

An Inter-Disciplinary Study of How Democracies Eventually Emulate  
Authoritarian Regimes, Considering *1984* As A Forewarning

By

Md. Hasibul Hassan  
ID: 20203044

A Thesis submitted to the Department of English and Humanities  
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Bachelor of Arts in English

Bachelor of Arts in English  
Department of English and Humanities  
BRAC University  
Feb 2022

© 2021. Brac University  
All Rights Reserved

## **Declaration**

'An Interdisciplinary Study of How Democracies Eventually Emulate Authoritarian Regimes, considering 1984 As A Forewarning' is the thesis I submitted as part of the requirements for the degree of Bachelor of Arts in English. I declare that my thesis is my original work. For the content of this work, I am solely accountable. The research paper complies with the University rules against plagiarism. It has not been submitted for any other degree at this university or any other university, nor has it been submitted for publication anywhere else. Finally, I have referenced all of the materials that I utilized to complete my thesis in the bibliography section.

**Student's Full name & Signature:**

**Md. Hasibul Hassan**

---

**Md. Hasibul Hassan**

**Supervisor's Full name & Signature:**

---

**Seema Nusrat Amin**

Lecturer, English & Humanities

BRAC University

**Examining Committee:**

Supervisor:  
(Member)

---

Seema Nusrat Amin  
Lecturer, Department of English & Humanities  
BRAC University

Departmental Head:  
(Chair)

---

Professor Firdous Azim  
Professor & Chairman, Department of English  
& Humanities  
BRAC University

**Acknowledgement:**

Writing this paper probably the most beautiful thing that I experienced since the corona outbreak. The moment I decided to do research on this topic, I realized that the journey would drive me to the depth of an ocean where only perseverance and determination could help me to attain the holy grail. In the previous few months, the topic and the materials that I researched relentlessly called into question my ideological strength and weakness and placed me in a position where I became fascinated to analyse various diagrams of political spectrum in other regions of the world.

I thoroughly believe, I would not have been able to complete my thesis without the constant support and co-operation I received from my supervisor Ms. Seema Nusrat Amin. Amidst all the confusions and loads of information, ma'am helped me to keep questioning relevant matters and to stay on the right direction throughout the journey. There was a time when the thesis was stuck in one path and I did not see any hope to process it to different directions, it was due to her incessant encouragement and catechisation that showed me beacon of hope.

I want to express my sincere regard to all the teachers from my department, who beautified the whole journey of under-graduation with their majestic guidance and way of teaching.

At last, to all my family members- This is for you all. I treasure each and every one of you tremendously! You all mean the world to me!

**Abstract:**

For decades following World War II, the inadequacies and opulence exhibited by dictatorships had prompted people to refocus their attention toward democratic administration. Democracy was triumphant in the Cold War against Totalitarians. It swept the board because of the overwhelming support it received from the general public. Despite the fact that totalitarianism had diminished in practical value, the democratic ruler in the contemporary world has maintained many of its trademarks, which are intricately linked to Oceania's depiction in *1984*.

The purpose of this paper is to conduct an impartial examination into why democratic rulers implement almost comparable policy initiatives to govern a nation like authoritarian states, how political functionalities of Big Brother have remoulded into newer shape in the twenty-first century democratic capitalist world, how we all the citizens are part of this. Affixing viewpoints penned in the book *The Dictator's Handbook* with the political stratagem taken by The Big Brother, some of the other autocratic and democratic leaders, this paper aims to examine the deeper reasons behind how and why authoritarian approaches are taken into account by the democratic leaders.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>DECLARATION.....</b>	<b>ii</b>
<b>APPROVAL.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKWOLEDGEMENT.....</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>ABSTRACT.....</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS.....</b>	<b>vi</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Research Methodology.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 3: Literature Review .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 4: WHY LEADERS DO WHAT THEY DO</b>	
<b>4.1: FRAMEWORK.....</b>	<b>31</b>
4.1.1 Dependent upon the will of majority.....	31
4.1.2 More focused on Power Play.....	34
4.1.3 Requires time to implement changes.....	36
4.1.4 Person-first Process.....	38
4.1.5 Conflict of Interest within the administration.....	40
4.1.6 Emphasizes more on quantity, than on quality.....	43
4.1.7 Lack of Accountability after Election.....	45
4.1.8 Lobbying of Interest group.....	47
4.1.9 Frequent occurrence of Gridlock.....	49
<b>4.2: Democracy in the Light of Will to Power.....</b>	<b>51</b>
4.2.1 No man rules alone.....	51

4.2.2 Fear of opponent getting power.....	53
4.2.3 Winning Coalition, all that matters.....	56
4.2.4 A democratic leader is no different.....	57
<b>4.3 Democracy in the Shadow of Economics.....</b>	<b>59</b>
4.3.1 Empowering Winning Coalition.....	59
4.3.2 International Trading System.....	61
4.3.3 Impact of Elites.....	63
4.3.4 Huge expenses of Election.....	64
4.3.5 Implementation of TAX.....	66

## **CHAPTER 5: HOW LEADERS SUPPLANT DEMOCRACY WITH AUTOCRACY**

<b>5.1: BY DESTABILIZING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES.....</b>	<b>67</b>
5.1.1 Deploying illegitimate action.....	67
5.1.2 Suspending or Amending Constitution.....	70
5.1.3 Restricting Opponent's Voices.....	73
5.1.4 Limiting Media's Action.....	76
5.1.5 Controlling Congress & Judiciary System.....	79
<b>5.2: HELPING ONLY WHO MATTERS .....</b>	<b>81</b>
5.2.1 Keeping Winning Coalition small .....	81
5.2.2 Making Nominal Selectorates large.....	83
5.2.3 Promoting Right-wing democracy.....	84

5.2.4 Fostering Division .....	86
5.2.5 Illegitimate Power to Militia.....	89
<b>5.3: ECONOMIC Consolidation.....</b>	<b>91</b>
5.3.1 A Systemized Corruption Framework.....	91
5.3.2 Investing money to sway election.....	93
5.3.3 Foreign Deal in exchange of Power-support.....	94
<b>5.4: TECHNOLOGICAL Consolidation.....</b>	<b>96</b>
5.4.1 Promoting Propaganda.....	96
5.4.2 Monitoring Personal data illegitimately.....	97
<b>CHAPTER 6: WHAT HAPPENS IF LEADERS DOES NOT DO THAT</b>	
6.1 To err is human being.....	99
6.2 Role of Money.....	101
6.3 A ruler is the head, but not their protector.....	104
6.4 More freedom, more chance of Rebellion.....	106
<b>CHAPTER 7: FINDINGS.....</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>CHAPTER 8: CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>Works Cited.....</b>	<b>115</b>



## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Democracy, in brief, is a decision-making process in which the final decision is explicitly associated with the expressed preferences of the people. The affinity of Democracy among normal citizens is based on characteristics such as individual freedom and equality. It is described as a method of processing disputes in which the results are determined by the actions of the participants, but no individual force is in charge of deciding what will happen. According to the Dr. Todd Landman, Democracy is a prominent example of a fundamentally contested idea, as there is currently no ultimate agreement on its interpretation or entire substance, and there is unlikely to be in the foreseeable future (2). The premise that democracy is a system of governance characterized by a certain extent of representative government and communal decision-making has remained virtually unchallenged. The term "democracy" has traditionally been comprised of several components in which individual people have the authority to approve or disapprove their figureheads through a comprehensive election campaign. In truth, democracy entails more than just giving people the opportunity to vote; it also involves preserving and safeguarding everyone's rights, even of those who lack authority and belong to the marginalised group. As the world progresses, the term "democracy" has come to have a variety of interpretations to fit various purposes, and the resulting lack of clarity makes policy implementation troublesome. However, as Landman states, it is the issue about the additional qualities to this fundamental concept that has sparked a substantial and specific dispute regarding the various interpretations of democracy (2). Collier and Levitsky (1997) note that a "procedural minimum" for democracy comprises fully contested elections with equal representation and no widespread vote irregularities, as well as meaningful protections for individual liberty (433-4).

So, rather than guaranteeing the achievement of certain goals, democracy is a collection of tools designed to ensure that solutions are reached fairly.

Democracy has diversified into various forms in today's world, each of which is used in different democratic governments in their own distinctive manner. There are no two systems that are precisely equivalent, and no one model can be considered ideal. Despite it being transmuted into numerous models, one significant similarity is perpetual- having the right to vote, in short "election". Since democracy does not guarantee the possibility to have power perpetually, many democratic leaders, it appears, have altered the mechanism in such a manner that their power and influence would last longer while also not jeopardizing their outward democratic look. In such context, democratic leaders with autocratic mindset implements acts like diminishing opponent, detracting free speech, unlawful acts and etc. are taken into consideration by democrat leaders. On the contrary to Democracy, a ruler with unlimited decision-making powers and total dominance over his subordinates is defined as authoritarian leadership. According to the definition, authoritarianism is a political system in which the state's role is concentrated either in a single individual or a small group of individuals who are not accountable to the community as a result of existing laws and regulations. It's a system in which blind loyalty to authority is rewarded or even imposed under extreme stress. As Almond and Powell (1996) states, those governments that exhibit authoritarian features are those that exercise centralized control over legislative and judicial authorities and those that do not conduct public elections to choose their leaders (124). For example, in *1984*, the political operation known is completely controlled by the ruling party and the leader named 'Big Brother', with no room for opposition. In Oceania, Big Brother has ultimate authority over the continent, and every action taken by Big Brother is considered to be the law of the land. This totalitarian propensity, on the other hand, cannot be

practiced by a leader in a democratic regime legally. As a result, democratic leaders with an autocratic mindset utilize a variety of methods to legitimize their authoritarian tendencies. For instance, when democratic leaders cannot vehemently deny "election" by renouncing democratic means, they have employed the outer mechanisms and spectacle of the basic democratic process, via "sham elections" "amendments of legislation," without the fundamental rights and prerequisites needed to guarantee that, among other ways to maintain control over the nation state. Even in the most modern countries, current revelations in the United States, a handful of European union countries, and India as well, have raised significant worries about the sustainability of democracy.

Despite the fact that the world has fundamentally altered in many irreconcilable ways and has been affected by diverse doctrines, one thing remains constant even in the democratic regime which talks about equality- that is, people's suffering. It is not that any kind of democracy has the potential to placate everyone or achieve the wishes of a majority, but a system that permits politicians to make adjustments to their own agenda raises questions about the effectiveness of the governing system as a whole. Although technological innovation and the Industrial Revolution have taken the world by storm and deeply influenced people's lifestyles, the authorities continue to downplay the fundamental features of freedom. Many countries began to evolve their policies in accordance with the democratic ideology's appropriateness with the expansion of democracy, owing to its ideals relating to human happiness. However, over time, the ideology that so prominently enunciated its insurrection began to erode the underlying foundations on which it was built.

## Chapter 2: Research Methodology

The purpose of this study is to look into the flaws in democracy's framework, which has metamorphosed into different forms in compliance with economic and political stratagem, that allow a democratic leader to disrupt its essential functions. Furthermore, the study examines how leaders make these endeavours successful by putting on a phony image of democracy. Most of the research is done with qualitative data, though it is heavily influenced by books on how democracies' plenitude and fundamental principles have been eroded by their leaders and how George Orwell's novel 1984 has a connection to contemporary political paradigms. It is also influenced by findings from the quantitative analysis of Bueno De Mesquita, Alistair Smith, Randolph M. Siverson, and James D. Morrow's research on "The Logic of Political Survival". I employ the Selectorate Theory, which was developed by them, to better understand the common actions of democratic leaders that have an autocratic outlook. Selectorate Theory states that leaders are solely concerned with maintaining their positions of power as long as possible and will attempt to manipulate their behaviour to that end. However, the major principles are developed in accordance with the opinions expressed in the book *The Dictator's Handbook* (2011), published by Bruce Bueno de Mesquita and Alastair Smith, which covers and develops the idea of Selectorate Theory, penned by them along with two other writers (1999).

However, since it is not a solitary research, this research substantially relies on other publication and journals. Several references and statements in the literature review section are taken into consideration to support the argument. The discussion sections explore the divergent framework of democracy and the eventual action of its leaders from different continent, with the help of various external research materials. Invariably, secondary sources are determined in

accordance with the multiple perspectives over which the research is required to put more emphasis, which include measures undertaken by autocratic leaders such as Saddam Hussein, the aftermath of autocratic regimes' downward spiral, and what consequently results after autocratic leaders consider taking comparatively liberal actions. Most fundamentally, people's participation in the whole functionalism of democratic backsliding, as well as how their goals change to obtain economic gain by sacrificing freedom of speech, is a major focus of this research.

The research mainly focuses on investigating how this transformation occurs across different regimes (from Communist, capitalist, democratic-autocratic) and ideological perspectives, by utilizing examples of incidents from historical and contemporary political scenario determined by power, economy and globalized politics. It purports to discover the nature of world politics from a comparative politics framework. The research for the thesis is done progressively, by asking the questions of why, how and what if in relation to this apparent transformation, with the majority of the information coming from secondary sources.

**Research Question:**

Is the democratic fundamental framework feasible enough to not adopt authoritarian policies, considering the fact that the political ideology fosters a form of political competitiveness and power-play in itself where the majority of support plays an indispensable role in forcing the government to legislate in consonance with their agenda? Subsequently, is democracy's mechanism only enticing on the surface but inadequate in achieving its goals and objectives since democratic leaders destabilize its principles and big powers (i.e. the United States of America, France) tend to have a shifting perspective of democracy contingent on their alliances with other nations and their economic profitability? Has the toxic competitiveness in

the democratic political arena devolved into a point of contention when politics no longer centre around consensus?

### **Chapter 3: Literature Review**

Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt in their written book *How Democracies Die* (2018), assert that they believe democracies gradually freeze to death when politicians undermine democratic protective measures against totalitarian control, using a comparable method to evaluate the trajectory of democratic collapse in different nations. The book *How Democracies Die* (2018) is primarily concerned with the transformation of American democracy's schema over the last few decades. They postulate that the current political landscape in Western democracies, particularly the United States, is characterized by growing ideological fragmentation. Considering this phenomenon, the book is a powerful warning against a distinctive democratic crisis. As the authors so aptly articulated it, the tragic irony of the democratic route to authoritarianism is that democracy's destroyers use democratically elements to destroy democracy, subtly and some even legally (11). To begin their assessment, the writers use a fascinating anomaly as a foundation. Since the post-cold War era, most democratic governments have been deposed from power from within, through the election system and subsequent control of power institutions by autocrats, rather than externally, through violent coup operations.

Democratic government, like any competition, is predicated on both formal and informal regulations. However, burgeoning political insurgents frequently utilize catastrophes to break or twist the rules of the game for their own political advantage. One of the biggest tragedies is that the preservation of democracy has also been used as an excuse for its disintegration, with elected democratic leaders claiming economic turmoil, conflicts, or acts of terrorism as rationale for

undemocratic policies (79). President George W. Bush, for example, persuaded the upper and lower houses of Congress to allow him the authority to go to war with several Middle Eastern countries, since, according to him, they are becoming more robust and colossal for terrorization. As claimed by the authors, the United States is today experiencing and confronting the complete breakdown and total collapse of cultural diversity (167). Indeed, a community cannot be integrated if multiple traditions and ethnic backgrounds are forcefully kept intact underneath.

They identify four signs that demonstrate authoritarian tendencies among democratic leaders to develop an understanding of elected authoritarian leaders: rejecting democratic rules, suppressing political opponents, encouraging violence, and curtailing opponents' civil liberties (including media). Most “elected autocrats start by promising prominent party, corporate houses, or media figures political stances, privileges, incentives, or explicit payoffs in exchange for their indirect assistance or, at the very least, theirs’s passive non-interference. If any of these characteristics are prevalent in an elected leader's policy, it signifies that he has a proclivity to assert his authoritarian control. According to the authors, the only way to avoid authoritarianism is for political groups to refrain from making laws and granting benefits that endorse one interest gain at the expense of another (75).

To illustrate the current atmosphere and situation in modern politics, Mark Chou's article, “Democracy Against Itself” (2014) demonstrates how democracy's underlying principle is decomposing due its own democratically elected leader. According to the writer, Democracy working against itself is a little-understood idea that can be characterized as democrats' ability to undermine democracy while carrying out their democratic responsibilities (1). The writer continues the reasons behind the destabilization of democracy, asserting that it occurs when

democratic individuals, their political representatives, popular participatory organizations and procedures, and the very freedoms and pluralisms that allow for mass rule, deploy legitimate means to act against democracy (1). In fact, with the exception of aggressive insurgencies and fascist movements, Democracy working against itself is distinguished by measures such as suspending the constitution, arresting opposition leaders, restricting the operations of the mass media, or falsifying electoral results that indubitably come from inside the government (1).

Democracies can accommodate both beneficial and harmful outcomes because they are ruled by majorities susceptible to public sentiment. Democracies, based on ideals of pluralism and diversity, can even accept the creation of a plurality unified by a democratic animosity, strong enough to undermine democracy itself (9). However, without intelligence and farsightedness, which democracy cannot ensure since it may go against the popular opinion-authority can be easily corrupted. The democratic majority could legally hold society fugitive, or left the state in a vulnerable position with an authoritarian rising on the throne over a fearing public. According to the writer, the American political system is troubled by a substantial percentage of polarization and a similarly low sense of shared objective when it comes to political rivalry causing splits and power struggle. And, given the current state of American political leadership, it's difficult not to regard voter illiteracy and incoherence as significant reason to worry (10). Rival political parties frequently have motivations to stress differences rather than finding a common ground, to ridicule and even demonize their opponents, and to resonate to emotion rather than rationales in their pursuit for votes. In recent years, the polarization of the geopolitical scene in democracies around the world has grown significantly. In Europe and Asia, outraged right-wing populists such as Viktor Orbán, Andrzej Duda and



Narendra Modi are drawing sharp divisions between themselves and other well-established political groups.

In other words, in recent times- the competence of governmental institutions to safeguard democratic government has suffered a significant setback in the most modern countries. There are constant complaints that democracy as a form of government is in jeopardy. Are we on the verge of losing democracy? It's an assertion that's getting more and more attention. In his latest book, *How Democracy Ends* (2018), David Runciman, a political science professor at Cambridge University, brings the same question to the fore. What sets this book apart from others is that it digs into an examination of democracy's deterioration following its most triumphant millennium. Runciman investigates the variables that distinguish the political crisis from others that have affected democracy in the past. To begin, he explains the circumstances, claiming that present political aggression is not comparable to that of previous generations, either in terms of magnitude or nature. It's because, after two world wars and the Cold War, Western society have fundamentally become more harmonious; this means the problem of intolerance has resurrected, and all the negative instincts have started manifesting themselves in new ways (64). Runciman has constructed his research around three components that undermine democracy: coup, catastrophe, and technology takeover, based on these assumptions. The prevalence of false narratives, post-truth, and populism is likely to continue to rise. Populism asserts that elites have plundered democracy and that the masses must recapture it (61). When people genuinely believe they have been left out, this attitude becomes more widespread, and it is linked to rising inequality. As a result, politicians operate in accordance with the opinion of the majority, even if this causes discontent and inequity in the country. The second factor is the shift in the potential danger of disaster. Climate change is a substantial threat to modern civilisation, but its

repercussions are too scattered and inconsistent for people to understand and relate to them effectively (74). This makes spreading awareness more difficult. Third, the pace of technological advancement has rendered us reliance on integration and communication that we don't have oversight over or understanding of. Despite all of the progress brought about by technological growth, Runciman contends that the digital revolution has inclined to strengthen authoritarian nations, rather than weaken it (81). For instance, technological stigmatization, as well as China's universal credit system (Sesame Credit), reinforcing negative ideals and inequalities among society's citizens.

The relevance of contemporary democracy is that it grants legitimacy to its citizens while also allowing them to assume that their opinions would be considered by officials. It also has long-term economic advantages. Despite all the problems that the modern democracy has brought about, what substitutes to current democratic structures are there, despite the exponential transformations in communities at different phases of development? The author proposes alternative ideas that could be used as solutions. However, all of these alternatives may result in a better lifestyle at the expense of freedom, or they may directly contradict the features upon which democracy was constructed. Most notably, the writer asserts that western countries as more civilized than they were previously was, but the warlike tendencies and antagonism of individuals toward people of different races, cultures, and religions are not adequately addressed (12). So, while the book demonstrates the self-destructive components of today's democratic framework to some extent, it also fails to explain why, despite being labelled as peaceful nations, European countries continue to invest large sums of money in the arms industry mostly on destructive features like atom bomb and nuclear warhead.

To discuss about democracy (mostly believed by U.S government and its difference on action when they perform it to other countries), in this book *Deterring Democracy* (1992), Noam Chomsky brings forth the fallacy of the United States through which it leverages its superiority brutally to impose its strategic interests, and underscores the catastrophic economic repercussions of this new imbalance on other countries. Chomsky analyses a significant transformation in international politics that has placed the United States uncontested, and how they have been abusing their position of strength, with many of their acts resembling those of authoritarian regimes.

Chomsky speculates that, while professing to promote both, the US has consistently favoured "stability" rather than "democracy" abroad; for instance, supporting Saddam Hussein during the Gulf war (468). These two goals are antithetical, according to Chomsky, because democratic context is an inconsistent domain, a continuous process in which struggling forces experience difficulties against autocratic regimes. Not unexpectedly, twentieth-century American foreign policy was forged in the middle of these unavoidable confrontations, in an epoch of capital-intensive industrialization and excessive labour. Chomsky claims that the United States is governed not only by the government, but also by the politico-corporate elites that have continuously collaborated with repressive governments in the industrialized regions. In fact, a governmental system in which commerce, capitalism, and the military are not dominant would be unrealistically expected to be tolerated in the United States (335). To add some ground, Chomsky goes on to argue that the US has maintained an intellectual structure that conceals these operations because they are fundamentally unfair. He demonstrates how the media benefits the political elite by justifying and camouflaging US government antagonism to the socioeconomic and political sovereignty of the world's working classes. Whatever the official

stance of the United States is, the media portrays it as a yearning for diplomacy and human rights instruments (232).

Besides, to illustrate international standpoints of USA, Chomsky deftly traces the United States' pursuance of a fascist 'stability' that is antagonistic to liberty and workers while accommodating US economic interests in acquisition of raw materials from the Third World. Chomsky exposes the duplicity of the 'new world order' in which the US encourages no nation to sacrifice one grain of its own autonomy. The proclamation, according to the government, is for collaborative conflict management rather than instability, destruction and chaos, as well as it may prompt to a world of unwavering commitment in human rights. Strangely, George Bush proclaimed all of these at a time when they had simply rejected diplomatic strategies and ended up invading Iraq and decapitating 200,000 Iraqis in the process of overthrowing terrorism. While the ambition to depose tyrants was intended as a warning to authoritarian regimes and tyrants, it is unquestionable that the US has no dilemma with homicidal maniacs as long as they serve US interests (considering the fact that they once had a good relationship with Saddam Hussein and Iraq), and that the US will decimate and destroy even committed democratic activists if they deviate from their official service role. (456).

