

Citation:

Muñoz, 2024. **Rethinking democracy 103: How can the present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law framework be used to point out key aspects related to the theoretical nature of democratic and non-democratic systems, their interactions, and implications.** In: *CEBEM-REDESMA Boletín*, Año 18, N° 10, La Paz, Bolivia.

Rethinking democracy 103: How can the present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law framework be used to point out key aspects related to the theoretical nature of democratic and non-democratic systems, their interactions, and implications.

By

Lucio Muñoz*

* Independent Qualitative Comparative Researcher / Consultant, Vancouver, BC, Canada Email: munoz@interchange.ubc.ca

Abstract

The present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law system quadrant-based framework(P-A-ETK-IRL framework) in terms of authoritarianism and democracy can be used to highlight different ways to appreciate the interaction between and within democratic and non-democratic based structures in order to point out their structure when in isolation and their structure when interacting with others so as to validate current knowledge and to unlock possible new knowledge or possibilities about the nature of democratic and non-democratic system and of competition implications. The goal of this paper is to stress the structure of those key aspects between democratic and non-democratic systems using the P-A-ETK-IRL framework one by one as well as to list relevant implications.

Key concepts

Democracy, perfect democracy, liberal democracy, normal liberal democracy, extreme liberal democracy, perfect authoritarianism, temporary authoritarianism, chaos, effective targeted chaos, Brexit, Usexit, exism movement, paradigm shift, normal democratic outcome, extreme democratic outcome.

Introduction

a) The P-A-ETK-IRL quadrant-based framework

The idea of setting the boundaries of democratic and non-democratic systems using the present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law quadrant-based framework (P-A-ETK-IRL) to capture their internal and external interactions has been recently shared (Muñoz 2024) as summarized in Figure 1 below:




Figure 1 The effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law system framework: EFK-IRL framework
Each quadrant Q_i contains a different social system SS_i

Figure 1 above displays the different social systems (SS_i) that fall in each quadrant Q_i ; and hence having effective targeted chaos (E) or not (e) and independent rule of law system (I) or no (i) as its boundaries. For example, the system in quadrant $Q4 = SS4$ has as its boundaries effective targeted chaos (E) and non-independent rule of law system (i)

Implication

The borders of each quadrant Q_i represent the necessary and sufficient conditions for each social system SS_i to come to exist and persist, for example when both the independent rule of law(I) and effective targeted chaos(E) are present we have a social system $SS3$.

b) The P-A-ETK-IRL quadrant-based framework in terms of democracy and authoritarianism

As a system SS_i where there is a need for permanent effective targeted chaos (E) to exist under a non-independent rule of law system (i) is under permanent authoritarianism (PA) and the

system where there is a need for permanent effective targeted chaos (E) to exist under an independent rule of law system (I) is under temporary authoritarianism (TA), this means that $Q4 = SS4 = PA$ and $Q3 = SS3 = TA$, respectively. On the other hand, a system SSi where there is no effective targeted chaos(e) and therefore there is no need for an independent rule of law system (i) to exist under is under perfect democracy (PD) authoritarianism (PA); and the system where there is no effective targeted chaos(e) under an independent rule of law system(I) is under liberal democracy thinking (LD), and this tells us that $Q1 = SS1 = PD$ and that $Q2 = SS2 = LD$, respectively. The situation above in terms of democratic and non-democratic systems ($Qi = SSi$) is summarized in Figure 2 below:




Figure 2 The effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law system framework: EFK-IRL framework in terms of autoracy(A) and democracy(D)
 Each quadrant Qi contains a diffent social value system: $Q1$ – Pefect democracy, $Q2$ – Liberal democracy, $Q3$ – Temporary authoritarianism, and $Q4$ – Permanent authoritarianism

Figure 2 above tells us that the boundaries of permanent authoritarianism (PA) are permanent effective targeted chaos and a non-independent rule of law system (Ei), the boundaries of temporary authoritarianism (TA) are permanent effective targeted chaos and an independent rule of law system (EI), the boundaries of perfect democracy are no effective targeted chaos and therefore no need for independent rule of law system (ei), and the boundaries of liberal democracy is no effective targeted chaos under an independent rule of law system (eI).

