

CHAPTER - II

DEMOCRACY IN INDIA

1. Introduction

2. Nehru's Concept of Democracy

2.1. Nature of Indian Democracy

2.2. Challenges to Indian Democracy in Plural Society

2.3. Democracy in India: - A Concept of

Multicultural Democratic Trends

3. Conclusion

Notes and References

1. Introduction

Nehruvian state is seen in terms of establishment of a viable structure of a relatively autonomous and democratic nation state at the core of the society. The constitution of India seeks to lay the foundations of a democratic republic embodying the ideals of constitutionalism as they have evolved in the western political traditions. It declares the ideals of secularism, of social justice, of political equality and embodies an impressive list of fundamental rights. State assumed responsibility to direct economic development, established a constitutional regime, and accumulated wide range of powers. It abolished untouchability, established places of higher education and tried to modernize the society. Indian state focused on the welfare role¹ of the state to ensure social, cultural, political and economic justice to its citizen to strengthen democracy. Democracy² may be described as a system of government under which the people exercises the governing power, either directly or indirectly through representatives of the people periodically elected. According to Sumit Sarkar³ democracy in India owes its beginning not to the 'democratic sense', of the English man, or of the English educated Indian but for the stern necessity, as the Indian Council Act of 1861⁴ which for the first time recognized the rights of the Indian people to representation in their legislative bodies. The Morley-Minto Reforms of 1909 increased the size of all the Legislative Councils, gave legal recognition to the elective principle, provided for non-official majorities and extended the powers of the councils by giving them power to move and vote on resolutions on all matters of general public importance including the budget. The act of 1919 introduced several 'democratic' features in the constitution like criticizing governmental activities and remodeling of public administrative system. The Act of 1935 was the last important milestone in the progress of democracy in India. It transferred all department of provincial government to administration by responsible ministers; proposed to introduce diarchy at the center which meant that subject to the special responsibilities of the Governor-General, ministers would be in charge of administration of all subjects.

The concept of democracy and democratic institutions were by no means alien to India. Republican forms of government, presence of elected representatives of people in local self institutions existed in many parts of ancient India. Democratic thinking and practices permeated in different aspects of the life of the people of India right from the Vedic age⁵. It may say that much later after the decline of the Vedic age, the Greek city-state or Greek democracy came into existence. The ancient rulers observed the symbolic

representation of the cosmic 'yajna' (sacrifice) among different classes in order to develop mutual dependence, co-operation and harmony among each other. Thus Yajna symbolizes the process through which the diversity is transformed into unity without sacrificing the distinctiveness of different categories of men. The social order in India was inspired by the idea of Vedic 'Yajna', that sustained 'unity in diversity', on the basis of sharing a common culture grounded in 'Samanachittata'⁶, (like-mindedness) and promoted the value of interdependence, co-operation and harmony. The early Indian political scholar like Kautilya had excellently portrayed the political attitude of ancient India in his work 'Arthashastra'. The social order based on Varna system provided the functional basis to the political decision making which had to observe the principles of dharma. Manusmriti, Buddhist and Pali literature and Jain treatises confirm the picture of widespread republicanism. The concept of the Gramsabha and welfare state was prevalent in Shanti parva of Mahabharat and in Bhagawat Gita⁷. Even in Kautilya's Arthashastra it is mentioned regarding the concept of welfare state, that king ought to derive his happiness from the happiness of the people, their own wellbeing from their contributions to the wellbeing of the people. Kautilya laid down the rules of administration for merchants, oppressed people, peasants and artisans and every individual of the society. The whole idea of democratic state in Vedic era was that king would work for the good of all without making any distinctions. Kohli argues⁸ that a close studies of ancient Indian texts is required to understand the roots of democracy in India. Gandhi, the father of the nation developed his ideology and concepts of democracy on Indian tradition by recognizing the spiritual energies generated through empowerment of the people⁹ (by creating self-sufficient village unit) as the main force behind human activity. Similarly in Aurobindo's concept of spiritualism¹⁰ a clear picture of ancient Indian ideology is predictable. The aim of life is the pursuit of perfection at all levels and it can be achieved through the path of dharma and every individual should achieve 'svabhava' and a svadharma of its own through which he would be able to adjust with society. Later on Swami Vivekananda, Rabindranath Tagore, Aurobindo Ghosh developed their concepts of democracy based on Indian tradition.

In the late eighteenth century, Benjamin Franklin announced democracy as the rising of a new sun. As a governing power, democracy¹¹ has overthrown the feudal system and vanquished mighty kings. Tocqueville in 1835 defined democracy as a governing power in the world's affairs, a power which he recognized as a universal and irresistible force. Territorially, the democratic idea appeared some two and a half millennium ago on the soils

of Athens, disappeared for a while to reappear again in Western Europe some three hundred years ago. Democracy¹² indicates a particular political regime and Tocqueville defines it as a notion of equality. Greek society¹³ came to signify as a democratic city-state, a community of equal men that is demos (people) and kratos (rule) absorbed in larger political units and enjoining the power of ruling or participating in political activity of the city-states. Athenian¹⁴ (Greek) democracy was direct participation of people but gradually the notion of democracy has changed from direct to representative, a shift from religion oriented to secular mode of governance. Later on, the western scholars like Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Bentham; Mill have reshaped the notion of democracy.

2. Nehru's Concept of Democracy

To Nehru¹⁵, democracy does not merely mean periodical exercise of franchise rather it determines the relationship between the citizens and the state and among citizens themselves. According to him, democracy was an extension of the democratic principle to the economic domain. Nehru stood for progress, for modernization and for the onward march of India towards a just and egalitarian order¹⁶. To ensure political equality, Nehru argued that it was obvious to achieve economic prosperity, and people should have equality of opportunity and they should be able to go as they can go. Nehruvian democracy opt the model of unique democratic traits which is distinct from other South Asian countries. The Asian countries have to work in the background of poverty and illiteracy, of multi-racial societies and of communities following many religions. But there are several problems¹⁷ to work democracy successfully in Asian context.

Firstly, masses of people in these countries are illiterate and ignorant. Thus people are attracted to the personalities and to the regional and linguistic groups and fractions and not so much loyal to the political parties.

Secondly, leaders mostly become self-seeking, satisfying their own personal ambitions and retaining power rather than helping the common people.

Thirdly, Masses are gradually alienated from the government mainly because of concentration of power at higher levels.

Fourthly in all Asian countries, corruption in administration has been so rampant that it has almost corroded the body politic of most of the Asian countries.

Fifthly, politics is the art of getting money from the rich and votes from the poor, on the pretext of protecting the one from the other. The democratic institutions in other South Asian countries¹⁸ like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Bhutan and Srilanka lost the true spirit of democratic ideals. Due to population explosion in these countries, they adopt new decentralized policies like privatization which lead to the erosion of traditional forms of sovereign political control by the nation-state and the trans-nationalization of economic activity result in the political centrality of the state.

Nehru opt a distinct model of democracy by combining the western liberal tradition of democratic ideals with ancient Indian philosophical ideals which is unique from rest of South Asian countries. Nehru's ideas of democracy¹⁹ were a combination of the ideas of Locke, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Bentham and Mill. Montesquieu's *Espirit des Lois*, Rousseau's *De Contract Social* (man is born free, but everywhere in chains), Mill's *On Liberty* all of which apparently made a considerable impression on his mind. The idea of Nehru's²⁰ democracy was very closely related to the goal of self-rule in India. Democracy meant freedom from foreign rule and the establishment of a truly representative government. Nehru defined democracy²¹ as a means to attain national unity, industrialization, parliamentary democracy, socialism and secularism. Nehru was much influenced by John Locke's concept of natural law which may be identified with morality. The formation of representative government according to the will of the people is the true essence of governance in democratic way where the members of the society could create restraints on the ruler in respect of their personal liberties and rights. Rousseau subscribed to the notion of active and involved citizenry who must meet in assembly to make laws by which their lives could be regulated. Thus for Rousseau, the exercise of power by citizens is the only legitimate way in which liberty can be sustained and safeguarded. Citizens both create and are bound by "the supreme direction of the general will", the publicly generated conception of the common good. Athenian democracy showed the basic feature of direct democracy where power was constantly passing in the hands of leading citizens like Solon and Pericles. Nehru was influenced by the concept of formation of civil society and political community with active participation of citizens in democratic process. Later on Montesquieu through his separation of power tried to modify the concept of democratic governance to ensure social, political and economic equality for people. Bentham regarded laws as the commands of the sovereign power imposing patterns of behavior and not as

rules of ethics or morality. Mill simultaneously described democracy as the 'greatest good of the greatest number'.

Like socialism, secularism too is an indispensable ingredient of Nehru's concept of democracy. According to Nehru 'secularism' did not mean opposition to or rejection of religion. It rather meant separation of religion and politics on grounds of rationality and social harmony. For a multi-religious society like India, secularism provided a valid and viable framework for national integration, since he believed that like land and resources, people and their ideas and interests are the true ingredients of democracy.

1. Nehru Defined Democracy as Individual Freedom

The democratic state is one in which there is a freedom for the realization of human values and the creative development of the individual. The purpose of a democratic society is 'to provide the individual' with the conditions of creative development. According to Nehru the modern democratic state ²²still represent a structure of society in which freedom is cherished in which human values can best be realized. In 1946, Nehru moved the objective resolution in which the Constituent Assembly declared its intension of drawing up a constitution guaranteeing and securing to all the people of India freedom of thought, expression, belief, faith, worship, vocation, association and action. Independent India had chosen democracy and individual freedom because it offered the highest dividends to all its citizens.

2. Nehru Defined Democracy as a Representative Form of Government

Nehru declared that the proper democratic way to deal with the representative institution²³ is through popular sovereignty through elected representative, majority rule and responsible political parties and leaders. Nehru demanded for a constituent assembly elected by means of an adult franchise so as to secure true mass representation. Nehru admitted that political equality was the very basis on which India build up other equalities and if the individual lacked political equality than other rights could not be secured. Democracy thus came to mean the right of the majority.

3. Nehru Defined Democracy as an Instrument of Political Leadership

According to Nehru modern democracy²⁴ encouraged the political leaders to function in a disciplined way because representative government requires responsible political leaders.

The problem of leadership in a democratic state is a complex one. Leaders frequently turned disloyal towards respective political party and became dishonest as a true representative of people. Nehru concluded that there was no clear answer to the problem of leadership in a democracy but it could be solved through election and choosing suitable political leader. Nehru has defined democracy in terms of certain governmental institutions and principles like popular sovereignty through representative's elections by adult franchise, majority rules, responsible political parties and leadership. In Nehru's thought the democratic state would cease to exist if these vital elements were destroyed. Democracy means equality and democracy can only flourish in an equal society where the political structure was supposedly built upon the principles of equality (one vote for every man). Hence democracy ensures economic advancement, social equality, political freedom and justice for all citizens.

4. Nehru Viewed Democracy as a Measure to Attain Social Self Discipline

The hallmark of democracy is defined as social self discipline²⁵ which meant tolerance and peaceful methods. A tolerance does not mean giving up one's opinion or surrendering to another's judgment for criticism and even opposition are also 'of the essence of democracy'. Tolerance means the willingness to recognize the existence of differing points of view, and to allow the strongest view to prevail according to established procedures.