The function of the media in a country's democracy protection is indisputable. The book *Manufacturing Consent* (1988) contains three in-depth testimonials to highlight the media's conspiratorial function, as well as a clear examination of the media's compliance with the interests of those in charge. Professors Herman and Chomsky developed their Propaganda Model after conducting substantial research on Latin American elections, the 1981 Pope assassination conspiracy, and the Indochina wars in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. In each occasion, the

media figured prominently in both screening and endorsing the agendas of the governments and companies that allow the mass media to prosper. To begin with, the authors argue that it is inaccurate to assert that the West has an independent media that has a moral imperative to solely fight for fairness and justice and to expose the make accountable those who are in power. The writers also discuss how the media portrays the victims, who are classified into "worthy" and "unworthy" categories. They indicate that the US mainstream press has always emphasized on victims in an enemy nation while ignoring or dismissing the voices of people being victimized in countries that are allied to the US (Chomsky & Hermann xii). For example, ideologies or incidents are acknowledged or disseminated in the preference of the United States. Because the two countries are perceived as "client" and "enemy" states, the media's role in two similar occurrences was dissimilar (15). American media were reportedly silent when the US bombed Cambodia in 1969. Many peasants who depended on their land died as a result of this conduct. In contrast to this, the many victims of US bombings previous to the communist revolt went unrecognized and unaddressed by the US media during the Pol Pot years. According to the media, the US involvement in the fight was "credible" and they were frequently targeted.

The intertwining of main stream media and corporate entities, according to the writers, distorts the dissemination of knowledge and mobilizes audiences in favour of the "Special interest groups" that regulate the governmental and corporate economic system (303). Furthermore, the authors address another inherent problem: people's reliance on the media for classified documents about country, which has given the media a sense of imminent power as the only means to communicate messages. However, it cannot be refuted that the government is undoubtedly the most important source of economic, social, and political news, because upon them the country is dependent. Even though the Propaganda Model was first proposed in 1988, it

is more relevant in today's context (306). In the current world, the concept of "anti-communist" has been largely superseded by the "War on Terror" and Islamophobia. However, when it comes to Russia, the US still depicts it as a "bad guy" on the international arena every now and then. In addition, China, being the world's superpower today, has been depicted in a negative way by the Western press on several occasions. All of this is attributable to the countries' bilateral complication and superior complexity in attaining the big superior role. However, as technology advances, the use of social media has increased dramatically. And, on occasion, we see TV, radio, and newspapers start to approach a problem after it has been heavily emphasized by social media. As a result, social media has become a platform for laying emphasis on traditional mass media and channelling their focus to subjects that people want them to be covered. Social media has rapidly evolved into a platform where individuals may express themselves and exert pressure on traditional mass media outlets, directing their (media) attention to the stories that people believe should be covered.

In other words, technology has reshaped people's relationships with the government by providing opportunities for citizens to raise concerns about the government and for the government to erode citizens' sovereignty. Mark Krispin Miller discusses how technology is being used to manipulate the masses and suppress rebellion in his journal "Big Brother is You, Watching" (1984), and how our receptivity to it leads to our ruination, given that ordinary people do not have absolute control over the technological element they are using. Those who are behind the creation of these elements have the potential to secretly capture people's confidential information and news. (712). The novel *1984* was published in 1949, and because of its enormous success, people had an innate propensity to ascertain if the world would end up as a kind of Oceania in the year 1984 or not. In his article "Big Brother is You, Watching" (1984),

Mark Krispin Miller recounts the political squabbles and badmouthing that erupted between the two then-world powers (the United States and the Soviet Union) in 1984. For example, George Bush, the vice-president of the United States of America in 1984, stated in a press conference that the novel is just an attack on Soviet dominance, and that as long as the United States is united, nothing akin to Oceania will eventuate in the country (695). In reality, they treated the fiction as a template for an anti-communist manifesto. All of this is intended to persuade US citizens that Oceania bears no resemblance to the United States and that they should not be concerned. Even if Orwell had not attempted to safeguard his text against right-wing expropriation, he would have objected to any such military exploitation, since this novel is a burlesque of the same cold-war sentiment that aspires to use it as a weapon, and it goes without saying, the United States is no exception (696). To illustrate the perception of Soviet Union regarding 1984, the writer asserts,

“According to major Soviet political journal, Nineteen Eighty-Four indicts not the Soviet System but "bourgeois society, bourgeois civilization, bourgeois democracy- in which, as [Orwell] feared, the poisonous roots of anti-humanism, devouring militarism, and oppression have today thrust up truly monstrous shoots” (696)

According to the writer, Orwell's novel demonstrates not just the idiocy of anti-Communist adherents, but the entire political system that jeopardizes to eternalize such senseless aggression, which stems from both "left" and "right" wing ideologies (696). For example, Oceania, allied with East Asia or Eurasia, keeps itself "solid and strong" against Eurasia or Eastasia; and in respect to this, they do the same with Oceania. The ostensible relevance of Oceania can be noticed in both the US and the USSR, given that both entities deploy its aggression against the

other through proxy warfare, resulting in an incalculable number of casualties and destruction; which in many instances, gives resembles to the more preposterous and enticing attestation of Orwell's imagination. In fact, Vice President Bush and his Soviet counterparts' judgment is premised not only on an unwillingness to comprehend Orwell's satire with precision, but also on a complementary reluctance or lack of willingness, to interpret the world with equal importance. *1984*, as seen by Mark Krispin Miller, is neither a blatant premonition nor a simple disclaimer; rather, it is a compelling form of expression that gives us insights about contemporary politics (699). As a corollary, the book is required to be taken seriously, both as a literary narrative and as an undertone on our own political culture. As the writer states, the main focus of Orwell's frightening satire isn't any certain totalitarian state, but a necessary modern impulse that has inadvertently resulted in all subsequent forms of tyrannies, whether left or right, centralized or pluralist (700). In fact, the compelling plausibility that the most deleterious modern society has developed through technology, tragically, is developed out of the exact urge to overcome any form of catastrophe. The things that are promised to develop with the means of protecting a person's inviolabilities are the things that actually impede personal security (699). Though the article was 36 years ago, its importance has taken into a more substantial position with the phenomenal advancement of technology in last two decades. Despite the fact that the article was primarily based on false dichotomy propagated by television, the world has become more globalized as a direct consequence of the internet, and the fallacies have become so pervasive that people are unable to discern how subtly they are being manipulated and inspected; and, more importantly, how implicitly their personal interests are being taken over by undetectable computer programming and technological features. Then it was only Television, and now it is done through every single fraction of our steps.



The problem is, most business sectors (including media) is owned and controlled by elites who are mostly have a good alliance with government and affixed with government's agenda. This brings to the important fact that business practitioners should inquire into not only sales practices, but also whether or not such a specific type of business structure is morally acceptable. According to writer Edmund F. Byrne's journal "The U.S Military-Industrial Complex is Circumstantially Unethical" (2010), the United States' involvement in war in the past has had some acceptable self-defence rationales, but current missions undertaken arguably violate the self-defence reasoning (154). The relevance of the military industry, according to the author, is substantial, but the raw power that the sector has accumulated over the years in swaying foreign trade ideals is frightening. Now, the industry exists to safeguard elitists' hegemonic business policies, not to protect the country from any form of horrific acts (154). The armaments industry's internationalization comprises a considerable movement away from conventional, single-country weapons manufacturing modules and toward globalisation of armaments technology, manufacturing, and commercialization. Simultaneously, the universality of arms production generates a slew of international security threats, casting doubt on the rationality of such an economic strategy. The spread of advanced military technology and the formation of new arms production centres will inevitably have a significant impact on strategies to limit, postpone, or resist the spread of conventional weapons.

So, in order to assess the United States' viewpoint on why it is always involved in a conflict, the author claims that it is an effective investment for the US financial system (155). Weapons manufacturers and outsourcing are a major source of wealth in the Country. It is also a significant source of employment. None of this is reasonably required by any level of legitimate threat to US citizens. Throughout the Vietnam War, there was a protest slogan that said, "War is

huge business.....invest your son." While unpleasant to hear, the tagline was completely accurate in terms of profitability. Because, if we examine closely, tens of thousands of soldiers perished not only to fail to restrain communism through a botched proxy war, but also to enormously benefit the Defence financial market and mercenaries. As shown in the paper, the most significant moral question addressed in the debate over the weapon industry's revenues is the inequity between two group where some people make big amount of money by selling war weapons while others struggle and die in the process of conflict (155). It also rewarded the many military commanders who participated with this and became wealthy when they retired from their lucrative professions in the Military Industrial Complex. It is true that in order to make recruitment to army appear tempting, video games, service-funded race cars, entertainment events and various other promotional agencies are being produced in order to catch the attention of young people (161).

In fact, following WWII, the armament manufacturing industry started to slow down. However, the elitists in the weaponry industry were successful in convincing sufficient politicians that the menace of communist dictatorships rising in China and Asia necessitated the United States being the main military power (156). Since then, USA has metamorphosed its business and international policy. Now, this alliance of weapon industry has a defence budget that exceeds that of the put all the other big countries' investment together. Eisenhower, former U.S President, served as a commander in WWII and seen first-hand the horrific devastation and misery that war brings to its victims. It is a sad indication of his failure as president of the United States to marshal political support for peace that he had to wait until his nearing retirement to express his opposition to war. Considering the financial complexity, the depletion in military industries may result in a sharp decline in the country's economic success. As a result, no

president appears to have reduced investment in the business. Because the more weapons they have, the greater their financial prosperity will be and the greater their opportunity will be to transfer America in the power position (164). As a result, despite being modelled after the democratic epitome, the United States strives to destabilize the peace and freedom of other countries, by getting involved into war, in order to obtain economic advantage and control over their governments. For example, Afghanistan had been ruled by a government backed by the United States for 20 years before the Taliban retook control in 2021. Without providing the country and its administration with adequate power and infrastructure, the United States withdrew its soldiers, despite the fact that the Taliban's devastation was increasing on a daily basis. Despite the fact that the war was initiated in order to weaken the standing of terrorists around the world, the United States withdrew its forces and backed away from its stance when it faced economic difficulties as a result of the conflict. As a result, in a matter of days, the Taliban seized control of the entire country, while the U.S-backed government departed the country without securing the safety of ordinary inhabitants. The reasoning of departure was simple: by pulling out of Afghanistan, resources such as money and military forces could be shifted to the war with China and Russia, where they might be utilized prevent China's expansion and their (Russia & China) coalition. According to a poll conducted by Gallup since 2005, In the latter half of the 2000s- the United States' primary enemies were Iran and Iraq. Since 2011, this number of percentages on both of these countries have fallen below ten. In fact, China is holding a 51 percent share of the graph in 2021 (as the biggest antagonist of the United States). To put it another way, the United States is particularly concerned about China's meteoric rise as a worldwide superpower, which has prompted the country to rethink its global strategies and international activities in several areas in response.

In fact, the country which often proclaim itself as the benchmark of democracy, has taken steps back from their stance of diminishing terrorist groups when the encountered economic crisis. Along with this, the populist right-wing tendency has also been rising in worldwide politics, where the importance of equality (one of the fundamental elements of democracy) is largely undermined by the populist leaders. Yascha Mounk, a Harvard political philosopher, in his most recent book, *The People vs Democracy* (2018), examines the emergence of illiberal democracy, which embodies the unfolding of societies in which citizens elect their governments but liberal procedures such as media freedom, constitutional protections, accountability, compassion, and personal freedoms are provided limited attention. *The People vs Democracy* (2018) is a straightforward look at how illiberal democracy slipped out of favour in large areas of Europe and worldwide. Mounk is frightened by the growth of populism and the fragility of liberal democracy, as one might expect. Authoritarian populists have grabbed power around the globe, from Brazil to Poland, Bolivia to India, Turkey to the United States. As a result, as Yascha Mounk indicates, democracy might well be in jeopardy (256).

This book primarily highlights the growing pieces of research on populism's emergence and its challenges to democracy. A system of "rights without democracy", emerged as the influence of money in politics, increased and critical problems were removed from public discourse. Opponents of this argue that it is time to restore power back to the people. In fact, therefore, they generate something equally as bad as seems: a system of "democracy without rights." As a result, as Mounk demonstrates in *The People vs. Democracy* (2018), public trust in politicians is eroding (100). The public is losing faith in its political system, as Mounk firmly connects three causes to the decline of liberal democracy: stagnant life expectancy, the emergence of multi-ethnicity, and the driven potency of social media (133).

Despite the magnitude of today's dangers to democracy, Mounk continues to believe that domesticating nationalist attitude, stimulating the economy, and restoring democratic confidence can all facilitate to protect liberal democracy. On the European side, the surge of Populism and acceptance for Poland's current government among Poles, despite adopting harsh measures against refugees by breaking rule of law implemented by European Union, demonstrates how populism has translated the anatomy of hate into a potential consequence (124). Hindutva is still prevalent in India, which not only sabotages minorities but also discriminates against their lower castes. It's Modi's contention that his critics are anti-Hindu and that he has fostered to an atmosphere where intellectuals who are believed to be critical of extreme Hinduism get death threats and are eventually slain (40). Most importantly, Erdogan has become more severe toward his opponent as a result of the failed coup he encountered in 2016, and it is apparent from his actions following the coup that he may now go to any length to undermine any type of dissent or dissent against his leadership. However, many of their country's majority citizens support them, owing to the fact that they all embrace the conservative path by dismissing liberal ideas. Many Muslims regard Erdogan as Islam's saviour, while Narendra Modi is revered as someone who is upholding Hindutva's genealogy. In other words, despite their dictatorial characteristics, these populist leaders are adored because their actions have modified and transmuted the majority's points of view. Though it made their democratically physiognomy sarcastic, they are still in the majority's choice.

If the situation in India is taken as an example, the country has seen a resurgence of heinous hate crimes against communities who are marginalized (in the country) due to their caste, religious affiliation, or sexual identity. Rather than presenting an overview political context and

activities of the mob, Revati Laul's book *The Anatomy of Hate* (2018) takes a comprehensive and insightful examination into the entities who were a participant of the Godhra atrocity in 2002 also how the prophecy of Hindutva was made use of for political gain to stop secularism (82). The book is explained from the perspectives of the participants who lived in Gujarat, revealing us the story and histories of people from dissimilar backgrounds of life who were profoundly impacted by the violence. To do so, the book presents a vivid portrait of one of the most essential but little-discussed perspectives on the Gujarat violence of 2002: that of some of its sympathizers, sponsors, and attackers.

The fundamental purpose of this publication is to remind us that every one of the men in these riots is also a normal human. They are identical to us. Most of them have families to whom they return after their fingernails have been splattered with bloodshed and after they have assaulted other women in their spouses' and husbands' mattresses. Though discussing about them conjures up images of nondescript, homogeneous distortion of unbridled terrible ideation, the question remains: who are these individuals? Why do they murder, assault, and pillage? What do they do with their lives after expressing their hatred in such a horrible manner? In essence, this work of long-form nonfiction delves into the lives of Suresh Jadeja, a man accused of sexual assault and death; Dungar, a Bhil rebel leader who endorsed the violent clashes and went on to attend the Vishwa Hindu Parishad, the Bharatiya Janata Party, and subsequently the Indian National Congress to become a prominent legislator in his region; and Pranav, a one-time VHP supporter and non-governmental organization.

It is said that, no one is born violent. It goes without saying that the philosophical precepts instilled in us during our youth were heavily influenced by how we were encouraged to act and

portray ourselves to the world. The descriptions of what happened to these three guys after their involvement in the communal tragedy of 2002 are the most compelling and often the most surprising element of Laul's narrative. The inquiry into these people's lives reveals that government and society have fashioned them into such characters. According to the author, it was difficult to convey the entire spectrum of stories pertaining to the animosity in one book. Because enmity has been sealed in the hearts of the people through biased and forged promulgation, and the extremity of it in such extent that even those who participated in the action were unaware of how their involvement in the movement was exploited for political benefit (161). The lack of meaningful socioeconomic progress in rural India appears to be a clear factor of Muslim community being marginalized. Laul asserts, when the demolition of Babri Masjid happened, Suresh, one of the three characters, did not travel to Ayodhya like so many other Gujaratis. However, he became entangled in the tidal wave of Hindu evangelism that accompanied it, as well as all of the attendant anti-Muslim propaganda (48). Racial prejudices and discrimination on the basis of religion and sexual identity can be seen on a regular basis around the world, not just in Asian or African countries. Viktor Orbán, for example, has taken a strong stance against bisexual and homophile people.

Since, whereas most countries fall anywhere between Democratic and Authoritarian government, Singapore is an extremely complex combination. In his paper, "Singapore: Authoritarian but Newly Competitive" (2011), Stephan Ortmann discusses the two distinguishing characteristics of Singapore that enable the country to preserve soft authoritarian practices while still prospering in terms of quality of life. The author begins by contrasting Indonesia with Singapore during the 1960s. During that moment, Indonesia proceeded so far as to prohibit foreigners from conducting business in the country, compelling them to hand over

control to an Indonesian national. Singapore, on the other hand, was in an unusual situation: it had no raw materials to monetise, such as diamonds, oil, or forests. As a result, they embarked on a journey that many other countries and politicians had hoped to take.

The administration, ruled by Peoples' Action Party (PAP) understands that any form of ethnic riot is terrible for business (154). They have been in the control of the government for 60 years. When it comes to analysing Singapore's mega plan's accomplishment, the idea is obvious: when you have 6 decades of continuous power, no responsibility, and no pushback to slow things down, you can certainly get stuff accomplished. Considering the absence of democratic rights in the country, people are not dissatisfied much since they content with their lifestyle, and eventually it makes government's place on the throne stronger. In fact, the leaders have grasped the public's perceptions, particularly what they desire most—freedom of speech or a better lifestyle—and have acted accordingly. However, as long as the leaders are destabilizing democracy under the pretext of supporting democracy, none of the advancements will be noteworthy. Singapore has been labelled a proxy democracy and a "competitive authoritarian state" despite the fact that its elections are totally free but far from fair (159). The Prime Minister has unrestricted power to establish constituency boundaries under the legislation, resulting in widespread manipulation. He has the power to alter territory at any time, which means the opposing party may not understand exactly whose constituency they are competing until the very last minute (159). Any type of protest is unlawful unless pre-approved by the authority, and the administration has exploited colonial-era legislation to stifle critics. Clearly, the government only promotes protests that align with its agenda. Unless they belong to the elitist clique, no one is above the law.



However, the election results demonstrate that the vast majority of people continue to support the PAP, and they clearly value industrial prosperity over democracy (153). The government-citizen relationship appears materialistic in the country; citizens want things to be better: schools to develop, healthcare to become more affordable, and so on. The party, on the other hand, is striving for validity. It explicates Big Brother's approach in *1984*, in which the proles are given more freedom than intellectuals, and are free from any form of telescreen, thoughtcrime, and so on. By doing so, the government is oblivious to the value of democracy among the masses. In reality, the Singapore government announced in 2015 that when it comes to public housing maintenance, it will prioritize PAP supporters. This type of behaviour poses a greater danger to democracy, especially if you position yourself as a paradigm of capitalist democracy (161).

Moreover, political nature in South Asia is illustrated in *The Wild East* (2019), edited by Barbara Harriss-White and Lucia Michelutti, which also demonstrates how the political structure operates in the region and how money is utilized to strengthen control. In one of the chapters, the book examines how politics and business are intertwined in Bangladesh, using the case study of the Tender system in the city of Barisal as an example. In this context of Bangladesh, the 'mafia' is defined as a syndicate of criminals who work in collaboration with local politicians and law enforcement authorities to further their own interests (266). Almost every government project and every corporate sector must form connections with the mafia and local leaders in order to be successful and finish on time. As a result, the local leaders share the workload among different goons proportionately according to their level of power, ability, and control over the territory; by doing so, they want to make the winning coalition (mafia leaders) pleased, content, and loyal to him (270). As a response, the mafias assist them in winning the election by the use of violence,

terrorization, and defamation, among other tactics. Most crucially, in the majority of situations, the leaders do not participate in the business; instead, they receive a substantial portion of the profits from those who are awarded the tender. However, it is also true that the tender is granted to the individuals who are closest to the leader and who usually provide the largest percentage (273). The allocation of tender is performed by a bidding process, but the leader assures that no one else can bid except for the one he decides to do, from his side. In other words, the entire system is constructed through political means, with a significant portion of the total budget (which comes from the tax given by normal citizens) being used illegitimately by political leaders.

To illustrate the nature of democratic leader (whose are more inclined to establish autocratic regime under their control) and their relevance with autocratic leader, this paper takes example from the policies taken by an autocratic dictator(Saddam Hussein) to strengthen his power over the Iraq and also over the neighbouring countries. Saddam Hussein began solidifying his authority in the party soon after being elected vice president of Ahmed Hasan Al-Bakr. In the book *Saddam Hussein: A Political Biography* (1991) the secular aggressive mindset of Saddam Hussein has been illustrated. Those who disobeyed his policy were doomed to suffer unfathomable consequences and outcomes. As a result, it didn't take him long to consolidate his grip on the country, and by the age of 42, he'd pressured Ahmed Hasan Al-Bakr to withdraw and installed himself on the throne (200). Most crucially, six days into his presidency, he has discovered that many political figures within his own party do not embrace his leadership and may attempt a coup against him at any time. So, he arranged a meeting for a senior 'Bath' party right away. During the conference, he summoned a popular leader to the front and threatened him that until he names all of the other leaders who are opposed to him, he would be killed. The

leader identified each of them out of fear, and after the meeting, every of them was killed. By doing so, Saddam Hussein was able to eliminate his most powerful opponent in a single day and begin the reign of terror that would later follow (205). Iraq was becoming one of the emerging world powers of that time, due to its terrorization over different countries and excessive military spending. During the Gulf War, the United States aided Iraq (284), but it was the United States that put an end to his reign in 2003. Saddam Hussein disregarded international rules on a regular basis as a result of his obsession with power and proclivity to abrogate other countries' national treasures. As a result, there was a moment when his opponent's allies numbered in the millions. Despite his secular attitude, he went to great lengths to destabilize the Kurdish minority in northern Iraq (132). To show his contempt for them, he used chemical weapons in 1988, killing and destabilizing the Kurdish minorities.

