



The Challenge of Liberal Democracy

¹ Sanjeev Kumar , ²Suresh kumar, ³ Parineeta

¹ Teacher Govt. Primary School Bela , Tehsil Nadaun District Hamirpur (H.P), India

² lecturer govt. senior secondary school ghagus, tehsil sadar (bilaspur) district bilaspur (h.p.) , india

³ teacher govt. primary centre school rambag (barmana) teh. sadar district bilaspur (hp) .india

Email - ¹sanjeevmnature@gmail.com, ²kumarsureshsuryavanshi@gmail.com, ³ parineetasuresh@gmail.com

Abstract: Liberal democracy was born with a design fault. Though a decent response to the existing social, cultural and economic conditions in which it took shape, it had inbuilt conceptual flaws that sooner or later were bound to run it aground. The very idea is destined to malfunction. Many experts viewed that liberal democracy which lead to capitalism has been the champion of world order. They believed there are no other appropriate system for now and the future except liberal democracy. On the fact that there some questions wherever coming from the democratic countries basing on the reality of capitalism and the gap of asymmetrical prosperity, oligarchy practice, states under control of the bourgeois, unemployment, energy crisis and global climate radical change. There are also some challenge from socialism and other concepts and disability of liberal democracy in providing public services. The issues in this area are wide but the article would like to focused concerning the concept of liberal democracy, practices and its problems, critics from outside to liberal democracy, the development of democracy and its future.

Key Words: Concept of liberal democracy; Practices; Problems; Critics.

1. INTRODUCTION :

PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS. First and foremost is the protection and security of private property rights against seizure by the government. Private property encompasses land, mineral resources, intellectual property, the means of production, and financial assets. When the ownership of private property become highly concentrated in fewer and fewer hands, and this concentration produces great wealth for a small number, then a liberal democracy can easily become an oligarchy, with the money of the very wealthy buying influence and even control over the government. The trappings of democracy will be honored , and elections will be held but the real political power will rest with the very wealthy through the politicians they have on their side, either through ideology or legal bribery, or both. A strong case has been made that the United States is now an oligarchy.

CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS/LIBERTIES. Laws must be passed and operate within the framework of a written or unwritten/customary constitution. Even here there is much room for corruption. Corruption such as slavery may be written into a constitution, as it was, for instance, under the original US constitution in regard to the institution of slavery. Slavery was constitutionally protected as an aspect of property rights. Property rights were primary and prevailed over human rights. Even after slavery was constitutionally abolished it continued to legally flourish through the renting out of prison inmates who in effect were treated as slaves by agricultural and commercial owners. In fact the owners boasted that this system of rented inmates was an even better form of slavery because the government bore the expenses of maintaining the inmate-slaves while the owners reaped the benefit of their labor at much lower costs than they had carried when they outright owned slaves. Here we see how the primacy of property rights can be protected by law and constitution to the detriment of human rights. Constitutions can be and have been corrupted through reinterpretation. For instance, in the US the Supreme Court consistently ruled that the constitution gave property rights but not liberty rights to corporations. This meant that only individual human beings were persons entitled to the individual liberties protected by the constitution, rights such as free speech and religious liberty. But only recently the “original intent” conservative justices overthrew these rulings and decreed that corporations are persons entitled to all the liberties that individual human citizens enjoy. This ruling led to the right by corporations to spend without restraint on elections and on lobbying legislators, making the makers of laws dependent on the money and approval of the wealthy. This is another reason that certain studies have concluded that the US is now an oligarchy.



ELECTED LEADERS AND LAW MAKERS CHOSEN TO SERVE THE PEOPLE. leaders come in two categories: legislators/law making leaders and executive leaders who enforce the laws through the implementation of policies. In theory, in a liberal constitutional democracy, law makers/legislators are elected by the people in order to serve the best interests of the people as a whole. But we have seen that the privileges of absolute property rights, and the money to buy the best propaganda, can and does corrupt law make, leading them to work in the interests of the very rich instead of the people as a whole. The executive leader democratically elected or selected by the political party with the most elected legislators, can also easily be corrupted by the power of money. Corrupt laws may also discriminate against minorities, or more often now, the laws do not discriminate but the discrimination and even oppression occurs in how the laws are enforced. Police treatment of minorities in the United States is an example of enforcement that harms a certain class of people. A case can be made that the elected chief executive in the US acts corruptly in operating a military and economic empire specifically designed to benefit the people at the top of the ownership class at ten expenses of all others.

Liberal democracy gave more satisfaction for individuals who led to liberal political practice and capitalism in economic affairs. There are few of parties and corporate which were maintain this system to protect and enlarge their interests in form of status quo and its enlargements. Liberal democracy belief that private or individual can provide welfare for all citizens so its gave limited to the state roles. The state only as the referee or the judge if there is a mistake of the liberal actors.

