntarily withdraw from selection when one does not rise above routine evaluations and special screenings to become a qualified candidate. Finally, service refers to experience. Quantitatively, it is as simple as years of service. Qualitatively, it is about exposure to different jobs, positions, agencies, levels, and sites of government. For example, technocrats who have served in a variety of circumstances dealing with a range of issues are more likely to surface in selection, although random and automatic, for higher levels of service. Indeed, by specific rules, only those with service in governorship may qualify in random selection for the office of national presidency.

Conversion of Power to Service

Government is not about power. It does not need power when it administers civil affairs. It does not exercise power while it keeps social order. In the same vein, technocrats and technocratic work revolve around service. Service requires knowledge and skills. It calls for passion, empathy, care, and dedication. There is no place in service for manipulation, negotiation, apathy, or neglect.

Away from power, government becomes an operation of service. In comparison to autocracy, a technocratic government neither holds power to keep the glory of an emperor, king, or royal family, nor employs power to control the thoughts and behaviors of any citizen, group, or civil society. On the contrary, it manages public utilities so that life goes on without incident, processes civilian matters so that business takes place in due course, and meets mass needs so that society runs in proper order. Toward service, government is no longer a machine of power. In contrast to democracy, a technocratic government does not need power to maintain a check and balance among groups and group interests, nor does it call on power to mobilize grass roots, build political coalitions, and unite a city, province, or country. Instead, it addresses individual concerns to a degree that collective consensus forms as to what is good for all citizens, tackles specific issues to an extent that public order emerges as to how economic prosperity or cultural vibrancy is continued, and coordinates civil activities in a way that they not only strengthen but also sustain overall social solidarity, coherence, and integration. Of course, a government of service can neither be a tool of a certain strong-willed individual to realize his or her dream for an expanding empire or lasting dynasty, nor a vehicle used by some well-organized party to advance its unique political ideal or grandiose social engineering. It may only exist and endure with constituents, for citizens, and through the populace.

Serving technocrats are not officials like those under autocracy. They do not fear whether they have the necessary power and ammunition to hold authority and keep commoners under control in their jurisdiction. Their only concern is whether they have the essential knowledge and skills to perform the duties of their job for individuals living in their city, province, or country. Working technocrats are not politicians like those in democracy. They do not worry about whether they have sufficient power and resources to win votes and maintain social order throughout their constituency. They just focus on how they might improve performance and expand experience with the aid of science and technology in fashioning governmental responses to mass needs and communal demands in everyday life. The

change from power to service manifests in attitudes. Technocrats do not look down on people as subordinates. They relate to people as neighbors, coworkers, and fellow citizens. They know neighbors' likes, desires, and wants. They understand coworkers' concerns, challenges, and dilemmas. They try everything they can to assist fellow citizens. Transition from power to service exhibits itself through action. Technocrats do not approach the populace as a quantity of votes. They go to residents in the community so they have up-to-date information about what individuals do from place to place. They work with laborers, professionals, and businesspeople in the world of production, trade, and service so they see how the economy expands or contracts from time to time. They live with fellow citizens in a city, province, or country so they remain part of policymaking, problem-solving, and program-implementing processes. Overall, service equalizes mayors, governors, ministers, premiers, and presidents with ordinary bureaucratic functionaries such as all civil servants. It also equalizes technocrats with blue-collar and white-collar workers, business owners and employees, organizational professionals and manual laborers to be all in one: an indiscriminative productive force.

Equilibrium of Government

With technocracy, government runs as a business, the people's business to take care of people's concerns, interests, and needs. No longer is it a battlefield whereby rulers apply power and force to suppress and control the ruled. No more is it a playground wherein representatives employ power and influence to manipulate and win the represented.

Government remains in a moving equilibrium. Moving, it retires old technocrats whose places are filled with new blood with ideas, attitudes, knowledge, and skills, as well as ways of thinking and acting current to the new era. It marches with science and technology, phasing out outdated software and hardware while embracing breakthrough discoveries, theories, inventions, and innovations. It races with the wave of change in population and group dynamics, territory and environmental evolutions, culture and spiritual oscillations, society and institutional movements so that it knows what constituents feel about life, understands how the constituency fares in reality, and acts properly in terms of the time and space in which it falls. In equilibrium, government weathers economic downturns and depressions as an operation of balance between input and output. It goes beyond cultural divisions and differences to be a system of tolerance for both conservatives and liberals. It rises above social contrasts and conflicts to be a state of existence with the old guard standing side by side with progressives. It

transcends localities and specifics as a sequence of flow in substance and activity over population and territorial ups and downs. Indeed, no matter what people experience from place to place, government exists as a steady source of inspiration, encouragement, and support. Regardless of what society faces, wrestles with, and attains, government serves as a stable force of reference, mobilization, and unification.

Government stays under a functioning equilibrium. Functioning, it feels the pulse of people, resonates with the rhythm of society, and seizes the sentiment of the constituency. In this regard, government knows what people think, understands how society operates, and responds to citizens and their everyday concerns. It handles issues in the workplace, manages conflict across the community, and solves problems throughout a city, province, or country. On this matter, government brings people together, organizing, uniting, and supporting them to take care of practical things for a smooth life. It establishes rules, makes policies, enforces orders, and implements programs. Over this domain, government keeps public order, guides economic vitality, maintains cultural vibrancy, and ensures social sustainability. Toward equilibrium, government treats people equally, with care, respect, and dignity. Whether they come from lower or higher social echelons, people face the same government, seeing their requests processed at the same speed through the same procedure. Government practices openness, fairness, and neutrality. Regardless of the issues or needs they have in life, constituents deal with the same technocratic staff who are knowledgeable in explaining why, honest in showing how, and professional to point out what, when, or where. Moreover, government upholds the principle of equity, justice, and integrity. No matter who is involved, what is at stake, and how long or complex it may be, government assures citizens that rewards are delivered on the basis of contributions, punishments are meted out in proportion to misdeeds, and all government actions or processes are fashioned in ways that are free from abuse, neglect, or corruption. Overall, government aims at effectiveness as it serves people with respect to mass concerns, interests, and needs. It strives for efficiency while it manages civil affairs, maintains social order, and masters the art of technocratic governance with the aid of science and technology and in terms of evidence, objectivity, reason, and rationality.

CHAPTER 16

IMPACT

Technocracy is still a concept in governance, far from reality as a whole system of government. Yet, much of the rank and file officialdom inherent in autocracy remains by default a technocratic existence. It is even quite salient that the civil service undergirding democracy stays in essence a technocratic operation. Of course, technocratic practices in other political systems may only offer pieces of information as to how a complete polity of technocracy impacts humans, human societies, and human civilizations (Stabile 1986; Tilman 1992; Wood 1995; Njalsson 2005; Kenneally 2009; Ginty 2012; Shaw 2013; Ackerman 2014; Habermas 2015; Zhang 2017; Friedman 2019; Nietzsche 2019; Shaw 2019; Meyer 2020).

Human Individuals

Humans form groups, create institutions, and make history. On the one hand, what humans generate depend upon who they are, when or what phase they pass through in their journey of life, and where or what setting they move in across their universe of existence. On the other hand, once a group is formed, an institution is established, and a way of life is made reality, they each and altogether feedback to humans, affecting how they socialize, guiding what they do, and molding who they become.

Analogous to individual development, humans in the evolutionary stage of childhood serve as camels. They bear burdens, endure hardships, and put up with suffering under the circumstance of their survival. Autocracy creeps in as a monopoly of human governance and social order. A few rule by a salient means of oppression while the majority follow with an overwhelming experience of forbearance. Then comes the tumultuous period of adolescence when humans turn into lions. As fierce as lions, humans attack cages, challenge barriers, and rebel against authority in the world of their existence. Democracy spreads out like a kind of political play and governmental operation. A number of representatives perform on stage to impress the audience whereas countless participating spectators or spectating participants in the masses cheer them on to take in the excitement.

It is not until the mature, stable, and secure phase of adulthood that humans feel by themselves, experience in themselves, and stay of themselves like an innocent child. Here exists neither the forced acceptance of discrimination, mistreatment, and injustice nor the acted-out exhibition of ego, selfness, and ethnocentrism. Now come only genuine individuals as to who one is or authentic living as to what occurs in nature. With regard to human polity, it is the era of technocracy wherein humans are not only ready to govern social affairs in a way that is reflective of technocratic spirits but also prepared to lead an individual life in a manner that is characteristic of technocratic practices.

Technocratic citizens live like innocent children. They do not suppress their desires, wants, and feelings. They speak their minds, present their ideas, and share their thoughts. The government exists to provide both a platform for the expression of individual likes or dislikes and a framework for the pursuit of private interests, growth, and actualizations. Technocratic residents do not organize, manipulate, or politick in order to gain power, wealth, or fame. They work in their regular jobs, follow their daily routines, and lead their commonsense lives. The government operates to offer not only a free process to administer civil affairs, manage communal conflicts, and coordinate social relations, but also an open system to address mass concerns, meet civilian needs, and maintain collective order. Indeed, individuals act with complete genuineness to be themselves when they know they can count on the technocrats in government to do what is right for the good of the citizenry. People live in their natural places to do what they do when they understand they may rely upon technocratic agencies to follow evidence, reason, and justice in the service of a city, province, or country. Life hereto becomes straightforward, routine, and predictable just as society therefore falls into simplicity, peace, and harmony.

Work as Business as Usual

Life is earned. Living requires productive work. There are times when individuals are forced to perform an undue amount of labor to support a leisure class. There are places where a few do less as they manipulate the majority to work more than their fair share. Under technocracy, however, each individual works on a job to support him or herself. Every member of society practices a line of business to remain in self-sufficiency.

Jobs exist due to business needs. They come wherever business booms. They change as business evolves. They go when business declines. There are no autocratic figures up there who create, expand, reduce, or eliminate jobs simply because they want to embark on an adventure,

complete a task, or pursue a mission out of their individual will, dream, or ambition. Technocrats down here provide information, maintain frameworks, and manage processes pertaining to jobs and job-performing citizens. Businesses operate in response to human needs and social demands. They profit in prosperity when human needs remain diverse, robust, and vibrant to be tackled. They grow or downsize as the economy expands or contracts. They bleed to death where social demands run out of fuel. There are no democratic factions or forces on stage that push one thing or kind of businesses up to the pinnacle while pulling another thing or type of enterprises down to the abyss. A technocratic government serves in society to facilitate civil transactions, settle trade disputes, and manage individual relations.

Technocratic citizens are working professionals. They take up positions for work. They play roles in organizational settings. For their jobs, they specialize by mastering foundation knowledge, sharpen specific skills, and maintain a wealth of expertise. In their roles, they observe rules, follow procedures, and keep a manner of professionalism. Since they remain active in their field of specialty or line of business, technocratic professionals stay current with regard to progress over various aspects of work from substance, setting, standard, and personnel to morality. They know what knowledge and skills they need to learn, relearn, or unlearn so they can move from one level or phase to another in their field. They understand how much effort they must make in order to keep a constant tie to the educational system, knowledge enterprise, and industry of their own trade. As far as government is concerned, it surveys labor markets, monitors employment situations, compiles job statistics, and regulates industrial relations. However, because it does not own any business entities, a government naturally rises above specific interests to provide fair guidance for labor. As they neither represent corporations nor unions, technocrats automatically go beyond particular groups to deliver a neutral service to all sections or society as a whole. This objective orientation of government feeds back well on labor. Labor hence flows with market forces. Individual workers do what they do per the job requirements and market demands, with no regard for humanmade factors or forces from governmental authorities. These noninterference approaches by technocrats leave no or minimal impact on business. Business therefore operates in response to trade dynamics. Working professionals commit to jobs and careers without any second thought for manufactured shocks and surprises from political arenas. In other words, work becomes business as usual when workers and working professionals adapt to nonpolitical governance on the basis of evidence, reason, and justice in the epoch of technocracy.

Life as Routine

Life flows in stability. It does not have to happen in sharp contrasts between scarcity, austerity, or suffering and abundance, extravagance, or indulgence as often seen under autocracy. Life unfolds through continuity. It does not have to occur with ups and downs, boredom and excitement, ordinary events and extraordinary incidents as commonly witnessed in democracy. Life goes on with consistency. It progresses naturally, free from political tides and waves driven by either authoritarian wills or democratic dynamics.

Living is about knowing oneself. One no longer fears any authority because there is no authority out there to intimidate, restrict, and repress individuals. One turns inward, acknowledging one's own desires, wants, and needs. One acts, taking steps to address one's concerns, advance one's interests, and actualize one's potentials. Living is about understanding nature. One can afford to care less about officials as technocrats are here to serve civilians with respect to their pursuits, attainments, and welfare. One studies nature, embracing it as one's motherland, stage of performance, and lifeline of survival. Living is about riding over variables that exist across space. One may choose to interact more with government for technocratic agencies are there to administer civil affairs toward the economic prosperity, cultural vibrancy, and social vitality of a city, province, or country. One works with existent factors and parameters, relying on them to produce goods, provide services, and maintain the amenities of life. Living is about following forces that take place over time. One does not need to remain submissive to an authoritarian regime, prepared to take its commands, carry out its orders, and meet its demands. Nor does one have to stay cunning, persuasive, and manipulative, in order to organize partisan allies, attack political enemies, and politick on stages of power, wealth, fame, or a combination thereof. One races along with real-world currents and streams, navigating them to bid a natural farewell to the past, deal in a matter-of-fact manner with the present, and keep a realistic hope for the future.

Technocratic residents are self-conscious. They know who they are, not just their names, assets, and social positions but also their interests, aspirations, and tangible attainments. They stay in their places, doing what they are supposed to do as everyday-life ordinary people. Keeping a private space, they cultivate their minds, attend to their needs, and take care of their feelings. Respecting fellow humans, they refrain from bullying classmates, manipulating peers, and politicking with or against folks of similar or different backgrounds and pursuits. Technocratic civilians remain free from categorization. Men work with women as united humans, not as two divided categories. Whites live with Blacks as diverse peoples, not as two different

racers. Northerners collaborate with Southerners as teammates, not through contrasts of their origin or any other discriminative mark. Technocratic citizens stay open to change. Living in reality, they naturally follow effective social factors and forces from the past to the present. Embracing science and technology, they automatically ride over active human imagination, creativity, and innovation from the present to the future. Economically, members of a technocratic constituency are self-sufficient. They labor to produce goods, meeting numerous material needs in everyday life. They work to provide services, satisfying various necessities for collective human existence. Socially, participants of a technocratic sovereignty are conscientious. They ask questions, raise concerns, present ideas, and voice opinions on critical issues. They pay taxes, volunteer time, donate funds, and contribute material for collective wellbeing. They serve technocratic operations, from defense, law enforcement, and the administration of civil affairs to the maintenance of culture, heritage, and humanity. In one word, technocracy brings order, certainty, and predictability, unifying ordinary people while universalizing life as routine.

Human Societies

Society goes back to what it is meant to be, a flat collection of people living together for a life. There is a rational division of labor, leading to a network of jobs, specialties, and careers. Nonetheless, labor does not differentiate individuals, sorting them into lower or higher social positions, classes, or echelons with differential access to resources and opportunities. There are free assemblies of peoples by interest, trade, or opinion. Yet, assembly does not pit one association, congregation, or union against another, without feeding them into ideologically disputed camps, economically competing enterprises, or politically feuding parties.

It is about things. Society serves as a platform for creating things, doing things, and taking care of things. Different from autocracy when more time is spent on who does things for what, technocracy focuses on the things themselves. Are these things what people desire, need, and want? Instead of doing things that prevent others' needs from being met, technocratic civilians create things that fulfill their desires. Do these things benefit the community, region, and country? Rather than sabotaging things to the advantage of a place, technocratic citizens take care of things that enhance their ways of life. Unlike democracy where energy is consumed relating to how things are done to whose gain or loss, technocracy engages in things from beginning to end. Things exist. They are managed for the good of collective order. No longer is there any feud as to who performs on stage

and who watches in the audience. Things happen. They are tackled to the benefit of social existence and sustainability. No longer is there any fighting over how harvests are distributed across the population. In a nutshell, technocracy lies down to, in, and with the earth. It is a matter-of-fact system in which things come and go as elements of human society. It is a here-and-now process through which things get done, managed, and settled in the flux of social life.

It is about people. Society operates as a stage for people to vent, act, and actualize themselves. If autocracy grants a special privilege for a few to exercise their wills at the expense of the masses, technocracy makes it a common practice for all to voice their opinions as they like, pursue their aspirational professions, and attain their aimed-for goals. If democracy deems it an earned opportunity for one group or party to advance its interests to the loss of other segments, technocracy turns it into a shared charge for individual citizens to express ideas, take initiatives, and strive for growth. Indeed, members of a technocratic society have ownership of their livelihood. They specialize in different lines of business, creating the amenities of life. The government is here to facilitate their enterprising and professional undertakings. Participants of a technocratic polity lay claim to their individual rights to expression, association, expansion, and actualization. They meet their personal obligations for social order, justice, peace, and harmony as well. Technocrats are there to perform the routine work of governance through planning, policymaking, programming, coordination, and service. In other words, people sit at the center of society. Whether it is economic prosperity, cultural diversity, and social vitality, it is all for people and their tangible development, satisfaction, and sense of fulfillment.

Societal Existence

Society exists to get things done. No longer is it forced onto a battlefield by strong wills, royalty, or rulers to control weak wills, commoners, or followers. Society operates to take care of people. No longer is it hijacked as a showplace by the active, aggressive, or combative to manipulate the contented, reserved, or obligated.

Collective order is the end. There are individuals. They work in jobs and enjoy recreational activities during their spare time as they are given the space to live their personal lives. They produce goods and relish material amenities at home for they are afforded the opportunity to translate their individual potentials into creative outcomes. Technocratic governance is here to cultivate individuality with a conscience, ethics, and virtue, ensuring personal growth and sustainability while preventing interpersonal

conflict and violation. There are groups, organizations, and communities. They organize members and provide them with a sense of belonging, identity, and pride. They serve members and turn their ideas, talents, and activities into programs, projects, and products. Technocrats are there to promote and preserve groups, organizations, and communities through institutional rules, mechanisms, and conventions, safeguarding organizational autonomy and expansion while stemming intergroup sabotage and destruction. There are cities, provinces, and nation-states. They connect citizens to organizations, allowing the former to fulfill their dreams through institutional means while letting the latter achieve their goals with individual contributions. They run governmental agencies, meeting individual needs by way of institutions and institutional forces while tackling organizational challenges via the mobilization of individuals and individual endeavors. Indeed, it is all about order, an orderly interface, and an orderly coexistence among individuals, organizations, and governments as well as between individuals and organizations, individuals and governments, organizations and governments. Order calls for a personal conscience, organizational discipline, and state restraint. So too, does order maintenance require interpersonal norms, organization-to-organization rules, and statewide codes of law.

Social transaction is the theme. First is the person-to-person interaction. Men engage with women in the form of love and intimacy. Individuals of older age relate to those of younger age by way of care and mentorship. Neighbors keep an eye on one another's property and personal wellbeing. Coworkers support each other on task and job performance. Technocrats live in communities as regular residents. They empathize with fellow citizens by understanding what people need in everyday life. They fulfill their duties by doing what is necessary to serve constituents and satisfy constituent demands through routine governmental operations. There are then group-to-group dealings. Farms buy chemicals and tools from factories. Supermarkets sell produce and dairy products from farms. Airlines transport goods and workers for corporations. Educational institutions prepare job entrants for labor markets. Technocratic governance sets standards in business-to-business contracts. It creates environments for intergroup exchanges. It settles disputes among organizational entities. Last is the person-to-organization relation. Individuals attend schools, work in corporations, join interest clubs, form professional associations, and contribute to charities. Restaurants feed patrons, hospitals treat patients, accounting firms serve clients, markets sell merchandise to customers, and farms offer produce to residents. A technocratic government stays in a jurisdiction as a routine operation. It makes rules, enforces laws, and

interprets contracts among individuals and institutions in an objective and neutral manner so that equity, fairness, and justice prevail all over the system and throughout the process. It oversees civil transactions, ensuring that no manipulation, exploitation, or discrimination occurs by one party or against another side.

Social Change

Society changes along with natural factors and forces. No revolution ever occurs as society is no longer coerced into one mode of existence by any autocratic authority to the point of breakdown or explosion. Society evolves by its own logic and rationality. No reformation ever happens because society is no longer conjured into one style of operation by any democratic player to a surreal or unreal state of existence.

Innovation is the driving force. Technocratic citizens are down-to-earth individuals. They focus on themselves, knowing who they are, what they want, and how they can do better. They follow everyday life, understanding that they need to study surroundings, mobilize resources, and explore opportunities in order to create amenities for survival. Technocratic officials are practical civil servants. While entertaining big ideas, grand plans, and visionary programs from time to time, they delve into concrete measures, specific operations, and tangible schemes to get things done most of the time. While debating on issues, comparing options, and exploring possibilities from place to place, they work on concerns of commonality, matters of urgency, and problems of constancy to have people taken care of squarely and on the spot in this or that place. The technocratic government acts on reality. It revolves around people, gathering information about citizens' needs, making policies toward citizens' welfare, and taking actions for the sake of citizens' benefits. It operates on the pulse of the constituency, exploring avenues of better service, finding means of higher effectiveness, and practicing ways of greater efficiency. The essence is betterment. Namely, technocrats concentrate on particular moments of life, learning from the present for better actions in the future. The key is innovation. That is, technocrats emphasize specific occasions of the world, drawing from the immediate for doing more on the horizon.

Progress is the outcome. Technocratic faith is in science. Science follows the logic of existence to find what governs in nature, how things change by their own forces, and why the world folds or unfolds in one way or another. Change is a natural development of time. It happens when time flows from the past through the present to the future. With regard to substance, where the present is well addressed in accordance with science,

the future will arrive in a state that is better than that it automatically emerges from. In other words, there will be progress. Technocratic practice lies in commonsense. Commonsense reflects the truth of a phenomenon by revealing what works in reality, how things come and go, and why life takes different trajectories. Change is an evolutionary adaptation of place. It occurs where place moves in form from singularity to multiplicity or by content from simplicity to complexity. As far as substance is concerned, when reality is well attended in terms of commonsense, what is forthcoming is bound to be in better shape than what is naturally ongoing. Technocratic governance relies on science. In the spirit of science, it studies existence with an aim to address existing issues to the benefit of constituents. As issues are tackled one at a time, it sees things turn healthier, prettier, and livelier, piece by piece or gradually. Technocratic government operates upon commonsense. On the ground of commonsense, it feels the rhythm of a phenomenon with goals to guard, manage, and sustain the life of the constituency. While life continues, it watches the world progress further, higher, and better, step by step or incrementally.

