Aircraftkiller wrote on Sat, 19 November 2011 03:37Which is still not the same as a pure democracy, as it has intrinsic checks and balances that do not exist in a state that is run by the tyranny of the majority.

You lose, sir. Good day!
What kind of checks do you mean? Yes, now we're forced to live the tyranny of the majority in the government. Only difference is that we get to choose who's *SHOULD BE* representing us.

Which makes the system worse, as we cannot hold the representative responsible DURING is time in the government. If he throws out all promises, then we're out of luck. Only thing that's left is not vote for him again, 4 years later.

Besides all this we are now ruled by the majority of representatives. How is that different from the people? Well, there's alot less direct influence.

If you are referring to the constitution then yes, that is a form of safeguard, however, that safeguard makes it technically less of a democracy. It also shows that it is necessary to have hard to change rules about what one/a government can and cannot do.

It works, but is hardly ideal since the best what we could do (if we weren't being zo collectively ignorant) is respect every individual. Now we have someone is telling us that we should get and give fair trails and such. Isn't it plain logic that these kinds of things should happen?

This my friend, shows the stupidity point. if we could *JUST GET ALONG*, behave like civilized beings and such, a constitution wouldn't be necessary. Since we're selfish and totally irrational, we need these safeguards.

Which isn't directly a problem, but as I stated, it's far from perfect or even good. It works, and yes, it's also the best system we have tried to date, but it's not perfect. That is something we should be aware of if we want to move forward with the society as a whole.

Edit: Now, please, try to be civilized and either quit the discussion or, better yet, return with arguments.