Saddam Hussein's control over his country had numerous parallels with Big Brother and, in particular, with the concept of *The Dictator's Handbook* (2011). During his time in power, Saddam Hussein used deadly persecutions to shake up the Baath Party echelons and crammed his prisons with political prisoners to neutralize any potential conspiracies, concrete or abstract. According to *New York Post*(2016), The Iraqi Intelligent Service, known as Mukhabarat agents, often held ethnic Iraqis in the tunnel, like Room101 in 1984, for up to 15 days at a period in order to force their families back in the homeland to submit and collaborate with the tyrannical government (Schram). Rather than serving as a national security organization, Saddam had transformed the Mukhabarat into an armed band of ruthless spies. However, after his dominion came to an end and Iraq became a 'democratic' country, the hardships of the people did not disappear; rather, they increased manifold. The economy has collapsed, and the politicians who have followed Saddam Hussein have done the same thing, but the problem is that they do so

while claiming to be the ideal of democracy. This puts us to an ambiguity, If Brotherhood were able to come into power by displacing Big Brother in Oceania, could we say that all the imprisonment and diminution of freedom would have ceased to exist?

However, in amidst of researching on why and how both autocratic and democratic leaders follow same rules often, this paper also tried to put focus on what happens also when the leaders much liberal (than previous leaders) and what consequences it may bring up. To focus on this, this paper took example from the political aspects during the Gorbachev's era before the collapse of Soviet Union. Serhii Plokhy correctly contends in his book *The Last Empire* (2014) that the Soviet Union's demise was caused by a number of causes, of which American action was only one. Gorbachev, according to Plokhy, is "a tragic figure with vision and a man of immense accomplishments," without whom the breakdown of USSR would have been far more deadly (365). Gorbachev was a charismatic leader who converted Soviet tyranny into a series of neoliberal policies aimed at reforming the Soviet system. His leadership supervised the emergence of a cooperative East-West cooperation as well as the development of the community competent of and allowed to express dissatisfaction with its government.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the Soviet Union was quickly emerging as a global participant, but with a generation of young being raised in such a rigorous atmosphere, reformation became essential rapidly. Gorbachev began restructuring the Soviet Union by enacting programs that promoted people's rights, governmental transparency, and productivity expansion, most notably the Sinatra Doctrine and Glasnost (4). Mikhail Gorbachev is one of the major persons who is thought to have played a role in bringing the Cold War to an end. The Sinatra Doctrine let countries that were previously under Soviet rule to choose their own way. Prior to Gorbachev,

the Brezhnev Doctrine governed these subsidiary countries and claimed that the Soviet leadership in Moscow should have strong control over their affairs. Glasnost was established by Gorbachev to render the Soviet Union freer and more aligned with other advanced industrialized economies (12). Glasnost is widely recognized for implementing measures that contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union, as citizens of the Soviet Union were getting more outspoken about their government's incapacity. Many concerned citizens started to voice their frustration with what they considered as their authoritarian government's inability because they Glasnost let them free to actively condemn their government without fear of reprisal. Because the media was no longer controlled by the government, they were more willing to report on resistance and broadcast stories that were unfavourable of the administration (395).

In the West, Gorbachev was regarded as a great leader, yet he was greatly reviled in his own nation. To some extent, he insisted on giving his people greater flexibility, but with the advancement of technology and globalisation, as well as the frustration of constant persecution by soviet leaders, people were increasingly enraged with the communist government. As a result, when Gorbachev endeavoured to ease the restrictions by enacting policies like Glasnost and Perestroika, citizens and political opponents took advantage of the newfound freedom to undermine the communist state (398). Many of the reasons for the dissolution of the USSR were due to prior leaders' unethical reigning tactics; nevertheless, it is also true that throughout Gorbachev's reign, people received more and more independence (400).

Furthermore, the transition from autocracy to democracy has not always been straightforward, but it also brings the reality that the situation in which democracy is accomplished in a country has not always been favourable for many countries. It is because, the

leaders who once mount rebellion in order to establish democracy, seems to stagnate democratic process when they come into power. A French political analyst who has worked in Libya and Syria, Thierry Meyssan, describes the transition phase that middle eastern countries went through during the Arab Spring, as well as how foreign superpowers used the movement to direct it in a direction that was consistent with their own agenda and interests in this book. Mohammed Bouazizi, a 26-year-old fruit vendor, set himself on fire in front of a government building. It was a retaliation for Tunisia's recent humiliation at the hands of government authorities. The Arab Spring was born as a result of the events that occurred as a consequence of this occurrence (108). With the help of the internet, the incident instantly generated a firestorm. People came onto the streets with their sole weapon—a mobile phone—rather than protesting with domestic weapons. The fire that murdered Bouzaizi reawakened an indignation that had been dormant for years. As a result, the monarch named Zine El Abidine Ben Ali was dethroned and forced to flee from the country after 23 years of his rule- and all this happened within 10 days of Bouazizi's death (108). Most importantly, the smell of protest and freedom soon spread to neighbouring countries, and some of them achieved the same result as Tunisia but many of them did not. However, the conflict of the Middle East has become a prominent aspect for proxy war between Saudi Arabia and Iran, indirectly coupled by USA, EU, Russia and China respectively. Thierry Meyssan, a French political analyst, has spent almost ten years immersed in the conflict in Syria and Libya, even working as a personal counsel to both administrations. In his book, the writer brings forth the incident of Arab spring and its consequence in post-Arab Spring phases and how different entities has taken advantage from this movement. In this regard, *Before Our Very Eyes, Fake Wars, Big Lies* (2019), narrates the invasion on Syria and Libya from the perspectives of three different components: the French neo-colonialists' idiocy, the Muslim Brotherhood's fundamentalism, and the Anglo-Zionist-American Empire's desperation for world dominance (2).

According to Meyssan, it is hard to ascertain everything. History, like any other science, calls into question what we think to be factual but also adjusts or even invalidates in light of new information. And, only the passage of time can expose the truth to light. So, from outwards what may seem a success, can also be the by-product of an act that was meant to destabilize the unfreedom with more unfreedom, remove subjugation with more heteronomy (1). Not that the writer denied the importance of Arab-Spring and the need of remonstrations at variance with the cruel monarch- but he points to the destructive repercussions the movement brought after the Arab-Spring; because the war is now not against the single monarch, rather now it is against their own-selves. The Western countries may have sparked the revolution in order to exert influence over the countries and dethrone leaders who did not share their ideologies, but they also bequeathed the countries with innumerable problems and destructions that will take many years to get resolved. According to the writer, "The conflict, which had earlier been limited to the Greater Middle East, has now spread to the whole of the Western world" (251)

## **Chapter 4: Why Leaders do what they do**

### **4.1 Framework**

#### **4.1.1 Dependent upon the will of the majority**

The accessibility of democratic institutions, their receptivity to the preferences of more people, and their flexibility in the face of their strength are all things that may often be improved. It is possible to strengthen democracy's 'participation of citizens' by integrating more participators into decision-making processes; there is also an incentive to improve democracy's "ability" and "desire" by awarding more authority to the people. In fact, through most of history,

difficulties in democratic governance have generally concentrated on either one or both of these aspects. As it appears, a democratic system will be non-dominant to the degree that it regards all people fairly, encouraging free and transparent discourse, and entails participatory decisions that is unbiased in both the opinions individuals possess and also who possesses these people. As a logical consequence, a process which evaluates all people's opinions and aspirations inherently, discreetly, and transparently is what a viable democratic system stands for. The procedure must not be fundamentally biased toward any particular viewpoint or body of citizens, while being constructively sensitive to the selection of people who have a particular viewpoint and capable of generating a definitive judgment.

According to Mark Chou's written journal *Democracy Against Itself* (2014), The notion of representative democracy connects the premise of majority rule to its standing as an indispensable by-product of democratic thought (7). Throughout recent times, democratic philosophy has been characterized by the conviction that the governed must be able to opt for and hold those in positions of authority beholden to them. In democracy, the "biggest proportion" is considered to be majority when there are merely two political parties. In reality, there are frequently more than two groups involved in any given situation, with the exact plurality of possibilities recognized as the most authentic expression of the popular will. It is important to take into account that "majority rule" does not imply that a country is ruled or governed by the majority. In actuality, governments, not majorities, are the ones who regulate in all modern democracies. Furthermore, because governments are generally minorities, the duty for handling a modernized state's affairs heavily rely to the minority in possession of the government's ministries. As a result, the government itself belongs to the minority group in this context. Plato believed that democracy was problematic because it was predicated on the



participation of citizens (mostly the un-educated masses). The majority of these citizens made their decision, and that decision became law. When the majority made the correct decision, democracy prospered. When they made the incorrect decision, democracy weakened (Chou 11). Whatever a majority appears to desire, it necessitates the establishment of an administration to carry it out. As a result, to refer to a majority as unrestricted, denotes the delegation of unlimited authority to a minority that has obtained access to federal posts. In fact, the case for electoral majority rule boils down to a minority's acquiescence of ultimate political authority.

The concept of majority rule means that most respondents always have the appropriate remedies for socioeconomic uncertainties and risks. To explain the idea, Mark Chou argues that multiple members of any given majority will inevitably have a variety of alternative approaches to the very same dilemma; and that some representatives of the marginalized community may have more wisdom and awareness than many of those who sided under the majority group (9). However, the government is unable to consistently retain both fractions in an unbiased fashion because, in the end, the majority of electoral votes is what contributes most in gaining power, and failing to consider the majority's desires frequently results in the loss of the large proportion of votes. Because, majority rule is frequently regarded as a cornerstone of participatory decision. One concern is that the decision has to be made by a mere majority of the populace. This signifies that the majority's slight advantages surpass the minority's major disruption. Even if the proposed legislation has a large negative benefit in the long run, it will prevail if the proportion of recipients outnumbers the proportion of sufferers. As a result, majority decisions may be ineffective and a significant problem if democratic fundamental principles are taken into account. In fact, due to the obvious systemization of democracy, people are oblivious to the fact

that a fifty-one percent inclination to renounce their status can compel the remaining 49 percent to do the same. In fact, absolute majority rule is based on this fundamental misconception.

#### **4.1.2 More focused on Power-Play**

The acceptance of the inhabitants within a democratic regime equips its government with sovereign power and responsibility. Individuals may have the legitimate right of political governance in a democratic country, but it is a collective and common prerogative that single person cannot claim total imperial authority and responsibility. As the saying goes, freedom dies when criticism ceases- it adequately stresses the importance of criticism in a democratic setting in order to maintain political rights. Though Oceania was not under a democratic regime, but the portrayal of Big Brother as an untouchable and unparalleled identity, illustrates some analogous tactics taken by many ruling parties of different democratic countries. For instance, in 1984, Big Brother has never been seen by anyone. Using the garb of Big Brother, the Party chooses to make its agenda and identity known to the rest of the world. They portrayed himself as a person who is second to none (Orwell, 98). When it came to promoting the image of the party's current principal leader or the leader who was most admired by the party, governments (in countries like India, Bangladesh, Hungary etc) everywhere tried all they could to promote his or her resemblance throughout the country. As a result, the figurine is presented as a symbol of grandeur and authority, as well as a component of the system that cannot be questioned. According to a report by *BBC* (2018), The Hungarian administration have dismantled a memorial of Imre Nagy, a martyr of the 1956 anti-Soviet rebellion, from a prominent Budapest square, which had been a popular tourist attraction (“Hungary removes statue of”). Because of its seeming rejection of democratic norms as well as its tacit acceptance of authoritarian leadership,

Hungary's brick-and-mortar revisionism is particularly concerning. As a matter of fact, it has all the hallmarks of a typical campaign of lies, along with the open refutation of existing verifiable events and the assertion of vulnerability at the hands of derogatory oppressors.

However, a democracy without resistance is detrimental to the country as a whole, hence opposing party plays a major role in any democracy's fruitful and effective functioning. In a parliamentary system, the opposition's obligation is not confined within the practice of operating as a "government-in-waiting", but also to restrain any of the government's authoritarian proclivities. In contrast to the ruling party, an organized opposition functions as a restraint, prohibiting the government from exceeding its functional impairment while also offering a host of challenges by proposing a credible alternative (Harriss-White & Michelutti 266). In other words, the importance of competition in all democracies cannot be understated, but the dissension that two competing parties may create in order to outshine one another may result in the establishment of a power play that, without a doubt, goes against the spirit of democracy. As a result, both parties make poor use of essential democratic qualities such as the right to oppose any point of view. In fact, political authenticity is now generating rage against democratic representation mechanisms over different views, and this is splitting democracy apart on its most fundamental levels. (Runciman 161). Because the differing viewpoints of two political parties eventually lead to the practice of denouncing the existence of the opposition, it gives rise to the nature of expressing disagreement with any policy adopted by the opponent, even without putting enough emphasis on why the policy was adopted in the first place. Thus, one can say in modern democracy, power dynamics exerts a huge influence in policy implementation as well as social and professional development, and they have a substantial impact on major societal challenges due to the existence of different political outlook. According

to Mesquita & Smith (2011), in politics, many autocrats have a lengthy history of putting their opponents to death, and now in democracy, the scenario is seen recurring in different forms (51).

As the context is described in *1984* where any form of opposition is strictly prohibited,

“In the vast majority of cases there was no trial, no report of the arrest. People simply disappeared, always during the night. Your name was removed from the registers, every record of everything you had ever done was wiped out, your one-time existence was denied and then forgotten. You were abolished, annihilated: *vaporized* was the usual word.” (Orwell 9)

In spite of the fact that Oceania is ruled by a dictator, Orwell's description on the country's political stance makes a connection with the direction many democratic governments are attempting to close down any room of political revolt from the opposition. In short, disparities in power play, such as who has political authority and who possesses the instruments of power, eventually lead to disruption in the effective execution of political proceedings. As a result, due to political antagonism over different viewpoints, the social tranquillity that democracy envisions cannot be brought to completion.

#### **4.1.3 Requires time to implement changes**

Importantly, a democratic framework is intertwined with widely divergent departments and legislation, necessitating a devotion to strengthening a greater good out of the contrasting and multifaceted component of our socioeconomic lifestyle, so that an output can be obtained that

considers the value of everyone, regardless of their differing viewpoints. According to its fundamentals, a democratic country does not operate in accordance with the ruler's willingness, but on the policies and standards set by the country's constitution. As a result, making a decision necessitates participation from a variety of sectors and follows a lengthy process of argument, discussion, and assessment to uncover all of the potential effects that the modification may have in the future. As a result, in comparison to authoritarian regimes, democratic procedures can be somewhat slow for implementing new policies. With its congressional oversight, bureaucracy, and formalities, democracy frequently appears to be too complicated and expensive for the twenty-first century (Runciman 142). In the United States, for example, if the president wishes to go to war, both the upper and lower houses of Parliament must approve the application and transmit it to the administration. This means that, while the president may urge warfare or veto military agreements, he couldn't go to war himself. As a result, any measures by the president that appear unnecessary or harmful to the country might be voted down by senators who oppose the decision. However, it is also true that each parliament contains a proportion of members from various political parties. As a result, any variations that are compelled from an ethical standpoint can be denounced by parliament members if the majority of them are from opposing parties, and senators can lengthen the workflow of an amendment by consistently refuting it driven by political discrepancies and without providing adequate clarification. As a result, while the democratic process does not allow the imposition of legislation in accordance with a leader's desire, the procedures that the process demands waste a lot of time when essential moves must be taken promptly. For instance, according to a report by Reuters- having divided its Executive, Legislative and Judicial branch among three major different group Lebanon is formed in such a way that all the major groups may have power in their hands. However, this policy backfires, considering the fact that all the three powers try to impose their authorization over another, and

makes the process of implementation more stagnant (“How bad”). Furthermore, because democracy provides the opportunity to rule a country for a short amount of time, and some countries constrain the limitations within a specific time frame, many leaders are unable to successfully execute some of the modifications. As a result, whenever power shifts from one politician to another, the new administration seems to have a tendency to cease the previous leader’s actions whichever they do not prefer. In fact, the new administration attempts to change all of the old policies to meet their objectives, and suspending and amending previous government measures becomes a common political trait eventually. As a result, ordinary people are the ones who suffer the most as a result of slow strategy implementation.

#### **4.1.4 Person-first process**

Individual autonomy is one of the ethical strengths that Democracy fosters, as it empowers every individual not to be bound by norms imposed by others. People are allowed to regulate their own destinies, but only to a certain degree by not causing any harm to others. To put it another way, it enables employees to work for their own advancement while simultaneously enhancing individual sovereignty. David Runciman, in his book *How Democracy Ends* (2018), *asserts-*

“The rise of identity politics is an indication that taking part in elections is not enough anymore. Individuals are seeking the dignity that comes with being recognised for who they are. They don’t just want to be listened to. They want to be heard (135)”.

Importantly, in a democratic voting process, each person's perspectives or sentiments depends primarily on what they want for themselves. For instance, Mr. Charrington from *1984*, informs Big Brother about Winston and Julia's relationship. Even though, Charrington himself cannot enjoy the freedom fully and also being monitored by thought-police (secret police of Oceania), he handed Winston over the Big Brother in order to get praised by the ruling party, and also to enjoy specialty from the party (Orwell 105). Nowadays, the future representative for a certain region is chosen based on the best interest of the people. However, rather than considering what might be beneficial to the majority of humanity, most voters justify their voting decisions on how it will influence their bank account, taxation, or overall cost of lifestyle. As an outcome, the election becomes a mechanism that stimulates everyone to prioritize their own wants over those of others, which often leads to people disregarding the greater good. Runciman asserts, when our prejudices are permitted to cancel each other out, collective decision-making performs better than individual decisions. The wisdom of the multitude is based on this (123). For illustration, in a society where the majority of people are employed in the plastics manufacturing industry, people are unlikely to vote for a politician who is more concerned about climate change. As a result, in order to safeguard their business, which in turn causes a major problem for the environment, individuals chose someone who supports their objective, regardless of whether it is detrimental or not. As a result, it goes without saying that when people vote solely on personal interests, society becomes disenchanting because it appears that the majority is attempting to suppress the minority, or lacks cohesion in objectives due to competing "pluralities." As a result, defending the rights of people who find themselves on the outside must be prioritized.

#### **4.1.5 Conflict of Interest within the administration**

Though democratic constitutions confine the president's or prime minister's authority, it is also true that with a substantial number of parliamentary representatives' support, the constitution's rules can be easily modified. In actuality, in the epoch of illiberal democracy, numerous officials are frequently seen modifying legislation for their own interest. For example, the Russian constitution prohibits a president from serving more than two sequential presidential terms. So, with the support of a majority of parliamentarians, President Putin proposes amending the constitution's rule so that he can run for the presidency again in 2024. As Mesquita & Smith (2011) brings forth, Russia had free and fair elections under Boris Yeltsin's post-Gorbachev government, but the current situation is not same anymore. Vladimir Putin, Yeltsin's immediate successor and former KGB chief, shifted the political system away from its reliance on big coalitions and effective governance. By restricting assembly rights, he made it more difficult for opposing parties to compete. By taking control over television nationally and many of the print media, he blocked the free spaces through where speeches of rival candidates could be illustrated. By establishing public dissent (over government) a misdemeanour, he made it increasingly challenging for citizens to express their dissatisfaction over the government. In summary, he progressively restricted the liberties that require a democratic government to listen to its citizens (138). Since getting into power, Putin has been president or prime minister of Russia almost of 20 years. He has switched between the two posts because the constitution now prohibits presidents from serving more than two terms in office in a row. In September 1999, three hundred people were killed in a series of explosions in Moscow and other places, just a few months after Putin was appointed prime leader. Putin retaliated by initiating a military campaign against Chechen separatists. Putin's political appeal and reputation quadrupled as a result of the



attacks. The Russian people rallied around Putin and began to support him in a way that had never been seen before (Levitsky & Ziblatt 81). In fact, by using his popularity and reputation, Putin began exerting influence over the constituency and enacting legislative changes that were consonant with his targets and strategies. Not that it happened only in Russia; rather, constitutional modifications are a typical occurrence in the acts of many leaders who seek control over a variety of issues that democracy does not support. Besides, to minimize conflicts within the party, often leaders bring forceful changes within the government and also within the party infrastructure. For example, a jobless fruit vendor burned himself on fire in front of a government building to avenge a governmental disgrace in 2011. The famous Arab Spring occurred after this calamity. Tunisia adopted democracy after deposing tyrant Zine El Abidine Ben Ali. Contrarily, since then, the friction within the various government organizations within the democratic rules, has intensified with time. Before the worldwide pandemic hit the economy, last year and coronavirus infection rates spiked this summer, many Tunisians had grown disenchanted with their democratic system. After much internal strife, President Saïed fired the Prime Minister and froze parliament to seize executive power. In Tunisia's capital, thousands of Tunisian people marched to express their opposition to President Kaïs Saïed's latest regulations, which strengthened the near-total power he has granted himself and which inexorably resembled the actions of the country's last autocratic leader. The country that usurped an authoritarian leader with a purpose to create harmony via democracy has reached a point where the democratic leader himself is destabilizing the fundamental principles of democracy.

In fact, most people strive to keep what they have accomplished. That is why family members continue to produce monthly mortgage instalments, professionals continue to upgrade their skills, and policymakers do whatever they can to maintain power. Democratic leaders are

no exception. Democracies establish appropriate systems to limit the effects of one person on society as a whole, but this isn't always the case. With the emergence of illiberal democracy in today's world, leaders may simply distort the charter and make illegal changes by using their representatives to make the amendments legal (Chou 18). As a result, in democracy, there is always the potential of fostering conflict of interest inside the administration. To give an example, the present condition of Turkish politics demonstrates how blurry the distinctions between democracy and its manipulation may become, once democracy is established as the default condition of politics. In 2017, President Erdogan orchestrated and narrowly won a referendum on considerably expanded presidential powers, which he now holds. Abolishment of military courts was one of the recommended reforms, which was a notable transition. All of these actions were taken in the name of democracy (Runciman 44). Furthermore, disputes might arise as a result of disparities in financial gain. When two politicians or two groups within the same political party demand the same things, a conflict occurs between them. Despite the fact that this is a regular scenario in political games, the situation spirals out of control when both groups begin pushing their agendas through violence. For instance, A scuffle erupted in Barisal city in 2015 between activists from the Bangladesh Chhatra League and the Jubo League, one party attempting to push out the other during the submission of bids for a BDT 10 crore infrastructure development project in three upazilas. It's worth noting that the two organizations involved, the Chhatra League and the Jubo League, are both organizational wings of the same ruling Awami League party (Harriss-white & Michelutti 271). Not only do these sorts of occurrences tarnish the political party's credibility, but they also generate internal strife inside the organization.