Human Civilizations

Human civilizations fall back to normality. Neither particular individuals, families, and groupings, nor specific political wills, economic activities, and military campaigns are featured. Rather, common human intellectuality, creativity, and productivity as well as general human drives, strivings, and survivals are exhibited.

It is about civility. Technocratic citizens respect one another in beliefs, values, norms, opinions, and sentiments. One listens when another speaks. One attempts to understand another where there is a difference of ideals, faith, approach, or opinion. They yield to each other with regard to profits, rewards, or benefits for everyone contributes according to his or her abilities while no one takes more than he or she needs. Technocratic officials are genuine civil servants who not only honor their jobs as a professional calling but also regard their services as a filial duty. In the roles of the employed, they perform with knowledge, skills, and professionalism. In the capacities of civil servants, they serve with heart, care, and dedication. They address issues while comforting affected residents. They solve problems while taking care of impacted constituents. A technocratic government is among the people. It treats citizens equally, regardless of their origin, background, gender, race, or any other demographic feature. It grants constituents the same access to resources and opportunities with no consideration of their qualifications, contributions, or attainments. A

technocratic government is in the community. It gathers information from residents as to what they need, how they navigate in reality, and why they succeed or fail in things in everyday life. It takes concrete steps to facilitate individual strivings toward self-actualization, coordinate communal efforts for collective prosperity, and manage constituency dynamics to the benefit of all constituents.

It is about humanity. Technocratic culture cultivates mutual concern, care, and support among humans. Individuals know who they are, taking time to develop, enrich, and consummate their own individuality. Technocratic culture fosters human admiration for nature, love of life, and a protective conscience toward the environment. People understand what they are all about, doing things to enhance the harmony of phenomenal existence, brighten the meaning of human civilization, and glorify the purpose of social evolution. A technocratic society revolves around constituents. It makes rules, plans, and policies to facilitate constituent growth, thriving, and actualization. A technocratic society serves members. It implements programs, carries out projects, and embarks on ventures to improve members' livelihood, welfare, and wellbeing. Along the same lines, technocratic governance follows logic and draws from science in fashioning a rational system of civil management and service for a constituent population. Citizen inputs are harmonized with official outputs in terms of logical soundness and scientific provability. With the same spirit, a technocratic government trails fact and acts on commonsense by running a practical operation of law enforcement, policy implementation, and order maintenance in the material interests of a constituency. Civilian initiatives are synchronized with governmental actions with respect to factual evidence and commonsensical utility. Indeed, humanity is aimed, attempted, and actualized as a technocratic government pursues peace among constituents, seeks harmony with nature, and embraces the coexistence of human creations with environmental occurrences.

Human Immersion in the Universe

In the phase of technocracy, humans recognize who they are and where they belong over phenomenal existence. There are no comparable things such as wills of autocratic figures to rebel against reality for remarkable humanmade deeds. Humans act upon what they face and why they exist across the universe. There are no similar happenings such as plays by democratic forces amid the phenomenon toward significant human triumphs.

Yet, in life human talents, creativities, and creations still spring forth. Talents are in all individuals, not just those from any particular family,

tribe, craft, guild, or social class. Creativities emit from all citizens, not merely from any specific club, union, profession, or line of business. Creations span all fields, not simply an area, domain, or sphere desired, favored, or demanded by any special interest, force, or grouping. In other words, technocratic residents are independent in demonstrating their talents, free to practice their creativities, and equal in relishing their creations. In the meantime, talents are spent on concrete things in a commonsense life, not necessarily on grand schemes of human ideals. Creativities are reflected in tangible amenities amid everyday routines, not always through spectacular programs from human dreams. Creations are here and now, making you and us content and comfortable with work and life at each moment and on every occasion. Furthermore, human talents are employed to explore nature and its universal laws so that humans live naturally and in harmony with their environment. Human creativities are utilized to understand the universe and its evolutionary paths so that humans behave rationally and in synchrony with their time and place. Human creations are processed to fit into nature, natural processes, and natural progression, becoming part of the universe, the universal occurrence, and universal existence. Namely, humans, through consciously thinking and acting, remain immersed in the phenomenon, its making, existence, and substantiation.

Certainly, in reality human endeavors, productivities, and products still pour forth. Technocratic citizens make efforts to contribute to collective welfare in the immediate community and throughout the constituency of belonging while attending to their personal matters. Opportunities to participate in public affairs are free and equally accessible across the citizenry. There are neither special privileges involved in civil engagements nor tangible benefits gained from individual contributions. Technocratic constituents are productive members of society. They labor to support their personal lifestyles. They work to sustain their collective ways of life. Resources to produce members' livelihoods are open and fairly available throughout the population. There are neither material holdings owned by particular interests nor business monopolies controlled through specific operations. A technocratic government sets to serve its constituents with the products they need, the services they want, and the amenities they desire for life. While it does not engage in the concrete processes of product production, service provision, and amenity delivery, it makes rules, implements policies, and coordinates civil actions for quality products, premium services, and superb amenities to which all of its constituents are entitled. Also important, human endeavors in the era of technocracy manifest in environmental quality and sustainability. People live in an

environment. In order to earn a continuous living from the environment, they must take actions to maintain and improve it. Human productivities become evident via natural protection and preservation. Humans survive in the embrace of nature. In order to secure a lasting life from nature, they need to demonstrate effectiveness and efficiency in creating amenities for human living while producing conditions toward natural evolution. That is, humans, by way of productive acts and exercises, stay synchronized with existence, its occurrence, exhibition, and continuation.

PART V

HUMAN AGENCY

Collectively, humans are acting beings. They build infrastructures, produce livelihoods, and expand settlements from village to township to city. They create cultures, maintain traditions, and spread civilizations from past to present to future. To appreciate what humans do to human society, human ways of life, and human existence or how human agency exhibits internally in human conditions, it is necessary to examine human collectives, collectivity, human rationales, and rationality. To understand what human doings and deeds mean to nature, natural phenomena, and the universe or how human agency manifests externally over natural evolution, it is essential to explore human potentials, potentiality, human actions, and consequentiality (Giddens 1984; Inglehart 1997; Shaw 2004; Martin and Dennis 2010; Lauffer 2011; Mayr 2011; Shaw 2013; Sebo 2017; Skattebol, Redmond, and Zizzo 2017; Sunstein 2017; Chen, Zhu, and Bi 2018; Moen 2019; Shaw 2019).

CHAPTER 17

COLLECTIVES AND COLLECTIVITY

Human collectives vary from family, kinship, tribe, congregation, school, farm, plant, business, corporation, and association to nation-state. Human collectivity demonstrates itself physically in the form of a residential community, organizational complex, institutional bureaucracy, jurisdictional constituency, or territorial sovereignty as well as by content in terms of knowledge, wealth, power, economic prosperity, cultural vibrancy, political stability, and social vitality (Malesevic and Haugaard 2002; Ong 2006; Shaw 2013; Gilbert 2014; Pavlidou 2014; Sinnreich, Lingel, Lichfield, Rottinghaus, and Avi Brooks 2015; Makowsky and Smaldino 2016; Schelly 2016; Schaub 2017; Schneider 2017; Tak 2017; de Boer, Te Molder, and Verbeek 2018; Hess, Igeneski, and Isaacs 2018; Campano, Ghiso, Badaki, and Kannan 2020; Weng 2020).

Collectives for a Purpose

Purpose can be abstract. What is the meaning of life? How does life become meaningful? As far as collective living is concerned, what does it entail in terms of meaningfulness by working together as a family? How does collective identity, sense of belonging, communal pride, corporate spirit, national sentiment, or patriotism develop, spread, and prevail in human collectives from community to corporation to nation-state?

On the one hand, members of a collective can make sense of their joint efforts, exercises, and fates. In blood-based groups such as families, kingships, and tribes, it feels natural for children and juniors to follow parents and seniors in thoughts and behaviors. Doing things is to sustain a family, kin, or tribe. Members survive, live well, and fare nicely in society only when their own family, kin, or tribe exists, prospers, and carries on a positive reputation. Among secondary groups like corporations, associations, and governmental agencies, members find their individual roles, responsibilities, and worth. Organizational resources decide how much one can do at work just as institutional opportunities determine how far one may go in life. From the perspective of human polity and its evolution, autocratic

times feature an outgrowth of controlling collectives whose leaders take a strong-handed approach to collective affairs whereas members are accustomed to following the established rules, carrying out the orders issued, and leading the lives expected by a sanctified source of authority. Democratic eras boast a flourish of playing collectives whose politicians perform on stage to entertain public affairs while members cheer on performers, relish performances, and ride over social dynamics between competing forces. It is only in the technocratic epoch that working collectives spring up to attend to members' material interests, create members' living amenities, and facilitate members' development processes toward common welfare and joint fulfillment.

On the other hand, a collective may connect meaningfully to a larger existence or a higher spirituality. Primary collectives find their purpose in larger ones to which they belong. For example, a family struggles to exist for the sake of kinship that by succession works to continue for the thriving of a tribe. Secondary groups realize their meanings in higher ones under which they fall. For instance, a local administrative apparatus exists to maintain order within its jurisdiction on behalf of a regional government that in turn operates to implement policies adopted for a whole country by a central state. In terms of human polity, a technocratic empire or kingdom appeals to Allah, God, or other supernatural entity for the legitimacy of its doings, deeds, and existence. Autocrats are likened to heavenly figures with otherworldly wisdoms, wills, visions, and powers to rightfully rule over worldly affairs. A democratic country or nation plays out on ideals, ideologies, or other human symbolism for a dynamic presentation of competing propagandas, campaigns, policies, and programs. Democrats perform on the public stage as if they were actors and actresses for ratings, followings, and stardom. It is not until the arrival of a technocratic society that people take time and effort to attend to concrete matters in everyday life, such as interactions between each other and relationships with nature. Technocrats are neither owners of power nor players of politics. They are professional workers who tackle the tasks of a job as well as civil servants who solve problems for their fellow citizens.

Collectives toward a Goal

A goal may be tangible. An autocratic collective strives for the vitalization of a culture or the unification of a country whereas a democratic collective struggles for the equal representation of rights or the fair distribution of resources. A technocratic collective, in comparison, works to sustain itself by measure of economic prosperity, cultural vibrancy, and social harmony.

Goals motivate collectives. A farm builds upon an objective of growing organic produce in a reciprocal relationship with nature. A factory operates around a goal of manufacturing quality products to the benefit of consumers. A corporation aims at profit with no regard for employee welfare. A nation-state commits to a utopian scheme without much concern for citizen wellbeing. In the past, faith-centered groups rallied believers in missions or crusades to spread a religion, converting indigenous peoples into pious practitioners. Territory-connected societies eye up lands and land-based resources to engage in wars of conquest. Smaller, simpler, and weaker societies voluntarily or involuntarily combine to form larger, more complex, and stronger ones through peace or conflict. Sometimes, an empire emerges simply because a strongman aspires to expand his scope of control throughout a massive territory or a racial-ethnic group strives to achieve dominance over all other groups in terms of language, mode of production, or practice of worship. At present, interest groups organize around material necessities such as business assets, consumer products, and life-related services as well as nonmaterial utilities like political power, relational leverage, and cultural influence. Mobilization, strategizing, and manipulation take center stage, motivating players on the frontline to speak eloquently, act diplomatically, and improvise fashionably. A democratic arena unfolds and expands wherein interest groups marshal resources and opportunities to gain knowledge, power, wealth, and influence through constant contrast and competition. Hope is hence upon the future when members of society retreat into themselves with due attention to both individual actualization and collective attainment. Following facts, logic, and science in work and life, technocratic citizens ever more embrace member livelihoods, mutual respect, collective order, common development, joint prosperity, and social justice in their technocratic way of life.

Goals shape collectives. Autocratic collectives generally revolve around a goal of national unification, territorial expansion, racial-ethnic domination, or ideological identification. The goal hence becomes the soul as to how government lays itself out, rule takes place, society operates, and citizens lead their lives. For example, a party fascinated by an ideal or utopia would emphasize member inspiration, purity, and commitment. An empire in pursuit of territorial expansion would work on citizen militarization, patriotism, and pride. Group structure, organizational process, and social life would take shape accordingly. Democratic collectives usually center on a goal of individual rights, group representation, people-to-people equity, social justice, or common interests. The goal then exists as the basis for what politicians say, government officials do, social affairs spread, and common citizens perform in public arenas. For instance, an interest group with an

aspiration for equal opportunity in education and employment could stage street protests against specific incidents of discrimination and fashion social movements toward a general climate of fairness. A nation-state with a commitment to civil liberty, individual freedom, and personal actualization could institute a check and balance on government, government officials, and government actions while providing due processes and proper safeguards for citizens, citizen initiatives, and citizen ways of life. It is certainly upon technocratic collectives to strive for a goal of balance between individual growth, attainment, or character and collective development, prosperity, or wellbeing. The goal thus serves to moderate personal thought and behavior while facilitating group unity and coherence, mold personality and personal character while fostering community and communal spirit, shape individuals and individuality while maintaining collectives and collectivity. One prospect is that a professional association gathers members through member interests and thrives due to joint pursuits. Here, governance is about finding common ground for both individual development and collective success. One scenario is that a city, province, or country is established as a connected territorial constituency and continues as a viable socioeconomic system. Government is there to admit reality, respect evidence, follow logic, use science, and run with program effectiveness, policy efficiency, outcome optimum, or a combination thereof.

Collectives by Functionality

Functionality is concrete. Does an organization, community, or country hold as a collective? Does it work in addressing member concerns, meeting member needs, and facilitating member pursuits? Does it function in solving internal problems, tackling external challenges, and fulfilling dreams shared by the membership?

From a historical point of view, collectives of an autocratic character function to carry out the orders of officials, the wishes of superiors, or the wills of rulers. Governments need to keep order, secure civil compliance, or muster resources for wars, civil projects, or elites' luxuries. Cities, provinces, or countries function when these needs are met by governments. Emperors or kings aspire to expand their reach, control, and influence by population and territory. Empires or kingdoms perform when these aspirations are realized. Rulers wish to spread certain ideas, practice some ideologies, or cultivate specific spirits throughout their reigns. Tribes, religious dominions, or state sovereignties stay when these wishes are fulfilled. Collectives of a democratic nature serve to showcase sets of human ideals, fashion blocks of group interests, or highlight waves

of social dynamics. Constituents assert rights, assume responsibilities, and uphold stakes. Constituencies remain functionally viable where those rights, responsibilities, and stakes are exercised. Representatives speak of constituent needs, advance group interests, and facilitate joint initiatives. City councils, state legislatures, and national assemblies work where those efforts are made with tangible outcomes. Politicians advocate ideas, officials promote policies, and bureaucrats work on programs. Governments stay vital and functional where those roles are played to full capacity and potentiality. In the future, collectives of a technocratic feature shall focus on members and their material needs, nonmaterial pursuits, and overall wellbeing. Governance is about organizing people, coordinating people-to-people actions, and maintaining a collective peace. Governments are to facilitate individual growth while keeping communal order, foster self-sufficiency while providing collective support, and translate personal potentials into social deeds while sustaining groups, cities, or nation-states with common means, ideals, and goals.

In a spatial perspective, collectives vary from small to large by size, from simple to complex in structure, and from rural to urban in location. Smaller collectives involve members in production, consumption, and everyday life just as larger ones organize constituents for defense, the construction of infrastructure, and the maintenance of a civil tradition. Smaller collectives demonstrate loyalty, solidarity, and coherence among the membership whereas larger ones feature organization, division of labor, and general order across a constituency. Smaller collectives offer individuals a line of business, way of life, and sense of belonging while larger ones grant people identity, meaning, and purpose. Similarly, simple groups serve to tackle ongoing issues, meet immediate needs, and fulfill specific objectives whereas complex societies function to manage large systems, control dynamic processes, and realize goals as general as territorial expansion, racial-ethnic integration, political unification, economic prosperity, and cultural vibrancy. Simple collectives come and go around personal interests, group moves, and social tides whereas complex ones exist, expand, and continue above local dynamics to demonstrate systematic characteristics and beyond periodic changes to make historical patterns. As far as location is concerned, collectives in the countryside are usually smaller, simpler, and of fewer functions. For instance, a family lives off farming, a farm specializes in dairy products, or a processing plant prepares produce for shipping to the city. Collectives in urban settings, on the other hand, are normally larger, more complex, and of multiple functions. For example, a university gathers faculty, staff, and students in their thousands on campus, a business corporation keeps several production

lines running twenty-four hours a day, and a transportation company owns hundreds of vehicles on the road and at the port of arrival or departure.

Autocratic Collectives

Autocratic collectives take center stage in the era as well as under the polity of autocracy. They feature autocrats, autocratic controls, and the suppression of commoners, commoner ideas, and commoner activities.

An autocratic era creates the political climate for autocratic collectives to form and expand. It is the time of a few who think, connect, speak, play, and lead as sages, missionaries, visionaries, leaders, or rulers versus the many who sleep, stay alone, listen, remain quiet, and follow as people who are secular, regular, ordinary, commoners, or subordinates. First is the blood-based collective where a head, patriarch or matriarch, or elder holds together a family, kinship, or tribe under one roof, in one settlement, or through one network. The atmosphere is not just commanding, controlling, or penalizing but also aiding, caring, and facilitating. There is then the variety of civil collectives specializing in farming, crafts, and other lines of business and civilian institutions with a focus on people and people's interests, needs, or welfare. The ether is more on organization, leadership, and organizational attainment than membership, individual experience, and personal wellbeing. Last is the supremacy of the military, government, and officialdom in the command of a general, king, or prime leader. The spirit is all about absolute submission to power, blind acceptance of orders, and complete control of civil society. This is true of both ancient military and modern armed forces, both past imperial sovereignty and a contemporary one-party state, both a surviving monarch of cross-generational influence and a rising authoritarian regime with global significance, so on and so forth.

An autocratic polity provides the social soil for autocratic collectives to develop and grow. It is a system of one who remains above all, willing, signaling, preaching, ordering, and ruling versus all who stay below him or her, intuiting, guessing, listening, taking, and following. At the bottom are the ordinary, submissive, and responsive masses. They not only look up to the top for instruction, direction, and supervision, but also keep an eye on each other regarding individual discipline, collective unity, and social sameness. Across the middle are groups of messengers, handlers, and go-betweens. On the one hand, they organize, propagandize, and mobilize the masses by acting on orders from the top. On the other, they inform, alert, and influence the top with selective reports or narratives about the masses. At the top are the autocrat and his or her inner circle of aides,

advisers, and disciples. The autocrat exercises his or her will, personality, and temperament whereas his or her attendants, servants and officials alike, find frames of interpretation, platforms of presentation, and means of implementation. Besides the entire government as autocratic machinery and the whole society as an autocratic operation, individual groups, organizations, and communities under the polity of autocracy tend to model themselves after the administrative apparatus, with a strongman or iron lady taking command at the center and a crowd of followers or subordinates carrying out orders throughout the collective.

Democratic Collectives

Democratic collectives feature participation, bargaining, and conflict. Inside, members of a democratic collective negotiate among themselves over access to power, resources, opportunities, and privileges. Outside, collectives engage in conflict with one another to gain independence, influence, or domination. For members or collectives, dealing is the key to survival, success, and sustainment.

Ideas are sources of inspiration for democratic collectives to organize and reorganize. There are identity-based ideas. They motivate people of same or similar origin, territory, language, lifestyle, class, ethnicity, nationality, or race to gather for cultural recognition, economic equity, political right, or overall autonomy. There are ideas associated with jobs, occupations, careers, enterprises, markets, or services. They drive people toward some goals, ideals, and standards, such as excellence in performance, maximum success, optimum management, and supremacy in quality. These ideas are universal to humans and humanity. They unite people under general moralities, principles, and spirits. For example, people care about each other as fellow humans. People hold sentimental feelings toward animals and lively beings. People love nature and have an instinctual connection to the physical environment in which they live. Communal groups, territorial or national organizations, and cross-border or international agencies hence appear early in time, survive from generation to generation, and remain ever strong now in charity, philanthropy, care for animals, and environmental protection.

Interests are bases of materialism for democratic collectives to build and rebuild. First are economic interests. Groups and business corporations form partnerships to guard assets, secure properties, protect investments, maximize profits, and share benefits. Second are political interests. Organizations and political parties join forces to expand influence, energize the masses, mobilize support, heighten propaganda, and ensure

victory. Third are cultural interests. Institutions and cultural establishments conspire to follow a tradition, keep a heritage, continue a pattern, fuel a fashion, or sustain a way of life. Fourth are relational interests. Kinships and membership associations make an effort to cultivate, broaden, and deepen individual identification with, commitment to, solidarity throughout, and pride in their specific network. Last are social interests. Units and social segments align with one another to establish rules or procedures, set agendas or goals, formulate plans or policies, implement programs or initiatives, share gains or benefits. For instance, in capitalist societies, the bourgeoisie join hands in political arenas, on cultural fronts, in relational fields, and across social spheres because they not only instinctually share economic interests in protecting private properties, promoting free enterprises, and maintaining open markets, but also naturally form a social class of wealth, power, knowledge, privilege, and leisure.

Technocratic Collectives

Technocratic collectives revolve around citizens and citizen needs. They are neither forced by individual wills nor driven by political motives. Citizens act genuinely as living individuals in reality. Citizen needs come and go naturally following the rhythm of life.

