

An Examination of the Past, Present, and Future of Vetocracy with a Critical View on Fukuyama's Theory

Yanbo Hou

Shanghai World Foreign Language Academy, No.400, Baihua Street, Shanghai, 200233, China
Corresponding Author: Yanbo Hou, Email: decadehyb@163.com

Abstract

The paper analyses the problem through a past-present-future lens. The "past" section examines the origins of the American system of checks and balances from a historical and political-philosophical perspective, and sets the stage for subsequent reform proposals. The "Future" section refutes Fukuyama's argument for weakening democratization, argues that preserving the American creed is the bottom line of reform, and gives directions for solving the three problems in the previous section, but at the same time shows that the implementation of any reform is limited by the politics of veto itself, and therefore makes a pessimistic prediction about the future of American politics, arguing that in the absence of The future of American politics will only get worse without external intervention.

Keywords

Fukuyama's theory; Vetocracy; Checks and balances

Introduction

In his book Political Order and Political Decay (2014b), Francis Fukuyama posed the question: "How has the American system of checks and balances become a vetocracy?" Fukuyama coined the term "vetocracy" to describe the constitutional crisis in which it is easier to obstruct government action than to promote the

common good. He argued that the system of checks and balances, combined with partisan polarization and the rise of well-funded interest groups, has created a "vetocracy" (2014a), building upon Samuel Huntington's theory of "political decay." Huntington maintained that the rapid development of the social economy would mobilize new social groups, and political stability would be affected if the existing political system could not meet their political participation needs. Fukuyama added that the political system had gradually become rigid over time, leading to a series of crises, including the polarization of Congress and the influence of vested interest groups, indicating that the US is experiencing political decay, and the current system is inadequate to meet the changing social environment.

This article examines the concept of vetocracy through a past-present-future framework. The past section discusses how the separation of powers and checks and balances have been crucial political concepts enshrined in the American Constitution since the founding of the United States. Inspired by Republicanism and liberalism, the Americans devised methods such as separation of powers and competitive parties to limit authority and decentralize power. However, in the present, these methods face a

Citation: Yanbo Hou. (2023) An Examination of the Past, Present, and Future of Vetocracy with a Critical View on Fukuyama's Theory. The Journal of Young Researchers 1(9): e20231023

Copyright: © 2023 Yanbo Hou. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Received on August, 2023; Accepted on August 30, 2023; Published on October 23, 2023

crisis of inefficiency, resulting in a reduction in the value of final outcomes. Looking ahead, this article predicts the future of American democracy and proposes solutions to address the issue of vetocracy.

Exploring the issue of vetocracy and political decay is significant because it sheds light on the challenges facing American democracy today. By analyzing the historical and philosophical roots of the American system of checks and balances and its current weaknesses, this article contributes to a better understanding of the issues and the possible solutions. Understanding how the political system has become rigid and polarized is essential to identify areas where reforms are needed to ensure that the system can adapt to the changing social and economic environment.

Literature Review

Past

The Origins of Separation of Power

In order to explore why the problem of vetocracy arose in the United States, we must necessarily look to the historical origins of the American political order to identify the sources of a noble idea of separation of powers so that we can discover what went wrong in its practical development today. The United States is a country rich in the spirit of separation of powers and checks and balanced. As Huntington (2006) states:

When an American thinks about the problem of government-building, he directs himself not to the creation of authority and the accumulation of power but rather to the limitation of authority and the division of power. Asked to design a government, he comes up with a written constitution, bill of rights, separation of powers, checks and balances, federalism, regular elections, competitive parties—all excellent devices for limiting government. The Lockean American is so fundamentally anti-government that he identifies government with restrictions on government.

The idea of separation of powers and checks and balances has existed since the founding of the United States. Throughout American history, this spirit has remained steadfast (Wilson, 1887), and it is safe to assume that it will persist into the future.

Historical Background

From the perspective of the history, or what Tocqueville (1835) referred to as moeurs (political culture), we can explain why there is such a strong need for checks and balances in the United States. First, the primary catalyst for American independence was the perceived tyranny and oppression of colonial governments under King George III. They made this complaint As the American people complained: “The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute Tyranny over these States.” (Jefferson, 1776, para. 2). Tea and taxation - just as the Boston Tea Dump was the originating event of the American Revolution of Independence - is also, deep down, the most fundamental political motivation of the Americans (Kirk, 2014). Specifically, the Americans charged ‘imposing Taxes on us without our Consent’ (Jefferson, 1776, para. 19). They charged that the British Crown and Parliament were bypassing the representative leadership of North America and imposing taxes on the colonial people without their consent. This contradiction ultimately led to a desire among the American people for a new government that would not repeat the same mistakes, and they sought to impose limits on the power of the government to prevent future tyranny and oppression.

Second, the American people have a longstanding tradition of self-governance that predates the formation of the United States itself. Before the establishment of the United States, the American colonies had developed their own systems of self-governance (Taylor & Foner, 2010). The colonists had experience in governing their communities and were able to establish local institutions such as town meetings, courts, and elected assemblies (Wood, 1991). These institutions provided a forum for

community members to come together, discuss issues, and make decisions through a democratic process. This longstanding tradition of self-governance also laid the groundwork for the development of democratic institutions in the United States after independence was achieved.

