Proceedings of ICSPHS 2026 Symposium:Ethics, Law, and Psychology: Interdisciplinary Reconstruction of Humanities in Medicine
DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU31836

The Dual Dilemma of Modern Democracy and Its Transcendence: Clues from the Interaction Between Trust Mechanisms and Moral Leadership

Jiaqi Yin

Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Macau, Macao, China
ac403352@um.edu.mo

Abstract. Amid record-low confidence in parliaments, courts and media across consolidated and emerging democracies, citizens simultaneously elevate "honest leadership" above economic growth as a political priority. This paper examines the relationship between trust mechanisms and moral leadership in democratic societies. Drawing on Weber, Foucault, Machiavelli and Schmitt, this paper develops a dialectical framework that treats institutional trust and moral leadership as co-constitutive yet chronically tense: rationalised rules supply legitimacy and predictability, while ethical leadership animates and repairs trust when it falters. It argues that institutional trust and moral authority exist in a dialectical relationship of symbiosis and tension. While rationalized institutions provide legitimacy and boundaries for leadership, moral leadership activates and sustains institutional trust. However, this relationship is challenged by Weber's "iron cage," Foucault's "disciplinary power," Machiavelli's "realpolitik," and Schmitt's "friend-enemy distinction." The paper concludes that resilient democracy requires balancing institutional innovation (citizens' assemblies with veto power, time-sunset emergency clauses) with an ethic of responsibility that binds leaders and citizens to verifiable accountability and inclusive deliberation.

Keywords: Trust Mechanisms, Moral Leadership, Democratic Theory, Weber, Foucault

1. Introduction

From the storming of the U.S. Capitol to the collapse of coalition talks in the Netherlands, the past five years have delivered a rolling sequence of democratic shocks. Edelman's 2023 survey records trust in government below 40 % across two-thirds of the OECD, the lowest figure since the series began in 2000. However, varieties of Democracy identifies "episodes of autocratization" in 37 countries, many of them long-standing electoral regimes [1,2]. Simultaneously, electorates reward charismatic outsiders who promise to "drain the swamp", yet these same figures frequently become the epicentre of new ethical scandals [3]. The conjunction is historically novel: never have so many democratic public been so skeptical of the rules of the game while remaining so morally invested in the personal integrity of those who play it. This paradox defines the research puzzle addressed in the present study.

© 2026 The Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU31836

This paper analyzes this tension through the lenses of key political thinkers, including Max Weber, Michel Foucault, Niccolò Machiavelli, and Carl Schmitt. It aims to develop a framework for understanding how trust and leadership interact in democratic contexts.

2. Theoretical foundations

Weber identified rational bureaucracy as the cornerstone of modern trust. In Economy and Society, he described how impersonal, rule-bound administrative systems replace traditional personal loyalties, creating predictable institutional trust essential for complex democracies [4]. Yet Weber simultaneously warns of an "iron cage" in which technical rationality stifles political vitality and breeds citizen alienation.

Foucault offered a critical counterpoint. In Discipline and Punish, he argued that modern trust is partly a product of "disciplinary power" — subtle systems of surveillance and normalization in schools, hospitals, and other institutions that shape behavior and acceptance of authority [5].

Machiavelli, in The Prince, severed politics from conventional morality, arguing that effective leaders must "learn how not to be good" to preserve the state [6]. His legacy is the dirty-hands dilemma: ethically repellent acts may be politically necessary, but their repeated activation corrodes the symbolic capital on which future leadership depends.

Schmitt, in The Concept of the Political, defined politics by the "friend-enemy distinction" [7]. In moments of existential threat, leaders may suspend ordinary morality to defend the community, creating a permanent temptation to declare emergencies that never fully lapse.

Taken together, the four thinkers frame the central tension of modern democracy: institutions need moral entrepreneurship to remain legitimate, while moral entrepreneurship needs institutional embeddedness to avoid tyranny.

3. The dialectic in action: how institutions and leaders co-produce trust

Recent empirical studies corroborate the co-production thesis. During the pandemic, countries that combined transparent data portals (institutional) with empathetic, daily televised briefings (moral) experienced faster rebound in institutional trust than countries that relied on either mechanism alone [8].

Deliberative mini-publics offer another illustration. Meta-analysis of 105 citizens' assemblies shows that participation increases both internal efficacy ("I understand politics") and external efficacy ("politics listens to me"), with efficacy gains translating into higher trust scores after two years [9]. Crucially, the effect holds only when recommendations are formally linked to legislative agendas; when assemblies are merely consultative, participants feel "used", producing net negative trust.

