THE RELATION BETWEEN DEMOCRACY AND VIOLENCE

Introduction

No matter the era, political philosophers and researchers have long been captivated by the intricate relationship between democracy as well as violence (Yang, 2021). Rather, the complicated nature of the link among state violence and politics is explored in this essay by critically analysing several theoretical perspectives that attempt to understand it. A range of ideas that capture the complex character of this dynamic connection are explored, from dissensual viewpoints to the influential Democratic Peace Theory. The essay goes beyond just discussing theoretical frameworks; it focuses on the problems that come from various kinds of hostility in democratic institutions. The module's goal is to provide learners with an analytical perspective by analysing differing viewpoints on contemporary politics along with international affairs. Students will get an understanding of the complex processes behind the connection among democracy as well as violence via this critical investigation, which will allow them to evaluate the merits of popular understandings. Students will have the skills to examine state politics along with violence in nations with democratic systems with sophistication and contribute to the continuing conversation about these topics.

Theoretical Approaches to State Politics and Violence

Democratic Peace Theory:

A well-known viewpoint in international affairs, the theory of democratic peace posits that democracies often refrain from engaging in violent wars with one another. The theory of democracy, which gained popularity in the second part of the twentieth century, contends that democratic institutions including government have a calming influence, encouraging people to resolve conflicts peacefully (Applebaum, 2020). Those who believe in this theory frequently point to past events, including the lack of big conflicts between democracies, to support their claims.

Emphasis on Democratic Institutions: When it comes to avoiding wars between democracies, the concept of Democratic Peace Theory stresses the importance of democratic institutions. Democratic states are said to be less prone to act aggressively against other democracies since they are answerable to their citizens (Papastephanou, 2021). A key deterrent to conflict is the democratic system's built-in system of checks and balances. One example is the belief that the division of powers, which allows the legislative, executive, and judicial departments to function separately, prevents conflict-inducing unilateral decision-making. Another important factor in

democracies that help keep the peace is a free press. The public's knowledge and examination of possible aggressiveness can be enhanced by an impartial and open media. The belief that conflicts should be addressed via diplomatic channels rather than using violence is further reinforced by respect for human rights, which is a pillar of democratic administration.

Criticism for Oversimplification: Even though it's widely used, the theory of democratic peace is said to oversimplify the intricate workings of global politics. The theory's detractors say it ignores other important considerations in favour of democratic norms as a peace guarantee (Duong, 2020). Democracies may get involved in wars to acquire resources or safeguard trade routes due to economic interests, for instance. Despite the supposed calming effect of common political systems, the advancement of national interest may at times victory, even among democracies. Rather, the Democratic Peace Concept similarly minimises the importance of cultural diversity and past injustices. Opponents argue that democratic institutions may not be able to alleviate long-standing cultural or historical tensions. The theory frequently assumes that democracies have similar values, which ignores the possibility of conflicting interests and agendas (Favell, 2022). In addition, the theory could overlook the significance of power dynamics in democracies. Despite the theory's best efforts, foreign policy decisions are occasionally impacted by internal political factors like public opinion, election cycles, or the power of interest groups. This is how the Democratic Peace Theory comes across: as unrealistically utopian and disconnected from the complex reality of global politics, with its hopeful portrayal of democratic organisations as the ultimate peacekeepers.

Power Structures and Violence
Focusing on inner power structures throughout democracies offers an alternate perspective on the link among state politics and violence. From this vantage point, it is clear that social, political, and economic power imbalances may lead to internal and foreign violence in spite of democratic governance frameworks.

