

JEL Classification: D63, F43, H5, L26, P16

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31521/modecon.V27(2021)-15

Nepal Achyut, Affiliated Honorary Research Fellow, Fil. Dr. Jan-U. Sandal Institute, Finstadjordet, Norway

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-2597-6037

e-mail: provost@janusandal.no

Reality of Democracy in Totality and its Connection with Social Entrepreneurship in Solving Problem of Poverty

Abstract. *The fundamental of democracy is the elected government and the rule of majority. Even in the nation of the developed world the population is heavily trapped with absolute poverty. Reality of democracy in totality is to be seen not only from the view point of majority rule and economic growth but from the opportunity available to all. Reality of democracy shall be reflected in social justice and equality. Every segment of the society plays important role in this direction and Social entrepreneurs can be change makers to target the unjust and unsustainable systems Understanding the role of social entrepreneurship is significant in studying reality of democracy in totality.*

This paper aims to get insight into the understanding of political philosophy, political economy, and theories of entrepreneurship and delves into the achievement of democratic system in preference of citizen. It is focused on critical understanding of the reality of government in totality from the view point of ordinary people seeking salvation from the life complexities like extreme poverty and role of entrepreneurship in this process. Related theories on politics and government and democracy as well as entrepreneurship from text books, journals, conference papers, newspapers, reports and online videos have been reviewed and the discussions are based on the findings of the review. More importantly it has been found that democracy as we provoke today is significantly not proving a means to reach the expected ends from the view point of ordinary people but the fruits have being snatched away by the groups of few elites and groups in their favour. Despite of the challenges posed to democracy, the alternative of democracy is democracy itself where entrepreneurship contributes in collaboration independent for the state mechanism.

Keywords: Democracy; Entrepreneurship; Majority; Poverty; People; Philosophy.

УДК 364.22

Непал А., почесний науковий співробітник, Інститут Санда, Фінстаджордет, Норвегія

Реальність демократії та її зв'язок із соціальним підприємництвом у вирішенні проблеми бідності

Анотація. *Проаналізовано, що основою демократії є обраний уряд та панування більшості. Досліджено, що навіть у розвинених країнах світу населення страждає від абсолютної бідності. Доведено, що у цілому реальність демократії слід розглядати не лише з точки зору правління більшості та економічного зростання, а й з усіх доступних можливостей. Реальність демократії відобразатиметься у соціальній справедливості та рівності. Проаналізовано, що кожен сегмент суспільства відіграє важливу роль у цьому напрямі, і соціальні підприємці можуть вносити зміни до несправедливих та нестійких систем. Розуміння ролі соціального підприємництва є важливим у вивченні реальності демократії в цілому.*

Дослідження спрямоване на розуміння політичної філософії, політичної економії та теорії підприємництва і поглиблюється в досягнення демократичної системи на користь громадянина. Дане дослідження в основному зосереджене на критичному розумінні реальності уряду в цілому з точки зору пересічних громадян, які шукають порятунку від таких складних життєвих ситуацій як надзвичайна бідність, а також роль підприємництва у цьому процесі. Відтак, були розглянуті відповідні теорії щодо політики, уряду та демократії, а також підприємництва на основі даних підручників, журналів, матеріалів конференцій, газет, звітів та інтернет-відео, а дискусії та висновки ґрунтуються на результатах їх огляду. Нами встановлено, що демократія в умовах сьогодення не є суттєвим засобом досягнення очікуваних цілей з точки зору пересічних громадян, при цьому її досягнення належать незначній кількості еліт та їх групам. Переконані, що незважаючи на виклики демократії, її альтернативою є сама демократія, де підприємництво вносить свій внесок у співпрацю, незалежну від державного механізму.

Ключові слова: демократія, підприємництво, більшість, бідність, громадяни, філософія.