#### **4.1.6 Emphasize more on quantity, than on quality**

It is said that, the more people participate in a democracy, the more democratic the nation becomes. Democracy's advocates hail its victories as proof of humanity's progression toward equity as well as a fairer society. Since the majority's perspective is prioritized in the foundation of democracy, the majority may wind up enslaving themselves to their own wishes, rendering them incompetent of comprehending and striving for any greater cause. Mark Chou in *Democracy Against Itself* explains that the democratic majority served as both a deterrent to anti-democratic impulses and a source of them. In this sense, majorities are king in a democratic society (11). And, for the most part, escalating conflict has been leveraged to meet the submissive wishes of the majority and elites, rather than high ideals.

Any mass movement toward a better society is the result of a fierce confrontation between a few ideological individuals, not of mass nobility. The followers of the ruling democratic party think that their existing system is adequate for the majority's welfare, and that all constitutional change must take place within that framework. Proponents of different democratic parties say that their chosen forms are more effective in achieving the majority's goals. However, therein lies the reason: democracy, at least theoretically, protects the majority (mass people) from being ruled undemocratically by any other groups or individuals. On the other contrary, it does not call into doubt the majority's oppression. The small proportion community is subjugated to the majority's demands through majority rule. In today's world, the rise of populism illustrates the modern political nature more significantly. Although populism contains a legitimate democratic component, it is considerably more adverse to reverence for the will of the large proportion of the population in the long haul. In compliance with Yascha Mounk (2018), the emergence of

illiberal leaders into power can resemble as an antecedent of an upsurge of autocratic rule. Most importantly, evaluating the context of Erdogan from Turkey, Chavez from Venezuela or Putin from Russia- this fact becomes more evident. Significantly, if the media is moderated by the government and numbers of unbiased corporation gets decreased, then it visible signifies an easy route for an illiberal leader to rise into dictatorship from populist (35). The crux of the democratic difficulty is not a consolidation of power or appropriate standards for activity by the majority. In fact, when the principles of mutual toleration are inadequate in a democratic country, it is difficult for democracy to survive there. (Levitsky & Ziblatt 88).

The problem is that the vast majority are of insufficient quality to be put to appropriate use even if they were obtainable. For instances, the lives of certain characters in the novel *The Anatomy of Hate* (2018), such as Suresh Jadeja, Dungar & Pranav, who all experienced troubles in their childhoods and were significantly influenced by the hostilities of their erstwhile ancestral people. Even though they are part of India's majority population, they are worried that the country may fall into the hands of the minority. They believe that because of this, even the smallest development/improvements made by the minority group is a slap towards them(majority) and it advances their (the minority group's) long-term goal of gaining control of the country. In reality, these individuals have no prior understanding where the hatred for Muslims originated, but they have fostered a small amount of animosity toward Muslims because their predecessors did the same (Laul 160). For the most part, majority groups react irrationally rather than logically; their actions and viewpoints toward anything are motivated by the ingrained fanaticism and hostility. This leads to them voting based on outdated ideas, which exacerbates the situation because they don't evaluate their long-term interests or fundamental needs. Not surprisingly, politicians utilize the antagonism in order to accomplish larger fraction

of vote and to strengthen their hold on the power. During the period of Athenian Democracy, Plato noticed that the general public was basically free to do whatever they preferred with their lives. Nobody cared about what was good or wise; just what was in their mind was important. Indeed, for all but a small fraction of Athens' people, respect for the law and for time-honoured institutions (e.g. family, schools) had become a farce (Chou 9). In democracy, interaction with the majority of people does not reveal radical ignobility, but neither does it reveal radical nobility. It does, however, demonstrate an unconcerned ineptitude towards minorities' views, a generalized acceptance with their agenda as long as they do not have to make too many sacrifices or put themselves in risk.

#### **4.1.7 Lack of accountability after election**

Accountability is foremostly a form of partnership in which one agrees to notify the other, clarify or rationalize their conduct, and comply to any pre-determined consequences imposed by others. Meanwhile, those who have been subordinate to the former's authority must furnish the relevant documentation, demonstrate how they are complying or disobeying the former's directives, and simply acknowledge the possible consequences. In fact, when accountability is functioning properly, it entails a fair exchange of obligations and possible ramifications between civilians and authorities, which is compounded further by the presence of a demanding and multicultural collection of delegates in between. The parameters for democratic accountability in numerous forms of governance are altering, and it is important to illustrate and analyse them. However, as opposed to traditional administration (direct democracy), the stumbling block of accountability in new models of governance is not the same as before. Although democratic government has evolved in a variety of ways, citizens' ability to

retain those in power answerable has remained mostly unchanged (Runciman 111). Citizens are expected to hold government accountable for the implementation of legislation when they participate in the political process. This is the institutional mechanism by which individuals can hold elected officials accountable for national legislation undertaken during their tenure in office. Citizens are considered to have entrusted the accountability function to public auditors and elected officials between elections. For instance, Noam Chomsky brings the incident of Bush Sr. merely expressing his aspirations when he won the election by repeating the “no new taxes” chant in his campaign and popularizing it across the country. People who thought Bush Sr. was promising no additional taxes, as Chomsky phrased it, couldn't understand that winning an election and governing a government are not the same things; both are different games with separate rules and agendas. (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 419). To put it another way, citizens are rarely given the opportunity to act as a fundamental and responsibility bearer in between two election. After the election, whatever the chosen representative decides then becomes the voice of majority's opinion. According to Runciman, despite the fact that representatives are meant to explain their activities to citizens in accordance with democratic norms, after getting elected, leaders frequently do not place themselves in a posture where they are required to justify their judgments (111). Since they are elected to represent their constituents, not being answerable to them does not appear to be an undemocratic conduct on the appearance. Mark Chou in *Democracy Against Itself* (2014) elucidates democracy as an imperfect system that nonetheless self-corrects by stating the fact that it is the only inadequate system that permits its citizens to freely and transparently confess its flaws. Because no government is infallible, and democracy is no exception, no underlying law should override the requirement that the government's flaws be freely and transparently recognised (2014: 17).

#### **4.1.8 Lobbying from Interest Group**

Lobbying opens the path of attempting to encourage major policymakers to modify their attitude. Lobbyists will endeavour to encourage public authorities to support a position that best serves the interests of the people they symbolize. While lobbying is a legal means of transferring facts between citizens and government decision-makers, it often results in some glaring inconsistencies. When policy changes result in consolidated advantages and scattered liabilities, the objectives and lobbying abilities of different groups vary enormously. Interested parties can often exercise undue power on policymakers owing to the small group size and significant cash advances. In Bangladesh, the technique of allocating projects through bids can serve as an excellent introduction to the function of political leaders. To avoid cheating and maintain a fair process, the tender system for government positions has certain features. But as it goes, most of the limitations are exclusively used to benefit the government's allies (Harriss-white & Michelutti 269). As a result, lobbying is extremely important in the operation of businesses and the maintenance of political power in Bangladesh. According to the writers, Tender politics is a popular way for Bangladeshi party youth and student wings to make money. By doing this, you're making sure that only relevant offers are received. Mastans (goons) are commonly installed in front of the office where the tender box is located in order to keep off undesirable bidders (270).

Because of this, in a democratic society where lobbying has the ability to influence decisions, strategies are enacted in a way to favour measures that bring advantages to the ruling party, eventually creating opportunities for corruption. Most crucially, the difficulty occurs when the government begins to intervene in favour of the elite's advancement, because the elites are

vital to the government's fiscal well-being. In fact, there was a possibility of an economic disruption in the United States' economy immediately following the conclusion of the Cold War since the country's economy is heavily focused on its weapon manufacturing industry. As a result, the government were forced by the Congress and elites to become involved in the war in order to prevent their economic infrastructure from becoming stagnant. However, the problem was that they did not have an adversary who could compete with them at the moment. In order to advance business and hierarchy, US dominance of the world has been enforced by four wars followingly– in Yugoslavia (1995 and 1999), Afghanistan (2002), Iraq (2003), and in Libya (Meysan 135). To keep its allies happy, the government offers a two-tiered approach to a similar prospect in two different cases. For example, the United States, as a democratic superpower, has a doctrine of double standards when it comes to international human welfare. In fact, in order to sustain and enhance their weapon industry, US always is involved into war with other countries, in the name of saving democracy. It differs from country to country depending on their relationship with the country's administration. Even though they proclaim to strive for the advancement of human rights, their noble intentions are compromised when the atrocity committed on the Palestinians are addressed. This is due to the fact that the US government receives a sizable chunk of money as compensation from Israeli businesspeople. According to the website of *US Embassy*, Israelis invest close to \$24 billion in the United States, roughly treble the amount they did a decade ago (“Fact sheet U.S-Israel Relationship”). Due to internal opposition or other reasons, the United States has been forced to delegate jobs to others in order to keep Israel as a barrier to Arab nationalism, and has cooperated in intelligence and weapons manufacture and testing. Israel has also served US interests globally. The Palestinians do not bring wealth or power to the table. As a result, they are powerless according to the most basic principles of statecraft (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 489). As a result, irrespective of which



party wins the election, the US government's approach on the Israel-Palestine dispute stays unaltered. To illustrate about double-standard stance of USA, Noam Chomsky asserts in his book *Deterring Democracy* (1992), When Saddam Hussein, the Iraqi dictator, invaded Kuwait in an attempt to oust US-British clients, his status shifted from favoured ally to new Hitler in an instant. The main concern has been that nationalist movements outside of US influence and control could gain significant control over the Arabian Peninsula's oil-producing regions (70).

#### **4.1.9 Frequent occurrence of Gridlock**

Gridlock in a democratic administration not only undermines the democratic process, but it also has an adverse influence on political stability and economic sustainability. The terminology "gridlock stalemate" refers to the difficulty in passing bills that address the requirements of general public. The democratic process falls under the trap of gridlock when the percentage of legislation permitted to achieve the legislature's goal falls below a certain threshold. Legislative priorities can be regarded as a requirement, whereas laws can be considered as a response. Lobbying has become a strategically significant middleman attempting to connect private wealth with governmental laws and regulations by affecting people's regular life; in other words, lobbying is becoming an organisational catalyst of its own and a primary factor to stagnation in the United States. As Runciman asserts, The American constitution's numerous separations of power, that are still functioning, made it a lot easier for the Congress to prohibit new legislative process than to implement it (168). Gridlock can arise when bicameral legislature houses, or the executive power and the senate, are controlled by opposing groups, and lawmakers make decisions based on their hostility to their opponents rather than focusing on the welfare of the country. When there is no willingness to work together between opposite political parties,

political animosity becomes a national concern. For instance, in Lebanon, every religious group in the country has specific political representation; considering the three largest groups are Christian Maronites, Sunni Muslims and Shiites. To keep peace and liberalism, the number of seats in parliament is shared between Christians and Muslims, with seats equitably apportioned within each denomination. Government and public sector jobs are likewise dispersed among the majority communities. Most notably, its constitution mandates the selection of a Maronite Christian president, a Sunni Muslim prime minister, and a Shia Muslim speaker of parliament. This is implemented to maintain that each community has enough access and freedom, and that no one organization may enforce dominance on another by violent means. However, the problems started when the three major group creates problem for each other utilizing their distinct power and position. For this reason, any sort of amendment or implementation of new policy has become more tougher to undertake in the country considering three groups having different perceptions over the same thing. As a result, the country has seen a significant economic slowdown. According to a Reuters research, about 78 percent of the Lebanese population has fallen into poverty in the last two years. The currency's value has dropped by more than 90%, eliminating disposable income in a society that relies largely on imported goods. Food prices have risen by 557 percent since October of 2019 (“How Bad”). However, instead of taking the necessary steps, Lebanon’s sectarian lawmakers were at odds over seats in a new government for more than a year. Rather than slowing down, Lebanon’s rapid deterioration has reached a very hazardous level, which has been exacerbated by political gridlock. It’s particularly problematic in two- or three-party systems, but it’s an issue in all democratic systems. Because no party is willing to make a compromise in order to reach a common ground and smooth out policy implications, and the nature of political animosity leading to deadlock eventually limits the economic growth of a country.

## 4.2 Democracy in the Light of Will to Power

### 4.2.1 No man Rules alone

According to Bruce Bueno De Mesquita and Alastair Smith (2011), politics doesn't have a complex logic. In truth, most of what happens in the arena of politics is fairly simple to understand if we are inclined to make bring modest modifications in our questioning. To truly comprehend politics, we must discard one fundamental supposition: we must abandon the notion that leaders can lead unilaterally (16). From a distance, the throne appears to be omnipresent, yet this is not the reality. A king can't even create roads by himself, can't enact rules by himself, and can't protect this country by himself. In actuality, a leader's authority lies in persuading others to perform on his behalf, using the wealth in his vaults. In other phrases, the leader's credentials to dominance are the people who are required to ensure the important things to happen. All of a leader's desired improvements will be only fantasies in his mind if the winning coalition and supporters do not obey his directions. As a result, there is always some form of preference or nepotism at the heart of democracy, leading to favouritism inside the framework leader classifies his or her people into three clusters: the winning coalition, the real electorates, and the nominal selectorates (Mesquita & Smith 18). The more a ruler can preserve his or her winning coalition united and delighted, the higher chances is there for the leader to reign for a longer period of time. In *1984*, the winning coalition group was comprised of members of the party's close supporters. Despite the fact that they make up only 2% of the population, their lives are filled with plenty of affluence and luxury products (Orwell 98). As it seems, these two percent have the power to dominate the rest of the population. This little fraction of people are the most powerful

people of the state, who controls the policy of the nation and also decides how the government will run.

The Real Selectorates, on the other contrary, are generally intelligent individuals who have been confined with a limited amount of power. These are the citizens who spend all hours of the day and night by working, bringing forth every energy to live a better life, and also, they are the people, who every year, pay national taxes in order to have their authenticity recognized by the courts. with the exception of the prole, Winston (the protagonist of *1984*) and most of the other characters, all represent the Real Electorates community in Oceania. They are, in fact, the most important portion of the entire citizenry, because without their participation, the winning coalition will lose power. Despite the fact that they do not represent the bulk of the population, these individuals are frequently involved in and notable in revolts and thwarts against the government. As Winston and Mr. Charrington both have opposing viewpoints on the government, they are susceptible to the different categories. As a result of their political views, individuals have been held to a different standard. However, if Winston had not been fallen for the Brotherhood, the administration or the winning coalition would not have persecuted him in such disastrous manner. Even though the proles from Oceania account for almost 75% of the total population, they are chiefly neglected and overlooked. They are the people who are categorized under 'nominal selectorate' group. The reality is, however, that they have more freedom and liberty than the real electorates, while being disregarded and ignored. By giving them more flexibility, the government makes them cheerful with constrained capacity, preventing them from committing any acts of revolt against the administration. If the government is able to do so, they (nominal selectorates) cannot be swayed by any real selectorates to disobey the government and launch an insurrection as long as they are swayed or motivated by their

substandard livelihood. In 1984, to illustrate the situation of nominal selectorate regarding their silence towards oppression, Winston asserts- *“Until they become conscious, they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious”* (Orwell 32). In fact, in the majority of cases, if they do not assist the protestors (who are almost always people from real selectorates), any potential for insurgency has a greater chance of being ruled out because the real selectorates lack the numbers and financial resources to incite a revolution on their own terms. On the other hand, the nominal selectorates has the population to support a protest and make it successful, but they lack the motivation to do so for the majority of time. In summary, the nominal selectorate is a pool of potential supporters for a leader; the real selectorate is comprised of individuals whose support is justifiably influential; and the winning coalition is constituted of only those adherents who are extremely important to the leader's survival. These three groups can be classified as incompatible, strategic, and necessary. (Mesquita & Smith 19).

#### **4.2.2 Fear of opponent getting power**

The substantial objective of a leader is to be as close to the seat of power as possible, and to accomplish so by doing whatever it takes, even if it means committing certain misdeeds and malfeasance. A leader must first decide how to keep his position despite disregarding all ethics. The reason is straightforward: if he does not do this, chances are there of his opponents doing it when they get power. As a result, after a ruler has succeeded to the throne and obtained legislative legitimacy, he starts eradicating any troublemakers and any potential threats to their authority (Mesquita & Smith 26). As a resemblance to this, many dictatorial governments, regardless of whether they are formed via a socialist revolution or democratic election, such as Big Brother in 1984, strip people of their basic rights and essential

commodities. For example, Big Brother forbids people from having any sexual relationship in order to detach them from any bodily pleasure, which may mislead and redirect people's attention away from the government. The Party aims to eradicate the sexual appetite from the populace. The only union members recognized by the Party are those whose prime purpose is to produce offspring for the sake of the party's survival. As O'Brien, one of the prominent leaders of Big Brother, says to Winston that, they (Big Brother) have complete control over all matter because they have complete control over the mind. Reality exists only in the mind's eye. In truth, there is nothing that they are unable to accomplish. Afterwards, he instructs Winston that he should abandon his nineteenth-century conceptions of the rules of Nature. Because, in Oceania, the laws of Nature are created by the Big Brother (Orwell 127). Similarly, in today's world, ruling party utilize the power of media, social media in order to control and manipulate peoples' attention. According to a report by *Scroll India*, the ruling BJP party used the suicide of Bollywood star Sushant Singh Rajput to distract people from their inability to tackle Covid-19. India's Republic TV, widely regarded as being allied to the present ruling party, brought up this subject and has kept it in the spotlight for nearly four months. 80,000 fraudulent social media profiles were identified by the Mumbai Police during that timeframe, which were utilized to preserve the occurrence in the public spotlight on social networking sites (Daniyal). In cases of *1984*, citizens of Oceania are more analogous to robots, with their every step being tracked and supervised. They do not have any freedom of their own, no belongings to their own, no life for their own. However, in democratic framework, the government sometimes cannot implant direct restrictions on opposition since it breaks their democratic image. According to Mark Chou, "It is because a vibrant democracy can easily endanger its own democratic order and principles by sanctioning too much democracy, leading to widespread dissent and opposition" (18). As a result, the ruling party must use extreme caution in all of its actions. This is because any new

political movements have the ability to influence public opinion, allowing a new leader to ascend to positions of political power. Over time, large-scale demonstrations can result in a politics of disruption and political upheaval. In order to destabilize the position of opponents, the government applies sanctions, refuses to grant them permission to hold anti-government protests, and imprisons them-all in order to weaken the opposition's infrastructural strength.

A leader's fear of being ousted from power, along with the fear of being constrained when power is not in his hands, causes the leader to execute harmful acts against the opponent (Runciman 89). Furthermore, the dictator of today may have had prior encounters being on the other side. As a result, when power comes to him after all of his hard graft and political manoeuvring, a leader wants to intensify his desire for the position. As a result, the democratic leader, with the backing of his victorious coalition, begins to engage in unlawful activities in order to reduce the prospects of opponents regaining power. Not all undemocratic measures are directed at political opponents; anyone who appears to be a threat to the leader's rule may face retaliation. By doing so, the government also helps to maintain his control over the territory by sending a message to everyone not to oppose him (Levitsky & Ziblatt 67). Not only does the leader do this to keep his position; all affiliates of the winning coalition, as well as followers from the nominal selectorate and real electorates, do that as well. This is because they must maintain their status in order to profit from the additional perks that the position provides. If they do not begin to act in accordance with the government's strategy, the other members of the winning coalition, along with the leader himself, will remove him from office. Being aware of the fact that many are awaiting to succeed them, each participant of a winning coalition will take better care not to grant the incumbents any reason to look for alternatives (Mesquita & Smith 25). In fact, it's a chain reaction that involves every sector and scale.

### **4.2.3 Winning Coalition, all that matters**

Governing millions of people with differing viewpoints, ideas, and groupings is a necessary part of ruling a country. Despite the fact that the leader has authority and the capacity to make the final decision, his every approach toward the verdict is dependent on the success of his winning coalition. The first task of a leader is to win the support of significant allies. This is why, political leaders build a strong coalition and keep it together by giving away valuable resources to its winning coalition. These exclusive benefits go only to the winning coalition's members, whose continuing support is required for the incumbent to stay in power (Mesquita et al. 149). With them on his side, a leader gains the utmost authority to operate; nevertheless, without them, a leader is powerless. In practice, a leader does not need the greatest number of followers to maintain control of the state; instead, persuasive, loyal, and unbreakable supporters are required to keep the government on the reign. Loyalty of winning coalition is the most crucial factor for a leader to succeed, and loyalty in the arena of twenty first century is rare. As Mesquita and Smith (2011) illustrates, the most important factor in forming a loyal coalition is money. It is necessary for a leader to have individuals who are willing to perform the dirty work for him in order to oppress, stifle, repress, and even kill his enemies in order for him to succeed. Such violence can be extremely costly (90). These winning coalitions are largely consisting of military forces and political masterminds in most countries. The government pays them with plentiful specialty and brings their requirements to completion in order to preserve them dependable and firm in their aspirations. According to the both writers (2019), all forms of government are fundamentally structured with same foundation. How real electorates and winning coalitions intersect determines how constrained or emancipated a leader is. These determinants limit or liberate what leaders could and should do to protect their jobs (20). The



more content the winning coalition is, the stronger the leader's allegiance will be. It's also important to recognize that no coup is conceivable without the winning coalition's cooperation. Because the participants of the winning coalition are those who actually run the country. So, unless they are dissatisfied with the leader and they create the conditions for a rebellion, a coup will fail miserably. As a result, a leader's first priority in such a situation is to establish a strong winning coalition and to satisfy them with sufficient specialties. Finally, and perhaps most crucially, this winning coalition may decide to change their viewpoint and loyalty at any time for the sake of better benefits; so, having the ability to select coalition members perfectly is as important for a leader as making the coalition competent. For example, France and its allies agreed to form the National Liberation Army in order to counter Gaddafi. To accomplish this, they appointed Generals Abdelfattah Younès and Khalifa Haftar to supervise the newly constituted military group. Surprisingly, General Abdelfattah Younès was well-known for his close relationship with Gaddafi and his friendship with him. Given the circumstances, he changed his stance and began acting against Gaddafi as soon as he recognized Gaddafi's position was jeopardized (Meysan 40). So, as it goes, a leader does not need a high number of followers to sustain control of a country; rather, ardent, loyal, and unbreakable supporters are obliged to keep the regime unscathed.

