

Resilient by Design? Democratic Recovery After Executive Overreach Through the Lens of Democratic Theory and Open Democracy

Mohd. Ruhul Amin

Sep 30, 2025

Abstract

This article presents democratic recovery after executive overreach as a process of reopening institutions rather than merely restoring formal legal boundaries. It describes how executive misconduct can leave politicized appointments, weakened oversight, restricted records, altered enforcement practices, intimidated officials, and concentrated agenda control. The article mentions open-democracy theory as requiring continuous accessibility, deliberation, transparency, inclusion, and responsiveness beyond periodic elections. Citizen assemblies, sortition, public consultations, and participatory systems may contribute to recovery when they possess clear mandates, balanced expertise, agenda access, implementation oversight, and mandatory institutional responses. The analysis also emphasizes judicial remedies, legislative scrutiny, record preservation, public disclosure, professional administration, and safeguards against replacing one form of politicization with another. It concludes that durable recovery occurs when citizens participate in public reasoning, affected communities influence reform priorities, institutions explain decisions, records become accessible, and future governments face stronger neutral limits regardless of political affiliation.



Executive overreach will need to be addressed with reopening the institutions along with the reversion of the legal boundaries. So, open-democracy theory presents a high bar to achieve: public power must be accessible, deliberative, transparent, and responsive not just at periodic election times, but all the time. If a court determines that it has been abused and acts as an administrative remedy, the form of removal may not remove the one element of abuse, but it takes the element of agenda control. Routes for affected communities to influence implementation as well as citizen access and oversight, and durability in professional neutrality, should be rebuilt with durable recovery. Chosen representatives can sometimes lead to disempowerment of specific groups, which to limit the perceived frustrations arising from the lack of influence.

It is not enough that an office-holder or a challenged order be replaced, to achieve democratic recovery. Politicized appointments, reduced watchdogs, changed enforcement procedures, initiated harassment of public servants, and popularly held beliefs that any election can allow for reshaping institutions can be a result of executive overreach. A restoration is thus required, along with investigation and prevention. Independent offices need to be securely tenanted and resources need to be provided, administrative records must be preserved, as defined by law, unlawful directives must be reviewed, and affected groups must be provided with the remedy.

Reform also requires some discipline pester X unsuccessful and X is no longer on offer, creates divisive winner mentality. Durable Recovery recovers neutral capacity, and makes it more difficult to abuse in the future, across party lines.

No longer is it about periodic authorization and now it's about on-going accessibility of power." This is the notion of open-democracy theory. Hélène Landemore is the author of work that focuses on openness, inclusive deliberation and representation that enables people to be involved in the political process, outside elections. One route which is possible is sortition, or citizens' assemblies, but selection does not help in itself solve the problem of equality. Practical influence is determined through agenda control, expert assistance, compensation, access and other responses from the public.

Election is complemented by open institutions which broaden the cognitive diversity and decrease monopolisation by professions. However, the conditions which are needed for success include constitutional protections, clear administration and a relationship of mutual accountability between citizens and their binding public authorities.

Democratic Innovation can take place through tokenism, capture or isolation. Randomly picked assembly can give ample deliberations and elected institutions will disregard each and every recommendation. Digital participation has the potential to increase participation and amplify organised growing voices and exclude individuals with gaps in connectivity, language access, time and trust. Thus, there must be an institutional mechanism to bring citizen's voice into decision making, review and implementation.

Reasons of acceptance, modification or rejection of proposals should be provided to the public authorities. Evaluating the rep. must also be based on representation, learning, agenda shaping, policy actually changed, trust and other longer lasting effects, and not on attendance or positive "participant surveys".

Focus more on how involved you can get than just participating. Doing extra consultations, hearings, having websites, citizen panels and advisory boards can expand voice without changing who sets the agenda, controls the information, and makes the decisions. Questions in evaluation should include: whose voice is being heard, who is using evidence, whose voice is being listened to, what happens to recommendations and if there are any excluded groups, do they get an opportunity to appeal? Participation may be superficial, when the authorities choose 'easier' participants or ask participants to comment when the main decisions are made. Good design enables participants to receive the information they need at the right time, to facilitate on their own, to clearly understand who is to respond, and to clearly make the link between deliberation and

eventual decision.

Independence, capacity, transparency and coordination are the mechanisms of action of institutional constraints. If a court isn't independent and doesn't have timely access or if there's no enforceable relief, then the court's protection is weak. Unprotected staffing places in the civil service means that the civil service can still be subject to loyalty tests. Election administrators are in need of resources, physical safety, legal clarity and trust of the public.

For media freedom, access to and freedom from information is needed. Constraints are reinforced when a number of institutions are in the position to "see" abuse, "name" it, "proxy" for it, and "react" to it. Redundancy also minimizes risk of a single body being taken out taking the entire accountability system down with an out of service.

