

POLITICAL SCIENCE
(PART II)

IV Semester

COMPLEMENTARY COURSE

BA
**HISTORY/ECONOMICS/SOCIOLOGY/
PHILOSOPHY & ENGLISH**

(2011 Admission)



UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut University P.O. Malappuram, Kerala, India 673 635

372

<u>CONTENTS</u>		Page
MODULE - I	THEORY OF SEPARATION OF POWERS	5
MODULE - II	FORMS OF GOVERNMENT	20
MODULE - III	ELECTIONS AND REPRESENTATION	36
MODULE - IV	POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES	57
MODULE - V	DEMOCRACY	72
MODULE - VI	PUBLIC OPINION	84

POLITICAL SCIENCE (PART-II)

COMPLEMENTARY COURSE (FOURTH SEMESTER)

- Module-1 Theory of separation of powers-organs of Government: Legislature- Executive- Judiciary-Structure and Functions- Judicial Review, Judicial Activism, Independence of judiciary.
- Module-2 Forms of Government: Unitary and Federal- Parliamentary and Presidential- characteristics-merits and demerits
- Module-3 Elections and representation-
- (a) Political parties- Pressure groups-Interest groups-Types and functions
 - (b) Representation of minorities
- Module-4 Political ideologies: Individualism, Liberalism, Marxism, Fascism and Gandhism
- Module-5 (a) Democracy-Meaning and postulates- Condition for the success of Democracy-Direct Democratic Devices- Referendum- Initiative- Plebiscite and Recall
- Module-6 Public Opinion-Agents of Public Opinion- Role of Public opinion in Democracies

MODULE - I

THEORY OF SEPARATION OF POWERS

The doctrine of separation of powers implies that there should be three separate organs of government-Legislature, Executive and Judiciary-with separate set of functions and powers.

The idea is not new as it was discussed by Aristotle in his work 'Politics' where he made a distinction between the deliberative, magisterial(Executive) and Judicial functions .But in ancient Greece this distinction was not followed, as all these powers were often exercised by the same person.

The idea was discussed in the writings of Polybius and Cicero of the Roman empire, where they emphasized the importance of a 'balanced equilibrium of power 'where each part of government acted as a check on the other part. In the middle ages too, the idea got resonance in the writings of Marsiglio of Padua who made a distinction between legislative and executive functions of government. Jean Bodin in the sixteenth century opined that judicial functions be given to independent magistrates and it should not be in the hands of monarchs as it "would mean the indiscriminate mixture of justice and mercy, of strict adherence to law and arbitrary departure from it".

John Lockes' 'Civil Government' talks about three powers that existed in every commonwealth. He mentioned it as legislative, executive and federative where the federative power relates to the conduct of foreign affairs. He opined that for the interest of liberty powers of government be separated from each other.

The best exposition of the doctrine of separation of powers was given by the French scholar Montesquieu in his work, 'Sprit of Laws' published in 1748. Montesquieu is widely regarded as the father of the doctrine of separation of powers.

Montesquieu lived in the times of Louis Fourteen who gave the famous dictum 'I am the state'. The monarch held absolute power, as his words was law and his authority unquestionable. The monarch combined in his person all the three powers of govt. Montesquieu observed that all the powers concentrated in one person or body of persons is dangerous, and it will result only in the denial of liberty to people. Montesquieu happened to visit Britain, and was greatly impressed by the liberty enjoyed by the people of that country. He misjudged it as a result of separation of powers that he thought existed in that country. So he came to the conclusion that separation of powers was the main reason for the liberty of British people. This view of Montesquieu was however incorrect, as the cabinet system was not fully developed in Britain(which itself is not based on the principle of separation of powers) when he visited that country, and there was no separation of powers in Britain.

Montesquieu believed that there must be separation of powers If liberty is to be safeguarded.

The doctrine of separation of powers, as stated earlier, implies that there should be three separate organs of government with their separate set of functions and powers. Function of government be differentiated and performed by different organs, consisting of different persons, so that each organ is limited to its own sphere of activity and not be able to encroach upon the independence and jurisdiction of the other. Allied to the theory of separation powers is the doctrine of checks and balances. Each organ of government has to act within the law and not beyond it. If an organ of government acts in excess of that permitted by law, it should be checked by the other organs to restrain its encroachments. Thus power halts power('le pouvoir artere le pouvoir') and the separation of powers within the structure of government make sure that one power operates as a balance against the other power.

Statement of the theory of Montesquieu which is often quoted runs thus:

"When the legislative and executive powers are united in the same person, or in the body of magistrates there can be no liberty;because apprehensions may arise lest the same monarch or senate should enact tyrannical laws ,and execute them in tyrannical manner. Again, there is no liberty if the judicial power be not separate from the legislative and the executive. Were it joined with the legislative, the life and liberty of the subject would be exposed to arbitrary control for the judge would then be legialator. Were it joined to the executive power,the judge might behave with violence and oppression. There would be the end of everything, Were the same man or the sane body....to exercise those three powers, that of enacting laws, that of executing the public relations, and of trying the case of individuals".

Montesquieu's theory of separation of powers had a great impact on the political thinking of the time and found its best expression in the constitution of United States of America. Founding fathers of the American constitution wanted to limit the powers of each organs of government, in order to protect the liberty of people. Montesquieu's writings influenced the French Revolution and the famous Declaration of Rights issued after the revolution, laid out that "every society in which the separation of powers is not determined has no constitution"

Criticism

Though the theory received wide recognition and had great practical implications, it also received a fair amount of criticism from various quarters. Major criticisms levelled against the theory are:

(1) Absolute separation of powers is not possible: Organs of government are like the organs of a human body; though distinct they must work in unison in order to be useful and effective for the purpose for which they are created. Absolute separation of power leads to division of organs of government into water-tight compartments. This can lead to inefficiency and deadlocks in the functioning of government and so is highly undesirable. Moreover, in modern times institutions exercise overlapping functions and provision is made for some degree of co-operation between different organs of government.

(2) All organs of government are not equal in powers: Theory of separation of powers assume that the powers of organs of government are equal. But with the emergence of democracy this assumption seems to be wrong with pre-eminence of legislature among the other organs being widely recognized. Executive has been reduced to a subordinate position. In the parliamentary system executive is responsible to the legislature and is dependent upon the legislature for its existence.

(3) Organs of government are mutually dependent: Rather than clear separation, organs of government today, depend and cooperate among one another to a great extent. For example, legislature performs some executive functions apart from its main function of law making, like wise executive performs some legislative functions apart from its main function of rule application. In USA bills are often prepared under the orders or will of the president and are introduced in the congress by the members of his own party. Ordinance are issued by the executive, which have the same effect of law, is a practice followed in many countries, including India.

(4) Montesquieu's view was that liberty is not possible without separation of powers. But this view is not right as many countries like Britain, India, Italy etc., which does not follow separation of powers guarantee liberty to its people.

(5) Modern democratic view does not accept the traditional doctrine of separation of powers. Montesquieu's theory emerged at a time when state powers was viewed with suspicion and danger. But with the advent of the concept welfare states, people expect more action and services from the state. This has led to the ascendancy of executive over legislative branch. Planning and active services demand fusion and not rigid separation of powers.

ORGANS OF GOVERNMENT

LEGISLATURE

Legislature occupies an important position in the machinery of government. Will of the state is formulated and expressed through the legislature. Legislature is treated with special respect and status as it is composed of people who represents the general population. Legislature in a democratic country enacts the general rules of society in the form of laws.

A variety of terms are used to denote legislatures in various countries: it is called congress in USA, Parliament in India, National Assembly in France, House of Representative in Japan and Congress of Deputies in Spain. The word parliament comes from the French "parler" which means to 'talk' or 'discuss'.

Functions of Legislature

Functions of the legislature are not identical in every country. It may vary from country to country, depending on the forms of government and the provisions of the constitution. Yet there are certain functions which are performed by legislatures in most democracies. They are as follows:

- (1) First and foremost function of Legislature is to make laws. Bills are introduced in the Legislature where it is thoroughly debated and discussed before it is passed by the legislature and sent to the Head of the State for his formal assent to become an act. In cabinet system it is the duty of the concerned minister to introduce the bill and get it passed and duly enacted. But in the presidential system executive is not directly involved in legislation, rather he only exerts his influence in the law making through his messages. Legislature is the creator of laws of a country and is thus rightly called the rule making department of the state.
- (2) Legislature exercises control over the general administration of the country. In parliamentary system legislature exercises control over the political executive. Ministers are individually as well as collectively responsible to the legislature for all their actions. Ministers can continue in office only till they enjoy the confidence of the legislature. Various measures like adjournment motions, censure motions and cut motions are available to control the executive. A vote of no-confidence can be passed by the legislature to remove the executive from office.
- (3) Legislature performs important financial functions. A major function it performs every year is the presentation, consideration and authorization of the budget. No money can be spent or no tax can be levied by the executive without the prior approval of the legislature. Ordinarily lower house enjoys more powers over the money bill than the upper house in countries with bi-cameral legislature
- (4) Legislature also performs some important judicial functions. In England the House of Lords is the highest court of appeal. The impeachment trial of the president and vice-president in America takes place in the senate and in India either of the two house at the centre can conduct the impeachment trial of the president.

- (5) Legislature also performs elective functions. In India parliament takes part in the election of the President and vice President. British parliament can make a law to determine the mode of succession and abdication of the monarch. In Russia judges of the Supreme Court are elected by the parliament of that country.
- (6) In most democracies the power to change or amend the constitution rests with the legislature. In India the parliament has the power to change certain provisions of the constitution by following a special procedure. In England there is no distinction between ordinary laws and constitutional laws and the legislature has the power to amend the constitutional laws in the same manner as it changes ordinary law.
- (7) In India parliament has the power to remove the judges of supreme court and high courts on grounds of proved misbehavior or incapacity. In Britain judges can be removed by a joint address of both house of parliament to the crown.
- (8) In the USA Senate shares with the President the power of making all federal appointments. All treaties negotiated and concluded by the president required to be ratified by the senate by a two-third majority. American President needs the approval of the senate for all the major Federal appointments he makes. And to declare war and for war expenses the President needs the approval of the senate.
- (9) Legislatures work as organs of inquest or enquiries. Legislature appoint commissions of enquiry to collect information, hear evidence and make recommendations on problems facing the country.

Organisation of Legislature

Legislatures are classified into two, on the basis of the number of chambers it possesses. When the legislature of a country is organized into two houses it is called Bi-Cameralism and when the legislature has only one house it is called Uni-Cameralism.

Bi-Cameralism

Legislatures of most countries have two houses, while a few countries have only one house. And when the legislature is organized into two chambers, it is called Bi-Cameralism. In India the two houses are Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha at the centre and Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly at the states. In England the two houses are the House of Lords and the House of Commons. In the USA their names are the House of Representatives and the Senate.

In Bi-cameralism one house is generally called the 'lower House' and the other the 'Upper House'. In India Lower house is the Lok Sabha and the upper house is the Rajya Sabha. Lower House is generally the larger house and its members are directly elected and they have a shorter term, while the upper house is generally the smaller house and its members are differently elected i.e., through election (often indirect) and nomination and generally enjoys longer term.

Generally the lower house enjoys more powers than the upper house mainly because of the fact that they are the house of the people. In India Lok Sabha is stronger than the Rajya Sabha and in England the House of Commons is stronger than the house of Lords. A major exception here is that in the case of USA where the upper house-senate- has been made deliberately stronger than the lower house-The House of Representatives. In most cases money can be introduced only in the lower house and they have a complete say in matters of money bill. In India Money Bill can only be introduced in the Lok Sabha.

Uni-Cameralism

When the legislature has only one house, it is termed as Uni-Cameralism. Some countries follow Uni-cameral system and prominent among them are China, Israel, New Zealand and Bangladesh.

Arguments in favour of Bi-Cameralism

Following arguments are put forward in defense of Bi-Cameralism-

(a) It act as a check on hasty, rash and ill considered legislation. Popularly elected members of the lower house in their zeal to perform miracles may bring out legislations that may be rash and ill conceived and even impractical. They may opt for sweeping changes which may not always be in the best interest of the people. Upper house which consist of generally senior members and who enjoy longer terms (often fixed terms) may act a check on the radicalism of the lower house.

(b) A related argument to the first one is that, Bi-Cameralism helps to check legislative despotism. If there is only one house a party having absolute majority in that house can come out with any legislations which it thinks fit. It can lead to tyranny and in such a situation liberty of the people will be in danger. According to lord Acton "for the protection of freedom, second chamber is necessary".

(c) It affords a convenient means of giving representation to special interest and classes in the state, who are otherwise not adequately represented in the lower house. Some eminent persons may not like to undergo the tribulations of fighting elections, but a country cannot afford to ignore the experiences of such people. In India for instance, president can nominate 12 members to the Rajya Sabha in the field of literature, social service, Science and arts.

(d) It is also pointed out that the two houses represents public opinion in a better way than one house. This is the position in India too.

(e) Second chamber act as a relief to the first chamber. Of late activities of the government has increased tremendously and as a result the need for new legislations has also increased many fold. This has led to congestion of work in the legislatures. second chamber helps to relieve this congestion as non-controversial bills can be introduced in the upper house and those of greater importance can be initiated in the lower house.

(f) Second chamber enable the legislature to attain perfection. The defects that have crept into a legislation in one house, can be rectified in the other house and thus enable a legislation to attain perfection.

(g) Finally, Bi-Cameralism is necessary in a federal state where the people have their representation in the first chamber and the units have their representation in the second chamber.