Writing in nineteenth century Nehru gave a socialistic interpretation of democracy as a way of peaceful methods. He pleaded to establish a classless society to resolve these conflicts other than that of applying force and coercion. Since independence the occasional outbreaks of violence have driven Nehru to emphasize the importance of peaceful methods in democracy. Nehru stressed on social self discipline of the community, the duties of the individual and the group. Hence he said that the people had every right to change laws and governments in a democratic manner. If the people leave off peaceful methods then progress of the community will not be achieved.

2.1 Nature of Indian Democracy

a) Bourgeois Nature of Indian Democracy

Scholars like Asutosh Varshney, Sumit Sarkar, Rajni Kothari, Partha Chatterjee, D.L.Sheth opine that India that has been described as the world's largest democracy may be characterized as bourgeois and authoritarian in character. The constitution was framed with

an egalitarian objectives and the Congress under Nehru had adopted a socialistic pattern of society as the vision of the Indian polity to ensure equality and justice for all. From 1991 onwards economic reforms, the policies of liberalisation²⁶ and globalization have explicitly undertaken by the government to bring development of the country. This gave rise to various political conflicts in the society. The rival elites, especially the regional elites who acquire economic power demand a greater share of political power and resources vis-a-vis the central government.

1. Scholars like Rajini Kothari, D.L Sheth and Partha Chatterjee opined that elite versus mass conflict in Indian democracy became a palpable picture. Lower castes were mobilized by the ruling elites (as portrait by Myron Weiner in few South Indian states) especially the poor lower caste and landless peasants who depended on landowning upper caste elites for their livelihood. This patronage and dependency constrained the political behavior of poor, illiterate Indian masses. This showed that Indian democracy has often had undemocratic roots. Low level of political mobilisation²⁷, (lower castes were not politically enough conscious of good governance) resulted in poor governance and gave rise to multiple political conflicts. Indian democratic trend thus included both the national and regional bourgeois and elites with legitimate authority within the governing institutions along with the incorporation of the India's un-conscious masses. Rajni Kothari opined that the bourgeois has become stronger and increasingly become a part of the capitalist process. They tend to capture vast market through advanced technology and information and produced huge goods for the consumers and the majority of the poor remained as the victim of capitalism. The anti-poverty measures since the regime of Mrs. Gandhi (1966) have failed to reduce poverty significantly in spite of several measures taken by the government. The number of poor continues to grow in spite of the allocation of governmental funds for health, education and social welfare, unemployment continues to rise high. Congress government had to depend on these elite classes for funds and secured their interest for economic growth and industrialization and gradually they were incorporated into the political process.

Gradually new elites entered the political arena, challenged the power of government²⁸. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, land reforms in the countryside particularly in areas where formerly the zamindari system was replaced created a space for the emergence of a new class of rich farmers who acquired wealth and political influence locally and gained political power. Green Revolution for example is a case where we find

that policies and political decision are now wished to taken by the newly rich political clout, and the state has favored these urban upper classes. Agricultural sector also gained prominence with the absence of any agricultural tax. Powerful farmer's lobbies formed by the mid 1960s tend to dominate the political process. In North Indian states during 1950s rich farmer's group left the Congress and formed their own political party and acted as a strong lobby in politics and in the absence of a single dominant party these groups became strong and influenced the working of government. For Partha Chatterjee most Indian states is diversified between the dominant and subaltern classes in Indian democracy.

2. The Marxist acknowledged the pre-dominance of capitalist relations and the continuing presence of semi-feudal elements in many parts of the country. If we look at the ground situation during the 1980s and 1990s, it shows a co-existence of persisting feudal relations in the form of bonded labor and caste-related production relations with a rising phenomenon of the emergence of modern capitalist farmers²⁹. This is evident in the behavior of the state organs and the political organizations. At the same time, despite the widespread feudal and semi-feudal relations, clearly the modern capitalist elements have become more and more powerful in the political process. The liberalization process has brought new sources of capital to them. They have established linkages with the world market. Conversely, if the world market puts them at a disadvantage, then they pressurized the state to protect their interests. The conflict between the elites (rich farmers) and the low caste people become palpable. Through education the low caste people, the dalits become conscious about their exploitation and through finance corporations and banking facilities they too try to increase their economic status which brings serious conflicts with the elites where state failed to ensure the interest of the ordinary masses.

3. According to Rajni Kothari³⁰ gradually incorporating the bourgeois or elite class in the democratic governance constraints the space of democracy. According to him, corporatist interests, using the very resources that democracy had generated, tried to sabotage the democratic mandate and to serve their interests. In this sense, the state become instrumental in using the legitimacy provided by democracy to further the interests of big capital which is today largely integrated within global capital. The masses themselves the backbones of democracy were increasingly reduced to ascriptive identities serving the interests of the elites. Such construction of identities and their proliferation is partly promoted by the state itself. Ashis Nandy³¹ pointed out that modernity itself is inimical to democracy. The emergence of regional bourgeois in many parts of India combining local interests with

cultural assertion tried to maintain a duality of linkages with feudalism on the one side and with foreign capital on the other. It is forward looking because it seeks modern technology and external markets and backward looking because it seeks to maintain social constraints on production at the same time.

Kothari hence argued the base of Indian democracy today is much weaker and electoral democracy has been increasingly co-opted within the creeping structure of bourgeois dominance. Democracy by definition involved participation of citizens in diverse kinds of roles at various levels of the political system. Such participation required that considerations of equality be extended to all citizens. The citizen himself was expected to play a positive role and needed the basic information, skills and confidence to act as a conscious citizen. Citizens required a range of liberties and an assurance that the citizen-community has a right to contest all modes of authority. But in analyzing the nature of Indian democracy it primarily seems to be bourgeois in nature where the main political decisions are taken by the Tata, Birlas and big entrepreneurs³² and not by the representative of the people (that is the political leaders) where the decision has been over-imposed from the elites in the process of governance. This creates a gap in between the citizen and the government that hampers democratic governance.

4. The Indian state, like any modern state, exercised relative autonomy and freedom vis-à-vis the capitalist forces³³. In 1990s as a new partnership between the state and the capital got cemented, the state willingly handed its developmental and economic functions to the capitalist class both to the Indian and foreign. The state now played a role of mere night watchman concentrating their power to maintain the security, law and order of the state and entrusted the welfare role of the state to the capitalist class. The state faced challenges caused by the agrarian movements, ethnic movements, autonomy movements and occasionally workers movements which were to be handled by the new techno-managerial capitalist state. According to D.L.Sheth³⁴ democratic decision making both economic and politics that is democratic decision making and accountability depends on the hegemonic power of the world capitalist system. IMF, World Bank and MNCs influences most of the decisions of the government which shows that liberal democracy is now a part of the larger agenda of global homogenization.

Partha Chatterjee argued that the civil society in India is understood as the institution of modern associational life³⁵ originating in western societies which are based on equality,

autonomy, freedom of entry and exit, contract, deliberative procedures of decision making, and recognized the rights and duties of members. The large masses had little access to the domain of civil society and the state identified them not as citizens but as ordinary masses hence according to Chatterjee the limited presence of civil-society in India increased the hegemony of the bourgeois. The dominance of these elites in the society³⁶ is in a way a challenge to liberal democracy and this dominance made the masses alienated from government. Both Hobbes and Locke had emphasized the individual's right to resist even though these rights were conceptualized as rights of the bourgeois or propertied class in a framework of possessive individualism. For Rousseau, the general will was not necessarily the majority's will. True democracy is the realization of the self determination of people based on the principle of equality, freedom, reason and justice. The utilitarian argument of the greatest good of the greatest number has to be understood in terms of diverse values of good. The radical perspective on liberal democracy points out the necessary class character of bourgeoisie democracy which leads to the degeneration of liberal democracy and marginalization of social groups and result in majoritarian rule.

b) The Authoritarian Nature of Indian Democracy

Scholars like Ashis Nandy, Sudipto Kaviraj and Partha Chatterjee analyzed the autonomy of political processes in Indian democracy. Kaviraj argued that a gradual process of democratic change mainly directed through constitutional mechanisms has shaped the base of democracy in India. Formal institutions like legislatures, executive, the judiciary, the bureaucracy and the federal system influenced democratic governance in their own way. The informal institutions include most importantly the political parties, movements, fractions, patronage networks and the political activists which sometimes disrupt the democratic process making the state authoritarian in nature. Sudipto Kaviraj³⁷ also felt that the democratic process is getting detached from its institutional constraints and becoming autonomous. The growing differentiation with regard to the relation between the centre and region in India overtime has changed. While there are regions such as Gujarat which tend to identify with the central government, there are other regions such as Tamil Nadu which has strongly tilted towards assertion of regional belonging. At the same time there are institutional weaknesses of democracy. Though our constitution designed a federal structure of governance, but it is observed that (article 2, 3, 4), our constitution offers extensive formal powers to the national parliament to recognize the states (enable parliament by law to admit a new state increase, diminish the area of any state or alter the boundaries or name

of the state). Mrs. Gandhi's rule reversed some of the fundamental principles of Indian democracy. She began to ignore institutional conventions in appointment of Supreme Court judges and conduct of cabinet affairs and turned democracy into an authoritarian regime. During emergency (1975-79), she exercised her tremendous control to avert threats to the entire institutional system and to prevent the territorial integrity of the country. Emergency provisions were meant to avert threats to the state, not to the individual but no doubt emergency violated the spirit of the constitution. Fundamental rights were suspended and any person who opposed the government was either detained or arrested without the right to appeal to courts. Article 352 of the Indian constitution gave extra ordinary powers to Mrs. Gandhi which she misused. Severe censorship was imposed on local and national media. People were detained and arrested under MISA and Defense of India Rules across the country.

Atul Kohli³⁸ mainly focused on two proximate variables – the level of institutionalization of the central state and the degree to which the ruling strategy of leaders accommodates their demands. Democracy is a system, norms and procedures and set of institutions which depends on one hand on the actors, functionaries and officials who run these and on the other the people who are termed as governed. First we will mention that decline of one party dominance led to the development of regional parties which started rearticulating their demands on regional issues such as development. Gradually there occurs a huge difference between the party in power at the centre and in the region (state). This resulted in interlocked co-operation and conflict between the two. As a result a large number of big and small regional parties have become stakeholders in political power at the state, region or union level (through alliance with centre and regional parties in central ministry), though none of them can afford to push their conflicts beyond a particular threshold.

Secondly we will mention the level of state's institutionalization and its authoritarian nature of governance. The coercive dimension of the Indian state has been manifest in numerous ways. The Preventive Detention Act³⁹ in the 1950s and the Maintenance of Internal Security Act (MISA) in the 1970s, the National Security Act which replaced it in the 1980s, the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (TADA) of the 1980s, which was not repealed even in the face of a nationwide campaign, the Armed Forces Special Powers Act, which operates in the North-Eastern region and Jammu and Kashmir and the Disturbed Areas Act are some of the draconian laws which have curbed human

rights of citizens in vast areas of the country. The ways in which rebellious elements have been suppressed – be they the Naxalites of Andhra Pradesh and Bihar or the militants in the autonomy movements in Jammu and Kashmir and the North-East ranging from indiscriminate arrests and killings by security forces also bring out the coercive character of the Indian state. This has caused a trend of violence on the part of the security forces as well as the rebellious forces both committing serious violations of human rights of common people.