We can therefore conclude that the US government needs to satisfy both claims to authority (Hamilton, 1788, No. 70) and freedom (Madison, 1788, No. 51). The two main responses to this were the separation of powers within the central government and the federal system of “multiplicity in unity” (Kirk, 2014).

Political Philosophical Background

From the perspective of political philosophy, there were many political philosophers who had a profound influence on that Constitutional Convention and whose theories became the cornerstone of the US Constitution. (Bailyn, 2017) The ideas of influential philosophers such as Rousseau and Locke played a pivotal role in guiding the founding sages of the United States (Richard, 1995), reinforced their approach to limiting authority (Klarman, 2018). As Locke (1689) said:

For no government can have a right to obedience from a people who have not freely consented to it; which they can never be supposed to do, till either they are put in a full state of liberty to choose their government and governors, or at least till they have such standing laws, to which they have by themselves or their representatives given their free consent.

The government derives its power from the people. The ruler needs to sign a "social contract" with the people in order to have a legitimate position of rule (Rousseau, 1762). So, the Lockean Americans (Huntington, 2006) like Jefferson (1776) recorded this in the Declaration of Independence in the following form:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.--That to secure these

rights, Governments are instituted among Men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. (Para. 2)

Having established the sources of power, Americans began to identify whether power needed to be limited. This time, they turned their attention to Montesquieu. Notably, Baron de Montesquieu is often cited as having had a greater influence on the Constitution than any other political philosopher, with his name being invoked more than any other at the Convention (Kirk & McDonald, 2004). As Montesquieu (1748, as cited in Klarman, 2018) said: “Constant experience shows us that every man invested with power is apt to abuse it, and to carry his authority as far as it will go.”. A government that is too centralised is bound to be arbitrary, to abuse the power given to it by the people and to exercise tyranny.

In the context of Montesquieu's conclusion that "man is bound to abuse his power", Madison (1788, No.51) drew a brilliant analogy: “If men were angels, no government would be necessary. If angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary.”. The reason for limiting government, in terms of human evil, is therefore that there is no angelic, perfect philosopher-king in the world (Hobbes, 1651). Hence, in order to prevent the abuse of power by a “government of men ruled by men with seven passions” and to safeguard people's freedom, it is necessary to limit the power of government.

The founding fathers of the United States and the Constitution Design

The American pioneers then gave their ideas on how to limit the power of the government. “A dependence on the people is, no doubt, the primary control on the government”. But the people's control over the government, while important, is far from sufficient. Madison (1788, No. 51) points out that the lessons of experience have taught us the necessity of auxiliary precautions.

There are two main ways of doing this--mutual control between the two governments and self-

control by the government itself: “In the compound republic of America, the power surrendered by the people is first divided between two distinct governments, and then the portion allotted to each sub- divided among distinct and separate departments.”

The former refers to the checks and balances between the federal and state governments, i.e. federalism, while the latter refers to the separation of powers into legislative, executive and judicial branches.

It is clear that their classification of power derives from Montesquieu (1748):

In every government there are three sorts of power: the legislative; the executive in respect to things dependent on the law of nations; and the executive in regard to matters that depend on the civil law. By virtue of the first, the prince or magistrate enacts temporary or perpetual laws, and amends or abrogates those that have been already enacted. By the second, he makes peace or war, sends or receives embassies, establishes the public security, and provides against invasions. By the third, he punishes criminals, or determines the disputes that arise between individuals. The latter we shall call the judiciary power, and the other simply the executive power of the state.

But the US government did not exactly copy it. They built their government on it and then adapted it. The separation of powers was a horizontal separation of powers; Montesquieu's separation of powers had no vertical separation of powers between the two levels of government (Martin, 1954). The American framers, on the other hand, added a vertical separation of powers between the federal and state levels of government to the separation of powers (Cameron & Falletti, 2005), based on the fact that a unitary state was not possible at the time, but only a federal one ((Hamilton, 1788, No.17). In designing the mechanism for the separation of powers within the central government, they rejected the Lomond concept of the executive power belonging to the king and, in keeping with the impossibility of a monarchy in the United

States, delegated the executive power to an indirectly elected president (Wright, 1933). They crafted a set of vertical and horizontal separation of powers in the Constitution. It can be said that the Americans developed the doctrine of the separation of powers in a creative way.

In addition to preventing the tyranny of the minority, the founding fathers of the United State were also committed to preventing the tyranny of the majority: “It is of great importance in a republic not only to guard the society against the oppression of its rulers, but to guard one part of the society against the injustice of the other part.”(No.51). However, this was an issue that was ignored in the state constitutions prior to the writing of the US Constitution. Madison (1788) criticized previous democracies for their failure to address this problem, noting that: “...and that measures are too often decided, not according to the rules of justice and the rights of the minor party, but by the superior force of an interested and overbearing majority.” (No.10). Madison went on to explain the causes of this phenomenon. He argues that if one group occupies more than half of the population, the form of popular government can instead contribute to the sacrifice of the public benefit and the rights of other citizens in order to achieve their own passions and interests of dominance.