Economic Inequality: Disparity in the Economy: Understanding the connection across state politics as well as violence must take into account economic disparity inside democracies. Unfortunately, due to the unequal distribution of income and resources, democratic ideals are frequently not fulfilled, despite their emphasis on the principles of equal protection and representation for all residents (Adorno, 2021). Because economically disadvantaged people may

feel they are not getting the benefits that democratic government promises, economic inequality is a potential catalyst for social upheaval. Protests may take many forms when people at the bottom of the social ladder feel disenfranchised in democratic nations where economic disparity is high. Civil disobedience can take many forms, including nonviolent protests, strikes, and other forms of public discontent. There is a chance that these demonstrations might become violent if the political system fails to appropriately address the underlying economic frustrations (Gorski and Perry, 2022). Dissatisfaction with economic disparity can weaken democratic institutions and societal cohesiveness, which can eventually lead to a collapse of democracy. Broad policies that encourage equal distribution of resources, opportunity, and social mobility are necessary to address economic inequality within democracies. The political system must be responsive to the demands of all people, especially the economically disadvantaged, and this requires not just reforms to the economy but also steps to achieve this. Societal cohesion and the avoidance of violence stemming from economic complaints can be enhanced when democracies address economic inequality (Waghid et al., 2022).

Unequal Distribution of Resources: Disparity in the Allocation of Assets: Politics in democracies and the likelihood of violence are both impacted by the uneven distribution of wealth. A just and equitable society must provide its members with resources, such as equal opportunity to learn and work (Papastephanou, 2021). On the other hand, social tensions and anger can intensify when particular areas or groups within a democracy perceive discrimination or neglect in relation to the distribution of resources. Disputes escalate into full-blown violence when people believe resources are being unfairly distributed. Some marginalised communities may see resource inequality as a systematic injustice that compels them to take a more militant attitude in their protests. The idea that democracy can eradicate such inequalities stands challenged by the fact that these divisions inside the country continue to exist. To the contrary, it stresses that democratic societies can't survive without tackling economic and social inequality.

Political Power Imbalances: Politics in democracies and the likelihood of violence are both impacted by the uneven distribution of wealth (Lawrence, 2020). A just and equitable society must provide its members with resources, such as equal opportunity to learn and work. On the other hand, social tensions and anger can intensify when particular areas or groups within a democracy perceive discrimination or neglect in relation to the distribution of resources. Disputes escalate

into full-blown violence when people believe resources are being unfairly distributed. Some marginalised communities may see resource inequality as a systematic injustice that compels them to take a more militant attitude in their protests (Lulwani, 2023). The idea that democracy can eradicate such inequalities stands challenged by the fact that these divisions inside the country continue to exist. To the contrary, it stresses that democratic societies can't survive without tackling economic and social inequality.

Challenging the Idealized Notion of Democratic Peace: Democracies are less likely to engage in disputes with one other, according to the idealised notion of democratic peace. However, this view is challenged by the focus on the structures of power and inequities within democracies (Amundsen, 2023). There is no assurance of internal peace inside individual democratic governments, but this theory is however applicable on an international level since democracies are more unlikely to go to conflict with one other. The fact that democracies can experience violence and internal strife shows that democratic rule is not perfect. A healthy democracy requires cohesive societies, which can be threatened by inequality and power imbalances. When it comes to complicated, varied, and ever-changing communities, the idea that democratic administration can guarantee peace on its own may be oversimplifying things (Okoi and Nalule, 2023). In addition, the assumption that democratic institutions alone are enough to provide stability is called into question by the emphasis on internal power conflicts. In order to keep the democratic fabric from unravelling from within, it is crucial to consistently work to defend democratic principles, guarantee fair representation, and correct power imbalances.

Dissensual Understanding of the Political

The dissensual conception of politics deviates from the traditional perspective, which tries to describe politics as a peaceful system with the goal of fostering consensus (Iosifidis and Nicoli, 2020). Those who have a dissensual view of politics contend that disagreements are unavoidable and intrinsic to the system, rather than an exception. According to these concepts, violence is not an exception but rather a natural consequence of the fundamental power conflicts, different interests, and opposing ideals in democratic regimes. Essentially, dissensual methods acknowledge that democratic administration is inherently fraught with tension as well as conflict and reject the idealised concept of a perfectly harmonious political environment.