As Ashis Nandy clarified that the democratic institutions (legislature, executive and judiciary) and procedures (the vote, representation, political parties and leaders) had contrasting features. Ordinary people especially the illiterate, poor mass through the act of franchise believed that they celebrated their real power, but they were mostly mobilized by the local political leaders. But the conscious voters thought that the representatives they choose did not pay attention to or care about what the voters thought. Though people showed respect towards the system of representation, but they gradually faced the problem that the higher officials who run the administration that is the bureaucrats maintained a strict rigid character and failed to fulfill the public interests and demands. The bureaucratic structure is highly hierarchical and work in one dimensional way hampering the sentiment of the ordinary people. Thus ultimately most of the people tend to believe that the judiciary and the election commission too functioned in a commendable manner. Due to inadequacy in democratic governance, true participation of the people hampered. The mass faced the problem of ‘dissatisfaction and alienation from the leaders, parties and certain institutions’.

According to Partha Chatterjee, the formal institutional state structures reconstruct the structures of dominance. State proves itself to be highly authoritarian in nature in times of emergency. The objective of the emergency government should be none but the restoration of normal conditions, preservation of the constitutional democratic order, maintenance of the independence of the state and the defense of the political and social liberties of the people. Thus state concentrates more and more on security related issues, wars, internal disturbances and economic crisis and hence government made some curtailments of the rights⁴⁰ and liberties of the citizens. However the centralizing tendencies in the congress government during Mrs. Gandhi’s time led to regional resentment and the rise of regional parties in Indian politics. From 1960s, the regional parties successfully captured state power and the regional parties like Akali Dal, DMK, and AGP owned their political existence through regional issues and demanded political autonomy. The present Narendra Modi

government's discretionary act⁴¹ like demonetization, passing GST Bill (goods and service tax), and reducing rate of interest as a part of its economic policy all shows the government's own whimsical discretion which is authoritarian in nature. Government tried to clarify that GST would enable the centre to levy and collect taxes across the country and would provide compensation to the states for their loss of revenue. Government upholds their clarification that the steps like demonetization or its nod for cashless society or reducing the rate of interest would help the government to squeeze black money from overall India. These whimsical actions of the government brings hardship for marginal and middle income based workers who do not have access to account suffers a lot and it retards India's economic growth from 7.2% to 6.1% because of government's disruptive move to ban cash. As regards the judicial safeguards, the record of the Indian higher judiciary as compared with other countries has been dismal. As far as judicial review is concerned, the main objective is to protect the rights of the people and to ensure that these are not encroaching by the public administrators in any way. But it has some limitations that is courts of law cannot intervene in any matter on their own, someone will have to approach them and many administrative activities have been kept outside the domain of judiciary. Moreover the judiciary can by law prevented from promoting upon the validity of certain rules and regulations and it has no other alternative but to refrain from pronouncing its judgment, then the judiciary may on its own decide not to interfere in a particular area though it may legally be competent to do so. The courts have by and large expressed their inability to nullify detention orders made during the operation of a proclamation of emergency⁴² (article 356,352,360). During an emergency the government has an overwhelming majority in both houses. The authority of parliament becomes the authority of the government. That is why there is no need for a coalition government in India at any time during the emergency and the centre acts as sole authority concentrating all the powers in its hand.

Though there is a distribution of powers between the union and the state under a federal system, the distribution has a strong central bias⁴³. The residuary power of taxation belongs to the centre – it means that the subjects which have not been included either in the union or in the state list may be taxed only by the union government. The most productive sources of revenue in every federation are with the centre while the most expensive heads of expenditure are with the states. Hence to run the expenses, state has to depend on centre for financial assistance which the ruling party at the centre may use to serve its political ends.

To relieve this dependence article 275, and article 282 of the constitution provides for grant-in-aid to some states for the promotion and welfare of the tribal people, grant in natural calamities and for development. But the union shall have unlimited power of borrowing grant from outside the country for the security of India (article 292). Foreign aid comes directly to union government. The borrowing power of a state is however subject to constitutional provisions. The union government may offer a loan to a state and may impose terms and conditions against the loan and has to return the outstanding loan with interest for the further demand of loan (article 293). Duties and some taxes (income tax) are levied by the union, collected by state and later deposit it to centre (article 270,272). According to the recommendations of Finance Commission aid given to the state sometimes remains discretionary to the Parliament of India (article 282). Sometimes discretionary grants may be return to the centre if centre feels so necessary. Thus it may be inferred that the nature of democratic state is authoritarian with highly centralized central powers and dismal federal design which creates a gap in center-state relations, denying of civil and political rights of the individual in times of emergency and in the name of state security. The presence of highly centralized institutions and bureaucratic mechanism make the nature of democracy highly authoritarian in nature and on the other hand weak institutional channels led to the weakness of democracy.

The Supreme Court criticized NDA government for its lackadaisical attitude to the appointments of judges and accused the government of “trying to starve out the cause of justice by not appointing judges”⁴⁴. Supreme Court argues that the present government wants to lock down the judiciary by not appointing the judges in Karnataka, Punjab and in several states. Though Modi government says the Memorandum of Procedure (MOP) for judicial appointments was not ready the Supreme Court pressurized the government to activate the work of appointment in its own way by constituting a judge bench constituting of 5 judges to clarify the appointments of judges quickly. Government’s authoritative acts were restricted by Public Interest Litigation ⁴⁵ (PIL) act. This enabled the court to hear out public grievances and deliver justice on key social issues to large masses of people who were denied basic human rights. We have some instances of PIL revolutionary cases. In Sheela Barse vs state of Maharashtra (15th February, 1983), court dealt with the issue of custodial violence against women in prison and gave order to facilitate separate police lockups for women convicts in order to shield them from further trauma and brutality. In M.C.Mehta vs union of India (pollution in the Ganga, January 12th 1988) the judgment of

the court lashed out at civic authorities for allowing untreated sewage from Kanpur's tanneries making its way into the Ganges. It was the beginning of green litigation in India and resulted in stringent orders against Mathura refineries for polluting the ambient air around Taj Mahal (30th December, 1966). Now the prism of judiciary has extended to put a check on the whimsical attitude of the central government in order to uphold the essence of democratic spirit of our country.

National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog aims⁴⁶ to build strong states that will come together to build a strong India. NITI Aayog leads initiative to convert cent percent government-citizen transaction to the digital platform. NITI provides critical knowledge, innovation and entrepreneurial support to the country. To enable this NITI is trying to build an Art Resource Centre with citizens of all states as a repository of research on good governance and best practices. Radically redefining centre-state relations, NITI has for the first time ensured that all states should take the lead in protecting the policy interventions of the union government. To provide a platform for co-operative federalism, it facilitates the working of the union and states as equals. NITI ensures that people are involved and informed at all stages of governance. NITI waited for the state governments to adopt a number of reforms oriented legislative bills which aim at transforming India and to develop a healthy centre-state relation and to curb the authoritative nature of Indian state for better governance.

2.2 Challenges to Indian Democracy in Plural Society

For nearly four decade, democracy in India has appeared somewhat of an anomaly. India is a multinational agrarian society with a rigid hirerical social structure. Our national leaders offered democracy to the Indian masses as a means of incorporating them into the decision making process. Apart from all this India is still, of course, a functioning democracy⁴⁷, but interestingly it is not well governed. The evidence of eroding of political order is everywhere that is the personal rule has replaced party rule in all levels – national, state and district. Below the rulers, the entrenched civil and police service have been politicized. Various social groups have pressed new and ever more diversed political demands in demonstrations that often have led to violence. The purpose of this study is to describe in which ways Indian democracy is facing a challenge today. Rajni Kothari tries to provide answers to the puzzle of why the “world's largest democracy”, has become difficult to

govern because of its leadership role leading to institutional decline⁴⁸ resulting various challenges in democratic setup.

a) Caste and Challenges to Indian Democracy

For decades, Indian politics was ruled by the traditional elites. Pranab Bardhan called them the proprietary or the bourgeoisie class and the Indian National Congress (congress party) dominated the political life relied on the collaboration of the elite groups⁴⁹, who exerted strong control over land as well as over industrial and business activities. Thus the congress system worked with the social hierarchy in a protective way, since the local notables who supported the party could call upon their 'vote banks' at the time of elections.

The conservative brand of democracy was more in evidence in northern India but in the south and in the west leaders from the lower castes – Jotirao Phule, Bhimrao Ramji Ambedkar in Maharashtra, Periyar E.V.Ramaswami in Tamil Nadu initiated consciousness among the lower caste people which had exerted a strong political influence. Gradually the non-Brahmins dominant castes such as the Marathas in Maharashtra, the Lingayats and the Vokkaligas in Karnataka, and the Reddys and Kammas in Andhra Pradesh sprang up posing their demands and in most cases the congress party accommodated these upwardly mobile groups. Things started to change when the congress party lost power in 1977, where in the northern states lower caste (intermediate castes and other backward classes, that the OBCs) rose to power almost twenty percent in Indian politics. The rise of intermediate castes began with the jats who are still a dominant caste in Punjab, Haryana, Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan. Though they are not well educated but their socio-economic status is higher than that of most peasant groups. They began to invest in irrigation systems and fertilizers and came to a position to defend their own interest against the state. The most famous was the congress politician from western Uttar Pradesh, Charan Singh, who was minister in the state government but who was never given his due by the party's high command of the province because of his peasant background. He broke from the congress party in the 1967 elections, joined with other opposition parties and the political force created by Charan Singh was to play a major role in Uttar Pradesh politics for two decades. He mobilized the cultivators who were accustomed to voting for their landlord or any other notable upper caste and convinced them to vote for the members of Charan Singh's party. The rise of a new Kisan Constituency partly explains the rise of OBCs⁵⁰ and members of parliament (MPs) among the lower caste in 1977 as many kisans were from OBCs. The OBCs are not primarily

defined by class criteria as the kisans are but by castes. Soon after the constitution was promulgated, president Rajendra Prasad appointed a commission to identify the needs of other backward classes (they were all lower shudras) and they need positive discrimination programs.

The demand for positive-discrimination⁵¹ programs are more precisely for quotas in the bureaucracy became the rallying cry of the OBCs all over India. In Bihar where caste divides were dramatic, politicians were especially successful in mobilizing OBC voters. In 1977, the rise of the MPs from the intermediate castes motivated the OBCs who stemmed for the electoral success and it resulted in the formation of an anti-congress coalition where Charan Singh played a significant role. The aftermath of Charan Singh's regime, the caste politics were continued by V.P.Singh and in the long run the OBCs were no longer simply an administrative category, they had risen to a position to challenge and organizing themselves politically and started to concentrate their vote on parties representing their interests, for example – Samajwadi Janata Dal. In this context, the OBCs were joined by the scheduled castes who feared that the anti-reservationists campaign of the upper castes might affect their own quotas. The dalit-led Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) later made an alliance with Samajwadi Janata Dal in 1993. Thus we find in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan the OBC leaders turned up for example – Shivraj Singh Chauhan in Bhopal (by caste kirar), Nitish Kumar in Patna (by caste kurmi), Mulayam Singh Yadav (a caste of cow herders) with their political powers and tried to influence the governmental decision in politics.