Acknowledgement: This article was created at the Fil. Dr. Jan-U. Sandal Institute, Norway under the supervision of Prof. Fil. Dr. Jan-Urban Sandal, Executive Director and owner of the Fil. Dr. Jan-U. Sandal Institute

Стаття надійшла до редакції: 12.05.2021

Received: 12 May 2021

Introduction. As has been mentioned in the mission statement of Democracy Without Border (DWB) universally provoked definition of democracy is the government of the people, by the people for the people, as has been mentioned in the mission statement of the [10]. Similar types of definition have often been attached with the name of the so-called great democrats from all over the world. The definition clearly mentioned the government as the core of democracy, the government of, for and by the people. But in the society there are so many types, segment, division, and ethnicity, even the economic classes like rich, poor and poorer or below the poverty line. Practically the definition is able to include all types of people in the society or few people who have controlled the society in various ways are playing in the name of the 'people' is pertinent question often raised. As Dahl said philosophers are much engaged in endless debate on the differences and judgements about goals, end values, reality, actuality and so on [8]. Every form of government is claimed by the ruler as a democratic form. Key characteristic of democracy is continuing responsiveness of the government to the preferences of its citizens [7]. The core value of democracy is generally believed to maintain the aspirations of the citizens at the top and all the democratic activists as the social worker voluntarily adopting the politics which means achieving the goal of people's preferences.

Even though great deal of literature is available on the relationship between democracy and economic growth, not enough is known about the relationship between the poverty and democracy. Voting is not the only mechanism available to the poor to influence the democratic polity. Most stable democracy adopting Westminster system also had mass extensive poverty. At the same time some dictatorships regime had successfully eradicated poverty [35]. Perspectives adopted in obstacles to the elimination of poverty are, heavily political. In every nation with population heavily trapped with absolute poverty, the circumstances conspire to prevent the poor from nourishing themselves and protecting their health, raising their skills, education, financing their productive activities, marketing of their product, guaranteeing ownership of their properties and protecting their right without discrimination [9]. Different types of hindrances against the aspiration of people leaving with absolute poverty can be seen in every part of the world. However, the aspiration of the people may be contextual to their livelihood and style of eliminating their aspiration by the political actor which may also be different subject to the given country context.

Investigating the discordance between the poverty and democracy articulating the underlying values of modern constitutional democracies analyzing the ways in which poverty violates democratic values and searching about why poverty is still widespread in contemporary democracies is very important [20]. Success of any democratic process can be measured in terms human

status. In fact, such imbalances between the accepted values of democracy and real achievement in the ground level motivates any time of study in the domain of democracy and poverty. Alleviation of poverty is inextricably collaborated effort of government and other segment of society. This study also delves into the contribution of social entrepreneur in collaboration as well as independently to achieve this goal of democracy.

Objectives and methodology. The general objective of this study is to get insight into the overall understanding of the political philosophy, political economy, form of democracy and government. The study also delves into democratic system achievement in preference of the citizens. The study is aimed to critic on if the reality of government in totality is for the ordinary people to get salvation from different complexities of life like extreme poverty and role of the other segment of the society including social entrepreneurs in achieving the goal.

The method of the study includes review theories related to politics and government and democracy. Analysis is based on the findings and conclusion of the previous studies reviewed. Review consists of comprehensive review of text books, peer-reviewed journals, conference papers, reports and online videos.

Literature Review. Understanding the Reality in Totality: We can find different theories of truth and knowledge not only reveals the truth but the truth arises from knowledge [23]. The only way of understanding the reality in totality is the study of philosophy. The word 'reality' come from the Western philosophy is somehow found to indicate the 'satya' (truth) of Vedic Philosophy.

Philosophy: What is a philosophy? To answer this we generally may jump to name a particular philosophy in our memory. So many philosophies are there in the arena of philosophy whether it is any branches of pure science or of the branches of social science. Very Simple understanding of the meaning of philosophy from the Oxford dictionary can be taken as the basic knowledge, reality and the existence [15]. Google dictionary simply mention the meaning of philosophy as a theory or attitude that acts as guiding principle or behaviour. It is the study of fundamental nature of knowledge, reality and existence especially when considered as an academic discipline.

Philosophy is important because the study of philosophy gives theoretical ideas about the natural and human world. Study of physical and social aspects of the world provides foundation for the physical and social sciences respectively. All ideas about any branches of science or philosophy including the idea to contempt the philosophy are themselves regarded as another philosophy. Review of literature reveals that philosophies have been broadly categorized into Western and Oriental philosophies. Western philosophies mainly studies in three categories ancient, medieval and modern philosophy started after the Renaissance. Oriental philosophy has basically two traditions, the Chinese

philosophy mainly the Confucianism and the South-Asian which is popularly called in the Western world as Indian philosophy. South Asian philosophy has been mainly relied on certain sacred texts called Vedas, Upanishads and Puranas which basically emphasize spiritual life instead of everyday life running for all physical happiness. The Chinese philosophy typically emphasizes effort to participate in the life of the state for the improvement of condition of the world. The Western philosophy generally named with ancient Greek philosophers like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle and then after enriched with the many great thinkers and philosophers has been now power of dominating the overall sphere of philosophical studies. Review also revealed that non-western culture has long history but due the difficulties in travel and communication, connection and interchange between Western and non-Western philosophies was very little resulting Western philosophies to develop independently.