In a technocratic society, members are independent and self-sufficient. They gather to address common concerns when they experience comparable issues in life. They meet to face collective challenges where they encounter similar problems in the real world. With no subordination by a top-down authority, individuals do what they feel is necessary in their chosen way of life. With no organization from any crisscross element or force, people take what they think are appropriate measures in tackling various matters of living and survival. Outside a collective, individuals have their own sense of purpose, initiatives, pursuits, and practices. When a collective serves out its term or has done what it has been set up to do, members go back to their individual routine, setting, or state of being. Inside a collective, people focus on facts, follow reason, commit to divisions of labor, play assigned roles, fulfill designated responsibilities, and aim at collective attainments. Where a collective still remains vital to its mission, members stay on with a complete dedication of spirit and a meticulous performance of duties until its very end.

Further down the inner mechanism of a technocratic collective, it builds, thrives, and ceases on issues. Issues arise from practical elements in life. People see things, experience problems, and feel the need to deal with things or problems as matters of fact. Logic kicks in, pointing to the validity

of recurrent issues. Reasoning takes place, highlighting the importance of science for finding a rational approach to challenges. It is not about who has better visions, more ideas, or stronger wills to bring together all the others to form a collective. It is about common knowledge, collective experience, and a joint commitment to act on issues of necessity for a shared way of life. Members contribute wisdom, material, and time. They take turns to lead, manage, or just operate the collective as it moves in the process from beginning to end. At a higher than individual level, it is not about which group holds more resources, greater leverages, or better positions to control or fortify a collective with its own representatives. It is about communal concerns, systemwide needs, and multilateral determinations to strive toward a fair, open, and prosperous state of affairs in collective living. Groups yield to each other over their respective claims, demands, or interests. They resort to respect, restraint, and reservation rather than aggression, manipulation, or even negotiation to the benefit of social unity, wellbeing, and sustainment.

Collectivity upon Fact

Collectivity in the era of technocracy is neither a demonstration of individual wills nor a realization of collective interests. Individuals come together to form collectives because of realistic needs in life. Collectivity exists as individuality.

Humans are gregarious beings. They live in groups, from families, kinships, and tribes to nation-states. They survive in collective settings, from villages, towns, and cities to metropolises. In collectives, individuals find their roles, responsibilities, productivities, and worth. For example, they play the familial role of husband or wife, parent or child, breadwinner or housekeeper. They grow crops on farms, make products in factories, move goods on transporters, or sell merchandise in marketplaces. Through collectivity, individuals realize their uniqueness, distinctiveness, particularity, and individuality. For instance, they assume particular positions, do specific things, and make certain contributions to final products through the division of labor. They develop skills, demonstrate talents, and fine-tune experiences in areas or over issues specific to their personality, ability, and sociality. From an objective point of view, it is human nature, a factual force in nature, that undergirds human collectives, fuels human collectivity, and actualizes individuality in the maintenance of collectivity.

Human livelihoods are collective endeavors. Crops are planted and harvested on large scales. Products are made and packaged on mass production lines. Goods are transported and distributed through expansive networks. Merchandise is kept and circulated across spreading marketplaces.

Scale is not attained for the sake of scale. It is out of reason, the principle of economy, spirit of science, or logic of reality. Materials are saved because of scale. Manpower is spared due to mass production. Productivity is raised where individuals work in teams and collective settings through a rational division of labor as well as scientific management. Effectiveness is achieved while efficiency is realized. Indeed, it is not only a plain fact that human collectives do things more effectively than individuals from organization, production, and consumption to survival. It is also a magic miracle that human collectivity exhibits greater creativity, flexibility, and efficiency than individuality over performance, functionality, and sustainment.

Collectivity in Terms of Science

Technocratic collectives appear, operate, and disappear due to facts, practical factors and realistic forces in the real world of life. In other words, they come, progress, and go for reasons that are analyzable, explainable, and understandable in terms of science.

Collectives from the past could disappear if no reason exists for them to serve any purpose in human lives. The family would disappear from history when it ceased to work as a social institution of reproduction, socialization, production, consumption, or any combination thereof. Kinship would leave the scene when blood relationships become unidentifiable, unimportant, or negligible. Religious groups would wane on the horizon as individuals focus on this world and look to science for spiritual guidance. Military forces would move off the stage in a place where people see no need to defend or protect anything against or for each other. Even nation-states could turn into antiques at a time when all humans realize that borders, fences, and walls are just humanmade barriers to separate one territory from another, advance one interest ahead of another, or secure one force over another. To the essence of human livelihood, a collective comes into being just because it assists individual members with their living needs, facilitates them in their striving toward higher goals or better outcomes, and makes them happier humans in grander social circumstances. Collectivity sustains simply because it not only informs, inspires, and lifts individuals, but also actualizes, deepens, and substantiates individuality.

Collectives of the future would debut, expand, and strengthen as the logic of science points to the inevitability of such groupings and institutions for the fulfillment of human potentials. Partnership can be the simplest as well as most common collective. Living partnerships feature couples in particular places and times for intimacy, love, companionship, sharing, and savings. Playing partnerships are represented by buddies in

specific spaces and time periods in games, sports, travel, and other recreational activities. Working partnerships highlight colleagues or teammates across different lines of business, in the sphere of production or service, for the sake of creativity or productivity, toward the goal of profit or efficiency. There are then, task-, issue-, and problem-specific collectives. Task-focused collectives revolve around tasks to be tackled, with tasks varying from manufacturing products, building roads, and marketing services to selling consumer goods. Issue-based collectives center on issues to be addressed, with issues ranging from barriers to communication, friction in relationships, and conflict on the division of labor to disputes over sharing arrangements. Problem-targeted collectives react to problems that may break out expectedly or unexpectedly, such as crimes, traffic accidents, fires, and natural disasters. Further, there are collectives to administer civil affairs, manage public utilities, and coordinate communal activities. Under technocracy when governance is free from power, manipulation, and politics, government becomes a matter-of-fact collective in the service of people and their individual, communal, and public needs. People come back to themselves as their own subjects. Collectives appear and disappear for and with subjects. A forced institution is gone. Natural organization takes the stage. In terms of science, individuals are not only subjects by and in themselves, but also generic elements or objects to and for collectives out of and away from themselves.

CHAPTER 18

POTENTIALS AND POTENTIALITY

Humans possess potentials at both individual and collective levels. Individually, one has potentials to grow from infancy to childhood to adolescence to adulthood to seniority to death. Collectively, a social unit owns endogenous powers to develop internally into a structure of complexity and expand externally with a sphere of impact. Potentiality, in an abstract perspective, signifies the tendency by both human individuals and collectives to translate their respective potentials into tangible deeds in the real world (Agamben 1999; Shaw 2013; Marom 2014; Moss 2014; Vetter 2015; Waghid 2015; Mikkelsen 2017; Berry 2018; Engelhard and Quante 2018; Baker 2019; Fuller and Ren 2019; Mercer 2019; Shaw 2019).

Potentials by Individuals

Humans come and go as individual beings. Individual humans hold potentials to expand as both subjects and objects, leaving marks upon their surroundings. Among themselves, human individuals tend to interact with one another in roles from mating couples, playing duos, and living partners to working collaborators.

In oneself, one is a subject of subjective perceptions, ideas, and attitudes. One perceives the world as the phenomenal exhibit of an objective force, the visual display of a subjective will, or something of a mixture. One embraces ideas in different forms from beliefs, values, and norms to rituals. For instance, one places self-discipline above mutual supervision in the cultivation of character, personality, and individuality. One holds attitudes toward nature varying from aggression to embracement, from exploitation to protection, from conquest to admiration, from control to appreciation. By oneself, one is an object with objective acts, creations, and impacts. One initially gathers and hunts for foods. One then grows crops and raises cattle to maintain a stable supply. Among individual creations, shelters are built, trails are opened, and farmlands are cultivated. Impacts upon surroundings are seen in outcomes as explicit as a killed animal, burned plot, or exposed

hillside, and as implicit as some unrecognized, unidentified, or unknown change in climate, animal behavior, or plant activity.

Toward fellow beings, humans first and foremost mate with one another, making husbands and wives, creating families, and giving birth to children. Humans then do things together. For products and productivity, they collaborate on farming, crafting, and manufacturing in different roles over a line of action. For services and efficiency, they coordinate mutual give and take in communication, exchange, and transportation. For fun and recreation, they play games, participate in sports, and engage in festivities. While competition pits one against another in an open arena of race, compromise points participants toward recognition, understanding, and respect of each other's interests and pursuits over a long-term relationship. Above practical interactions, humans tend to organize into interest clubs, religious congregations, and political groups based upon ideas and ideals. For example, beliefs in supernatural forces motivate individuals to explore a joint sphere of an otherworld in which they find their shared purpose or destiny. Beyond tangible outcomes, humans are inclined to adore, admire, and appreciate spiritual attainments. For instance, in art, music, and poetry people discover a common state of mind through which they recognize their cultivated meaning or goal.

Potentials from Collectives

Humans play, work, and live in collectives. Collectives hold potentials to guide and shape individuals with respect to their thoughts and behaviors. They also differentiate members in terms of access, benefit, and status. Outwardly, human collectives create social deeds, establish cultural heritages, and leave environmental impacts by pooling and integrating individual talents, resources, and activities.

Inside, collectives exert overwhelming leverages over individuals. Families raise children with both material means and nonmaterial directions, such as food, clothes, ambience, and exemplification. Schools teach the young knowledge and skills, preparing them for entry into productive labor and social life. Farms, factories, and other business units organize employees in various roles and duties for differential accomplishments and rewards. Military forces allow generals to lead soldiers. Governments grant officials the power to make rules, enforce orders, and implement policies for ordinary constituents. Nation-states even divide people into social classes, entitling nobles to authority, fame, and privilege while depriving commoners of rights, dignity, and fair treatment. Across the board, every human collective exhibits a tendency to mold its members, cultivating

minds with particular beliefs, values, and norms, training bodies through specific programs, procedures, and routines, and shaping natural persons into ideal roles for optimal performances. In commonality, all human collectives possess potentials to advance or sabotage, respect or mistreat, benefit or harm individuals with respect to their interests, rights, and feelings. On the positive side, an organization can make resources and opportunities available to some of its members, enabling them to feel accomplished, blessed, and privileged. Negatively, an institution may exploit, mistreat, or even injure part of its membership, giving them a salient sense of unfairness, unreasonableness, and injustice.

Outside, collectives serve as vehicles to translate individual ideas and actions into social creations and sceneries with marks and impacts upon natural environments and future generations. As part of collective makings, harvests pile up in open fields, products roll out of mass assembly lines, and consumer goods glitter in bustling marketplaces. There are also expansive irrigation networks, defense complexes, and road systems as well as towering construction cranes, cultural monuments, and missile launch pads. Amid collective scenes, religious devotees bow to Allah, Buddha, or God from mass to mass, partisan enthusiasts cheer on party leaders, initiatives, or ideals from rally to rally, and daring soldiers keep disabling, injuring, or eliminating enemies from battleground to battleground. As well, there are sprawling population settlements including towns, cities, and metropolises in parallel with vast installations of humanmade devices such as countless markers on the face of the earth and numerous satellites in outer space. The weight of a collective doing is certainly neither just on its temporal scale nor over its spatial scope. The significance lies in not only how it influences people in the time of the future, but also how it impacts nature to the limits of existence. People are born to social settings. What exists and happens in society teaches, guides, and molds them as to how to think and behave in reality. Nature with regard to human living is the planet earth in the solar system of the universe. Humans have transformed the earth with their collective doings and deeds. On the negative side, mass production, industrial revolution, and population growth have combined to give rise to a greenhouse effect or global warming which in turn leads to erratic climate occurrences across the sphere of human life.

Potentials as A Species

Humans evolve through generations of individuals. Being a living species, they use some animals and plants as foods or medicines, fight some objects and happenings as threats or enemies, change some existences and

phenomena over surroundings or backgrounds. In essence, humans own intelligence or intellectual faculties in a subjective dimension. They have potentials to discover the truth of existence, counter phenomenal occurrences, and even alter the course of self-evolution.

In the world of living beings, humans have domesticated many natural plants and animals. There are now not only multiplicities of crops for continuing cultivation with high yields, but also varieties of cattle and pets in use as tools of tillage, vehicles of transportation, toys of play, objects of leisure, or sources of food supply. While grafting and breeding continue for preferred plant and animal hybrids on traditional farms, genetic composing and engineering take place on the scientific frontier for products or outcomes to meet various human needs from the boosting of production, the enhancement of performance, and the treatment of disease to the control of pandemics. In terms of potentials, although male donkeys and female horses making mules might appear as a surprise to human ancestors, drought-resistant flowers or disease-free cows will be expected by contemporaries because nowadays scientists systematically experiment with existing flora and fauna in laboratories to purposely identify and combine genes of specific properties for envisioned or preferred plants and animals. With regard to potentiality, just as they have driven some species to extinction, humans could make new breeds and creatures with unusual physical features or unprecedented functional capacities.

Across the universe, humans follow what they discover about nature, uncover on natural processes, and know of objective beings to act upon their surroundings. Laws of nature are generalized and applied to harness, control, and conquer nature to the ease of human living. Truths about phenomenal existence are kept and employed to abort, resist, or reverse natural happenings for the benefit of human survival. Knowledge of specific things is mustered and utilized to raise production, facilitate movement, and improve consumption in everyday life. For example, rivers are altered, canals are opened, and reservoirs are built on the face of the earth to collect, channel, and preserve water for irrigation, navigation, and other uses. In the sky, rains are made to fight droughts in particular and climate is pushed under a greenhouse effect by human activities in general. As far as potentials are concerned, humans can build cities, make new plants or animals, change weathers, raise sea levels, and even alter their own destinies for living here or there, now or then, and with temporality or longevity. By way of potentiality, humans may recollect, reveal, and replay in their subjective world the original idea, scheme, or secret of creation by the creator if there is such a mighty creator from beginning to end. If there is no creator in existence or no creation amid phenomenal occurrences,

humans may find, expose, and exhibit in their subjectivity the code, law, or truth about existence or a phenomenon as existence is here in itself or a phenomenon is there by itself.

Autocratic Potentials

Humans are ethnocentric. Individuals revolve around themselves as centers, purposes, and goals. As a result, one tends to think in a way as if one were more intelligent, better positioned, and higher experienced than one's fellows. The same holds true in the manner that one acts in comparison to one's companions, neighbors, or work partners.

In one's mind, one follows one's wills as to how to raise children, educate the young, or shape the future. One speaks one's ideas, with the intent to spread them to one's contacts and beyond. One shares one's beliefs or faiths, passing them on to one's apprentices, students, or followers. One communicates one's values, showing what is good or bad, important or unimportant, holy or unholy. One exhibits one's norms, pointing to what is appropriate or inappropriate, correct or incorrect, right or wrong. In all these matters, one may feel one's wills to be stronger, think one's ideas to be brighter, regard one's faiths to be more valid, see one's values to be better, view one's norms to be higher so that it becomes automatic, habitual, or natural for one to impose one's own upon others. With all these potentials by individuals, it is no surprise that one custom forms in a group, one tradition establishes across a community, one policy launches over a constituency, one legal code dominates throughout a country, making a patriarchal family, a conservative stronghold, a radical battleground, or an autocratic nation-state.

Just as one has potentials to assume that oneself is smarter than everyone else who is either a fool or on a wrong train of thought, one has tendencies to act as if across the whole world only oneself could take right, rational, and effective steps toward correct, beneficial, and superlative outcomes. In the concrete, one could do things to abort or sabotage what others do at their own initiative. For example, an authoritative parent engages in a series of acts to halt an intimate relationship that he or she does not approve for one of his or her children. One might do things to override or overturn what others have done in their own right. For instance, a dominant supervisor embarks on a chain of actions to undo a work project that he or she does not recognize as a job accomplishment by one of his or her supervisees. One would do things to prevent others from doing what is right in their own interests. In a typical scenario, an autocratic leader institutes a set of rules to limit or eliminate individual rights for the

expression of opinions, the choice of business enterprises, or the protest of unusual treatments. Overall, autocratic potentials in the behavioral dimension constitute material bases for highhanded practices in families, kinships, or tribes, overbearing procedures across schools, workplaces, or professional guilds, and authoritarian policies throughout administrative apparatuses, military forces, or governmental agencies. In terms of potentiality, they give rise to patriarchy, matriarchy, bureaucratic apathy, an organizational cage, state repression, or dictatorship.

Democratic Potentials

Humans compare with one another in gregarious living. One gains a sense of advantage when one collects, hunts, or produces more living articles, such as foods and medicines, than one's coworkers or neighbors. Humans contrast with each other over collective settings. One maintains a feel of superiority when one owns, holds, or controls more assets, including resources and opportunities, than one's fellow constituents or citizens.

Beginning with bodily capacities, comparison centers on ideas and acts. One speaks loudly. One relies on one's loud voice to drown others' quiet voices in order to spread one's ideas. One talks repeatedly. One resorts to one's constant expressions to overwhelm others' intermittent expressions so that one can promote one's thoughts. One takes extraordinary actions. One follows one's extraordinary acts to advance one's interests at the expense of those of others. One makes drastic moves. One builds on one's drastic movements to attain one's goals over others' losses. Although loud and constant voices do not necessarily carry wise ideas and reasonable thoughts, they do however dominate the arena of comparison and competition from place to place. The essence is: Prevailing and dominance inhere in bodily strength. While extraordinary acts or drastic moves do not always lead to positive outcomes or beneficial results, they nonetheless prevail over the field of contest and race from time to time. The key is: Winning and control lie in bodily perseverance.

Moving on to social capital, contrast revolves around positions and influence. One accumulates wealth and expands one's material possessions. One employs one's economic assets to raise one's social position and spread one's overall influence. As individuals with material assets dominate, the economy becomes an arena for a minority of the rich to exploit and profit from a majority of the poor. One engages in government and builds one's public profile. One follows one's political career to climb the hierarchy of governance and advance one's general candidacy. Since members of society in power rule, politics changes into a battleground for an elite of the

powerful to manipulate and keep control over a mass of the powerless. One acquires knowledge and extends one's expertise in a field of inquiry. One applies one's cultural capital to enhance one's special role as an authority on certain issues and secure one's broad reputation as a spokesperson, celebrity, or source of inspiration over some subjects. While people with knowledge take charge, culture features as a sphere of conflict and clash between a small group of knowers and a large crowd of non-knowers. Indeed, it is eventually a matter of who is rich, powerful, or knowledgeable of how society operates. It essentially does not matter whether the world is factual, logical, or true.

Technocratic Potentials

As part of phenomenal existence, humans embody laws that govern what occurs and exists in the universe. With their subjective capacity, humans can even explicitly and implicitly find, follow, and utilize laws of existential phenomena in their experiential consciousness. Here then come human technocratic potentials.

Humans follow facts in reality. From facts, one seeks truths, overcoming one's assumptions. Instead of assuming that one's neighbors do not know how to think or act correctly out of one's autocratic potentials, one looks into what happened in the past to find objective factors and forces behind their viable ways of life. In facts, one gains objectivity, rejecting one's speculations. Rather than speculating that one's workmates are not likely to understand how important it is to say or do things effectively by one's democratic potentials, one keeps an eye on what is going on in the present to chase after the realistic elements and currents underlying the workable measures of their jobs. Indeed, technocratic potentials prompt people to take a matter-of-fact approach toward nature and natural occurrences, individuality and individual undertakings, as well as society and social events. When something happens, one acknowledges the happening and hence decides how one shall react to it sufficiently. Where something exists, one recognizes the existence and therefore chooses how one will necessarily act upon it.

Humans resort to reasoning in life. By reasoning, humans discover the logic of objective existence, identify the law of phenomenal change, and ascertain the chain of cause and effect. One hence sees the order of the world, thinking logically. One senses the rhythm of life, acting rationally. In reasoning, humans entertain evidence, conduct analysis, and maintain objectivity. One therefore focuses on facts, foregoing wishful thinking. One follows reason, refraining from aimless venturing. With reasoning, humans

acquire knowledge, develop skills, and gain understanding. One thus remains firmly grounded in reality, tackling one thing on one occasion. One stays steadily engaged in life, progressing one step at a time. As a matter of fact, technocratic potentiality anchors individuals in logic, allowing them to search for order in an apparently disorderly mass of things. It programs individuals with analytic instincts, enabling them to trace effect to cause or follow incidence to outcome over a seemingly chaotic flow of happenings. In a sense, humans are technocratic beings with natural innocence. Whenever they do things, they act around the plainness of law, over the regularity of rule, and toward the simplicity of order. To a certain degree, humans are technocratic creatures of automatic curiosity. Wherever they settle for life, they live to find out why, figure out how, and sort out what.

Potentiality across Existence

As part of phenomenal existence, humans have potentials to leave their mark, especially influencing how the human world takes shape. Over the flow of existential occurrence, humans hold potentiality to charter the course of movement, in particular directing where human life goes.

It is up to humans as to how far the human world spreads, how deeply or intensely it intertwines with its surroundings, and how long it sustains over the larger existence. Humans are born with capacities for thought. They own desires, wishes, and wants that drive them to action. They have ideas, visions, and ideals that guide them in action. They develop reflections, afterthoughts, and lessons that give them feedback on action. Humans are armed with abilities of doing. They build shelters, make clothing, and grow foodstuffs. They open farms and factories to produce goods. They construct roads, ports, and hubs to transport goods. They settle from place to place, giving rise to villages, towns, and cities. All these human doings and deeds converge to form the human world. The human world, on the face of the earth, obviously impacts how the earth shakes up in general existence. For instance, farming changes soils, mining alters lands, and logging threatens animal habitats. More saliently, humans grow new plants, make new animals, and produce new species. In a systematic manner, humans and human activities lead to deforestation, desertification, global warming, and climate change, all of which affect how nonlife objects distribute, what life subjects do for survival, and how long all earthly things stay.