Arguments against Bi-Cameralism(or Arguments in favour of Uni-Cameralism)

(a)It is argued that Bi-Cameralism paralyse the will of the people. Sovereignty resides with the will of the people, and two chambers imply the existence of two sovereignties. Critics of Bi-cameralism opine that this amount to dividing the will of the people, and if will is divided, it is paralysed.

(b)it is often argued that Bi-Cameralism duplicates work and it is highly wasteful. It leads to loss of time, energy and it is a drain on the national resources.

(c) Special interest can be accommodated even in the lower chamber itself by reserving seats for this category, and there is no need for a second chamber for this purpose. Moreover, minorities get better protection from constitutional safeguards than from representation in a second chamber.

EXECUTIVE

The Executive refers to that organ of government which executes, administers or put into effect the laws made by the legislature. The term Executive is used in a broad as well as in a narrow sense. Dr.Garner , while explaining the meaning of executive said, "In a broad and collective sense the executive organ embraces the aggregate or totality of all the functionaries which are concerned with the execution of the will of the state as that will have been formulated and expressed in terms of law". This comprehensive definition implies that in a broad sense executive includes the Head of the state, council of ministers and all other officials who implement the laws. The term executive when used in a narrow sense will include only the president and the council of ministers and the officials are excluded. Generally the term Executive is used in a narrow sense to mean the head of the state and the council of ministers.

Kinds of Executives

1. Political and Permanent Executive - Political executive consists of popularly elected leaders who heads the office of various departments and whose tenure is a temporary one. In India political executive consists of the prime Minister and his council of ministers. They can only remain in office as long as they enjoy the confidence of the legislature. Permanent officials on the other hand, consists of all those permanent and salaried officials and subordinates who carry on the day- to- day work of the administration. These officials carry out the policy as laid down by the political executive. These officials having entered service through competitive exams continue in service until retirement. Efficient administration demands close co-operation of the amateur and the experts, that is; of the politicians and the specialist administrators.

2. Nominal and Real Executive - The executive may be real or nominal. This distinction is between Head of the state and the Head of the government. In parliamentary systems like India and Britain this distinction is very clear. In India, President is the nominal executive or titular executive and the cabinet headed by the Prime Minister is the real executive. In India, in theory the president enjoys wide powers, but in actual practice all these powers are exercised by the Prime Minister and his council of ministers. All the actions of the government are carried out in the name of the nominal executive. There is no nominal executive in the Presidential system as followed in USA. There the President is the head of the state as well as the real executive. He is both the Head of the state and Head of the government. In absolute monarchies and Dictatorships all the power will be concentrated in a single person or with a few elites and thus the distinction of real and nominal executive there is meaningless.

3. Single and Plural Executives - In the case if single executive the ultimate power is in the hands of a single person, and he does not share powers with others. American President is an example of single executive. Cabinet form of government combines the single and plural executive. The Prime minister follows the principle of single executive and his colleague follow the principle of plural executive. However, it is to be noted that, in parliamentary system the real executive- the prime minister and his cabinet- act as a team or as a single unit and hence the whole cabinet can be viewed as a singular executive.

In the case of plural executive or collegiate executive, the executive power is in the hands of group of persons, having co-equal authority. Federal council of Switzerland is an example of plural executive. Federal Council consists of seven councilors, having co-equal powers and one of the members are elected annually to serve as chairman for a one year term with the title of president of the federation. The president does not enjoy any special powers apart from presiding over the council meetings. Federal council is elected by the federal assembly (legislature) for a four year term and the council functions essentially as a business body subordinate to the Assembly. The federal council implements the policies of the Federal Assembly. The Federal council also advises the Federal Assembly on legislative matters.

PARLIAMENTARY AND PRESIDENTIAL TYPE OF EXECUTIVES

Parliamentary Executive- In the parliamentary system, political executive is responsible to the legislature, and remain in office till he enjoys the confidence of the legislature. There exist a distinction between real and nominal executive in the Parliamentary system, where Prime minister and his cabinet is the real executive, and the head of the state is the nominal executive. Head of the state may be hereditary King or Queen as in the case of England, or an elected president as in the case of India, or an Emperor as in the case of Japan. Theoretically, all the powers are vested in the hands of the

head of the state, but in practice, he does not exercise these powers. Real power is exercised by the cabinet, headed by the Prime Minister. Since the cabinet holds the real power, and is responsible to the popularly elected legislature it is also called responsible type of executive. This system is followed in many countries including Britain, India, Australia and Japan.

Presidential Executive

In the Presidential type of executive the executive is separate from the legislature. There is no nominal executive, and there is only one executive-the President- and he is the real executive, in both law and practice. This type of executive developed in USA and now is practiced in many countries.

In the Presidential executive the president is directly elected by the people and enjoys a fixed tenure and can only be removed by a cumbersome special procedure called impeachment. President appoints the ministers and they are responsible to him for all their actions. Ministers hold office during the pleasure of the President. There is no collective responsibility and the president is responsible for all the actions of his ministers.

Though Presidential system is based on the principle of separation of powers, powers of the organs of government do overlap. A system of 'checks and balances' are also devised in the system, which makes the powers of the respective organs limited, as well as responsible. Though the President enjoys enormous power, he also face some limitations as regards to legislation and while making federal appointments.

Functions of the Executive

The executive performs the essential activities of government which is relate to rule application. Functions of the executive can be discussed under the following heads: Administrative, Military, Legislative, Financial and judicial.

Administrative Functions- Administrative functions include all those matters which have to deal with the strict administration of the government such as the appointment, direction and removal of officers, issue of instructions and all acts relating to the execution of laws. Internal administration is an important concern of the executive. Maintenance of peace and rule of law is the most important function of the executive, without which state cannot effectively function. Home department, which is under the control of the political executive and he along with the permanent executives is responsible for the maintenance of internal peace and security.

External administration also falls under the prerogative of the executive. It is the duty of the executive to see that a state is safe from external aggression. Executive head frame foreign policy of the state, which is pursued by the trained and professional diplomats. Executive appoints ambassadors and other diplomats, who conducts international relations under the overall guidance of the political executive. Ministry of external affairs is in charge of the conduct of relations with other countries.

Military Functions- Duty of defense of the country rest with the executive. It is an essential function of the executive to secure territorial integrity and to protect the country from external aggression, and if necessary, to wage war. The Executive has to maintain an efficient and strong army, navy, air force to defend its territory against the attack of outsiders .In USA the President can declare war or peace with the consent of the Congress and in India head of the state can declare war or conclude peace but in reality this power is exercised by the Prime Minister and his cabinet. The department which is concerned with the defense of the country and controls its military operations in India is called the Ministry of defense.

Legislative Functions-Though lawmaking is the prerogative of the legislature executive also performs some legislative functions. In Parliamentary form of government executive summon, adjourn and prorogue the session of parliament, and he can also dissolve the popular house. Executive exercise the power to issue ordinance when the legislature is not in session. Ordinance is the law made by the executive. In parliamentary systems political executives introduce the bills in the legislature and takes up the responsibility of passing the bill in the house. Assent of the chief executive or nominal executive is necessary for a bill to become act. The growth of Delegated legislation is an extension of the sphere of executive in the legislative field. As the laws are growing more complex these days, the system of passing what is known as skeleton bills is being resorted to. This has enabled the executive to supplement the law by issuing rules and regulations which makes up the case of departmental or delegated legislation.

Financial functions- The executive controls the purse of the nation. The Budget is prepared and introduced by the politic executive in the legislature.

Judicial Functions- In most countries appointment of the judges are made by the executive. Executive also exercise the power to grant pardon or reprieve to the offenders. Head of the state enjoys the power of granting mercy, whereby he may commute the sentence given by the highest court of the land. Executive may also grant amnesty to the offenders or reduce their sentence by his discretionary power.

Executive also performs miscellaneous function like regulation and control of productive forces in the country ,national planning, emergency power during war and internal disturbances, conferring of awards and honours , etc.

JUDICIARY

Judiciary is that organ of government which interpret and enforce the laws of the state. In ancient polity, the executive and the judicial functions were combined in one person. But in such an arrangement, justice could not be secured when the same person made and interpret laws. So the need for an independent and impartial organ to interpret laws was felt in modern state and the result was the advent of judiciary as a separate organ of government.

Judiciary is regarded as the guardian of the rights and liberties of the people, and also of the constitution. Welfare of citizens depend on the efficiency and impartiality of the judiciary. James Bryce has aptly remarked that there is no better test of excellence of a government than the efficiency of its judicial system. No one doubts the importance of judiciary in modern state, but its degree of importance varies from country to country. For instance in UK, where the laws are not codified, judiciary not only interprets, but also makes law. And in countries with written constitution, it acts as its guardian.

Judiciary is regarded as the rule adjudicating agency. It is the duty of the judiciary to interpret laws and punish the guilty. Rule adjudication refers to those authoritative decisions whereby conflict relating to rule application are resolved. Disputes that arise between citizens or between citizens and state are resolved by the judiciary. So in modern state an independent and impartial judiciary is a necessity for the administration of justice. Garner observed that "a society without legislature is conceivable and indeed, fully developed legislative organ did not make their appearance in the life of the state until modern times, but a civilized state without judicial organ is hardly inconceivable."

Independence of Judiciary

A judge is often pictured as a blindfolded person who holds the scales of justice, which he administers even handed. A Judge must be a person of high integrity, dignity and independence; then only he will be able to give judgments freely and impartially. Need for an independent judiciary in a modern state has become of utmost importance with the change in the nature of functions performed by the state. With the advent of welfare states the functions of the state have multiplied and role of the executive have become more important resulting in states becoming one of the biggest litigant before the courts. If the judiciary is not independent it will not be able to give decisions against the government when required and protect the rights and liberties of the people.

Modern states have devised various measures to uphold the impartiality and independence of the judiciary

Mode of appointment of judges is one most important aspect that can go a long way in ensuring the independence of the judiciary. Generally three methods are adopted by states – Elected by the people, Elected by the legislature and appointment by the executive.

In some states of America, and in some of the cantons of Switzerland judges are elected by the people. Though in theory this method appears impressive, it suffers from a number of defects. A scholarly and a quiet man may not be able to win a poll as it demands him to be talkative and popular. Popularly elected judges may not be expected to be impartial and independent, as he may have received support from political parties in his election. Moreover he is likely to give judgments which will make him popular and increase his chance of re-election. Worst of all a person who is popular but lacks legal knowledge may become a judge. According to Prof. Laski "of all the methods of appointment, that of the election by the people at large is without exception the worst".

In Switzerland judges are elected by the two federal chambers (Federal Assembly and Federal Council) sitting together, for a six year term. System has worked well in that country but it is not without defects. This method violates the spirit of separation of powers and make the judiciary subservient to the legislature. Judges elected by the legislature often are party candidates and the competence and impartiality of judges is a casualty.

Judges appointed by the executive is the most common method and is considered to be the best. Laski see this as the “the best available method of choice”. It is widely followed in many countries including India, Britain, Australia and Canada .It is claimed that executive is the most appropriate agency to judge the qualities necessary for a judicial officer. Opponents of this method content that favouratism and political considerations may cloud the appointments in this method. Though there is some merit in this argument, these defects can be easily rectified by making changes in the procedure of selecting judges by the executive. For instance, with the implementation of supremecourt guidelines regarding appointments of judges of higher judiciary, the judicial appointments has become fairly independent.

While appointing judges, care should be taken to make sure that persons who are highly qualified in the field of law are only appointed. Ideally, people with high legal knowledge, integrity, dignity and independence should only be appointed as judges.

Judges should have long tenure and should feel secure in their job. If judges are appointed for short periods they may be tempted to be corrupt, and also they may be always thinking of re-appointment .Ideally tenure of a judge should neither be too short nor it should be for life. In India, Supreme Court Judges hold office till they reach the age of 65 and high court judges till the age of 62.

Security of service is another Important aspect that ensures the independence of judiciary. If judges are under constant fear of being removed from office, they are unlikely to give judgments that annoy the executive. .So in most countries legislature is the organ that have a say in the removal of judges .In India judges can be removed from office by the President only on account of proved misbehavior or incapacity, and that too on the basis of a resolution passed by not less than 2/3rd majority in both the houses of parliament.

Judges should be paid adequate fixed salaries that will allow him to maintain a good standard of living and thus not be tempted to adopt corrupt means to amass wealth. Office of a judge must carry high salary and other emoluments, so that his social position and mode of living, may attract capable and deserving people to the legal profession. According to Bryce, honesty and independence of a judge also depend upon inducements or prospects that his office carries. Executive should not be vested with the power to alter the Judges’ salaries and allowances to his disadvantage.

For independence of judiciary, Montesquieu emphasized separation of judiciary from the executive. Judges should not be entrusted with executive and administrative duties. Liberty of people will a major casualty in such a situation. Directive Principles of state policy enshrined in the Indian constitution (Art.50) desires separation of judiciary from the executive.

Judges should not be given appointment after his retirement from service .This is necessary to prevent the judges from unduly favouring the government at the fag end of his career in the hope of executive returning the favour, in the form of appointments after retirement.

It is also required that judges avoid excessive public contacts and keep immune from public pressures in the interest of judicial independence. This will allow the judges to try cases that come before him purely on legal merit, and not on the basis of public opinion.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Judicial review is the power of the court to review the laws passed by the legislature and orders issued by the executive, when challenged by the affected persons, and to declare them null and void, if they infringe the provisions of the constitution. Judicial review holds in check legislature and the executive within the limits laid down by law.

