

## The Critique of Deliberative Democracy: A Philosophical Implication

Mohasina Khatun

Research Scholar, Dept. of Philosophy, Vidyasagar University

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

#### Article History

Published Online: 16 Mar 2020

#### Keywords

Democracy, Liberal Democracy,  
Deliberative, Pluralism, Agonism

#### \*Corresponding Author

Email: mohasinakhatun01[at]gmail.com

---

### ABSTRACT

*In the current situation, liberal democracy is the all around perceived authentic type of government. American President Bush Jr. also, his rationalist counsel Fukuyama guaranteed win over the enemies of liberal majority rule government. There are shifting cases concerning how the current trumpet of win will blow. While not many challenge to challenge the liberal-majority rule model, the indications of antagonism with present organizations are quickly surfacing. The fundamental contention for the antagonism is that individuals feel says that conventional gatherings in a liberal majority rule arrangement have stopped to consider the interests of individuals, and that outrageous traditional gatherings are making advances into numerous Western liberal vote based systems. In this paper, I need to show that, besides, even among the individuals who are opposing the call of political pioneers looking for well known help by abusing individuals' cravings and biases and not entering verbose talk, as proposed by Deliberative vote based system, there is a checked doubt about governmental issues and legislators, which is subverting mainstream vote based qualities. There is unmistakably a flood of resistance arising in most liberal-democracy's, which uncovered the triumphalism saw after the breakdown of Soviet Union.*

Democracy is perhaps the most arising and huge ideas of the twenty first century counterparts world. Vote based system is that, where it says various methods of good administration and it result is that in today the various nations have followed to move from non-popularity based to majority rule political administration frameworks. Before we talk about just administration and any investigation of democratization, it will be befuddling to us without understanding what democracy is, and what are the base conditions that must be found in a vote based government? I have extensively learned about democracy then I have locate that different sort of just establishments and the socio-political masterminds, thinkers about vote based system and they have built up their own thoughts and they give on how we ought to relate to the term 'majority rule government' and under which circumstances an administration or states or countries can be called popularity based. Since most punctual timeframe, the Greek word 'Demokratia' and to the French word 'Democratie', and after that to English word 'democracy', has been utilized with various destinations with the end goal of political systems. Albeit the Greek word 'Demokratia', followed from the root words 'Demos' which signifies 'individuals' and the words 'Kratos or Xratos', which signifies 'rule', hence 'demokratie' alluded to the standard by individuals, which these days applies to the liberal delegate government. In actuality, popular government is a genuine political framework that has been not forever imagined this strategy but instead democracy is a modestly new certainty in this day and age legislative issue.

Consequently, as per the Encyclopedia of Democracy, the meaning of democracy is that

Democracy is a system of government in which all adult persons within the unit of rule are entitled to participate equally in making general laws and policy. Each of the elements within this and most other

definitions will require further specification. In the course of such elaboration most theories go beyond description and definition to some statement of democratic ideals. (Lipset, 1995, p.1278)

Therefore, the exclusion in Athenian democracy of both slaves and women resulted in social inequalities. The modern liberal democratic system with its economic structure that allows accumulation of wealth maximizes power and opportunity in the hands of a few that ends up with disproportionate inequalities. Further, through a historical analysis of democracy from ancient Athens to contemporary states reflects defects in the claim to justice and fairness, egalitarian system, ideal political system that places equality at the core of society while benefiting the least well-off in the society. The realised defects of the system that has come to be known as Liberal democracy led thinkers and philosophers to find alternatives either as an extension, supplement or improvement of the theory, like with Deliberative Democracy, or suggestion of replacing the fundamental organization of society, like in Radical Democracy. Deliberative democracy is not a single hypothesis but is presented through many different explanations and justifications. However, the basic idea between the variants is to provide a strong account of political legitimacy. In a democracy, the legitimacy of collective decisions is the will of the majority. However, Liberal philosophers, like Tocqueville (2000) and Mill (1978), have questioned the principle of majority and have argued that this may end up in the 'tyranny of the majority' which sometimes unfairly restricts the availability of liberties to the citizens belonging to a minority. In order to avoid this unfair restriction political thinkers of Deliberative democracy propose problematisation of the liberal account of the legitimate collective will.

Therefore, democracy constitutes the system in which people become conscious of their rights and dignity. The main purpose of democracy or the aim of a democratic government is to manage justice among the people, as well as to guarantee the basic rights of people such as freedom and equality. In Mill's socio-political thought, utilitarian structure of values of democracy becomes meaningful only in the light of his deliberations on the concepts of justice and equality. Mill says that for any society to be held truly democratic, then there must be hold these two goals of democracy because their realization enhances both social and political freedom. Mill says that any state that does not hold more liberty to its individuals, then it is said to be more just like that which does not, and any democratic form of government which helps us in achieving these ideals of justice and equality, then these type of democracy is said to be practicing ideal democracy.