In order to ensure both public and private interests are protected, and to maintain the content and form of popular government, the founding fathers proposed two possible solutions:

Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority at the same time must be prevented, or the majority, having such coexistent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression. (No.51)

This idea is best reflected in the legislative branch of the government. The law is not just a piece of paper, but rather that unify the different regions, classes, and interests of a country into a just political model (Raz, 1979/2009). It is therefore more representative of the public

interest and social justice to have democratically elected parliamentarians in control of the legislative power. Representative government contributed to the creation of industrial paternalism (Hamilton, 1788, No. 35). These elected MPs have “enlightened views” and “virtuous sentiments” (Madison, 1788, No.10), which allow them to recognize the true interests of the country. In fact, many British legal commentators have pointed out that, one of the greatest advantages of the US Constitution - over its mentor, the British constitutional system - is that it “estrains upon the power of a temporary majority in the legislative branch.” (Kirk & McDonald, 2004).

The size of the electorate is also a challenge: too many voters make it difficult for MPs to understand all aspects of the constituency and therefore to understand the various interests; compress the number of voters too small and MPs become too focused on local interests and have no way of understanding and pursuing macro national goals. Federalism, on the other hand, has successfully solved this problem: the large aggregated interests are entrusted to the national; the specific local interests are entrusted to the state legislatures (Benz & Behnke, 2009).

Present

Vetocracy as a phenomenon

The goal of “Madisonian democracy” was to prevent a single individual or group from having too much political power to exercise authoritarian rule. The United States adopted the means of separation of powers between the three branches and between the Union and the states to achieve this goal. However, the Americans forgot that “government was also created to act and make decisions”. From “a system designed to prevent anyone in government from amassing too much power to a system in which no one can aggregate enough power to make any important decisions at all”, the U.S. political system has “deteriorated into what Fukuyama called “vetocracy” (Friedman, 2012).

Definition

Fukuyama introduced the term 'vetocracy' in 2014 to describe the American political system characterized by redundant and nonhierarchical

authority that enables different parts of the government to easily block one another:

Under such a system of redundant and nonhierarchical authority, different parts of the government are easily able to block one another. In conjunction with the general judicialization of politics and the widespread influence of interest groups, the result is an unbalanced form of government that undermines the prospects of necessary collective action something that might more appropriately called ‘vetocracy’.

He further explained vetocracy in depth in his book <Political Order and Political Decay: From the Industrial Revolution to the Globalization of Democracy> published the same year: “Veto players are political actors whose agreement is necessary for any policy change. The more veto players there are in a political system, the harder it is to make any policy change at all.” and “Vetoes by powerful groups can prevent the adoption of policies that would be in the public interest, leading to outcomes that are inefficient or unjust.”.

Thus, we can have a definition: vetocracy is a political system in which multiple individuals and groups have veto power in collective action. This system often leads in the present day to the total termination and ineffectiveness of a policy because of one or several 'vetoes' among its many veto points. It is like a series circuit: each component is involved in the functioning of the whole, but as soon as one component gives the will to veto, the whole system comes to a halt.

In an environment of sharp political polarization, this decentralized system is less and less able to represent majority interests and gives excessive representation to the views of interest groups and activist organizations that collectively do not add up to a sovereign American people.

Fukuyama sums up the US dilemma in this way. He argues that the US has fallen into a vicious circle: with checks and balances on each other, national decision-making is inefficient and costly. As a result, the government does not perform well, and the public becomes increasingly distrustful of it. Under these

conditions, people are reluctant to raise taxes, and they feel that the government is wasting money. But with government finances stretched to the limit, it is impossible to function well, and eventually falls into unstoppable political decay.

Fukuyama believes that the US needs to address two key obstacles to overcome this situation: political parties and ideas. Regarding the latter, he argues that there is a need to reduce the number of “would-be democratizing reforms”, which will be discussed later. As for political parties, this paper contends that party politics is not the essence of the problem of vetocracy, but rather a manifestation of underlying economic, social, and cultural problems. These problems become evident in the form of party polarization. Let us first focus on the party polarization and then, proceed to these underlying economic, social, and cultural problems.

Party polarization

The Founding Fathers of the United States had many criticisms of parties; in the Constitutional Convention the delegates were full of negative words when they mentioned parties; Madison (1787), who compiled the minutes, had no kind words when he mentioned parties: “moral diseases”, “the violence of faction”, “sinister designs”, “intrigue” and “corruption” were all words he used to describe party activity. According to Madison (1788), a republic “has over a democracy in controlling the effects of faction” (No. 10). They believed that a representative republic would control the rampant partisan activity (Manin, 1997).