Judicial Review is a feature of countries with written constitution and federal systems. Judicial review protects personal rights against legislative and executive actions; states' rights against national action; national rights against state action; and respective rights of three branches of government against one another.

The doctrine of judicial review originated in USA in 1803 in a leading case of Marbury v/s Madison, where chief justice Marshall ruled that court had the power to declare the actions of the congress and the executive invalid.

Chief justice Marshall defined Judicial Review as “the examination by the courts in cases actually before them of the legislative statues and executive administrative acts to determine whether or not they are prohibited by a written constitution or are in excess of powers granted by it.” Judicial review essentially means the courts of law have the power of testing the validity of legislative as well as other governmental action with reference to the provisions of the constitution.

In India ,by basis of Article 32 and 136 of the Indian constitution Supreme Court can exercise the power of judicial Review, similarly under Article 226 and 227 High Courts have the power of judicial review. Though the term judicial review is not mentioned in the constitution ,Article 13 entrust the courts of the review power, it states:

(i)All laws in force in the territory of India immediately before the commencement of this constitution, in so far as they are inconsistent with the provisions of this part, shall, to the extent of such inconsistency, be void

(2) The state shall not make any law which takes away or abridges the rights conferred by this part and any law made in contravention of this clause shall, to the extent of the contravention, be void

The scope of review power of judiciary in India is comparatively less to than that of USA.

Scope of Judicial Review in India is mainly on two grounds:

(1) Whether the law under challenge falls within the competence of the authority that has framed it; and

(2) Whether it is consistent with the part 3 of the constitution dealing with fundamental rights.

Though, Judicial Review has many positives, it has also come under fierce criticism. A major criticism is that judicial review has resulted in judicial tyranny and the whole concept is undemocratic. It is strange that one organ of government sit in judgment of the other two. Laws passed by the legislature represents popular will and it is pointed out that it is

Undemocratic for judiciary- which is not a representative body- to strike down the laws made by legislature. Moreover, it can lead to conflict between judiciary and the executive as it has happened many times in India. Finally, there is always the possibility of progressive legislations being struck down by conservative judges.

JUDICIAL ACTIVISM

Judicial activism emanates from the power of judicial review enjoyed by the courts. It refers to the assertive role played by the judiciary to force the other organs of government to discharge their constitutional obligations towards the public. Basically the courts interfere only when the other organs fails to discharge their constitutional duties. Judicial activism is a way through which relief is provided to the disadvantaged and aggrieved citizens.

Activist means 'being active' or 'one who favours intensified activities' and an activist judge activates the legal mechanism and makes it play a vital role in socio-economic process. In the words of Justice V R Krishna Iyer "every judge is an activist either on the forward gear or on the reverse"

Judiciary has moved from being passive to an activist mode. Judiciary has shed its pro-status-quo approach and taken upon itself duty to enforce the basic rights of the poor and vulnerable sections of the society, by progressive intervention and positive action. Judiciary has started playing the role of a policy maker or even the legislature in the interest of the common man. By doing this it has furthered the cause of social change or stood for upholding liberty, equality and justice for the deserving masses. More importantly courts have become more accessible to the common man and he feels that justice is within his reach. It is no wonder that judicial review enjoys much support and appreciation among the masses.

Judicial Activism in India

Judicial activism was not in vogue in India in the first 30 years of its independence. It was in the Keshavananda Bharathi case in 1973 that Supreme Court ruled that the executive had no right to tamper with the constitution and alter its 'basic structure'. During the late 1980s and early 1990s the Supreme Court began to deal frequently on issues of

political, social and economic in nature. Judicial activism in India acquired importance due to the mechanism of Public Interest Litigation(PIL).PIL means a suit filed in a court of law by the aggrieved citizen or a public spirited person for the protection of public interest such as pollution, environment road safety etc. Former Chief Justice of supreme court, Justice P. N. Bhagwati and former judge of Supreme Court Justice V.R. Krishna Ayer played a key role in promoting PIL as a way of rendering justice to people who are denied of it. Areas where judicial activism gained prominence includes issues like child labour, health, political corruption, education and generally the denial of fundamental rights to the people. The first major case of judicial activism through social action litigation was Bihar under trial case in 1979 .And after that Supreme Court began to take cognizance of custody deaths, bride burning and rape in police stations. It has also led to the prosecution of number of corrupt politicians, and other public servants due to the activism of the judiciary.

Judiciary is gradually extending its activities earlier considered to be the preserve of the executive. When the legislature and the executive shy away from taking hard and unpopular decisions, yet necessary, it is the judiciary that has filled the void. Kuldip Nayar eminent journalist, observed “judicial activism fills the vacuum that non-activism of other institutions create.”

The effect of judicial activism has generally being positive- corruption exposed in high offices and penal action initiated against the politicians and public servants, strict enforcement of environment laws and closure or relocation of large number of polluting industries, authorities do their duties mandated by law and support and satisfaction of the people with the review power of the judiciary.

Critics of Judicial activism argue that in the short run it may be beneficial, but if it is resorted to quite often it will upset the ‘balance’ of the organs of government and will obstruct the smooth functioning of government machinery.

MODULE – II

FORMS OF GOVERNMENT

Unitary Government

A unitary government is that in which all the powers are concentrated in the hands of the central government. For administrative purpose, the country may be divided into units, provinces or districts, but, their existence as well for their powers they depend upon the will of the centre. Units are merely the creation of the central government and they exist as long as the central government allows them to exist. Which means, centre can abolish these units whenever it likes, and even create new ones at its discretion. Powers are not distributed between the centre and the states under the constitution, but are concentrated in the centre only.

According to C F strong “a unitary state is one organized under a single central government, that is to say, whatever power are possessed by the various districts within the area administered as a whole by the central government, are held at the discretion of that government and the central power is supreme over the whole without any restrictions imposed by any law granting special power to its parts”. And Dicey says, “Unitary government is the habitual exercise of supreme legislative authority by one central power”.

Unitary governments exists in countries like England , France. Italy, Japan Sri-Lanka, etc.

Merits of Unitary Government

The following are the major merits of Unitary Government

Unitary type of government is considered as the most effective type of governmental organization. This is because, all important decisions are made at one common centre .This allows the centre to make prompt decisions. Powers given to the states are, only for the purpose of administrative efficiency and the centre can at any time take back those powers. This concentration of power, make the centre very strong.

Another merit is that, the organization being simple, the system posses the great merit of flexibility. It can easily adapt to the changing needs and circumstances .Constitution can be amended without much difficulty, and according to the demand of a particular situation. Governments can always keep harmony with the public opinion.

Unitary systems possess efficient administrations as there are no conflicts between the centre and the states and states are to strictly abide by the orders of the centre. So, there is no delay in the administration and the centre can take decisions very quickly.

Uniformity of administration is another big advantage of unitary form of government as there is no dual government. There is only one administrative service for the whole country and provincial administrators are to act according to the orders of the centre. There is only one parliament for making laws and one cabinet to run the administration for the whole country.

Unitary system is less expensive compared to the federal form of government as there is no duplication of political institutions at the regional level - there is only one parliament and cabinet for the entire country.

There is no division of allegiance of the citizens like in the case of federation as there is only single citizenship. This means in a unitary state, a citizen is a citizen of the entire country and no separate citizenship for states. This system check separatist tendencies in the constituent units.

Demerits of Unitary System

One major defect of unitary system is that it tends to repress local initiative as excessive centralization reduce the regional units to the position of mere agents of the centre. This impairs the vitality of local governments which is of much importance for the success of democracy. One problem with centralization is that, centre may not be fully aware of the needs of the region and thus the interest of the region may suffer in the unitary system.

Another defect with unitary system is that, there is the chance of the central government becoming despotic. Vesting full authority in the centre may tends to make the centre autocratic. As Laski observes, "the formidable centralization of the modern state is so great an enemy to an ideal system of rights. For only where power is distributed widely is there any effective restrain upon those who wield it."

Lack of local autonomy is a major demerit of the unitary system. Centre may not have sufficient time to tackle local problems. Local administrators are appointed by the central government and local people may not get enough representation in the decision making apparatus. This impairs the vitality of local administration. Interest of the region are best understood by the people of the region themselves

It is argued that unitary system is not suitable for big countries with many diversities, like India and U.S.A. Here separate legislatures and de-centralisation are needed for the units to satisfy the varied interest of the region.

Unitary system, it is argued, is more prone to collapse. Since Unitary system has only one central authority, it may easily collapse under stress from within and outside the country.

Federal Government

Federal government is one in which there is division of powers between the centre and the units. Power and authority of the state is divided and distributed between the centre and the states in a federation. Hence, in a federation, more than one government exists within a sovereign state.

According to Finer, "A federal state is one in which part of authority and power is vested in the local areas while the another part is vested in a central institution deliberately constituted by an association of local areas". According to Dicey "A federal state is nothing but a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity with the maintenance of state rights".

Word Federation is derived from the Latin word 'Foedus', which means treaty or agreement. A federation is a union of states and it is generally the result of two kinds of forces –Centripetal and centrifugal.

A federation may be formed as a result of centripetal forces, when independent states join together to form a new state. Here, two or more hitherto independent states agree to form a new state, for reasons as varied as economic interest or security. The federal union is brought through a treaty or agreement, where mutually agreeing states surrender their sovereignty. Distribution of powers between the centre and the states is based on a constitution and alteration in this can only be brought about through the tedious process of amendment. Central government is generally entrusted with matters of common or general interest and states are allocated matters of local interest. United States of America and Australia, are prime examples of federation formed as a result of centripetal forces.

Sometimes a unitary government may be transformed into a federation as a result of centrifugal forces. Here, federation comes into existence through a process of 'disintegration'. Units demand a larger measure of autonomy and this result in the formation of a federation with the distribution of power and authority between the centre and the states. This arrangement is brought about through a constitution and can be altered only through amendments. The central governments retains only those subjects, which are of national importance and transfers the rest to the jurisdiction of the units, each autonomous within the sphere assigned to it. This was the case in India when greater autonomy was given to the provinces by the Government of India Act, 1935. K C Wheare characterizes India having a 'quasi- federal' feature; a unitary state with subsidiary federal features. Canada is an example of a federation formed as a result of centrifugal forces.

Essential Features of a Federation

Distribution of Powers between the Centre And the States-

Distribution of powers between the centre and the states is indispensable for the existence of a federation. The scheme of distribution of powers will be provided in the constitution and it can only be changed through amendments. For administrative efficiency, central government grants autonomy to provincial governments. Generally, the division of powers is done in such a way that matters of national importance and which are of common interest and that require uniform treatment are handled by the central government. And, regional governments are entrusted with matters of local interest. Defence, Foreign Relations, Communications etc., invariably, are handled by the central governments and matters like supervision of local government, Education, agriculture, co-operation etc., falls within the power of state or regional governments. Actually, there is no clear rule regarding the division of powers in a federation, but generally it happens according to the circumstances in which it adopted the federal form of government.

Two methods are adopted in the distribution of powers, between the centre and the states. In the first method, the central government is given enumerated powers and the state government the residuary powers. This is the case in United States and Australia. The reason for adopting this system by the U.S.A. was largely historical. In America, states initially, refused to join the federation when it was trying to form one. And when they finally decided to join the federation, the states were not willing to give more powers to the centre. As a result, in the united states, by the tenth amendment “the powers not delegated to the united states by the constitution nor prohibited to it by the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.

In the second method, enumerated powers are given to the provinces, and the residuary powers are left to the dominion government. This is the case in Canada. In Canada too, historical events determined that, it adopt a system with strong Federal Government and weaker provincial governments. When the representatives of Canada met at Quebec in 1865 for the purpose of forming a federation, all the powers were then in the hands of the Federal Government. The desire to keep a strong federal government was high among the people, as they felt they could not ignore the lessons from the civil war in the United States, which could have easily been tackled had America possessed a strong centre. India too, opted for a strong central government as the constitution was framed after the partition of the country and the framers of the constitution decided have a strong centre which they thought will check secessionist tendencies in the future.

Supremacy of the Constitution-

Second and essential feature of a federation is that constitution should be supreme. This essentially means that, the it should not be possible for the units as well as the federal governments to change the constitution, whenever it pleases. Centre and the states must have full faith in the constitution and it should be considered as the highest law of the country. Both the centre and the units should work within the allotted spheres and if they go beyond it, they are bound to be checked by the judiciary. A written and rigid constitution make sure that constitution can be changed only with the consent of the federal government and the units and that too, the both, working together. A special procedure is adopted to amend the constitution and the amending procedure is deliberately made difficult in a federation .This is done to ensure that there are very few amendments made and so the stability of the constitution is maintained. Dicey says “the law of the constitution must either be immutable, or else capable of being changed only by some authority above and beyond the ordinary legislative bodies, whether federal or state legislatures existing under the constitution”

Supremacy of the Judiciary

Stability of a Federation depends largely upon the existence of an independent and impartial judiciary. Federal Judiciary performs two important functions in a Federation

(1) It adjudicates on disputes arising between central and the regional governments or between one regional government against the other.

(2) It keeps different governments within their limits laid down by law, so that none may encroach upon the jurisdiction of the other.