While they might do things to cause their own sufferings, downfalls, or demise, humans could use their consciousness, intelligence, and creativity to charter a new course of life for themselves, their objective

or subjective companions, and their motherland or fatherland, the earth. Before a forest is devastated by an infectious disease, swarming insects, or fierce wildfires, people save it with humanmade products such as pesticides and retardants. Before a species goes extinct, people protect it by preserving its natural habitat or maintaining its material environment. When a tragic incident is brewing to break out in a community, individuals take actions to mitigate, contain, or counter it, minimizing its negative impacts. Where a destructive disaster is bound to take place across a land, individuals dodge, face, or run away from it through forecasting, fortification, or evacuation. Perhaps by natural development, a pandemic would wipe out half of the human population at some time. But advanced medicine and organized social responses prevail over it, saving humans from the tragedy. Maybe in an automatic occurrence, a gigantic celestial object would strike the earth, resulting in the massive destruction of human settlements. Yet modern science and technology provide knowhow and tools to protect the earth from the catastrophe. An epitomical likelihood is this: Humans find, land, and thrive on a different planet in outer space as the earth serves out its term as a ground for human living.

Potentiality through Evolution

Humans evolve as time goes on. Among themselves, humans move from autocratic to democratic to technocratic personalities. In relation to natural environments, humans progress from submission to domination to self-sufficiency.

Internally, humans take different perspectives in viewing and dealing with each other, signaling distinctive stages of evolutionary growth, maturation, and status. At the phase of autocratic personalities, humans tend to think and act under the assumption of self-supremacy in contrast to other-inadequacy. One takes a natural belief that only oneself in the world can see the essence of reality, think correctly, and do the right things. One is quick to dismiss others' ideas as out of reason, feelings as untruthful, and actions as useless. In the phase of democratic personalities, humans are inclined to see and face one another as targets, contenders, or even enemies. One follows an automatic approach by which one refutes other ideas, rejects other actions, and overall overrides others in terms of individual agency. One remains alert so that one can counter others as likely competitors, beat others as probable challengers, or neutralize others as possible threats. Toward technocratic personalities, humans return to themselves as who they are in humanity and by what they do as independent living subjects. One relates to others as neighbors of the same brilliant or creative ideas,

teammates with similar workable or effective measures, and fellow human beings of comparable intelligence, striving, and capacity. One is factual, logical, and reasonable in admitting one's own weaknesses, acknowledging others' strengths, and accepting collective advantages in creating life amenities for common human prosperities.

Externally, humans assume different positions in relation to nature and natural environments as they progress over their evolutionary path. At the beginning, humans see the mighty power of natural factors and forces, feel the negligible effect from individual trials and errors, and hence remain in awe, fear, and submission. One prays for blessings and manages to live through diseases, disasters, and other destruction. One wishes for miracles and strives to survive famines, wars, and other tragedies. As they gain knowledge about nature, humans experience increased capacities to change material environments for improved living conditions. With continued success from the mass production of goods, the systematic movement of materials, the public control of epidemics, the accurate forecasting of disasters, and the effective containment of disruptions, humans feel they not only take charge of their own affairs in life but also secure domination over all other matters across their natural environment. Individuals claim ownership of estates and everything within their properties from plants to animals to inorganic objects. Organizations make use of production or service facilities and all under their spheres of management including raw materials, products, and tools. Nation-states declare control of territories and anything that falls under their sovereignties. Domination, however, leads to the exploitation of natural resources, the pollution of natural environments, and an overall abuse of nature, all of which threaten human existence itself. To sustain as a species in evolution, humankind needs to strike a balance between living human needs and supporting material conditions or enter the equilibrium of human survival with nature. The key is self-sufficiency. Namely, humans contribute to nature an amount of nonhuman outputs out of human activities that is the same as the amount of nonhuman inputs they take from nature for human living. If humans as a collective ever become a super species which outlives its destined or programmed expectancy of life, they achieve such a status through self-sufficiency and mutual sustainment with phenomenal existence rather than domination over nature or a unilateral conquest of the natural process.

CHAPTER 19

RATIONALES AND RATIONALITY

Humans are reasonable beings or subjects of fact, logic, and reason. They look up to reason. They strive for reasonableness. In other words, humans operate in rationality. They embrace and follow rationales when they think, plan, and act in everyday life. They search for and stick to rationales behind their thoughts, schedules, and actions in reality (MacIntyre 1988; Nozick 1993; Davidson 2004; Shaw 2004; Shepsle 2010; Buchak 2013; Shaw 2013; Cian, Krishna, and Schwarz 2015; Boyle 2016; Landoe Hedrick 2016; Strandberg 2017; Ullmann-Margalit 2017; Fink 2018; Donahue 2019; Sterenberg 2019; Whitehead, Jones, Lilley, Howell, and Pykett 2019).

Rationales by Individuals versus Collectives

Individually, humans are acting beings. Rationales begin with and end up in individuals. Humans are also living beings collectively. Individual rationales combine to make collective ones just as people gather to form groups, communities, and nation-states.

Rationales by individuals revolve around personal choices in the real world. Factors affecting choices range from inner ones including wills, wishes, and abilities to outer ones such as resources, opportunities, and conditions. Wills drive, wishes inspire, and abilities facilitate one in making one's choices. For example, one with strong wills, wishes, abilities, or a combination thereof chooses to face and fight a danger instead of avoiding or running away from it. Forces influencing choice vary by source, frequency, intensity, and duration. One source inhibits while another encourages. A frequent, intense, and lasting force could embolden one to take action, just as a random, intermittent, and fleeting power might dash one's hope for something altogether. For instance, belonging to a religion prohibits one from a military mission. Continuing support from peers and friends serves as a simple reason for commitment to a substantive task, project, or program. Indeed, although rationales are literally reasons before actions or justifications after deeds in one's mind, they are realistic factors

and forces that are perceived, processed, and experienced from both within and without one's bodily existence.

Collective rationales surround ways of thinking, behaving, and living shared by members of a neighborhood, institution, or society. Naturally, people choose to live on hillsides, engage in agriculture, avoid certain plants or animals as part of their diet, celebrate some holidays, or pay homage to a few objects or symbols as protectors or sources of blessings. Over time, common practices develop into cultural observances or social customs. For example, Buddhists follow vegetarian diets because they abhor the killing of lives. Christians revere the cross as it symbolizes Jesus' sacrifice. Muslims observe Salah by praying five times each day since it purifies their hearts toward Allah. Besides common choices in everyday life, collective rationales include justifications made by organizations to perform tasks, enforce rules, or realize goals. An interest club protests in a public square to draw people's attention. A small business contributes to disaster relief to build a positive reputation. A health agency launches an information campaign to raise public awareness of an infectious disease. Collective rationales also involve rationalizations propagandized by governments to practice austerity, undertake reform, or initiate wars. For instance, a municipal authority cites rising crime to impose a citywide curfew. A regional government refers to repeated incidents for the enforcement of a control measure or the levy of an exercise tax. A state sovereignty appeals to age-old feuds for an engagement of hostility or an imposition of an embargo against another country. Obviously, collective rationales can be shared by all members of a population or forced upon the larger membership by a few elites or stakeholders in a society.

Rationales behind Actions

Behind acts and actions, rationales are usually specific. There are ideas, ideals, goals, plans, or explanations by individuals for their acts. There are also ideologies, mandates, schemes, agendas, or propaganda by collectives for their actions. From an analytical point of view, causes, inputs, or precedents serve as rationales for effects, outputs, or incidents.

One translates one's ideas into actions. Ideas as rationales explain actions. One pursues one's ideals in a series of efforts and results. Ideals as reasons illuminate efforts and results. One realizes one's goals through concrete measures. Goals as rationales justify why certain steps are taken. One follows one's plans toward tangible achievements. Plans as reasons inform how some achievements are made. In a sense, ideas, ideals, goals, and plans as they prompt, guide, or lead to acts directly present, expose, or

exhibit rationales with considerable accuracy. On the other hand, explanations, excuses, defenses, or justifications by individuals for their doings do not necessarily feature, inform, or enlighten actual rationales with much precision. To a degree, they are offered to divert attention, shift blame, or misguide investigation. One explains what one did to avert a tragedy for one's neighborhood. The chance is that one might exaggerate one's personal contribution or unselfish sacrifice in the incident. One provides an excuse for why one failed to do certain things in an emergency. The risk is that one could hide evidence to avoid public condemnation. One defends one's course of action in the aftermath of a destructive event. The likelihood is that one attempts to put one's original mistakes in an acceptable or forgivable light. One issues justifications as to how one would serve one's constituency wholeheartedly by staying in one's position. The opportunity is that one does everything one can just to keep one's power, control, and influence.

At the collective level, a group has its purpose or mission. Rationales behind actions are derived from group missions. An organization has its area of business or performance targets. Rationales for actions are linked to organizational undertakings. A community has its way of life or cultural spirit. Rationales underlying actions are tied to communal states of affairs. A constituency has its mechanisms of governance or public processes. Rationales toward actions are drawn from constituent dynamics. While collective rationales are explicitly inferable for actions concerning interests, businesses, operations, goals, traditions, conventions, standards, and other substantive matters, they are not always discernible directly from actions with regard to ideology, propaganda, mobilization, movement, or any nonmaterial issue. For example, ideology is a system of beliefs, values, norms, and sentiments. Adopted by a political party, it fuels purification, cultivation, indoctrination, and other actions. Rationales inherent in ideology-inspired actions thus vary from personal worship, membership identification, and management or control to collective order or synchronization. The same holds true for social movement. As a mass process of ideals, a practice of ideals, actions, and a coordination of actions, social movement fans a challenge to the status quo, innovation, reform, transformation, or even revolution. Rationales essential to movement-driven actions therefore oscillate between secular concerns and otherworldly devotions, practical needs and idealistic aspirations, material pursuits and nonmaterial actualizations, endeavors by commoners and contributions from elites.

Rationales in Contexts

Across a context, rationales are often general. Historically, there are ancestries, heritages, and traditions. They offer explanations as to what individuals do in the present. Spatially, there are larger forces, higher powers, and broader dynamics. They provide reason for how people act on and react to things in their immediate environments.

Ancestors pass on genetic profiles biologically, personality traits psychologically, and ways of life culturally. Ancestries, to a degree, determine descendants, their physical features, trains of thought, and modes of production. One is tall or short, has a strong or weak mathematical skill, demonstrates higher or lower productivity, all traceable to one's parents, grandparents, great grandparents, and remote ancestors. Heritages concern origins of material conditions ranging from shelters, clothes, foods, medicines, tools, and settlements to daily living articles. In a sense, they establish physical environments into which new generations are born for growth, survival, and expansion. One grows crops or raises cattle, eats meats or follows a vegetarian diet, practices farming in valleys or goes fishing along seacoasts, largely owing to a series of choices in one's heritage. Finally, traditions involve patterns of cultural maintenance, including perceptions, beliefs, norms, values, and sentiments. To an extent, they mold individual thoughts, guide collective behaviors, and shape social atmospheres. One believes in Allah, Buddha, or God, views loyalty as important, unimportant, or irrelevant, abides by laws, rules, or folklores, feels deeply, shallowly, or neutral about something, mostly due to chains of actions over one's tradition. In a nutshell, ancestry, heritage, and tradition serve as sources of rationales for people to develop ideas, do things, and lead lives during specific periods of time.

Larger forces lie beyond particular groups, organizations, and communities. However, they force members of impacted collectives to act or react, sometimes radically or irrationally. For example, the breakout of an infectious disease in neighboring cities prompts a municipal government to implement a tough measure of border inspection, control, or closure, making it difficult or impossible for local residents to engage in leisure travel and business dealings outside of it. Higher powers go beyond specific townships, municipalities, or regional constituencies. They, nonetheless, weigh heavy in influencing local authorities as well as ordinary constituents over their respective decisions or choices. For instance, a central government stages a campaign against corruption or implements a program of austerity, sweeping through each level of government and every type of social unit in related actions and activities. Dynamics are chains of events

or currents of incidents that take place across an entire region, a whole country, or even the world. They not only mold different peoples in their thoughts and behaviors, but also shape various groups, organizations, or communities over their policies and practices. Common dynamics include pandemics, wars, and natural disasters. In the middle of a war, individuals use the feud as a reason why they flee from it, fight on the frontline, or make a profit out of it while collectives from civilian groups, professional organizations, and business corporations to governmental agencies refer to the conflict when they develop justifications for extraordinary policies, such as censorship, surveillance, and prohibition or where they find rationales behind extreme programs, including discrimination, internment, and even genocide.

Autocratic Rationales

Autocratic rulers appeal to supernatural sources, refer to secular lineages, or resort to inner wills when they look for reasons behind actions. As they usually act without civil consultation, they rarely secure public agreement to their rationales. Since they often launch, oversee, and evaluate actions behind the scenes or in secrecy, they seldom allow civilians to know and understand their rationales.

Autocratic rationales center on personal wills. One acts on a radical idea or ideological system, a lofty ideal or utopian dream, a grandiose vision or futurist scheme, pushing one's subordinates into a world of hardship, struggle, or suffering. Impractical policies become reasons for practical consequences, such as hunger and material deprivation. Unrealistic plans serve as rationales behind realistic outcomes, including the waste of human resources and the pollution of natural environments. Autocratic rationales relate to genealogy. One builds upon blood relationships, relative networks, and rules of succession to consolidate power, tighten control, or take extraordinary measures, forcing commoners or civilians under one's authority into a life of fear, subordination, or servitude. One adopts an irrational rule simply because one assumes power legitimately from one's family. One implements an unjustifiable program due to the plain fact that one enjoys the support of one's larger kingship or tribe. Finally, autocratic rationales revolve around supernatural elements or forces. One compares oneself to a godly existence so that one lays claim to a sacred mission to govern a country or territory. One cites heavenly mandates, holy orders, or divine duties as reasons for why one leads one's group, nation, or fatherland to war, religious crusade, economic reform, cultural awakening, or social transformation.

It is natural that autocratic rationales do not coincide with civilian opinions and public sentiments. As an autocrat, one believes in the rightness of one's personal wills, the blessing of one's ancestry, the sacrosanctity of a supernatural existence, or a combination thereof. One does not care much about what one's subordinates think or how commoners react. As long as one feels plausible within one's own consciousness, one proceeds to give commands, issue orders, and demand results. It is normal that autocratic rationales do not meet with the knowing of the masses and the understanding of the populace. As an authority, one considers it critical that the less people know, the better they blindly follow, behave, and comply. For sure, knowing fuels questioning, motivates resistance, and complicates each situation. As a leader, one deems it true that difference keeps individuals in place, distance causes awe, and ignorance sustains compliance. Indeed, understanding stimulates public discussion, blurs social stratification, and challenges official justification. The more people understand something, the less likely they have faith in, make a commitment to, and implement an order about it.

Democratic Rationales

Democratic players entertain one another. They express ideas, debate issues, and fashion reactions to events in public spheres. Rationales are improvised to meet certain needs under a circumstance, resonate with particular sentiments by a population segment, or fit into specific atmospheres across a constituency. From subjects, democratic rationales may be anything but candid, genuine, and straightforward. To audiences, nevertheless, they must be something culturally appropriate, morally rightful, and politically correct.

Democratic rationales are relational. They are all about human interactions, from beginning to end. Words are spoken in order to win personal trust or public confidence. Acts are performed for the purpose of the self-demonstration of individual capability or the mass exhibition of policy effectiveness. Democratic rationales are presentable. They are not kept in mind to make one feel justified about one's thoughts and conduct. They are expressed explicitly to change others' minds, shaping and reshaping others' behaviors. Democratic rationales are comparative. They are in for comparisons between them in terms of strength and weakness. Weaker rationales in official settings are abandoned, making way for stronger ones. Democratic rationales are competitive. They are out for competition with one another by outcome, failure or success. Successful rationales in political contexts shine while failing rationales go off stage in darkness. Lastly, democratic rationales are transmissible. They are borrowed

from occasion to occasion. One same reason can be utilized to explain multiple policy initiatives or programs. They are passed on from generation to generation. One similar rationale may be mobilized to clear public confusion and resistance in different times.

With a focus on results, effects, or impacts, democratic rationales do not always reflect actual intentionality on the part of subjects. As a candidate, one says something to appeal to voters for the sake of votes. One does not necessarily believe and practice what one has said in everyday life. As an official, one takes some measures to secure support from constituents. One may hate what one has done in reality. As a politician, one advocates for special treatment for a particular group under social pressure. One is likely to feel a strong sense of betrayal of conscience over one's inner world. On the other hand, democratic rationales work on audiences as long as they sound pleasant to their ears, look attractive to their eyes, or a combination of both. A political ideology and its propaganda expand as certain elements of the ideology catch individual citizens over their common aspirations, dreams, or idealism. It does not matter whether the ideology is grounded overall in history, logic, or fact. A legal framework and its enforcement deepen when some features of the legal system please different constituents with regard to their collective interests, needs, or wishes. It is no longer important whether the legal code itself is fair, just, or reasonable. A policy program and its implementation widen where parts of the scheme fit in with an entire constituency in its shared spirits, sentiments, or experiences. It does not seem relevant whether the policy as a whole proves to be well thought-out, designed, or executed in terms of science or other-based rationality.

Technocratic Rationales

Technocratic rationales inhere in fact, logic, and science. Civilians tell their stories or present their cases. Administrators in government can easily find the backgrounds or reasons behind these stories or cases. Officials describe future programs or explain past actions. Members of a constituency may see facts and justifications directly underlying those programs or actions.

Fact is what exists in a phenomenon. It determines how life begins. Fact is what occurs over existence. It guides how life unfolds. Humans who live their lives through phenomenal existence own intelligence. Yet intelligence is not for challenging, resisting, or rebelling against fact in the form of personal will. It is for following, understanding, and utilizing fact to the benefit of human living. Logic lies beneath chains of causes and effects in life. It governs individual choices. Logic undergirds series of

human events from inputs to outputs over reality. It shapes social dynamics. Humans who strive for order in experience possess the capacity for reasoning with logic. However, the capacity of reasoning is not to disregard, disobey, or defy logic in favor of human impulsivity. It is to respect, master, and act on logic for the good of human livelihood. Finally, science connects fact to logic. Science studies facts and factual flow by logic, with the aim to uncover laws, rules, and regularity across the universe of facts. Science combines logic with facts. It substantiates logic and logical reasoning with facts, in an attempt to reveal substance, truth, and truism in the world of logic. Overall, fact, logic, and science are three pillars underneath rationale and rationality in the era of technocracy.

Different from autocrats who focus on what they want to do, technocrats admit reality, inquiring about what they can do under specific circumstances. As a technocrat, one knows so much about one's surroundings, one is capable of doing many different things to enhance one's living conditions. In comparison, since one as an autocrat does not understand enough about the world of reality, one is likely to face failure or see dismal outcomes from one's risky endeavors. Unlike democratic players who commit to what they pursue through partisan politics, technocratic participants follow logic, exploring what they may undertake in the real world. Since one as a technocrat commands knowledge and skills of reasoning, one in actuality is able to harvest tangible benefits to improve one's quality of life. On the other hand, because one as a democrat is to some degree fixated or programmed for calculation, competition, and manipulation, one often falls into the trap of unstoppable bickering or meddles through the process of unproductive politicking for no purpose, meaning, and result. In general, being an epoch and era forward from autocracy, technocracy, inclusive of technocratic rationales, is nonetheless close to people, in tune with what they think and do in everyday life. While being a layer and level upward above democracy, technocracy, with technocratic rationality therein, is down to earth, in synchrony with how human life goes on and the real world operates.

Rationality upon Objective Evidence

Causes for human actions are objective, immersed in factors and forces amid phenomenal existence or existent phenomena. Rationality upon objective evidence therefore threads through the material world in which humans strive for survival. From a historical point of view, it charts a human journey of acting upon immediate surroundings, larger environments, and a universe of things, interactions, and evolutions.

Ontologically, rationality upon objective evidence involves two fundamental issues. One is about humans and how they react to their physical environment. The human body is basically a system of biochemical substances. Living is to maintain equilibrium of the body by eating foods, drinking liquids, taking medicines, and releasing wastes. Reasons for bodily intakes or discharges hence boil down to natural laws governing biochemical structures and processes. The other is about nature and what nature does to integrate human activities in its existence. Humankind is a species, along with many other species of animals and plants surviving on the face of the earth. Humans open roads, build dams or reservoirs, and construct settlements just as some animals dig burrows, weave nets or nestles, and make colonies. Rationales behind human actions or inactions thus coincide with rules and principles undergirding animal behaviors and species evolutions. Indeed, rationality on the basis of fact is by nature itself, reflected in the patterns and trends of natural happenings and existences. In other words, rationality upon objective evidence is in the material world itself, exhibited through laws and rules behind natural incidents and developments.

Over time, rationality upon objective evidence features humans and their progress or progression from acting upon immediacy on, out, or upward. In the beginning, humans are only able to see and deal with things situated in their proximity. Migrants move from place to place for jobs which have a higher income and prospects of a better life. Nomadic tribes navigate from season to season in search of sources of greater supply and lands having a better livelihood. Once they settle in a form of production or a way of life, such as agriculture or craftsmanship and rural or urban living, humans begin to look beyond their localities to view and face factors and forces in the larger environment. Outwardly, they engage in trade, travel, and other material or nonmaterial exchanges with the outside. Reasons for outward engagement usually come from their need to consolidate what they have in their close surroundings while benefiting from things in other places. In a similar line, as soon as they reconcile events in proximity with happenings over distance, humans start to rise above their current states of survival or existence to know and understand the dynamics and equilibria over the universe. Upwardly, they undertake experimentation, exploration, and other experiences of nature to find out how life emerges from nonlife, what humans do to keep human ways of living or existence, and why subjective efforts by humans will eventually merge with or submerge in objective processes across the universe. Rationales behind upward undertakings typically derive from both human instincts as natural creatures

of subjective consciousness and human curiosities as innocent organisms of intellectual capacity or intelligent faculty.

Rationality in Terms of Subjective Experience

Humans are subjective beings. Rationality makes the human sense when it is recognized, followed, and utilized by humans in their subjective experience.