Implication

The borders of each quadrant Q_i represent the necessary and sufficient conditions for each type of authoritarianism and each type of democracy to come to exist and persist, for example when both the independent rule of law (I) and effective targeted chaos (E) are present we have temporary authoritarianism (TA).

c) Linking the P-A-ETK-IRL quadrant-based framework in terms of democracy and authoritarianism to key aspects related to the theoretical nature of democratic and non-democratic systems

The P-A-ETK-IRL framework above can be used to point out the following structures and related implications: i) the structure of permanent authoritarianism and temporary authoritarianism dynamics; ii) the structure of perfect democracy and liberal democracy dynamics; iii) the structure of true minority view ruled systems; iv) the structure of true majority view ruled systems; v) the structure of the authoritarianism versus democracy clash; vi) the structure of permanent authoritarianism versus perfect democracy clash; vii) the temporary authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash; viii) the structure of temporary authoritarianism and perfect democracy clash; ix) the structure of the permanent authoritarianism and liberal democracy clash; x) the structure of the old cold war; and xi) the structure of the new cold war, as indicated in Figure 3 below:




Figure 3 Linking the P-A-ETK-IRL quadrant based framework to different democratic and non-democratic system structures

Hence, Figure 3 above shows that the P-A-ETK-IRL framework can be useful to appreciate different ways to see the interaction between and within democratic and non-democratic based structures to point out consistency with known structures and to highlight the coming of new ones. And this raises the question: How can the present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law quadrant-based framework (P-A-ETK-IRL) be used to point out key aspects related to the theoretical nature of democratic and non-democratic systems, their interactions, and implications. The goal of this paper is to highlight the structure of those key aspects between democratic and non-democratic systems and within each of them one by one as well as to list relevant implications.

Implication

The present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law system framework (P-A-ETK-IRL) can be used to appreciate the structure and implications of interactions between and within authoritarianism-based and democratically-based social systems.

Goals of this paper

a) To point out one by one the theoretical nature of each democratic and non-democratic structure in terms of the type of chaos and rule of law under which they exist; b) To highlight the implications, known or new, related to these structures when alone and when in competition; and c) to stress, by simplifying the P-A-ETK-IRL framework, the structure and implications of the old cold war and of the new cold war.

Methodology

First, the terminology, operational concepts and tools used in this paper are shared. Second, the structure of permanent authoritarianism and temporary authoritarianism dynamics and relevant implications are given. Third, the structure of perfect democracy and liberal democracy dynamics and relevant implications are stated. Fourth, the structure of true minority views ruled systems and relevant implications are stressed. Fifth, the structure of true majority view ruled systems and relevant implications are highlighted. Sixth, the structure of the authoritarianism versus democracy clash and relevant implications are indicated. Seventh, the structure of the permanent authoritarianism versus perfect democracy clash and main implications are listed. Eighth, the structure of the temporary authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash and relevant implications are outlined. Ninth, the structure of temporary authoritarianism and perfect democracy clash and relevant implications are pointed out. Tenth, the structure of the permanent authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash and key implications are shared. Eleventh, the structure of the old cold war between permanent authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy and main implications are shown. Twelfth, the structure and implications of the new cold war where three different ways of thinking interact and compete for access to power are stated. And finally, thirteenth, some food for thoughts and relevant conclusions are presented.

Terminology

P = Present

A = Absent

ETK = Effective targeted chaos

IRL = Independent rule of law system

NIRL = Non-independent rule of law system

Qi = Quadrant “i”

SSi = Social system “i”

PA = Permanent authoritarianism

TA = Temporary authoritarianism

PD = Perfect democracy

LD = Liberal democracy

NLD = Normal liberal democracy

ELD = Extreme liberal democracy

E = Effective targeted chaos

e = Non-effective targeted chaos

I = Independent rule of law

i = Non-independent rule of law

NDO = Normal democratic outcome

EDO = Extreme democratic outcome

NO = Normal outcome

EO = Extreme outcome

Au = Authoritarianism

D = Democracy

Brexit = exism movement UK

Operational concepts and analytical rules

a) Operational concepts

1) Independent rule of law system, the one where no one, person or institution, is above the law.

2) Non-independent rule of law system, the one where one, person or institution, is above the law.

3) Effective targeted chaos, the one that induces full true majority voting complacency.

4) Non-effective targeted chaos, the one that does not induce full true majority voting complacency.

5) Majority rule contest, the one where the majority of votes wins the voting contest.

6) Normal democratic outcome, the one where the true majority view wins the voting contest.

7) Extreme democratic outcome, the one where the minority view wins the voting contest.