However, the fact is that American republic does not, as Madison has expects, effectively controls factions. On the contrary, the party-system has become one of the most fundamental features of American constitutionalism, which are operating a representative republic (Maisel, 2016). The political situation in the United States can be likened to a game of checkers between two players: the Democrats and the Republicans. Each party holds three pawns, namely the legislature, the executive, and the judiciary, in a constant tug-of-war, adhering to the rules of the game. Parliamentary elections occur every two

years, while the presidency is contested every four years. Judicial appointments are also up for grabs. Parties, driven by “interests, passions, and opinions” (Madison, 1788, No.63), constitute an essential feature of American political life. They act as the first impetus to propel the wheel of the three powers, separated by function, to make it work.

Today, we might be as critical of the polarization of party politics as former Democratic Senator Russ Feingold: “We’re going to have Republican and Democrat toothpaste.” Anything would be required to represent a different political position. But initially, the two-party system in the United States was not entirely polarized. Although the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution indirectly recognized the legitimacy of political parties, the system was criticized as window dressing. As Gore Vidal put it in 1970: “In reality, the United States has only one political party It has two right wings: the Republican Party and the Democratic Party , but essentially there is no difference between the two parties”.

Thus, we can see that a society with unified interests and ideology, moving in the same direction, cannot suddenly be divided and fragmented by a party system. Political polarization only manifests itself when there is a serious class division, ideological confusion, and serious opposition of social groups to each other, leading people to divide themselves into different factions in the form of political parties.

Discussion

Present Two the Root Causes of Vetocracy

This article will look at three specific aspects: Interest groups and money politics, Economy and Social Issues and National Identity

The reason behind the analysis of vetocracy is important. Different from Fukuyama who focuses on / emphasizes most on the constitutional/ institutional problem, I propose the causes are not limited to institutional one, but also the deep-seated causes of social polarization

Interest groups and money politics

Madison believed that conflict between interest groups could facilitate the pursuit of the public good, as it would prevent any one group from gaining too much power and dominating the political process. However, 'different individuals and groups will interpret the common good differently.' (Schumpeter, 1942). As Berlin (1958) puts it, "Freedom for the wolves has often meant death for the sheep". The combination of American check and balance system with pursuit of narrow self-interest by interest groups has often led to a bloated and inefficient political system today.

The impact of campaign finance laws in the United States can be seen in *Buckley v. Valeo*, which removed restrictions on campaign spending by individuals and candidates. In *Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission*, corporations and unions were ruled to have the same First Amendment rights as individuals, including the ability to spend money to influence political campaigns.

This decision opened the door for corporations and unions to spend unlimited amounts of money on independent political spending, leading to the rise of so-called "super PACs." This money made it easier for interest groups to compete for their own interests in the political arena. When Obama's healthcare bill was introduced, each industry, from doctors to insurance companies to the pharmaceutical industry, asserted its own interests, eventually leading to a bloated bill. The Glass-Steagall Act of the 1930s during the Great Depression required only a few sheets of paper, while the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, which was introduced in response to the 2008 financial crisis, was hundreds of pages long and ultimately failed to address the "too big to fail" problem of the big banks (Fukuyama, 2014). Even the recent collapse of Silicon Valley Bank indicates that the purpose of the interest groups that seemed to be blocking success back then has not been achieved.

Madison's view of "interest-group pluralism" seems wildly inaccurate today. The political system of money has had a disproportionate

impact on the political process (Lessig, 2012). Interest groups support candidates and parties that hold ideologies that match their own interests, causing the system to become bloated and greatly reducing the efficiency of government.

Economy

Nowadays, the slowdown in economic growth economic inequality between classes, particularly between capitalist families and everyone else, has made class antagonisms more and more pronounced and promoted party divisions.

Such a crisis has not always existed. Before 21 century, there is no such a lasting and serious class division (except in some special time). Werner Sombart (1906)'s revival of American exceptionalism points out that there is no such thing as a class stigma for American workers. This is because while the distribution of wealth in the US has become increasingly unequal, the consumption and overall standard of living of the working class has continued to rise as a result of tremendous economic growth, which has allowed class consciousness to be effectively suppressed in the US for most of the past.

But this scenario has been changed in modern times. Economic growth in the United States has been slowing since the 1970s, with the period 1989 - 2000 being particularly slow (Gordon, 2016). Data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and Bureau of Economic Analysis also suggest this. According to the BEA (2020), Real GDP has averaged 2.4% per year since 1989 - 2000, compared to an average of 3.4% per year from 1961 - 1988. The BLS data (2009) shows that labour productivity averaged 1.5% per year from 1989 - 2000, compared to an average of 2.3% per year from 1948 - 1988.

In addition to the slowdown in growth, the distribution has become more unequal (Michener & Brower, 2020). In 2000, the median income of capitalist households was 9.04 times greater than the median income of all households, whereas in 1989 this figure was only 7.90 times greater. The share of total income received by capitalist households even doubled (Wolff & Zacharias,

2013). In more recent years, with the impact of the COVID-19 epidemic and manufacturing outflows due to the Global Strategy, economic inequality between classes has increased and has led to shocks on bipartisan policy proposals.

In terms of labour policy, the Democrat-held House of Representatives passed in 2021 what in 2019 became known as the Wage Increase Act, which called for an increase in the US minimum wage to \$15 per hour. This bill has never received a vote in the Republican-controlled Senate. Instead, Republicans passed Right-to-work laws in several states to attract businesses, resulting in lower wages and less protection for workers.