In the absence of an independent judiciary, Centre and the states would have interpreted the constitution to their own liking. In a federation, supreme court is established to decide constitutional disputes and to interpret the constitution. In India and the United States, supreme court performs these functions and its judgment is binding on both the central and regional governments. A free judiciary is essential, so that the centre or the states may not have decisions in their favour by exerting pressure on the judiciary. Moreover, to win the confidence of the centre and the states a free and impartial judiciary is a necessity. J S Mill has emphasized this fact, that “not only that the constitutional limits of the authority of each (central and regional governments alike) should be precisely and clearly defined, but the power to decide between them in any case of dispute should not reside in either of the governments, or in any functionary subject to it, but in an umpire independent of both. There must be a supreme court of justice, and a system of coordinate courts in every state of the union, before whom such questions shall be carried, and whose judgment on them in the last stage or appeal shall be final”

Conditions Necessary for the Success of Federation

Certain conditions are essential for the successful functioning of a federation. They are as follows-

Geographical contiguity is essential for the states desirous of forming a federation. It is very difficult to create a spirit of unity and mutual help, if states in a federation are widely separated by land or sea. Gilchrist has remarked, “Distance leads to carelessness or callousness on the part of both central and local governments. Natural unity is difficult to attain where the people are too far apart”. Defense of the federation is a major problem when states are far apart. For instance West and East Pakistan were separated by thousands of kilometers and during the war of 1971 with India, Pakistan failed to defend its territory, and that eventually led to the creation of a separate nation- Bangladesh. There is geographical unity in the case of India, USA and Canada.

Another condition is that, there should be a genuine desire among the states to form a federation, in other words, states should voluntarily join in a federation. The will to have a federation among the states is the basis of formation of a federation. The units joining the federation should be bound together by common ties of national affinity and sentiment. Otherwise, federal government will be unable to stand up to the stress and strains inherent in a federation. Federalism is an effective device to keep together a plural society, or to secure unity in diversity. India, Canada and USA are examples of states that have many diversities, but for one reason or the other, they have developed a sense of common identity, which they really cherish and do not wish to lose. At the same time, units should be able to maintain their separate identity. In the words of Dicey “they must desire union and not unity”.

Absence of marked inequality among the units is cited as an important condition for the success of federation by some writers. Though, in practice, equality among all the units in a federation is inconceivable. It is said that, units of a federation should be comparatively equal as regards area and size of the population. If there is marked inequality, there is every chance of exploitation of weaker units by the stronger ones. Inequality among states can lead to conflict and thus, hurt the stability of the federation. According to K C Wheare, "There must be some sort of reasonable balance which will ensure that all the units can maintain their independence within the sphere allocated to them and that, no one can dominate the others. It must be the task of those who frame and work a federal government to see that no unit shall be too large, and, equally important, none too small".

A federating unit must possess adequate economic resources. The dual government entails a lot of expenses. Units in a federation must have sufficient economic resources to carry out its functions and should not be too dependent on the centre for its financial needs. If that is the case, then, units would not be able to enjoy real independence. Moreover, wide economic inequality has the potential to create conflicts among units.

Similarity of social and political institutions is an important factor for the formation as well as for the better working of a federation. This helps the federation to work harmoniously. It is difficult to create unity if there exists wide dissimilarity in the political institutions of the state. The constitution of India, Canada and Australia provide for the parliamentary form of government at the centre and in the units. Likewise, constitution of America demands that it should be the 'republican' form of government at the centre and in the federating units.

Federal government requires people to be politically competent as well as enlightened. People should be politically educated, which would allow them to forget differences and work with a compromising spirit for the welfare of the federation. The dual allegiance to the central and provincial governments requires a proper balance and can be better handled by the people who are politically educated and mature.

Merits of Federal Government

Countries that have vast territory and characterised by diversities of language, culture, race, religion etc., have found the federal form of government advantageous. The merits of federation are many and important among them are as follows-

It is well accepted that the federal form of government seek to reconcile national unity with regional autonomy. It harmonises local autonomy with national unity and thereby provides an equilibrium between centripetal and centrifugal forces. In this type of government local self government, regional autonomy and national unity are all achievable. In this system, unit can retain their separate identities and autonomy, but it is not at the cost of national unity. Dicey has rightly observed, "Federal state is a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity and power with maintenance of 'state rights'".

Division of powers between the centre and the states is a sure way to administrative efficiency. In fact, a federal system is based on the principle of decentralization and division of powers. A major reason for administrative inefficiency is said to be the concentration of authority and the consequent overburdening of work. But, in a federation with the distribution of power and authority, this problem does not arise. In a federation, burden of work of the centre is lessened and centre does not have to be bothered about the problems, purely of local nature. Centre can concentrate on issues of national importance and the units can effectively tackle issues of regional nature. This arrangement inevitably leads to the efficiency of administration.

Distribution of powers is an effective check on the rise of despotism. If all the powers are vested with the centre, it may become despotic. In a federation distribution of powers is carried out according to the provisions of the constitution. Any attempt to usurp the powers of the units by the centre will be firmly resisted by the units. Moreover, federal judiciary ensures that centre does not exceeds the power which it is authorized to hold as per the constitution. According to Bryce, federalism thus prevents the rise of a despotic central government. It also facilitates the establishment of democratic institutions in a widely diffused area. It provides for limited and constitutional government.

In a federal set up it has been observed that people take more interest in the local and regional affairs. People gets ample opportunities to take part in the affairs of the region and they play a part in the formation of local governments. This naturally stimulates the interest of the people in public affairs and makes them active participant in the democratic process.

Federation provides condition for faster economic growth as free flow of labour and capital is possible in a federation where it is in short supply. Moreover, vast territories with abundant and varied natural resources come in handy in its pursuit of economic growth.

Another great merit of federation is, it's strength. The federation consists of many states and their combined resources give them greater security and strength. For instance, the most powerful nation-U.S.A., consists of fifty states, and these states individually would not have commanded the respect and stature that it commands now, had they stayed independent. Same is the case with India, where the erstwhile princely states would not have got any importance in the international arena, had they not joined the Indian union. It can be added here that small states derive more advantage while joining the federation than staying alone.

Demerits Of Federal Government

Federation is not without demerits. Some of them are listed below-

Federal government is generally considered to be weaker, compared to the unitary ones. Since the authority is divided between the centre and the states there cannot be any prompt action as the centre will have to ascertain the views of the units before taking a decision. Distribution of powers leads to division of responsibility and this weakens the government. Dicey feels that "A federal government is, as compared with a unitary constitution, a weak form of government..... A true federal government is based on the division of powers. It means the constant effort of statesmanship to balance one side of the confederacy against another".

One of the biggest threat, a federation faces is the danger of secession of units from the federation. Units enjoy autonomy and sometimes they are allowed to have separate constitutions, legislature, executive and even judiciary in a federation. Units may develop a spirit of defiance and independence and this may prompt them to think of secession. This happened in the case of U.S.A. where the southern states seceded from the federation and were brought back with the help of force.

Another demerit is that, federal system entails huge expenses. Since there are two sets of government, it is more expensive and complex. Federation has to maintain separate legislatures, cabinet, bureaucracy etc., for the centre and the states. Dual system also adds to the complexity of government functioning.

Federal form of governments demand constitutions which are written and rigid. It is difficult to make changes in the rigid constitution. Critics of federation point out that, because of the difficulty in making changes in the constitution, federal constitutions often are not able to keep pace with the changing needs and aspirations of the people. This impedes national progress.

Federalism also create divided allegiances and divided loyalties. Generally, federation provides double citizenship- an individual is a citizen of his own state as well as the citizen of the federation. Therefore, the citizen has to be loyal to their state as well as to the centre. Problem arises when loyalty of a citizen come into conflict with the loyalty towards centre.

There are some weakness with regard to pursuance of vigorous foreign policies by the federal government. State governments sometimes may not agree with the centre on foreign policies. For instance, when government of India transferred some area of Berubari in December 1960 to Bangladesh as per the ninth constitutional Amendment, the state of West Bengal lodged a strong protest with the centre. Likewise, various local considerations have an impact on the way finally how the foreign policy of a federation is framed, which may not always be in the best interest of the federation.

Federations are characterised by the vast diversity of legislation and administration. Each units have their own legislature and administration. The laws made by one unit may hugely differ from the laws made by the other unit on the same subject. This leads to a lot of confusion, as a citizen may violate the law of one unit but not the other when he carry out the same action at different units. Such diversities of legislation leads to a lot of confusion and complexities.

PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT

Governments have been classified on the basis of the relationship of the political executive with the legislature. If the political executive is immediately responsible to the parliament, it is called parliamentary form of government. It is also called cabinet or responsible form of government, because the cabinet enjoys the real powers of government and is responsible to the parliament. According to Dr. Garner, "cabinet government is that system in which the real executive-the cabinet or ministry-is immediately and legally responsible to the legislature or branch of it(usually the more popular chamber) for its political policies and act, and immediately or ultimately responsible to the electorate; while the titular or nominal executive-the chief of the state-occupies a position of irresponsibility". Some of the countries that have parliamentary form of governments are Britain, India, Australia and Canada.

There exist dual executive in the Parliamentary system- one executive is real and the other, nominal. In India real executive is the Prime Minister and his Cabinet and the nominal executive the President of India. In England King is the nominal executive and the Prime Minister and his cabinet is the real executive.

Parliamentary form of government is characterized by the close relationship of the political executive and the legislature. Ministers are chosen from the members of the legislature and are responsible to the legislature for all their acts of commission and omission. Political executive can continue in office only till they enjoy the confidence of the legislature.

In the cabinet form of government Prime Minister is the leader and he selects his cabinet and presides over the meetings of the cabinet.

Features of Parliamentary Form of Government

Following are the main features of parliamentary form of government.

Head of the State Exercises Nominal Powers- In Parliamentary system there exists a titular Executive or Head of the State. He may be the President, the Governor General, the King or the Queen. Presidents are the Head of the states in countries like India, Australia and Italy, and the King or Queen in countries like Britain, Japan and Denmark. Constitutionally the Head of the State enjoys many powers, but in practice he does not utilize these powers. Hence, head of the State is called the nominal executive. Real power, rest with the Prime Minister and his cabinet, where Prime Minister is the Head of the Government. The executive power of the government is actually exercised by the cabinet in the name of the head of the state. Legally speaking cabinet is appointed by the head of the state and can be dismissed by him, but, politically it is unthinkable, unless the government has lost majority in the parliament.

Collective Responsibility-Cabinet system is based on the principle of collective responsibility; which means the cabinet is collectively responsible to the parliament. It is said that 'they swim or sink together'. It means once a decision has been taken by the cabinet, it is then the responsibility of the ministers to support it, inside and outside the

parliament, even if he had not agreed to it in the cabinet. Ministers are collectively responsible to the Parliament. If a no-confidence motion is passed by the parliament against one minister, it is considered to have been passed against the entire cabinet. Prime Minister and the cabinet has to then tender their resignation. The principle of 'all for one and one for all' applies in the working of the cabinet form of government.

Individual Responsibility- Apart from collectively responsible to the Parliament, ministers are also individually responsible to the parliament for the conduct of his ministry. A Minister is answerable to the members of Parliament on matters regarding the department the minister heads. In India by Art 75(3) of the constitution, ministers are responsible to the lower house of the Parliament. In case of any lapse in its administration, ministers are personally answerable to the parliament. In the case of severe adverse criticism against a minister, he may resign, so as to not put the whole cabinet in an awkward situation. There have been instances in India where ministers have resigned owning moral responsibility of the lapses of their ministry, like Lal Bahadur Shastri did in 1956, after a major railway accident when he was then the railway minister.

Clear and Stable Majority- In Parliamentary system, administration is run by **the** party that gets a majority in the legislature. Head of the state invites the leader of the majority party in the legislature to become the Prime Minister and to form government. Prime Minister selects his minister and they are appointed by the head of the state as ministers. The ministers can continue in office as long as they enjoy the support of the lower house of parliament. In the case of coalition governments, the head of the state invites the leader of the coalition that got the majority in the legislature to form government.

Political Homogeneity-Members of cabinet are generally drawn from a single political party having majority in the legislature. They must constitute a homogeneous team. Harmonious working of the cabinet will be a casualty, if ministers are from different political parties having different political ideologies. But in countries with multiparty system like France and in India, it is not always possible for a single party get majority in parliament and form government. The result is the formation of coalition governments in these countries, where different political parties come together on the basis of some common understanding or ideology and agree to form governments.

Leadership of the Prime Minister-The main characteristics of Parliamentary system is the leadership of the Prime Minister over the cabinet. Prime Minister is generally the leader of the majority party in the lower house and thus he is also called the leader of the house. Ministers are selected by the prime minister and appointed by the head of the state on his advise. Prime Minister is the leader of the cabinet and the leader of the council of ministers. Prime Minister allocates the portfolios to the ministers and supervise and coordinates their functions. He can promote or recommend to the President the dismissal of any minister at his own will. If a minister does not cooperate with the Prime minister or has any serious difference with any policy, the minister will have to resign. If he fails to do so, the Prime Minister can get him removed from the cabinet. Prime Minister can also recommend to the president for the dismissal of a ministry as a whole. He can also recommend to the President for the dissolution of the parliament. Prime Minister presides

over the cabinet and council meetings. Though he acts on the advise of the cabinet, he is the one who makes the final decisions of the government. All major decisions and policies are formulated by the cabinet and here prime minister by virtue of his position as head of the cabinet exerts tremendous influence over each any every decision made by the cabinet. Prime Minister is an important link between the ministry and the head of the state, where he keeps the head of the state informed of all decisions of the cabinet. As per the Art.78 of the constitution Prime minister of India is duty bound to inform the president of all decisions of the council of ministers relating to the administration of the affairs of the union. Prime Minister is the chief spokesman of the government it is the Prime Minister who clarifies if there is any confusion or misunderstanding in a government policy or decision. His word is taken as the last and final word of the government. Finally, death or resignation of the Prime Minister leads to the dissolution of the whole cabinet.