Caste however, provides channels of communication and bases of leadership and organization, which enable those who still submerged in traditional society and culture. It motivated the lower castes to gain political literacy and increased their ability to participate in democratic politics. Caste has been able to perform this key role by developing a new form of political activity to form the caste association which became a central feature of Indian politics and hence we can say that the political literacy enabled them to take part in democratic politics. The caste association like the Kshatriya Mahasabha or the Jat Kisan Sabha is no longer a natural association rather they aimed at raising caste status to maximize their 'caste representation' to influence in state cabinets and governing bodies and to use ministerial, legislative and administrative channels to promote welfare in educational and economic realms. Thus we find that Bahujan Samaj Party came into prominence in 1993 under the leadership of Kanshi Ram. The party projects itself as an

organization of the scheduled castes or dalits. Its ideology is aggressively anti-upper caste based. Leaders like Mayawati publicly denounced Gandhiji as having led the scheduled castes or Harijans onto the wrong path. The party swears by Ambedkar⁵² and believes in the separate mobilization of the scheduled castes on caste lines. The DMK in Tamil Nadu under the leadership of E.V. Ramaswami Nalcker formed a caste association which criticized the dominance of the Brahmans in south India. The party launches Self-Respect Movement which aimed to uplift the Dravidians and aimed at removing the exploitation and control of the Brahmans at the social level. It touched the heart of the lower class. DMK later participated in elections of 1967 and came out as the ruling party. In 1987, the party suffered a split and ADMK under the leadership of Mrs. Jayalalitha in 1991 owned the election.

The aim of these caste based political parties is to acquire and demand more powers and autonomy from the state. Similarly the Reddies and Kammas of Andhra play an important role in the politics of their state. The Nair Service Society of Kerela played an important part in the politics of the state. A caste association combines in itself the modern and the traditional and represents the qualities of adopting itself to modern, social, economic and political changes. Caste based political parties seek social upliftment, economic development and effective participation in the political process. They provide channels of communication and base for the leadership and want to take part in active politics of the country. The caste groups posed a challenge to Indian state and democracy. As most of the leaders in the governance were all from upper caste in the long run the party leaders from the upper castes set out to broaden their policies by recruiting the members from the lower castes. Ram Monohar Lohia set out to mobilize the backward castes, while Charan Singh, a Jat (peasant proprietor), brought large numbers of members of the middle class and backward castes into his political party – for example the Bharatiya Kranti Dal (BKD). To hold power the congress leaders build a coalition with the middle and the lower caste leaders.

Caste politics⁵³ really is not a threat but it challenged the edifice of India's democracy. They fully want their identity to be accepted in the mainstream culture that is not as dalits but to achieve their rights as members of other castes (upper caste). They want their socio-economic development by organizing their own caste association or political party based on caste identity. The leaders of the caste groups also secured their position in mainstream politics by mobilizing huge masses belong to backward class and sometimes in

obtaining reservation status for the backward community. The struggle for equality is the basis of caste politics in Indian democracy; we really do not clarify it as a threat but definitely a challenge or a revolutionary challenge that shakes the very nature of Indian democracy. Today India has to incorporate the caste based political party in its domain of democratic setup and to reshape its ideology.

b) Language and Challenge to Indian Democracy

Language issue can give rise to the strongest expressions of cultural nationalism among its users. It is only in modern times as the members of the Indian constituent assembly discovered that the language or individual's 'mother tongue' is couched with unique set of emotional powers. However the same languages were spoken in older times, in a completely self-conscious and functional way. But in modern era languages suddenly created a consciousness⁵⁴ among the members of the community.

Of the one hundred and fourteen languages, eighteen are included in the eight schedule of the constitution and ninety six are non-scheduled. Thus the eighteen languages dominate the list and are the most widely spoken in the country. During the constituent assembly debates, except for English and Sanskrit, other major languages added in the list with the pressure of the Hindi speaking zone. Part xvii in the constitution (articles – 343-351) constitutes the provisions on the government's language policy. But the language question gave rise to the maximum amount of stress and strain for the members of the constituent assembly. The acceptance of Hindi as the national language was vociferously pushed by the hard core linguistic extremists from the Hindi belt that is from the states of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Rajasthan who constituted less than half the members in the Assembly. Finally, it was decided that Hindi would be the official, rather than national language. Hindi would also be used for inter-state communication. Hindi extremist proclaimed that in order to maintain one cultural tradition, they want one language and one script for the whole country. Linguistic groups played an important role as separatist groups in politics of the country. Protagonist of the language groups tried to promote the languages concerned in their states. These groups demanded an increasing use of the regional languages by the state in education and in official matters like employment. For example - the DMK advocates the cause of Tamil language and Tamil culture, the Akali Dal advocates the use of Punjabis in every sphere. The creation of the bilingual state⁵⁵ of Mumbai created great controversy in politics. Sampooran Maharashtra Samiti came into

existence and they agitated for the creation of unilingual states continued till the creation of the states of Maharashtra in 1960. Similar demands were put forward by other states like Gujarat, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. In the mid-sixties, when the issue of imposition of 'Hindi' as the national language was revived, riots broke out in Tamil Nadu and hence paved the path for the further growth of regional politics, following the fall of the Indian Congress party. The movement for the state of Telangana became strong, in 1969 and a group called the Telangana Praja Samiti under Dr. Chenna Reddy was formed. It took part in the Lok Sabha election of 1971 and state assembly elections of 1972 and tried to dominate Indian politics. Similarly the Gorkha League acts as a strong secessionist group in the politics of West Bengal to safeguard the interests of the Gorkha language and culture.

To solve these separatist tendencies, in Indian democracy the use of a regional language as the language of administration in a state and as the medium of instruction in schools is by now an established policy. Right now, there is a dual system of schooling in every state, creating a 'Bharat' versus Indian syndrome. Mother tongue instruction for children is an accepted principle everywhere. Under the constitutional language policy, some states are thus expected to be multi-lingual, because school children must learn Hindi and English, in addition to their mother tongue. In the Hindi speaking belt, they are really only expected to learn two languages, namely Hindi and English, even though Sanskrit may be tagged along in the curriculum as an appendage. Resistance to Hindi as official language involved not just the issue of its linguistic complexity⁵⁶ but on the other hand it raised the demand of recognition to other regional languages. The language controversy has taught us at least one lesson: we must learn to 'imagine' ourselves as a nation state that is forced into redefinition by the moral force of multiculturalism⁵⁷. Hence national identity is obtained through political stability of state's dominant cultural and linguistic groups.

c) Communalism and Challenge to Indian Democracy

After independence the leaders of the Indian National Congress, including Gandhi and Nehru argued that India's religious diversity could effectively be managed through the creation of a secular and democratic state. Hence Indian democracy tried to achieve an overarching Indian identity by accommodating all ethnic identities and safeguarding the interests of minorities, and ensured freedom of religion to all its citizens⁵⁸. Even as Indian political elites accepted ethnic plurality and worked to promote and strengthen such diversity, they agreed of a secular and federal polity. To secure the rights of the majority

and minority community India adopts secular principles. Indian secularism does not mean the strict separation between church and state but rather the recognition and promotion of all religious communities by the state. Hindu political parties such as the Jana Sang, the predecessor of the BJP, RSS, the VHP, the Shiv Sena, Akali Dal and the Bajrang Dal referred to communal issues such as the assignment to “special status” to Kashmir by India government. The Jana Sangh argued that the congress government was pandering to the Muslims and ignoring to the legitimate interests and grievances of the Hindus⁵⁹. When the era of complete congress dominance⁶⁰ of Indian politics had started to fade and the party began to face serious electoral competition from the Hindu nationalists and fundamentalists, Indira Gandhi, for example – to win state assembly elections in Kerala made electoral alliances with a number of political parties including the communal Indian Union Muslim League (IUML). Similarly Rajiv Gandhi continued this tradition of making concessions to “minority communities”⁶¹ in order to win support and votes. This was dramatically displayed during the Shah Bano affair in 1985. To Hindu nationalists, this act was a glaring appeasement of minorities by the congress for political purposes which once again exposed the party’s pseudo secular credentials.

Throughout the 1980s, as Muslim fundamentalist voices grew stronger and communal tensions simmered in the territory. Hindu nationalist parties such as the BJP gained popularity especially in the Hindi speaking states of central, northern and western India. The ideology that the Hindu political parties promoted was known as Hindutva – which may be broadly translated as “Hinduness”⁶² or even “Indianness”. Behind the notion of Hindutva lies a particular vision of the Hindu or Indian ‘nation’, and it is a matter of debate whether Muslims and other religious minorities have a place within it. But to Hindu organization such as the RSS (Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh), the VHP (Vishwa Hindu Parishad), and the BJP (Bharatiya Janata Party), Hindutva “embodies the notion that all Indians including Muslims – are part of a Hindu nation and that Ram and the gods and heroes of Hindu mythology are part of their patrimony”. As the 1990s unfolded, Indian national politics seemed to be entering an era of turmoil and weak central governance, the BJP and its allies choose to play the ‘religion’ card as a way of capturing political power by tapping into the “Hindu vote”. One of the most militant regional political organizations is the Shiv Sena⁶³ in Maharashtra. Founded in 1966 by Bal Thackeray, the Shiv Sena’s ideology is based on the concept of the ‘bhumi Putra’ (son of the soil) and ‘Hindutva’ (Hinduness). Taking advantage of the socio-economic grievances and frustrations of the

Hindu Maharashtrian community, the Shiv Sena rose to political prominence in Maharashtra under the banner of 'Maharashtra for Maharashtrians'. They started 'verbal and physical' attacks at South Indian immigrants and Muslims to create communal tension in the state.

Much earlier prior to partition, during 1919, the Singh Sabha Movement⁶⁴ and Central Sikh League was formed to safeguard the economic and political interests of the Sikhs and to promote a sense of self-consciousness and identity based politics among the Sikhs. The Akali Dal was formed in 1920 as a part of the Gurdwara Reform Movement and tried to protect the interests of the Sikhs, especially they seeks representation in the legislative bodies. It worked for the reservation of seats for the Sikhs in nominated bodies and they tried to inculcate a separate group consciousness among the Sikh community members. They demanded Sikh majority state and exploited the religious sentiment of the Sikhs. The Akali Dal⁶⁵ demanded separate and sovereign Sikh state of Khalistan and demand an environment in which national sentiments and aspirations of the Sikhs will be satisfied fully. Later on, it resulted in violent communal clash. Sant Jarnail Singh Bhindranwala along with his lieutenants took shelter in Golden Temple of Amritsar with their destructive weapons to fight against Indian state. But to prevent the situation, Bhindranwala was killed and the Golden Temple was cleared by the Indian government in an operation known as "Operation Blue Star". But after this Mrs. Gandhi was assassinated in 1984. .

Thus it may be inferred that after independence till now Indian democracy was severely threatened by the communal forces and communal based political parties. In 1992, the 'party cadres' belonging to the RSS, the VHP, the Shiv Sena and the Bajrang Dal completely destroyed the structure of the sixteenth century mosque (the Babri masjid) in the north Indian city of Ayodhya (Uttar Pradesh). The BJP and its allies claimed that the mosque had been constructed by the Mughal Emperor Babar after the destruction of a Hindu temple that had venerated the birth place of Lord Ram (an icon in Hindu mythology). The complete failure of the Indian government to prevent the situation sparked Hindu-Muslim riot and communal tension across the country. Muslim criminal gangs in Mumbai set off a series of bomb blasts in India's major commercial city in 1993. In retaliation, Hindu mobs are organized and carried out massacre of Muslims. The VHP periodically threatened to begin the construction of a Hindu temple on the site of the demolished Babri Mosque and set the date 2002 as a deadline for the construction of temple. This event was followed by the Godhra incidence where several compartments of the Sabarmati Express

were caught fire and attacked by the Muslim mob in Godhra dominated by the Muslim masses. The Godhra incident⁶⁶ sparked some of the worst anti-Muslim violence in Indian democracy. Similarly in the Hindu holy city of Varanasi, bombs were exploded which resulted in several deaths of innocent people.