Individually, one lives in one's own experience. Family sets a basic tone for one's habit to follow feelings, facts, reasons, or a combination thereof. It may even be used as a rationale for specific thoughts, words, or behaviors. For example, one chooses something simply because it is one's family tradition to do so. Faith serves as a key criterion for one to make moral judgments or take realistic actions. It is logical, legitimate, and rightful to pursue something if such a pursuit is believed to be God's order or wish for all who strive toward salvation from the secular world. Education determines the nature of rationality as to how much one relies on reasoning, commonsense, religion, or science. In the era of scientific education, the more education one receives, the more likely one resorts to fact, logic, and reasoning to find answers to questions in commonsensical life. Work or employment relates to trains of thought or ways of conduct at a distance varying from material to nonmaterial worlds. While manual laborers come across solutions in their immediate surroundings, brainworkers take enjoyment in active learning and discovery through analysis, calculation, and inference. Finally, social status as an integral element of personal experience shapes one's sense of rationality in terms of power, wealth, knowledge, or an equilibrium thereof. Just as politicians play with power, businesspeople revolve around wealth, intellectuals pitch to knowledge, members of an overall high social status may entertain all in developing excuses, explanations, and justifications for doing or not doing things on the public stage.

Collectively, humans live in one another's experiences. Rationales are derived from group norms. Rationality is reviewed, judged, and accepted in collective settings. Community is immediate, specific, and concrete. Individuals live naturally in concrete communities, know automatically what prevails in their immediate environments, and customarily rationalize their sayings and doings in accordance with specific communal moralities. Culture is atmospheric, general, and comprehensive. People grow up under a culture, internalizing its beliefs, values, norms, and spirits as they breathe air from the atmosphere. People operate within a culture, following its ways of thinking, speaking, and acting like they labor

during the day and rest at night. Culture is hence a natural source of rationales. People cultivate and keep their sense of rationality in the dynamics of culture. Besides community and culture, a country grants citizenship, provides space for living, and determines how one navigates, what one attains, and who one becomes in life. Being the citizen of a country, one develops one's rationale for personal thoughts and acts in tune with state ideologies, countrywide courts of opinion, and national sentiments. Rationality resonates with political correctness in general and rolling official propaganda in particular. When conservatism rules, one makes justifications on the basis of national heritage, pride, or supremacy. Where liberalism flourishes, one offers explanations with reference to civil liberty, choice, and responsibility.

CHAPTER 20

ACTIONS AND CONSEQUENTIALITY

Individuals perform acts. Individual acts combine to make personal life courses, correlating with how one fares in life, what one goes through over a lifetime, and whether one fails or succeeds in terms of secular achievements from power, wealth, and knowledge to fame. Humans in collectivity take actions. Social actions converge to charter human evolutionary journeys, illuminating why a specific collective struggles through war or thrives in peace, when a particular era epitomizes political repression or features social vitalization, and how far or high a peculiar society reaches by material attainment in the form of economic prosperity or nonmaterial fulfillment by way of cultural vibrancy (Scheffler 1988; Mele 1997; Shaw 2004; Crinean and Garnham 2006; Hurley 2009; Sigman 2009; Herriges, Kling, Liu, and Tobias 2010; Portmore 2011; Shaw 2013; Dancy and Sandis 2015; O'Brien 2015; Simonen 2016; Cheng and Almor 2017; Lynch 2017; Fargues and Winter 2019; Garrido 2019; Seidel 2019; Smithies and Weiss 2019; Demange and Kedar 2020).

Actions of Impulsivity versus Rationality

Groups, organizations, and communities act out of their collective perceptions, feelings, and spirits. Constituencies, states, and countries take actions upon solid facts, thorough analyses, and serious policy calculations. There are then comparisons between impulsive and rational actions by humans in collectivity.

Actions of impulsivity are likely to take place in closely-knit communities, ideologically charged societies, or nation-states of long tradition, high pride, or uniform spirit. Within society, impulsive actions sometimes feature systematic prejudice, bigotry, racism, hatred, discrimination, repression, persecution, and even genocide. In this direction, they pit people against one another, intensifying social surveillance, spreading mass suspicion, and sustaining cultural intolerance. To nature, impulsive actions often inflict widespread damage on the earth, ranging from deforestation, the salinization of soil, and the desertification of land to the pollution of air.

On this path, they separate humans from their physical environments, aiming at the human conquest of nature, emphasizing human exploration or exploitation into phenomenal existence, and celebrating human triumph over the material world. With regard to process, impulsive actions usually come as a shocking surprise, escalate by an overwhelming intensity, and fade into obscurity or nothing in a quick blink of the eye. Overall, actions of impulsivity relate to human instincts, wills, emotions, feelings, and sentiments as origins, driving forces, refueling factors, expressive scenes, and experiential fields. For example, sentiments fuel actions, actions express sentiments, sentiments feedback on actions, so on and so forth.

Actions of rationality originate from reality, reason, or both. They are planned or programmed partly due to realistic factors and forces, such as efforts taken to put out a ferocious fire and measures instituted to halt the spread of an infectious disease. They are scheduled or staged partly out of logical reasoning and calculation. A rescue operation is called off when the chance of victims' survival, the risk to first responders, and the cost of the operation do not balance out for the continuation of the rescue. Rational actions correlate with education, knowledge, and ways of thinking. When the level of education is low, individuals tend to cheer one another on irrational moves. Where knowledge spreads about things in everyday life, people are inclined to engage in rational actions. As a whole, populations educated in knowledge with scientific ways of thinking are likely to join hands in movements on the basis of evidence, reason, and efficacy. Rational actions change by era, nation-state, and systems of polity. An autocratic era typically experiences the suppression of rational actions by personal wills. A democratic state usually witnesses the fluctuation of rational actions from one administration or party to another. In general, constituents habituated in technocracy under practical systems of polity are likely to work together on activities to the benefit of constituency order, wellbeing, and vibrancy.

Actions of Personality versus Collectivity

A group, organization, or community acts in response to its common challenges. Actions taken reflect its collective interests. A kinship, tribe, or kingdom does things in accordance with its head's personal wills. The steps made are more demonstrative of an autocratic leader's ambitions, commands, or demands. Here, therefore, is the contrast between the doings of personality and the deeds of collectivity.

The essence of actions of personality is that a collective is manipulated or coerced by a powerful leader or central leadership into performing tasks not necessarily reflective of its fundamental interests.

Actions of personality happen to social units of all sizes or scopes, nonetheless they are more likely to occur in those with patriarchal traditions, autocratic heritages, or centralized mechanisms of policymaking and program enforcement. They take place in collective entities of all purposes or pursuits, yet are less probable in those of civil activisms, democratic practices, or decentralized apparatuses for administration and governance. As far as process is concerned, actions of personality are top down, with the leader or central leadership giving orders, providing guidance, and issuing judgments on the one hand, and the masses executing commands, bearing surveillance, and accepting penalties on the other. With regard to a consequence, actions of personality glorify the authority when they lead to expected results just as they devastate the masses where they go wrong or cause unexpected things. Regardless of failure or success in terms of outcome, actions of personality inherently involve great risks or dangers because often they are basically a gamble on a collective and its wellbeing by a few persons and personalities. They inevitably incur high costs or prices for they are, from time to time, essentially bets coincident with subjective wills, wishes, faiths, and fates rather than informative of objective evidence, logic, reasoning, and analysis.

The core in actions of collectivity is a collective act out of its common interests, needs, or challenges. Civilians of a society perform volunteer work as they advance their common interests toward a better way of life. Members of a constituency pay taxes when they address their public needs for a higher system of welfare. Citizens of a country serve in the military while they meet their collective challenges toward a stronger network of defense. Because they are actions grounded in collectivity, they reflect joint traditions, customs, and sentiments. Originating from the past, actions of collectivity continue historical practices. A community observes a festivity from year to year as part of its communal tradition. Springing out of the present, actions of collectivity highlight prevailing cultural fashions or ongoing social momentums. A society celebrates rites of passage from adolescence to adulthood when the youth subculture gains popularity. Leaping into the future, actions of collectivity feature trendy lifestyles. A country undergoes reform to catch up with the worldwide march toward modernity in production, service, and consumption. In relation to polity, actions of collectivity rebel against dominance by actions of personality under autocracy. They win over competitions with actions of personality amid the dynamics of democracy. Yet, only in the era of technocracy may they maintain clear and systematic salience over actions of personality.

Actions of Inner Dynamics versus Outer Pressures

Actions of inner dynamics take place when individuals join hands to address concerns, manage conflicts, and solve problems from community to community or where people pool resources to meet needs, tackle issues, and face challenges from constituency to constituency. Actions of outer pressures, on the other hand, occur when groups and organizations react to market changes or governmental regulations or where autonomous enclaves and sovereign states respond to hostile takeovers or foreign invasions.

Inner dynamics inhere in factors existing and forces happening within a collective entity. Economically, causes vary from the ownership of properties, access to opportunities, and the distribution of resources to the differentiation in divisions of labor while effects manifest typically in unemployment, the income gap, homelessness, poverty, and welfare dependency. It is obvious that causes prompt actions, actions generate effects, and effects provide feedback on causes. Featured in the economic actions of inner dynamics is hence an incessant chain from cause to effect. Politically, there not only exist the stratification of social classes, segregation among racial categories, gentrification of ethnic communities, and discrimination against minority groups, but also the spread of partisan bickering, bureaucratic lagging, official dodging, and moral declining. There is no doubt that the former coincides and resonates with, and reinforces the latter just as the latter extends, deepens, and solidifies the former. Reflected in political actions of inner dynamics is therefore a constant theme of inaction at worst and reaction at best. Another important dimension in actions of inner dynamics involves the masses, their attitudes and conduct. Public opinions matter, feeding cultural exercises, guiding economic choices, and shaping political decisions. Mass sentiments pull, swaying groups, communities, and often a whole population from left to center to right. Social movements push, throwing institutions, constituencies, and sometimes an entire sovereignty into decline, disarray, or demise.

Outer pressures creep in to a smaller collective, more distant place, or lower level simply because it belongs to a larger system, connects to a broader network, or submits to a higher level of authority. Here typically come policy directives, market waves, and cultural tides. A farming community adjusts to an increase or decrease of cost for fertilizers, pesticides, production tools, and daily living articles due to market ups and downs. An outlying township responds to a shelter-in-place order imposed under the authority of a county administration or an economic revitalization scheme implemented at the initiative of a provincial government. A regional constituency resonates with the nation in patriotic spirits, traditional values,

customary practices, cultural pursuits, and public sentiments. To a nation-state or sovereign entity, outer pressures usually take the form of diplomatic condemnation, economic embargo, military invasion, or political annexation. A tribal state faces a diplomatic debacle with almost all its neighbors when it mistreats members of an ethnic minority under its control. A national government in pursuit of religious or nonreligious ideals or idealisms struggles in years of economic blockade coordinated by a few powerful countries around the world. A sovereign territory fights a war of invasion by foreign forces. A smaller or weaker country sees part of its land forcibly taken away by a larger or stronger counterpart in proximity. All these incidents trigger actions and reactions, leaving immediate impacts upon leaders and leaderships, governments and governmental operations, institutions and institutional practices, civilians and civilian ways of life.

Autocratic Actions

Autocratic actions happen when a strong leader commands a group, organization, or state to do things that are more reflective of his or her personal ideas, ideals, or wills. They occur where a community, constituency, or country follows a central leadership to execute tasks that are not much related to its practical interests, needs, and wishes.

Coincidence is key to understanding autocratic actions. An autocrat develops his or her ideas on the basis of his or her knowledge. The more he or she knows his or her constituency, the more likely his or her ideas resonate with what constituents think and expect. A leader cultivates his or her ideals out of his or her practical experience. The closer he or she interacts with people under his or her leadership, the better his or her ideals correlate with what his or her collective sets as its joint goals and purposes. A king or queen forms and fine-tunes his or her wills through a series of policy initiatives and program practices. Success boosts confidence while failure shakes the determination for implementation, even experimentation. In all, coincidence is about autocrats and commoners, leadership and constituency, and the wills, commands, or policies of the former and the sentiments, needs, or expectations of the latter. Autocratic actions expand if autocrats happen to represent commoners in acting out mass sentiments. They gain popularity when a central leadership fulfills coincidentally what its constituency hopes for. They continue where a ruler's rules or a government's policies become congruent, by chance or necessity, with mass feelings, opinions, desires, demands, or a combination thereof.

Eventually, consequence is all that matters from autocratic actions. First of all, autocratic actions prove themselves to be right and rightful as

long as they do what they purport to do, regardless of whether they reflect public sentiments or fulfill mass needs. A citywide curfew stays if it applies without noticeable violations and with tangible effects in the reduction or containment of target problems. Second, autocratic actions gain support when they prevail even though they are wrong and unjust. People celebrate a war of invasion into a foreign territory simply because it brings home military victory, national pride, and material treasures. Third, autocratic actions expand as they consolidate powerbases for autocrats and autocratic leaderships even when they are unreasonable and unjustifiable. A politically strengthened leader tends to take a more strong-handed approach to his or her rule often at the expense of ordinary constituents. Fourth, autocratic actions fall apart when they fail even though they are of kind intent and carefully planned. An austerity program to stem waste and corruption falters amid official antipathy, media criticism, and mass uncooperativeness. Lastly, of course, autocratic actions continue when they function to vent citizens' feelings to a degree or where they serve to meet constituents' needs to some extent, whether they are of civilians' likes, mass interests, or public benefits. A measure of surveillance weathers civil resentment as it assists with the maintenance of social order. A program in taxation withstands taxpayer resistance if it helps in the alleviation of economic disparity.

Democratic Actions

Instead of individuals and individual wills, democratic actions stem from groups and group interests. Rather than betting essentially on effects, democratic actions spring steadily out of public fascinations, wants, or fashions.

Individuals join hands in groups. Groups become main forces or players on democratic stages. A group that consists of a large number of members is likely to gain dominance, translating its ideas into actions. A group that commands a huge amount of resources tends to wield influence, turning its initiatives into tangible achievements. A group that owns talents, talented leaders, knowledge, and a knowledgeable membership has the potential to prevail, advancing its interests ahead of those of other groups. A group that shares concerns, needs, and pursuits with other counterparts in the larger society has capacities to form formidable alliances, representing a whole constituency while making specific attainments for itself. Obviously, one group, no matter how sizable, resourceful, meritorious, or representative, is inclined to take a constituency or nation-state into one particular direction or destination that is not necessarily of benefit to all constituents or citizens. It is hence natural, if not inevitable, that groups take

turns in leading a society or country with periodic changes in rules, policies, and practices.

Feelings come from individuals. They affect how one perceives life and what one does in one's surroundings. Here are democratic actions at individual initiatives. As they spread from one another, individual feelings converge in group-wide sentiments. Group spirits intensify, shaping group ways of thinking and dictating collective behaviors. Then appear democratic actions upon group determinations. When they expand beyond their particular boundaries, group spirits form society-prevalent sentiments. Mass sentiments strengthen, feeding courts of public opinion, driving official policies, and commanding social movements. There arise democratic actions out of governmental power or societal mobilization across a city, province, or country. The same holds true for ideas, interests, and fashions. Ideas incubate from individuals to communities to a complete constituency. At the individual level, they prompt democratic actions from exercising self-discipline, appealing to peers, and networking with job-related professionals to volunteering for community service. Interests originate from individuals, demonstrate themselves among groups, and compete with one another throughout an entire society. In the phase of group demonstration, they motivate democratic actions, including negotiation, collaboration, alliance, concession, manipulation, and confrontation. Fashions span individuals, groups, and a whole culture. On a social scale, they fuel democratic actions, such as conspicuous consumption or leisure, countercultural expressions or actions, and partisan bickering or bipartisan cooperation in the political arena.

Technocratic Actions

In the era of technocracy, individuals act on reality, their concrete experiences, material conditions, and socioeconomic circumstances. Collectively, people follow logic, science, and reason in making plans, formulating policies, and taking actions to tackle daily tasks, address practical needs, and meet realistic challenges.

Different from autocratic comparisons, technocratic actions do not result from an autocrat's wills, wants, or wishes. They result from individuals and their ideas. Individuals develop ideas on the basis of their living experiences. They follow ideas to analytically design, fashion, and fine-tune actions. Technocratic actions correlate with people and their moralities. People foster moralities in the context of their socioeconomic environments. They observe moralities to logically explore, make, and exercise choices. Technocratic actions connect to civilians and their needs.

Civilians find needs as they live their lives in the world of commonsense. They rationally engage in a complete spectrum of productive activities in order to meet their needs. Technocratic actions correspond to constituents and their expectations. Constituents cultivate expectations in reaction to government and governmental services. They naturally weigh costs with benefits as they make specific efforts to fulfill expectations. Finally, technocratic actions speak of citizens and their sentiments. Citizens brew sentiments in resonance with the spiritual ambience, cultural atmosphere, and political climate of a country or nation-state. They automatically have an eye on evidence and logic when they adjust thoughts, adapt words, and change acts to properly produce, regulate, and channel sentiments.

Unlike democratic contrasts, technocratic actions do not revolve around groups and group interests, wants, or needs. No organizational group stands out in the cultivation of desires, the demonstration of wants, and the expression of wishes. Individual citizens fashion desires, moderate wants, and fulfill wishes through a routinized daily life, standardized social process, and institutionalized governmental service. No social unit leads on the advancement of interests, the formulation of goals, and the distribution of benefits. All civilians play a role in validating interests, justifying goals, and sharing benefits by way of data, data collection, logic, logical analysis, science, and scientific optimization. No population segment marshals the identification of demands, the exposition of needs, and the presentation of challenges. Every member of society feels a duty, senses the freedom, and owns the ability to feed individually personal experiences and hence jointly pool social dynamics in terms of material demands, livelihood needs, and challenges from survival to thriving. Indeed, technocratic actions spring out of individuals; nonetheless, they reflect collective interests, wants, and needs. Technocratic actions correspond to social norms, public policies, and administrative rules; yet, they resonate with individual aspirations, sentiments, and expectations. Most importantly, they rise above individual differences and conflicts, overcome bureaucratic barriers and overheads, hence highlighting the power and supremacy of technocracy in bridging civil needs, initiatives, and experiences with public planning, programing, and practicing.

Consequentiality upon Humankind

Individual acts build to influence personal, familial, and kinship styles, trajectories, and destinations of life. Collective actions pool to shape organizational, communal, and constituency states of affairs, wellbeing, and progress toward the future. Indeed, human doings and deeds determine what

humans experience and what humankind face yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

Human actions mold personal characters, individual personalities, and national spirits. The mind, cultivated by acts, unfolds in the form of character, personality, and spirit. Autocracy breeds bravery, austerity, and endurance in personal character. An autocratic personality manifests in suspicion, prejudice, and self-pride. At the scale of an empire, autocratic spirit leads to dogmatism, censorship, brainwashing, thought control, and ruler worship. Democracy brews such characters as risk-takers, adventurers, critics, challengers, duelers, and competitors. A democratic personality exhibits traits ranging from expressiveness, bickering, networking, persuasiveness, and manipulation to partisanship. At the level of a state, the democratic spirit results in ideological campaigns, public opinion, mass media, and civil society. In comparison, technocracy rears personal characters of fact and factuality, logic and logicity, object and objectivity, reason and rationality, truth and truism. A technocratic personality features scientists, technologists, professionals who observe rules made on the basis of evidence, and technocrats who follow procedures established in accordance with logic and reason. Across a living community or self-governing constituency, technocratic spirits correlate with a non-assuming attitude, a matter of fact approach, and a methodical style to life and the world.

Human actions create cities of settlement, barriers of interaction, and wars of homicide. The body, exercised through action, settles in place, interacts with others, and perishes over conflict. Autocracy builds castles and chateaus for defense, control, and power. It establishes castes and classes to categorize, stratify, and manage individuals. It engages in clashes and conflicts to conquer new territories, acquire material resources, and expand its rule in the form of an empire or kingdom. In the dimension of body, commoners are confined in place, segregated from one another, and sacrificed amid invasion, conquest, or repression. Democracy opens common markets for trade and exchange. It builds public squares to debate issues and spread ideas. It entertains the mass media to survey civil opinions and check governmental operations. From a bodily point of view, citizens move from place to place, interact with each other, and show off on the economic stage, in the political arena, or across the cultural sphere. In contrast, technocracy places people naturally wherever they feel at home, from a village, township, or city to a metropolis. It automatically facilitates civilians in their mutual contacts, communications, or dealings whenever they deem them necessary, from study, work, recreation, and rest to pleasure. Physically, individuals choose places of work and life on the basis

of fact and reason. They engage in communal affairs and social activities according to outer needs and inner abilities. They contribute to constituency wellbeing in particular and human progress in general as a matter of fact, by the logic of nature, and in the spirit of science.

Consequentiality toward Nature

Humans are programmed to be self-centered. They explore things and take actions for self-survival, expansion, and triumph. Where humans know specific happenings and their codes of existence, do they expose those phenomenal existences or existential phenomena to the hazard of contamination, risk of alteration, or even danger of annihilation? When humans expand beyond their due boundary of life, do they push the earth to the brink of destruction?

Humans possess consciousness. With consciousness, they are aware of the rhythm of nature. Living in rhyme with nature, they accumulate experience. Humans retain subjectivity. In subjectivity, they reflect on the objectivity of existence. Revolving around the objective phenomenon, they gather information. Humans have intelligence. Utilizing intelligence, they explore the world. Amid exploration, they gain knowledge. Humans hold intellectual faculties. Operating upon their intellectual faculty, they analyze life. Out of analysis, they reach understanding. Humans possess capacities for thought. Following their capacity for thought, they experiment with reality. Through experimentation, they harvest wisdom. Information, knowledge, experience, understanding, and wisdom combine to place humans in awe, command, and ownership of facts about, the logic of, and laws in nature. From a human point of view, humans hence act on nature in greater precision, with higher effectiveness, and with better efficiency. On the part of nature, is nature at risk for exploitation, damage, and even destruction as more and more of its codes, rules, or secrets are exposed to human consciousness or revealed in human subjectivity? For example, as they know enough about genes and rules of genetic grouping, humans doctor genes to make plants or animals appear or disappear against the flora and fauna that exist normally in nature.

The effect, of course, comes after action. At the outset, human actions have turned much of the earth's surface into farmland, fishing waters, production lines, shopping malls, office complexes, road networks, housing compounds, recreational parks, and marketplaces. Population expands, letting people disperse to almost every corner of the globe. Human creations multiply, making artifacts scatter nearly all over the world. On a negative note, excessive cultivation in agriculture leads to soil salinization.