Why to study philosophy? The appropriate answer to the question is to understand the reality in totality. In other words the study of philosophy has the basic motive to understand the reality of the matter of study in totality. Reality is the real presence or existence of the truth which is in contrast to any imaginary or mere illusionary concept. Study of philosophy helps to understand the reality of any particular theory in totality.

Study of philosophy does not posed with any demarcation. It may extent to the barysphere of the idea or the concept. Every theories including the theories relating to human society or social sciences may even extended to the core of why and how is the universal creation, human and its relation with all other creations, existence of universe and human society and the position of individual human being

Political philosophy: In the whole gamut of the study of democracy, democracy is driven by the study of political philosophy. This covers the political science, sociology, anthropology, economics and all other field of the studies falling under the scope of study of humanities and social sciences.

Democracy: The whole framework of democracy comes within the political philosophy. But we can find different forms of democratic processes. Wikipedia has mentioned the processes as pure democracy, representative democracy, participative democracy and deliberative democracy. The democratic process determines the form of government. Dahl mentioned every form of government is claimed by the ruler as democratic [7]. Philosophy of democracy is influenced by the popular proverb as government of the people, for the people by the people. But the problem lies on, as can inferred from the saying of Dahl, who are people? Are they the influential elite groups of people, parties or communities controlling the state in the name of the people?

Social Entrepreneurship: This indicates the act of social entrepreneur who are self-motivated, skilled and

expert individuals active in bringing changes in the life of everybody in the society. The body of knowledge of social entrepreneurship is rich with various underpinning theories. Singh [31] has mentioned various theories including the Great Person School, the Psychological Characteristics School, the Classical School (Schumpeterian), the Management School, the Leadership School and the Intrapreneurship School under the domain of theories related to social entrepreneurship. Social entrepreneurs can prove be real change maker as the fundamental feature of social entrepreneurship is to target the unjust and unsustainable systems and drive the society towards entirely new, superior and sustainable form [24]. Learning of social entrepreneurship is also highly contextual in understanding reality of democracy in totality.

Result of the research. David Ricardo, James and John Stuart Mill and Karl Marx are the great pillars of economic thinking. Schumpeter has also been recognized as one of the giants of economic thoughts of the first half of the twentieth century contributing on economic theory, political theory, and topics as imperialism, social classes and democracy [11]. Generally, democracy is regarded as majority rule. Sanders opined that democracy is commonly associated with political equality and rule of majority. The procedure is egalitarian and democratic as these all have an equal chance to influence outcome but obviously not majoritarian [28]. Majority rule operates under two different restrictions; logrolling permitted and logrolling not permitted, starting with the latter. Since logrolling is a norm, discussion of the non-logrolling case must start with consideration of the institutional structure which eliminates logrolling. It seems clear that the system of majority voting is not by means an optimal method of allocating resources [33]. Majoritarian rule in democracy is meant to maintain unity in diversity, but it cannot be accepted as a means to eliminate the genuine aspiration of the other side of the society simply because of being in minority.

Even though many scholars plead that democracy improves the welfare of the poor, the actual scenario in not as claimed because democracies spend more money on education and health than non-democracies, but the benefits are snatched by the middle and upper income group [25]. In his study Ross used data on infant and child mortality to challenge the above claim. The cross-national studies conducted in the studies indicated democracy has little or no effect on infant and child mortality rates.

Growth alone will not necessarily promote the life chances of all the individuals in a given society. It only is continuing those who are left by the wayside may lose confidence in democracy. If democracy offers any particular benefits, these should be measured in terms of the opportunities made available rather that the average growth rate alone [17]. Economic indicators are the overall picture of the operation of the economic system

of a country in terms of production, income and exchanges of resources. But the limitation of the system of state practices to report the economic performance of the country is that the real picture of the overall situation of the society is not presented or somehow hidden. Globally it has been accepted to compare the status of development in terms of economic growth has been, but poverty still exists at a significant level even if the high rate of economic growth has been achieved by the reporting countries. Therefore, we can find conflicting views about real economic development and reported growth rates leading to the opinion that rate of the growth alone cannot be taken as the sign of development rather the development shall be reflected in the total situation of the society where opportunities to each and every individual to have good life is ensured. Where academically the role of the other segment of the society like the social entrepreneurs who are self-motivated hard working skilled expert to achieve something significant in society contribute significantly for the transformation of the society for the long run, democratic political system given at the current situation is the means for meeting the aspiration of the citizens.