In terms of tax policy, Republicans passed THE Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in 2017, which made significant reductions to corporate tax rates and provided significant tax cuts for high-income households. When it came time to vote on whether to pass the bill, all Democrats in the Senate and House of Representatives voted against it, in what can be described as an extremely serious party polarization. This is a sign that the two parties have reached a dangerous bottom in terms of legislating on economic-related policies - if left unchecked, many policies will not be implemented properly.

Social Issues and National Identity

“The rootless are always violent”, Hannah Arendt (1951) said. It is clear that social issues such as immigration and political correctness, gender identity, minorities in the United States have created a significant divide between different groups, which has seriously undermined American national identity. And this polarization has the potential to create significant challenges for the government and the country as a whole. Let me take the immigrants problem for example.

With the perception of a zero-sum game, Americans are not so friendly to immigrants these days. According to the BLS, the United States lost 5.7 million manufacturing jobs between 2000 and 2010. Many of these jobs were moved offshore to countries with lower labor

costs. Even if these people can find work again, their standard of living will be lower. The Economic Policy Institute reports that workers who lose their jobs as a result of offshoring earn 22% less on average in their new jobs. Against this backdrop, Americans have become increasingly hostile to foreign immigrants, as they see them as taking their jobs, both those that have been transferred out and those that they cannot get at home. A 2019 Gallup poll found that 56% of Americans believed that immigration was making the job situation in the U.S. worse.

At the same time, immigrants don't seem to think of themselves as Americans all that much, for example, people of Mexican descent, and they will have a huge impact on the so-called American creed. First, they are numerous. According to the Migration Policy Institute (2018), the estimated number of Mexican immigrants in the United States is approximately 11.2 million. This represents the largest group of immigrants in the United States, accounting for approximately 25% of the total immigrant population. Second, neither children nor adults have a sense of identity with the United States. A 1992 study of immigrant children in Southern California and South Florida asked the question, "What country are you from?" None of the children born in Mexico said they were American; only 3.9% of the children of Mexican descent born in the United States said they were American. Regardless of where they were born, children of Mexican descent do not identify with the United States and call themselves American. And those adults raised the Mexican flag and booed the Stars and Stripes at the 1998 CONCACAF Gold Cup. “Uncle Sam no es mi tío”. Poor educational standards, comfort with poverty, reluctance to learn English, deep-rooted Catholic beliefs...They reject to accept the fundamental beliefs that represent the bedrock of American racial identity and political culture (Fukuyama, 2014b).

Such a social conflict has had a huge impact on Parliament, Court, the relationship between government and people, as well as the relationship between the federal and states.

In Congress, a bipartisan debate rages around former US President Donald Trump's proposed US-Mexico border wall. Republicans generally support a border wall and see the need to protect the United States from illegal immigration and drug trafficking. Democrats, on the other hand, generally oppose the border wall as a waste of money and resources where opportunity costs spent could have been invested in other diversionary spending. They also see the wall as a symbol of xenophobia and racism. The controversy between the two parties culminated in the 2018-2019 United States federal government shutdown, which was the longest lasting government shutdown in US history (Zaveri et al., 2019).

There has been a long-standing debate between Republicans and Democrats in Congress over the proposed US-Mexico border wall, with Republicans generally in favor of it and Democrats generally opposed. The debate revolves around several issues, including the need to protect the United States from illegal immigration and drug trafficking, the cost and effectiveness of building a wall, and the symbolism of the wall as a potential expression of xenophobia and racism.

The controversy over the border wall reached a critical point in 2018-2019, when the United States federal government experienced the longest-lasting government shutdown in its history. This shutdown was the result of a budget impasse between President Donald Trump, who was pushing for funding for the border wall, and congressional Democrats, who were unwilling to provide the necessary funding (British Broadcasting Corporation, 2018).

Ultimately, the shutdown ended after 35 days, with Congress passing a funding bill that did not include the full amount of funding requested by the president for the border wall. The debate over the border wall, however, remains unresolved, with both sides continuing to argue their positions and seek a resolution to this contentious issue (Kobilinsky, 2019).

In the courts, conservatives and liberals are equally pitted against each other. On October 31 last year, the US Supreme Court heard oral arguments in *Students for Fair Admissions v. President and Fellows of Harvard College* (DOCKET NO. 20-1199) and *Students for Fair Admissions v. University of North Carolina* (DOCKET NO. 21-707) in which the SFFA complained of "reverse discrimination" in the admissions process by including ethnic background in the admissions criteria, to the detriment of the rights of the Asian community. During the debate, the conservative justices repeatedly pressed lawyers representing Harvard and the University of North Carolina to question when race would no longer be a factor in university admissions. As their predecessor Justice Sandra O'Connor wrote in *Grutter v. Bollinger* (DOCKET NO. 02-241) in her ruling, "We expect that 25 years from now, the use of racial preferences will no longer be necessary to further the interest that we approve today." The liberal chancellor, on the other hand, maintained the exact opposite view.