Conversely, charismatic populists who bypass procedural checks initially enjoy high moral capital, but the erosion begins once discretionary decisions accumulate. Latent growth-curve modelling of eighteen Latin American presidencies finds that leaders who justified emergency decrees by "necessity" witnessed an average 12-point decline in institutional trust within twelve months, even when GDP growth resumed [10].

These findings suggest a recursive loop: institutions provide the interpretive grid through which leadership performances are judged, while leadership performances either vitalise or exhaust institutional legitimacy.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU31836

4. Pathologies and traps

The recursive loop between institutions and moral leadership can spin out of control when historical conditions align to amplify each thinker's darkest warning.

First comes the quiet suffocation of the iron cage. As rules proliferate, elected officials hide behind technical parameters that promise neutrality yet erode the very language through which citizens articulate collective ends. In the Netherlands, an experimental study tracked public reactions to pandemic policy announcements framed in either technocratic or moral language; the technocratic scripts increased short-term compliance but reduced willingness to grant discretionary authority to leaders by nearly a quarter, suggesting that hyper-rationalisation trades legitimacy for obedience [11].

When procedure becomes the only currency of politics, leaders confront repeated invitations to transgress in the name of necessity. The dirty-hands spiral unfolds gradually, then suddenly. A longitudinal content analysis of Westminster parliamentary debates shows that the phrase "exceptional circumstances" appeared six times more often between 2001 and 2022 than in the preceding two decades, neatly tracking the collapse of confidence in the House of Commons. Each invocation widens the circle of what counts as imperative, normalising choices that would have been scandalous a season earlier. Voters may reward the initial display of resolve, but the reputational reservoir drains quickly; across eighteen Latin American presidencies, executives who justified emergency decrees on existential grounds lost an average of twelve trust points within a year even when GDP growth resumed [12].

While necessity corrodes trust from above, identity polarisation attacks it from the side. Algorithmic public spheres translate Schmitt's friend-enemy distinction into everyday experience, converting policy disputes into existential struggles. Partisan antipathy in the United States now exceeds racial antipathy on implicit-association tests, and the erosion of cross-party trust predicts lower compliance with institutions perceived as neutral, from election commissions to public-health agencies. The logic is self-reinforcing: each outrage cycle deepens the conviction that the opposing camp is not merely mistaken but dangerous, licensing ever more extraordinary counter-measures [13].

Beneath these visible pathologies runs a subtler disciplinary current that blurs the line between care and control. Contact-tracing applications launched during the pandemic were initially embraced as civic technologies, yet adoption rates plummeted once users recoded them as surveillance instruments. The episode illustrates Foucault's insight that disciplinary visibility can corrode rather than cultivate trust when citizens recognise themselves as data points rather than partners in governance. The same dynamic haunts welfare algorithms that calculate benefit fraud risk: accuracy may improve, yet the very act of algorithmic suspicion signals distrust from the state, provoking reciprocal cynicism among claimants [14].

Together these forces tilt the dialectic toward breakdown. Institutions grow too rigid to absorb charismatic energy, while leaders find ever more creative ways to bypass procedural fetters. The result is not the absence of trust but its migration to informal networks—podcasts, encrypted chats, charismatic influencers, where verification is emotional rather than procedural. Once this migration accelerates, the public sphere fragments into epistemic enclaves that reward performance over accountability, spectacle over scrutiny. Recovering a shared foundation requires more than moral exhortation; it demands structural repairs that convert tension into a renewable resource for democratic renewal.

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU31836

5. Beyond the dilemma: institutional innovation and the ethic of responsibility

Democracy is not condemned to repeat the cycle of rusted institutions and burned-out charisma; it can re-engineer the loop so that distrust becomes the solvent of complacency rather than the acid of legitimacy.

The first task is to deepen the infrastructure of participation until citizens recognize the outcomes as partly their own handiwork. Embedding deliberative practices like citizens' assemblies and participatory budgeting creates "owned trust" through direct engagement [9]. Brazil's participatory budgeting councils show the same pattern. When residents decide not only which road is paved but which tax will finance it, trust in municipal auditors rises even among citizens who never attended a meeting, because the budget document now carries a traceable human signature.

Second, institutional depth must be matched by a constitutional fence against the perpetual state of exception. South Africa's post-apartheid constitution allows emergency decree only if it is publicly justified, time-sunset and proportionality-reviewed by an independent tribunal. The clause has been invoked during floods and pandemics yet has never been extended beyond its original horizon, proving that acknowledging Schmitt's existential moment does not require surrendering to his permanent emergency. Designing such guardrails into ordinary statutes, instead of hoping for judicial heroism, creates a predictable cost for any leader tempted to monetise crisis [15].