Preconditions for democracy are rule of law accepted by the voters, transparent voting rules and fair counting as confirmed by an independent body. Other important conditions are willingness to accept the free elections, fair system of deciding on constituency and the free press. Even after having these conditions there are views to find a way to limit ability of some families to hold office consecutively, not only in the autocratic system but in the societies like USA and Japan where some families seem to hold sway from generation to generation. So democracy is not a panacea [6]. The ugly side of the majority rule is that the society is bound to accept the situation in the name of democracy and rule of majority as mentioned by Cortazzi. But there is no denial of the fact that democracy is the only panacea for fairly elected government where there is dictatorship in some countries or societies like Pakistan [4]. We can still see the countries in the world where the autocratic forces and the military sitting behind control the election to gain the majority in order to run the society according to their values where they also have been able in wrapping up their interest with the democratic label.

Democracy does not necessarily resolve problems related to poverty and economic inequality. It is an essential but any type of government could not solve the economic problem. Western formula of democracy could not be fit for every situation as its principles have been formulated for industrialized capitalist countries with relatively small economic gaps and considerable cultural homogeneity [13]. Democratic political system is indispensable to systematically run the society. There are various models of democracy and every ruler adopting certain model of political systems claims to be democratic. But in every form political system is not necessarily able to solve the problem of justice, equal

opportunities and more specifically the situation of poverty.

Reviewing the book by Philip Caggan titled *The Last Vote: Threats to Western Democracy*, John Gray in his article titled *No panacea for public ills: why democracy is in trouble* mentioned perhaps it's time democracy was removed from its pedestal, if only to dust down the icon. Both the appeal and limitation of democracy is universal. Apart from all the other and the freedom, there may be worst system of government. While pleading protection of freedom the worst system of government cannot be taken lightly because democracy is not panacea for public ills and it is in trouble [12]. Public ills cannot be ignored even if there is democratic system and democratically elected government.

Democratic society must be able to distinguish between ends and means of democracy. The ultimate end of democracy is indeed the well-being of the individual and the means for achieving this goal, if they are to be effective, it must be continuously modified according to the changing environment. Democracy is not merely a procedure such as majority rule. Democracy, as a philosophy has an ultimate changeless humanitarian goal. The political process like federal system, two-house legislature, separation power etc. are simple means but we may consider them as democracy itself [22]. Two important points to consider here is even if the political process is democratic these are means to achieve the end result in the life of each and every citizen.

The literature discussing the impact of media and journalism upon democracy, typically criticizes both media and journalism for their content and in order to discover news standards by which the quality of news journalism can or should be evaluated in all the four normative models of democracy; Procedural, Competitive, Participatory and Deliberative democracy [32]. Whatever be the model of the democracy the role played by the media seems to be creating favorable opinion on the system of democracy they themselves believe. In present world where the media has powerful holding on the learning of the current affairs of democracies everywhere the quality of news in the media should be critically judged and evaluated.

Democracy should not be merely taken as sets of rule that somebody can be winner through the game of rule. But current democratic institutions are in crisis. We can see that even the leaders elected through the democratic process can gradually subvert democratic process to be themselves more powerful [19]. The instances of the attempts of political leaders to become more and more powerful willfully using the democratic process and the system can show the situation of how democracy fails.

Even though there are different school of thoughts of democracy. Some emphasizes individual freedom, rule of majority and strong power of representatives while other emphasizes equity, justice and strong power of the governments and overall mechanism of state. There is

another dimension of the thoughts that democracy is not the panacea for the contemporary world problem of conflicts within the country and between countries to countries.

Previous studies reviewed indicate that there are number of challenges for effective democracy. Some instances of such challenges are attainment of prosperity for all, alleviation of poverty and ensuring equal opportunity for quality of education, health and employment for all. On the other hand, internally strengthened democracy shall meaningfully contribute to world peace as well as bullying in international politics by the powerful countries and societies needs changes.