This is not the first time that such a polarization of mutual stalemate has occurred. The last time the Supreme Court ruled on affirmative action was *Fisher v. University of Texas* (DOCKET NO. 11-345) in 2016, which was narrowly won by one vote in favor. With such a close vote margin, one could even argue that the supporters in this case were able to win not because they were so representative of public opinion, but simply because the total number of justices was an odd number. The serious polarization of ethnicity and immigration-related issues in the judiciary can be seen in general.

However, a Pew Research Center survey (2019) shows that 73% of Americans, including a majority of blacks or Latinos, believe that race should not be taken into account in college admissions. This shows the public's opposition to the government. And a total of nine states have banned affirmative action from public universities. This shows the conflict between federal and states.

From the case of the immigrants and minorities, we can see that the differences in opinion between government and the public, federal and state, have inevitably lead to a loss of efficiency in the future. A further consequence is that it has shattered the American national identity. As Huntington said, social issues such as immigration have shaken people's belief in freedom, democracy and individual rights and changed their ideological support for an American national identity, turning the country into a nation of two languages, two cultures and two peoples. The resulting abuse of the veto power has left the government wavering and ineffective.

Joseph Schumpeter (1942) has argued that the reduction of government efficiency is only due to the political struggle between different factions, that is, 'struggle for political office'. However, this paper argues that the mere struggle for political opportunity is not enough to lead the US into the political mess it is in today. it is vetocracy because the American divisions and crisis represented by the two parties themselves are polarising. Therefore, the political struggle – not only as struggles for political opportunities, but also as a projection of the popular divisions in government leadership - is intensifying.

The two major political parties in the United States, shaped by differing ideologies, represent the most polarized segments of society on various social issues. However, their endless battles over positions and proposals, particularly in Congress and between the President and Congress, lead to a significant loss of time and energy for both parties, resulting in reduced administrative efficiency. The bureaucracy, which is responsible for carrying out orders, is often confused by contradictory rules and decrees. To prevent government paralysis, the bureaucracy is forced to adapt to the exigencies of the ongoing political struggle, further undermining administrative efficiency. Legislation and administration, in this case, become mere by-products of the polarization struggle.

Future

Whether the United States will remain in vetocracy or return to being a wonderfully efficient country that serves as a beacon of freedom and democracy may be a complex question to which no one can give a precise answer. This section will attempt to give possible solutions and challenges these solutions might face.

In the previous section, two solutions to the issue of vetocracy were mentioned, as proposed by Fukuyama: the first solution involves an ideological program to reduce democratization, and the second solution involves political parties and the issue of party polarization. As for the latter, it has been previously noted that the problem does not simply lie in party politics, but rather in the underlying economic and social issues that contribute to polarization. These issues must be addressed in order to effectively address the problem of political gridlock.

In the former case of reducing democratization, Fukuyama concludes that the traditional American solution to political decay, which involves expanding democracy, has been ineffective. Citing Bruce Cain, Fukuyama points out that the majority of citizens lack the necessary time, background, and inclination to actively participate in politics. As such, simply expanding democracy would only result in more interest groups getting involved without necessarily leading to a more efficient political system.

Fukuyama might be correct. With regards to "neither the time," as Benjamin Constant (1819) noted, modern people cannot gather in public squares to discuss and decide political matters as the Athenians did in ancient times. Furthermore, the abolition of slavery has taken away the free time of the free population. Modern individuals have their own occupations and commitments, leaving them with little time to actively participate in politics. Concerning "nor the background," both the Anti-Federalists and the Federalists contend that representative elections have an aristocratic effect (Manin, 1997). Whether representatives pursue the interests of

society as a whole or their own passions, as Madison suggests, they are more prominent and prosperous than ordinary people. Lastly, regarding "nor the inclination," modern young individuals are often less inclined to participate in politics and more focused on their personal interests.

Therefore, it is reasonable for Fukuyama to oppose the traditional way of expanding democracy and replaces it with the way of reducing democracy. He suggests that some democratic participation or government transparency should be weakened, and some autonomy should be given to technocrats to enhance government efficiency. Fukuyama's conclusion opposes the idea of continued expansion of democracy and instead focuses on efficiency as a means to address the issue of vetocracy.

However, as Fukuyama himself acknowledges, suggesting a reduction in democratic participation and transparency is a highly contentious and unpopular proposition. 'no one dares suggest that what the country needs is a bit less participation and transparency', he said so. The ideals of freedom and democracy are deeply ingrained in the American national identity and have been championed by the country as a model for the world throughout the 20th century. To advocate for a reduction in democratic participation is to call into question the very foundations of the country and its core values. While addressing the issue of vetocracy may require the development of specific strategies, it cannot involve compromising on the fundamental principles of democracy itself. Any program that seeks to curtail democratic participation and transparency would face insurmountable political opposition and would likely be impossible to implement.

So, I propose another solution here: to address the underlying issues that cause party divisions analyzed above. The major difference with Fukuyama is that this solution is not intended to modify the fundamental American democratic system, but rather to improve and strengthen American democracy today in order to avoid

endless struggles not only between political parties, but also among the three branches of government and between the states and the federal government.