8) Normal populism, the one that aims to advance the best interest of the true majority.

9) Populism with a mask, the one that aims to advance the best interest of the true minority.

b) Analytical tools and rules

i) Majority rule-based thinking

If there is a true majority view (T) and a true minority view (M), and they compete for power in a democratic system of the form $DC = T.M$, then the following is true:

1) DC = T.M -----> T wins since T > M

Expression 1 above tells us that when the true majority view (T) competes with the true minority view (M) for power in the democratic system DC, the true majority (T) wins. Hence, under democratic thinking, be it perfect democracy or liberal democracy, the true majority (T) wins the voting contest under majority rule.

b) Majority rule-based thinking under no effective targeted chaos (e)

2) e(DC) = e(T.M) -----> T wins as T > M

Expression 2 above tells us that when the true majority view (T) competes with the true minority view (M) for power in the democratic system DC when there is no effective targeted chaos(e), the true majority (T) wins. Hence, under democratic thinking, be it perfect democracy or liberal democracy, the true majority (T) wins the voting contest under majority rule under no effective targeted chaos(e). In other words, chaos does not affect the democratic process under democratic thinking, as chaos does not exist in perfect democracy (PD) or normal democratic chaos exists in liberal democracy (LD), but it is sorted out by an independent rule of law system(I), where normal chaos without evidence of electoral fraud is cast aside and the true majority(T) win is certified, the true majority(T) wins under majority rule under no effective targeted chaos where the true majority has done no wrong.

c) Majority rule-based thinking under effective targeted chaos (E)

3) E(DC) = E(T.M) -----> M wins as T < M

Expression 3 above tells us that effective targeted chaos (E) affects the democratic process DC as it leads to full true majority voting complacency where $T < M$ and the true minority view (M) wins the voting contest. In other words, expression 3 indicates that Effective targeted chaos(E) flips the liberal democracy system (LD) from a normal liberal democracy model (NLD) where the true majority view wins (T) the voting contest to an extreme liberal democracy model (ELD) where the true minority view wins (M) the voting contest as effective targeted chaos (E) induces full true majority complacency, which leads to $T < M$. The concepts and operational tools above supporting this article are shared with all articles in the series of articles on democracy and on rethinking democracy; and therefore, additional consistent concepts and operational tools can be found in articles such as Muñoz 2021 and Muñoz 2024.

The structure of permanent authoritarianism and temporary authoritarianism dynamics

The structure of permanent authoritarianism (PA) and of temporary authoritarianism (TA) and their dynamics are indicated in Figure 4 below:




Figure 4 The world of authoritarian systems under permanent(PA) and temporary(TA) authoritarianism

We can appreciate based on Figure 4 above the following: i) The factor that both permanent (PA) and temporary (TA) authoritarianism have in common is the presence of effective targeted chaos(E) as indicated by the blue line that represent their effective targeted chaos border; ii) If the independent rule of law system (I) is captured and becomes non-independent (i), then temporary authoritarianism (TA) shifts towards permanent authoritarianism (PA) as indicated by the green arrow going from right to left from TA to PA; iii) If the non-independent rule of law system (i) becomes an independent rule of law system(I), then permanent authoritarianism (PA) shifts towards temporary authoritarianism (TA) as shown by the green arrow going from left to right from PA to TA; and hence, iv) without effective targeted chaos present (e) there cannot be authoritarianism. In other words, Figure 4 above shows that authoritarianism dynamics can be seen as going from quadrant 4 to quadrant 3 and from quadrant 3 to quadrant 4, all depending on whether we introduced independent rule of law systems, or we destroy independent rule of law systems.

Implication

If there is effective targeted chaos, then we can see a world where permanent authoritarianism interacts with temporary authoritarianism, in conditions where permanent authoritarianism does not have independent rule of law limitations, but temporary authoritarianism has those limitations.

