The Crisis of Democracy


The report observed the political state of the United States, Europe and Japan and says that in the United States the problems of governance “stem from an excess of democracy” and thus advocates “to restore the prestige and authority of central government institutions.”[1] The report serves as an important point of reference for studies focusing on the contemporary crisis of democracies.[2]

1 Overview

1.1 Europe

The report outlines that in 1960s Western Europe the governments are “overloaded with participants and demands” which the highly bureaucratic political systems are unable to handle, thus rendering their societies ungovernable. It points to a political decision made by France that was made in “semisecret, without open political debate, but with a tremendous amount of lobbying and intrabureaucratic conflict.”

1.2 United States

The vitality of democracy in the United States in the 1960s produced a substantial increase in governmental activity and a substantial decrease in governmental authority.

—Samuel P. Huntington

The report says the problems of the United States in the 1960s stemmed from the “impulse of democracy ... to make government less powerful and more active, to increase its functions, and to decrease its authority” and concludes that these demands are contradictory. The impulse for the undermining of legitimacy was said to come primarily from the “new activism” and an adversarial news media, while the increase in government was said to be due to the Cold War defense budget and Great Society programs. To remedy this condition, “balance [needs] to be restored between governmental activity and governmental authority.” The effects of this “excess of democracy” if not fixed are said to be an inability to maintain international trade, balanced budgets, and “hegemonic power” in the world.

2 Reception

It has been observed by critics that many members of the Trilateral Commission subsequently had roles in the Carter Administration and have been influenced by the report.[3] Specifically, Zbigniew Brzezinski restated the conclusions of the report in an op-ed for the *St. Petersburg Times.*[4] Noam Chomsky has cited the report as an example of reactionary policies coming from “the 'liberal' wing of the state capitalist ruling elite.”[3]

3 New Crisis of Democracy

In 2013 Fareed Zakaria wrote that the United States is facing a new crisis of democracy in which there is low approval of political institutions, political paralysis and poor democratically made decisions (such as low taxes and high government spending).[5]

4 See also

- *Political Order in Changing Societies*
- *The Limits to Growth*
- Powell Memorandum
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