Secrecy of Procedure- It is a pre-requisite of Parliamentary form of government. In India ministers are required to take oath of allegiance to the constitution and secrecy of office before taking charge as a minister.

Merits of Parliamentary System

The great virtue of Parliamentary system is the harmony and co-operation between legislature and the executive departments. Legislature is the creator of political executive in the parliamentary system. Prime minister and the ministers come from parliament and are responsible to it. Prime Minister has control over the house and the cabinet and he is the leader of the both. Close co-operation between legislature and political executive is necessary for the passage of bills in parliament. Close cooperation that exists between the political executive and legislature in parliamentary system helps in the smooth functioning of the government.

Another merit of cabinet form of government is that, it as a responsible form of government. In this system executive is responsible to the parliament for administration and policy. Parliament has a day-to-day control over the government (executive) for its administration and policies. There are various methods at its disposal to effectively control the government. Parliament can bring in censure motion, adjournment motion, no-confidence motion etc, against the government and can put questions and supplementary questions to the ministers. In this way government is always made responsible to the legislature, and in an indirect way, to the people.

It is said that the pulse of the nation is accurately felt in the cabinet form of government. The cabinet ministers are always in close contact with the members of the majority party supporting them. Ministers sit in the legislatures and listen to the views of the members both from their party and the opposition. Opposition constantly raise questions and often criticizes the ministers. This enables the ministers to ascertain the minds of the house and also that of the people whom the various members represent. Bryce points out "Being in constant contact with the members of the opposition as well as in closer contact with those of their own, they have opportunities of feeling the pulse of the assembly and through it the pulse of public opinion."

A great merit of Parliamentary system is that, the chances of government becoming autocratic are very less in Parliamentary system. As have already been explained, in Parliamentary system government is always responsible to the Parliament. Legislature has many devices at its disposal to check the government, if it behaves in an arbitrary manner, like censure motion and the vote of no- confidence. In this system those vested with power are under constant threat of being ousted from office, if they abuse their power and authority. Power is not concentrated in one person, rather it is vested in a group of cabinet ministers. This dispersal of authority puts effective curb on the possible despotic tendencies of the government

Parliamentary governments are considered as more responsive to public opinion. Parliamentary governments seek to satisfy the desires of the people. It is the duty of the ministers to fulfill the promises that they have given to the people at the time of elections. If they fail to fulfill those promises their party would face difficulty winning the next elections. Moreover, governments should be able to know the changing needs and aspirations of the people and act accordingly, otherwise there is the danger of the government not only becoming unpopular but also of losing support of the members of Parliament.

De-Merits of Parliamentary Form of Government

Parliamentary system violates the principle of separation of powers. As discussed earlier, legislature is the creator of the political executive and the both the organs functions in co-operation and harmony. But, in this system the executive is dependent on the legislature for its existence. This makes the executive subservient to the legislature which is not good as it can lead to inefficiency. So, critics point out, harmony between the legislature and the executive is at the cost of efficiency. And again, critics point out, concentration of legislative and executive power in one person lead to the passage of tyrannical laws.

Another major demerit of Parliamentary governments is its instability. Parliamentary governments are dependent on the vagaries of the legislature. A government can remain in office, only till they enjoy the confidence of the legislature. So there will be a lot of uncertainty regarding a governments continuance in office, especially if they are surviving on a wafer thin majority in the legislature. Unstable nature of Parliamentary governments are even more pronounced in countries with coalition governments. Here governments are formed by various political parties coming together based on some understanding. By its vary nature coalitions governments are unstable as the parties supporting the government may withdraw support, if it suits them.

There is the apprehension of Parliamentary governments becoming the dictatorship of the cabinet. If the government has sufficient majority in the Parliament the cabinet may act in an arbitrary manner.

Cabinet government is criticized as being an inefficient form of government. It is termed as a government by amateurs. The various departments in the ministry are handled by individual ministers who are often not trained in the art of administration and its technicalities. While in office lot of their time is spent nurturing their constituencies so as to win the next election. The result is that, the administration suffer for lack of proper supervision and leadership.

In the cabinet form of government the executive may become subservient to the legislature. Dicey stressed this aspect when he said that the dependence of the executive on the legislature for its very existence may turn the former into a mere slave or appendage of the latter. Thus the executive may become uncritical, ineffective and paralysed.

It is well acknowledged that parliamentary systems are unsuitable in emergencies. The emergency situation demands quick and strong response. But the delay in decision making process in the cabinet system makes it unsuitable for dealing with emergency situations.

Frequent change of governments hampers the continuity or consistency in policies. The instability of governments wrecks the continuity and consistency of policy which is essential for efficient administration.

PRESIDENTIAL GOVERNMENT

Presidential system is based on the principle of separation of powers. Independence of the legislative and executive powers is the specific quality of Presidential government. Here executive is independent of legislature and is not responsible to it for his acts. The executive is neither the creator of the legislature, nor is it responsible to that body for its public acts or dependent on it for remaining in office. President is directly elected by the people and he enjoys a fixed tenure. President can be removed from office only through a special procedure called impeachment, which is not easy. According to Garner Presidential form of government "is a government in which the executive is independent of the legislature as regards its tenure and to a large extent as regards its policy and ends". This system is followed in the U.S.A., Brazil and many countries of South America.

There is no nominal executive in the Presidential system. There is only one executive—the President—and he is the real executive. The President and his ministers do not sit in the legislature and take part in the proceedings, as they are not members of the legislature. Here, President can choose men of known administrative qualities as ministers from the public. Ministers are responsible to the President for all their actions and they can continue in office as long as the president wants them to. Which means, President can select as well as dismiss a minister at his own discretion. Ministers in the Presidential system are not colleagues of the President, rather they are subordinate officers of the President. Advice of the ministers are not thus, binding on the president. The 'cabinet' under the Presidential system is different from that of the Parliamentary system in that president can override the opinion of the cabinet or if he so desires, he may not even seek the opinion of the 'cabinet'.

In Presidential system there is no collective responsibility as in the case of parliamentary system.

United States of America is the best example of Presidential system. Presidency of USA is widely regarded as one of the greatest political offices in the world. He enjoys great many powers and is regarded as the most powerful head of the government. He enjoys the power of 'veto' where the President can turn down the laws passed by the congress. A bill 'vetoed' by the President can become a law, only if it is passed by both the houses with two-third majority.

In USA, where there exist the separation of powers, a system of 'checks and balances' have been devised to make the power limited, controlled and diffused. It means that the independence of the three organs of government are not absolute. Though these branches are separate, a kind of interdependence and interrelationship exist among these organs of government. By this mechanism the excessive independence of one organ of government is reduced through the check of the other organs.

Though president of USA enjoys wide powers, there are also certain limitations to his power. President does not have the authority to summon or dissolve the congress. President cannot initiate any bill directly in the congress. President can only sent messages from time to time, to the congress, recommending the enactment of particular laws. All major federal appointments made by the President needs the approval of the senate. International treaties signed by the president also needs the ratification of the senate. Expenditure incurred for war has to be granted and approved by the senate.

Merits of Presidential Government

Lot of merits are attached to the Presidential form of government and many countries have adopted this type of government. Some of the merits of Presidential government are:

Chief merit of Presidential System is its stability. President is elected by the people for a fixed tenure and cannot be removed from office by a no-confidence motion like in the case of Parliamentary system. President can only be removed from office through the process of impeachment, which is a complicated process. Moreover, in most countries, including the U.S.A. President can be impeached only for the violation of the constitution. Till date, no president has been removed from office in the U S A, through impeachment, though constitution of that country was established as early as 1789. Only once was impeachment proceedings initiated in the USA , and it was against President A. Johnson, but it failed to carry through for want of required numbers in the senate. Principle virtue of this system is that it creates a stable executive within the framework of a democratic order.

Presidential government ensures consistent and continuous policies. Since the president enjoys fixed tenure and cannot be easily removed, he can follow consistent and continuous home and foreign policies. In this system real power is held by only one person- president- and he can choose his own advisors as per his discretion. This allows him to put in practice the vision he has for his country.

Another merit of Presidential system is that, President enjoys a lot of independence and flexibility while choosing his ministers. This a great advantage, as the President can rope in services of experts and people of exceptional administrative qualities from the public. President can appoint ministers irrespective of party affiliations and even non- party men can be appointed .In the united states there have been instances where retired army generals given appointed as defense ministers.

There is the greater chance of efficiency of administration in the presidential system as it is based on the principle of 'division of labour'. President can carry on with job of administration without any interruption from any quarter and likewise, the congress can carry on its job of legislation without much interference from outside. There is no excessive

work, either for the legislature or for the executive. President and his ministers does not have to 'nurture' any particular constituency as they are not elected from a particular constituency. This allows the President and his team to devote all their time to the administration of the country. President can take quick and prompt decisions and act firmly without any loss of time, when needed. The unified control in the administration that is possible in the Presidential government help in enhancing the efficiency of administration.

Presidential system is suitable for dealing with emergency situations. Unity of control, Quickness in decision, and concerted policy, which emergency situations demand can best be obtained in the presidential system. President does not have to act according to the direction of the legislature or members of his cabinet. Since all powers are concentrated in the hands of the president he can take quick decisions in the least possible time which an emergency situation may demand, This was amply proved by the way president Roosevelt dealt with during the second world war as United States' President.

De-merits of Presidential Form of Government

Presidential system has many short comings. Major de-merits of Presidential systems are:

The possibility of the chief executive becoming autocratic are high in the Presidential system. President does not have to fear the opposition, as he knows that he cannot be easily removed from office. Esmein asserts that Presidential system is 'autocratic, dangerous and irresponsible'. President may act according to his whims and fancies, if he may so desires. There is also the chance of President behaving in an irresponsible manner as he is not responsible and answerable to the legislature for his actions. No immediate action can be taken against the President if he behaves in an arbitrary manner. Only course available will be to wait for the expiry his term, if impeachment is out of reach for the opposition.

The Presidential system is also not self corrective. President and the ministers do not sit in the legislature or take part in the proceedings of the parliament. President does not get to hear criticisms and different points of view emanating from the opposition benches regarding the administration of his government. Consequently, the chance of the president becoming blind to his misgivings and shortcomings are high in the presidential system.

The separation of legislature from the executive is not always desirable as it may lead to conflicts between the legislature and the executive. It can lead to a situation of deadlocks and delays in the working of the government. Here three possibilities arise- one, executive may ask the legislature to enact a particular legislation which he thinks is necessary, but the legislature may refuses to comply. Two, legislature pass a bill, but it is turned down by the Presidential veto. Three, legislature may pass certain laws and the executive may not enforce them in the spirit in which they were passed and thereby making the legislation ineffective. All these situations lead to certain deadlocks and delays in the administration which ultimately affect the efficiency of the system.

As regards following vigorous foreign policies Presidential system suffers from certain weakness. In the united states all major federal appointments and international treaties signed by the president has to be ratified by the Senate. Expenses for the conduct of war needs the approval of the legislature. President will face a tough time, if the congress is dominated by the members from the opposition party. Such situations place limitation on the president in the conduct of international relations.

The inability of the executive to initiate legislation is a serious disadvantage of the Presidential system. The President can only request or persuade the legislature to enact a particular legislation. There is no certainty that the legislature will accede to his request.

MODULE – III

ELECTIONS AND REPRESENTATION

A: POLITICAL PARTIES

Political parties are indispensable for the working of modern representative democracy. They have made their way into vast majority of countries of the world and in most political systems. Nature of these parties may differ widely—they may be democratic or authoritarian; they may seek power through elections or through revolutions; and may be ideologically as varied as left, right or centre. But one thing is certain, there will be some kind of political parties in almost all countries of the world, regardless of the fact that where that country is situated.

Historically, the origin of party system is intimately connected with the development of British party system and politics. Hence, party system in England is regarded as the progenitor of modern parties. Generally, party system is viewed as an extra-legal growth in most democracies, as it is not mentioned in the constitutions and it exists outside the legal framework of the states. Constitution of United States of America does not presume the existence of political parties. So is the case with Britain. In fact, makers of American constitution were against political parties, as they felt parties were highly detrimental to national solidarity, as they encouraged strife, division, chicanery and personal manipulation. President George Washington even advised the people against formation of political parties. Yet, within a few years (by the beginning of the 19th century) party system became well established in America.

Parties of the modern kind first emerged in the USA, where the federalist party (later the wigs, and, from 1800, the Republican Party) appeared as a mass based party during the election of 1800. Many conservative and liberal parties started their life as factions. But later on, they widened their base and transformed into mass based parties. Socialist and parties representing religious and ethnic groups on the other hand, were born as a result of social movements or interest groups operating outside government. They developed into full fledged political parties in the hope of winning formal representation and shaping public policy. By the middle of the 20th century about 80 per cent of the world's states were ruled by political parties. But in the 1960s and early 1970s, a lot of developing countries, especially the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa reverted to military rule. This was largely because of the feeling that democracy was divisive and failed to solve the problems of the people. Added to this was the inconvenience the democracy caused to the economic and military elites in these countries. But the upsurge in the democratization felt in the 1980s and 1990s world over have again brought back the importance of political parties.