The new development is that private sector and individuals was proved cannot provide prevalent welfare, more over with the term of free trade, investment and globalization these has re-enforce their capital accumulation and power. It is so bearing to review the events of the past quarter-century. Twenty-five years ago, liberal democracy was on the march. The Berlin Wall had fallen; the Soviet Union had collapsed; new democracies were emerging throughout Europe, and Russia seemed to be in transition as well. South Africa's apartheid regime was tottering. Even though China's government had brutally repressed a democracy movement, it was possible to believe that a more educated and prosperous Chinese middle class would eventually (and irresistibly) demand democratic reforms. Liberal democracy had triumphed; it seemed, not only in practice but also in principle. It was the only legitimate form of government. There was no alternative.

But there is also an internal challenge to liberal democracy—a challenge from populists who seek to drive a wedge between democracy and liberalism. Liberal norms and policies, they claim, weaken democracy and harm the people. Thus, liberal institutions that prevent the people from acting democratically in their own interest should be set aside. It is this challenge on which I wish to focus.

2. Definition, Discussion and Findings:

Liberal democracy is the champion of world order competition which succeed to form the world in transparent and close relations; liberal democracy secede to provide human rights and freedoms for individuals but lack of being spread evenly to reach for all of peoples welfare provision, on the contrary its led to wider gap and strengthen the previous capitalist and few of new capitalist groups

Liberal Democracy

Liberal democracy was born with a design fault. Though a decent response to the existing social, cultural and economic conditions in which it took shape, it had inbuilt conceptual flaws that sooner or later were bound to run it aground. The very idea is destined to malfunction.

For a start, the term 'liberal' in liberal democracy drew its nourishment from a particular conception of liberty which the philosopher Isaiah Berlin termed negative. The core idea of negative liberty revolves around the existence of a private sphere where an individual may do whatever she wishes, free from interference of state or oppressive social forces. Negative freedom is secured by limiting the capacity of states or social organizations to impose constraints on individuals.

Democracy is the ancient of human kind social system which was always modified by the experts and rulers to be a modern system. Democracy base on the rule of people whom had the power to govern the whole system in state. The system covered the human right and freedom as core of virtue for the people. The development of democracy leads to liberalism in the political issues and capitalism in the economic issues. Its seem that peoples have gained the power but practically its tend to few powerful circles. The system more likely seem manipulated the power holders necessarily to whom they were gave the authority to maintain the power as the representatives. Democracy system is the improvement from aristocracy system, but practically democracy lean to oligarchy system. Democracy gave more



opportunity to the capital holders in the form of resources, power and popularity. Than in the next form of democracy videlicet liberal democracy has prevailed a law that “the survival of the fittest”.

A democracy is a set of binding electoral institutions that effectively translates popular views into public policy. Liberal institutions effectively protect the rule of law and guarantee individual rights such as freedom of speech, worship, press, and association to all citizens (including ethnic and religious minorities). A liberal democracy is simply a political system that is both liberal and democratic – one that both protects individual rights and translates popular views into public policy

Liberal democracy, or Western democracy, is the combination of a liberal political ideology that operates under a representative democratic form of government. Liberal democracy is a form of government. It is a representative democracy in which the ability of the elected representatives to exercise decision-making power is subject to the rule of law, and usually moderated by a constitution that emphasizes the protection of the rights and freedoms of individuals, and which places constraints on the leaders and on the extent to which the will of the majority can be exercised against the rights of minorities.

The rights and freedoms protected by the constitutions of liberal democracies are varied, but they usually include most of the following: rights to due process, privacy, property and equality before the law, and freedoms of speech, assembly and religion. In liberal democracies these rights (also known as "liberal rights") may sometimes be constitutionally guaranteed, or are otherwise created by statutory law or case law, which may in turn empower various civil institutions to administer or enforce these rights.

Liberal democracies also tend to be characterized by tolerance and pluralism; widely differing social and political views, even those viewed as extreme or fringe, are permitted to co-exist and compete for political power on a democratic basis. Liberal democracies periodically hold elections where groups with differing political views have the opportunity to achieve political power. In practice, these elections are nearly always won by groups who support liberal democracy; thus the system perpetuates itself.

The term "liberal" in "liberal democracy" does not imply that the government of such a democracy must follow the political ideology of liberalism. It is merely a reference to the fact that the initial framework for modern liberal democracy was created during the Age of Enlightenment by philosophers advocating liberty. They emphasized the right of the individual to have immunity from the arbitrary exercise of authority. At present, there are numerous different political ideologies that support liberal democracy. Examples include conservatism, Christian Democracy, social democracy and some forms of socialism.

Democracy—literally meaning "rule by the people"—has historically taken many forms. In ancient Athens, democracy meant direct rule by free male citizens. In the twenty-first century democracy is generally understood to mean indirect rule, that is, popular rule through elected representatives.