The structure of perfect democracy and liberal democracy dynamics

The structure of perfect democracy (PD) and of liberal democracy (LD) and their dynamics are shown in Figure 5 below:




Figure 5 The world under perfect(PD) and liberal(LD) democracy

We can state based on Figure 4 above the following aspects: i) The factor that both perfect democracy (PD) and liberal democracy (LD) have in common is the absence of effective targeted chaos(e) as indicated by the blue line that marks their no targeted chaos border; ii) If the independent rule of law system (I) is not needed as there is not even normal chaos, then liberal democracy thinking (LD) becomes perfect democracy thinking (PD) as LD shift to PD as indicated by the green arrow going from right to left from LD to PD; iii) If the non-independent rule of law system (i) becomes an independent rule of law system (I) as there is democracy chaos that needs to be legally sorted out, then perfect democracy thinking (PD) shifts towards liberal democracy thinking (LD) as shown by the green arrow going from left to right from PD to LD; and therefore, iv) With effective targeted chaos (E) present there cannot be democracy. In other words, Figure 5 above indicates that democracy dynamics can be viewed as going from quadrant 1 to quadrant 2 and from quadrant 2 to quadrant 1, all depending on whether we look at democracy from the imperfect point of view where there is normal democratic chaos that to be sorted out legally or the perfect point of view where there is no chaos to be worried about legally as perfect conditions hold.

Implication

If there is no effective targeted chaos, then we can see a world where perfect democracy interacts with liberal democracy, in conditions where perfect democracy does not need an independent rule of law system as there is no chaos to sort out legally, but liberal democracy needs one as there is normal democratic chaos to sort out legally.

The structure of true minority views ruled systems

When there is authoritarianism (Au) we have a system where the minority view has access to power as they are extreme outcomes, through elections or not, a situation shown in the upper part of Figure 6 below




Figure 6 The world of true minority ruled systems

Figure 6 above tells us that there can be two different extreme outcomes, one under permanent authoritarianism (PA) and one under temporary authoritarianism (TA), where the true minority view rules the system. In other words, Figure 6 above displays minority view ruled systems in quadrant Q4 and quadrant Q3, both extreme outcomes (EO).

Implication

All forms of authoritarianism, permanent or temporary, are led by extreme outcomes that reflect the views of the true minority.

The structure of true majority view ruled systems

When there is democracy (D) we have a system where the majority view has access to power as they are normal outcomes, through elections, a situation shown in the lower part of Figure 7 below:




Figure 7 above indicates that there can be two different normal outcomes, one under perfect democracy (PD) and one under liberal democracy (LD), where the true majority view rules the system. In other words, Figure 7 above show majority view ruled systems in quadrant Q1 and quadrant Q2, both normal outcomes (NO).

Implication

All forms of democracy, perfect or liberal, are led by normal outcomes that reflect the views of the true majority. Notice that the structure of democracy in Figure 7 above reflects the liberal democratic landscape before 2016 Brexit as competition for access to power here is between different normal democratic outcomes.

The structure of the authoritarianism versus democracy clash

There is an ongoing clash, where authoritarianism (Au) forces want to take over democratic(D) forces or keep them at bay or democratic(D) forces want to take over authoritarianism (Au) forces or keep them at bay, a situation summarized in Figure 8 below:

AUTHORITARIANISM VERSUS DEMOCRACY CLASH




Figure 8 The structure of the clash between authoritarianism and democracy

Figure 8 above helps us to see the following: i) that authoritarianism forces (A) aim at flipping democratic systems (D) and thinking towards them ensuring the supremacy of the true minority view over the true majority view as indicated by the continuous green arrow pointing up; ii) that democratic forces (D) see the flipping of authoritarianism systems (A) and thinking towards them seeking the supremacy of the true majority view over the true minority view as indicated by the continuous green arrow pointing down; and iii) that the existence or no of effective targeted chaos determines the direction of the flip. Figure 8 above states a world that exist under effective targeted chaos, the authoritarianism-based world, in a clash with a world that flourishes under no effective targeted chaos, the democracy-based world and vis a verse as indicated by the green arrows going down and going up.

Implication

The fight between authoritarianism and democracy comes down to a fight between effective targeted chaos and no effective targeted chaos as if there is effective targeted chaos democracies shift to authoritarianism permanent or temporarily.

The structure of permanent authoritarianism versus perfect democracy clash

The classic clash between permanent authoritarianism (PA) and perfect democracy (PD) where authoritarian count on the presence and/or creation of effective targeted chaos to gain ground; and where perfect democracy (PD) relies on the absent of or eradication of effective targeted chaos to persist can be stated as shown in Figure 9 below:

PERMANENT AUTHORITARIANISM VRS PERFECT DEMOCRACY CLASH




Figure 9 The permanent authoritarianism(PA) and perfect democracy(PD) clash

Notice the following based on Figure 9 above: i) Perfect democracy (PD) does not have an independent rule of law system “i” as indicated by the continuous black arrow going from right to left as there is no chaos to sort out; and therefore, it does not need it to ensure perfect democracy thinking persist; ii) Permanent authoritarianism (PA) does not have an independent rule of law system “i” as indicated by the continuous black arrow going from right to left because it needs it to keep effective targeted chaos permanent and stay in power permanently. Figure 9 above represents the clash between a world under perfect permanent authoritarianism and perfect democracy as indicated by the green arrow going up and going down.