#### **4.2.4 A democratic leader is no different.**

A leader is first and foremost a ruler whose task after ascending to the power is to strengthen his hold on the realm. In *1984*, to ensure his continued existence, the Big Brother hires loyalists like Mr. O'Brien and eliminates dissenters like Emmanuel Goldstein. Most importantly, if the leader is astute and foresees the future, he would undoubtedly disregard the

people who assisted him in deposing the previous president. Because if they can get rid of one headman before, they can get rid of another one in the future. In truth, it is the leader's responsibility to oust anyone who appears troublesome from his status and substitute him with those who are faithful. In the book *The Dictator's Handbook*, it is said that having loyal incompetents is preferable to having skilled opponents. Having skilled consultants is, of course, often unavoidable (58). The reason for this is that, as the popularity of a junior leader develops inside the party, he will almost likely become the existing leader's primary challenger. A junior political leader who considers himself in a position where the public and party members want him to succeed to the throne will almost certainly mutiny against his superiors. In reality, this component has been implicated in a large number of successful coups. If example is taken from the rise(to power) of autocratic leader Saddam Hussein, his rise from a small member of Iraqi Baa'th Party to the presidency involves how he destabilizes the former president General Ahmed Hassan al-Bakr's position, who actually gave Saddam Hussein the position of vice-president of him. So, when he got the position, he made his position powerful and supreme within the party and the country. As written in the book *Saddam Hussein: A Political Biography* (1991), in 1979, he compelled his commander to "withdraw" on the claimed reasons of declining health story; however, after getting into the power, Hussein's discloses that he did not want President Bakr out of the way until the mid-1970s. The realistic and painstaking concerns of a genuinely cautious man hid beneath his outwardly courteous hesitation (Karsh & Rautsi 158). In fact, according to the writers, Saddam Hussein would only risk supplanting the President if he was confident of success. That is why, as both of the writers stated, he'd effectively cleansed any possible successors to the presidency, increased his control on the armed services, and made the intelligence bureaucracy his personal domain. Every important economic and diplomatic decision had his influence (160). In fact, it goes without saying that a leader must be wary of

both his own party and the opponent. Because the enemy of the opponent is considered an ally in politics. As a result, whenever someone rises to prominence and opposes the existing leader, the opposition wants to establish alliances with him in order to strengthen the opposition power. As a result, increasing autocratic power is a difficult task. Only the leader who sways the winning coalition, seizes control of the riches, eliminates wasteful government spending, and kills unproductive keys will have a long and fruitful career.

### **4.3 Democracy in the Shadow of Economics**

#### **4.3.1 Empowering Winning Coalition**

In a dictatorship, there are usually only a few dozen military commanders, ministers, and government representatives who control access to power. If a leader can persuade them to embrace his side, the dictator will have complete control over the country, but this leads to another refutation: if the leader displeases them, they will eventually overtake him. In a democracy, though, the winning coalition is typically far broader. Because the vitality of governance is connected with multiple fields, each with its own specific feature of power. As a result, in democracy, the approach to government in terms of forming an alliance with a winning coalition differs. Regardless of how many keys there are or how few there are, the rules remain the very same. To persuade essential people to sign up on the leader's side, and to ensure that key people acts are carried out in accordance with his agenda, the leader must have control over the resources. As a result, in the particular case of Bangladesh, most government projects are awarded to supporters of political leaders, or a large portion of the budget is allocated to political figures (illegally). The leader will ensure that there is no competition because the tender has been

agreed previously. This allows political leaders to maintain control of their power as well as their financial hierarchy in the territory (Harriss-white & Michelutti 273). Because a large percentage of the treasure must be handed to his winning coalition, the leader must ensure that all of the money his country has amassed is in his control. If these objectives to rule are met, the system will be suitable for the leaders and resistant to feared any change from opposition (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 389). In essence, a leader's primary work as a ruler is to find out the best method to acquire and redistribute wealth in hopes of keeping the house of cards untouched on which his throne rests from collapsing.

Nevertheless, a country's vaults can only hold that amount of treasure which the empire can only produce. Every penny spent on citizens is money that could have been spent on loyalty (Mesquita & Smith 72). Now, if the number of winning coalitions increases, the distribution of funds will remain stagnant because wealth has its limits. In addition, if the winning coalition is dissatisfied with the supply of wealth, a coup is more likely to occur. As a result, no matter what, a democratic leader must keep his or her winning coalition small. Most significantly, if the leader decides to invest the majority of his wealth on the citizens by condemning the winning coalition, it brings up the reality that doing the right thing and spending the nation's wealth on the citizens of this country gives his adversaries a tool for power procurement. Because, at the end of the day, it is these winning coalition members who will assist the ruler in maintaining his or her position of power through any deeds (e.g.: violence, turmoil, corruption), not the general public; thus, any action that is not helpful to them may cause them to lose their loyalty to the ruler. No wise leader would make such a blunder. As a result, the most prominent figures are the affiliates of the winning coalition who operate for the leader. As a result, as a leader, he must satisfy the

winning coalition. Making them satisfied entails providing them more exclusive influence over their earnings.

#### **4.3.2 International Trading System**

Understanding the drivers of renewable power pricing is vital as developing countries become largest consumer of the worldwide production of sources of energy. In reality, many democratic countries form alliances with countries that adhere to contractual ideologies solely for the purpose of conducting commerce. Thierry Meyssan in his book *Before our very eyes, fake wars, big lies* (2019), points out that Gaddafi declared the emancipation of all human beings as well as the abolition of slavery; nevertheless, despite the fact that France has not practiced slavery on its own territory since 1848, it has no issue allying itself with slave states such as Saudi Arabia and Qatar (20). It is due to the fact that oil-producing countries in the Middle East have become extraordinarily wealthy. This is why, the majority of western countries desire to form a strong alliance with them in order to maintain a flexible business relationship with them. Simultaneously, many developing nations depends on the exportation of their very own environmental assets, such as tropical hardwoods, oil, tin, gold, and other minerals, to create much sought foreign cash. How much of a material is mined today versus how much is kept for the hereafter is influenced by federal policies. Dysfunctional strategies waste valuable wealth of the nation in an unnecessary way. State-owned firms acquire and commercialize organic resources in various countries. Others have privately operated resources that are subject to state laws. In truth, natural resources are the cornerstone of many countries' economies. Natural resources are also a tool for building economic relationships with other countries. Venezuela and Saudi Arabia, for example, are both known for their vast oil reserves. In truth, Venezuela was

once better well-known for its oil industry, but the nation's economy has suffered a catastrophic downturn as a result of poor systemization. Hugo Chavez unified all oil manufacturing enterprises under state control when he rose to power in 1999, and in response to a workers' insurrection, the leader forcefully rusticated many skilled employees driven by political disagreement (Levitsky & Ziblatt 10). However, while the consequences of the decision were not imminent, the excessive monopolization of natural resources as a result of corruption threw the government into a huge problem when the price of oil dropped dramatically in 2008. As a result, while natural resources might provide wealth to a country, poor policies based on those resources can also pull the country down (Mesquita et al. 153). Furthermore, in Africa, the foreign invasion of major countries for natural resources has resulted in a sharp decline in human welfare. However, the governments of those countries permit to large countries to deliver natural resources in exchange for a low-value cash. Nonetheless, by forming an alliance with large countries, the leaders expect protection and amenities from those countries in order to avoid being deposed, and if these leaders face any complication within the country, the large countries should respond to their aid. In fact, the economic prospects of globalization tend to favour hierarchy's viability. For instance, When Ronald Reagan took office in early 1981, the United States' diplomatic approach toward Nicaragua became more strident. All forms of assistance to the Sandinistas were abruptly halted after the US administration accused Nicaragua of transporting guns from Soviet-bloc nations to Salvadoran insurgents, who once fought against a US-backed regime. It was immediately evident that the US would soon start to adversely affect Nicaragua, with superior support from all ends of the spectrum, until its loyalists were reinstated to power, as Noam Chomsky argues in his book *Deterring Democracy* (334). In 1985, Reagan officially stated the desired purpose that the US had been attempting to achieve since the beginning: the overthrow of the Sandinista government and to form a new alliance between the

new governor and the US. Besides, leaders from poor countries often utilizes the economic position of the country to attract foreign funding, but does not utilizes the funding for the betterment of economy or its people. Surprisingly, the corrupted leaders do not miss any opportunity to enhance their bank economic account, even if the situation is catastrophic. As Mesquita and Smith Illustrates, Earthquakes and tsunamis are unpredictable events that are difficult to predict for a leader. Their aftermath, on the other hand, is not. Often, Political leaders tend to overstate the extent of damage in order to collect more relief monies. Once assistance is obtained, it is routed to political leaders' personal bank accounts instead of being used to rebuild the infrastructure facilities. (86).

### **4.3.3 Impact of Elites**

When powerful elites perceive that the existing democratic system is no longer serving their economic or material needs, they take action against the government. And no leader wants to lose the support of his or her elites. Managing a corporation entails increasing output and improving profitability for the government. For this, the government provides a plethora of specialties to those who wish to invest more. In order to do so, the government frequently has to deviate from the fundamentals of democracy by providing them with illegitimate benefits. Professor Chomsky continues, it would be irrational to expect the US to sustain a democratic structure that is not driven by commerce, elite, and military interests aligned with those of the US elite (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 335). In essence, the elite who plays a key factor in country's economy eventually absorbs an inherent power that the government also relied upon those because if the elites starts supporting the opponent and starts investing on opponent, then the government has less chances to retain its power again in next election. Throughout the 19<sup>th</sup>

and 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the emergence of democratic politics was preceded by a pervasive perception that it was all a deception, with hidden elites pulling the strings behind the scenes. The fact that representative democracy empowers elites and allows them to do much of their business behind closed doors fuelled this distrust (Runciman 51). Besides, the economy of the country is also much dependent on some specific elite companies, who embodies almost the bigger portion of whole economical resources of the country, so denouncing them means losing a huge chunk of money. As it goes, no leader or party wants to dissatisfy any powerful elites as it may eventually destruct their own economic benefits. As stated in *Manufacturing Consent* (1998), In the United States, there is a considerable divide between the elite and the broader population on a wide range of subjects such as trade deals, free healthcare, and the adequate amount of the military expenditure, but the government still decides to what goes better for the elites (Herman & Chomsky 44). In other words, the power elite group can influence government decisions, and they are frequently the driving force behind power shifts from one group to another.

#### **4.3.4 Huge expenses of Election**

Conducting the voting process necessitates a significant amount of managerial and administrative expertise. Dismal management can alienate voters and jeopardize the fairness and legitimation of election campaigns. It is costly to provide sufficient resources to oversee a nationwide electoral process. In several nations around the world, administrative expenses alone amount to millions of dollars (US) per campaign. According to a report published by *Bloomberg* (2019), the 2019 Indian Lok Sabha elections cost over Rs 55,000 crore (\$8 billion), with Modi's Bharatiya Janata Party expending nearly half of total (Usmani). Democratic campaign



expenditures, more media exposure, heightened security, and special electoral resolving disputes methods are all included in. There may be considerable additional costs pertaining to public formal schooling on voting duties and privileges, nationwide branding producing voting process guidance to employees, the execution of international and domestic independent monitoring programs, and prescriptive and budgetary verifications attributed with an electoral cycle, contingent on the sociological phenomena. In the book *The Wild East* (2019), a situation of a local election from Bangladesh was brought forth, where a university professor becomes a nominee. According to him, his district has 4 lakh residents. In order to reach everyone, he must first travel to 200 villages, hamlets and markets. He needs activists in every village and neighbourhood. They need a stall, tea and food, money for their phones, petrol, microphones and platforms, and activists require rented offices. He has to travel to different sectors with his advisors, having adequate protection and bodyguard surrounding the. After doing all the required process, the overall cost becomes substantially higher (262-263). This is the situation of a local election in Bangladesh, a small country. If a local election necessitates so many procedures and a large sum of money, how much preparation, money, and personnel are required and involved in US elections? According to Chomsky, in order to cast a favourable light on its elections, the US government depletes a number of devices and invests a huge amount of money (Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* 89). This raises the question of where the money for the campaign comes from, given that all political parties act independently throughout the campaign and are obligated to cover their own expenses. As the nominee from Bangladesh's local election says, "There is no legitimate source of funding, and yet the demand is huge" (262) In fact, many of the money come from elites and corporate companies who support a specific political party in the hopes that if the party wins, the elites will be able to attract more opportunities to run their businesses. Furthermore, the elites invest in some parties because they have previously worked

with them, and the investment is made out of courtesy and with the purpose of strengthening their relationships. Money plays an important part throughout the campaign since it allows a party to reach out to more people and encourage them to vote for them in a variety of ways. In fact, the nominee went on to say that if his opponent had mastans (goons), he'll need them as well. He intimated that he was prepared and had an armed gang of 20 to 25 goons. He invests money on them so that he can get sufficient co-operation from the goons (263). In other words, every political party has always attempted to combine enough preparation in order to obtain sufficient financial capabilities in order to gain more prominence and drive more attention. As a result, the elite's relevance continues to be a significant component for both parties, because keeping them on their wing implies earning more money, and owning more income means having the capacity to influence the political dynamism. As a result, providing elites with unique facilities may empower a party to garner a monetary advantage over its opponent. As a response, all political parties aim to convince or encourage elites to support them in the exchange of beneficial advantages

#### **4.3.5 Implementation of TAX**

A leader must find a reliable source of income. Democracy is largely founded on the production of its citizens. In this case, the higher the productivity, the better. Because, unlike autocracy, a leader cannot directly compel citizens to perform. People's productivity and desire to work for their personal advancement eventually contribute to the production of additional commodities and facilities, which benefits the nation financially. However, in a democratic political system, keeping all of the predominant supporters delighted is hard and expensive; as a result, the government intends to keep its winning bloc smaller so that the accumulation of

wealth (public funds) does not become completely inadequate, and each individual receives a considerable amount of money and wealth. The higher the productivity, the higher people's earnings will be, and the more money the government will be able to earn through taxes based on their earnings. In contrast to autocracy, democracy allows individuals to be more liberated and skilled, which increases the overall median income because education allows people to make significant amounts of money in a variety of ways (Mesquita & Smith 87). Furthermore, people earning more wealth ensure that they are comfortable and satisfied, which prevents them from engaging in any type of unsatisfactory behaviour. In truth, while lowering tax rates is a crowd-pleasing gesture, in a democracy, the government seeks out a variety of sources to levy taxes on to the point where the government can gather sufficient resources to invest for their own interest.

## **CHAPTER 5: How Leaders supplant democracy with autocracy**

### **5.1: BY DESTABILIZING DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES**

#### **5.1.1 Deploying illegitimate action**

When the USSR fell apart and rulers were deposed in countries throughout the globe, there was a light of hope that the world was experiencing its "third wave" of democracy. Regional and international organizations were engaged granting nascent democracies with technical assistance and advice on how to enhance their embryonic democratic principles. At the moment, it was anticipated that the reform process would lead to democratic consolidation through the accumulation of parliamentary practices. However, this may materialize if governments were willing to accelerate internal and external transparency of entities such as parliaments,

judiciaries, civil liberties commissions, anti-corruption commissions, electoral commissions, political organizations, independent media, and non – governmental organisations. Democratic consolidation is a term used to define a system that produces the maturation and sophistication of democracy and marginal probability of an authoritarian rule returning. It refers to the maturation of both governmental systems and community as a whole. The consequences of long-term democratic collapse have become progressively extensive, affecting both those dwelling under the most brutal dictatorships and also to the inhabitants of long-established democracies. This is because many of the democratic rulers started exploiting their power to alter the democratic process in their country. It is also important to realize that, a democratic leader who intends to keep the regime under his control, he also has to protect his democratic image in order to not displease foreign countries. In fact, pertaining to democratic image is also crucial to instil undemocratic features within the country. For that, the leader deploys and transforms many undemocratic actions through legal means via the constitution and also by different procedures to quell rebellion. David Runciman asserts, “Pragmatism in countries like Hungary and Russia comes a distant second place to scapegoating and elaborate conspiracy theories. Elections still take place. Democracy is talked up, stripped of its liberal credentials. As a result, it is barely democracy at all – some political scientists prefer the label ‘competitive authoritarianism’ to describe what’s going on. In the election, the choice is there but it’s an empty one. This is a parody of democracy rather than a replacement for it (133)”. As a matter of fact, there are two diametrically different approaches that a leader can take in response to the prospect of revolution. He has the ability to increase chances for people by improving their quality of life to the point where they no longer desire to revolt against him. Furthermore, he also has the option to enhance despotism, letting the people even more grotesque than they were before, while also denying them a feasible prospect of success in a popular uprising against their regime (Mesquita

& Smith 128). Orwell asserts in *1984*, A ruling party can lose control in only four ways. At some point, the government will be overthrown from without, or it will be governed by a weak and dissatisfied Middle group, or it will lose its own self-confidence and willingness to lead, causing the masses to rebel (87). So, in order to rule for a longer length of time, it is essential to minimise and diminish internal divisions within the party; otherwise, a practice of skepticism in the ruler's political stance develops gradually among party's members. Authoritarian but Newly Competitive" (2011) by Stephan Ortmann highlights Singapore's ruling party People's Action Party (PAP) determination to administer the country like an enterprise, which signifies that the Industrial Revolution will be adopted into administration. As soon as the People's Action Party was elected to power, it immediately set about removing any and all forms of "destabilization," whether they came in the form of socialist opponents, labour unions, or student leaders. As a result, the group abducted or killed practically everyone without showing any mercy (154) In reality, maintaining control over the land and its residents without encountering opposition will not only improve the government's position, but it will also make it easier for the administration to incorporate initiatives and persuade international organizations to cooperate with the government. Last but not least, while the industrial revolution brought about greater prosperity for a longer length of time, it is also true that the successes took a long time to come about. Meanwhile, the changeover could see a spate of difficulties, and if the opposition is given free rein to protest, long-term improvements could be stymied. According to the author, A combination of successful governance, co-optation, and repression has characterised the PAP's half-century of political control. PAP adopted a variety of policies targeted at encouraging multinational firms to invest in the country's infrastructure in order to ensure the country's long-term success (155). They also advocated for a world-class educational reform system capable of creating highly educated, submissive workers, as well as an unrivalled health-care system that

guarantees residents and wealthy overseas tourists are satisfied with the quality of care they receive there. In other words, People's Action Party (PAP), the country's ruling party, has brought economic prosperity to Singapore, but at the expense of removing people's core democratic rights.

### **5.1.2 Suspending or Amending Constitution**

Many rulers throughout the world have attempted to circumvent term restrictions and extend their reins of power over the last two few decades. The most common perpetrators are African national leaders; the governments of more than ten African countries have orchestrated amendments to electoral reform, and as a result, the pattern has spread throughout the continent. Some of them are- Teodoro Mbasogo from Guinea, Yoweri Museveni from Uganda, Paul Biya from Cameroon and many more. Most fascinatingly, Vladimir Putin and Chinese President Xi Jinping, both epitome of current authoritarianism, have lately modified or repealed term limits. As Levitsky and Ziblatt describes in their book, in terms of how democracies die, one of the most ironic aspects is that the very act of defending democracy is frequently used as an excuse for its destabilization. Geological crises, environmental catastrophes, and security threats such as wars and terrorist attacks are frequently used by democratic leaders (with an autocratic mentality) to rationalize anti-democratic acts. In fact, during times of national security crisis, citizens are more willing to endure and embrace authoritarian methods, particularly when they worry for their personal safety (80). As previously stated, Putin was able to consolidate greater power in his own hands and the hands of his associates by taking advantage of the 1999 bombing attacks on Moscow. In reality, the bombings created the framework for Russia's ferocious military campaign against Chechnya, as well as for Mr. Putin's political rise as prime minister,

whose unwavering pursuit of the war resulted in a surge of public support that carried him to the presidency, also to give him enough power that he would subsequently begin altering the constitution for his own benefit.

Countries like Azerbaijan, Bolivia, Iraq have all encountered similar form of situation. To talk about Bangladesh, political opportunism has been utilized to advance the ruling party's election prospects in the country, and constitutional revisions have been employed in an instrumentalist technique to accomplish different objectives. Successive governments have taken advantage of democratic systems and institutions of accountability in order to pass constitutional revisions that are favourable to the ruling party. The 15<sup>th</sup> amendment to the constitution of Bangladesh was ratified by the parliament on June 30, 2011, effectively ending the country's caretaker government structure during election period. As stated in *The Daily Star*, The repeal of the non-political caretaker government provision led in widespread unrest throughout the country, as well as an election in which the major opposition groups did not participate in 2014 (Kalimullah et al). With this, the ruling party, the Awami League, has established overall control over the election and, since then, has been using the advantages to sway the election in its direction. On the other hand, despite constitutional limits, President Trump has boldly considered trying a third presidential term in the U.S. In essence, the change of constitution in compliance with the leader's own agenda is not a recent phenomenon. In Iran, when Khomeini returned from confinement, with 98 percent of the vote in his favour, he altered the legislation to put mullahs in charge. After a series of rigged elections, this amendment was accepted, and he was designated Supreme Leader, with the authority to veto non-Islamic legislation and politicians through the Council of Guardians (Mesquita & Smith 31). By doing this, he ensured the authority to rule the country exactly in the way he wanted Iran to be transformed. In Hungary,

Prime Minister Viktor Orbán has systematically filled the ranks of bureaucratic organizations that were once impartial with ardent supporters of his party, thereby undermining the independence of the country's court. Hugo Chávez, the president of Venezuela, changed the country's constitution (Yascha Mounk 45). In fact, many of the leaders who have survived long in the arena of politics had utilized their power illegally to lengthen their position on the power. In fact, many of the political leaders who have survived for a long time in the arena of politics have done so by abusing their positions of authority in order to prolong their own positions of power. After gaining a two-thirds parliamentary majority in 2010, Viktor Orbán's Fidesz party utilized its newfound authority to revise the country's constitution and electoral rules, among other things. Consequently, it rewrote the election rules to favour the major party while gerrymandering the districts to ensure that it received the highest number of votes possible. Although the ruling party's vote share decreased significantly from 53 percent in 2010 to 44 percent in 2014, it was successful in maintaining its two-thirds majority in parliament. (Levitsky & Ziblatt 75). Moreover, term limitations must be recognized as a fundamental political rule if democracy is to reclaim its grounding. The reasons advanced by lingering existing firms that citizens need another tenure, that a longer term will bring peace and protection, or that changes in the law are the product of legitimate and participatory processes—are frequently a weak covering for expanding authoritarianism. According to Levitsky and Ziblatt (2018), the government does one thing that is to modify the rules of the system, in order to consolidate their position in power. In order to consolidate their power, leaders (particularly those with an authoritarian bent) recurrently amend the constitution, election system, and other power structures in ways that restrict or destabilize the opposition, essentially shifting the power balance in their favour. Most of these modifications are conducted under the guise of providing some sort of community interest, but in actuality they are intended to manipulate the system in



the interest of rulers and its loyalists. (75). In many democratic countries, there is no limit to how many times a leader can compete for the office of the presidency or prime minister. For instance, in Bangladesh and India, people can run for the highest post an unlimited number of times. There is no specific restriction in the constitution regarding this. Thus, since democracy was reinstated in Bangladesh in 1990, just two individuals have come to power (Harriss-White & Michelutti 13). Furthermore, it appears that in many countries where people cannot run numerous times, after their presidential term expires, they seem to nominate members of his family to compete for the top spot. In this way, the leader unofficially maintains influence over the administration. For instance, as reported in *BBC*, with only a single six-year term permitted by the Philippine constitution, there are chances of the former president Rodrigo Duterte only allowing Sara Duterte-Carpio (his daughter) to nominate for the presidency in Philippines' upcoming 2022 elections. In doing so, Duterte will retain influence over the administration, if her daughter ascends to the presidency (Johnson).