Asutosh Varshney emphasized the role of civil society in the outbreak or absence of communal violence. Lack of civic engagement between members of two communities⁶⁷ resulted in such violent clash. Gramsci made a link between culture and political practice which in the long run created identity problems. Gramscian theory have played a major role in focusing attention on the dynamics of culture within the Indian context, later on specified by the political parties such as RSS, the VHP and the BJP in their ideology. According to the RSS ideology, it 'is to salute the saffron rather than the tri-color flag and to oppose the Indian constitution'. This shows that the hidden face of the culture is often political. The BJP's version of cultural nationalism attempted to explore the Brahmanical cult in nation-building that is they uphold socio-religious values, folk culture of the upper caste Hindus who are marginalized and devalued by the present secular government. Democracy they argued not alien to Hindu civilisation⁶⁸, rather they preferred monarchy prevailed in Vedic times as an ideal form of government. They insisted on the Atharvaveda where people choose their king. Thus the Hindu traditionalists were not hostile to democracy rather they want to preserve democracy rooted in Indian soil and culture. Every fundamentalist religious party tried to use culture in obtaining their rights and hence they challenge the existing democratic set up of the country.

d) Regionalism and Challenge to Indian Democracy

The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences defines a region as, "a homogenous area with physical and cultural characteristics distinct from those of neighboring areas. As a part of national domain, a region is sufficiently unified to have a consciousness of its customs and ideals and thus possesses a sense of identity distinct from rest of the country". Regionalism is defined as an emotional attachment to a particular region in preference to the whole country and in some cases, in preference to the constitutional unit of which the region is a part. Regionalism⁶⁹ is an ideology and political movement that seeks to advance the causes of regions. The regional political parties have turned out to be the most potential and threatening force challenging the institutions and practices of parliamentary democracy in contemporary India. Regionalism can be defined in two forms – one the demand for state

autonomy and formation of smaller states and the other secessions from the union government. Further the regional political parties usually confine its activities within the boundary of a state or region, sometimes show militant attitude towards the national politics or to the central government or engaged in unscrupulous political activities. Some of these regional political parties are the DMK and ADMK of Tamil Nadu, the Telugu Desham Party of Andhra Pradesh, the National Conference Party of Jammu and Kashmir, the Akali Dal of Punjab, the Trinamul Congress of West Bengal, the CPI (M) of West Bengal, the Assam Gana Parishad of Assam, the Gorkha League and Gorkha Janamukti Morcha (GJM) of Darjeeling in West Bengal.

The demand for the smaller states is based on the following arguments –

1. It will halt the process of increasing regional economic imbalance.
2. It will quicken the pace of development.
3. It will enable the local people to govern themselves and control their economy and thus to help them get rid of what is often called neo-colonial exploitation.
4. It will facilitate formulation of more responsive policies.
5. It will help some ethnic groups to maintain their independent culture, way of life etc.
6. Some of the states are too big and populous to be administered effectively and hence smaller states for administrative convenience.

The state reorganization of the 1950s did not put a stop to demands for the creation of new states. For example, in 1960s, mainly due to the agitations of Marathi and Gujrati speaking populations of the state of Bombay, the Bombay Reorganization Act created the linguistic state of Maharashtra and Gujrat. Similarly in 1966, the Hindi-speaking state of Haryana was created by dividing the Punjab. In the northeast, the Indian government tried to bring the Naga insurgency to a close end by accepting the Naga's demand for a separate state; hence, in 1962, the districts of Assam were detached to create the new state of Nagaland. In the early 1970s three more new states – Meghalaya, Manipur and Tripura were created in the northeast⁷⁰. The demand for new states however did not stop there. In West Bengal the Gorkhas of Darjiling and the Rajbanshis of Cooch Behar have long agitated for the creation for a separate Gorkhaland and Kamtapur. In Assam the Bodos have made a similar demand of creation of new states. The Telengana agitation in Andhra Pradesh, the

movement to create Vidharbha in Maharashtra and a demand for a separate state of Jammu are all the cases with relatively long histories of political agitation.

Regionalism is rooted in the wider logic of development, democracy, responsive policy formation, identity, maintenance and better administration. The ethnic groups seem to have developed feeling of insecurity resulting in a demand for a separate state within the Indian union or sovereign state outside the Indian union. The roots of the problem lie embedded in the socio-economic structure of the country, the problem has been aggravated by the policies of the government and the political manipulation of ethnic nationalities. The demand for smaller states⁷¹ has gained considerable momentum after the step taken by the central government to create Uttarkhand state. After this it motivated the Jharkhandis of Bihar, Gorkhas in Darjeeling hills, Bodos in Assam, Gonds in Andhra Pradesh, the tribals in Chattisgarh and other places in India to raise their demands for the creation of new states with political autonomy. The demands has been supported by some political parties who seek their own interests for acquiring power in the specific region, including BJP, Janata Dal and Samajbadi Janata Dal. BJP government suggested for the creation of the new states of Uttarkhand from Uttar Pradesh for their economic development. Similarly Jkarkhand Autonomous Area Council felt that they also continue to fight for a separate state for their development. Ethnically the Uttarakhandis argued that they were different in language, in culture from the rest of the people of Uttar Pradesh and they raised their voice for the creation of new states. The Jharkhandis demanded separate state for their own economic upliftment and to set up their own political administration⁷². The demands of the tribals of Madhya Pradesh were same for the creation of Chattisgarh to achieve development for the tribal community. The strong tendency of centralization and unequal financial distribution rather a dismal centre- state relation resulted in the development of regional politics⁷³ in Indian democracy. The question of equity is an important issue in these demands for separate state, and obviously the manipulation of the political leaders to seek their own interest finally mobilize the people of the underdeveloped region to put forward the demands of separate state for them. Later on the existing state of Jharkhand from Bihar, Uttaranchal from Uttar Pradesh and Chattisgarh from Madhya Pradesh were carved out and given their political autonomy by Indian state. Many or most of the people who have demanded for their own homeland are the deprived marginalized people and people from economically backward section. For example Gorkha leaders⁷⁴ who are in favor of the creation of Gorkhaland put forward the agreement that they receive less central grant

compare to Sikkim. Thus assertion for regional autonomy develops where these marginalized section of the people demand expanded political participation and free access in state and local politics by capturing the power in the newly created state. These regional parties had an intension to promote and protect the interests of the community which has been long neglected by the government.

The central problem that confronts Indian state and the ruling coalition is the problem occur from variety of regional movements and pressures in the process of nation-building and national integration A major aspect of the problem of regionalism is the dialectic of centralization (powers of national government) and decentralization (distribution of powers to the respective states) between the center and the states regarding the appropriate pattern of devolution of power. The general factors behind the growth of regional movements in Indian politics are tendencies of the regional parties towards greater decentralization, the cultural and linguistic diversity of India, the inevitable unevenness of capitalist economic development, the growing strength of the agrarian bourgeoisie and the intermediate classes (the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie), the growing electoral strength of opposition parties and the decline of democratic mentality of the country. Sub-state movements⁷⁵ usually aim either at attaining power at the state level (this was the implicit thrust of the Assam agitation) or at achieving some degree of political autonomy like statehood or ‘autonomous’ council status (Gorkhaland). In case of Assam Gana Parishad (AGP), they feel different from so-called mainstream politics and raised their region specific cultural, political and economic demands which is only restricted to a particular ethnic community. Assam movement (1979-85) demanded for detecting, disenfranchising and deporting the illegally settled foreigners that lay at the heart of Assam and predicted for a distinction between the citizens and the foreigners. They solely believe that the survival of a nation-state depends on its ability to make and maintain this distinction between an alien and a citizen⁷⁶. As Assam a neglected region continuously exposed to the incessant influx of foreigners from across the borders particularly from Bangladesh which has not been resolved by the central government and thus United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) demanded sovereign and independent Assam where they would enable to carry their own administration. The Mizo struggle for secession in the 70ties was led by the Mizo National Front (MNF) and its armed wing the Mizo National Army (MNA) under Laldenga demanded state autonomy for the Mizo people and finally settled by getting autonomy within the Indian Union. Similarly the Nagas were given their autonomy by the government to meet their demands of secession.

Separation is not at all a solution rather it pose a threat to the democratic structure of India which favors unity and integration. It is the responsibility of the central government to remove the cause of dissatisfaction of the people of the area demanding separate state to maintain the integrative spirit of Indian democracy.

2.3 Democracy in India: - A Concept of Multicultural Democratic Trends

Democracy has taken root in India in a face of a low-level of economy, widespread poverty, illiteracy and immense ethnic diversity. Two processes⁷⁷ have guided the negotiation of power conflicts. First, a delicate balance has been struck between the forces of centralization and decentralization and second, the interests of the powerful in society have been served without fully excluding those on the margins. Clearly democracy has struck very deep roots in the inhospitable soil of India. It has taken deep roots disproportionately among the historically marginal groups, especially among the most depressed section of the society. Equally the democratic values have become entrenched among intellectual elites and institutions which are vital for the consolidation of democracy. Steps like investigative reporting in national newspapers has exposed corruption and forced political accountability, meticulous planning by the Election Commission has assured free and fair general elections and the expanded role of judiciary ensured civil and political liberties of the citizen further enhanced democratic governance in India.

Like the founders of the Indian Constitution, scholars studying Indian democracy recognized that under Indian conditions certain exceptions were given by the liberal state to ensure individual freedom and protection of minority rights which ensured national unity and equality among all groups of citizens. Marginalized social groups are incorporated into an inclusive political process, through political alliances for stable governance. State also protect the interest of religious minorities and strengthened the competitiveness of socially disadvantaged groups (individuals belong to low socio-economic strata, the dalits) to ensure their effective participation in the democratic processes. Contextual democracy in its origin had a liberal vision where it aimed to preserve the individual and group rights of the community people. State aimed to preserve the identities of all the minority groups having distinct cultures in order to promote a plural culture. Through the strategy of political accommodation the liberal democratic state tried to safeguard the cultural identity of the community and ensures equal opportunities in order to receive the allegiance of the community or the electorates towards Indian state. India embarks on the path of

multiculturalism and it incorporates the major diversities (religious, linguistic, cultural and ethnic) within her arena. Multiculturalism is a system of beliefs and behaviors that recognizes and respects the presence of all diverse groups in an organization or society, acknowledges and values their socio-cultural differences, and encourages and enables their continued contribution within an inclusive cultural context which empowers all within one organization called society. India was among the first few democracies to embark on the multicultural path. India acknowledges the rights of minorities and valued the cultural diversity of the country. But question arises can democratic nation states accommodate cultural diversity while sustaining a sense of collective identity? Can cultural diversity be protected and nourished without compromising national wellbeing and the commitment to equality? Exceptionally, India acknowledged the rights of minorities and valued cultural diversity? To make democracy successfully workable in Indian multicultural context, India adopted a path of consociation or power sharing means. Four means can be clarified in adopting the consociation path – that is Cultural Autonomy, Proportionality, Grand Coalition and State-Society Relationship.