Concept of poverty almost uniquely applied to humans implying a denial of equal dignity of all. Poverty is lack of economic resources making its victim unable to participate in a range of activities expressive of their nature as human being. It is poor status of a person fallen behind the standard of life thought for human being in particular society [20]. In other words it is understood as deprivation from the essential opportunities to which every human is entitled. United Nations (UN) defines poverty as the condition of severe deprivation of basic human needs including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information. Extreme poverty, deep poverty, abject poverty, absolute poverty, destitution or penury is the severe type of poverty categorised by the UN. In 2020 about 155 million people faced acute food security [34]. Over the decades many global effort have been taken to solve the problem of poverty. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the UN has identified seventeen goals to achieve until 2030. The statistical analysis published by many national and internal organizations indicates that it is declining in terms of ratio of people living below the line of poverty and the total population. But it seems that complete elimination of poverty is not expected in the near future. This is because still billions of people are affected by conflicts, wars and violence in different parts of the world irrespective of the forms of democratic and non-democratic governance in that particular society [16]. In addition different types of situation human or non-human caused situation including natural disasters and calamities has caused slowdown of the rate of reduction of poverty. Recently the World Bank has predicted that COVID 19 pandemic will cause the global poverty to increase [29]. Equally important to consider is that poverty is not only caused by the relation between the economic and social forces in the society along the production function. Although the indirect impact of such relation cannot be ruled out to cause the situation of fragility, conflicts, violence and war these situation have direct impact on poverty. International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) mentions as on 2018 about two billion people were affected by fragility, conflict and violence causing half of these people to live in extreme poverty. Due to violence 68.5 million people were

displaces and almost 120 million people worldwide needed some sort of humanitarian aid [16]. Poverty reduction seems to be threatened by different factors. Even in the renowned democratic societies in Europe poverty per cent in term of total population seems to be alarming because the World Bank data shows double digit poverty per cent in powerful European countries. India, the so-called biggest democracy has 21.9 per cent of people in poverty while China the so-called non-democracy has achieved poverty reduction and has now stood at 5.7 per cent. In this context one point importantly noted is that although individual freedom cannot be negotiated but it is difficult to conclude that poverty reduction can be achieved merely as the result of democratic form of the society.

Human society has passes along the process of social transformation. Along the development of human civilization different stage of evolution have been analysed. Some Philosopher basically under the Marxian ideology feudalism, capitalism, socialism and communism are the steps of development. Among the other views as for example Schumpeter envisage basically two type of society commercial and socialist and the other incidental only.

By virtue of its core character feudalism embedded at the highest level of the system and the total organ of the society including the government bureaucracy and the industries are most corrupt. In the feudal society the system works as master-servant relation between the feudal power and the labour force basically the agriculture labour, thus existence of poverty is extreme. In the capitalist society the relation of employer-employee also has furthered the ugly situation of poverty and deprivation of basic needs to the majority of the citizens. Schumpeter [30] also analysed capitalism could never eliminate unemployment and poverty. Introducing the work of Noam Chomsky titled Profit Over People, McChesney [21] mentioned neo-liberalization is the defining political economic form of our time where relative handful private interests are allowed to maximize their private profit by controlling social life to the maximum extent possible. The issue of neo-liberalism and global order are of great human significance and not clearly understood, thus somebody needs to be sensible to know the reality separating from the doctrine [5]. Neoliberalism, whatever one thinks undermines education and health, increases inequalities and reduces labour's share in income [5]. Socialism has generally been understood to be oriented toward the working class of the people and more accountable system of governance. However there is no unanimity on the understanding of socialism and its different forms are practices around the world and every ruler under the system claimed that they are the real socialist. Even though, reduction of relative poverty, comparatively better health care and relatively equal opportunity in education, progressive taxes and emphasis of public ownership in basic public utilities are taken as the best of

the socialism but it is also not reducing the extreme poverty significantly.

Weinberger [36] quoted Hutchins saying “the death of democracy is not likely to be an assassination from an ambush; it will be slow extinction from apathy, indifference and undernourishment.” This indicates necessity of what the best every part of the society can do to save the democracy from such assassination. But as Diamond [9] mentioned do democracies eliminate poverty more effectively than authoritarian regime and what is the relationship between governance and poverty? These are very pertinent questions in this context. Diamond mentions bad governance as the deepest root cause of development failure and it is attributable to inability and unwillingness to mobilize public resources to generate public good while good governance is reflected in the capacity and commitment to act in pursuit of public good, transparency, accountability, rule of law and public participation. Effectiveness of democracy in reducing poverty depends to a great extent to the type of degree of democracy.