Today's political discourse, especially among the political philosophers and theorists, demonstrates that the liberal democratic governments have failed, both theoretically and practically even with the notion of participatory democracy. Classical Liberal democracy failing in its endeavours required new forms of justification and operation. Deliberative democracy is the latest effort to justify Liberal democracy, while admitting the failure of classical Liberal democracy. Deliberative democracy presents the thesis that

...democratic decision making ought to be grounded in a substantial process of public deliberation, wherein arguments for and against laws and policies are given in terms of whether they advance the common good of citizens and the justice of the political society. This conception is to be understood by contrast with interest-group pluralist and elitist conceptions of democracy. While many have proclaimed adherence to the idea that public deliberation ought to play a major role in democratic society, few have offered a clear account of the significance that deliberation has for democracy. (Christiano, 1997, p. 243)

In Deliberative democracy, emphasises is on dialogue and deliberation, which describes the position of Gutmann and Thompson. Both of them affirm that, the controversial moral issues would not be expelled from public debate, but these issues become a subject of collective deliberation. According to Gutmann, a liberal state should be

...dealing with moral conflict. The consensus on these higher order principles that liberal propose is not sufficient to eliminate moral conflict from politics, and a more robust set of principles is necessary to govern the conflict that inevitably and legitimately remains. The higher order principles that constitute the core of the consensus, we suggest, must permit greater moral disagreement about policy and greater moral agreement on how to disagree about policy. (Gutmann, 1990, p. 125)

The phrase "Deliberative" was first used in 1489, to refer the political discussion within a small and limited group of political leaders. Then in the eighteenth century, deliberation was part of a protection of political representation that pointedly resisted appeals to popular judgment. Edmund Burke's "Speech to the electors of Bristol," which declared that "Parliament is a deliberative assembly," is famously to a defence of an administrator conception of representation that

today seems more aristocratic than democratic (Burke, 1959, p.115).

Most essentially, the deliberative democracy insists that the need to justify decisions which made by citizens and their elected representatives. Both are expected to justify the laws which they would act out to one another. Deliberative democracy, which makes the room for many other forms of decision-making including bargaining among groups and secret operations ordered by executives, as long as the use of these forms themselves is justified at some point in a deliberative process. In this democracy, the first and most important characteristic is its reason-giving requirement. In deliberative democracy, agents receive part is by presenting and responding to reasons, or by demanding that their representatives do so with the aim of justifying the laws under which they must live together. The reasons are meant both to produce a justifiable decision and to express the value of mutual respect.

Therefore, deliberative democracy is that process where people and government representatives aims at producing a decision that is binding for some period of time. In this process the deliberation is not like a talk show or an academic seminar. In this process, the participants do not argue for argument's sake and they do not argue even for truth's own sake although the truthfulness of their arguments is a deliberative virtue because it is a necessary condition to aim in justifying their decision. They intended to their discussion to influence a decision the government will make, or a process that will influence how future decisions are made better for society or state. Amy Gutmann notes that deliberation,

...may sometimes increase moral conflict in politics by opening up forums for argument that were previously closed ... Deliberation encourages people with conflicting perspectives to understand each other's point of view, to minimize their moral disagreements, and to search for common ground, but it begins by opening politics up to a range of reasonable disagreement that is restricted by less deliberative politics. (Gutmann, 1999, p.199)

While deliberation aims at a justifiable decision, it does not assume that the decision at hand will in fact be justified, let alone that a justification today will do for the indefinite future. It keeps open to the possibility of a continuing dialogue, firstly in this situation citizens can condemn the previous decisions and secondly they move ahead on the basis of that criticism. Although a decision must stand for some period of time, because it is temporary in the sense that it must be open to challenge at some point in the future.

Cohen's model of deliberative democracy is strongly normative in character and is partly grateful to Habermas's discourse the theory of democracy. The significance of such a normative theory of deliberative democracy for our present purposes is that it well spokes the conditions under which a fair debate among competing collective identities and conflicting conceptions of the good can be conducted. Cohen's theory of deliberative democracy embodies all normative theories tend to do an ideal model of fair deliberative procedures, but its explicit aim is to investigate ways in which to institutionalize such an ideal. So as to make our social and political institutions more open to free public deliberation. It is not an ideal thought-experiment, but an attempt to work out the fairest conditions for

the conciliation of conflicting moral perspectives on the common good. Finally, the ideal of deliberative democracy is not a perfectionist doctrine, since it does not depend on a particular view of the good life. Rather,

It is organised around a view of political justification that justification proceeds through free deliberation among equal citizens- and not a conception of the proper conduct of life. (Cohen, 1989, p.27)