a) Cultural Autonomy

The unexpected success of India's fledgling democracy put differently, a politics of recognition, based on identities of caste, language and religion that is the post-colonial elites sought to manage the problem of diversity amidst inequality by constructing a semi-consociational democratic regime which recognized the claims of particular social groups in the formal political arena. Atomistic conception of a person, which conceives of individuals as socially rootless beings and according to Taylor⁷⁸, our identity "is partly shaped by recognition by others or its absence, often by the misrecognition of others". The lack of proper social recognition could take various forms. It could mean the absence of significant cultural ties – bound by language, ethnicity, race, religion and region – which diminished the lives of individuals in historically marginalized communities. It could also manifest itself through inferior, demeaning or dehumanizing beliefs and images of and behavior towards particular social groups. Kymlica and Bikhu Parekh were of same view with that of Taylor, through classical liberal proponents questioned the legitimacy of granting special rights or collective entitlements to particular social groups on ascriptive grounds in order for these communities to survive. Such conception of giving special rights to a particular community threatened to obscure the hierarchies of power, wealth and status within

particular communities. Taylor's claim that modern liberal democracies could justifiably grant special rights to specific minority groups, either to ensure their cultural survival or rectify historic injustices, so that these minority groups could easily collide with the notion of a single common good or a civic political culture. The politics of recognition based on particular group identities threatened to fragment the national frame of modern democratic states. The desire for equality for equal standing in various realms fuelled three major forms of identity based politics- linguistic, communal and regionalism in post independent India. Thus India embarked for granting cultural autonomy for religious and linguistic groups through power sharing means in federal arrangements. Firstly, in co-operative federal design state and linguistic boundaries largely coincided with each other to provide a big degree of linguistic autonomy. Secondly, the religious and linguistic minorities were given greater autonomy to establish and administer their own autonomous area. Thirdly, separate personal laws were sanctioned for each religious community by the Indian state. Indian democracy has all these three forms for successful working of democracy.

From 1950s pressures from below forced a complete change in governmental policy and in the Linguistic Provinces Commission after the state of Madras was divided into separate Tamil and Telegu speaking states. Linguistic federalism has not fully satisfied the minorities' desire for autonomy and security. The special autonomy was constitutionally granted to Kashmir as the Muslim majority state. This triggered the other linguistic minorities of other states to raise similar demands for regional autonomy and raised the demand for the creation of new states. In India however the constitution provided the right of educational and cultural autonomy to these ascriptive groups. Article 30 of the constitution states that all minorities whether based on religion or language shall have the right to establish and administer educational institutions of their choice and more important that the states shall not be granting aid to educational institutions, discriminate against any educational institution on the ground that it is under the management of a minority⁷⁹, whether based on religion or language. Thus there is little doubts that the linguistic reorganization of states by granting autonomy to these linguistic minorities within the national context tried to curb the regional aspirations. Even Indian state guaranteed separate personal laws for Hindus, Muslims and smaller religious minorities that is Hindu Marriage Act, The 1956 Hindu Succession Act and The 1937 Muslim Personal Law (Shariat). Linguistic groups play an important role as separatist groups, demanding increasing use of the language by the state in official matters. To solve problem, Indian democracy use the

regional language as the language of administration in a state and as medium of instruction in schools. In exception to English and Hindi, the use of the regional language officially has been guaranteed by the government and vice-versa to Hindi, regional languages were given official recognition. A major aspect of the problem of regionalism is the dialectic of centralization and decentralization between the center and the state – but India accommodates all the cultural and linguistic diverse groups together in the way of giving cultural autonomy to these groups and hence adopt a model of contextual democracy to work successfully in multicultural society.

b) Proportionality

The normal electoral system in power sharing democracies is proportional representation. In India, too, power sharing has managed to coexist with the plurality of electoral system inherited from the British. One reason is that plurality does not disfavor geographically concentrated minorities and India's linguistic minorities which are regionally based⁸⁰. In addition, a special feature of the electoral law guarantees the so-called scheduled castes (untouchables) and scheduled tribes (aboriginals) proportional shares of parliamentary representation by means of 'reserved seats', that is seats for which only members of these groups are allowed to be the candidates. Finally, these scheduled groups and the so-called other backward classes have benefited from other quotas – so-called reservations- with regard to public service employment and university admissions. Even adequate women representations were given in parliament and all units of governmental elections. All political arrangements in the early phase which were clearly dominated by an educated, nationalist elite (bourgeois class), were now tend to dominated by all section of people of the community⁸¹. To maintain equal opportunity in politics all marginalized section (caste groups) were given their rights in all spheres of political dominance.

c) Grand Coalition

The Indian case adds even greater variety through the measure of grand coalition. Its main vehicle for grand coalition is the cabinet, which is not an exceptional form, but the unique aspect in India is that cabinets are produced by the broadly representative and inclusive nature of a single, dominant party, the Congress Party or the coalition party in power previously the UPA (United Progressive Alliance) or at present by BJP led NDA (National Democratic Alliance) government which is also a dominant party at the centre. Kothari⁸²

tried to analyze the Indian party system from the comparative perspective of the distinction between one, two, and multiparty systems. The Congress Party's location in the center means that minor parties surround it on all sides. These, in turn, which Kothari calls "parties of pressure," perform the role of preventing the ruling "party of consensus" from straying too far from "the balance of effective public opinion." India's political system has served as the foundation for a consociation grand coalition. Despite never winning a majority of the popular vote in parliamentary elections, the Congress Party has been balanced in the political center and has encompassed "all the major sections and interests of society". Prior to independence the Congress was already an internally federal organization with a high degree of intra-party democracy and a strong penchant for consensus. This "historical consensus" Kothari writes, was successfully trans-formed into a "consensus of the present," and he comes close to using consociation terminology in describing Indian democracy as a "consensus system which operates through the institution of a party of consensus," namely, the Congress Party. Lijphart's theory⁸³ of consociational democracy was applied to the Indian pattern of political integration. The national political elite were committed to reconcile differences within the party of coalition through bargaining and concessions among themselves. The combination of the Congress Party's inclusive nature and political dominance has generated grand coalition cabinets with ministers belonging to all the main religious, linguistic, and regional groups.

d) State-Society Relationship

The developmentalist nature on Indian state hampers the rights of individual and groups. We find in case of New Social Movements, where the affected person vigorously protested against the state which pretend to be democratic in nature⁸⁴. Nation-states with the global circulation of capital tries to homogenize the economic right of the groups and the state subjugates these groups (women, indigenous people and the rural poor) as the dominant discourse of national elites. In the discourse of development, the state is mandated to unify the national economy, to establish a common national market, and to impose linguistic and cultural norms. The Indian state has mediated class, ethnic, gender and caste conflicts through the medium of secularism, political democracy and the capitalist economic system. Although couched in a vocabulary of 'protection and development', the development discourse of the Indian state subordinates women, dalits, and tribal and minority populations. Under the guise of development and welfare state, national elites have

transformed caste, gender and ethnic from relations of difference into relations of dominations. Such entity is both defined by the state and ordered in relation to the state. As the official guardian and development of these groups, the state denies them any creative alternative. New Social Movement challenges this anti-patriarchal attitude of Indian state and democracy.

To cope up with the problem, that challenge the democratic setup of the state, Indian state uses both coercion and persuasion to generate consent for development and try to collaborate with the affected groups in order to maintain hegemony of the state in its developmental scheme. Indian state tries to integrate the local, the regional and the ethnic acts of the marginalized groups as a citizen (through democratic electoral process) and as a consumer (through the free-market). On the one hand, India's durable democratic tradition has created the political space in which new social movements and their demands have emerged and on the other increasing bureaucratization and political centralization have repressed local struggles for autonomy. But the marginalized section has sometimes benefited from state-sponsored developmental and welfare programmes where these deprived groups received some concession from the state and integrate with democratic state. Here through these concessions the Indian state tried to mobilize both the ideological and material resources for development programmes in meeting the acute crisis created by the affected and marginalized groups. Here we find Indian state try to make a favorable relationship with the society. Where there is a gap between the state and society⁸⁵, state tried to fill the gap and act as a true guardian of its citizen in the democratic state. According to Rawlsian theory of justice, we find that justice and facility should be given to those groups who are in not advantageous position, justice should be of distributive nature. Here Indian liberal state in order to run the democratic setup of the country give adequate opportunity to the women and effected groups (to meet feminist challenges to the hegemony of the Indian state) merely integrating women into patriarchal development. Development projects have everywhere been intolerant to the voices of tribal, women and low castes (as we find in Chipko movement, women affected by green revolution, affected for bauxite mining in Gandhamardan, Orissa, limestone mining in the Doon Valley or uranium mining in Singbhum, Jharkann, forest dwellers affected from governmental scheme of social forestry and poor people affected especially the santhals by the construction of multi-purpose projects of that area).

The patriarchal attitudes of Indian state⁸⁶ has not changed fully but partially has changed and in order to run democratic governance successfully it gives some benefits to the subaltern classes. Democracy today is not defined not only as representative democracy but as a social relation which is consultative and participatory. Today to enhance participation, democracy changed its prevailing notion of power. Power is exercised through the apparatus of government or political parties in quite sensibly and it gradually influenced the culture, communicative and ethical spheres of the life of the subalterns and in the long run state through its various social agencies integrate these marginalized people into the mainstream politics. State today tried to evolve a distinctive knowledge system which can represent the experiences of the subaltern groups by using alternative ways of producing and validating knowledge. Thus women's dalit's and indigenous people's knowledge be integrated into a readymade body of dominant development discourse – thus state incorporates a new dimensions into its arena to cope up with new problem in its governance. State proves its developmental discourse to be a correct measure in uplifting the lifestyle of the indigenous people. But state undoubtedly has changed its attitude of dominance⁸⁷ that is folkloric, common sense based knowledge of indigenous people has been included in the process of development and state has definitely changed its language of the dominant development disclosure and reconstructed in appreciation of the knowledge claims from the bottom (marginalized or indigenous groups).

State allows society⁸⁸ to act in wide space to reduce the gap between state and its citizen. Society acts as a agent which allows the citizen of the state to move and act freely and to express their views against or in favor of state and in turn society influences the disadvantageous groups or individuals to act in favor of state-led developmental projects. West Bengal Government's decision to impose Bengali language in all the schools from class I to IX triggers the problem in Darjeeling in 2017 which according to GJM (Gorkha Janamukti Morcha) violates 6th schedule of the Indian Constitution addresses the administration of tribal areas. The people of Nepali-Indian Gorkha ethnic origin on the Northern part of West Bengal who tried to preserve their cultural identity which is different from Bengali culture started agitation against the state government. The long drawn agitation of the GJM hinders states economic growth but granting them their autonomy may create a stable and responsible government in Darjeeling and it will end one of the longest movements for the creation of a separate state in India. Today the importance of the states has increased as Myron Weiner⁸⁹ observes, “The effectiveness of national planning is

conditioned by the performance of the states. The instabilities and shocks associated with the economic development process are left first at the state level and only thereafter move into national politics". Hence regional recognition in terms of statehood or state autonomy gives self-determination to the people of that particular region and they feel empowered and happy. Federalism is seen here as a political equilibrium which appropriately strikes a balance between shared rule and self-rule. Even state in turn also considered the knowledge and suggestion of the minority groups as an ideology of governance and order to lessen the distance between the state and the groups in one hand and in other to ensure more responsibility towards the society and its people and to enhance participatory democracy and to cope up the challenge created against developmental state which in the long run helps the Indian democratic state to work in multicultural plural society.