a. Conflict as Inherent in Politics

According to dissensual theories, political conflict is an essential part of government rather than a flaw in it. Opposing utopian ideals that seek absolute agreement, dissensual viewpoints recognise that democratic societies are inherently diverse, and political conflicts are just a reflection of that (De Paor and Heravi, 2020). Conflicts between ideas, beliefs, and interests, according to these theories, are a natural part of the democratic process rather than an aberration. This divergent view calls into question the long-held belief that political discourse can produce a perfect and comprehensive agreement. To the contrary, it forces people to reconsider political systems as a whole, and it calls on academics and policymakers to acknowledge that conflicts are inevitable. In this view, political disputes are not hindrances but rather forces that propel democratic rule forward. Dissensual theories provide for a more complex comprehension of the functioning and evolution of political institutions by recognising conflict as an inherent and essential part of politics (Glück, 2019). In order to better understand the intricate relationship between different interests and viewpoints within a democratic framework, this viewpoint promotes letting go of utopian aspirations. Essentially, dissensual theories call for a change in perspective, stressing the need to manage and redirect conflicts instead of trying to eliminate them in order to build a democratic system that is stronger and more variable.

b. Civil Disobedience and Nonviolent Resistance:

Investigating dissensual theories necessitates looking beyond traditional violent tactics for political engagement. Dissensual viewpoints emphasise nonviolent opposition and civil disobedience. These strategies challenge the conventional concept of conflict resolution within democratic settings, according to scholars, but they offer practical and ethical options of conventional violence (Hameleers, 2021). People believe that civil disobedience and nonviolent resistance are effective ways to voice their disapproval and bring about social change without using violence. These strategies draw on the ideas of civil resistance, in which people draw attention to wrongs and seek political and social change by purposefully disobeying established norms and laws. According to dissensual theories, these peaceful approaches not only question the current quo but also help democratic institutions grow and progress without damaging anybody or threatening democracy's basic foundations (Peterson and Kagalwala., 2021).

- **Ethical Alternatives to Violence:**

Nonviolent demonstrations as well as civil disobedience are examples of ethical approaches to violence that are effective from a dissensual standpoint. These strategies can protest and promote social change with no resorting to violence, which is why scholars support them as morally sound alternatives to physical damage (Mullinix et al., 2021). In nonviolent resistance, activists deliberately disobey rules or regulations in order to draw attention to injustices, raise awareness, and demand for political and social change. By taking a calculated and principled stance, we may effectively question the status quo and encourage the careful reform of political and social institutions in accordance with democratic principles.

- **Principles of Civil Resistance:**

Nonviolent tactics offer a principled and strategic way to bring about social and political change; they are based on the ideas of civil resistance. The idea that nonviolent resistance to power may bring about revolutionary changes in society is central to this strategy (Fisher, 2021). Activists seek to challenge the current quo and bring attention to underlying injustices by purposefully and symbolically breaking set laws. In democratic countries, this deliberate breach of norms helps bring attention to systemic problems and starts conversations about them (Jost et al., 2022). Intentional disruption causes people to rethink social norms, which in turn encourages them to question existing systems and push for change within a democratic framework.

- **Evolution and Improvement of Democracy:**

Dissident theories stress the importance of nonviolent approaches in questioning established power structures and enhancing democratic systems. Individuals may hold democratic institutions responsible by using civil disobedience as well as nonviolent resistance to bring about reforms that are long overdue without jeopardising democracy's core values (Roe and Shapira, 2021). This view maintains that these approaches, far from weakening democracy, spur constructive change and advancement within democratic systems. People support an ever-changing cycle of reflection, reform, and adaptation by strategically dissenting by nonviolent methods, which strengthens the durability and adaptability of democratic structures in the face of social issues and altering political landscapes.

Challenges Arising from Antagonism

There are obstacles in today's political climate that originate from animosity, and these challenges risk undermining democratic regimes. Growing political polarisation and populism is a major obstacle. Simplifying difficult issues, fostering division, and heightening societal tensions are typically hallmarks of populism, which is characterised by charismatic individuals who claim to be the voice of the majority against entrenched elites (Szostek, 2020). This polarising speech adds to political polarisation, as citizens become more ideologically split, fostering a "us versus them" mindset.