Implication

Perfect democracy does not need an independent rule of law system as there is no chaos, neither normal democratic chaos, but permanent authoritarianism does not have an independent rule of law system because it needs it to stay in power even when it cannot maintain permanent effective targeted chaos. However, Figure 9 above shows the possibility, at least theoretical, that a perfect democracy under effective targeted chaos flips to permanent authoritarianism and an authoritarian system that fails to maintain permanent effective targeted chaos can flip back to perfect democracy.

The temporary authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash

The clash that gained relevance since 2016 Brexit in the UK is the clash between temporary authoritarianism (TA) led by extreme democratic outcomes (EDO) and normal liberal

democracies (LD) driven by normal democratic outcomes (NDO) can be indicated as shown in Figure 10 below:




Figure 10 The temporary authoritarianism(TA – ELD) and normal liberal democracy(LD –NLD) clash

Figure 10 depicts the new liberal democracy landscape where normal liberal democracy (LD) is in competition for power with temporary authoritarianism (TA). Notice that since both normal liberal democracy (LD) and temporary authoritarianism (TA) have in common an independent rule of law system(I), then the flipping from normal liberal democracy to temporary authoritarianism or vice a verse, depends on whether there is effective targeted chaos(E) or not(e). Notice that temporary authoritarianism (TA) is not a normal democratic outcome (NDO) as it reflects the views of the true minority; and therefore, normal liberal democracy (LD) cannot be an extreme democratic outcome (EDO) as it reflects the views of the true majority; and hence, we cannot treat extreme democratic outcomes (EDO) as normal democratic outcomes (NDO) when playing politics as they have opposite objectives, one advances the best interest of the true minority and the other advances the best interest of the true majority. Figure 10 above highlights the clash between a world under imperfect authoritarianism under extreme democratic outcomes as it is temporary under independent rule of law system when there is no evidence of electoral fraud and there is no effective targeted chaos and imperfect democracy under normal democratic outcomes as there is normal democratic chaos to be sort out through the independent rule of law system, a clash indicated by the green arrow going up and going down.

Implication

The clash between temporary authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy is clash between extreme liberal democracy driven by extreme democratic outcomes and normal liberal

democracy led by normal democratic outcomes. Hence, temporary authoritarianism is a threat to the survival of liberal democracy from within. Notice that Figure 10 above shows the structure of liberal democracy landscape after 2016 Brexit as here competition for access to power is between extreme democratic outcomes and normal democratic outcomes and the deciding factor is the type of chaos during the electoral contest, effective targeted chaos or not. The shift from normal liberal democracy (LD) to temporary authoritarianism and flip back to normal liberal democracy consistent with the structure in Figure 10 has taken place in the UK (2016-2024) marked by the fall of Brexit in 2024 (TG 2024) after coming to power in 2016 (BBC 2016), in the USA (2016-2020) highlighted by the fall of Trumpism in 2020 (Collinson 2020: TG 2020) after gaining power in 2016 (Rawlinson 2016), and in Brazil (2018-2022) stressed by the fall of Brazilianism in 2022 (BBC 2022) after coming to power in 2018 (TG 2018).

The structure of temporary authoritarianism and perfect democracy clash

As temporary authoritarianism (TA) is inconsistent with perfect democracy thinking (PD) a clash between these 2 ways of thinking can be stated as in Figure 11 below:




Figure 11 The temporary authoritarianism(TA) and perfect democracy(PD) clash

Figure 11 allows us to depict the perfect liberal democracy landscape (PD) in competition for power with temporary authoritarianism (TA). Notice that perfect democracy (PD) and temporary authoritarianism (TA) have nothing in common: 1) perfect democracy has no chaos as

it does not need chaos to exist and persist as shown by the blue arrow “e” while temporary authoritarianism needs effective targeted chaos to exist and persist and 2) perfect democracy exist in a world without need of independent rule of law system and temporary authoritarianism exist within an independent rule of law system. In other words, Figure 11 above gives the idea that if there is effective targeted chaos perfect democracy (PD) will shift towards temporary authoritarianism (TA) and if there is no effective targeted chaos, temporary authoritarianism (TA) would shift back to perfect democracy (PD) as represented by the green arrow pointing up and down

Implication

Figure 11 above shows the theoretical possibility that social systems under perfect democracy can interact with social systems under temporary authoritarianism separate if each system can maintain permanently the type of chaos that needs internally to exist and persist but failing to maintain that means they will shift from perfect democracy to temporary authoritarianism or vice a verse.