Measuring democracy involves complex institutions being transformed into comparable indicators, and in each democracy index, fundamental decisions are made concerning the concept, evidence, aggregation and uncertainty of the measure. The different dimensions are in the Electoral competition, civil liberties, judicial independence, media freedom, participation, equality and deliberation. To address this complexity, V-Dem employs a number of indices and expert coded indicators and other projects have different frameworks. While scores facilitate comparison, a national average can obscure issues of local variation and disempowerment and very quick administrative change. A single rank cannot, therefore, be considered a full diagnosis, and responsibility focuses on movement at the indicator level, coding notes and corroborating evidence.

The "guard rails of the constitution" are only as effective as the ability to access the courts at the right time, along with remedies and compliance. An emergency measure might last for a period of time before a ruling is issued, this could help clarify doctrine but wouldn't help protect the people. The standing rules and rules of secrecy, classification, cost and procedure can bar review of the most significant decisions. To be effective, judicial control must be provided for speedy procedures, access to evidence, effective remedy and anti-retaliation measures must be effective.

Administrative records which outline reasons and alternatives are also relied upon by courts. Where executive action is devoid of any discernible track in this sort of case, judicial oversight is diffused like smoke and constitutional words may turn out to be more like a political warning or a signal than a real restriction on executive power.

Legislative oversight provides a democratic mandate and on-going oversight, and

legislative sanction without accountability can result in ineffective supervision. Committees should be staffed, documents accessible, have hearing power, participation by opposition and power to limit or cancel delegated power. There should be some new evidence that a renewal vote should take into account, instead of responding to the same crisis narrative. Appropriations also are significant since fine programs survive appropriations until after legal debates become a distant memory.

Public reporting can be used to enhance accountability – for sensitive data this needs to be carefully designed access – not complete obscurity. An institutional stress test can show whether legislatures are independent caretakers or extensions of the leadership of government parties.

By choosing citizens via lottery, not parties, money or networks of contacts, sortition can help to achieve greater representation. Stratification has the potential to bring balance to the demography and participation barriers can be reduced through compensation and support. Requirements for the accountability remain: A public mandate, transparency regarding its selection, conflict rules and responses from the elected institutions. Random selection doesn't remove the bias for agenda setting, expert choice and facilitation.

Thus an independent governance and public scrutiny is necessary for a citizen assembly. Taking demofication to the field of judgment value then comes from openness of access with the responsibility for the last decisions and implementation.

The problems that do and those that do not get official attention are determined according to agenda power relations. The possibility to petition, to make minority proposals, to give public evidence and to review issues that are rejected and have been proposed in open institutions. Thresholds need to be designed to keep the system from being overwhelmed without denying gatekeepers the ability to deny claims that they don't like. Reasons need to be published, to draw the boundaries between limited capacity and political avoidance.

Openness of the agenda also contributes to early-warning, since the usually first signs of repression are closure. As authorities increasingly refuse to justify exclusions or cut eligibility in ever-decreasing ways that reflect a preference for one or a number of options, democratic access is diminished, despite ongoing apparent consultations.

There should be a discussion of reopening access to records and reasons after the instances of overreach. Secret orders, incinerated documentation or murky buying fails to inform the public, or permit a legal response. Preservation, disclosure and independent investigation provides fact base. Citizen's participation can subsequently make a

difference in shaping the priorities for reform and help to monitor the effective implementation of the new safeguards.

No-dominion, sortition-based decision-making can help to restore by examining ways to control emergency powers, ethics regulations or program cateness during a healthier response to crises that is not dominated by partisan contests. Electoral accountability is not to be replaced by such bodies, they should be adjuncts. Deliberation is linked with constitutional authority by a clear mandate, the availability of experts, public hearings and a mandatory legislative response.

There is no magic bullet with open democracy to address institutional erosion. Authority, information, inclusion and visibility of response from decision makers is important for citizen assemblies, consultations and participatory systems. These things (openness) can broaden democratic ownership together with elections, rights, courts, and professional administration, and expose early closure. A powerful transition to recovery occurs when citizens are co-participants in public reasoning, can question implementation and see decision change.

So long as it respects the real access to power, the complete freedom of opposition and the possibility of opposition action later, it remains democratic. Elements of openness include having access to an agenda, evidence, deliberation, reasons and review of implementation. Non-participation – passive – can reinforce cynicism, not a sense of democracy. There is a need for citizen bodies to have authority in line with the expectations attached to them.

Electoral institutions must not supplant participatory institutions, but contribute to strengthening it. Elements of openness include having access to an agenda, evidence, deliberation, reasons and review of implementation. Non-participation – passive – can reinforce cynicism, not a sense of democracy.