With regard to money politics, there are several potential measures. One potential solution is to implement laws and regulations that require candidates to disclose the sources and amounts of their campaign funds. Additionally, limits could be set on outside sources of funding to prevent interest groups from exerting undue influence on candidates. Another potential solution is for the government to establish a public election fund and an evaluation system based on factors such as the candidate's level of public support, past policy implementation, and performance in the election. Candidates who meet the criteria can receive more election funds from the public election fund, thus reducing their reliance on outside sources of funding. By taking these measures, the government can help create a level playing field for candidates and minimize the influence of money and interest groups in elections.

With regard to economic problems, the government could consider implementing policies such as increasing tax rates for the wealthy and large corporations, raising tax thresholds, and lowering tax rates for the poor and micro and small businesses. The government could also invest more in transfer spending to balance class differences and reduce income inequality. In terms of promoting aggregate economic growth, the government could create subsidies for innovation, invest in infrastructure to reduce transportation costs, and establish more training institutions for job skills. These measures will not only stimulate demand but also foster the growth of the production side, which will lead to overall economic growth.

In terms of addressing social issues and promoting national identity, it is important for the government to create policies that promote inclusivity and cultural understanding. This could include supporting community events and festivals that celebrate diversity, as well as promoting cultural education in schools.

Additionally, the government could create initiatives to support minority groups, such as providing funding for community centers and organizations that serve underrepresented populations.

To address misunderstandings and conflicts between groups, the government could create platforms for open dialogue and discussion. This could include town hall meetings, community forums, and online discussion groups where people from different backgrounds can come together and share their perspectives. The government could also create programs to promote intercultural exchange and understanding, such as exchange programs for students or cultural exchange events.

Overall, it is important for the government to take a proactive role in promoting social cohesion and national identity. By investing in education, dialogue, and cultural initiatives, the government can help create a more inclusive and unified society.

Although we have provided some practical suggestions for addressing the fundamental issues behind vetocracy in the preceding paragraphs, this is not the root cause of the veto politics that has persisted in the US. The issue is not that the US government has been unable to identify a path to solving the underlying problem, as the three branches of government, the two major political parties, and the country as a whole have recognized the need for change. Rather, the root cause of the issue is that the necessary reforms require political decisions to be made through group consensus. Due to the current state of vetocracy, however, groups are in disagreement over the implementation of specific programs and who should lead them, which only further divides politics and raises the likelihood of decisions being vetoed.

As Fukuyama argues, America's political ills have become so entrenched that it is difficult to make productive reforms from within alone. In other words, social stratification, class division, party polarization, and the separation of powers have all reached a point where any attempts to

address these issues through political decisions will likely be rejected, resulting in even greater division and conflict. Furthermore, any efforts to save American democracy may well lead to further vetocracy. It seems that an external force of significant power will be necessary to effect change and break the current cycle of political decay.

Conclusion

This paper provides a historical and theoretical analysis of how the US system of separation of powers and checks and balances has become vetocracy, and its potential future implications. The paper highlights the dual quest for authority and freedom in the US, which led to the establishment of the separation of powers and checks and balances system. However, the paper argues that the underlying social divisions, such as interest groups and money politics, economics, social issues, and national identity, have caused political polarization and vetocracy. The paper refutes the argument for weakening democratization and argues that maintaining the American creed is the bottom line of reform.

This article stands out from other studies of vetocracy and political decay in the US by delving into the origins of the idea of separation of powers and checks and balances. It establishes the basis for its proposed reform program - the rejection to the retrogression of democratization. Additionally, the article combines political theory and social behavior to illustrate how political polarization, which led to the vetocracy, is caused by the fracturing of the society that politics represents. This comprehensive approach offers a unique analysis of the issue, shedding light on the underlying causes of vetocracy in the US.

Although the paper offers solutions to the three problems raised, it ultimately suggests that the implementation of any reform is limited by vetocracy itself and cannot be passed, leading to a pessimistic prediction of the future. The paper's comprehensive perspective provides a unique analysis of the issue, but it is limited in its specificity in some aspects and does not offer a feasible solution. Therefore, further research is

needed to develop practical solutions to the problem of vetocracy in the US.

Conflict of Interests: the author has claimed that no conflict of interests exists.