As democratic principles encounter both internal and foreign challenges, the likelihood of conflicts intensifies. Populist narratives that cast doubt on the veracity of long-standing political systems are fueling a loss of faith in democratic institutions, which in turn is creating internal pressures (Gearhart et al., 2020). Democratic systems are additionally strained by external influences like geopolitical conflicts and economic challenges. When people in divided communities feel they have nowhere else to turn, they may take violent action to express their frustrations.

Populism and Polarization

A modern problem that exacerbates hostility inside democracies is the growth of populism as well as political division. To gain support, populist politicians would frequently demonise particular groups or simplify complicated issues. In addition to widening existing gaps in society, this type of speech fosters an environment where opponents of politics are viewed as hostile rather than as legitimate opponents expressing different viewpoints (Yang, 2021). A climate where compromise is more difficult to achieve, legislative deadlock, and ineffective government are all possible outcomes of political polarisation that is fostered by populism. As a result of being left out in the cold, the "winner-takes-all" mindset can make some people angry and frustrated. When this polarisation gets out of hand, it can lead to bloodshed between different political groups, which undermines democracy itself.

1. Populism and Simplification of Complex Issues:

One of the major problems caused by political polarisation and populism is the simplifying of complicated issues, which has serious ramifications. To appeal to a wider audience, populist politicians often use simplified language to describe complex issues, riding the wave of public dissatisfaction. Although this technique appeals to a wider audience, it runs the danger of

simplifying complicated issues and ignoring their complexities (Applebaum, 2020). A more thorough grasp of complex challenges is prevented by the purposeful simplifying, which maintains an uninformed public discourse. Oversimplified narratives that are based on this distortion may fail to address the complex nature of modern issues, which in turn hinders effective policymaking and constructive discourse. Raising the bar for public discourse and fostering more nuanced conversations are both necessary for meeting this issue.

2. Scapegoating and Division:

One of the worst aspects of populism is the practice of scapegoating, which is used by certain politicians to shift the blame and divert popular anger. Blaming particular groups or institutions for social issues is a divisive tactic that may be used in democracies to create a "us versus them" mindset. By focusing on specific groups, populists inflame societal tensions and widen gaps in understanding, creating an environment where opponents of politics are perceived as foes rather than as opponents with different viewpoints (Papastephanou, 2021). By further solidifying already-held ideological differences, this inflammatory language does more than just damage to the cooperative spirit necessary for democratic government; it also prevents people from having productive conversations. Developing a deeper awareness of the complex challenges confronting democratic societies, tackling structural issues responsibly, and encouraging inclusion are all necessary to mitigate the divisive repercussions of scapegoating.

3. Legislative Gridlock and Governance Challenges:

Legislative a deadlock is one of the most obvious manifestations of the challenges that political polarisation, exacerbated by populism, poses to efficient governance (Duong, 2020). Extremely divided political groups are less likely to work together or compromise as a result of the widening gap between their respective political ideas. It is difficult to pass necessary laws and resolve pressing social issues while the legislative process is stalled. The end result is a legislative framework that struggles with inefficiency and slow responses to citizens' varied demands. The impasse highlights the effect of populism on the efficacy of democratic government institutions and undermines the democratic concept of collective policymaking by maintaining an atmosphere where ideological differences take priority over the need to discover realistic solutions (Favell, 2022).

4. Winner-Takes-All Mentality:

By silencing groups of the public with opposing ideas, the winner-takes-all mindset, which results from increased political polarisation, exacerbates challenges inside democracies. By letting the dominant political ideology take centre stage, this method silences dissenting opinions and ignores varied points of view (Adorno, 2021). When citizens feel their opinions are being disregarded, it can lead to feelings of anger and irritation, which can impact marginalised parts. A healthy democracy relies on inclusive and representative discourse, which are under jeopardy due to the winner-take-all attitude that is prevailing in today's politically heated debates. In addition to undermining democratic principles, this exclusive dynamic deepens societal divisions and makes it harder for people to work together, two factors that are critical for good leadership. To combat this mindset, we must work together to strengthen democratic values of diversity and representation, make inclusion a top priority, and eliminate ideological divides (Gorski and Perry, 2022).