### 5.1.3 Restricting Opponent's Voices

Politics, on the other hand, does not end after getting into the throne. Other politicians are after him as he takes the reins of authority and reaps the benefits. They are vying for the same role that the leader is vying for! Politics is a dangerous game. Successful leaders, it appears, handle these dangers by forming a loyal alliance. Those who fail to complete this initial assignment leave the door open for someone else to take their place. Obtaining authority and staying in power are two different entities. As written in the book *The Dictator's Handbook*, to gain authority, a leader requires to recognize an opportunity, act quickly, and act forcefully to grab occasion (43). Rising to power also entails conquering any adversaries, both conceptually

and practically in democracies and dictatorships. According to the writers, it is not for the people with fragile of spirit to rise to prominence (43). These ostensibly certainties have been put into question in recent years. Many wealthy democracies are seeing the most intense period of political transformation in decades, with populations becoming increasingly enraged. Major parties that had been solid for a long time are now collapsing. In the 2021 West Bengal election, for example, the Indian National Congress (INR) and the Communist Party of India (CPI) both obtained zero seats. People were surprised by the result, given that INR is India's oldest and most politically influential party, and the CPI ruled West Bengal for seven consecutive terms (1977-2011) before Mamata Banerjee took the reins. Most notably, a current influx of populist movements has infiltrated parliament or even rose to executive authority in a huge portion of countries across Europe, Asia and North America. Furthermore, democratic leaders' acts are taking on a new component, in which opponents are downplayed and weakened in varying methods. To impede the process of disseminating knowledge regarding existing governments' mismanagement, opponents are imprisoned, killed, or restricted. Same exactly how Syme was made vanished in *1984*. Syme is an extremely intelligent character that works alongside Winston in the Ministry of Truth. Unfortunately, just as Winston prophesied, Syme unexpectedly vanishes as a result of his remarkable intellect (Orwell 70) People who express their dissatisfaction with the authorities are incarcerated forcibly, their relatives are mistreated, and any political leader with opposing views is called a traitor. Most importantly, the government is not the sole perpetrator of this activity. In fact, amid supporters of the government, animosity toward opposing viewpoints is widespread, so whenever a gleam of rebellion appears, supporters of existing leaders seize every opportunity to reduce the likelihood of insurrection. Not that Syme, in *1984*, expressed any dissatisfaction directly towards Big Brother, but his intellectual strength was seen as a force which can be detrimental for Big Brother's dominance in future. In 2019, a

student named Abrar was brutally murdered by his own classmates and dorm mates, all because he publicly expressed his dissatisfaction with the ruling party's choice on social media.

Bangladesh was taken by surprise by the incident, not only because Bangladesh is considered to be a democratic country where freedom of expression must be guaranteed for all, but also because of the manner in which the assassination was carried out and how intolerant people have become towards those who hold opposing viewpoints.

Bangladesh is nominally a multi-party democratic country, but due to its miserable human and low political freedoms record, it cannot be termed independent or progressive. The mainstream press and society organizations have been targeted by the police and military services. Advocates of the ruling government and its front organizations frequently alert the state security agencies about the presence of their opponents in the workforce and in indigenous communities. These dissidents and enforcement authorities are operating cooperatively. Native AL "activists" are often just working without their leaders' permission or explicit directives. Without convictions, indictments, or paperwork, security agencies are also functioning privately. The most notable human rights violations were committed by law enforcement agencies, the Rapid Action Battalion, and the Border Guards Bangladesh. The RAB is the prosecutor's dedicated anti-terrorism unit in Bangladesh. In accordance with the book *The Wild East*, RAB has been convicted of more than a thousand unlawful deaths, illegal detentions, and abductions. A case was brought up in the book regarding the disappearance of Santu, a local gang boss from Barisal who served as the right-hand man of the local leader. He was apprehended by RAB, and he hasn't been seen or heard from again since. When the RAB was questioned about the incident, they categorically denied it. As both writers hinted, RAB was allegedly given Rs. 25 lakhs in order to eliminate and kill Santu from the local political scene (Harriss-White & Michelutti 278). Since RAB is a government-sponsored anti-terrorist and anti-crime force, committing a crime or

assassinating an opponent through the RAB offers more protection and risk-free circumstances. By doing all these, the government keeps themselves in the arena of political game alone, where no one can muster the forces needed to contest against them.

#### **5.1.4 Limiting Media's Action**

In order for democracy to flourish, it is essential that information be made accessible through the media. Because it empowers citizens to become more responsible and well-informed about decisions. It also serves as a monitoring mechanism for citizens to determine whether political representatives are adhering to their constitutional obligations or not, and, more importantly, whether leaders are prioritizing the interests of the majority who elected them into power. Educating, attempting to engage, and alerting the general public is the responsibility of the mass media. Its function is also to indoctrinate in individual citizens the fundamental values, cultural beliefs, and social conventions that will enable people to become assimilated into the institutional arrangements of the broader community (Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* 301). However, the constitutional freedom to obtain and distribute knowledge through an independent voice is being contested. In many democracies, official governments have made clear steps to stifle critical media perspectives while bolstering companies that provide fair coverage. The phenomenon can be traced back to a global deterioration in democracy. Freedom of press is eroding as an indicator of and precursor to the downfall of other democratic traditions and values. According to Chomsky and Herman (1988), Many journalists are fully aware of how the system operates, and they take advantage of the rare opportunities it affords them to give data and insights that are beneficial to the elite consensus in order to further their careers (304). To put it another way, in many democratic countries, the entire media infrastructure is aware of how

centralized the system is, how it operates, and what will happen if the system does not operate in accordance with the government's priorities. For example, *Outlook India* reports on an incident that occurred during the 2019 election in Bangladesh, when a famous TV satellite channel named Jamuna Television was forced to go off the air due to political pressure. It was due to the fact that the news media was broadcasting the fraudulent activities committed by goons of the ruling party during the election. In order to prevent the channel from showing the incidents, the government forced the channel's broadcasting to be halted until the election was completed ("Bangladesh's Leading"). This, in reality, fits under the third sign of authoritarian inclinations in democratic countries, as identified by Levitsky and Ziblatt (48). Now, the media is being urged to bring structure and guidance to political systems that are heavily reliant on entrepreneurial ventures, elites, and loosely organized corporate interests. Noam Chomsky illustrates the scenario of the circumstances in the United States, where the primary media organizations are controlled by highly wealthy individuals or decision makers who are subject to significant restrictions placed by owners and other revenue-driven forces. (Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* 14). In fact, they are the significant filter that influences news selections in accordance with their interests.

Significant sectors of the populace in some of the world's most powerful democracies are no longer providing neutral knowledge and updates. This isn't only because reporters are being imprisoned, as might be the case in totalitarian regimes. Instead, the media has been subjected to more subtle attempts to curtail their impartiality. Government-backed leadership changes, financial and operational pressure, and widespread vilification of trustworthy journalists are all utilized as effective tools to undermine the importance of press. According to Chomsky and Herman (1988), in nations where a state bureaucracy occupies the positions of power and

influence, exerts dominant control over the media, which is regularly augmented by government surveillance, makes it utterly obvious that the media plays into the hands of the elite people or winning coalition (2). Governments have often taken aggressive initiatives to assist favoured channels, such as attractive government tenders, supportive policy determinations, and privileged access to public data. Now, the idea is for the journalists to work for the benefit of those in authority rather than the general population.

Benjamin Netanyahu, Prime minister of Israel which is one of the few democracies in the Middle East, has regularly chastised professional journalists and threatened fraud accusations for potentially providing legislative advantages to two large media companies in exchange for favourable coverage. Despite Netanyahu's opposition to formal indictment and trial on these claims, findings illustrate that he was prepared to surrender journalistic freedom in order to keep political control. In the April 2019 elections, many voters appeared to accept this bargain, placing Netanyahu's party and its partners in a condition to create a new coalition agreement. India, the world's biggest democracy, is also dropping hints that the press's role in attempting to hold the government responsible is curtailed. The current Bhartiya Janata Party has backed initiatives to suppress antinational discourse, and goons from the party have stormed the homes and businesses of dissident media pundits. *RSF's* 2021 World Press Freedom Index places India at 142nd place out of 180 countries. It has been shown that India is one of the most dangerous countries for journalists in the world, according to *RSF* research in 2021. India was ranked 133 in 2016, but has slowly slipped to 142 by 2020 ("Modi Tightens"). They(journalists) are at risk of being assaulted by law enforcement or political figures, or even facing retaliatory action from organized crime or corrupt local officials. Following charges that the government offers orders on how the journalism should depict his activities and antagonizes journalists who oppose, the

media has become increasingly complimentary of Prime Minister Narendra Modi, who was re-elected again after his first term. The authorities have also been cautious in granting broadcasting contracts, ultimately shutting out adversarial broadcasters. The independent media could be on the edge of collapse if democratic authorities stop supporting media freedom domestically and constantly utilize the media to establish a distorted image of the country. As Chomsky and Hermann stated, any opposing voices and news are marginalized as a result of elite control over the media, which consequences from the application of these filters (by state government and corporations). This appears to happen so inherently that mainstream press news reporters, who are commonly functioning with thorough moral fibre and generosity, have no choice but to persuade themselves that they are ought to choose and decipher the news "objectively" and in accordance with professional news principles. They are certainly neutral within the confines of the filter limitations; nevertheless, the restraints are so profound, and are integrated into the system in such a substantial manner, that conducting and promoting alternate units of news selection are difficult to envisage (2).

### **5.1.5 Controlling Congress & Judiciary System**

A judiciary free of legislative and judicial interference, as well as other controlling shareholders, is not only a foundational premise of the legal framework, but also a necessary precursor for effective governance and democratic consolidation. Government officials who violate or exploit their power can be punished by lay magistrates. Neutral judiciary, on the other contrary, can proclaim statutory provisions or regulatory frameworks illegitimate under judicial scrutiny. An independent court may denigrate any distorting implications through their judgements because it is free of obligation and other government interference. The segmentation

of power and authority structure divides the functions of the government into three classifications: legislative, executive, and judiciary. These responsibilities are allocated across multiple participants in a way wherein each entity may independently verify the operation of the others. As an outcome, no single authority in a democratic politics can become so resilient that it gets capable enough of destabilizing the model. However, the problem lies in the fact that, many political parties start putting their own people into other branches, and utilizes their power in order to fabricate the constitution process by forming new laws. As reported by *VOX*, throughout his presidential campaign, Trump promised to delegate control of the judicial nomination process to the Federalist Society, a prominent conservative legal organization that comprises at least four current or previous Supreme Court justices (Millhiser). A large number of lifetime appointments to lawyers have been granted by Trump, who are mostly conservative and his allies. When he came into power, within first three years, Trump had appointed 53 judges to the courts. Without a question, the decisions of these justices will have an influence on American law much after Trump leaves office. After being finalized, Trump's candidates will serve for years in their respective roles (Vox 2019). Regardless of the fact that Democrats won a stunning victory in the 2020 elections and won majorities in both houses of Congress, these justices will have significant authority to sabotage the programs of the next president and his government. As, in the parliamentary system like Bangladesh, where mostly the ruling party has the majority of representatives, does not take much effort to amend new laws and policies. However, there are also instances where whenever any neutral embody tries to oppose any laws that are established in accordance with the government's agenda, the person is indirectly harassed or taken out of his position. For example, the Bangladeshi Supreme Court, under the leadership of Chief Justice S K Sinha, repealed the 16<sup>th</sup> constitutional modification, which allowed parliament to remove Supreme Court judges for misconduct or incompetence from their positions. The Prime Minister



was enraged by the comment, which she perceived as a sort of disgrace for the country because it came from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. As a result of this incident, the ruling party accused him of duplicity and unscrupulous behaviour, which Sinha categorically denied. In the next month, Sinha travelled for Australia, indicating that he would only be gone for a short period of time. According to *The Indian Express*, the Supreme Court issued a statement a day after Sinha was ousted, in which it stated that other lawyers had opted not to sit on the bench with him as a response of allegations of corruption and civil rights violations. Sinha was discharged from the panel. As a matter of fact, while he was away on leave, Sinha resigned from his position. (“Arrest Warrant”). Every country, as the saying goes, wishes a government powerful enough to protect citizens but not so robust that it becomes tyrannical. In short, democratic leaders may exploit the legislative and executive branches with deception and fill the branches with their own people to unify all branches with their ideology in order to strengthen their hold on the country.

## **5.2: HELPING ONLY WHO MATTERS**

### **5.2.1 Keeping Winning Coalition small**

The next rule to consider is the need of keeping the winning coalition as small as possible. For a leader to be able to keep the prosecutor on his or her side while also raising the treasure, his or her country must increase its riches and strength (Mesquita & Smith 35). Everything outside of this is subordinate; this is the most essential core of authority. Now, a leader who has a large number of significant adherents is having serious challenges. It is challenging to manage not only their costs, but also to balance their contrasting interests and antagonism. In fact, the

more intricate their monetary and social sections are, the easier it is for an opponent to persuade a mass movement. The more key supporters a ruler has on average, the shorter their reign (Mesquita & Smith 25). According to Mesquita and Smith (2011), a small coalition permits a leader to rely on a limited number of individuals in order to maintain power. Fewer essentials equals greater control and helps to increase spending prudence (19). Aside from that, it must be acknowledged that almost no rebellion can succeed without the direct involvement of the winning coalition. In other phrases, a violent coup occurs when the people who protect the regime become dissatisfied and frustrated. This is why a wise leader paves the way for his or her suitable winning coalition and important backers to make money. The total amount of income generated by a country can be classified into three categories. One pool consists of untaxed commodities that are placed in the hands and whim of each citizen to use as they like. Food, Cloths, Accommodations, and other human necessities are among the resources available for the citizen. The remainder of the nation's revenue is taxed and divided into two categories by the government. The winning coalition gets one pool as a private good (stored for them); the rest of the people from the country gets the other (Mesquita et al. 149). For instance, in Bangladesh, the local politician and his network of various types of middlemen play a significant role in the contracting business in provincial Bangladesh. The system centres around leasing for local government work, primarily construction projects, but it also includes items like licences and permits, as well as the occasional request to the police or government office to 'turn a blind eye' to certain aspects of a commercial operation. There has been an increase in the integration of the local media, which is more of a tool for politics than a watchdog for the political sphere. (Harriss-white & Michelutti 265). In fact, the government helps its winning coalition by giving them more power to break laws. Similarly, the winning coalition works their fullest and moves heaven and earth to maintain the leader's role; However, in democracy, since it is not possible to

make every supporter happy, the government insists on keeping its winning bloc slimmer so that the accumulation of wealth is provided sufficiently and each individual receives a significant amount of power and money. Leveraging public resources and government funding, the winning alliance establishes near-immediate hegemony. They remain unanswerable for their despicable and harmful deeds, which have harmful effect for the country's productive resources as well as for the country itself.

### **5.2.2 Making Nominal Selectorates large**

Having a smaller winning coalition entails having a large nominal selectorate. According to the book *The Dictator's Handbook* (2011), a leader must keep a wide pool of interchangeable supporters. On hand. By doing so, he will be able to simply substitute any of his coalition's rabble rousers, both significant and vital. After all, a wide selectorate indicates a greater supply of alternative sympathizers to warn the powerful people that if they are not committed and well conducted, they will be easily dismissed (26). Establishing a powerful foothold on nominal selectorates is equally vital for a leader. Because they are undereducated and unfamiliar with political dynamics, having them on the side of the leader implies the leader wielding verbal authority over others. As written in the journal "Policy Favour and Political Survival" (1999), a country's population is divided into a number of subgroups. The total number of people in the country is the largest category. An institutionally legitimated group of citizens has a say in who makes up the government. The selectorate is a subset of this group. Leaders must make a political judgment about who belongs in the selectorate, which is one of the most important tasks for a leader to do (Mesquita et al. 148). However, it is also apparent that nominal selectorates are the people who have the numerical ability to deploy a rebellion, but they lack the ideological

prospect. As a result, the government attempts to create a structure within which the nominal selectorate can gain more freedom. In *1984*, for example, the proles are not subject to any type of monitoring or spying. They can also engage in any physical relationship with others, which is something that real electorates cannot do (Orwell 32). They were not forced to adhere to the Party's strict sexual puritanism. When it came to prostitution, there were no consequences, and divorce was authorized. Further, religious worshiping would have been approved if the proles had shown some sign that they had a need for or desire for the spiritual devotion. They were deserving of scrutiny. For this reason, the party slogan says- "Proles and animals are free" (Orwell 33). In short, as to describe the Selectorate Theory, the writers say-

"The general principle is straightforward. When the winning coalition gets bigger, private goods get spread more thinly, and so they less easily can make up for failed public policies. As the selectorate shrinks, the risks from defection drop off, making the incumbent's advantage from using private rewards smaller and smaller. So, the greatest incumbency advantage in using private goods to satisfy constituents belongs to leaders of political systems that have small winning coalitions and large selectorates. This makes the value of current private goods high for the average supporter and makes the expected value of private goods following a political defection small. It also means that the incumbent can, if so inclined, cull lots of the private goods budget for his or her own ends." (Mesquita et al. 151)

### **5.2.3 Promoting Right-wing democracy**

After World War II, liberal democracies in western Europe experienced a significant extent of peace and stability during the years that followed. Economic growth that has been preserved,

rising individual affluence, and the advancement and elegance of the welfare state have all made a significant contribution to a social and political climate that has been favourable to good governance, while simultaneously stripping away assistance for extreme fundamentalist solutions both on the left and the right win parties. Stability and common understanding, unfortunately, were only episodic. Right-wing populist parties became more progressive in their repudiation of the entrenched socially constructed and socio-political system and their campaigning of individualism, a capitalist enterprise, and a massive reduction in the role of the state. According to Runciman, “Early twenty first-century democracy ultimately got an enormous injection of energy from the populist challenge. Elected politicians were forced to confront public anger and find ways to assimilate it back into the mainstream” (57). Over the course of last several years, extreme right-wing populist parties have really been able to expand both their share of votes and their proportional representation. The rise of Viktor Orbán from Hungary, Law and Justice Party from Poland, BJP from India are all good example of the insurgence of right-wing democracy in today’s world. The liberal democratic political system, as described by Yascha Mounk (2018), has been the prominent system of government in most of the continent for the past several decades. Possibly, the end of that age is in sight (254). He goes on to say that in past couple of decades, nations in Western Europe and North America have becoming more autocratic in nature. Their democratic system claims that the people will have the final say. In practice, however, it frequently disregards the will of the people. A system of rights without democracy has gained ground, largely unnoticed by most political scientists (255). By promoting right-wing democracy, the government attracts the objective of majority, which often undermine the importance of marginalized community. Most importantly, in the face of liberalism which suggests equal rights to all people regardless of their community, the majority group of people starts supporting the right-wing populist party in order to get more votes.

A one-time win for a populist leader does not necessarily imply that liberal democracy is doomed. When the system's criminals band together against populists, utilize mass demonstrations to prevent their power grabs, and remove them from office as soon as possible, they have a good chance of recovering the system (Runciman 55). But there are two or three stories of populist triumph for every narrative of populist failure. Leader with autocrat mindset, who were generally predicted to fail or collapse have solidified their grasp on power in many nations around the world, making it difficult for the opposition to unseat them (ruling party) in democratic elections. the instance of Hungary's Viktor Orbán or Venezuela's Hugo Chavez exemplifies this exactly. When Chavez's populism sparked fierce resistance, and in April 2002, he was nearly deposed by the military. It was the failure of the coup that allowed a victorious Chavez to claim even greater democratic legitimacy for himself (Levitsky & Ziblatt 81). Because, despite the fact that he expresses his system of governing as illiberal democracy, a big portion of his country's population prefers to be ruled by his government.

#### **5.2.4 Fostering Division**

Democracy has accomplished amazing things in terms of making our societies more equitable and balanced. Electoral democracy has risen to prominence as the world's leading political process over the last century. Internally, electoral systems have changed as the practice of enslavement, imperialism, racism, sexism, and marginalization have all been questioned and eliminated. However, as the world evolves, new issues emerge. The dominant narrative in many representative democracy cultures is one of conflict, fury, and incoherence. It's difficult to envision a route forward that brings all together in reaction to the critical difficulties

people confront. Elections aren't a mystical event. They don't make things better on their own. They are only effective in certain social situations. Elections, on the other hand, can make matters worse if such prerequisites do not materialize. For instance, Greece's democracy had been in a horrible shape for a considerable time; the country was theoretically fragmented between the left and right, as well as administratively between the king, army, and parliament. There were syndicates within syndicates, and none of the various factions considered reliable to each other. In fact, elections did not resolve their issues; the one conducted in 1961 was largely regarded as being robbed by the winners (the right-wing National Radical Union) following a tumultuous campaign conducted by them (Runciman 27).