Poverty elimination is basically political issue and largely connected with the government. But what type and degree of democracy is effective in reducing poverty is still a big question. Because, review of empirical analysis does not indicate that open democratic societies are only successful to achieve this goal. In contrast to this often blamed to be closed and non-democratic societies is also successfully working. If we take example from Asian countries like India and China that how these countries are achieving the goal. This indicates flatly we cannot conclude the authoritarian regime of any type cannot eliminate poverty while claimed democratic societies are the mean to the desired ends. However, we cannot contradict on the fact that bad governance, corruption and abuse of power, irresponsiveness, and inactions are few of the obstacles in this path irrespective of the characteristics of the political system in most of the countries in the world. Globally reducing poverty has been often understood as the sole responsibility of the public sector or the government and governmental institution. But it can also be analysed from the side of the non-profit sector as well. Non-public sector is also an important segment of the whole society. Essentially, entrepreneurs are from the non-public sector and play key role in uplifting the economy. In understanding reality of democracy understanding different categories of entrepreneurs is very important.

Over the past years research interest in social entrepreneurship has been flooded and resulted important insights about role social entrepreneurship in inclusive growth and institutional changes [26]. Entrepreneurship is inextricably linked to the fundamental common western value of democracy. Independent, autonomous, and decentralized decision making process serves as the corner stone of the democracy which may ensure important policy mandate for entrepreneurship and these elements fuels

democracy as well as the entrepreneurship [2].

Entrepreneurs play key role in job creation, greater prosperity and economic growth [3]. Hence, within the whole framework of democracy, entrepreneurship can play significant role in solving the problem of poverty.

Even in case of China it has been shown by various studies that significant body of research and experience has accumulated on entrepreneurship, firm strategies and growth. Commitment to entrepreneurship is growing in and it is essential to understand the institutional, cultural and related incentives in China and transferring the experience in other developing countries [1]. The findings of the studies on entrepreneurship development and Chinese success in reducing the poverty can be understood to have direct relation between the promotion of entrepreneurship and reduction in poverty.

Connection between the initiation like microfinance, microenterprises, social enterprises and the ability of societies to generate their own public good without state assistance in Asian countries like Thailand and India have impact on development [14]. Alleviating poverty and social inequality demand widening and deepening of democratic institutions and democratic governance. Indian government has launched various ambitious plan to uplift the status of poor but the results are not encouraging [18]. To progress in this socio-economic issue requires participation from the entire segment of society as Lakha & Taneja citing Kothari mentioned poverty alleviation requires empowering the poor with support from other groups of the society in addition to the bureaucratic planning. This indicates the contribution of the whole part of a society including the social entrepreneurs in socio-economic issues like poverty.

Summing up the discussion, we can find that every ruler in whatever type of political system claim themselves as democratic. However, by virtue of the core characteristics of the political system in our world it can be said the poverty is deeply rooted in a feudalistic society. Capitalism will not be successful to achieve the goal of poverty elimination as it allows to maximise profit by the handful private interest and now capitalism with its revised version of neo-liberalism has been criticised much from the view of the social security, justice and equality. Socialism on the other hand has been taken to be effective social justice and equality, but there is no unanimity to mean what socialism is. Democracy as it generally is understood to be the system of participation of people through elections, majority and rule of law. But barely adopting the majority and neglecting the voice of minority cannot make the system as democratic. The slogan of democracy can be popular in an environment of limited individual freedom and can be panacea for that context but it often has not been proven to be panacea where internal or external conflicts and unresolved social issues are prevailed. Reality of democracy in totality is justice and equality for all. To achieve this goal the bureaucratic planning is not

sufficient as experienced by many countries in the world. In addition the contribution of every segment of the society including the contribution of social entrepreneurs shall be equally recognized. Sandal [27] has mentioned that everyone from all walks of life including the lower strata of society go beyond the current societal structure in direction towards economically and socially better society for all.