3. Conclusion

The big puzzle of Indian democracy is its survival today despite the countries deep ethnic and communal, linguistic divisions. All cleavages in Indian democracy are solved by the consociation interpretation. India has had a power-sharing system of democracy during its almost fifty years of independence. After the late 1960s, as a result of greater mass mobilization and activation, power sharing became less strong and pervasive, marked by the centralization of the congress party's electoral strength, the attack of minority rights and the rise of the Bharitya Janata party (BJP). As consociational theory would have predicted, Indian democracy has remained basically stable, but the weakening of power sharing has been accompanied by increase in inter-group hostility and violence.

The consociation interpretation of India strengthens our understanding of the Indian case by providing a theoretically coherent explanation of the main patterns and trends in its political development. Challenges came from caste groups for example the Jats and caste based political parties like Bahujan Samaj party, Samajwadi Janata Dal, Janata party and these challenges were meet by giving these groups cultural autonomy and proportionality in political governance, and reservation in employment, in education for the upliftment of their socio-economic status in compare to the others in society. Like that to meet the communal challenges from the religious based or identity based political parties like Jana Sangh, Bharatya Janata Party, Vishwa Hindu Parishad, Rashtiya Sevak Sangh, Akali Dal, Bajrang Dal, proper recognition of the identity of the religious minority was given by the government and representation was given to the minority religious groups and their personal

laws. In our constitution our framers guaranteed the right to equality and freedom of religion, educational and cultural rights and constitutional remedies to secure the rights of every individual in the country thus democracy also ensures justice to all its citizens. Through the process of judicial activism true justice has been ensured to every individual. To meet the challenges of the linguistic groups and to prevent separatist tendency of these groups, regional language, Hindi and English language were given preferences officially by the government to maintain the integrity of the country. Demands of the regional assertive groups were solved by government by given the respective state like Jharkhand, Uttarakhand, Chattisgarh their autonomy for self-administering their own state. State by giving these groups like the Gorkhas, their cultural autonomy prevent the state from separation, and state tries to prevent cleavages through proportional means especially in the states of the North east India. And lastly, we must mention that the challenges thrown from the activists of new social movement which to some extent tackled by state society inter-relationship. Indian democracy today has become more decentralized (irrespective of some exception like President's Rule in times of state emergency) adopting a true structure of federalism that is very lenient center-state relation where the state has been given autonomous power in order to safeguard unity and cohesion of a democratic setup. We will also mention the method of grand coalition is a unique from to adopt with multicultural society. All the pressures from below (challenges from several minority groups) make it difficult to maintain the rule of one major party. Rather from 1967 onwards India has shifted from a dominant to a multi-party system that is government made grand coalition with the parties from minority groups for example- party based on caste or regional based. Party like BJP though secular in nature but (the party in power at present in centre with its majority) its growing strength represent a major potential threat to power sharing in India – that is the party is clearly anti-consociational. But apart from this government incorporates political parties from minority groups into its grand-coalition of power sharing which to some extent proves beneficial in designing state's contextual or multicultural design. Thus, it may be rightly concluded that through the measure of power sharing of consociational means lie the secret of the countries stability. The constitution of India embodies the principle of democratic ideas of secularism, socialism, social justice, political equality and fundamental rights. Indian democracy is the right intermixing of Western and Indian tradition of thought. Democracy respects the egalitarian and liberal principles of governed by recognizing group rights, secular principles and strengthen the welfare role of the state. India's democratic model was fashioned by Nehru in a realistic way to face the magnitude

of challenges, the nation faced in the long run in the post independent period. It is inevitable that in multiethnic and plural society like India democracy will face an obvious challenge from several groups like caste, religious, linguistic, regional forces and people affected from developmental projects and hence it finds a unique way to meet these challenges through consociational interpretation and adopting a model of contextual or multicultural democratic trend in India. Today democracy has struck very deep roots in the inhospitable soil of India.

Notes and References

1. Kaviraj Sudipta, 'Democracy and Social Equality', in Hasan Zoya ed, (1999), Transforming India Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy, Delhi, Oxford University Press, p.86
 2. Appadorai A, (1944), Democracy in India, New York, Oxford University Press, pp.3-5
 3. Kohli Atul, 'Introduction', in Kohli Atul ed. (2001), The Success of India's Democracy, Cambridge University Press pp.5-19
 4. Appadorai A, (1944), Democracy in India, New York, Oxford University Press p.4
 5. Sharma Sanjeev Kumar, (2005), Ancient Indian Democracy- Studies, Research and Some Modern Myths, Indian Journal of Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Vol.xxxix, No.3, July-September, pp.155-166
 6. Roy Ramashray, (2005), Democracy in India: Form and Substance, Delhi, Shipra Publication, pp.57-58
 7. Chakraborti Atulananda, 'The Welfare State', in Chakraborti Atulananda ed. (1961), Nehru- His Democracy and India, Calcutta, Thachers Press Publication Limited pp.79-88
 8. Kohli Atul, 'Interpreting India's Democracy: A State Society Framework', in Kohli Atul ed. (2001), India's Democracy: An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations, Hyderabad, Orient Longman Publication, pp.6-11
 9. Roy Ramashray, (2005), Democracy in India: Form and Substance, Delhi, Shipra Publication, pp.66-67
 10. Sharma Sanjeev Kumar, (2005), Ancient Indian Democracy- Studies, Research and Some Modern Myths, Indian Journal of Political Science, Aligarh Muslim University, Aligarh, Vol.xxxix, No.3, July-September, pp.158-159
 11. In case of the world like democracy not only that there is no agreed definition but the attempt to make one is resisted from all sides.....The defenders of any kind of regime claim that it is a democracy and fear that they might have to stop using the word if it were tied down to any one meaning,.....George Orwell.
- Roy Ramashray, (2005), Democracy in India: Form and Substance, Delhi, Shipra Publication, pp.3-5
12. Democracy means 'the rule of the people', which is the root of the matter, when the electoral success of one set of human beings spells the utter loss of power to rule for the other: more so when as too often is the case again becomes the loss of the superior numbers and the loss victory of the fewer. This condition gave birth to Magna Carta, the culmination that produced the French Revolution, the atmosphere that matured the 'no taxation without representation', for democracy is a state of deliverance of human beings from the oppressive rule of one, more or far away many.
- Naqavi S, M, (1967), Democracy in India, Calcutta. Cosmopolitan Publication, pp.103-147
13. Thucydides notes Athenian Democracy under Pericles, were of direct type, the demos (people) universally were supposed to participate actively in the affairs of the state, citizens of Athens enjoyed equality before law, demos were dedicated to the republican city-state, were supposed to subordinate private interests to the public good and state was a unified entity that ensures justice to its citizens.

Chaube, S.K, 'India's Republican Democracy and Ideology and Politics in India', in Chaube, S.K ed. (1999), Indian Democracy At the Turn of Century, New Delhi, Kaniska Publication, pp.23-25

14. The foremost man in Greece, the law giver (Solon), the Philosopher (Plato), the wise leader (Pericles), Studios (Aristotle) and demos (people). Apparently, we can infer that the political community now came to be constituted by separate, autonomous individuals who exercise their power as citizens in the political realm that is rule of people was the foremost criteria in ancient Greek democracy.

Roy Ramashray, (2005), Democracy in India: Form and Substance, Delhi, Shipra Publication, pp.34-35

15. "I have often wondered why the people of India put up with people like me, after all that has happened during the last few months (a reference to the terrible aftermath of partition). I am not quite sure that I had not been in the government, I would put up with my government". A few years later (1952), when reminded of the government's failure to end all food imports, he frankly admitted, I regret that my words have been falsified and I feel thoroughly ashamed that what was almost a pledge to the country has been broken".

Chakroborty Bidyut, (1993), Wither India's Democracy, New Delhi, K.P Bagchi and Company, pp.144-145

16. Jalal Ayesha, (1995), Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia, A comparative and Historical Perspective, New Delhi, Cambridge University Press, pp.20-26

17. World Brotherhood All India Committee, (1960), Indian Democracy in the Asian Background, New Delhi, Allied Publishers Private Ltd, pp.62-63

18. A hungry man is not going to put the ballot box before his next meal. If our way of life is to survive and spread and vitalize, we must offer prosperity as well as freedom. As Bernard Shaw said, "Democracy cannot rise above the level of the human material of which its voters are made". According to L.T.Hobhouse," Democracy can be worthy of us only in so far as we are worthy as human beings".

Ibid pp.88-89

19. Nehru wrote in 1935, "My roots are still perhaps party in the nineteenth century and I have been too much influenced by the humanist liberal tradition to get out it completely. Nehru's democratic thought is more the product of this broad tradition, the humanist liberal tradition,

Eugene Donald, (1958), The Political Thought of an Asian Democrat, Calcutta, Orient Longman Publication p.43

20. Democracy is not only political or economic but something of the mind, as everything is ultimately something of the mind. It involves equality of opportunity to all people as far as possible in the political and economic domain. It involves the freedom of the individual to grow and to make the best of his capacities and ability. It involves a certain tolerance of others and even of other's opinion when they differ from yours. It involves a certain inquisitive search for truth and a dynamic concept, its domain is much wider and Nehru defined democracy as a mental approach applied to our political and economic problems.

Chakroborty Bidyut, (1993), Wither India's Democracy, New Delhi, K.P Bagchi and Company, p.44

21. Hidayatullah M, (1965), Democracy in India and the Judicial Process, New Delhi Asia Publishing House, pp.42-53

22. National freedom as far as the nation is concerned, personal freedom so far as the individual is concerned. For every restriction and inhibition stops the growth and development and produces apart from economic disorders, complexes and perversions in the nation and individual. So freedom is necessary.

Mehta Bhanu Pratap, 'The State of Indian Democracy', in Basrur Rajesh. M ed. (2009), Challenges to Democracy in India, Oxford, Oxford University Press, pp.49-51

23. The democratic way was not only well known but was common method of functioning in socio-political life, in local government trade guilds, religious assemblies etc, caste, with all its evils kept up the democratic habit in each group.

Eugene Donald, (1958), The Political Thought of an Asian Democrat, Calcutta, Orient Longman Publication, p.50

24. Then a politician or statesman, call him what you will, has to deal not only with the truth but with men's receptivity of that truth because if there is not sufficient receptivity of it from the politicians or statesman's polite of view, that truth is thrown into the wilderness till minds are ripe for it.

Chakraborti Atulananda, 'The Welfare State', in Chakraborti Atulananda ed. (1961), Nehru- His Democracy and India, Calcutta, Thachers Press Publication Limited, p.87

25. A scheme of values and moral standards in life. Whether you are democratic or not depends on how you act and think as an individual or as a group. You may define democracy in a hundred ways but surely one of its definitions is self-discipline of the community. The less the imposed discipline and the more the self-discipline the higher is the development of democracy.

ibid pp.63-64

26. Varshney Ashutosh, (1995), India and the Politics of a Developing Countries, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, pp.90-95

27. The base of institutional democracy in India will have to expand beyond parties and elections, and the political authority will have to seek legitimating by also responding to the politics of non-party and non-electoral organizations and movements that have arisen in the wider public realm (that is within civil society) and largely in response to structural changes in society.