5. Potential for Violent Clashes:

In the worst-case scenario, the merging of populism as well as political polarisation leads to dangerous confrontations between rival political groups. Physical confrontations are more likely to occur in an atmosphere where political opponents are seen as adversaries and compromise is avoided (Waghid et al., 2022). Under these conditions, the possibility of violence not only jeopardises the basic basis of democracy but also erodes the democratic ideals of peaceful speech. As severe polarisation increases hostility and decreases the potential for productive discourse, social stability as well as the cohesion of democratic societies are put at jeopardy. To avoid the disastrous outcomes of severe political polarisation, it is critical to promote discussion, mitigate polarising influences, and reinforce the common principles that support democratic government in light of the potential for violent conflicts.

Media Influence and Political Violence
The media's ability to influence public opinion and political narratives is another major challenge that results from animosity. Violence inside democracies may be exacerbated by the media, which is a potent weapon for information dissemination (Papastephanou, 2021). Discord within social and political factions can be stoked by sensationalism, biassed reporting, and the spread of polarising stories.

This unit delves into the topic of media dynamics and how they heighten disputes. Finding common ground may be made more difficult by the proliferation of false information, the establishment of confirmation biases, and the polarisation of the media (Lawrence, 2020). Public opinion becomes more divisive, and people may be more prone to radicalization and political violence in such a setting. As it becomes clear that editorial biases, problem framing, and story selection may greatly affect the political atmosphere, the media's responsibilities in democratic nations is being examined. In order to tackle this challenge, it is important to raise awareness about the media, make sure that journalists are honest, and hold media organisations responsible for how they influence public opinion and whether political violence is worse or better.

❖ **Biased Reporting and Sensationalism:**

The media, being a powerful source of information, unintentionally has the power to amplify violence in democracies due to biassed reporting and sensationalism. The use of sensationalism and biassed reporting are two major factors that contribute to this problem. Conflicts can be exacerbated unintentionally when news items are presented with inherent biases, either by editorial viewpoints or organisational leanings (Lulwani, 2023). Media sources run the risk of inadvertently escalating tensions between various social and political groups by highlighting some viewpoints while downplaying others. By placing an emphasis on dramatic features rather than nuanced reporting, sensationalism, which is frequently motivated by the desire for increased viewing or reading, makes the issue even worse. As a result, people are shown an inaccurate story that makes them feel more angry and helps create a climate where violence might escalate.

❖ **Misinformation and Echo Chambers:**

The module critically explores the intricate dynamics of misinformation and the polarization of media outlets, unraveling their role in creating alternate realities for different segments of the population (Amundsen, 2023). Misinformation, whether disseminated intentionally or inadvertently, can warp public perceptions and hinder the quest for common ground. The prevalence of echo chambers, where individuals are exposed predominantly to information that aligns with their existing beliefs, exacerbates this challenge. In such an environment, divergent perspectives are marginalized, and individuals become entrenched in their own ideological bubbles. This not only makes finding common ground challenging but fosters a polarized atmosphere where public discourse becomes increasingly fragmented. The consequences of

misinformation and echo chambers are profound, as they contribute to the polarization of society, making individuals more resistant to alternative viewpoints and potentially fostering an environment ripe for radicalization and political violence (Okoi and Nalule, 2023). Addressing this complex challenge requires a multifaceted approach, encompassing media literacy initiatives, journalistic integrity, and efforts to break down echo chambers through diverse and inclusive information dissemination.