Conclusion. Social security, justice and equality shall prevail in democracy. Theoretically this is accepted, but poverty as the main threat to this value of a democratic society still remains in every society either the self-claimed to be democratic society or blamed by other to be non-democratic. Very often inactions, corruptions and illegal practices by the political powers and the government have been blamed for the poverty continuing as the shame for human civilization.

Human being has passes through various forms of the system of government along the development of political economy. Even the feudal form of society did not deny humanity and put sympathy on poverty. Capitalism as the newest form of feudalism and ultimately causing the poverty in the society also does not reject the alleviation of poverty in words. Communism emerging with radical slogans and bloody revolutions for developing the means of salvation from all inequalities also turns into

dictatorships, autocracy, corruption and further deterioration of the socio-economic status of the poor people. Socialism somehow is standing between the extremes of capitalism and communism which also could not deliver expected results in terms of uplifting the status of people living below the poverty level wherever it has been practiced in the world. This phenomena leads to the studies about why socialism could not deliver as expected or in some instance how the slogan of socialism destroyed the society on which it has been practicing.

Despite of challenges, good alternative of democracy is only democracy. The word democracy has been interpreted differently by different scholar and thinker in their own of thinking. For some, democracy is a means of ensuring the participation of people in selecting the government, but significantly for some thinkers it is the stage of the development of civilization where everybody has equal opportunity of a good life. Therefore, further studies on how and why any political system fails to ensure justice, equality and prosperity of all is pertinent. This paper follows another study of understanding on reality of political economic thoughts including capitalism and socialism to solve the problem related with social justice and equality including poverty alleviation in achieving the real goal of democracy.

References:

1. Ahlstrom, D. & Ding, Z. (2014). Entrepreneurship in China: An overview. *International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship*, 32(6), 610–618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266242613517913>
2. Audretsch, D. B. & Moog, P. (2020). Democracy and Entrepreneurship. *Entrepreneurship: Theory and Practice*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1042258720943307>
3. Bradley, S. W. & Klein, P. (2016). Institutions, economic freedom, and entrepreneurship: The contribution of management scholarship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 30(3), 211–221. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2013.0137>
4. Butt, T. (2018, August 13). Democracy is the only panacea. *The Nation, Pakistan*. <https://nation.com.pk/13-Aug-2018/democracy-is-the-only-panacea>
5. Chomsky, N. (1999). Profit over people: Neoliberalism and global order. In *Seven Storis Press*. Seven Stories Press.
6. Cortazzi, H. (2008). Democracy is not a panacea | The Japan Times. *Japan Times*. <https://www.japantimes.co.jp/opinion/2008/01/26/commentary/democracy-is-not-a-panacea/>
7. Dahl, R. A. (1971). Democratization and Public Opposition. In *Poliarchy: Participation and Opposition*. Yale University Press. https://books.google.com.np/books?hl=en&lr=&id=JcKz2249PQCc&oi=fnd&pg=PP9&dq=dahl-polyarchy+participation+and+opp+osition&ots=PE0JVZS6R_&sig=yKJxualbUxga8hX_owZTbVrz20&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
8. Dahl, R. A. (2020). Chapter 3: What Lies Ahead? In *On Democracy* (Veritas Pa, p. 27). Yale University Press. https://books.google.com.np/books?hl=en&lr=&id=piQGEAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=how+best+democracy+is+defined&ots=-y3LN-ueKX&sig=dqFcrwHtmkTUaDw_ZAVAi3R7LbI&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
9. Diamond, L. (2005). Empowering the Poor: What Does Democracy Have to Do with it? In D. Narayan (Ed.), *Measuring empowerment: cross-disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 403–426). The World Bank.
10. DWB. (2021). *Mission Statement | Democracy Without Borders*. Mission Statement Democracy Without Borders. <https://www.democracywithoutborders.org/mission/>
11. Elliott, J. E. (1994). Joseph A. Schumpeter and The Theory of Democracy on JSTOR. *Taylor & Francis Ltd.*, 52(4), 280–300. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29769747?seq=1>
12. Gray, J. (2013). No panacea for political ills: Why democracy is in trouble. *NewStatesman*. <https://www.newstatesman.com/politics/2013/08/no-panacea-political-ills-why-democracy-trouble>
13. Grinberg, L. (2011). Democracy is no panacea | Bahrain News | Al Jazeera. *Aljazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2011/2/28/democracy-is-no-panacea-3/>
14. Horn, D. M. (2013). Democratic governance and social entrepreneurship: Civic participation and the future of democracy. In *Democratic Governance and Social Entrepreneurship: Civic Participation and the Future of Democracy*. Taylor and Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203597859>
15. Hornby, A. S. (Ed.). (1983). *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* (1983rd ed.).
16. ICRC. (2018). *Global trends of war and their humanitarian impacts | International Committee of the Red Cross*. <https://www.icrc.org/en/document/global-trends-war-and-their-humanitarian-impacts-0#>
17. Kapstein, E. B., & Converse, N. (2008). Why democracies fail. *Journal of Democracy*, 19(4), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.0.0031>