Mohanty Monoranjan, 'Indian Democracy', in Vora Rajendra and Palsikar Suhas ed. (2004), Indian Democracy ; Meaning and Practices, New Delhi, Sage Publications, p.35

28. The state such as West Bengal, Kerala the poor have been more systematically incorporated by reform oriented communist parties

Sarkar Sumit, 'Indian Democracy; Its Historical Inheritance', in Kohli Atul ed. (2008), Reprint,(2011), The Success of India's Democracy, New Delhi, Cambridge University Press p.15

29. Khothari Rajni, 'The Crisis of the Moderate State and the Decline of Democracy', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed. (2007) Reprint, (2010) Democracy in India, New Delhi, Oxford University Press Publication p.122

30. Rudolph and Rudolph, 'Democracy and Identity Politics', in Rudolph and Rudolph ed. (2008), Explaining Indian Democracy. A Fifty Year Perspective; 1956-2006, Vol.I, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.608-610

31. Mitra Sharmila Deb, 'Democracy and Development; State Society Approach', in Mitra Sharmila Deb and Manisha M ed. (2009), Indian Democracy; Problems and Prospects, New Delhi, Anthem Press, pp.89-92

32. Kohli Atul, 'Political Change in a Democratic Developing Country', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed. (2007) Reprint, (2010) Democracy in India, New Delhi, Oxford University Press Publication p.149
33. Kohli Atul, 'Interpreting India's Democracy: A State Society Framework', in Kohli Atul ed. (2001), India's Democracy: An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations, Hyderabad, Orient Longman Publication, pp.6-7
34. Sheth D.L and Nandy Ashis , "Introduction", in Sheth D.L and Nandy Ashis ed.(1998), The Multiverse of Democracy, Sage Publications, New Delhi (pp.9-23)
35. Gupta Sobhanlal Datta, "Social Character of the Indian State", in Das Samir Kumar and Vanaik Achin ed. (2014), The Indian State, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.55-60
36. Kothari Rajni, (2005), Rethinking Democracy, New Delhi, Orient Longman Pub. pp.68-72
37. Kaviraj Sudipto, (2011), The Enchantment of Democracy and India; Politics and Ideas, Orient Black swan Publications, New Delhi, pp.274-76
38. Mohanty Monoranjan, Indian Democracy in Vora Rajendra and Palsikar Suhas ed. (2004), Indian Democracy ; Meaning and Practices, New Delhi, Sage Publications pp.115-117
39. Zubair Alam, (1987), Emergency Power in Indian Democracy, New Delhi, S. K Publishers p.87
40. Alam Zubair, (1987), Emergency Power in Indian Democracy, Delhi, S.K. Publishers, pp.94-95,110-111
41. www.hindustantimes.com, 28th October, 2016
42. Rodrigues Valerian, 'Two Discourses on Democracy in India', in Basrur M Rajesh ed. (2009), Challenges to Democracy in India, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.69-71
43. Johari J.C, (1987), Indian Government and Politics, Delhi, Vishal Publications, p.286
44. www.hindustantimes.com, 28th October, 2016
45. www.hindustantimes.com, 28th October, 2016
46. National Institution for Transforming India – www.niti.gov.in
47. Kohli Atul, 'Interpreting India's Democracy: A State Society Framework', in Kohli Atul ed. (2001), India's Democracy: An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations, Hyderabad, Orient Longman Publication, p.5
48. Huntington Samuel, (1968), Political Order in Changing Societies, New Haven, Yale University Press Pub. Chapter I, pp. 19-25
49. The Congress leaders came mostly from the intelligentsia – many of them were lawyers by profession – whose caste backgrounds drew generally from the literate castes includes Kayasthas and more importantly Brahmins (like Nehru), Congress leaders also had established close working relationships with traders and industrialists that is the capitalists (pujivadi) and with the landlords (the former zamindars, jagirdars, malguzars and maharajas) who financed in times of election and exert their strong feelings on the administration in government affairs. The upper castes (including Kshatriyas and Vaishyas) became a symbol of power elite.
- Jaffrelot Christophe, 'Caste and the Rise of Marginalized Groups in Ganguly Sumit', ed. (2009), The State of India's Democracy, New Delhi, Oxford Publications, pp.68-69

50. Rudolph and Rudolph, 'Living With Differences in India', in Rudolph and Rudolph ed. (2008), *Explaining Indian Democracy, A Fifty Years Perspective (1956-2006)*, vol.I, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.102-108
51. Alam Zaveed, *What Is Happening Inside Indian Democracy?* 1999, In EPW, vol 34, No.37 (September-11th-17th September), pp.2652-2653
52. Jaffrelot Christophe, 'Caste and the Rise of Marginalized Groups', in Ganguly Sumit ed. (2009), *The State of India's Democracy*, New Delhi, Oxford Publications, pp.75-79
53. Myron Weiner, 'The Struggle for Equality; Caste in Indian Politics', in Kohli Atul ed. (2008), reprint, (2011), *The Success of India's Democracy*, New Delhi, Cambridge University Press Publications, pp.196-197
54. Anderson claims that the new significance attached to languages was facilitated by the advent of the printing press and mass production, which made the nation 'imaginable'. From face to face communities of village life, we have move to the anonymous world of nation-building, where the role of media is enormous.
- Rajan Nalini, (2002), *Democracy and the Limits of Minority Rights*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, p.134
55. Shankarrao Deo, for once reacted to this sentiment by proclaiming that he was a Marathi speaker and also an Indian. There was a warning from T.T. Krishnamachari of Madras that such an attitude of 'Hindi' - imperialism would exacerbate secessionist tendencies in the South.
- Sten Widmalm, (1997), *Democracy and Violent Separatism in India*, Sweden, Uppasala University Publications, pp.185-187
56. Vanaik Achin, (1990), *The Painful Transition; Bourgeois Democracy in India*, London, Verso Publication, p.199-205
57. Rajan Nalini, (2002), *Democracy and the Limits of Minority Rights*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, pp.142-143
58. Ganguly Rajat, 'Democracy and Ethnic Conflict', in Ganguly Sumit ed. (2009), *The State of India's Democracy*, New Delhi, Oxford Publications, p.46
59. Mohanty Monoranjan, *Democracy Limited* (1996), EPW, vol.31, no.13 (March 30th), pp.804-805
60. Engineer Ashgar Ali, "Democracy and the Politics of Identity", (1998), EPW, Vol.33, No.13 (March 26th April 3rd), pp.697-698
61. Kohli Atul, 'Interpreting India's Democracy; A State-Society Framework', in . Kohli Atul ed. (1991), *An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations*, Hyderabad, Orient Longman, pp.320-323 and 327-330
62. Jaffrelot Christophe, 'Hindu Nationalism and Democracy', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed. (2001), *Democracy in India; Themes in Politics*, New Delhi, Oxford Publication, pp.509-513
63. Basu Partha Pratim, 'Parliamentary Democracy and Communalism in India', in Chatterjee Aneek ed. (2005), *Indian Parliamentary Democracy in Transition*, Kolkata, Presidency College Pub. Department of Political Science, pp.34-37
64. Puniyani Ram, (2010), *Communal Threat to Secular Democracy*, Delhi, Kalpaz Pub, pp.86-91

65. Rajan Nalini, (2002), *Democracy and the Limits of Minority Rights*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, pp.125
66. Ganguly Rajat, 'Democracy and Ethnic Conflict in Ganguly Sumit', ed. (2009), *The State of India's Democracy*, New Delhi, Oxford Publications, p.50
67. It is the task of civil society to fill the gap between the individual and government. It is the failure of both of them that it fails to challenge the efforts of Hindutva forces to culturally transform civil society that has led to the present crises that is threat to democracy.
- Rajan Nalini, (2002), *Democracy and the Limits of Minority Rights*, New Delhi, Sage Publications, pp.123-124
68. Shiva Vandana, (2005), *India Divided, Diversity and Democracy under Attack*, New York, Seven Stories Press Pub, 109-111
69. Datta Prabhat, (1997), *India's Democracy, New Challenges*, New Delhi, Kanishka Pub, pp.74-75
70. Vanaik Achin, (1990), *The Painful Transition; Bourgeois Democracy in India*, London, Verso Pub, pp.121-123
71. Kohli Atul, 'Interpreting India's Democracy; A State-Society Framework', in . Kohli Atul ed. (1991), *An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations*, Hyderabad, Orient Longman, pp.323-325
72. Ganguly Rajat, 'Democracy and Ethnic Conflict', in Ganguly Sumit ed. (2009), *The State of India's Democracy*, New Delhi, Oxford Publications, pp.49-50
73. *ibid* pp.51-53
74. *ibid* pp.123-124
75. Datta Prabhat, (1997), *India's Democracy, New Challenges*, New Delhi, Kanishka Pub, pp.80-81
76. *ibid* pp.98-101
77. Kymlica.W, (2002), *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*, Oxford, Clarendon Press Pub. pp.22
78. Taylor Charles, (1994), "The Politics of Recognition", in A and Gutmann ed. *Multiculturalism; Explaining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, Princeton University Press pp.25-27
79. Kohli Atul, 'Interpreting India's Democracy: A State-Society Framework', in Kohli Atul ed. (2011), *India's Democracy, An Analysis of Changing State-Society Relations*, New Delhi, Cambridge University Press, pp.15-16
80. Lijphart Arend , 'The Puzzle of India's Democracy: A Consociational Interpretation', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed. (2001), *Democracy in India, Themes in Politics*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.334-336
81. Frankel.R.Francine, (2000), "Contextual Democracy; Intersections of Society, Culture and Politics in India", in Hasan Zoya ed. *Transforming India, Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.6-7
82. Lijphart Arend, 'The Puzzle of India's Democracy: A Consociational Interpretation', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed. (2001), *Democracy in India, Themes in Politics*, New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.330-331

83. A further comparison with Japan, not yet so obvious in the early 1960s, reveals the additional contrast between India's Congress party and Japan's right of centre Liberal Democrats. Mexico's Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) is probably the closest parallel to the centrist congress party, except that it does not operate in a fully competitive democratic setting.

Ibid p.332

84. Parajuli Pramod, 'Power and Knowledge in Development Discourse: New Social Movements and the State', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed. (2000), Democracy in India: Themes in Politics, New Delhi, Oxford University Press Pub. pp. 274-75

85. Rajan Nalini, (2002), Democracy and the Limits of Minority Rights, New Delhi, Sage Pub. Pp.128-29

86. Frankel R Francine, Contextual Democracy: Intersections of Society, Culture and Politics in India in Hasan Zoya ed. (2000), 'Transforming India, Social and Political Dynamics of Democracy', New Delhi, Oxford University Press, pp.9-12

87. Kothari Rajini, (2005), Rethinking Democracy, New Delhi, Orient Longman Pub. Pp.55-58

88. Hegemony stands for a condition of domination and Gramsci's notion of hegemony is important to analyze this contestation as well. Dominant state culture is imposed through civil society to the subordinate section of people and as a result 'dominant' culture superseded the 'weak' culture as mentioned in Gramsci's 'Prison Notebook'. The subaltern section has been locked within the iron age of the society which acts as an agent of the state and subjugates these weak groups to the dominant discourse of national elites.

Parajuli Pramod, 'Power and Knowledge in Development Discourse: New Social Movements and the State in India', in Jayal Niraja Gopal ed.(2000), Democracy in India: Themes in Politics, New Delhi, Oxford University Press Pub. pp. 260-61

89. Mukherjee Bharati, (1992), Regionalism in Indian Politics, K.P.Bagchi and Company Pub. Calcutta, pp.106-107