Definitions of Political Party

Some of the important definitions of political parties are stated below:

According to R N Glichrist “A political party is an organized group of citizens who profess to share the same political views and who by acting as a political unit try to control the government”

According to R.G. Gettle, “A political party consists of group of citizens, more or less organised, who acts as a political unit and who by the use of their voting power, aim to control the government and carry out their general policies”

According to R.M.MacIver “A political party is an association organized in support of some principles or policy which by constitutional means in endeavors to make the determinant of government”

Basic Features of Political Parties

A close reading of the above definitions of political parties given by various scholars lead us to some idea about the basic features of political parties. We can summarise the characteristics or ingredients of political parties as thus:

Organisation- Political parties are more or less organized. Without organization people make just a disorganized crowd and it will be difficult to conform to the common principles on which they agree. Moreover, organization provides strength to the party and helps it to influence people better. Political party needs a good organization to communicate their policies and programs to the people.

Members agree on principles- Members of a political part must agree on fundamental principles of public policy adopted by the party. Members may differ on details, but there should be no difference of opinion on the fundamental principles they stand for. If there is disagreement among members on fundamentals, then cooperation among the members become difficult and their political ends even more difficult.

Formulate clear programmes- Political party should formulate clear and specific programme which they should place before the electorate to win their support. Political party can succeed in this, only if the party members support their programme wholeheartedly and work for its realization

A political should adopt only constitutional and peaceful means to capture power and form government- It is the ballot box which should decide the fate of a political party and its claim to form government. Violence as a means of capturing power cannot be the character of political party in a democracy.

A political party must promote national interest – A political party must endeavor to promote national interest and not sectarian or communal interest . Burke defines a political party as “a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed”. When a political party tries to promote sectional interest and selfish ends, it degenerates into a faction.

A political party should aim to capture power - party that does not aim to capture power and form government cannot be termed a political party in the technical sense. And as stated earlier a political party should use only constitutional means to capture power.

Basis of Political Parties

There are five distinct basis for the formation of political parties. They are as follows:

(1) One important explanation of party divisions is that, it is based on human nature. Origin of political parties can be traced in the domain of human psychology. People have different temperaments. If some are moderates, others are extremist; if some are radical, others are reactionary. Thus, people form parties to give expression to their instincts. The conservatives may get together and form a party, catering to conservative and orthodox views, while the radically inclined people may constitute a liberal or socialist party. According to their temperamental differences and leanings, people are attracted to one party or the other. This is the reason why people who want to retain and maintain their old institutions are attracted towards the conservative parties and people who desire change in the organization and working of institutions are attracted towards radical parties.

(2) Economic interest is one major reason for the formation of political parties. If some people desire economic freedom, others prefer more and more state control on the economic liberties of the people. Thus, some advocate *laissez faire* while others desire socialism that stands for state intervention in the economic life of the people. Thus, we see people forming liberal parties which are in favour of less and less state control over the economic life of the people and some forming socialist parties which advocates more of state intervention in peoples economic life. Halcombe has observed "National parties cannot be maintained by transitory impulses or upon temporary needs. They must be founded upon permanent sectional interest, above all upon those of an economic character".

(3) Political parties may be formed on the basis of ideology. The clash of economic interest that we have already mentioned above can be further studied in the factor of ideology. Parties of the 'right' like Fascist and Nazis are interested in protecting and promoting the interest of the capitalist and other affluent sections of the society. Whereas, parties of the 'left', like socialist and the communist desire a change in the present system, so as to give benefits to the underprivileged sections of the society. But, today ideological differences between political parties are not that pronounced. For instance, policies and programmes of the Republican and Democratic parties in the USA are such that, it is difficult to distinguish one from the other on the basis of ideology. Marxist parties on the other hand, are keen on them being different from others on the basis of ideology and term all non-communist parties as organizations of 'right reaction'.

(4) Religion, caste and communal sentiments also play a part in the formation of political parties, especially in the developing countries of the world. Here people have very strong sentiments for their religious or communal order. It becomes relatively least for the political parties to appeal to their primordial identities like caste or community and thus convert their support into political support. Christian democrats in Switzerland, Hindu Maha Sabha and Akali Dal in India etc., are examples of parties based on religion and ethnicity. Dravida Munnetra kazhgam in Tamil Nadu and Mizo National Front in Mizoram falls in the category of parties mentioned above.

(5) Environment also induces an individual to seek the membership of one party or other. Generally people inherit politics as they inherit religion. Children get their basic political orientation from the family and it has a tremendous influence over the child. Often, thus, political views of the family also become the political views of the child. In the USA for example, people of Irish descent traditionally show their inclination towards the democratic party, while the people of German descent prefer the republican party.

Types of Political Parties

There are any number of classification for the political parties. The most important of these are as follows:

Cadre and mass parties

Representative and Integrative parties

Constitutional and Revolutionary Parties

Left-wing and Right-wing Parties.

The most common distinction is that of '**cadre**' parties and '**mass**' parties. The *cadre* party originally meant a 'party of notables', dominated by an informal group of leaders who saw little point in building up a mass organization. Such parties developed out of parliamentary cliques or factions at a time when franchise was limited. However, the term cadre now denotes trained and professional party members who exhibit high level of political commitment and doctrinal discipline. The distinguishing feature of cadre parties is their reliance on a politically active elite, that is capable of offering ideological leadership to the masses. Chinese communist party, Nazi party in Germany, Fascist Party in Italy are examples of cadre parties.

Mass parties emphasis on broadening membership and constructing a wide electoral base. For this to happen, they give much importance to recruitment and organization, than on ideology and political conviction. Earliest examples of mass parties were European socialist parties, like German Social Democratic Party and UK Labour Party, which constructed organizations designed to mobilize working class support. Most modern, fall in the category of 'catch- all parties' as mentioned by Otto Kirchheimer. These are parties have played down their ideology in order to appeal to the largest possible number of voters. Best example of catch all parties are found in USA in the form of Republican and democratic party. Modern de-ideologised socialist parties such as German Social democrats and the Labour party in the UK also fit this description.

A party distinction advanced by Sigmund Neumann is that of between **Integrative parties** and **Representative parties**.

Representative parties attempts to reflect, rather than shape public opinion. Primary function of these parties is to secure as many votes as possible in elections. In this respect they place pragmatism before principle. The prevalence of such parties in modern politics have given force to arguments which portray politicians as power- seeking creatures who are willing to adopt whatever policies that will bring them electoral success.

Integrative parties, on the other hand, adopt proactive, rather than reactive political strategies. These parties emphasis on mobilizing people and they try to educate the masses, rather than merely responding to their concerns. Although Neumann saw the typical mobilizing party as an ideologically disciplined cadre party, mass parties also exhibit mobilizing tendencies. For example, until they faced electoral failure and got consequently discouraged , socialist parties were bent on winning over the electorate to a belief in the benefits of public ownership, full employment ,redistribution, social welfare and so on.

Third classification of parties is of, **Constitutional parties** and **Revolutionary parties**. Constitutional parties acknowledge the rights and entitlements of other parties, and thus operate within a framework of rules and constraints. These parties understand that there is division between the party and state, between party in power and state institutions, that enjoy formal independence and political neutrality. Constitutional parties, above all, acknowledge and respect the rules of electoral competition. They understand that winning or losing an election is part of the electoral process. Mainstream political parties in liberal democracies all have such a constitutional character.

Revolutionary parties, on the other hand are anti-system or anti-constitutional parties, either of the left or the right. Revolutionary parties aim to seize power, by overthrowing the existing constitutional structure through insurrection and popular revolution or through quasi-legalism as was practiced by Nazis and Fascists. Revolutionary parties when they win power, they invariably become 'ruling' or regime parties, suppressing rival parties and establishing a permanent relationship with the state machinery. In single party systems ,whether established under the banner of communism, nationalism fascism etc., the distinction between party and the state is weakened and ruling party substitute for government, creating a fused 'party- state apparatus' This was the case in the former USSR where the general Secretary of the communist party used to act as the head of the government.

The final classification of political parties is on the basis of ideology especially between parties those labeled **Left- Wing** and those labeled **Right-Wing**. Left parties (progressive, socialist and communist parties) stands committed to change, in the form of either social reform or whole scale economic transformation. These parties have traditionally drawn their support from the ranks of the poor and disadvantaged sections of the society. Right-wing parties (conservative and fascist parties in particular) generally uphold the existing social order and stands for continuity. Their supporters usually include business interest and the materially contented middle class. These classification of right and left are often misleading in the present times, as a single party may show the characteristics of both the right and the left.

Functions of Political Parties

Political parties are considered as the backbone of democracy without which modern democratic governments would not have functioned to our satisfaction. They perform a variety of functions which helps in the smooth working of democracy. Some of the functions performed by political parties are:

Political parties unite, simplify and stabilize the political process. They bring together sectional interest overcome geographical distances, and provides coherence to divisive governmental structures. Political parties, especially, national parties are a unifying force in a society, characterized by diversities of language, religion, caste, culture etc. With the huge population of modern states without the medium of political parties, political process would have been in utter chaos.

- (a) Representation is often seen as the primary function of political parties. Political parties are meant to represent the views of the people whom they represent.
- (b) Political parties help to aggregate and articulate various interest found in society. Parties act as vehicles through which various interest of society- business, religious, labour, ethnic- are advanced or defended. For instance, the UK Labour party was created by the trade union movement with the aim of achieving working class political representation. Political parties recruit various interest and groups in order to broaden their electoral base. National parties articulate demands of a multitude of groups, aggregate their demands as well as balance their competing interest against one another.
- (c) Political parties act as a link between the government and the people. It is mainly through the political parties that governments are kept informed about the wishes and aspirations of the people.
- (d) Political recruitment is an important function performed by political parties. Parties are responsible for providing the state with their political leaders. Politicians hold office by virtue of their party post. In parliamentary systems leader of the largest party in the lower house normally becomes the Prime Minister and his cabinet colleagues are normally, senior party members. In presidential systems, President generally represent a political party. Parties generally act as training grounds for politicians equipping them with skills, knowledge and experience needed for playing larger political roles.
- (e) Political parties are important agents of political education and socialisation. Political parties constantly educate people through debates and discussions and campaigning, especially during elections. Their advocacy of personalities and policies is carried through press, meetings and personal contacts. Issues that political parties highlight set the political agenda, and the issues and attitudes they articulate become part of the larger political culture.
- (f) Political parties also perform social welfare functions. They work for eradication of social evils like illiteracy, untouchability, ignorance etc. During the time of emergencies, they work for the alleviation of the sufferings of the people. This is often demonstrated in the time of natural calamities like earth quakes, floods cyclones, famines etc.

Political Party Systems

An easy and common way of classifying party systems are on the basis of number of parties competing for power. On this basis Maurice Duverger distinguish between 'one-party' 'two- party' and 'multi- party systems.

One-Party Systems

One-Party or Single Party System is one in which a single party enjoys the monopoly of power, through the exclusion of all the other parties. Here one party dominates the politic of a country. There may be other parties but they are insignificant players, as they do not get enough votes to form a government or an effective opposition. One- party systems are generally associated with totalitarian regimes. In single party systems, authority of the party is total and the party members are well disciplined and are committed to the ideology of the party. Opposition parties are either banned by law or are removed using brute force. All the authority of the state will be concentrated in a single party and the party even absorbs the state, instead of merely acting on its behalf. Single party's authority embraces all aspects of human life. One-Party system first came into being with the emergence of communist state in Russia in 1917 under the leadership of Lenin. Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini are all examples of single party systems.

Two different types of single party systems can be identified. The first type is found in state socialist regimes where communist parties have directed and controlled virtually all the institutions and aspects of society. Such parties practice strict ideological discipline and have highly structured internal organizations, in line with principles of democratic centralism. They function as cadre parties and the membership is restricted on political and ideological grounds. Just above 5 percent of the Chinese population are said to be the members of Chinese communist party.

The second type of one party system is associated with anti-colonial nationalism and state consolidation in the developing world. Here 'ruling' party developed out of an independence movement that proclaimed the need for nation-building and economic development. One-party systems in Africa and Asia have usually been built around the dominant role of a charismatic leader and ideology proclaimed by that leader. Julius Nyerere in Tanzania Robert Mugabe in Zimbabwe are prime examples of this.

Merits of Single -Party Systems

Great merit of single party systems is that it provides stability to the governments. Since the party has monopoly of government and politics and there is no opposition to dislodge it from power the governments are stable.

Another merit is that single party is that it enhances national unity. It is argued that democratic pluralism sacrifices national unity by encouraging sectional interest. Single party, preserves national unity and looks at all problems from the national point of view.

There is no chance of conflict between party and government since members of one are also the members of the other. This is reflected in the efficiency of administration as chief executive faces no difficulty in implementing the policies of the party.

Single party systems are also less expensive as there is no possibility of frequent elections as the governments are stable. Even the elections process is less expensive as there is only one party to contest.

De-merits of Single Party System

The main defect of single party system is that, overtime, it tends to become tyrannical and irresponsible. Since a single party has complete control over the politics and government and there is no genuine opposition to check the arbitrariness of the government and thus, it becomes authoritarian. It ruthlessly suppresses or even eliminates any form of genuine opposition or dissent.

Another major defect of one party systems is that there is no chance for alternative governments or politics. All sections of the society may not be adequately represented in the party. People who are not satisfied with the system does not have any option, other than to continue with the system.

Single party rule often leads to rule of the elite, where power is concentrated in the hands of a select few. Party is more prone to commit mistakes, since there is no opposition to point out the mistakes of the government.

Two-Party Systems

Two-party system or Bi-party system is one in which two 'major' parties dominates the politics of a country and have equal prospect of forming governments. Two party systems can be identified by three distinct criteria:

(a) Though a number of minor parties exist, only two parties enjoy sufficient electoral and legislative strength for winning government power.