The structure of the permanent authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash

The clash between normal liberal democracy (LD) and permanent authoritarianism is reflected as done in Figure 12 below:

THE STRUCTURE OF PERMANENT AUTHORITARIANISM AND LIBERAL DEMOCRACY CLASH




Figure 12 The structure of the clash between permanent authoritarianism(PA) and liberal democracy

Figure 12 above highlights the structure of the most well-known clash between perfect authoritarianism (PA) and normal liberal democracy (LD), where two perfect inverse opposite

structures clash: perfect authoritarianism requires both a non-independent rule of law system and permanent effective targeted chaos to persist in power and normal liberal democracy needs an independent rule of law system and permanent normal democratic chaos to persist in power.

Hence, permanent authoritarianism will strive to have a system under permanent effective targeted chaos and captured court system and normal liberal democracies need to have a system under independent rule of law to filter normal and extreme chaos coming from outside.

Implication

The weakest points that permanent authoritarianism has from the normal liberal democracy point of view are that they do not have an independent rule of law system and the knowledge that without effective targeted chaos they will collapse; and the weakest points that normal liberal democracy has from the point of view of authoritarianism is that they can use effective targeted chaos to affect the democratic process and to undermine the independent rule of law system in liberal democracy run states. The threat, direct or indirect, to the survival of both systems comes from the outside.

The structure of the old cold war: Permanent authoritarianism versus liberal democracy

Simplifying the P-A-ETK-IRL system framework to show the structure of the old cold war in Figure 2 above we arrive at the situation in Figure 13 below:




Figure 13 The structure of the old cold war

Figure 13 above stresses that the old cold war was a clash between quadrant Q4 and quadrant Q2; and therefore, it was a clash between permanent authoritarianism (PA) and normal liberal democracy (LD). And this is the structure of the old cold war period known as the red socialism versus capitalism cold war that began in 1848 with Karl Marx's communist manifesto (Marx and Engels 1848) and continue until the fall of red socialism in 1991(EP 2015) and ended with a flip back to pure capitalism (Muñoz 2019).

Implication

The most well-known cold war structure is that of permanent authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy in the form of the clash between red socialism and pure capitalism. In this clash, the threat to normal liberal democracy come from outside. Liberal democracy works to undermine effective targeted chaos and to promote the implementation of independent rule of law systems in authoritarian states; and authoritarianism works to export effective targeted chaos and the undermining the credibility of independent rule of law systems in liberal democracy-based states.

The structure of the new cold war: Permanent authoritarianism versus extreme liberal democracy in conflict with normal liberal democracy

As right now the liberal democracy landscape has changed as it faces threats from within and threats from outside, then the structure of the new cold war is one when permanent authoritarianism (PA) is in the clash with the type of liberal democracy in power, normal liberal democracy(NLD = LD) or extreme liberal democracy(ELD = TA) and normal liberal democracy (NLD = LD) is in clash with permanent authoritarianism (PA) and temporary authoritarianism (TA) for survival, a situation summarized in Figure 14 below:

THE NEW COLD WAR STRUCTURE




Figure 14 The structure of the new cold war

Figure 14 above highlights the dynamics of competing systems of power in the new cold war structure: 1) To survive or exist, normal liberal democracy (NLD = LD) must be able to fence against permanent authoritarianism (PA) threats and temporary authoritarianism (TA) threats; 2) To survive or exist, permanent authoritarianism (PA) must be able to neutralize normal liberal democracy (NLD = LD) threats and temporary authoritarianism (TA) threats as they come; and 3) if it wants to survive or exist, temporary authoritarianism (TA) must be able to withstand permanent authoritarianism (PA) pulls and normal liberal democracy (NLD = LD) pulls, towards them.

Implication

The liberal democratic world is now divided since 2016 Brexit into normal liberal democracies (LD) and extreme liberal democracies under temporary authoritarianism (TA), all of them interacting with permanent authoritarianism (PA), which forms the structure of the new cold war where permanent authoritarianism (PA) now competes with a divided liberal democratic world. In the new cold war, normal liberal democracy faces threats to its survival from within and threats from outside.