The most convoluted hypothetical record of a deliberative model of popular government is given by Jurgen Habermas. Like Cohen, Habermas offers a depiction of an ideal deliberative interaction whose regulating legitimacy lays on the accompanying rules: initially, cycles of consultation should appear as a trade of data and contentions supported by reasons; also, thoughts are exhaustive and public, nobody might be barred on a basic level and each one of those influenced reserve an option to participate; thirdly, considerations are liberated from any outer or inward power that could degrade the equity of the members; fourthly, thoughts focus on judiciously spurred arrangement and can on a fundamental level be proceeded uncertainly or continued whenever. In any case, political considerations should be concluded by greater part vote given the institutional pressing factors to arrive at a choice. Since it is inside associated with an act of consultation, lion's share decide legitimizes the supposition that the choice embraced might be viewed as worthy until additional notification, in particular, until the minority persuades most of the rightness of its own perspectives; fifthly, political thoughts extend to each one of those issues that can be directed in the equivalent interest of all, including matters, for example, the inconsistent conveyance of assets, that influence the equivalent and compelling activity of the privilege to cooperation in the political cycle; sixthly, political considerations, should likewise incorporate the understanding of requirements, the enunciation of aggregate characters, and the change of pre-political mentalities and inclinations. (Habermas, 1996, pp.305-306)

It is not difficult to perceive how deliberative majority rule government depends on a re-translation of the chance of universalism in vote based system. To the conventional Marxist-communist undertakings, universalism emerged from the comprehensiveness of the problem solver: the working class was the progressive subject never really place in the relations of creations. Habermas and the other deliberative scholars evade to calling attention to favored situations from where all inclusiveness can be guaranteed. In any case, they keep up the general concept of arriving at comprehensiveness, specifically through the 'power less power' of the better contention in the ideal discourse circumstance. From a post-primary point of view, that the possibility of the power less power and the actual chance of arriving at reasonableness seem suspicious. When meant majority rule hypothesis as on account of deliberative popular government two arrangements of issues shows up. The first is that agreement is impossible, and should it be accomplished it isn't objective. The second is that the mix of the faith in objectivity through understanding and

the debilitating of the interest of general or expansive investment effectively lead the heroes of deliberative popular government into a blue-blooded position.

Despite the fact that Habermas in his most recent compositions seem to have repudiated on the interest for agreement just as the chance of sanity in the exacting sense, however there is no uncertainty that objectivity stills capacities as some sort of regulative ideal and that vote based system in the last model is favored on the grounds that it is a social request which takes into account the nearest approximations of this ideal. As indicated by Seyla Benhabib for instance, one of the focal issues to be tended to is bow the verbalization of the benefit of everyone can be made viable with the sway of individuals. In her view, the principle challenge facing democracy today lies in accommodating judiciousness with authenticity. She places it in the accompanying manner,

According to the deliberative model of democracy, it is a necessary condition for attaining legitimacy and rationality with regard to collective decisions making processes in a polity, that the institutions of this polity are so arranged that what is considered in the common interest of all results from processes of collective deliberation conducted rationally and fairly among free and equal individuals. (Benhabib, 1996, p.69)

As Mouffe has called attention to on a few events, the issue with the ideal of levelheadedness is that it blinds us to the utilization of force and avoidances characteristic in any interaction of choice. On a first, prompt level is very certain that agreement and arrangements isn't the prevailing image of governmental issues in present day cultures. Obviously deliberative masterminds contend that this is an indication of sickness and that should be relieved and that it very well may be restored under the correct conditions. In the event that real dynamic was coordinated by the standards of deliberative majority rule government, at that point agreement would be the outcome. Notwithstanding, on a more philosophical level, the issue is whether choices can be made judiciously, and with no utilization of power. On the off chance that this isn't the situation, the general concept of levelheadedness as the point of democracy is problematized.

To finish up I might want to say that, since we never arrive at the purpose of all inclusiveness, neither by a specialist pre-arranged for the assignment, or through setting up circumstances like the ideal discourse circumstance, we will consistently need to pick and settle on other options. Regardless of how well the discussion has been framed, choices making includes the rejection of choices. Indeed, even in the presumably uncommon instances of unanimity an insignificant measure of power for example power, has been included, in particular the force it takes to 'smother' choices that can't be decreased to 'mistakes' in an algorithmic figuring. As Laclau puts it, this prompts the end that majority rule government isn't tied in with making power vanish, yet rather to shape power as per the vote based standards of fairness and freedom.

## References

1. Burke, E. R. Hoffman and P. Levack, (Eds.), (1959). *Burke's Politics: Selected Writings and Speeches of Edmund Burke on Reform, Revolution, and War*, pp. Xxxvii, 536. New York: Alfred A Knopf

2. Cohen, J. (1989). Deliberation and Democratic Legitimacy, in A. Hamlin and P. Pettit (Eds.). *The Good Polity: Normative Analysis of the State*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
3. Gutmann, A. (1999). *Democratic Education, with a New Preface and Epilogue*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
4. Habermas, J. (1996). *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. (Trans.) REHG, W. Cambridge, Polity Press.
5. Mouffe, C. (1996). Democracy, Power and the 'Political, in S. Benhabib (Eds.), *Democracy and Difference: Contesting the Boundaries of the Political*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
6. Mouffe, C. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*, London: Verso.
7. Lipset, S. M. (1995). *The Encyclopaedia of Democracy*, (Vol. 4). Congressional Quarterly.