Massive industrial production results in air pollution and water contamination. Lumbering causes deforestation. Construction triggers erosion. Overall, human activities bear the direct blame for desertification, the extinction of species, global warming, and climate change. On the positive side, human actions improve living conditions for many population groups. With higher standards, more individuals experience less suffering from diseases, maintain better control against epidemics, and enjoy higher life expectancies. Beside themselves, humans deliver unintended benefits to certain species, plants and animals, as well as some objects and objective existences through their living activities. Above the earth, humans install a variety of devices to monitor, explore, and intercept things from outer space. The actions therein help humans to ward off probable attacks from extraterrestrial objects, find fellow living beings elsewhere, or locate possible places for resettlement before the earth becomes unsuitable for life. In other words, human actions may alter the way that nature evolves by its own logic or fares with its original fate.

CONCLUSION

Human polity is about how humans govern themselves in societal living. On the one hand, it features collective demonstrations of individual wills. On the other, it entails individual assignments from collective decisions.

Human polity takes three forms. Over time, autocracy arises when one leads a family, kingship, tribe, principality, kingdom, or empire, imposing one's personal wills upon all others herein. Democracy follows as groups develop and compete to represent collective wills on behalf of one or more groups of individuals in political arenas. Technocracy establishes itself in the era of science in which humans face reality factually, tackle life objectively, and embrace the world with knowledge, logic, and rationality. While it is generally correct that human polity progresses from autocracy to democracy to technocracy, it is specifically true that autocracy persists from pocket to pocket when democracy dominates overall just as technocracy prevails with democracy, autocracy, or both enduring under it from place to place. Across space, first is the coexistence of all three polities, autocracy, democracy, and technocracy, on the face of the earth. Second is the inclusion of one in another, such as autocracy in democracy, democracy in autocracy, and technocracy in democracy, all over the world. Third is the exclusion of one against another, including autocracy without democracy, democracy of no autocracy, and technocracy void of autocracy, across a constituency. Last is the subjugation of one under another, varying from autocracy inherent in democracy, democracy beneath technocracy, and technocracy above autocracy to technocracy over democracy, throughout a sovereignty. Whereas it is largely accurate that technocracy encompasses autocracy and democracy, it is definitely precise that democracy brews technocracy in a way that is similar to how autocracy breeds democracy.

Autocracy as a system of polity has its roots in individuals and individuality. There are not just individuals, scattered here and there. Individuals are differenced at the time of their birth, further divided over the course of their life, between leading and followed, ruling and governed, repressing and oppressed, controlling and manipulated, discriminating and victimized, so on and so forth. There are not simply persons, dispersed now and then. Persons are separated from persons by barriers or walls such as caste, class, rank, or level. Persons from one caste look down upon persons of another. Persons in one class exploit those of a different class. Persons of

an upper rank command persons from ranks below. Persons in a lower level follow those of a higher one. There are not only people, distributed across society. People break down into aristocrats and commoners, nobles and regular folks, magnates and paupers, literate and illiterate individuals, and various other contrasts. They sit in different roles, positions, cells, levels, or echelons of a social hierarchy, restrained or bolstered by their specific circumstances. As an aristocrat, one is entitled to a myriad of privileges while as a commoner one can only pray for an opportunity to serve his or her aristocratic master. As a magnate, one holds an enormous business empire whereas as a pauper one may just feel happy to have a job of triviality available in his or her wealthy owner's laundry room. Individuality features strong versus weak wills, the master versus slave mentality, as well as the autocratic versus obedient personality. For example, one with an autocratic personality assumes that one is smarter than any other person, one knows everything, and one understands things better than everyone else. As a result, one is quick to criticize, reject, or deny others and their ideas, opinions, reasoning, approaches to work, recreation, and even ways of life.

Democracy as an institution of governance resonates with groups and group dynamics. Groups gather people. Members therein define a group as to what it is, an ethnic minority, a workers' union, or a professional association. Groups pool resources. Properties and capital thereunder determine a group as to how strong it is, a troop armed with state of the art weaponry, a factory with a critical shortage of raw materials, or a foundation of multiple assets. Groups revolve around interests. Needs and pursuits thereof drive a group as to what goals a business corporation sets, what programs a municipal agency implements, and what outcomes a college campus harvests. Groups compete for domination. Power and influence thereto illuminate a group as to why a political party succeeds over a public election or how a ruling coalition sustains from one government to another. Group dynamics are exhibited in larger social factors and forces such as ideologies, public opinions, civil society, group representation, changes of term, and rotations of government. For instance, in the court of public opinion, once an idea, position, view, or ideology gains inner strength and outer popularity, it quickly spreads to every corner of society with unimaginable intensity, thus overwhelming, overrunning, or even annihilating all other ones. With regard to representation, no one elected official ever completely represents any interest or population group. No one selected group or segment ever fully represents a whole society or population. As far as term of service is concerned, the change of term, even the term limit, neither prevents the making of a lifetime politician nor inhibits the formation of a power family, the growth of a political dynasty, or the

inheritance or transfer of office from spouse to spouse, relative to relative, and most commonly, parents to children.

Technocracy as a mechanism of administration operates upon fact, logic, and science. It is about individuals, their wills, wishes, conditions, needs, and feelings. However, it remains free from ambition, aspiration, effort, or influence by any particular person. It is about groups, their interests, pursuits, attainments, situations, and sentiments. Nonetheless, it stays open amid the agenda, action, movement, or impact of any specific unit. Technocracy comes after autocracy and democracy. Naturally, it inherits, incorporates, and integrates the positive characteristics from its preceding systems of polity. Technocracy is yet to come as a whole apparatus of governance in human civilizations. Logically, it calls for questions as to what it is, how it works, and why it is bound to arrive next for civil administration. First, technocracy is staffed with professionals or technocrats who are educated in science, trained in rational ways of thinking, and experienced in bureaucratic protocols. Second, technocracy serves civilians who know, understand, and practice science in work and everyday life as a matter of fact, logic, and rationality. Third, technocracy is a nonpolitical operation, free from individual influence, group power, and social dynamics. Fourth, technocracy recruits entrants by a public procedure that places emphasis on qualifications such as education, specialization, and experience. Fifth, technocracy pushes technocrats up the ladder through an open process that takes into account expertise, performance, merit, proximity, availability, and randomness. Sixth, technocracy allows a head of administration to serve only a fixed length of time, giving every eligible candidate an opportunity for service. Seventh, technocracy selects a head of government by lottery from all eligible technocratic administrators at the immediate lower level, with a total lack of manipulation, lobbying, politicking, voting, or competition. Eighth, technocracy runs under the limelight of the mass media, gaining complete exposure to public scrutiny, criticism, and guidance. Ninth, technocracy remains accountable to constituents, responsible for the fulfillment of constituent needs and expectations. Tenth, technocracy evolves along with science, constituency, humans, and human livelihood.

Autocracy, democracy, and technocracy are each an ideal type of human polity. In a form of completeness, none of the three yet exists in reality. With a content of purity, nothing like any of these has ever appeared in the world. Among all existent administrations throughout human history, those identified as autocratic hence called the autocratic ones just happen to contain more or the most autocratic characteristics, including a ruthless dictator holding power firmly in his or her hand, a top-down decision

making and implementation mechanism, a wide network of public surveillance, and the full censorship of the mass media. From government to government around the present world of human civilizations, those regarded as democratic thus named the democratic ones simply demonstrate more or the most democratic features, such as group interests, civil leverages, voting, election, term of office, representation, check and balance, media exposure, and public accountability. In the era of technocracy, offices of civil affairs from constituency to constituency exhibit technocratic traits and therefore are entitled technocratic apparatuses of governance simply because they more and more or mostly operate upon evidence, logic, and science, steer clear of individual wills, group interests, or mass sentiments, and continue to pass a constant test of constituent accountability, media inquiry, and public supervision. A particular agency of technocracy could nonetheless commit to certain chains of autocratic actions when a visionary leader serves his or her term. A specific bureau of technocracy would still engage in some series of democratic exercises wherein different departments compete with each other for the best job performance, client service, and institutional efficacy.

Human polity overall evolves from autocracy to democracy to technocracy. Is the process progressive in general? It is undoubtedly an advance from a concentration around one or a few persons to representation through a group of people to participation by an entire population in a constituency inasmuch as how power is exercised, governance is executed, and civil affairs are administered. Indeed, as more civilian ideas, interests, and needs are incorporated in government, policymaking and program implementation become wiser, closer to reality, more reflective of constituent sentiments, and higher in efficiency. Is it possible that technocracy arrives directly from autocracy without an intervening stage of democracy? Technocracy features a staff of trained, experienced, and professionalized civil servants who enter with specific qualifications, move up by clear procedures, and remain loyal only to their duty of service to the populace. When an autocratic system sustains long enough to eventually produce top leaders by an organizational process other than family succession, power struggle, or politicalized race, autocracy can change directly to technocracy. In this regard, China is likely to serve as a human testimony with its long history as an established civil service from dynastic to warlord-controlled to party-dictated governments. Is it inevitable that democracy in the end grows into technocracy? Where a democratic structure evolves far enough to go above and beyond group interests through an institutional progression other than collective influence, human manipulation, or public campaign, democracy shall naturally turn into technocracy. On this development, the

United States of America is seemingly unfolding as a human experiment through its illustrative journey of a dynamic democracy from group representation to partisan competition to ultimately all people participation.

REFERENCES

- Achen, Christopher H. and Bartels, Larry M. 2016. *Democracy for Realists: Why Elections Do Not Produce Responsive Government*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ackerman, Bruce. 2014. *The Civil Rights Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Agamben, Giorgio. 1999. *Potentialities: Collected Essays in Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Akin, William E. 1977. *Technocracy and the American Dream: The Technocrat Movement, 1900-1941*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Andrews, Joel. 1995. *Rise of the Red Engineers*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Appleby, Joyce. 1992. *Liberalism and Republicanism in the Historical Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Archibugi, Daniele. 2008. *The Global Commonwealth of Citizens: Toward Cosmopolitan Democracy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bader, Julia, Grävingsholt, Jörn, and Kästner, Antje. 2010. "Would Autocracies Promote Autocracy? A Political Economy Perspective on Regime-type Export in Regional Neighborhoods." *Contemporary Politics* 16.1: 81-100.
- Bailey, John and Goodson, Roy. Eds. 2000. *Organized Crime and Democratic Governability: Mexico and the U.S.-Mexican Borderlands*. Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press.
- Baker, Gideon. 2019. "Critique, Use and World in Giorgio Agamben's Genealogy of Government." *Global Society: Journal of Interdisciplinary International Relations* 33.1: 12-25.
- Balcerak Jackson, Brendan. 2019. "Against the Perceptual Model of Utterance Comprehension." *Philosophical Studies* 176.2: 387-405.
- Barlow, Rebecca and Akbarzadeh, Shahram. 2018. *Human Rights and Agents of Change in Iran: Towards a Theory of Change*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bartels, Larry M. 2008. *Unequal Democracy: The Political Economy of the New Gilded Age*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

- Becker, Peter, Heideking, Juergen, and Henretta, James A. 2002. *Republicanism and Liberalism in America and the German States, 1750–1850*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, Daniel. 1963. “Veblen and the New Class.” *The American Scholar* 32.4: 616-638.
- Bell, Daniel. 1973. *The Coming of Postindustrial Society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Benhabib, Seyla. 1996. *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Berger, Harry Jr. and Anderson, Judith. 2005. *Situated Utterances: Texts, Bodies, and Cultural Representations*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Bernstein, Richard J. 1971. *Praxis and Action: Contemporary Philosophies of Human Activity*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Berry, Sharon. 2018. “Modal Structuralism Simplified.” *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 48.2: 200-222.
- Blattberg, Charles. 2000. *From Pluralist to Patriotic Politics: Putting Practice First*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Birch, Anthony H. 1993. *The Concepts and Theories of Modern Democracy*. London: Routledge.
- Bourrat, Pierrick. 2019. “Evolutionary Transitions in Heritability and Individuality.” *Theory in Biosciences* 138.2: 305-323.
- Boyle, Matthew. 2016. “Additive Theories of Rationality: A Critique.” *European Journal of Philosophy* 24.3: 527-555.
- Brennan, Jason. 2019. “Democracy as Uninformed Non-Consent.” *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 36.2: 205-211.
- Buchak, Lara. 2013. *Risk and Rationality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Burris, Beverly H. 1993. *Technocracy at Work*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Bush, Stephen S. 2017. *William James on Democratic Individuality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Campano, Gerald, Ghiso, María Paula, Badaki, Oreoluwa, and Kannan, Chloe. 2020. “Agency as Collectivity: Community-based Research for Educational Equity.” *Theory into Practice* 59.2: 223-233.
- Carothers, Thomas and O'Donohue, Andrew. 2019. *Democracies Divided: The Global Challenge of Political Polarization*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Carston, Robyn. 2008. *Thoughts and Utterances: The Pragmatics of Explicit Communication*. New York: Wiley-Blackwell.

- Ceka, Besir and Magalhaes, Pedro C. 2020. "Do the Rich and the Poor Have Different Conceptions of Democracy? Socioeconomic Status, Inequality, and the Political Status Quo." *Comparative Politics* 52.3: 383-412.
- Chen, Feifei, Zhu, Shimin, and Bi, Chongzeng. 2018. "The Development of Self-esteem and the Role of Agency and Communion: A Longitudinal Study among Chinese." *Journal of Child & Family Studies* 27.3: 816-824.
- Cheng, Li., and White, Lynn. 1990. "Elite Transformation and Modern Change in Mainland China and Taiwan: Empirical Data and the Theory of Technocracy." *China Quarterly* 121: 1-35.
- Cheng, Wei and Almor, Amit. 2017. "The Effect of Implicit Causality and Consequentiality on Nonnative Pronoun Resolution." *Applied Psycholinguistics* 38.1: 1-26.
- Chou, Mark, Pan, Chengxin, and Poole, Avery. 2017. "The Threat of Autocracy Diffusion in Consolidated Democracies? The Case of China, Singapore and Australia." *Contemporary Politics* 23.2: 175-194.
- Cian, Luca, Krishna, Aradhna, and Schwarz, Norbert. 2015. "Positioning Rationality and Emotion: Rationality Is Up and Emotion Is Down." *Journal of Consumer Research* 42.4: 632-651.
- Collins, Phillip Darrell and Collins, Paul David. 2004. *The Ascendancy of the Scientific Dictatorship: An Examination of Epistemic Autocracy from the 19th to the 21st Century*. Lincoln, NE: iUniverse.
- Copp, David, Hampton, Jean, and Roemer, John E. 1993. *The Idea of Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Corbett, Jack. 2020. "The Deconsolidation of Democracy: Is It New and What Can Be Done About It?" *Political Studies Review* 18.2: 178-188.
- Crinean, Marcelle and Garnham, Alan. 2006. "Implicit Causality, Implicit Consequentiality and Semantic Roles." *Language & Cognitive Processes* 21.5: 636-648.
- Crozier, Michel, Huntington, Samuel P., and Watanuki, Joji. 1975. *The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Governability of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission*. New York: New York University Press.
- Curato, Nicole. 2020. "Toxic Democracy? The Philippines in 2018." *Southeast Asian Affairs* 46.1: 260-274.
- Dahl, Robert A. 2000. *On Democracy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dancy, Jonathan and Sandis, Constantine. 2015. *Philosophy of Action: An Anthology*. New York: Blackwell.
- Davenport, Christian. 2007. *State Repression and the Domestic Democratic Peace*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Davidson, Donald. 2004. *Problems of Rationality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- de Boer, Bas, Te Molder, Hedwig, and Verbeek, Peter-Paul. 2018. "The Perspective of the Instruments: Mediating Collectivity." *Foundations of Science* 23.4: 739-755.
- De Cleen, Benjamin, Moffitt, Benjamin, Panayotu, Panos, and Stavrakakis, Yannis. 2020. "The Potentials and Difficulties of Transnational Populism: The Case of the Democracy in Europe Movement 2025 (DiEM25)." *Political Studies* 68.1:146-166.
- Dedon, Theodore. 2019. "Technocracy, Ecological Crisis, and the Parliament of the World's Religions." *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 39: 311-313.
- Demange, Dominique and Kedar, Yael. 2020. "Physical Action, Species, and Matter: The Debate between Roger Bacon and Peter John Olivi." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 58.1: 49-69.
- Diamond, Larry and Gunther, Richard. 2001. *Political Parties and Democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Diamond, Larry and Plattner, Marc. 1996. *The Global Resurgence of Democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Diamond, Larry, Plattner, Marc, and Costopoulos, Philip. 2005. *World Religions and Democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Donahue, Sean. 2019. "Knowledge Exclusion and the Rationality of Belief." *Analysis* 79.3: 402-410.
- Dukalskis, Alexander and Gerschewski, Johannes. 2017. "What Autocracies Say (and What Citizens Hear): Proposing Four Mechanisms of Autocratic Legitimation." *Contemporary Politics* 23.3: 251-268.
- Eckersley, Robyn. 2020. "Ecological Democracy and the Rise and Decline of Liberal Democracy: Looking Back, Looking Forward." *Environmental Politics* 29.2: 214-234.
- Engelhard, Kristina and Quante, Michael. Eds. 2018. *Handbook of Potentiality*. Dordrecht, Netherland: Springer.
- Ernst, Ricardo and Haar, Jerry. 2019. *Globalization, Competitiveness, and Governability: The Three Disruptive Forces of Business in the 21st Century*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Esmark, Anders. 2020. *The New Technocracy*. Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press.
- Everdell, William R. 2003. *The End of Kings: A History of Republics and Republicans*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Fargues, Émilien and Winter, Elke. 2019. "Conditional Membership: What Revocation Does to Citizenship." *Citizenship Studies* 23.4: 295-303.

- Feldmann, Andreas E., Merke, Federico, and Stuenkel, Oliver. 2019. "Argentina, Brazil and Chile and Democracy Defense in Latin America: Principled Calculation." *International Affairs* 95.2: 447-467.
- Fink, Julian. 2018. "The Property of Rationality: A Guide to What Rationality Requires?" *Philosophical Studies* 175.1: 117-140.
- Fischer, Frank. 1990. *Technocracy and the Politics of Expertise*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Frantz, Erica and Kendall-Taylor, Andrea. 2014. "A Dictator's Toolkit: Understanding How Co-optation Affects Repression in Autocracies." *Journal of Peace Research* 51.3: 332-346.
- Freud, Sigmund. 1962. *The Ego and the Id*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Friedman, Jeffrey. 2019. *Power without Knowledge: A Critique of Technocracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frogel, Shai. 2020. "The Will to Truth, the Death Drive and the Will to Power." *American Journal of Psychoanalysis* 80.1: 85-93.
- Fuller, Martin and Ren, Julie. 2019. "The Art Opening: Proximity and Potentiality at Events." *Theory, Culture & Society* 36.7/8: 135-152.
- Fukuyama, Francis. 2014. *Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy*. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Gabardi, Wayne. 2001. *Contemporary Models of Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Garrido, Daniel Rueda. 2019. "Krause, Spanish Krausism, and Philosophy of Action." *Idealistic Studies* 49.2: 167-188.
- Gehlbach, Scott and Keefer, Philip. 2012. "Private Investment and the Institutionalization of Collective Action in Autocracies: Ruling Parties and Legislatures." *Journal of Politics* 74.2: 621-635.
- Gessen, Masha. 2020. *Surviving Autocracy*. New York: Riverhead Books.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gilbert, Jeremy. 2014. *Common Ground: Democracy and Collectivity in an Age of Individualism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ginty, Roger Mac. 2012. "Routine Peace: Technocracy and Peacebuilding." *Cooperation and Conflict* 47.3: 287-308.
- Gómez Bruera, Hernán F. 2013. *Lula, the Workers' Party and the Governability Dilemma in Brazil*. New York: Routledge.
- Graham, Loren R. 1993. *The Ghost of the Executed Engineer: Technology and the Fall of the Soviet Union*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Graham, Matthew H. and Svobik, Milan W. 2020. "Democracy in America? Partisanship, Polarization, and the Robustness of Support for Democracy in the United States." *American Political Science Review* 114.2: 392-409.
- Gross, Jonathan and Wilson, Nick. 2020. "Cultural Democracy: An Ecological and Capabilities Approach." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 26.3: 328-343.
- Gutmann, Amy and Thompson, Dennis. 1996. *Democracy and Disagreement*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, Amy and Thompson, Dennis. 2002. *Why Deliberative Democracy?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Haber, Samuel. 1964. *Efficiency and Uplift*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen. 2015. *The Lure of Technocracy*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- Haldane, Robert Burdome. 1918. *The Future of Democracy*. London: Headley Brothers Publishers.
- Halperin, Morton H., Siegle, Joseph T., and Weinstein, Michael M. 2005. *The Democracy Advantage: How Democracies Promote Prosperity and Peace*. New York: Routledge.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman. 1991. *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Hariri, Jacob. 2012. "The Autocratic Legacy of Early Statehood." *American Political Science Review* 106.3: 471-494.
- Held, David. 2006. *Models of Democracy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Herriges, Joseph, Kling, Catherine, Liu, Chih-Chen, and Tobias, Justin. 2010. "What Are the Consequences of Consequentiality?" *Journal of Environmental Economics & Management* 59.1: 67-81.
- Herron, Matthew D. 2016. "Fitness and Individuality in Complex Life Cycles." *Philosophy of Science* 83.5: 828-834.
- Hess, Kendy M., Ignieski, Violetta, and Isaacs, Tracy. Eds. 2018. *Collectivity: Ontology, Ethics, and Social Justice*. London: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Ho, C. S. Bryan. 2011. "Political Culture, Social Movements, and Governability in Macao." *Asian Affairs: An American Review* 38.2: 59-87.
- Hu, Yue. 2020. "Refocusing Democracy: the Chinese Government's Framing Strategy in Political Language." *Democratization* 27.2: 302-320.
- Huang, Pei. 1974. *Autocracy at Work: A Study of the Yung-cheng Period, 1723-1735*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

- Huddleston, Andrew. 2016. "Normativity and the Will to Power: Challenges for a Nietzschean Constitutivism." *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 47.3: 435-456.
- Hurley, Paul. 2009. *Beyond Consequentialism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Inglehart, Ronald. 1997. *Modernization and Post-Modernization: Cultural, Economic, and Political Change in 43 Societies*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Isakhan, Ben and Stockwell, Stephen. 2011. *The Secret History of Democracy*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Isenberg, Nancy and Burstein, Andrew. 2019. *The Problem of Democracy: The Presidents Adams Confront the Cult of Personality*. New York: Viking.
- Jäger, Heidi, Han, Chang, and Dingemanse, Niels. 2019. "Social Experiences Shape Behavioral Individuality and Within-Individual Stability." *Behavioral Ecology* 30.4: 1012-1019.
- James, William. 1960. *The Will to Believe, Human Immortality, and Other Essays in Popular Philosophy*. New York: Dove Publications.
- Jeffrey, Julie Roy. 2019. "They Cannot Expect ... That a Loyal People Will Tolerate the Utterance of Such Sentiments: The Campaign against Treasonous Speech during the Civil War." *Civil War History* 65.1: 7-42.
- Johnston, Sean F. 2017. "Technological Parables and Iconic Illustrations: American Technocracy and the Rhetoric of the Technological Fix." *History & Technology* 33.2: 196-219.
- Jones, Barry. 1996. *Sleepers, Wake! Technology and the Future of Work*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Garrett. 2020. *10% Less Democracy: Why You Should Trust Elites a Little More and the Masses a Little Less*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Joshi, Devin K., Maloy, J.S., and Peterson, Timothy M. 2019. "Popular versus Elite Democracies and Human Rights: Inclusion Makes a Difference." *International Studies Quarterly* 63.1: 111-126.
- Kaminski, Andrzej. 1992. *Republic vs. Autocracy: Poland-Lithuania and Russia, 1686-1697*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute.
- Kateb, George. 2019. "Individuality and Loyalty to Truth under Tyranny." *Social Research* 86.3: 607-632.
- Kendall-Taylor, Andrea and Frantz, Erica. 2014. "Mimicking Democracy to Prolong Autocracies." *Washington Quarterly* 37.4: 71-84.