18. Lakha, S., & Taneja, P. (2009). Balancing democracy and globalisation: The role of the state in poverty alleviation in India. *South Asia: Journal of South Asia Studies*, 32(3), 408–424. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00856400903374319>
19. Levitsky, Steven; Ziblatt, D. (2018). *How Democracies Die*. Crown. <https://crownpublishing.com/archives/feature/democracies-die-steven-levitsky-daniel-ziblatt>
20. Lotter, H. P. P. (2008). Poverty as a Threat to Democratic Values. *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 22(2), 175–193.
21. McChesney, R. W. (1999). Introduction. In *Profit over People: Neoliberalism and Global Order* by Noam Chomsky (First). Sever Stories Press.
22. Parks, W. R. (1953). Goals of Democracy. *AgEcon Search*, 112–121. <https://ageconsearch.umn.edu/record/17208/files/ar530112.pdf>
23. Phillips, S. (2019). *Epistemology in Classical Indian Philosophy* (*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*). The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Spring 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (Ed.),. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology-india/>
24. Roger, L. M. & Osberg, S. R. (2015). How Social Entrepreneurs Make Change Happen.: University of Liverpool Library. *Hbr*, 10, 2–7. <https://eds-a-ebshost-com.liverpool.idm.oclc.org/eds/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?vid=1&sid=88445940-4f45-4c4e-af51-6a48f6f22621%40sdc-v-sessmgr05>
25. Ross, M. (2006). Is democracy good for the poor? *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(4), 860–874. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5907.2006.00220.x>
26. Saebi, T., Foss, N. J., & Linder, S. (2019). Social Entrepreneurship Research: Past Achievements and Future Promises. *Journal of Management*, 45(1), 70–95. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206318793196>
27. Sandal, J.-U. (2015). In the Footsteps of the Early Joseph Alois Julius Schumpeter. *Article Presented at the 10th Economic-History Meeting, Lund University, 4 – 5 October 2013*. janusandal.no
28. Saunders, B. (2010). Democracy, political equality, and majority rule. *Chicago Journals*, 121(1), 148–177. <https://doi.org/http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/656474> . Accessed:
29. Schoch, M. & Lakner, C. (2020). *Global poverty reduction is slowing, regional trends help understanding why*. World Bank Blogs. <https://blogs.worldbank.org/opendata/global-poverty-reduction-slowng-regional-trends-help-understanding-why#>
30. Schumpeter, J. A. (1997). Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. In *Foreign Affairs* (Vol. 76, Issue 5). <https://doi.org/10.2307/20048211>
31. Singh, A. (2016). The Process of Social Value Creation: A Multiple-Case Study on Social ... - Archana Singh - Google Books. In *Google Book*. Springer. https://books.google.com.np/books?hl=en&lr=&id=WPsgDAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=social+entrepreneurship++in+India&ots=Pffk6_yHEp&sig=nReNSgf1Zml5ilypWWZ7sRcZXSsM&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
32. Strömbäck, J. (2005). In search of a standard: Four models of democracy and their normative implications for journalism. *Journalism Studies*, 6(3), 331–345. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700500131950>
33. Tullock, G. (1959). Problems of Majority Voting. *Chicago Journals*, 67(6), 571–579.
34. UN. (2020). *155 million faced acute food insecurity in 2020, conflict the key driver* | | UN News. <https://news.un.org/en/story/2021/05/1091302>
35. Varshney, A. (2005). Democracy and Poverty. In D. Narayan (Ed.), *Measuring empowerment: cross-disciplinary perspectives* (pp. 383–401). The World Bank.
36.]Weinberger, C. W. (1975). Social Goals and Individual Freedom Congress. *Presidential Studies Quarterly Published by Wiley on Behalf of the Center for the Study of the Presidency and Congress*, 5(4), 19–23.