❖ **Susceptibility to Radicalization:**

In environments characterized by heightened polarization, individuals are more prone to susceptibility to radicalization, potentially paving the way for acts of political violence (Iosifidis and Nicoli, 2020). The interplay between media dynamics and polarized public discourse emerges as a key catalyst for this susceptibility within democratic societies. The saturation of divisive narratives, amplified by media biases and sensationalism, creates an environment where individuals may gravitate towards extreme ideologies. The echo-chamber effect, fueled by selective exposure to information that aligns with existing beliefs, further isolates individuals within ideological bubbles, intensifying their susceptibility to radical ideas. This heightened vulnerability is particularly concerning as it elevates the risk of individuals resorting to extreme actions in pursuit of their political beliefs (De Paor and Heravi, 2020). Addressing this susceptibility necessitates a multifaceted approach, encompassing media literacy initiatives, efforts to break echo chambers, and strategies to promote a more inclusive and balanced public discourse.

❖ **Media Responsibility in Democratic Societies:**

The responsibility of the media in democratic societies assumes a critical role in shaping the political climate and influencing the potential for violence. The framing of issues, the selection of news stories, and editorial biases wield significant power in molding public perceptions (Glück, 2019). In response to this challenge, a multifaceted approach is imperative. First and foremost, promoting media literacy becomes essential to empower citizens to critically evaluate the information they consume and discern biased reporting. Ensuring journalistic integrity through rigorous fact-checking processes and ethical reporting standards is fundamental in maintaining public trust. Additionally, holding media organizations accountable for their role in either contributing to or mitigating political violence involves transparent mechanisms for addressing

bias and promoting diverse perspectives (Hameleers, 2021). By fostering a media landscape characterized by responsibility, accuracy, and inclusivity, democratic societies can mitigate the risks associated with media-induced political violence and uphold the principles of informed and constructive public discourse.

Synthesizing Contemporary Perspectives

Synthesizing contemporary perspectives on democracy and violence requires a nuanced integration of diverse theories such as Democratic Peace Theory, dissensual understandings, and power structure analyses. By critically evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each, students cultivate a comprehensive understanding that transcends oversimplifications (Peterson and Kagalwala., 2021). This process involves considering contextual factors and fostering ongoing critical thinking, ensuring a dynamic framework that acknowledges the complex interplay between democracy and violence in diverse global contexts.

Integrating Theories for a Holistic Understanding

Achieving a comprehensive understanding of the intricate relationship between democracy and violence necessitates the synthesis of contemporary perspectives through an integrated approach (Mullinix et al., 2021). This holistic endeavor acknowledges the diverse and multifaceted nature of the complex interplay between democratic systems and violence. Instead of adhering to simplistic or one-dimensional analyses, this synthesis involves a meticulous consideration of the strengths and weaknesses inherent in various theoretical frameworks. By bringing together diverse perspectives, ranging from the influential Democratic Peace Theory to dissensual understandings and analyses of power structures, scholars and students alike can navigate the intricate nuances of this relationship (Fisher, 2021). This integrated approach encourages an exploration of the intricate intersections and overlaps between these theories. It recognizes that the complexities of state politics and violence cannot be fully grasped by relying on a singular theoretical lens. Rather, by critically evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of each theory, a more nuanced and holistic understanding emerges, facilitating a deeper comprehension of the dynamic and evolving nature of the relationship between democracy and violence within the contemporary political landscape (Jost et al., 2022). The synthesis becomes a pathway to transcending theoretical boundaries, fostering intellectual flexibility, and encouraging a more nuanced appreciation of the multifaceted dynamics that characterize this crucial interplay.

1. Recognizing Diverse Theoretical Approaches:

Contemporary perspectives on democracy and violence present a diverse array of theoretical approaches. The Democratic Peace Theory posits that democracies are less likely to engage in international conflicts, emphasizing the potential pacifying effect of democratic institutions (Roe and Shapira, 2021). Dissensual understandings highlight inherent conflicts within democratic systems, focusing on dissent as a fundamental aspect. Power structure analyses delve into internal dynamics, scrutinizing economic, social, and political inequalities as potential sources of conflict. Each theory contributes unique insights, addressing different dimensions of the complex relationship between democracy and violence. Recognizing this diversity sets the foundation for a comprehensive synthesis.