(b) One party is able to rule alone and the other party becomes the opposition

(c) Power alternates between these two 'major' parties; both parties are electable and the opposition serving as 'government in the wings'.

Bi- party system is prevalent in countries such as USA, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. In USA the two major parties are the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. In UK it is the Labour Party and the Conservative Party.

Merits of Two –Party Systems

Two- party systems are characterized by stability ,choice and accountability.

Bi-party systems are characterised by stability of governments. The party that comes to power generally gets a comfortable majority in the legislature in the parliamentary system. The governments thus formed can effectively implement the policies and programmes proclaimed by the party. It ensures efficiency of administration and continuity of policies. Vigorous and consistent home and foreign policies are possible only if the government is stable.

Two party system secures the democratic government in the real sense. Two parties offer the electorate, the choice between rival programmes and policies. People can make a choice knowing that, if their party wins the election, the party will be able to carry out the promises made in the election manifesto without having to make compromises with other parties.

Each party plays a positive and constructive role so as to win as many supporters as possible for their party. It behaves in a responsible manner, so that the other party does not make political capital out of its objectionable acts of commission and omission.

Opposition party plays a constructive role in two party systems. Opposition points out the flaws in the acts of the government, and unmasks its real infirmities. Criticism is not always aimed at pulling down the government. Constructive and active role played by the opposition is amply demonstrated by Her Majesty's opposition in the UK and by the opposition parties in the USA.

In two party system responsibilities are easily identified- one party rules and the other becomes the opposition. The leaders of both the parties as well as the people know the responsibilities of each other. Chances of corruption are also less in this system as the ruling party does not have to tolerate the corruption of other parties as In the case of coalition governments where governments are dependent on the support of other parties.

Advantages of bi-party has been very well summed up by Laski "it is the only method by which the people can at the electoral period directly choose its government. It enables that government to drive its policy to the statute book. It makes known and intelligible the results of its failure. It brings an alternative government into immediate being".

De-merits of Bi-Party System

In two-party systems there is the chance of executive becoming very strong and with the support of the legislature the cabinet may act like a dictator. Rulers know that government cannot be easily defeated in the legislature and they can continue with their policies even when they are opposed by the opposition.

Electorate have choice, but it is effectively restricted to only two parties .Even if one is not satisfied with both the parties ,still he has no effective choice other than voting for either of the two parties. This situation may leads to polarisation of vested interest and party prejudices.

Minority interest may not be adequately represented, or worse, ignored in the bi-party systems. The division of the country into two parties amounts to ignoring a good number of other interest not falling in the domain of these two parties.

Ruling party may ignore the opposition or even the public opinion in a bi-party system. Governments when they have comfortable majority, they know that they can be brought down only in the next general election and they don't have to pay much attention to the opposition or public at present.

Multi-Party System

Multi party systems is characterized by the existence of three or more parties which regularly, secure substantial number of votes and are able to share power. Parties are well organized and they are able to exert considerable influence on the politics of a country. In multi-party systems, usually single parties are not able to secure absolute majority and form governments, and the result is the formation of coalitions governments. Smaller parties may form coalitions and form governments by excluding the major parties. This is what happened in India during the Janata party rule in 1977, and the various non-congress governments that were formed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Multiparty system exists in a number of countries including India, France, Germany, Italy, and Switzerland.

Merits of Multi-Party System

Multi-party systems are considered more democratic than all other systems. True democracy demands interest of all voters to be adequately represented. Here all shades of opinion, every conceivable interest of people, find their place in multi-party system. All sections of the population feel that their interest are being taken care off in the multi-party system.

Dictatorship of the executive or cabinet is virtually impossible in multiparty systems, as the governments that come to power are, generally dependent on other parties for its survival. Displeasing the parties that support the government, may lead to the supporting parties withdrawing its support. Governments being aware of this danger, usually does not act in a despotic manner.

Wide choice are available with the electorate and all parties have a realistic chance of gaining governmental power. Thus voters are not constrained to vote for a particular party as in the case of single and bi-party systems.

Governments are more sensitive and responsive to public opinion. Governments cannot afford to ignore the interest of any section of society, as it can pave the way for the downfall of the government.

De-merit of Multi-Party System

The main drawback of multi-party system is the instability of the governments. Coalition governments formed in multiparty system are inherently unstable. Parties in a coalition may, at any time withdraw support to the government in the slightest of provocations or discomfort, if it suits the supporting party.

Efficiency of administration may be affected due to the uncertain nature of coalition governments as the governments may shy away from taking hard, yet necessary decisions. Government will be often compelled to make compromises and concessions due to the pressure of coalition partners.

Frequent change of governments affect the continuity of policies and it can severely impact negatively on the foreign policy front.

The sheer multiplicity of choice to the electorate in times of elections may confuse the voters, especially in countries with large section of illiterate and uneducated voters.

Maurice Duverger's Analysis of a Political Party.

French scholar Maurice Duverger's study of the organization and working of a political party has given us some useful insights about a political party. For him "Political party is not a community, but a collection of communities, a union of small groups dispersed throughout the community (branches, caucuses, local association etc.) and linked by coordinate institutions." He makes comprehensive view of the horizontal and vertical elements of a political party. An empirical examination of the organization and working of a political party shows the role of several 'inner circles' as:

- (a) **Caucus:** It is like a small unit like clique, core committee, coterie etc., where the size is deliberately kept small. Its strength depends not on the size but on the quality of its members. It is actually, a group of 'notables', chosen because of their influence. Caucus play a very important part in the decision-making process, though its activity reaches its peak on the eve of elections.
- (b) **Branch:** It is largely an invention of socialist parties which desires to maintain intimate touch with the people. It is less centralized than the caucus and appreciates its growing proximity with the masses. Leaders of the socialist party often visit branch members and free exchange of ideas takes place between the leaders and the branch members.
- (c) **Cell:** It is an invention of fascist and communist parties. The units of a party are scattered in every nook and corner of the country and every cell has a much greater hold on its members than the caucus or a branch. The members of the cell carry much importance than other members of the party. The entire network of the cell is controlled by the highest unit of the party composed of the real decision-makers at the top.
- (d) **Militia:** Fascist and communist parties have a military wing under their command like the Shock Troops of Mussolini, or the Red Guards of Mao. The members of these organizations remain civilians, though they are given military training. The members wear prescribed uniforms, hold party flags and act at the behest of the party leaders working under the supreme commander of the chief of the organization.

INTEREST AND PRESSURE GROUPS

Apart from political parties there are various associations and groups existing in almost all countries of the world. A group has an interest of its own and it also represents a pattern of process rather than a static form. A group can emerge, only when the interactions among its members are relatively frequent and sufficiently patterned to produce directional activity. What binds members of the group is the interest – a shared attitude concerning a claim or claims to be made by one group upon certain other groups in a social system.

Interest is the main reason for the organization of groups. People holding similar views and interest may form groups for the realisation of their interest. The shared interest may be political, religious, occupational, cultural etc. Groups or association formed by like minded people for the protection and promotion of specific interest or goals are called Interest Groups. It is a formal organization of people who share one or more common aim or interest. Interest groups may be formed at the national, state or even at the local level. A person can be a member of different interest groups at the same time. Interest groups may or may not indulge in politics, but their main aim is to protect the interest of the group.

Hitchner and Harbold describe pressure groups as “any collection of persons with common objectives who seek their realization through political action to influence public policy”. Pressure groups are part of political process and they attempt to reinforce or change the direction of government policy. It can be said that, pressure groups are those interest groups that exert pressure on the government with the aim of accomplishing what is advantageous to them. An interest group when they start influencing the formation and administration of public policy by the government, they become pressure groups.

Pressure groups do not seek to influence the electorate on the basis of certain programmes. They are only concerned about the interest that they espouse. They normally do not actively get involved in politics, but at the same time they are not averse to indulge in politics if that helps their cause.

Generally, no distinction is made between interest groups and pressure groups and both terms are used interchangeably by most writers on the subject.

Main Features of Pressure Groups(Interest Groups)

We can identify certain characteristics which are common to all pressure groups. They are:

- (a) **Self Interest-** Self interest is guiding force for the formation of a pressure group. Individuals having common interest come together to form groups to fight for their interest.
- (b) **No Open Alignment with Politics-** Pressure groups are not organizations without politics, but at the same time they do not prefer to have open alignment with politics. They are somewhere in the middle. In the view of Eckstein, “Pressure group politics represent something less than the full politicization of groups and something more than de-politicization: it constitutes an intermediate level of activity between the political and the apolitical.” Generally a group keeps its political complexion mainly for the sake of expediency.
- (c) **Pressure Groups Differ from Political Parties-** political parties are generally bigger associations and represent the interest of various sections of a society. Pressure groups on the other hand are comparatively smaller groups and have specific interest to pursue. One can be a member of different interest groups simultaneously, but that is not possible in the case of political parties.

- (d) **Universality**- pressure groups enjoy universality. They are formed in all parts of the world. They include organizations catering to the interest of various sections of the society. These include business, labour, farm cooperative, church and other organizations. Interest groups based on religion and caste are predominantly a feature of developing countries like India.

Types of Interest and Pressure Groups

Two most common classification of interest groups are:

- (a) sectional and promotional groups ;
- (b) insider and outsider groups

Sectional Groups (sometimes referred as protective or functional groups) strive to advance or protect the interest of their members. Trade unions, business corporations, trade associations and professional bodies are the prime examples of this group. Their 'sectional' character is derived from the fact that they represent various sections of society; workers, employers, consumers and ethnic or religious groups , etc.. In the USA ,sectional groups are often classified as 'private interest groups' , as these groups are concerned with the betterment and well being of their members, and not of the society in general.

In India we can find various sectional interest groups working for protection and promotion of specific interest. For instance in the business sector we have groups like federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, All India manufacturers Association, Confederation of Indian Industry etc. Likewise, in the labour sector in Kerala, employers and employees have organised pressure groups like Private Bus Owners Association, the Merchants Association CITU, INTUC,BMS, AITUC ,etc. Among the professionals like doctors, lawyers, teachers etc., we have pressure groups like Indian medical Association, The Bar Association, All Kerala Private College Teachers Association etc. In India we also find pressure groups based on religion, caste and community. The Nair service society, Hindu Maha Sabha, the Scheduled Caste Federation etc., are examples.

Promotional Groups are groups that are set up to advance shared values, Ideas or principles. These are groups that aim to help groups other than their own members. In the USA they are called 'public interest groups' to emphasis that they promote collective, rather than selective benefits. They espouse many causes like campaigns favouring civil liberties, protest against pollution, defence of traditional or religious values etc. When involved in international politics these groups are called nongovernmental organizations or NGOs. Some organizations have both sectional and promotional features. For instance, the National Association for the Advancement of coloured people addresses the Sectional interest of American black people , but is also concerned with causes such as social justice and racial harmony.

The alternative system of classification is based on the status that group have in relation to government and the strategies they adopt in order to exert pressure. One such classification is 'insider groups' and 'Outsider groups'. **Insider groups** have regular privileged and institutionalized access to government through routine consultation or representation in government bodies. Insider and sectional groups classification do often overlap. This is because of the ability of powerful sectional groups like those in the business and trade to impose sanctions, if their views are ignored by the government. Government may also consult groups that possess specialist knowledge and information that may be of help in the formulation of various policies.

Outsider Groups are either not consulted by the government or are consulted only irregularly. Outsider groups, since they lack formal access to government are often forced to 'go public', so as to indirectly influence the policies of the government. This strategy of outsider groups often do not produce the desired results. Radical protest groups (espousing the cause of animal rights, environment protection etc.) have little choice than being outsiders as their causes are often not the goal or priorities of the government.

G. .A Almond classify pressure groups into four categories . They are:

- (a) **Institutional Groups**- This is Almonds own invention. Here he includes departments of the state like legislature, executive, bureaucracy and judiciary in the category of pressure groups. Almond's reasoning is that even the organs of government put pressure on the government. For instance, bureaucrats may influence the ministers and then a decision may taken, so as to protect and promote the interest of the administrators.
- (b) **Associational Groups**- This category includes all the leading pressure groups of a country like the organizations of businessmen, workers, farmers professionals etc., These are formally organized and largely registered bodies having their constitutions, rules of organizations finances ,record of activities and the like.
- (c) **Non- Associational Groups**- In this category Almond includes groups having informal organisation . These are based on factors of kingship, religion, tribal loyalties and the like. These bodies appear and disappear from time to time. These bodies appear when some important matters are to be taken up by the community
- (d) **Anomic Groups**- This category includes all those organizations whose behavior is unpredictable. Such organizations often act spontaneously and indulge in activities of violence and extremism. Students unions and youth organizations are best examples of this category.

Tactics of Pressure Groups

Various strategies are adopted by pressure groups for the realization of specific interest. Some of the common tactics used by pressure groups are given below:

Lobbying-This is the common and an effective strategy adopted by the pressure groups. Here pressure groups resort to relentless persuasion on the public authorities to make them act according to their wishes. Public authorities include not only political executives but also bureaucrats and all other public servants who are involved in policy making and implementation.

Public Opinion-Creating favourable public opinion for one's cause is a sure way of influencing the policy of the government in modern democracies. Pressure groups use the tactics of publicity to call attention to their appeals. To influence the opinion of the people, pressure groups use various methods like, bringing out pamphlets and books, conducting of press conferences and delivering of speeches, holding of panel discussions etc. Through propaganda and special pleading with the electorates, they build up considerable influence in the matters of public policy.