Liberal democracy owes its origins to particular philosophic doctrines and constitutional developments, which arose especially in England and the United States. The adjective *liberal* points to a set of philosophic doctrines emphasizing human equality that were developed in the early modern period, beginning roughly in the seventeenth century. The English philosopher John Locke (1632–1704) argued that legitimate government arises only from consent and the right to consent, in turn, stems from a fact of nature: human equality.

For Locke, writing in his *Second Treatise of Government* (1690), the state of nature that predates all government is a state wherein "Creatures of the same species and rank ... should also be equal one amongst another without Subordination or Subjection." (Locke 1988, p. 269) According to Locke, because human beings are by nature political equals (although not equal in all respects), the only way in which anyone gains legitimate political authority over another is through the other's consent. Government remains legitimate only so long as it protects the natural rights of individual citizens (i.e., those who have entered the social compact by consenting, explicitly or tacitly, to the particular government). Natural rights include some things to which individuals are entitled in the state of nature, such as life, liberty (including freedom of conscience), and property. A strong conception of rights of the person thus existed at the dawn of modern liberalism and continues to inform the practice of liberal democracy worldwide.

Understanding rights is different, however, from preserving and protecting them in practice. Even majorities can only legitimately consent to pursue the common good. As Locke maintained, no one is all-wise or all-powerful and human reason is influenced by passion. A rudimentary separation of powers doctrine appeared in Locke, who argued that government by nature consists of the legislative, executive, and judicial power, and that danger exists in combining these powers in one set of hands. Such concern for separation also appears in the French philosopher Montesquieu (1689–1755), who, like Locke, was sympathetic to the relative moderation and tolerance embodied by English constitutionalism. Both of these philosophers would influence the thinking of the American founders.



3. Liberal Democracy, Its Problems & solution :

For the newest liberal democracies and those nations that aspire toward liberal democracy, some problems seem obvious, including lack of experience with liberal democratic institutions and the remnants of sometimes hostile political cultures. Even in the longest established and most powerful liberal democracies, theoretical and practical problems abound, both from within and from without.

Of the obvious problems from within, protecting minority rights is a perennial concern, because of the basic tension between the claims of liberalism on the one hand and democracy or majority rule, on the other. Of the obvious problems from without, liberal democracies have from their earliest days been challenged on the battlefield and in the world of ideas. At first, resistance came from clerical establishments and then later from powerful illiberal ideologies such as Nazism and communism.

Less obvious challenges from within have to do with the status of the consent principle itself. At least partly from the French Revolution came a version of liberalism that opposes traditional moral and social authority but not the overall power of the state. The French political thinker Alexis de Tocqueville (1805–1859) in his work *Democracy in America* (1840) warned of the dangers of governmental power and centralization coupled with a weak civil society. He suggested that people who crave or acquiesce to such government power for the sake of immediate comfort lose the capacity for self-government. As government takes over the traditional workings of the marketplace and civil society, people are expected to do less for them and for the common good and so less can be expected of them politically. It is "difficult to imagine," he claimed, "how people who have entirely given up managing their own affairs could make a wise choice of those who are to do that for them. One should never expect a liberal, energetic, and wise government to originate in the votes of a people of servants." (Tocqueville 1988, p. 694.) In this view, liberal democracy needs freedom in the form of spontaneous, non-governmental activities and organizations, which also provide social cohesion. In the absence of such activities and organizations, hyper individuality and moral libertinism necessitate more and more state control, which encourages still less active citizenship.

In the twenty-first century, those on the liberal right (or "classical liberals," as they are sometimes called) are inclined to share concerns and support the market and limited government not simply for economic reasons but also as a check on state power and as a means of developing citizenly virtues. On the other hand, those on the liberal left often see state power in its modern, administrative incarnation to be a positive good. In their view, such power is necessary for social justice and to tame the worst effects of the marketplace.

Whatever the merits of these arguments, it is clear that liberal democracy requires freedom to be political in a meaningful consensual way but also necessitates freedom *from* politics, that is, freedom to engage in one's own pursuits. Democracy would be totalitarian rather than liberal if citizens were constantly occupied by obligations to the state and were able without constraint to impose on other citizens similar obligations.

The ability to impose non consensually one's views on matters of fundamentally contested moral and constitutional principles raises yet another challenge to liberal democracy. Such impositions are invariably linked to questions of overall government power, who exercises it, and the manner in which it is exercised. In the United States this problem has taken the form of concern over the limits of judicial power. Of all branches of government, the judiciary is, by design, the least consensual. It is subject to popular control only very indirectly. To the extent modern liberalism exalts the individual qua individual, certain conceptions of rights might well be in tension with conceptions of the common good. The power of the state in the form of nonconsensual courts can be used to overturn laws that might be seen as legitimate consensual decisions of the popular branches of government.