- Kendall-Taylor, Andrea, Frantz, Erica, and Wright, Joseph. 2020. "The Digital Dictators: How Technology Strengthens Autocracy." *Foreign Affairs* 99.2: 103-115.
- Kendon, Adam. 2004. *Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kenneally, Ivan. 2009. "Technocracy and Populism." *The New Atlantis* 24.1: 46-60.
- Khan, L. Ali. 2003. *A Theory of Universal Democracy: Beyond the End of History*. Leiden, Netherlands: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Kmezić, Marko. 2020. "Rule of Law and Democracy in the Western Balkans: Addressing the Gap between Policies and Practice." *Journal of Southeast European & Black Sea Studies* 20.1: 183-198.
- Knott, Martin Otero. 2014. "Mandeville on Governability." *Journal of Scottish Philosophy* 12.1: 19-49.
- Köchler, Hans. 1987. *The Crisis of Representative Democracy*. Pieterlen, Switzerland: Peter Lang.
- Kockelman, Paul. 2013. *Agent, Person, Subject, Self: A Theory of Ontology, Interaction, and Infrastructure*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kohli, Atul. 1990. *Democracy and Discontent: India's Growing Crisis of Governability*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Köllner, Patrick and Kailitz, Steffen. 2013. "Comparing Autocracies: Theoretical Issues and Empirical Analyses." *Democratization* 20.1: 1-12.
- Kosec, Katrina and Mogues, Tewodaj. 2020. "Decentralization Without Democracy." *World Politics* 72.2: 165-213.
- Kouba, Karel and Došek, Tomáš. 2018. "Fragmentation of Presidential Elections and Governability Crises in Latin America: A Curvilinear Relationship?" *Democratization* 25.7: 1270-1290.
- Krasner, Stephen D. 2020. "Learning to Live with Despots: The Limits of Democracy Promotion." *Foreign Affairs* 99.2: 49-55.
- Kretchmar, R. Scott. 2005. *Practical Philosophy of Sport and Physical Activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kroenig, Matthew. 2020. *The Return of Great Power Rivalry: Democracy versus Autocracy from the Ancient World to the U.S. and China*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Landoe Hedrick, Lisa. 2016. "The Structure of Rationality and the Ideal of Aesthetic Harmony in Whitehead's Pragmatic Philosophical Theology." *Process Studies* 45.2: 223-235.
- Lauffer, Armand. 2011. *Understanding Your Social Agency*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- LeComte, Robert S., Sofis, Michael J., and Jarmolowicz, David P. 2020. "Independent Effects of Ideal Body Image Valuation and Delay Discounting on Proximal and Typical Levels of Physical Activity." *Psychological Record* 70.1: 75-82.
- Lee, Alexander. 2011. "Attractions of Autocracy." *History Today* 61.7: 18-25.
- Levitsky, Steven and Ziblatt, Daniel. 2018. *How Democracies Die*. New York: Broadway Books.
- Lijphart, Arend. 1999. *Patterns of Democracy: Government Forms and Performance in Thirty-Six Countries*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1959. "Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy." *American Political Science Review* 53.1: 69-105.
- Liu, Youngmou. 2016. "The Benefits of Technocracy in China." *Issues in Science and Technology* 33.1: 25- 28.
- Loeb, Harold. 1996. *Life in a Technocracy: What It Might Be Like (Utopianism and Communitarianism)*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Luo, Zhaotian and Przeworski, Adam. 2019. "Why Are the Fastest Growing Countries Autocracies?" *Journal of Politics* 81.2: 663-669.
- Luo, Zhitian. 2019. "Wholeness and individuality: Revisiting the New Culture Movement as Symbolized by May Fourth." *Chinese Studies in History* 52.3/4:188-208.
- Lynch, Kevin. 2017. "The Divisibility of Basic Actions." *Analysis* 77.2: 312-318.
- Lynn, Barry C. 2020. *Liberty from All Masters: The New American Autocracy vs the Will of the People*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Maboudi, Tofigh. 2020. "Participation, Inclusion, and the Democratic Content of Constitutions." *Studies in Comparative International Development* 55.1: 48-76.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 1988. *Whose Justice? Which Rationality?* Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Macpherson, C. B. 1977. *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Maduro, Peter N. 2019. "The Experience of Relationally Embedded Individuality and the Analytic Attitude of Affect-Respect That Fosters It." *Psychoanalytic Inquiry* 39.5: 335-343.
- Magaloni, Beatriz. 2006. *Voting for Autocracy: Hegemonic Party Survival and its Demise in Mexico*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Makowsky, Michael D. and Smaldino, Paul E. 2016. "The Evolution of Power and the Divergence of Cooperative Norms." *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 126: 75-88.
- Malešević, Sinisa and Haugaard, Mark. Eds. 2002. *Making Sense of Collectivity: Ethnicity, Nationalism and Globalisation*. London: Pluto Press.
- Manning, Erin and Massumi, Brian. 2014. *Thought in the Act: Passages in the Ecology of Experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Marom, Amnon. 2014. "Universality, Particularity, and Potentiality: The Sources of Human Divergence as Arise from Wilhelm Dilthey's Writings." *Human Studies* 37.1: 1-13.
- Martin, Peter J. and Dennis, Alex. Eds. 2010. *Human Agents and Social Structures*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.
- Martine, Brian John. 1984. *Individuals and Individuality*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Mayr, Erasmus. 2011. *Understanding Human Agency*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- McCole, John. 2019. "Georg Simmel: Decentering the Self and Recovering Authentic Individuality." *Germanic Review* 94.2: 151-162.
- McDonnell, Duncan and Valbruzzi, Marco. 2014. "Defining and Classifying Technocrat-Led and Technocratic Governments." *European Journal of Political Research* 53.4: 654-671.
- McKenna, Bernard J. and Graham, Philip. 2000. "Technocratic Discourse: A Primer." *Journal of Technical Writing and Communication* 30.3: 223-251.
- Mead, George Herbert. 1938. *Philosophy of the Act*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mele, Alfred R. Ed. 1997. *The Philosophy of Action*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Melville, Andrei, Stukal, Denis, and Mironiuk, Mikhail. 2014. "King of the Mountain, or Why Post-Communist Autocracies Have Bad Institutions." *Russian Politics & Law* 52.2: 7-29.
- Mercer, Jarred A. 2019. *Divine Perfection and Human Potentiality: The Trinitarian Anthropology of Hilary of Poitiers*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Meyer, John M. 2020. "The Politics of the 'Post-Political' Contesting the Diagnosis." *Democratization* 27.3: 408-425.
- Mikkelsen, Henrik Hvenegaard. 2017. "Never Too Late for Pleasure: Aging, Neoliberalism, and the Politics of Potentiality in Denmark." *American Ethnologist* 44.4: 646-656.

- Miller, Michael K. 2020. "The Autocratic Ruling Parties Dataset: Origins, Durability, and Death." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 64.4: 756-782.
- Mitchell, Neil J. 2004. *Agents of Atrocity: Leaders, Followers, and the Violation of Human Rights in Civil War*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moen, Lars J. K. 2019. "Redundant Group Agency." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 49.5: 364-384.
- Moore, Alfred. 2017. *Critical Elitism: Deliberation, Democracy, and the Problem of Expertise*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, Edmund. 1989. *Inventing the People: The Rise of Popular Sovereignty in England and America*. New York: Norton.
- Mosley, Ivo. 2003. *Democracy, Fascism, and the New World Order*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.
- Mosley, Ivo. 2013. *In the Name of the People*. Exeter, UK: Imprint Academic.
- Moss, David A. 2017. *Moss Democracy: A Case Study*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Moss, Peter. 2014. *Transformative Change and Real Utopias in Early Childhood Education: A Story of Democracy, Experimentation and Potentiality*. New York: Routledge.
- Muller, Richard A. 2017. *Divine Will and Human Choice: Freedom, Contingency, and Necessity in Early Modern Reformed Thought*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Publishing.
- Nabi-Abdolyousefi, Marzieh. 2014. *Controllability, Identification, and Randomness in Distributed Systems*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Nelson, Daniel. 1978. "Technocratic Abundance." *Reviews in American History* 6.1: 104-108.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1966. *Beyond Good and Evil*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 2019. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Ottawa, Canada: East India Publishing.
- Njalsson, Gunnar K.A. 2005. "From Autonomous to Socially Conceived Technology: Toward a Causal, Intentional and Systematic Analysis of Interests and Elites in Public Technology Policy." *Theoria: A Journal of Political Theory* 52.108: 56-81.
- North, Christopher Titus. 2005. "From Technocracy to Aristocracy: The Changing Career Paths of Japanese Politicians." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 5.2: 239-272.
- Notebaert, Lies, Georgiades, Jessie Veronica, Herbert, Matthew, Grafton, Ben, Parsons, Sam, Fox, Elaine, and MacLeod, Colin. 2020. "Trait

- Anxiety and the Alignment of Attentional Bias with Controllability of Danger.” *Psychological Research* 84.3: 743-756.
- Nozick, Robert. 1993. *The Nature of Rationality*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- O’Brien, Lilian. 2015. *Philosophy of Action*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Olson, Mancur. 1993. “Dictatorship, Democracy, and Development.” *The American Political Science Review* 87.3: 567-576.
- Ong, Lynette. 2006. “Multiple Principals and Collective Action: China’s Rural Credit Cooperatives and Poor Households’ Access to Credit.” *Journal of East Asian Studies* 6.2: 177-204.
- Qvortrup, Matt, O’Leary, Brendan, and Wintrobe, Ronald. 2020. “Explaining the Paradox of Plebiscites.” *Government and Opposition* 55.2: 202-219.
- Palombella, Gianluigi. 2019. “Two Threats to the Rule of Law: Legal and Epistemic (Between Technocracy and Populism).” *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 11.2/3: 383-388.
- Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula. Ed. 2014. *Constructing Collectivity: ‘We’ across Languages and Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Peng, Yongbo and Li, Jie. 2019. *Stochastic Optimal Control of Structures*. Singapore: Springer Nature.
- Phongpaichit, Pasuk and Baker, Chris. 2014. “A Short Account of the Rise and Fall of the Thai Technocracy.” *Southeast Asian Studies* 3.2: 283-298.
- Picciotto, Sol. 2015. “Indeterminacy, Complexity, Technocracy and the Reform of International Corporate Taxation.” *Social & Legal Studies* 24.2: 165-184.
- Pink, Thomas and Stone, M.W.F. Eds. 2003. *The Will and Human Action: From Antiquity to the Present Day*. London: Routledge.
- Plattner, Marc F. and Espada, João Carlos. 2000. *The Democratic Invention*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Plattner, Marc F. and Smolar, Aleksander. 2000. *Globalization, Power, and Democracy*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Portmore, Douglas W. 2011. *Commonsense Consequentialism: Wherein Morality Meets Rationality*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Przeworski, Adam. 2019. *Crises of Democracy*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Putnam, Robert. 2001. *Making Democracy Work*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

- Raaflaub, Kurt A., Ober, Josiah, and Wallace, Robert W. 2007. *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Raco, Mike and Savini, Federico. 2019. *Planning and Knowledge: How New Forms of Technocracy Are Shaping Contemporary Cities*. Bristol, UK: Bristol University Press.
- Rayman, Joshua. 2016. "Will to Power as Alternative to Causality." *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 30.3: 361-372.
- Riker, William H. 1962. *The Theory of Political Coalitions*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Ríos-Figueroa, Julio and Aguilar, Paloma. 2018. "Justice Institutions in Autocracies: A Framework for Analysis." *Democratization* 25.1: 1-18.
- Roets, Arne, Bostyn, Dries, De keersmaecker, Jonas, Van Assche, Jasper, and Van Hiel, Alain. 2019. "Generalized Ingroup-Stereotyping as a Response to Perceived Individual Failure." *Personality & Individual Differences* 145: 15-18.
- Roller, Matthew B. 2001. *Constructing Autocracy: Aristocrats and Emperors in Julio-Claudian Rome*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenthal, Maoz. 2017. *Israel's Governability Crisis: Quandaries, Unstructured Institutions, and Adaptation*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Ryde, Gemma C., Atkinson, Patricia, Stead, Martine, Gorely, Trish, and Evans, Josie M. M. 2020. "Physical Activity in Paid Work Time for Desk-Based Employees: A Qualitative Study of Employers' and Employees' Perspectives." *BMC Public Health* 20.1: 1-10.
- Schaub, Laird. 2017. "Community as Economic Engine." *Communities* 175: 26-30.
- Scheffler, Samuel. 1988. *Consequentialism and its Critics*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schelly, Chelsea. 2016. *Crafting Collectivity: American Rainbow Gatherings and Alternative Forms of Community*. New York: Routledge.
- Schneider, Nathan. 2017. "How Communists and Catholics Built a Commonwealth." *America* 6: 18-26.
- Scicluna, Nicole and Auer, Stefan. 2019. "From the Rule of Law to the Rule of Rules: Technocracy and the Crisis of EU Governance." *West European Politics* 42.7: 1420-1442.
- Sebo, Jeff. 2017. "Agency and Moral Status." *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 14.1: 1-22.
- Seidel, Christian. Ed. 2019. *Consequentialism: New Directions, New Problems*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Sen, Amartya K. 1999. "Democracy as a Universal Value." *Journal of Democracy* 10.3: 3-17.
- Shaw, Victor N. 2004. *Career-Making in Postmodern Academic: Process, Structure, and Consequence*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishing Group.
- Shaw, Victor N. 2013. *Conspicuous and Inconspicuous Discriminations in Everyday Life*. New York: Routledge.
- Shaw, Victor N. 2019. *Three Worlds of Collective Human Experience: Individual Life, Social Change, and Human Evolution*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Shepsle, Kenneth A. 2010. *Analyzing Politics: Rationality, Behavior and Institutions*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Skattebol, Jennifer, Redmond, Gerry, and Zizzo, Gabriella. 2017. "Expanding Children's Agency: Cases of Young People Experiencing Economic Adversity." *Children & Society* 31.4: 315-329.
- Sigman, Stuart J. Ed. 2009. *The Consequentiality of Communication*. New York: Routledge.
- Simonen, Mika. 2016. "Social Identity and Procedural Consequentiality in Welfare Interviews." *Text & Talk* 36.5: 589-612.
- Sinnreich, Aram, Lingel, Jessa, Lichfield, Gideon, Rottinghaus, Adam Richard, and Avi Brooks, Lonny J. 2015. "Everybody and Nobody: Visions of Individualism and Collectivity in the Age of AI." *A Review of General Semantics* 72.4: 320-336.
- Smith, Michael G. 1988. "Marx, Technocracy, and the Corporatist Ethos." *Studies in Soviet Thought* 36.4: 233-250.
- Smithies, Declan and Weiss, Jeremy. 2019. "Affective Experience, Desire, and Reasons for Action." *Analytic Philosophy* 60.1: 27-54.
- Song, Wonjun and Wright, Joseph. 2018. "The North Korean Autocracy in Comparative Perspective." *Journal of East Asian Studies* 18.2: 157-180.
- Sorabji, Richard. 2006. *Self: Ancient and Modern Insights about Individuality, Life, and Death*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Stabile, Donald R. 1986. "Veblen and the Political Economy of the Engineer: The Radical Thinker and Engineering Leaders Came to Technocratic Ideas at the Same Time." *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* 45.1: 41-52.
- Stanley, Jason. 2018. *How Fascism Works: The Politics of Us and Them*. New York: Random House.
- Stasavage, David. 2020. *The Decline and Rise of Democracy: A Global History from Antiquity to Today*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Stein, Edith. 2011. *Potency and Act*. Washington, DC: ICS Publications.

- Sterenbergh, Matthew. 2019. "John Macmurray and the Politics of Rationality in Interwar Britain." *History of European Ideas* 45.5: 737-753.
- Strandberg, Caj. 2017. "A Puzzle about Reasons and Rationality." *Journal of Ethics* 21.1: 63-88.
- Sunstein, Cass R. 2017. *Human Agency and Behavioral Economics: Nudging Fast and Slow*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tak, Sangdong. 2017. "Cooperative Membership and Community Engagement: Findings from a Latin American Survey." *Sociological Forum* 32.3: 566-586.
- Takano, Yohtaro and Osaka, Eiko. 2018. "Comparing Japan and the United States on Individualism/Collectivism: A Follow-up Review." *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 21.4: 301- 316.
- Tannsjo, Torbjorn. 2008. *Global Democracy: The Case for a World Government*. Edinburgh, UK: Edinburgh University Press.
- Taylor, Astra. 2019. *Democracy May Not Exist, but We'll Miss It When It's Gone*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Thompson, Dennis. 1970. *The Democratic Citizen: Social Science and Democratic Theory in the 20th Century*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Tian, Lingling, Guan, Yongqiang, and Wang, Long. 2020. "Controllability and Observability of Multi Agent Systems with Heterogeneous and Switching Topologies." *International Journal of Control* 93.3: 437-448.
- Tilman, Rick. 1992. *Thorstein Veblen and His Critics, 1891-1963: Conservative, Liberal, and Radical Perspectives*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Tocqueville, Alexis de. 2000. *Democracy in America*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Truex, Rory. 2016. *Making Autocracy Work: Representation and Responsiveness in Modern China*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Uleman, James S. 2018. "I/C: Individualism/Collectivism or Individuate/Categorize?" *Asian Journal of Social Psychology* 21.4: 317-323.
- Ullmann-Margalit, Edna. 2017. *Normal Rationality: Decisions and Social Order*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Vetter, Barbara. 2015. *Potentiality: From Dispositions to Modality*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Vigoda-Gadot, Eran. 2016. *Building Strong Nations: Improving Governability and Public Management*. New York: Routledge.
- Volk, Kyle G. 2014. *Moral Minorities and the Making of American Democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

- Vu, Thi Hoang Lan, Bui, Thi Tu Quyen, Nguyen, Thi Kim Ngan, and Hoang, Van Minh. 2020. "Adverse Influence of Multilevel Socioeconomic Status on Physical Activity: Results from a National Survey in Vietnam." *BMC Public Health* 20.1: 1-9.
- Waghid, Yusef. 2015. "On the (Im)potentiality of an African Philosophy of Education to Disrupt Inhumanity." *Educational Philosophy & Theory* 47.11: 1234-1240.
- Way, Lucan. 2016. "Weaknesses of Autocracy Promotion." *Journal of Democracy* 27.1: 64-75.
- Weatherford, Jack. 1990. *Indian Givers: How the Indians Transformed the World*. New York: Fawcett Columbine.
- Weingast, Barry. 1997. "The Political Foundations of the Rule of Law and Democracy." *American Political Science Review* 91.2: 245-263.
- Weng, Jeffrey. 2020. "Uneasy Companions: Language and Human Collectivities in the Remaking of Chinese Society in the Early Twentieth Century." *Theory & Society* 49.1: 75-100.
- Whitehead, Laurence. 2002. *Emerging Market Democracies: East Asia and Latin America*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Whitehead, Mark, Jones, Rhys, Lilley, Rachel, Howell, Rachel, and Pykett, Jessica. 2019. "Neoliberalism: Cognition, Context, and the Geographical Bounding of Rationality." *Progress in Human Geography* 43. 4: 632-649.
- Wilentz, Sean. 2005. *The Rise of American Democracy: Jefferson to Lincoln*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Willard, Charles Arthur. 1996. *Liberalism and the Problem of Knowledge: A New Rhetoric for Modern Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams, Mark Eric. 2006. "Escaping the Zero-Sum Scenario: Democracy versus Technocracy in Latin America." *Political Science Quarterly* 121.1: 119-139.
- Witzel, Herman. 2020. *A Pragmatic Approach to Agency in Group Activity*. Berlin: Water de Gruyter.
- Wolkenstein, Fabio. 2020. "The Revival of Democratic Intergovernmentalism, First Principles and the Case for a Contest-Based Account of Democracy in the European Union." *Political Studies* 68.2: 408-425.
- Wong, Daniel W., Hall, Kimberly R., Justice, Cheryl A., and Hernandez, Lucy Wong. 2015. *Counseling Individuals through the Lifespan*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wood, Ellen M. 1995. *Democracy Against Capitalism: Renewing Historical Materialism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Wood, Gordon S. 1991. *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Wood, Patrick M. 2018. *Technocracy: The Hard Road to World Order*. Mesa, AZ: Coherent Publishing.
- Wright, Claire. 2015. *Emergency Politics in the Third Wave of Democracy: A Study of Regimes of Exception in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Yakouchyk, Katsiaryna. 2019. "Beyond Autocracy Promotion: A Review." *Political Studies Review* 17.2: 147-160.
- Yanov, Alexander. 1981. *The Origins of Autocracy: Ivan the Terrible in Russian History*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Zavatta, Benedetta. 2019. *Individuality and Beyond: Nietzsche Reads Emerson*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Zhang, Zhihui. 2017. "Technocracy Chinese style." *Issues in Science and Technology* 33.3: 18.
- Zhu, Qin and Olson, Richard. 2017. "Chinese Technocracy." *Issues in Science and Technology* 33.2: 14-16.
- Zohny, Ahmed Y. 2019. "The Balancing Act in a Military-Dominated Transition to Democracy in Egypt After the Arab." *DOMES: Digest of Middle East Studies* 28.1: 89-106.