2. Critically Evaluating Strengths and Weaknesses:

The integration of these theories demands a critical evaluation of their respective strengths and weaknesses. While the Democratic Peace Theory illuminates international relations, it faces critique for oversimplifying intricate geopolitical realities, often neglecting economic and cultural factors (Szostek, 2020). Dissensual theories, emphasizing internal conflicts, may not fully encompass external threats to democratic stability. Power structure analyses, insightful into socioeconomic dynamics, might overlook the crucial role played by democratic institutions. Recognizing these strengths and limitations is essential for a balanced synthesis, fostering a nuanced understanding of the intricate relationship between democracy and violence.

3. Developing a Nuanced Understanding:

Synthesizing contemporary perspectives demands the cultivation of a nuanced understanding by navigating the intricate terrain of democracy and violence. Students are urged to engage in critical examination, probing the intricacies of each theory and exploring their intersections (Gearhart et al., 2020. For instance, inquiries into how power imbalances within democracies affect their behavior on the international stage or how dissensual understandings of internal conflicts interact with external pressures on democratic governance can unveil profound insights. By posing such questions, students can transcend surface-level analyses, fostering a comprehensive and nuanced comprehension of the intricate relationship between democracy and violence.

4. Considering Contextual Factors:

An integrated approach underscores the significance of considering contextual factors that shape the dynamics of democracy and violence. Historical, cultural, and economic contexts intricately influence the manifestation of conflicts within democratic systems. The synthesis must encompass these contextual nuances, acknowledging that the interplay between democracy and violence is not universally applicable but contingent on specific circumstances. Recognizing the unique historical trajectories and cultural landscapes of different societies enriches the analysis, ensuring a more accurate and contextually sensitive understanding of the complex relationship between democracy and violence (Yang, 2021).

5. Encouraging Critical Thinking:

Encouraging critical thinking is a pivotal aspect of the synthesis process, urging students to actively question assumptions and challenge prevailing narratives. This intellectual exercise goes beyond mere acceptance of theoretical frameworks, fostering a dynamic mindset that constantly seeks refinement. By acknowledging the limitations of individual theories, students are prompted to explore alternative perspectives and adapt their understanding based on evolving insights and changing realities (Applebaum, 2020). This continuous refinement ensures that the synthesis remains responsive to the dynamic nature of democracy and violence, empowering students to navigate the complexities with intellectual agility and contribute to ongoing scholarly discourse in this multifaceted field.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this need to get beyond our basic preconceptions and have a sophisticated knowledge of the complex link between violence and democracy. Examining several theoretical frameworks, such as dissensual viewpoints, studies of power systems, and the Democratic Peace Theory, reveals the intricate and multi-dimensional character of this interaction. Students develop understanding of the complex interplay between state politics as well as violence by analysing the strengths and limitations of different theories and recognising the merits and limitations of each viewpoint. In order to reveal the internal tensions inside democratic institutions, it is crucial to acknowledge opposing viewpoints. By acknowledging that conflict is not an exception but rather a fundamental part of politics, idealised ideas are challenged and democratic administration is subject to a more practical evaluation. To get a whole picture that goes beyond democratic

principles, it's important to understand how economic disparity, political differences, and power imbalances affect democracies.

Adding even more complexity to the conversation are contemporary concerns including media influence, political polarisation, and the growth of populism. Through tackling these difficulties, students actively participate in the dynamic world of contemporary politics and international affairs, acknowledging the possible dangers to the stability of democracies. By the end of the course, we hope that students will have developed the analytical skills and self-awareness necessary to successfully traverse the complex terrain of modern politics. Promoting an ongoing mental challenge, students are prepared to critically evaluate presumptions, oppose dominant narratives, and adjust their viewpoints in light of new information. This programme equips students with the necessary abilities to actively participate in conversations about the connection among state politics and violence. Its goal is to produce critical thinkers who are up to the challenge of today's complicated political landscape.