3.1. Solutions:

The Ability to Limit Destructive Escalation — Democracies must provide citizens with ways to address grievances and resolve disputes that do not escalate conflicts to destructive levels where substantive debate is replaced with mutual hatred and a desire to hurt one another. They must also provide mechanisms to de-escalate conflicts when they do become overheated. Right now, in the United States, people on both sides of the Red-Blue (conservative-liberal) divide seem to believe that the only way they can protect their vital interests is by winning the next election. And the way to do that, many people believe, is to drive distrust and hatred of the other side higher and higher. Between traditional and social media, both sides are stoking anger, fear, and hatred, and disseminating false stories, in order to get people to believe their sides' view of "the truth." This distorts the images that people have of both their friends and their enemies. It progressively erodes critically-important social taboos against illegitimate and, sometimes, morally abhorrent confrontation strategies, including violence. This is not an environment in which democracy can flourish. It might not even survive.



Reliable Analyses of Problems and Potential Solutions Based on Verified Facts — Successful democracies must be able to reliably identify the problems they face, based on an understanding of verified facts, not the self-serving analyses and manufactured truths that are being promoted by both sides. (The Left tends to think this is only a problem of the right, but it is not. The Left does it too, but they do it differently. Problems cannot be solved without an accurate understanding of what the problem is and what is causing it. Hyper-polarization causes people to oversimplify their understanding of problems by simply blaming the other side, without considering the way in which they may be contributing to the problem or the role of factors that are beyond anyone's ability to control.

Fair and Equitable Power Sharing Public trust in and willingness to support liberal democracy ultimately depends upon the belief that the government will be responsive to and responsible for protecting the rights and interests of all citizens, not just the powerful. Ironically, now, both sides of the political divide seem to feel as if the government is not treating them fairly. On the left, there are a wide range of "marginalized" groups that feel as if they have been unfairly treated as long as they have lived in the United States. On the right, there are many who are struggling, but are not "marginalized" according to the left. Nevertheless, they feel that they are being unfairly treated now. For instance, in the U.S., most of these people think that Trump actually won the election which was "stolen" from him (and hence from them). They also think that all of the Left's policies designed to help people of color and other minority groups (such as LGBTQ) are discriminatory against whites.

Underlying Common Vision — When former South African Ambassador to the United States, Ebrahim Rassool was asked what lessons the United States could learn from South Africa's reconciliation process, he said that "we must begin from the end." By that he meant that we need to develop a society-wide image of the nature of the country we want to live in. Right now in the United States, the Left has such an image, and the Right has a competing and very different image. These dueling visions set the stage for a continuing struggle over which image is going to be pursued, and as we said in the previous section, together with our current power balance, that just swings the pendulum back and forth every few years.

Ability to Solve Problems — Successful democracies need to be able to integrate successes in each of the above areas into a trusted and broadly-supported problem-solving system. Such a system would employ collaborative principles to give all stakeholders a role in jointly analyzing the nature of mutual problems, and developing, evaluating, selecting, and implementing options for addressing those problems while also fairly distributing benefits, costs and risks. Other types of less collaborative problem solving are also sometimes effective, such as expert problem solving. Still, the more the people affected by a decision are involved in making that decision, the more likely it will be accepted. Such collaborative problem solving is a very tall order if the earlier steps are not taken. However, it is a natural outgrowth of those steps once they are followed.

4. Conclusion :

The discussion showed us some facts that: liberal democracy is still the champion in the era with some advances and obstacles. The advances including the generic system of political and economics, and the obstacles including inability of privates and individuals to provide welfare in equal form. Liberal democracy has advance conception providing human rights and freedoms but lack of common and interests of all the peoples. The future of the world affairs would Continue the domination of liberal democracy in new mix favored with other ideologies such as socialism and Islam. Even though there are China, European Union and Muslims emerging countries but U.S.A. Would still dominate the world order base on its power in economics, politics, technology, military and influence linkages.

REFERENCES :

1. [Http://www.governmentvs.com/en/history-of-liberal-democracy/mode](http://www.governmentvs.com/en/history-of-liberal-democracy/mode)
2. Platter FM (2010) Populism, Pluralism, and Liberal Democracy. Journal of Democracy.
3. Jothia L (2012) Liberal Democracy: An African Perspective Agreement, Academic Research International 3.
4. Fotopoulos T (2005) The Multidimensional Crisis and Inclusive Democracy.
5. [Http://www.governmentvs.com/en/characteristics-of-liberal-democracy/ model](http://www.governmentvs.com/en/characteristics-of-liberal-democracy/ model)
6. [Http://www.governmentvs.com/en/liberal-democratic-countries/ model](http://www.governmentvs.com/en/liberal-democratic-countries/ model)
7. Ceaser, James W. *Liberal Democracy and Political Science*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.