INDEX

- Absolutism, 52
Achen, Christopher H., 106
Ackerman, Bruce, 129, 130
Actions of Impulsivity versus
 Rationality, 212
Actions of Inner Dynamics versus
 Outer Pressures, 215
Actions of Personality versus
 Collectivity, 213
Acts in Effect, 37
Acts in Society, 34
Acts of Futility, 38
Acts on Nature, 33
Acts out of Habits, 35
Acts toward Goals, 36
Actualization toward Death, 11
Adams, 85
Agamben, Giorgio, 191
Aguilar, Paloma, 41, 52
Akbarzadeh, Shahram, 31
Akin, William E., 129, 142
al-Assad, Bashar, 60
Allah, 10, 54, 202, 204
Almor, Amit, 212
Anderson, Judith, 3, 22
Andrews, Joel, 129, 154
Appleby, Joyce, 83, 106
Archibugi, Daniele, 106
Arctic Ocean, 25
Atkinson, Patricia, 31
Auer, Stefan, 154
Autocrats by Birth, 42
Autocrats by Selection, 43
Autocrats of Charisma, 44
Autocrats of Experience, 45
Autocracy through Expansion, 50
Autocracy through Isolation, 49
Autocracy upon Social Elites, 47
Autocracy upon Political Parties, 48
Autocratic Actions, 216
Autocratic Collectives, 185
Autocratic personality, 224
Autocratic Potentials, 195
Autocratic Rationales, 205
Avi Brooks, Lonny J., 180
Badaki, Oreoluwa, 180
Bader, Julia, 52
Bailey, John, 3, 13
Baker, Chris, 154
Baker, Gideon, 191
Balance of Power, 114
Balcerak Jackson, Brendan, 22
Barlow, Rebecca, 31
Bartels, Larry M., 83, 106, 117
Becker, Peter, 84
Bell, Daniel, 41, 42, 129, 130
Benhabib, Seyla, 95
Berger, Harry Jr., 3, 22
Bernstein, Richard J., 3, 31
Berry, Sharon, 191
Bi, Chongzeng, 179
Blattberg, Charles, 41, 63
Birch, Anthony H., 83, 117
Bostyn, Dries, 31
Bourrat, Pierrick, 3, 4
Boyle, Matthew, 201
Brennan, Jason, 83, 117
Buchak, Lara, 201
Buddha, 10, 54, 204
Bui, Thi Tu Quyen, 31
Burris, Beverly H., 130
Burstein, Andrew, 95
Bush, 85
Bush, Stephen S., 3, 4

- California, 85
 Campano, Gerald, 180
 Carothers, Thomas, 106
 Carston, Robyn, 3, 22
 Ceka, Besir, 84
 Centralization of Power, 68
 Change of Government, 115
 Chen, Feifei, 179
 Cheng, Li, 142
 Cheng, Wei, 212
 Chicago, 85
 China, 47, 226
 Chou, Mark, 41, 73
 Cian, Luca, 201
 Collectives by Functionality, 183
 Collectives for a Purpose, 180
 Collectives toward a Goal, 181
 Collectivity in Terms of Science,
 189
 Collectivity upon Fact, 188
 College of Cardinals, 44
 Collins, Paul David, 63
 Collins, Phillip Darrell, 63
 Commoners, 76
 Compromise, 112
 Consequentiality toward Nature,
 221
 Consequentiality upon Humankind,
 219
 Conversion of Power to Service,
 163
 Copp, David, 84
 Corbett, Jack, 84
 Cost, 73
 Costopoulos, Philip, 95
 Crinean, Marcelle, 212
 Crozier, Michel, 13
 Cult of Personality, 63
 Curato, Nicole, 95

 Dahl, Robert A., 84
 Dalai Lama, 43
 Dancy, Jonathan, 212
 Davenport, Christian, 41, 52, 63
 Davidson, Donald, 201

 de Boer, Bas, 180
 De Cleen, Benjamin, 95
 De keersmaecker, Jonas, 31
 Dedon, Theodore, 154
 Demange, Dominique, 212
 Democracy through Inner
 Sufficiency, 92
 Democracy through Outer Alliance,
 93
 Democracy upon Powerful Interests,
 89
 Democracy upon Prevailing
 Parities, 90
 Democratic Actions, 217
 Democratic Collectives, 186
 Democratic Potentials, 196
 Democratic Rationales, 206
 Democrats by Association, 84
 Democrats by Representation, 85
 Democrats of Achieved Deeds, 88
 Democrats of Ascribed Traits, 87
 Dennis, Alex, 179
 Diamond, Larry, 83, 95, 106
 Dingemans, Niels, 4
 Discovery of the New World, 60
 Diyala, 59
 Donahue, Sean, 201
 Došek, Tomáš, 3, 13
 Dukalskis, Alexander, 42, 63

 Eckersley, Robyn, 83, 117
 Enforcement through a Built-In
 Mechanism, 70
 Engelhard, Kristina, 191
 Enlightenment, 60
 Equilibrium of Government, 164
 Ernst, Ricardo, 13
 Esmark, Anders, 142
 Espada, João Carlos, 106
 Evans, Josie M.M., 31
 Everdell, William R., 42
 Evil of Power, 60
 External Acts, 32

- Fargues, Émilien, 212
 Feldmann, Andreas E., 95, 117
 Fink, Julian, 201
 Fischer, Frank, 129, 154
 Following as an Exercise of
 Individual Rights and
 Obligations, 99
 Following as Embodiment of
 Existence and Evolution, 55
 Fox, Elaine, 22
 Frantz, Erica, 41, 42, 63, 73
 Freud, Sigmund, 3, 4
 Friedman, Jeffrey, 129, 166
 Frogel, Shai, 3, 13
 Fuller, Martin, 191
 Fukuyama, Francis, 83, 117
- Gabardi, Wayne, 117
 Gaddafi, Muammar, 60
 Garnham, Alan, 212
 Garrido, Daniel Rueda, 212
 Gehlbach, Scott, 41, 42
 General Secretary of the Communist
 Party, 44
 Georgiades, Jessie Veronica, 22
 Gerschewski, Johannes, 42, 63
 Gessen, Masha, 41, 73
 Ghiso, Maria Paula, 180
 Giddens, Anthony, 179
 Gilbert, Jeremy, 180
 Ginty, Roger Mac, 129, 166
 God, 10, 27, 53, 54, 204
 Gómez Bruera, Hernán F., 13
 Goodson, Roy, 3, 13
 Gorbachev, Mikhail, 44
 Gorely, Trish, 31
 Governed as Maintenance of Social
 Routines, 147
 Governing as Administration of
 Civil Affairs, 145
 Grafton, Ben, 22
 Graham, Loren R., 129, 142
 Graham, Matthew H., 117
 Graham, Philip, 129, 154
 Grand Canal of China, 59
- Grävingsholt, Jörn, 52
 Great Pyramid of Giza, 59
 Gross, Jonathan, 106
 Group Interests, 107
 Groups, 77
 Groups and Groupings, 118
 Guan, Yongqiang, 22
 Gunther, Richard, 106
 Gutmann, Amy, 83, 94, 117
- Haar, Jerry, 13
 Haber, Samuel, 41, 52
 Habermas, Jürgen, 129, 166
 Haldane, Robert Burdome, 84
 Hall, Kimberly R., 4
 Halperin, Morton H., 106
 Hampton, Jean, 84
 Han, Chang, 4
 Hansen, Mogens Herman, 83, 84
 Hariri, Jacob, 63
 Harrison, 85
 Haugaard, Mark, 180
 Heideking, Juergen, 84
 Held, David, 83, 84
 Henretta, James A., 84
 Herbert, Matthew, 22
 Hernandez, Lucy Wong, 4
 Herriges, Joseph, 212
 Herron, Matthew D. 3, 4
 Hess, Kendy M., 180
 Ho, C.S. Bryan, 13
 Hoang, Van Minh, 31
 Howell, Rachel, 201
 Hu, Yue, 84
 Huang, Pei, 41, 63
 Huddleston, Andrew, 13
 Human Civilizations, 174
 Human Immersion in the Universe,
 175
 Human Individuals, 166
 Human Societies, 170
 Huntington, Samuel P., 13
 Hurley, Paul, 212
 Hussein, Saddam, 60

- Ideas and Ideology, 120
 Igeneski, Violetta, 180
 Individual Initiatives, 106
 Individuals and Individuality, 117
 Indus Valley, 59
 Industrial Revolution, 60
 Inevitable Beings, 4
 Inglehart, Ronald, 179
 Inner Wills, 13
 Institutions, 78
 Internal Acts, 31
 Iraq, 44, 60
 Isaacs, Tracy, 180
 Isakhan, Ben, 83, 95
 Isenberg, Nancy, 95
- Jäger, Heidi, 4
 James, William, 3, 13
 Jarmolowicz, David P., 31
 Jeffrey, Julie Roy., 22
 Johnston, Sean F., 129, 154
 Jones, Barry, 130
 Jones, Garrett, 95
 Jones, Rhys, 201
 Joshi, Devin K., 84
 Justice, Cheryl A., 4
- Kailitz, Steffen, 41, 73
 Kaminski, Andrzej, 41, 42
 Kannan, Chloe, 180
 Kästner, Antje, 52
 Kateb, George, 3, 4
 Kedar, Yael, 212
 Keefer, Philip, 41, 42
 Kendall-Taylor, Andrea, 41, 42, 63,
 73
 Kendon, Adam, 3, 22
 Kenneally, Ivan, 129, 166
 Kennedy, 85
 Khan, L. Ali, 83, 117
 Kim, Jong-Un, 43
 Kling, Catherine, 212
 Kmezić, Marko, 106
 Knott, Martin Otero, 13
- Köchler, Hans, 83, 95
 Kockelman, Paul, 3, 4
 Kohli, Atul, 3, 13
 Köllner, Patrick, 41, 73
 Kosec, Katrina, 42
 Kouba, Karel, 3, 13
 Krasner, Stephen D., 83, 117
 Kretchmar, R. Scott, 3, 31
 Krishna, Aradhna, 201
 Kroenig, Matthew, 41, 52
- Landoe Hedrick, Lisa, 201
 Lauffer, Armand, 179
 Leaders as Volunteers, 96
 Leading as a Representation of
 Collective Wills and Wishes, 97
 LeComte, Robert S., 31
 Lee, Alexander, 41, 73
 Levitsky, Steven, 83, 106
 Li, Jie, 22
 Libya, 60
 Lichfield, Gideon, 180
 Life as Routine, 169
 Lijphart, Arend, 83, 117
 Lilley, Rachel, 201
 Lingel, Jessa, 180
 Lipset, Seymour Martin, 83, 95
 Liu, Chih-Chen, 212
 Liu, Youngmou, 129, 142
 Loeb, Harold, 129, 142
 Los Angeles, 85
 Luo, Zhaotian, 42
 Luo, Zhitian, 4
 Lynch, Kevin, 212
 Lynn, Barry C., 73
- Maboudi, Tofigh, 84
 MacIntyre, Alasdair, 201
 MacLeod, Colin, 22
 Macpherson, C.B., 83, 84
 Maduro, Peter N., 4
 Magalhaes, Pedro C., 84
 Magaloni, Beatriz, 41, 42
 Makowsky, Michael D., 180

- Malesevic, Sinisa, 180
 Maloy, J.S., 84
 Manning, Erin, 3, 31
 Marom, Amnon, 191
 Martin, Peter J., 179
 Martine, Brian John, 3, 4
 Massumi, Brian, 3, 31
 Mayr, Erasmus, 179
 McCole, John, 3, 4
 McDonnell, Duncan, 142
 McKenna, Bernard J., 129, 154
 Mead, George Herbert, 3, 31
 Mele, Alfred R., 211
 Melville, Andrei, 52, 63
 Mercer, Jarred A., 191
 Merke, Federico, 95, 117
 Meyer, John M., 129, 130, 154, 166
 Mikkelsen, Henrik Hvenegaard, 191
 Miller, Michael K., 41, 63
 Mironiuk, Mikhail, 52, 63
 Mitchell, Neil J., 41, 73
 Moen, Lars J.K., 179
 Moffitt, Benjamin, 95
 Mogues, Tewodaj, 42
 Mohenjo-daro, 59
 Moore, Alfred, 83, 84
 Morgan, Edmund, 53, 106
 Mosley, Ivo, 41, 52, 83, 84, 106
 Moss, David A., 95, 191
 Moss, Peter, 191
 Muller, Richard A., 3, 13
- Nabi-Abdolyousefi, Marzieh, 22
 Natural Ego, 8
 Needing Individuals, 7
 Neighbors, 79
 Nelson, Daniel, 129, 154
 Neutrality of Power, 151
 New York, 85
 Nguyen, Thi Kim Ngan, 31
 Nietzsche, Friedrich, 3, 13, 166
 Njalsson, Gunnar K. A., 166
 North, Christopher Titus, 129, 130
 North Korea, 43, 60
 Notebaert, Lies, 22
- Nozick, Robert, 201
- Ober, Josiah, 83, 95
 O'Brien, Lilian, 212
 O'Donohue, Andrew, 106
 Officials as Professionals, 144
 O'Leary, Brendan, 95
 Olson, Mancur, 41, 52
 Olson, Richard, 130
 Ong, Lynette, 180
 Osaka, Eiko, 3, 4
 Outer Wills, 14
- Palombella, Gianluigi, 130
 Pan, Chengxin, 41, 73
 Panayotu, Panos, 95
 Parsons, Sam, 22
 Partisan Doctrines, 109
 Pavlidou, Theodossia-Soula, 180
 Peng, Yongbo, 22
 Peterson, Timothy M., 84
 Phongpaichit, Pasuk, 154
 Picciotto, Sol, 130
 Pink, Thomas, 3, 13
 Place and Situations, 122
 Plattner, Marc F., 83, 95, 106
 Policymaking by Top-Design, 69
 Politicking and Politics, 123
 Poole, Avery, 41, 73
 Pope, 44
 Portmore, Douglas W., 212
 Potentiality across Existence, 198
 Potentiality at Birth, 10
 Potentiality through Evolution, 199
 Potentials as a Species, 193
 Potentials by Individuals, 191
 Potentials from Collectives, 192
 Professional Codes of Conduct, 156
 Progression of Technocratic
 Functionaries, 161
 Propaganda, 64
 Przeworski, Adam, 42, 106
 Public Conscience, 157
 Public Opinions, 110

- Putnam, Robert, 83, 106
 Pykett, Jessica, 201
- Quante, Michael, 191
 Qvortrup, Matt, 95
- Raaflaub, Kurt A., 83, 95
 Raco, Mike, 142
 Random Individuals, 5
 Randomness of Selection, 102
 Rationales behind Actions, 202
 Rationales by Individuals versus
 Collectives, 201
 Rationales in Contexts, 204
 Rationality in Terms of Subjective
 Experience, 210
 Rationality upon Objective
 Evidence, 208
 Rayman, Joshua, 13
 Redmond, Gerry, 179
 Reformation, 60
 Ren, Julie, 191
 Renaissance, 59
 Riker, William H., 83, 106
 Ríos-Figueroa, Julio, 41, 52
 Roemer, John E., 84
 Roets, Arne, 31
 Roller, Matthew B., 41, 73
 Roman Catholic Church, 44
 Roosevelt, 85
 Rosenthal, Maoz, 3, 13
 Rottinghaus, Adam Richard, 180
 Routinization of Governance, 160
 Rule of Terror, 67
 Ruler as God, 53
 Rulers, 75
 Ruling as Revelation of Truth and
 Wisdom, 54
 Ryde, Gemma C., 31
- Sandis, Constantine, 212
 Savini, Federico, 142
 Schaub, Laird, 180
- Scheffler, Samuel, 212
 Schelly, Chelsea, 180
 Schneider, Nathan, 180
 Schwarz, Norbert, 201
 Scicluna, Nicole, 154
 Sebo, Jeff, 179
 Seidel, Christian, 212
 Sen, Amartya K., 106
 Shaw, Victor N., 3, 4, 13, 22, 41,
 52, 63, 73, 83, 84, 95, 106, 117,
 129, 130, 142, 154, 166, 179,
 180, 191, 201, 212
 Shepsle, Kenneth A., 201
 Skattebol, Jennifer, 179
 Siegle, Joseph T., 106
 Sigman, Stuart J., 212
 Simonen, Mika, 212
 Sinnreich, Aram, 180
 Smaldino, Paul E., 180
 Smith, Michael G., 129, 130
 Smithies, Declan, 212
 Smolar, Aleksander, 95
 Social Civility, 158
 Social Identity, 9
 Society, 80
 Society and Social Movements, 125
 Sofis, Michael J., 31
 Song, Wonjun, 41, 73
 Sorabji, Richard, 3, 4
 Soviet Union, 44, 60
 Stabile, Donald R., 129, 166
 Stanley, Jason, 63
 Stasavage, David, 106
 States of Affairs Assumed as
 Objectivity, 149
 States of Affairs Assumed as
 Sanctified, 58
 States of Affairs upon Creation, 101
 Stavrakakis, Yannis, 95
 Stead, Martine, 31
 Stein, Edith, 3, 31
 Sterenberg, Matthew, 201
 Stockwell, Stephen, 83, 95
 Stone, M.W.F., 3, 13
 Strandberg, Caj, 201
 Strong Wills, 18

- Stuenkel, Oliver, 95, 117
 Stukal, Denis, 52, 63
 Succession, 71
 Sunstein, Cass R., 179
 Surveillance, 66
 Surviving Beings, 6
 Svolik, Milan W., 117
 Syria, 60
- Taft, 85
 Tak, Sangdong, 180
 Takano, Yohtaro, 3, 4
 Tannsjø, Torbjorn, 84
 Taylor, Astra, 83, 95, 117
 Te Molder, Hedwig, 180
 Technicality of Governance, 152
 Technocracy through Evolutionary
 Progressivity, 140
 Technocracy through Operational
 Excellence, 138
 Technocracy upon Civilian
 Maturity, 135
 Technocracy upon Institutional
 Stability, 137
 Technocratic Actions, 218
 Technocratic Collectives, 187
 Technocratic Potentials, 197
 Technocratic Rationales, 207
 Technocrats by Practice, 131
 Technocrats by Training, 130
 Technocrats of Civility, 133
 Technocrats of Service, 134
 Things Approached as Matters of
 Fact, 148
 Things in the Making, 100
 Things Taken for Granted, 56
 Thompson, Dennis, 83, 95, 117
 Tian, Lingling, 22
 Tigris, 59
 Tilman, Rick, 129, 166
 Time and Terms, 121
 Tobias, Justin, 212
 Tocqueville, Alexis de, 83, 84
 Truex, Rory, 41, 73
- Uleman, James S., 3, 4
 Ullmann-Margalit, Edna, 201
 Uncertainty of Governance, 104
 Union of Technocrats, 154
 United Nations, 94
 United States of America, 85, 227
- Valbruzzi, Marco, 142
 Van Assche, Jasper, 31
 Van Hiel, Alain, 31
 Verbeek, Peter-Paul, 180
 Vetter, Barbara, 191
 Vigoda-Gadot, Eran, 13
 Volk, Kyle G., 84
 Vu, Thi Hoang Lan, 31
- Waghid, Yusef, 191
 Wallace, Robert W., 83, 95
 Wang, Long, 22
 Waste and Excitement, 126
 Watanuki, Joji, 13
 Way, Lucan, 83, 117
 Weak Wills, 17
 Weatherford, Jack, 83, 117
 Weingast, Barry, 83, 95, 106
 Weinstein, Michael M., 106
 Weiss, Jeremy, 212
 Weng, Jeffrey, 180
 White, Lynn, 142
 Whitehead, Laurence, 106
 Whitehead, Mark, 201
 Wilentz, Sean, 83, 117
 Willard, Charles Arthur, 84
 Williams, Mark Eric, 129, 142
 Wills Here and Now, 19
 Wills Then and There, 20
 Wills to Command, 15
 Wills to Follow, 16
 Wilson, Nick, 106
 Winter, Elke, 212
 Wintrobe, Ronald, 95
 Witzel, Herman, 3, 31
 Wolkenstein, Fabio, 83, 117
 Wonder of Power, 59

- Wong, Daniel W., 4
Wood, Ellen M., 166
Wood, Gordon S., 95
Wood, Patrick M., 129, 142
Words in Private, 22
Words in Public, 23
Words of Affection, 24
Words of Defense, 27
Words of Description, 28
Words of Explanation, 29
Words of Logic, 25
Words of Offense, 26
Wright, Claire, 13, 83, 95
Wright, Joseph, 41, 63, 73
Yakouchyk, Katsiaryna, 41, 52, 73
Yanov, Alexander, 41, 73
Zavatta, Benedetta, 3, 4
Zhang, Zhihui, 166
Zhu, Qin, 179
Zhu, Shimin, 130
Ziblatt, Daniel, 83, 106
Ziggurat of Dur-Kurigalzu, 59
Zizzo, Gabriella, 179
Zohny, Ahmed Y., 106