References

1. Arendt, H. (2017). *The Origins of Totalitarianism*. Penguin Classics. (Original work published 1951)
2. Bailyn, B. (2017). *The ideological origins of the American Revolution*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
3. Batalova, J. (2018, October 31). Mexican Immigrants in the United States. Migrationpolicy.org. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/mexican-immigrants-united-states>
4. Benz, A., & Behnke, N. (2009). *Federalism and constitutional change*. Oxford University Press.
5. Berlin, I. (1958). *Two concepts of liberty*. Clarendon Press.
6. British Broadcasting Corporation. (2018, December 17). US shutdown: Democrats refuse funds for Trump wall. BBC News. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-us-canada-46596272>
7. *Buckley v. Valeo*, 424 U.S. 1 (1976)
8. Cameron, M. A., & Falleti, T. G. (2005). Federalism and the Subnational Separation of Powers. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 35(2), 245–271. <https://doi.org/10.1093/publius/pji012>
9. Constant, B. (2020). *The Liberty of Ancients Compared with that of Moderns*. Good Press. (Original work published 1816)
10. *Citizens United v. FEC*, 558 U.S. 310 (2010)
11. De'Tocqueville, A. (2003). *Democracy in America*. Penguin Books. (Original work published 1835)
12. Farrand, M. (1987). *The records of the federal convention of 1787*. Yale University Press. (Original work published 1911)
13. *Fisher v. University of Texas*, 570 U.S. 297 (2013)
14. Friedman, T. L. (2012, April 21). Opinion | Down With Everything. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/2012/04/22/opinion/sunday/friedman-down-with-everything.html>
15. Fukuyama, F. (2014a). *America in Decay: The Sources of Political Dysfunction*. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), 5–26. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24483299>
16. Fukuyama, F. (2014b). *Political order and political decay - from the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy*. Macmillan Publishers.
17. Graf, N. (2019, February 25). Most Americans say Colleges should not Consider Race or Ethnicity in Admissions. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/02/25/most-americans-say-colleges-should-not-consider-race-or-ethnicity-in-admissions/>
18. *Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306 (2003)
19. Hamilton, A., Goldman, L., Jay, J., & Madison, J. (2008). *The Federalist papers*. Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1788)
20. Hamilton, A., Jay, J., & Madison, J. (2009). *The essential federalist and anti-federalist papers*. Classic Books America.
21. Hobbes, T. (1651). *Leviathan*. Dover Publications, Inc.
22. Huntington, S. P. (2006). *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press.
23. Jones, B. (2019, January 31). Majority of Americans continue to say immigrants strengthen the U.S. Pew Research Center. <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2019/01/31/majority-of-americans-continue-to-say-immigrants-strengthen-the-u-s/>
24. Jones, J. M. (2019, June 21). New High in U.S. Say Immigration Most

- Important Problem. Gallup.com; Gallup. <https://news.gallup.com/poll/259103/new-high-say-immigration-important-problem.aspx>
25. Kirk, R., & McDonald, F. (2004). *The roots of American order*. ISI Books.
 26. Klarman, M. J. (2018). *The framers' coup : the making of the United States Constitution*. Oxford University Press.
 27. Kobilinsky, D. (2019, January 28). Government shutdown ends after 35 days. The Wildlife Society. <https://wildlife.org/government-shutdown-ends-after-35-days/>
 28. Kurland, P. B., & Lerner, R. (2001). *The founders' Constitution*. University of Chicago Press.
 29. Lessig, L. (2012). *Republic, lost : how money corrupts congress, and a plan to stop it*. Twelve.
 30. Locke, J., & Shapiro, I. (2003). *Two treatises of government : and a letter concerning toleration*. Yale University Press. (Original work published 1689)
 31. Maisel, L. (2016). *American political parties and elections : a very short introduction*. Oxford University Press.
 32. Manin, B. (1997). *The principles of representative government*. Cambridge University Press.
 33. Martin, K. (2018). *French liberal thought in the eighteenth century*. Forgotten Books. (Original work published 1954)
 34. Michener, J., & Brower, M. (2020). What's policy got to do with it? Race, gender & economic inequality in the united states. *Daedalus*, 149(1), 100–118. https://doi.org/10.1162/DAED_a_01776
 35. Raz, J. (2009). *The Authority of Law*. Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1979)
 36. Richard, C. J. (1995). *The founders and the classics : Greece, Rome, and the American Enlightenment*. Harvard University Press.
 37. Rousseau, J.-J. (1953). *The Social Contract*. Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1762)
 38. Saez, E., Zucman, G., & Piketty, T. (2017). *Economic growth in the US: A tale of two countries*. CEPR. <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/economic-growth-us-tale-two-countries>
 39. Schumpeter, J. (1942). *Capitalism, Socialism, And Democracy*. Harper & Brothers.
 40. Taylor, A., & Foner, E. (2010). *American colonies : The settling of North America*. Penguin Books ; [United States].
 41. U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis . (2020). Integrated industry-level production account (KLEMS) | U.S. bureau of economic analysis (BEA). www.bea.gov. <https://www.bea.gov/data/special-topics/integrated-industry-level-production-account-klems>
 42. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. (2009). Multifactor productivity trends news release. www.bls.gov. https://www.bls.gov/news.release/archives/prod3_03252009.htm
 43. Wilson, W. (1887). *The Study of Administration*. *Political Science Quarterly*, 2(2), 197–222. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2139277>
 44. Wolff, E. N., & Zacharias, A. (2013). Class structure and economic inequality. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 37(6), 1381–1406. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bet026>
 45. Wood, G. S. (1991). *The Radicalism of the American Revolution*. Vintage Books.
 46. Wright, B. F. (1933). *The Origins of the Separation of Powers in America*. *Economica*, 40, 169. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2548765>
 47. Zaveri, M., Gates, G., & Zraick, K. (2019, January 9). The government shutdown was the longest ever. here's the history. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2>

019/01/09/us/politics/longest-
government-shutdown.html