Pluralism and the Impossible Implementation: An Academic Understanding

Areeba Naveed

Research Assistant, BIPP

Pluralism and the Impossible Implementation: An Academic Understanding

by

Areeba Naveed

In order to discuss the implementation of democratic pluralism, it is imperative to understand what actually encompasses democratic pluralism. Democratic pluralism, or a pluralist democracy — both terms used interchangeably — regards the state as a neutral set of institutions for adjudicating between conflicting interests. But what makes it distinct from other conceptualisations of the state? Pluralist interpretations of politics, the state is understood as an "umpire", i.e. a mediator, rather than a collection of institutions that is recognised for defending a particular class and its subsequent privileges, shows an overt bias towards specific interests, or pursues interests of its own, for example, those of its bureaucracy (Smith, 2007). In essence, pluralism also takes into consideration the interests of civil society. Pluralism inherently consists of various associations, for either interest aggregation (political parties) or interest articulation (civil society acting as pressure groups) (Smith, 2007).

A comprehensive understanding of the various concepts of pluralism present within academic discourse is an essential prerequisite for proceeding with the potential implementation in future government policy. Pluralism may be defined by three main types: political, value and liberal. Political pluralism refers to the dispersion of authority across multiple institutions and social groups rather than its concentration within the state. In this regard, individuals, families, religious bodies, and civil society organisations are in possession of authority that is not the sole derivative of political power. As a result, the state cannot claim dominance within all spheres of life and refrains from interference within other spheres of the state,

provided that public order and justice are maintained, i.e. the state proclaims the role of a mediator rather than an interferer.

This is a framework further strengthened by value and liberal pluralism through the rejection of a single conception of a universally superior life. Value pluralism holds that moral distinctions, while they can be objective, are multiple in existence, qualitatively different goods that should not be subject to a hierarchical rank. Liberal pluralism builds on value pluralism through the emphasis of expressive liberty, a presumptuous discernment in favour of individuals and groups living according to their own conceptions of meaning and value. Within this model, the role of the state is limited to the prevention of major 'human evils', maintaining public order, and safeguarding its own survival, rather than the imposition of uniform moral and cultural ideals on society (Galston, 2009).

The theory of pluralist democracy emerged in the mid-20th century as an optimistic response to earlier disillusionment created by previous historical events, i.e., WWI and WWII. The study was built on empirical studies based on two American cities, New Haven and Oberlin. Political theorists, Dahl and his students, argued that political power had dispersed amongst various parts of society. They claimed that class and elite domination were now replaced by a system in which multiple groups competed within different spheres of government, none of which was able to exercise lasting control (Parenti, 1970). According to this view, industrialisation had fragmented power, created 'slack resources' and enabled even disadvantaged groups to influence political outcomes through elections and pressure groups, and civic participation.

Criticism of pluralist democracy challenges both its empirical foundations and its conceptual assumptions. They argue that the apparent diffusion of power at the local level obscures deeper structural inequalities rooted in economic, social, and institutional arrangements (Burtenshaw, 1968). The New Haven case study, upon closer examination, appears to demonstrate the continued influence of business interests, centralisation of administration, and elite coordination rather than genuine application of pluralism (Parenti, 1970; Burtenshaw, 1968). The definition of power has been restricted too narrowly, focusing only on observable decisions while ignoring

non-decisions, agenda control, and how elites preserve the status quo by preventing certain issues from ever making public debate (Burtenshaw, 1968).

More fundamentally, pluralist democracy misunderstands the nature of the state itself. Rather than being a neutral arena for the consensus and compromise, the state is an instrument of coercive power, monopolising force and enforcing the interests of dominant groups. The assumption that all groups possess sufficient resources to protect themselves from oppression is contradicted by persistent political alienation, racial inequality, and episodes of urban unrest. Events such as widespread riots and demands for radical change reveal the limits of pluralist optimism and suggest that access to state power remains highly unequal. As a result, the theory of pluralist democracy is seen not as a realistic account of political power, but as an idealised and ultimately flawed interpretation of modern democratic life. From a Habermasian perspective, pluralist democracy fails insofar as it equates the availability of political resources with genuine democratic participation, ignoring structural barriers that exclude marginalised groups from meaningful influence (Wheeler, 1995).

Inherently, when pluralism is invoked in cultural and political discourse, it is often assumed to signal the genuine inclusion of alternative perspectives and the displacement of dominant hegemonies. In practice, however, pluralism frequently operates as a form of managed inclusion that acknowledges difference while maintaining hierarchical boundaries. As, e.g. the incorporation of feminist perspectives into the arts demonstrates, recognition does not necessarily entail equal authority. Instead, what dominant frameworks portray is remaining intact, while alternative viewpoints are confined to marginal spaces. This dynamic reflects a broader tendency within subsequent pluralist systems to accommodate diversity symbolically, while maintaining structural asymmetries of power, resulting in marginalism rather than actual inclusion (Chin, 1989).

Democratic pluralism has neither been successfully implemented nor can it be fully realised in practice. While pluralist democracy rests on the assumption that political power is widely dispersed and that all groups possess sufficient resources to influence outcomes, empirical evidence consistently demonstrates enduring structural inequalities in access to state power. Economic elites, administrative institutions, and

agenda-setting mechanisms continue to shape political outcomes in ways that marginalise disadvantaged groups, rendering formal political equality substantively hollow. Episodes of political alienation, social unrest, and persistent exclusion reveal that the pluralist claim that "no one governs" obscures rather than explains the realities of power.

More fundamentally, democratic pluralism is normatively flawed. As Habermas's theory of constitutional morality suggests, democratic legitimacy depends not merely on competition among interests but on the meaningful inclusion of all citizens in deliberative processes governed by fairness and reciprocity. Modern states, however, operate through coercive authority, bureaucratic domination, and unequal social conditions that systematically distort participation.

As a result, pluralist democracy mistakes the absence of overt domination for genuine legitimacy and confuses procedural access with effective political influence. Democratic pluralism, therefore, represents not an achievable model of governance, but an idealised narrative that masks the structural limitations of democratic inclusion.

References

Burtenshaw, C. J. (1968). The political theory of pluralist democracy. The Western Political Quarterly, 21(4), 577–587. https://doi.org/10.2307/446749

Chin, D. (1989). Interculturalism, postmodernism, pluralism. Performing Arts Journal, 11(3)–12(1), 163–175. https://doi.org/10.2307/3245434

Galston, W. A. (2009). The idea of political pluralism. In Moral universalism and pluralism (Nomos, Vol. 49, pp. 95–124). New York University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/24220093

Parenti, M. (1970). Power and pluralism: A view from the bottom. The Journal of Politics, 32(3), 501–530. https://doi.org/10.2307/2128829

Smith, B. (2007). *Good governance and development*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Wheeler, B. R. (1995). *Democratic pluralism or pluralist democracy: Jürgen Habermas's theory of constitutional morality and its institutions. German Politics & Society, 13*(3), 66–80. https://www.jstor.org/stable/23736489