Food for thoughts

1) Should temporary authoritarianism be expected to be friendly to all forms of permanent authoritarianism? I think No, what do you think?; 2) Should we expect temporary authoritarianism to be friendly to all other forms of temporary authoritarianism? I think Yes, what do you think?; and 3) Should we expect temporary authoritarianism to be in constant disagreement with normal liberal democracies? I think Yes, what do you think?

Conclusions:

a) It was shown how the P-A-ETK-IRL system framework can be used to point out the structure and implication of the following system interactions one by one: 1) Permanent authoritarianism and temporary authoritarianism dynamics; 2) Perfect democracy and liberal democracy dynamics; 3) True minority views ruled systems; 4) True majority view ruled systems; 5) Authoritarianism versus democracy clash; 6) Permanent authoritarianism versus perfect democracy clash; 7) Temporary authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash; 8) Temporary authoritarianism and perfect democracy clash; and 9) Permanent authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy clash; b) It was indicated how the P-A-ETK-IRL system framework can be simplify to show the structure of the old cold war between permanent authoritarianism and normal liberal democracy, where they live in an inverse opposite world, one living under permanent effective targeted chaos and non-independent rule of law system and the other thriving in a world under an independent rule of law system and permanent normal democratic chaos, where it can be appreciated that the internal and external threats to democracy both have an outside link; and c) It was pointed out that the P-A-ETK-IRL system framework can also be adapted to show the structure and implications of the new cold war where three different ways of thinking interact and compete for access to power, permanent authoritarianism (PA), temporary authoritarianism (TA) and normal liberal democracy (NLD = LD), where you can appreciate that normal liberal democracies now after 2016 Brexit face external and internal threats to its survival, independently or in association.

References

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 2016. [Brexit: Europe stunned by UK Leave vote](#), EU Referendum News, June 24, London, UK.

British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), 2022. [Brazil election: Lula makes stunning comeback](#), News online Latin America, October 31, London, UK.

Collinson, Stephen, 2020. [Trump in denial over election defeat as Biden gears up to fight Covid](#), November 9, Politics, CNN, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

European Parliament (EP), 2015. [Democratic Change in Central and Eastern Europe 1989-90 The European Parliament and the end of the Cold War](#), European Parliament History Series, January 15, European Union.

Marx, Karl and Friedrich Engels, 1848. Communist Manifesto, Communist League, London, UK.

Muñoz. Lucio, 2019. [The 1991 fall of red socialism and the flip back to pure capitalism: Pointing out the market structure of the paradigm shift from red socialism to economy friendly red socialism that never took place](#), Boletín CEBEM-REDESMA, Año 13 No. 9, October, La Paz, Bolivia.

Muñoz, Lucio, 2021. [Sustainability thoughts 134: How can normal and extreme democratic outcome theory be used to point out the structure of the 2016 shift from true democracy thinking to temporary democratic authoritarianism thinking and its main implications?](#). In: CEBEM-REDESMA Boletín, Año 15, N° 5, May, La Paz, Bolivia.

Muñoz, Lucio, 2024. [Rethinking Democracy 101: How can a general present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law quadrant-based framework be built to capture the necessary and sufficient conditions for democratic and non-democratic models to come to exist and persist in power once in power?](#), In: *CEBEM-REDESMA Boletín*, Año 18, N° 8, La Paz, Bolivia.

Rawlinson, Kevin, 2016. [The world's newspapers react to Trump's election victory](#), Thursday, June 10, London, UK.

The Guardian (TG), 2018. [Jair Bolsonaro declared Brazil's next president](#), News, Monday, October 29, London, UK.

The Guardian (TG), 2020. [US election results 2020: Joe Biden's defeat of Donald Trump](#), US News, US Elections, December 08, London, UK.

The Guardian (TG), 2024. [UK general election results in full: Labour wins in a landslide](#), UK Politics, July 05, London, UK.

Citation:

Muñoz, 2024. **Rethinking democracy 103: How can the present-absent effective targeted chaos and independent rule of law framework be used to point out key aspects related to the theoretical nature of democratic and non-democratic systems, their interactions, and implications.** In: *CEBEM-REDESMA Boletín*, Año 18, N° 10, La Paz, Bolivia.