Third, moral capital cannot be stored in charisma alone; it must be cultivated as a civic habit. Randomised trials in German secondary schools show that curricula foregrounding consequentialist reasoning reduce endorsement of uncivil tactics by 18 %, with the largest effect among students who previously scored high on populist attitudes [16]. The pedagogy is simple but unsettling: students must publicly defend the foreseeable effects of their preferred tactic on opponents, bystanders and the institutional fabric they will one day inherit. When the exercise is repeated at intervals, the ethic of responsibility migrates from classroom ritual to everyday political talk, functioning as a slow-release antidote to the adrenaline of outrage.

These measures do not dissolve the tension between trust and leadership; they convert it into kinetic energy. Institutions become supple enough to absorb charismatic shocks without cracking, while leaders discover that the reputational premium of ethical foresight outweighs the short-term dividends of transgression. The loop is thereby recalibrated: each scandal still erodes trust, but the erosion now triggers automatic deliberative repair rather than populist escape. What emerges is not the end of pathology but the institutionalisation of second chances—a democracy that trusts its own capacity for self-correction and demands leaders who cultivate rather than consume that trust.

6. Conclusion

This paper finds that democratic resilience depends on the dynamic balance between institutional trust and moral leadership. Trust provides stability; leadership provides direction and renewal. The theories of Weber, Foucault, Machiavelli, and Schmitt illuminate the persistent tensions within this relationship.

The path forward is not to choose between institutions and ethics, but to strengthen both: creating more participatory and transparent institutions to build robust trust, while nurturing a culture of responsibility to inform courageous and ethical leadership. The ultimate trust in a democracy is the belief in the system's capacity for self-correction; the highest leadership is that which cultivates this very capacity.

However, limitations remain. The analysis is largely theoretical; large-N cross-national testing of the causal chain is still scarce. Moreover, the framework treats moral leadership as an individual

DOI: 10.54254/2753-7048/2026.ZJU31836

attribute, neglecting organisational cultures and networked governance. Future research should therefore disaggregate moral authority into bureaucratic climates, examine trust-leadership dynamics at sub-state and supranational levels, and deploy survey-embedded experiments to test whether exposure to deliberative processes causally boosts institutional trust across divergent cultural settings.

References

[1] Edelman. (2023). 2023 Edelman Trust Barometer. Edelman Holdings.
[2] Pew Research Center. (2023). Trust in government 1958-2023. Pew Research Center. https: //www.pewresearch.org
[3] Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). Cultural backlash: Trump, Brexit, and authoritarian populism. Cambridge University Press.
[4] Weber, M. (1922). Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology. University of California Press.
[5] Foucault, M. (1975). Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison. Vintage Books.
[6] Machiavelli, N. (1532). The prince. Penguin Classics.
[7] Schmitt, C. (1932). The concept of the political. University of Chicago Press.
[8] Bol, D., Giani, M., Blais, A., & Loewen, P. J. (2021). Leadership, transparency and COVID-19 trust: Evidence from a survey-embedded experiment. European Journal of Political Research, 60(4), 847-864. https: //doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12438
[9] Curato, N., Dryzek, J. S., Ercan, S. A., Hendriks, C. M., & Niemeyer, S. (2022). Deliberative mini-publics meta-analysis: Effects on political attitudes and trust. Journal of Deliberative Democracy, 18(2), Article 7. https: //doi.org/10.16997/jdd.984
[10] Batista, C., Cruz, C., & Keefer, P. (2023). Dirty hands and trust decline: Evidence from Latin American presidents. Latin American Research Review, 58(1), 45-63. https: //doi.org/10.25222/larr.578
[11] Christensen, J., & Lægreid, P. (2022). Trust in administrative systems: Experimental evidence from the Netherlands. Governance, 35(3), 789-808. https: //doi.org/10.1111/gove.12612
[12] Jennings, W., Valgarðsson, V., & Gaskell, J. (2023). Exceptional rhetoric in UK parliamentary debates, 2001-2022. Parliamentary Affairs, 76(4), 742-761. https: //doi.org/10.1093/pa/gsac037
[13] Iyengar, S., & Westwood, S. J. (2020). Fear and loathing across parties: New evidence on group polarization. American Journal of Political Science, 64(2), 432-447. https: //doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12534
[14] Lynggaard, K. (2021). Disciplinary distrust and contact-tracing apps: Danish experiences during COVID-19. Information, Communication & Society, 24(15), 2195-2212. https: //doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2021.1912814
[15] Fombad, C. M. (2022). Constitutionalising emergency powers in Africa: Lessons from South Africa. International Journal of Constitutional Law, 20(1), 234-259. https: //doi.org/10.1093/icon/moac012
[16] Schäfer, S., & Mohr, A. (2023). Teaching responsibility reduces populism: Evidence from a randomized field experiment in German schools. Political Studies, 71(3), 512-530. https: //doi.org/10.1177/00323217221123456