Humans individuality is inextricably linked to our belongingness and favourable attitudes regarding it. They may easily establish these subgroups and minority cultures based on subjective and even fictional qualities. People in south Asia, where there are instances of countries (India & Pakistan) being divided due to religious differences, are predominantly conservative and fanatic when it comes to their religious faith and ideals. Using the Gujarat Riot as an example, the book *Anatomy of Hate* (2018) introduces three convicted criminals who were personally implicated in the communal rioting, which was erupted due to animosity towards different religious belief. According to the writer, their experiences demonstrate that ideologies are spread with fanatical zeal, encouraging people to participate in illegal activity (Laul 3). Suresh's fundamental mode of communicating evolved as a result of his upbringing, which included a lot of neglect and discrimination. This restricted ideological paradigm encompasses his "marital relationship" to Farzana. As retaliation for his sister marrying a Muslim, he pressures Farzana to marry him. In other words, the marriage happened out of hatred and

inclination to get a revenge. The sheer proclivity for hatred illustrates how deeply abhorrence is ingrained in this demography. Marriage, which is a sacred institution, is also swayed by the magnitude of hatred. Another key law is that in order to fully comprehend, humans categorize everything, even other humans. It is because people are particularly drawn to form organizations that are both accessible and exclusive. As a result, politicians use hostility in order to gain the support of the dominant group. As a result, rather than seeking harmony and equality, leaders favour the majority group by pursuing their agendas, sowing the seeds of marginalization in the minority group (Laul 15). Though the examples from India largely go against Hindus, comparable forms of hatred can be discovered in other countries with different religious majority groups. In Bangladesh, for example, Islam is being used to radicalize the violent concept of majority superiority. Despite the fact that “Bangladesh is a country with many ethnic groups,” sentiments such as “Bangladesh is a country with 90% Muslims” are glorified. In both cases, the ultimate sufferers are the minority group; because at the end of the day, normal citizens are mobilized by the democratic leaders, who do this in order to gain more and more votes. Since different cultures have multiple objectives, the government has to reach a compromise; yet, it is also true that adopting an intercession does not imply a lasting solution, thus the divide between the two parties persists. In such a situation, right-wing parties seize the chance to appeal to larger audiences in order to secure a majority of votes in that location. For example, in the 2010 national elections of Hungary, Viktor Orbán's Fidesz party was victorious by an overwhelming margin. Once in power, Orbán set about gradually consolidating his position. As a starting point, he described himself as an upstanding Democrat with moderate policies. Now, he is vociferous in his opposition to liberal democracy and its mechanisms. He asserts that democracy should be centralised rather than liberal in its approach to issues. Under his administration, Hungary will transform into an illiberal democratic state based on national underpinnings (Mounk 10). In fact,



when they have power, the marginalized group's strength is weakened because right-win populists do not support liberalism; instead, their objective is more concentrated on the majority group in their country. Consequently, the division that is produced between the majority and minority communities disintegrates social stability within the country and dehumanizes marginalized populations on a serious level. Yascha Mounk (2018) continues the discussion of Poland and Hungary's illiberal political positions in Europe, as well as how they are expanding and exercising their intolerant behaviour on marginalized groups and liberal values. Viktor Orbán has constructed a large border fence and employed 3,000 border hunters in order to prevent a minority number of immigrants from entering his country (176). Additionally, Poland's current president, Andrzej Duda, has signed legislation that makes it lawful to arrest foreign nationals without first obtaining a court order and has closed the Council Against Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia, and Intolerance. Since denial of immigrants, homosexuality and etc are a crowd-pleasing act for the majority people of their own country (who are religiously fanatic) and is in the interests of the majority of the population, it assists populist politicians in gaining support from the majority of the population.

### **5.2.5 Illegitimate Power to Militia**

Democratic accountability, ideally, always be a two-way interaction between the military and community. Constitutional mandate safeguards are required to shield the state including the armed services from two categories of possible threats: officials with military aspirations and military with political agendas. In order to further enhance his control, a leader with dictatorial intentions often quests to enlist the cooperation of military forces. This is because, without the use of weapons, no coup could be carried out, and no insurrection could be put down. Since the

weapon is held by army personnel, having their support ensures that the leader is immune from any inter-nation disputes. As a result, the militia gradually emerges under the category of the elite group, which has oblique power over the country (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 63). This is why, the government spends a significant funds in order to satisfy the military status quo. Aside from that, the military power as a whole is factionalized. When Dwight Eisenhower created the term “Military Industrial Complex,” he was referring to the economic and financial linkages that exist between politicians, national military services, and the defence industry of those countries. A few instances of these ties include political spending, legislative approval for expenditures on weapons and war, political campaigning to sustain bureaucracy, and industrial control (Byrne 157). As a result, every leader aspires to place military personnel in command of an entire battalion who are supporters or allies of their political party or business allies. By doing so, the government and the party’s supporters within the militia work together to maintain their respective levels of power. For example, in order to make the military more submissive to his sentiments, Saddam appointed family members and residents of his Tikriti Clan in main strategic job roles, most notably Colonel Adnan Khairallah Talfah, who became the lead of Iraq’s military. In practice, Adnan’s position and atrocity within the system put Hussein’s armed forces under his direct authority (Karsh & Rautsi 161-162). Moreover, Military is crucial for maintaining power over other territories. The United States’ military capabilities not only protect the country and its population from direct attacks, but they also contribute to the maintenance of peace and stability in regions essential to the country’s interests and the financing of the country’s defence commitments around the world. As Thierry Meyssan illustrates in his book *Before our very eyes, fake wars, big lies* (2019), since the two empires (the United States and the Soviet Union) were propped up one against the other, it was thought that- the disintegration of the Soviet Union should have logically resulted in the disintegration of the other superpower, the

United States. To not get into such devastation, in 1995, Congress compelled President Bill Clinton to rearm their and prioritize their military in order to keep the country from collapsing, so that the financial and foreign-policy problem (related to military) does not get risen. The military forces, which had just demobilized a million men, began to reorganize, despite the fact that they faced no adversary who could compete with them at the time (135).

The United States supports wars in order to sell arms; they start or initiate a war, then sell arms to both sides; it is in America's financial interests to have a constant war something in the world, and they will ensure that it continues. According to Edmund F. Byrne (2010), the self-defence justification for going to war is not taken into consideration by U.S. spokespersons because it is incompatible with the motives, they have in mind for supporting military operations in the first place. As these targets are achieved, U.S. spokespersons continue to emphasize the importance of national defence as the ultimate goal. However, they maintain inconclusively that the United States, as a superpower, is free from the moral limitations that apply to ordinary nation states (159).

### **5.3: ECONOMIC Consolidation**

#### **5.3.1 A systemized Corruption Network**

Establishing a corrupted framework within the country may appear to be a negative step at first, but the government obtains the most crucial goal by doing so: making people oblivious of their fundamental rights. When people are able to earn more money than they usually do, it gives them a sense of fulfilment. Giving citizens an open channel to make money also aids the

government in gaining public support. Runciman brings the opinion given by Brennan on Democracy that- most individuals do not value political participation. In reality, democracy serves little use for most of the general people and ultimately strives to deafen and contaminate people with the opportunities of corruption (140). Furthermore, giving people spaces to get corrupted allows the government to open additional doors for the elite to invest in the country. It is because, when the foreign investors get less restrictions and more opportunities to run business, they try to invest more money on the country. Despite widespread corruption, many individuals consider that only a minority number of wealthy elites rules the country and that the majority of people in the country are insignificant, even though they are also a part of this corruption process. Elites can also be defined as groupings of people who hold or compete for power. Liberal democracy, according to Yascha Mounk (2018), is a promise to the common people that they will be provided with the ability to make decisions; an assurance to minorities that their civil liberties will be protected from the oppressive greater part; and a guarantee to corporate elites that they will be granted the power to ensure their own affluence. The fact that liberal democracy is distinguished by its ability to adapt has been credited with the country's extraordinary stability (54). However, He continues that, the consolidation of power by political and monetary elites is to blame for the people's demoralization. To reap large inheritances, big businesses and the super-rich pushed for separate central banks and business-friendly trade treaties. By doing this, government creates the both fraction (elite & normal citizen) happy through financial security (93). As a result, the government does not impose many restrictions on elites, as they are the ones who generate the majority of the country's revenue. Losing the coalition will result in the country's economic strangulation.

### 5.3.2 Investing money to sway election

When it comes to aspects of government, the fundamental distinction between authoritarian and democratic administrations is that one does not permit anyone to point fingers at them, whereas the other removes all opportunity for others to pin the blame on them. The democratic system is set up in a manner that people can only cast their votes after a certain amount of time has passed. As soon as the regulations are modified to his advantage, the leader seizes control of important elements, sow the seeds of illegal markets, wields the whip hand over everything, and buys votes right before the election. It cannot be stated that every citizen of a country vote with the same earnestness. Indeed, because there are so many disadvantaged and underprivileged people for whom money or food is more essential than voting, political leaders bribe them to vote for them. As a result, votes can be purchased with money. According to a report by *CNN* which covered a report of CMS regarding 2019 Indian Lok Sabha Election, while Prime Minister Narendra Modi's personal charisma was seen as a crucial element in the BJP's victory in the 2019 election, the party's overwhelming financial advantage enabled it to build a national campaign focusing on Hindu nationalism and national security (Gupta). Significantly, a lot of money is spent during election campaigning to impress people and to persuade them to believe that if they vote for the leader, the way he is assisting them would improve. As a result of the exploitation of money, people's votes in democracy can also be swayed. Besides, peoples' psyche is being controlled through media, social media and in many ways in order to persuade them to not vote the opposition. Steven Levitsky and Daniel Ziblatt brings forth the negative impression promoted during the 2008 US election. According to them,

“The 2018 presidential election was a watershed moment in partisan intolerance. Through the right-wing media ecosystem- including Fox News, America’s most watched cable news channel- Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama was cast as Marxist, anti-American and secretly Muslim. More troubling is that, right-wing media’s rhetoric of intolerance was picked up by leading Republican politics.” (128)

### **5.3.3 Foreign Deal in exchange of Power-support**

The budgetary management of a country is reliant on economic expansion operations such as commerce, products, sufficient distribution, facility maintenance, and so on. It is not true that a leader does not want his country to become wealthy and sophisticated; rather, he seeks it more than anybody else because it will provide him both widespread acceptance and a great deal of money. In practice, the more his country develops, the more opportunities he will have to raise profit and collect more taxation. Furthermore, support for a country is contingent on the other country’s political ideology and who their adversaries are. Iraqi opposition troops were always given short shrift in the United States during the Gulf War, and hence overlooked in the media. When they petitioned the Bush administration for support for a campaign to establish parliamentary democracy, they were vetoed. All of this was done by the US government to bolster Saddam Hussein’s fight against Iran, which was also a US foe (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 463). As a result, every country form fiscal alliance with others, with the majority of rich countries coming to the defence with federal assistance for subjugated nations. Wealthier countries get an advantage over poorer countries as a result of this. To some amount, this leads to indebtedness for the rest of a leader’s life and, eventually, to collapse. The United States, for particular, spent a substantial amount of money in Liberia in place to avert the country from

aligning itself with the Soviet Union during the Cold War between the United States and Soviet Union in the 1980s. With so much wealth, Liberia's then leader, Samuel Doe, began lavishing gifts on his admirers and important adherents. However, the Soviet Union dissolved in 1989, and the United States stopped providing money to Liberia. As a result, Doe was unable to make an investment in the disciples; eventually, his core followers vanquished him and executed him in a televised display. Doe had no inkling what a president was supposed to do, let alone how to lead a country, when he was elected. To his credit, he understood how to seize and maintain power: remove the previous monarch, devise a means of payment, create a small winning coalition, and accommodate them with enough adequate facilities to secure their blind devotion (Mesquita & Smith 28). To give a brief overview of the economic domino effect in international politics, Leeson and Dean assert that America's role is to use its enormous economic toughness to outmanoeuvre weaker nations for their own benefit (539). As a final point of reference, the United States actively supported the overthrow of Philippine democracy in 1972, preventing the emergence of national capitalism in the country by substituting a regime of intimidation and brutality. When the United States expressed dismay about Thailand's movement toward democracy in 1973, the United States reduced international assistance while increasing military support to the country in planning for the coup attempt that materialized with US support in 1976 (Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent* 246). In short, US did what is best for them, not what is good for democracy.

## **5.4: TECHNOLOGICAL Consolidation**

### **5.4.1 Promoting Propaganda**

The origins of political propaganda may have been with a vision to the betterment of people, believing that its use was justified, even vital, during situations of turmoil, but that it should be used with caution during peaceful times. During the Cold War, the curtains were opened for white propaganda, or unmasked propaganda, to be used in everyday politician's act. Following that, it became harder to monitor this utilization. However, the harmful impacts of digital propaganda, black or white, used by some governments to destabilize democracies have raised awareness of violence that propaganda brings in political and military environments.

The media are vital in a democratic society. Media outlets are supposed to convey popular opinion, respond to developing concerns, and push federal authorities to operate in people's best interests. The media and the democratic landscape are inextricably linked. And media are frequently used by the government to motivate the population. The huge media is owned by various company owners; thus, they don't encourage unbiased dissemination of news and opinion that goes against their inclinations. As a result, more people are creating and spreading incorrect information. The writers, Noam Chomsky and Edward S Herman (1988), fear that "propaganda" in the US mainstream media is filtered and shaped to suit market factors, right-wing pressures, and corporate elites (62). Propaganda, deception, and false narratives have the capacity to polarize public sentiment, encourage terrorism and extremism and bigotry, and, in the end, destabilize democracies and disrupt public confidence in democratic processes. Nowadays, the government or opponents of a political party invest heavily to create misleading narratives in



order to garner more attention. In fact, Runciman (2018) suggests that a successful Coup D'état requires a successful conspiracy (50). Because social media has become a common occurrence, it is becoming quicker to communicate with people through social media. Events will need to transpire swiftly enough in a well-planned rebellion to verify that the larger people do not have time to mobilize in reaction. That is why it is critical to seize control of key communication networks and begin airing pro-new regime propaganda (Runciman 37). Furthermore, there are insufficient opportunities to determine if a news item is fraudulent or accurate, given the millions of news items posted every day on such platforms. As a result, in order to divert people's attention to a certain issue, political leaders now use the platform to get the general public hooked on that news. People are easily persuaded and manipulated in this way. Taking into account the Vietnam War, in which the NLF (Viet Cong) and North Vietnamese were presented in an almost completely one-dimensional manner as severe, violent, and fanatic, in contrast to the glorious and sympathetic image of American fighters who were portrayed as the protectors of democracy throughout the conflict (Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent*: 205).

#### **5.4.2 Monitoring Personal data illegitimately**

As surveillance grows more prevalent in our daily lives, confidentiality may no longer be taken an inalienable human right. Everything from our web surfing to smart phones and 'Internet of Things' technologies put in our homes has the capacity to destroy our privacy and data security, and people can't rely on suppliers or constantly changing espionage guidelines to keep them safe. In the arena of internet, nothing is anymore secured and can be said as private. Because, digitally every steps of peoples' life are being monitored and on the basis of data, a human's tendency is being calculated. In reality, because nothing is hidden in the realm of

technology, our devotion to it leads to our demise. As stated, there is no such thing as erase on the internet; it is merely a made-up scenario designed to deceive ordinary people. According to the journal *Big Brother is You, Watching* (1984), Mark Krispin Miller gives foresights about the effects of technology (more precisely, television of that time), arguing that instead of a totalitarian government compelling us to acquiesce through terror and repression, we'd joyously choose to be tranquilized by our technology. The more imminent risk nowadays, however, is the introduction of a concept of international spying in which we are observed for most of our workday by political agencies and enterprises aiming to separate us from our resources and each other (717).

Furthermore, in the same way that the government regulates firmly in people's internal privacy through the internet as it did in 1984's *Big Brother*, the government now conspires strongly in people's confidentiality in the modern world. Nowadays, a person's innermost secret information, sincere emotions and dislikes, or even their planning can all be revealed by a search on google. And the authorities may be able to examine all of that material and so on without a warrant. Indeed, Searching and internet history can disclose people's private sentiments like nowhere else, acting as a computerized supply closet as individuals lower their barrier and glance into their smartphones. The use of advanced technologies to allow for bulk eavesdropping of social media outlets is now out of reach. Over the years, there has always been a suspicion of state espionage, but this has never been proven. When Edward Snowden, the world's most renowned whistle-blowers, published top-secret information revealing widespread worldwide monitoring systems run by Us, Britain, and other intelligence operatives in 2013, everything transformed. However, it isn't just about spying and snooping. Citizen statistics can also be designed to regulate them as ai techniques such as pattern and face detection improve. In rare

cases, officials can use the legislation to collect more information kept on devices, similarly as done in Oceania in 1984. Many democratic regimes' grip on power has been strengthened rather than weakened by digital technologies. It may be an extremely effective tool in the hands of authoritarians. It is no longer a decisive weapon in the hands of freedom fighters; rather, it has evolved into a vital tracking device for the ruling government. Many opposition groups in countries like Ethiopia and Venezuela have discovered that authoritarian regimes infiltrate their operations considerably more easily than they penetrate authoritarian governments (Runciman 118). By doing so, the basic principles of democracy are getting destabilized and authorities in power making illegal use of peoples' secret, often to stop any chances of rebellion, to diminish the opposite's voice and sometimes by selling citizen's personal data to big companies.

## **CHAPTER 6: WHAT HAPPENS IF LEADERS DO NOT DO THAT**

### **6.1 To err is human being**

There is a philosophical argument that politicians should not confess when they make mistakes, ostensibly because doing so will cause them to lose credibility and authority. In politics, it appears that a major percentage of political leaders firmly and completely disregard blunders by spinning through all kinds of nonsensical statements and justifications, or by purposefully disregarding what they did, which is something that happens all the time in the political sphere. The real challenge of a person's intelligence is not whether or not they make wrong decisions, but what they end up doing when they commit a mistake. People look up to leaders as someone who can resolve their country's problems. As such, leaders are expected to resolve all of the problems and challenges that people are experiencing in their lives. If, on the

other hand, the leader makes a mistake and confesses it, his or her credibility is likely to be harmed. Furthermore, any erroneous decision is the consequence of a complex web of alliances and the participation of a large number of people in the process. Consequently, the misstep puts into doubt the strength of the other partnerships as a result of this miscalculation. As a result, a mistake that is acknowledged by the leader can put a huge number of people in a difficult circumstance. Furthermore, the opposition party is always eager to bring out the mistakes made by the administration in its policies. Therefore, if they are given the opportunity to call attention to a mistake made by the leader himself, they will take advantage of the opportunity to cast doubt on the leader's qualifications for the position. For instance, when Mikhail Gorbachev was in power and facing immense difficulties, his once-friend Boris Yeltsin turned into his biggest rival and started criticizing him. In such a situation, when a reporter openly criticized Yeltsin, urging Gorbachev to lash out at his greatest political rival, the Soviet president did not accept the temptation. In public, he demonstrated a willingness not to criticize Boris Yeltsin (his main opponent), regardless of what he thought of him. Gorbachev shown far more restraint toward his foe than past Soviet leaders had (Plokhy 273). Giving opponents a chance is the same as digging his own grave. This is why, every day in Oceania, the image of Emmanuel Goldstein (the leader of opposition party Brotherhood) is televised on telescreen as an enemy of the country. This is done in order to let people perceive the opposition leader as a person who is detrimental to the country (Orwell 5). In doing so every day, the ruling party Big Brother diminishes the psychological support of people towards the Brotherhood, and also decreases the opportunity for the opposition to convince to go against the ruling party. In truth, Gorbachev's prudence in dealing with his opponent and the opposition's comments gave the impression that Gorbachev lacked competence in ruling the Soviet Union. People began to believe that the majority of the questions raised by Yeltsin were correct since Gorbachev did not always respond. This is why, even when political

leaders make a mistake, they refuse to acknowledge responsibility. However, the fact that the leader is a human, and for him too making mistakes is an unavoidable characteristic. However, given the magnitude of the difficulty that a leader's error might cause, as well as the likelihood of the opposition's predicament, no leader generally acknowledges their own mistakes.

Accepting a mistake often means allowing the public to cast doubt on the leader, which grows greater over time. As a result, if the situation worsens at any point in the future, it may incite the public to revolt. Therefore, autocratic practices (even under democratic regimes) frequently have structures with smaller winning coalitions and a big electorate that are exceptionally well-designed from the factor of perspective of the leader (Mesquita et al. 160). In fact, by using these strategies helps coalition members stay loyal to their leaders even in the midst of policy failures, which can happen even under the most challenging of conditions. By doing so, leaders can be less concerned about the effects of their actions when there is political upheaval as long as the winning coalition is content and ready to diminish the protest (Mesquita et al. 160).

## 6.2 **Role of Money**

Money has had a key role in the evolution of the democratic process. Increasingly, money is being used in politics in all aspects of life, from everyday party action to nominee recruitment to the day to day operation of government. In recent years, the influence of businesspeople and affluent individuals in political parties and legislatures has increased at such a phenomenal rate that national politics has been increasingly dominated by money interest. Unfortunately, even the most public-spirited political groups and people find it difficult to break into politics. Nowadays, a political party can influence constituents in numerous ways by deploying financial resources (Harriss-white & Michelutti 263). A leader must also find the answers of monetizing riches in

order to have dedicated, qualified essential personnel in order to form a powerful winning coalition. The more content the winning coalition is with their power, the more they will attempt to preserve the leader's position. In fact, according to Harriss-White & Michelutti, Money is essential in politics, both to conduct a campaign and to function in a way that satisfies a politician's wide network of sympathizers, goons, and other security personnel that he must engage for intimidation and protection, as well as to assure that the candidate is elected (263-264). At the end of the *1984*, when the reader gets to see a different Winston, who is no more a people with morality, instead becomes a supporter of Big Brother- Orwell describes that, Winston now has plenty of money. With a higher wage than he had previously, he no longer keeps track of how many drinks he consumes (Orwell 139). All of these perks are provided to him from the moment he decides to support Big Brother.

However, in today's environment, a leader seeks out opportunities to make money while also promoting economic development in his or her country (or for his party). In the free market economy, the government aims to guarantee that the industrialisation process takes place in their country. Foreign investors are needed for this, and the government is enticing them with lucrative specialties and opportunities. When the People's Action Party came to power, they immediately began the process of industrialization in their country and began investing money in the education and health systems, ensuring that if foreign investors came to their country, they would be able to take advantage of high-quality infrastructure. Additionally, when numerous international organizations began to invest in the country, the people of Singapore were presented with the opportunity to benefit from industrialisation, and their standard of living improved as a result (Ortmann 159). In fact, when a significant quantity of money is deposited on the landscape of his country, it increases job prospects for local inhabitants. However, to do

this, the ruling party of Singapore controlled every sector within their grip, and decreases freedom of speech within the country. In truth, a leader may make his country prosperous with competent economic planning; yet, this also means that the government must often follow undemocratic ideals in order to do so. Most significantly, if the ruling government party lacks sufficient funds, the opposition would use the opportunity to lure voters through money. In reality, the moment when the elites start believing that the present leader is incapable of dealing with their agenda, they will start investing in the opposition in the hopes of gaining public attention and dethroning the existing leader (Mesquita & Smith 102). In essence, the ruling party must have substantial funds on hand, as the task of ruling becomes more difficult without them. Furthermore, today's followers will not be on the leader's side tomorrow if the leader does not give them with additional opportunities. When it comes to maintaining power, it is crucial for a leader to provide sufficient incentives to the winning coalition so that even the most dissatisfied coalition member tend to prefer to remain on the leader's side rather than switching allegiances to a competitor. Competitors, who are supposed to be available at all times during the election process, can convey any solemn promise they wish in an attempt to persuade the winning alliance to reject the current ruling coalition and its current leader (Mesquita et al. 150). Despite the fact that Samuel Doe was an autocratic leader, the primary factors that contributed to his collapse examine the correlation between supporters and extra income, as well as how money could buy or discard loyalty. Following Doe's ascension to the presidency of the Liberian government, he significantly increased army salary. This instantly drew the attention of his fellow army friends, who were eager to lend their support. However, they were aware that they might not be rewarded in perpetuity (Mesquita & Smith 30). As a result, when the situation deteriorated, they did not hesitate to take action against Doe. Not only were they unfaithful to Doe, but both Doe and these individuals were also unfaithful to the country, with solely Doe

suffering the repercussions. Therefore, losing significant supporters can also spell the end of a ruler's power, which is why democratic leaders resort to acts of favouritism and undemocratic behaviour in order to maintain their positions of power.