References

Adorno, T.W., 2021. The meaning of working through the past. In *Remembering the Holocaust in Germany, Austria, Italy and Israel* (pp. 157-169). Brill.

Amundsen, M., 2023. *Does Foreign Direct Investment by Multinational Corporations Increase Interpersonal Violence in Host Countries? A Cross-National Analysis of 170 Countries, 1990-2019* (Master's thesis, NTNU).

Applebaum, A., 2020. *Twilight of democracy: The seductive lure of authoritarianism*. Anchor.

De Paor, S. and Heravi, B., 2020. Information literacy and fake news: How the field of librarianship can help combat the epidemic of fake news. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*, *46*(5), p.102218.

Duong, K., 2020. *The virtues of violence: Democracy against disintegration in modern France*. Oxford University Press.

Favell, A., 2022. *The integration nation: Immigration and colonial power in liberal democracies*. John Wiley & Sons.

Fisher, A., 2021. Trickle Down Soft Power: Do Russia's Ties to European Parties Influence Public Opinion?. *Foreign Policy Analysis*, *17*(1), p.oraa013.

Gearhart, S., Moe, A. and Zhang, B., 2020. Hostile media bias on social media: Testing the effect of user comments on perceptions of news bias and credibility. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, *2*(2), pp.140-148.Glück, J., 2019. Wisdom vs. populism and polarization: Learning to regulate our evolved intuitions. *Applying wisdom to contemporary world problems*, pp.81-110.

Glück, J., 2019. Wisdom vs. populism and polarization: Learning to regulate our evolved intuitions. *Applying wisdom to contemporary world problems*, pp.81-110.

Gorski, P.S. and Perry, S.L., 2022. *The flag and the cross: White Christian nationalism and the threat to American democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Hameleers, M., 2021. They are selling themselves out to the enemy! The content and effects of populist conspiracy theories. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, *33*(1), pp.38-56.

Iosifidis, P. and Nicoli, N., 2020. *Digital democracy, social media and disinformation*. Routledge.

Jost, J.T., Baldassarri, D.S. and Druckman, J.N., 2022. Cognitive–motivational mechanisms of political polarization in social-communicative contexts. *Nature Reviews Psychology*, *1*(10), pp.560-576.

Lawrence, M., 2020. Violence, conflict, and world order: Rethinking war with a complex systems approach.

Lulwani, M., 2023. Transitional Justice in Context of Justice Beyond Peace and Conflict.

Mullinix, K.J., Bolsen, T. and Norris, R.J., 2021. The feedback effects of controversial police use of force. *Political behavior*, *43*, pp.881-898.

Okoi, O. and Nalule, V.R. eds., 2023. *Governing Natural Resources for Sustainable Peace in Africa: Environmental Justice and Conflict Resolution*. Taylor & Francis.

Papastephanou, M., 2021. Philosophy of education in times of crises and pandemics. *Education Sciences*, *11*(11), p.687.

Peterson, E. and Kagalwala, A., 2021. When unfamiliarity breeds contempt: How partisan selective exposure sustains oppositional media hostility. *American Political Science Review*, *115*(2), pp.585-598.

Roe, M.J. and Shapira, R., 2021. The Power of the Narrative in Corporate Lawmaking. *Harv. Bus. L. Rev.*, *11*, p.233.

Szostek, J., 2020. What happens to public diplomacy during information war? Critical reflections on the conceptual framing of international communication. *International Journal of Communication*, *14*, p.21.

Waghid, Y., Davids, N., Mathebula, T., Terblanche, J., Higgs, P., Shawa, L., Manthalu, C.H., Waghid, Z., Ngwenya, C., Divala, J. and Waghid, F., 2022. Philosophy of education in a

new key: Cultivating a living philosophy of education to overcome coloniality and violence in African universities. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, *54*(8), pp.1099-1112.

Yang, G., 2021. The Paradigm Shift of Political Science from Being "Change-oriented" to "Governance-oriented:" A Perspective on History of Political Science. *Chinese Political Science Review*, *6*, pp.506-545.