### 6.3 **A ruler is the head, but not the protector**

Many people look up to a monarch, yet he or she is not their defender. In actuality, people protect themselves, and they do so by employing the same approach that a leader employs to keep himself secure. Every agency, corporation, firm, or business is nothing more than a microstate with only a few select members. What happens on the outside in the state applies on the inside of every corporation as well. Every citizen is a part of it. Isn't it true that people go to considerable extents to keep unscathed their own position? What the government undertakes for its winning coalition, that coalition does the same for its followers, and those proponents do the same for the people under them. This is a chain reaction in which everyone is interconnected and encounters the consequences; the upper echelon receives the most, while the lower echelon receives the least. The dogmatic fanaticism, wilful ignorance, ethical and spiritual degeneration of the culture, as described by Noam Chomsky in his book *Deterring Democracy* (1992), are all seen in today's society. The political system in which we dwell is one in which official procedures operate with little solidity, while at the same time dissension, agitation, instability, and unstructured democracy have been on the rise, imposing restrictions on state aggression that are by no means insignificant. (86).

On Father's Day, for example, countless of status updates are posted on social media stating, "My father is ethical and sincere." This is an illustration of the scenario in Bangladesh.



What should a person do if he or she is confronted with a similar inquiry about his or her father? It is expected that he or she will answer in the similar approach. If that is so, why, then, is this country still on the list of the worlds' "Most Corrupted Countries"? According to the research index given by *Transparency International*, Bangladesh scored only 26 out of 100 in corruption report, making the country ranked in the 146<sup>th</sup> position among the 180 countries worldwide. In South Asia, Bangladesh is only slightly ahead of Afghanistan when it comes to combating corruption. If the truth be told, everyone is corrupted to some degree; as a result, if the leader does not provide any opportunities for others to become embroiled in corruption, the movement will eventually turn against the leader. This is due to the fact that no one wants their position to fall into a downward spiral. Everyone wants to improve their lives, and a sudden halt to earning (even if it is done illegally) will cause dissension among the elite, winning coalition, and citizens. In 1984, when Syme was vaporized suddenly, no one said anything; instead everyone acted so naturally in the next day nothing has happened (Orwell 70). Democratic Ruler with an autocratic mindset (together with his winning coalition) strengthens their power and keeps damaging democracy's fundamentals by leveraging this attitude of people. As Runciman (2018) writes-

“Pragmatic twenty-first century authoritarianism represents a real alternative to contemporary democracy. It offers a different sort of trade off. Which do we prefer: personal dignity or collective dignity? Short-term rewards or long-term benefits? These are serious questions. That said, the way modern democracy currently works makes it hard to tell whether anyone is taking them seriously.” (131)

#### 6.4 **More freedom, more chance of Rebellion**

Humans have an innate desire to acquire more and more. The essential democratic principle is autonomy. Though a ruler must grant sufficient sovereignty to all persons as a democratic representation, it is also true that more freedom allows citizens to mobilize against the government. Due to their global status and economic circumstances, each country operates differently, yet rulers of every country have to adhere to a set of rules in order to maintain their relevance to citizens. Every act of a ruler cannot bring fruitful consequences for citizen, considering the fact that even the citizens itself are divided into numerous fractions. Runciman (2018) suggests that “The more democracy is taken for granted, the more chance there is to subvert it without having to overthrow it” (40). Besides, the partiality to the winning coalition, militia and elites has also required to be ensured, so, a leader cannot give moral equality to every citizen. When Gorbachev took control, he implemented two distinct policies known as Glasnost and Perestroika. Both of these policies were implemented in response to the Soviet Union's bleak decade, which saw economic stagnation, decreased productivity, considerable shortages, and a sharp drop in living standards. For Mikhail Gorbachev's renovation of Soviet culture and government from 1985 to 1991, Perestroika (reconstruction) and Glasnost (transparency) were the guiding principles (Plokhy 30). As a result, due to the reformation phase, the soviet people started getting more knowledgeable about what was happening outside the USSR, they started getting more and more serious about their freedom, the economical downfall stimulates them to raise voice against the government. Not that, only due to the Perestroika and Glasnost, people started becoming more concerned about their freedom, but both these factors indubitably stimulated the rage. The opponent of that time Boris Yelstin utilizes the opportunity to bring changes in the country (Plokhy 270). According to Chomsky, Gorbachev's movements toward

détente have little to do with the, economic militarization, or the spread of international terrorism (Chomsky, *Deterring Democracy* 107). The nature of previous leaders somehow dragged U.S.S.R to a such problematic situation. It is said that, if Gorbachev was not there, then there would be uncountable bloodshed on the occasion of disintegration of USSR.

Though the damages to the USSR had already been done before Gorbachev came to power, he sought to make some reforms and chose to represent the country by allowing people more flexibility. However, his decision to award people more freedom ends up creating more opportunities for the opponent to incite people's resentment. Not that the country would have been in a better situation if the split had not occurred, but Gorbachev's liberal actions accelerated the USSR's demise. So, if making people more informed, giving them more opportunities to speak out against injustice, and giving them more freedom causes trouble for the leader, the leader is unlikely to do so. At the end of the day, all a leader wants are to preserve his position. However, according to Mesquita and Smith (2011), the execution of political opponents has been a long-standing tradition among autocrats for centuries. We must not lose sight of the moral significance of Gorbachev's moderation in this situation. Mao Zedong, Fidel Castro, Adolf Hitler, Samuel Doe, and a slew of other dictators shown no such self-control. They assassinated their former supporters once they figured out who was most likely to be faithful and who was most likely not to be, but Gorbachev did not.

## Chapter 7: Findings

Amidst the rising insurgence of intolerance and antagonism towards opposing views, it cannot be denied that Democracy is still proclaimed as the ideology of equality and independence. Surprisingly, the decline of democratization is not happening due to authoritarianism prospects; instead it is made rotten through the democratic means. No country is sufficient of itself in this modern era of free market economy and technological evolution. For which, even in democratic countries has to go through alterations to get fit into this competitive world. While doing so, the democratic leaders also tighten up their position to reduce any form of revolt against them. Good that when a country gets economically better, but what about when the economical betterment does not come out fruitful for the betterment of the country's citizen themselves? Economic prosperity is good, but not in the mean of sacrificing freedom of democratic rights. Singapore's scenario exemplifies the country's loss of democratic freedom, since the People's Action Party may have manufactured the economy affluent whilst robbing citizens of their right to freedom. Not that it does mean a country to get economically better, has to destabilize the democratic process. In fact, a country can get financially in more superior position even whilst ensuring democratic rights as long as the political leaders do not make ill-treatment of their power and authorization. However, as it is stated in the Selectorate theory in the context of modern political dynamics coupled with economical stances, the continent of class of people are divided into different module, to which a leader's approach and planning differs from one to another. This, in response, gives birth to a division and breaks the harmony of quality, and lets the leaders follow a biased route.

No leader man can manage the country by himself, no matter how much the leader wishes to lead with egalitarianism. A leader is just a human being like others, and to rule, he requires people alongside with him. Those people, who are described as winning coalition, has the power over their hand to rule the country; and in response, they do what they are required to make the leader unaltered from the power. These practice of giving power and helping his supporter goes to a multiple layer or division, making only a small fraction of whole fraternity (from each division) to attain the benefit of power and control. Many leaders from different countries do this to ensure that their close associates have access to the highest levels of authority. When it comes to Sri Lanka, the Prime Minister and the President are both brothers, and the country is administered in accordance with their political ideologies and positions. Duterte wants to select her daughter to succeed him for the exact same reason, and it appears that dynasties in democracy develops as a result of this decision. In fact, the whole system of governance and public orders gets accustomed to a corrupted framework where power-play starts being initialized within the local and nation-wide spectrum. While leaders get elected through democratic policies, they change the policies that are intertwined with democracy to make their hold stronger. This is why leaders like as Putin and Orbán, as well as others, are constantly amending the constitution in order to further strengthen their positions of power. Because, in accordance with basic principles of democracy, election is bound to happen after a specific period where citizen can cast their opinion. However, A ruler making his hold stronger in the regime brings some undemocratic acts, which mostly go against the normal citizens aka real selectorate and nominal selectorate. As a result, if the election is held fairly, then the leader cannot prolong his power for a long time. Postponing elections, on the other hand, could be interpreted as a barefaced strike on political leader's democratic reputation. This is why, most

democratic leaders (with dictatorial tendencies) conduct elections regularly, but the vast majority of them are shams in their very essence.

Importantly, Constitutional independence of the judiciary is fundamental to the maintenance of the rule of law, as well as to the efficient functioning of democracy and the respect for human rights. In democratic countries, Initiatives by the administrative and legislative branches to exercise power and direct the judiciary have grown exponentially, this has raised concerns about the court's impartiality and its ability to function effectively. When it comes to the settlement of conflicts, judges' predominant and solemn obligation is to uphold the rule of law in cases brought by petitioners or the administration. Judges are required to abide of the court. They make every effort to maintain their understanding of the law and of social concerns up to date as often as possible. All jury members must be exempt to dispense justice in consonance with their law and constitution without interference or dictate from anyone, whether it be the administration, the government entity, mainstream public sentiment, lobbyists, or other jury members; but, to the significant degree that the perspectives of other judges have been documented and considered as important as litigation in a particular case or circumstance. The expulsion of SK Sinha as a result of his raising his voice to defend the importance of constitutional independence against a constitutional provision that would have undermined the neutrality of judges to a greater extent exemplifies the obliterations of democracy as well as the unjustifiable influence of the government on an independent judiciary branch.

Aside from that, the possibility of enacting constitutional amendments with the complete support of the legislative branch opens the door for the government to exercise its authority while disregarding democratic values, and it also serves to justify the government's anti-

democratic activities. For instance, The Fifteenth Amendment to the Bangladesh Constitution removed the method of holding elections under a non-political caretaker administration, which helped the country to hold three successful elections before that. The deletion of the non-political caretaker government clause resulted in considerable upheaval throughout the nation, as well as a 2014 election in which the largest opposition groupings did not participate because of the loss of the provision. The plotline of constitutional modifications in Bangladesh, particularly in regard to the Non-Party Caretaker Government (NCG), is a shining example of the greater political dysfunction that exists in the nation. The firm assumption of feudalistic political figures in their power to govern, as well as their perception that the opposing side has no genuine incentive to intervene in politics, is at the forefront of Bangladesh's disorder of politics. In fact, in many different democratic countries- Driven by political leaders' familial mindsets, combined with a legacy of nepotism and magnetic dominance, intrinsic democracy inside major parties has deteriorated, resulting in grovelling uniformity among party activists. Even when parties have incurred defeats in national elections, the posts of power structure have never been called into question. This results in the total concentration of power at the top of the ruling class.

In accordance with Selectorate Theory, since leaders' main intentions are mostly to keep holding their power, the democratic process also starts following in autocratic nature eventually. However, not that all the democratic countries are doing the same; but the competitiveness of power-play that democracy entails, indeed tempts the current ruler to utilize his power against the opposition. In response, the oppositions also resort their position to destabilize the ruling government. In midst of all these, the power-play goes into a contention that where no mutual consensus among different perception remains discernible; instead the antagonism leads to a disharmony and contention where the normal citizen ends up suffering. According to my

perception, the entire structure of political dynamics is encapsulated within a circle, where the charismatic leader (with either the most charm and charisma or the greatest number of staunchest supporters) comes to power, then he ends up reinforcing his status by assisting his coalition and elite alliances in acquiring more specialties while also depleting opponents. On the other hand, there are ordinary citizens who vote on a timely manner in the hope of improvement and personal autonomy, but many of them losing track of the fundamental need when they receive additional government assistance and begin to take actions that reduce their probability of gaining considerable freedom. As a matter of fact, there are people like Mr. Charrington who will diminish even the smallest glimmer of positivity in the response of getting some little specialties, when their small amount of conviction would have resulted in a more peaceful world and a better future for a larger population. If all of the misfortunes are believed to have occurred as a result of the leaders' actions, it would be completely incorrect. This is a communal universe in which every action (even if it is our silences) has the potential to result in a cascade of disordered decisions.

Authoritarianism and Democracy are distinct in that the former precludes anybody from placing blame on the government, while the latter closes off all legal avenues to do so (misuse of power). Both dishes have same fragrance, but made with different spices. People can vote in a democracy once after a certain amount of time has passed, but all the undemocratic actions happens during the interval between two election. As time passes, the leader tweaks the regulations to better suit his needs, seizes leadership of everything important, prepare the grounds for illegal activity, and buys votes in the election with the help of money and terrorization. As a result of this, democracy eventually evolves into a system controlled by the elite and only for them who supports the strongest party. The ruling party uses financing and



muscle to weaken the opposition while simultaneously seizing the votes and supports of the people, yet the opposition does not become completely extinguished in the process. For instance, in order to demonstrate how beneficial Big Brother is to them and how terrible Emmanuel Goldstein is, regularly people are reminded about Brotherhood in Oceania. Millions of dollars are spent in the run-up to an election to influence voters and entice them with false hope, India's 2019 election is an example. Despite this, the ruling party manages to deceive and stage a democratic election (sham election) under their control, which they undoubtedly finish first.

Besides, though democracy is filled with ideology and equality towards everyone, countries seem to have contradictory standard towards the same matter over dissimilar nation depending on their connection and relation. For instance, though U.S talks about bringing peace and tranquillity, they have different opinion regarding Israel's warfare with Palestine. In other words, the economic alliance puts an enormous influence over a country's policy and regulation, and the benefit is not only tested by the leader, but the whole fraction of people (depending on different matter and their position) who is allied with leader and ruling party. It is because of this that, despite the fact that power has the most vibrant position in the world, the final decision is taken in accordance with "how large the amount is". To put it another way, money is the most powerful force on the planet. The political graph of Samuel Doe exemplifies the dilemma; despite the fact that he was an unsuccessful leader, he maintained control over his regime until he had enough money to finance his tyranny. The question is not whether or if there will be a settlement to this imbalance, but it is whether or not people truly want their lives to be independent enough to allow them to appreciate and fight for the collective good. The Selectorate Theory states that "No ruler rules alone," and it is also apparent that no infringements would have been accomplished if all people felt exactly the same way, not only when their

judgments were disrupted by others, but also when they themselves undermined the rights of others.

## **Chapter 8: Conclusion**

To recapitulate, what looks to be democracy from the outside is actually quite different when it comes to practical implementation. In the process of consolidating their authority, the leaders weaken democratic institutions. Ordinary individuals, motivated by a desire to improve their standard of living, either fall victim to corruption or remain silent in the face of corruption. People do what is best for them, and in the middle of this, the fundamental premise of democracy is being undermined, with the ultimate result being a move closer to authoritarianism and authoritarian rule. Indeed, politics has created societies in which, when people's expectations are not met, it is always the responsibility of politicians to explain why this has occurred. In the majority of cases, this is correct, yet it cannot be disputed that we are all a part of the process leading to the demise of democracy. Democratic leaders (with autocratic tendency) are aiming to corrupt their own judiciary system in a methodical and misleading manner under the pretence of legitimacy. This is similar to how they attempt to weaken the credibility and efficacy of international institutions in order for them to operate as a deterrent to domestic decline. This is why protecting the rule of law is vitally important, and it should be the first line of defence in any conflict situation. To summarize, our destiny will be defined by our ability to reawaken to the power of genuine democratic government in order to manage the transition from an era of economic manipulation to an era of wealth and equality.

## Works Cited

- Almond, Gabriel, et al. *Comparative Politics Today: A World View (9th Edition)*. 9th ed., Longman, 2007.
- “Arrest warrant against Bangladesh’s first Hindu chief justice: Who is SK Sinha, what’s the case against him.” *Theindianexpress.com*, The Indian Express, 5 Jan 2020, <https://indianexpress.com/article/explained/arrest-warrant-against-bangladeshs-first-hindu-chief-justice-who-is-sk-sinha-whats-the-case-against-him-6201090/>. Accessed 7th October 2021.
- “Bangladesh's Leading News Channel Taken Off Air On Election Day.” *OutlookIndia.com*, Outlook India, 30 Dec 2018, <https://www.outlookindia.com/website/story/world-news-bangladeshs-leading-news-channel-taken-off-air-on-election-day/322618>. Accessed 31st September 2021.
- Buchholz, Katharina. “The United States’ Biggest Enemies.” *Statista.com*, Statista, 17 Mar. 2020, <https://www.statista.com/chart/17231/united-states-biggest-enemy-poll/>. Accessed 28 December 2021.
- Byrne, Edmund F. “The U.S. Military-Industrial Complex Is Circumstantially Unethical.” *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 95, no. 2, Springer, 2010, pp. 153–65.
- Chomsky, Noam. *Deterring Democracy*. Verso Books, 1992. Print.
- Collier, David, and Steven Robert Levitsky. “Democracy 'with Adjectives': Conceptual Innovation in Comparative Research”. *Cambridge University Press*, 1997, pp. 430-51

Daniyal, Shoaib. "Research Paper Shows How BJP Pushed the Sushant Singh Murder Conspiracy to Target Shiv Sena." *Scroll.in*, Scroll.in, 7 Oct. 2020, [scroll.in/article/975091/research-paper-shows-how-bjp-pushed-the-sushant-singh-murder-conspiracy-to-target-shiv-sena](https://scroll.in/article/975091/research-paper-shows-how-bjp-pushed-the-sushant-singh-murder-conspiracy-to-target-shiv-sena). Accessed 31st September 2021.

Chou, Mark. "Democracy Against Itself: Sustaining an Unsustainable Idea". *Edinburgh University Press*, 2014, pp. 1–23.

"Democracy(Ancient Greece" [nationalgeographic.org](https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/democracy-ancient-greece/), National Geographic, <https://www.nationalgeographic.org/encyclopedia/democracy-ancient-greece/>. Accessed 23rd October, 2021

Mesquita, Bueno De, et al. "Policy Failure and Political Survival: The Contribution of Political Institutions." *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, vol. 43, 1999, pp. 147–161., <https://www.jstor.org/stable/174273>. Accessed 3 Oct. 2021.

Gupta, Swati. "India's Election Spending Surges Past US to Record High." *CNN*, 9 June 2019, [edition.cnn.com/2019/06/08/asia/india-election-spending-intl/index.html](https://edition.cnn.com/2019/06/08/asia/india-election-spending-intl/index.html). Accessed 3 Oct. 2021.

Harriss-White, Barbara, and Michelutti. *The Wild East*, UCL Press, 2019, pp. 262–287.

Herman, Edward S, and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*. Pantheon Books, 1988. Print.

“How bad is the crisis in Lebanon?” *Reuters.com*, Reuters, 10 Sep 2021,

<https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/how-bad-is-crisis-lebanon-2021-09-10/>.

Accessed 3rd October 2021.

“Hungary removes statue of anti-Soviet hero Imre Nagy.” *BBC.com*, BBC, 28 Dec 2018,

<https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-46704111>. Accessed 14 Jan 2022.

Johnson, Howard. “Rodrigo Duterte: Philippine President Announces Retirement from Politics.”

*BBC News*, BBC, 2 Oct. 2021, [www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-58772586](http://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-58772586).

Kalimullah, Dr, Nazmul Ahsan, and Dr. A.K.M. Reazul Hassan. “Electoral Reform: Thinking

out of the Box.” *The Daily Star*, The Daily Star, 7 Mar. 2014,

[www.thedailystar.net/electoral-reform-thinking-out-of-the-box-14562](http://www.thedailystar.net/electoral-reform-thinking-out-of-the-box-14562).

Karsh, Efraim, and Inari Rautsi. *Saddam Hussein: A Political Biography*. Brassey’s, 1991. Print.

Landman, Todd. “Democracy and Human Rights: Concepts, Measures, and Relationships.”

*Centre for Democratic Governance*, 2018, pp. 1–18. *Idea Journal*,

[www.idea.int/sites/default/files/speeches/Developing-Democracy-Concepts-Measures-and-Empirical-Relationships-PDF.pdf](http://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/speeches/Developing-Democracy-Concepts-Measures-and-Empirical-Relationships-PDF.pdf).

Laul, Revati. *The Anatomy of Hate*. Westland Publications, 2018. Print.

Levitsky, Even, and Niel Ziblatt. *How Democracies Die*. Crown, 2018. Print.

Mesquita, Bueno De, and Alaister Smith. *The Dictator's Handbook: Why Bad Behavior Is*

*Almost Always Good Politics*. PublicAffairs, 2011. Print.

Meyssan, Thierry, and Pete Kimberley. *Before Our Very Eyes: Fake Wars and Big Lies: From 9/11 to Donald Trump*. Progressive Press, 2019. Print.

Miller, Mark Crispin. "Big Brother Is You, Watching." *The Georgia Review*, vol. 38, no. 4, 1984, pp. 695–719.

Millhiser, Ian. "What Trump Has Done to the Courts, Explained." *Vox*, Vox, 9 Dec. 2019, [www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/12/9/20962980/trump-supreme-court-federal-judges](http://www.vox.com/policy-and-politics/2019/12/9/20962980/trump-supreme-court-federal-judges).

Mouk, Yascha. *The People vs. Democracy: Why Our Freedom Is in Danger and How to save It*. Harvard University Press, 2018. Print.

Orwell, George. *1984*. Secker and Warburg, 1949. Print

Ortmann, Stephan. "Singapore: Authoritarian but Newly Competitive." *Journal of Democracy*, pp. 153-64. Print.

Reporters Without Borders. "Modi tightens his grip on media." *RSF.org*, <https://rsf.org/en/india>. 3 October 2021.

Runciman, David. *How Democracy Ends*. Basic Books, 2018. Print.

Schram, Jamie. "Saddam Hussein had a secret torture chamber in NYC." *nypost.com*, New York Post, 12 Oct. 2016, <https://nypost.com/2016/10/12/inside-saddam-husseins-secret-nyc-torture-chamber/>. Accessed 09 January 2022.

Usmani, Azman. "In Charts: India's Election Becomes The World's Most Expensive". *Bloomberg*, 4 June 2019, [www.bloombergquint.com/elections/india-election-expenditure-2019-lok-sabha-elections-was-the-worlds-costliest](http://www.bloombergquint.com/elections/india-election-expenditure-2019-lok-sabha-elections-was-the-worlds-costliest).

U.S Embassy. "Fact Sheet U.S.-Israel Relationship." [il.usembassy.gov](https://il.usembassy.gov), <https://il.usembassy.gov/our-relationship/policy-history/fact-sheet-u-s-israel-economic-relationship/>. Accessed 7th October 2021.