Political Allegiance- Some pressure groups actively associate with political parties. They exert influence on the political party they associate with to achieve their objectives. They even try to get one of their members nominated in the elections or even in the ministry. Traditionally, British trade unions have had much influence in the policies of the Labour Party.

Electioneering- Some pressure groups, though they do not openly align with any political parties, yet they support candidates who can be relied upon in the time of elections. This they do in the hope that once elected the supported candidate will help them back to realize their interest.

Strike- Strike is the temporary stoppage of work. Generally pressure groups resort to strike only when they have failed to achieve their objectives through the above mentioned (Lobbying, public opinion, political allegiance etc.) tactics.

B: REPRESENTATION OF MINORITIES

Most countries follow the 'First Past the Post System' where the candidate who secures the majority of votes in an election is declared elected and the rest non-elected. The elected candidate, represents in the legislature the point of view of electors, who have voted for him. But, those who have voted for an unsuccessful candidate, remain unrepresented. There is gross injustice in a situation, where the difference between the votes secured by an elected candidate and the defeated candidate is almost negligible. For instance in an election, candidate A secures 5005 votes and candidate B secures 4995 votes out of the total 10000 votes, candidate A is declared elected. It means that 5005 voters find representation and the remaining 4995 voters remain unrepresented. Here minority, though a significant minority, does not find representation.

In a system of representation, where minority fails to secure representation cannot be a real basis of democracy. The essential principle of democracy is that, it must not deny a considerable number of people, participation in the conduct of their political affairs. Democracy is the government of the people and people constitute the whole population in a state. Thus, democracy if it claims to be the government of the people it must give representation of all classes of opinion.

Laws made by the state should have the widest consent of the people. But this can happen only if all sections of the population including minorities find adequate representation in the legislature. For the effective implementation of laws it needs the backing of all sections of the society. Moreover, if the minorities remain unrepresented, it will lead to discontentment and resentment against the majority rule. In the words of John Stuart Mill "In real equal democracy every and any section would be represented, not disproportionately but proportionately. A majority of electors would have a majority of representatives and minority of the electors would always have a minority of representatives".

All democracies are aware of the need for providing adequate representation to the minorities. Minorities may be of many kinds-political, national, racial, linguistic or communal. Political minorities are the product of representative government. Problem of minority representation can be solved, when people are divided on political ideologies, with some effort. But, when minorities differ from majority in race, religion and language and every minority desires to have a separate identity in order to safeguard its distinct social, religious and cultural institutions, it is then that minority representation becomes a difficult question. At the same time there should be some mechanism to ensure the representation of minorities. Mill observed that in a democracy the majority must rule, but he insisted that the minority should be represented in proportion to its number. There are various methods of minority representation. They are – proportional Representation system, which includes, The Hare system and The List system; The Limited Vote Plan, The Cumulative Vote system, the Second Ballot System, The Alternative Vote, Separate Electorate System and the Joint Electorate with Reserved Seats System.

Proportional Representation

The principle of Proportional Representation is that parties should be represented in the parliament in direct proportion to their overall electoral strength. Which means a political party should be represented in parliament in proportion to its share of the popular vote. The assumption here is that, if a party secures 10 per cent of the votes, then that party should get exactly 10 per cent of seats in the parliament. This ensures representation to all sections and interest in proportion to the numerical strength of their votes, and also it ensures that no vote is wasted.

There are two varieties of proportional representation:

- (a) Hare Scheme of Single Transferable Vote, and
- (b) The List System.

Proportional representation gives representation to minorities in proportion to their electoral strength. Both the Hare and List system formally recognise each party or groups and are given special representation. Two aspects of proportional representation system is that:

One, it works only in multi-member constituencies, and

Two, the candidates are elected not by securing a relative or absolute majority but by securing a quota of votes.

Quota is generally arrived at by dividing the total number of votes cast by the total number of seats. This is done to bring about mathematically the exact representation of the electorate in the legislature.

The Hare System

The Hare system is associated with Thomas Hare who formulated it in 1857 and explained it in his book 'The Machinery of Representation'. This system is also known by the name Single transferable Vote System. Yet another name is preferential system, because of the preferences which a voter is required to give to different candidates on the list.

In Hare system, the constituencies are multimember with at least three seats. No maximum is prescribed for the number of seats. Regardless of the number of representatives to be elected, each voter has only one vote. However, voters can indicate on the ballot paper his preference or choice- first preference, second preference, and so on by marking the figures 1,2,3, against the name of the candidates. He can vote for as many candidates as there are seats to be filled from that constituency by denoting his preference. A candidate to be declared elected requires to get a certain quota of votes. Different methods are followed to determine the quota. The simplest method is to divide the number of votes cast by the number of seats to be filled from the constituency, and the quotient is taken as the quota or the number of votes necessary to elect a candidate. For example, if the total votes cast are 10000 and 10 members are to be elected from that constituency, the quota necessary would be 1000. But, in 1881 Droop pointed out certain defects in this system and suggested another method of determining the quota. He suggested determining of the quota by dividing the total number of votes cast by one more than the number of seats to be filled and then by adding one to the result.

$$\text{Quota} = \frac{\text{total no of votes}}{\text{number of seats}+1} + 1$$

In counting the votes, only first preference or choice are counted first and a candidate securing the quota is declared elected. His surplus votes are passed on to candidates not yet elected, in the order expressed in the preferences. The process of transferring surplus votes to the next preference continues down the list, until the necessary number of representatives have been elected. If need be vote of unsuccessful candidates are also transferred. The idea is that no vote should be wasted. The voter is thus assured that if the candidate of his choice does not require his vote, his second or other choices will gain by it.

This method of proportional representation prevailed in Britain in the election of the four university constituencies to the House of Commons. In India, members of the Rajya sabha are elected by members of the state Legislative Assemblies through the system of proportional representation by means of a single transferable vote. Presidential election also follows the same method. In South Africa it is used for senatorial elections.

List System

List System is a variant of proportional representation. In this system, candidates are grouped in list according to their party labels and every party offers a list of its candidates up to the number of seats to be filled for each constituency. Here, voters vote for party and not for candidates. When a voter votes for the party he automatically votes for the list submitted by that party and the candidate thereon in the list given by that party. Seats are divided among the parties in proportion to the number of votes each list has secured. List system has two variants- 'bound list' and 'free list'. In the bound list system a voter can only vote for the party and cannot indicate any preference in the list, whereas, in the free list system (which was adopted in Italy and certain parts of Australia) voters can indicate his preference among candidates of a party list.

The number of votes required for the a candidate to be elected is determine as in the Hare system by securing a quota. Quota is determined by dividing the total number of votes cast by the number of seats to be filled, or by dividing total number of votes cast by one more than the number of seats to be filled, and then adding one to the result, as suggested by droop. Then, the total number of votes polled by each party list is divided by the quota and the result is the number of representatives to which each party is entitled. Finally, if all seats are not filled up, then the party which has the largest fractional surplus gets the remaining seat. There is another measure which are sometimes followed- The fractional surplus of votes secured by the party in the neighbouring constituency is added to make up the deficiency in the quota.

The list system is a simple method as the voter need only to select the party and by selecting it, he votes for the entire list of candidates given by the party. But, a major drawback of bound list system is that voters cannot choose a candidate of their choice. Moreover, list system gives undue importance to party leaders as they have a major say in the selection of the party list.

Merits of Proportional Representation

Advocates of proportional representation argue that it is the most democratic and just method of election as it ensures representation of all parties big and small in proportion to their voting strength. Parliament thus becomes a mirror of opinion of all the people.

This system gives to minorities a sense of security and political contentment. The Hare system gives every elector a real representative for whose choice he alone is responsible.

A. B. Keith in defence of proportional representation has given the following arguments:

(a) Under this system voters will be able to vote for men of character and independence of judgment and they will not be forced to accept the policy of a particular party.

(b) the margin of unattached voters, the swing of which usually decides the fortunes of elections, will diminish to insignificance.

Demerits of Proportional Representation

One major defect pointed out by critics of proportional representation is that it has been an effective agent of ministerial instability. The system breeds small parties and groups and pave the way for coalition governments. Presence of large number of small parties make it impossible to obtain coherent public opinion.

According to Sidgwick, proportional representation gives encouragement to demagoguery and sectional legislation. For him the worst side of proportional representation is that it destroys the national character of the legislature and makes it an arena of divergent sectional interest.

Multimember constituencies intensify the complexity of choice and increase the power of parties. Nomination, especially under the list System become the preserve of the party elites or bosses and the ordinary party members have not much say in these matters. This ensures continuous allegiance of the elected members to the party machinery and this leads to a situation where the elected members giving more attention and time to party bosses at the expense of their elected constituency.

The system of proportional Representation is a complicated one and often beyond the comprehension of an average voter. In the Hare system counting and recounting is a complex and tedious problem with the intricacies of preferences and transferring of votes. Moreover, it places voters at the mercy of the counting authorities.

Other Schemes of Minority Representation

Apart from proportional representation, there are also other schemes of minority representation. All these schemes device some methods of minority representation but are not necessarily in proportion to their numerical voting strength.

The Limited Vote Plan

Under this system there will be multimember constituencies with at least three seats. Each voter is allowed to cast a smaller number of votes than there are seats to be filled. Each Voter can give not more than a single vote to each candidate and his votes are to be spread over to as many candidates as there are votes to cast. For example, in a five member constituency, each voter may be allowed to vote for four candidates or even less. In this system minority parties become reasonably certain of electing a few of their candidates.

This method is intended to give only limited representation. It does not work when there are many parties. Moreover, this system secures representation only for fairly large minorities and also does not allow proportional representation. This method can be employed only under an electoral system in which three or more members are to be chosen from each constituency. Finally, party decides the candidates in the list and this increases the power of the party bosses and limits the independence of the elected members.

The Cumulative Vote System

In this system electors can cast as many votes as there are representatives to be chosen from a constituency. He can either cumulate all his votes on a single candidate or distribute them among the different candidates as he pleases. For example, if there are four members to be elected from a constituency, the elector can give all his votes to one candidate, or give one vote to each, or distribute them in any other way as he pleases. Cumulative method is popularly known as 'plumping'.

The main advantage of this method is that it enables even a small minority to elect at least one member, by cumulating all the votes on one candidate. But for this to happen, minorities must be well organized. It also requires strict party discipline and proper instructions on how they are to distribute their votes. All this entails rigidity of party control and the evils connected with it. This method can lead to a situation where, say, out of five seats a majority of seats may go to the minorities. This system also involves wastage of votes, as surplus votes are not distributed. Finally, it does not secure proportionate representation.

The Second Ballot System

This is another method of minority representation. Here there is single member constituencies and electors have only one vote. To win, a candidate must secure a majority of votes cast, that is, at least 50 per cent of total votes cast. If no candidate has secured that majority, then a second run-off ballot is held between the two leading candidates after dropping other candidates from the fray. In the second ballot the candidate who gets absolute majority is declared elected.

In this system a candidate can win only with majority support and thus, he will need to get the support of the minority, even though they may not be contesting the second ballot. This allows the minority to play a larger role in the political arena.

This system does not provide proportional representation and is not fair to 'third' parties as they are kept out from the second ballot.

The Alternative Vote or Contingent Vote

This is an improvement upon the second ballot system. Here there is only one election, but each voter is permitted to mark his preferences on different candidates by indicating his choices. Candidate of the first preference is declared elected if he gets an absolute majority. If none of the candidates gets an absolute majority, then, the candidate who has got the least number of first preference is dropped and his votes are distributed to other candidate according to the second choice of the voters. The candidate who gets an absolute majority after redistribution of votes is declared elected. If still no candidates gets an absolute majority, then the candidate at the bottom will again be dropped and his votes similarly transferred according to the third choice of the voters. Finally, the candidate who secures an absolute majority will then be declared elected.

This method also does not ensure proportionate representation and the chances of small minorities getting elected in this system are less.

Separate Electorate System

In this system constituencies are delimited on the basis of religion. British introduced this system in India in 1909. In this system seats were reserved for every community and constituencies were made according to the seats. For instance, from the Muslim constituencies, only Muslim candidates could contest elections and only Muslims could cast their votes. In this system minorities were assured of representation, but it had some serious defects. Most importantly, people were divided on communal lines and national feelings were hurt. People becomes more narrow minded and paved the way for the rise of communalism.

Joint Electorate with Reserved Seats

In this system seats are reserved for minorities in the legislature, but constituencies are not made on a communal basis. In this system all communities can participate in the election. For instance, Hindus can vote for a Muslim candidate and vice versa. Only those candidates who secures the support of all communities can get elected. It creates a spirit of unity and nationalism among the people. The constitution of India has provided for the reservation of seats for Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes to ensure their representation in the parliament.

MODULE – IV

POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES

INDIVIDUALISM

The ideology of Individualism also referred to as the *laissez faire* originated in the latter part of the eighteenth century in France. Individualism arose as a reaction against the mercantilist measures of state control of industry and commerce. As a political theory individualism advocates giving maximum possible freedom to the individual and minimum of state functions.

The theory of non-intervention of the state was propagated by Adam Smith in his well received work 'The Wealth of Nations' published in 1776. He advocated for the cause of private property and free competition. Individualism received its fullest expression in the writings of J. S. Mill and Herbert Spencer. The ideology reflected the mode of thinking and aspirations of the rising middle class, who were agitated against the restrictions placed by the state on the private enterprises and were waiting to get rid of them.

Individualism regards individual as the centre of all activities in a society. Individualist advocated giving maximum liberty to the individual to determine his own affairs; for every individual knows what is good for himself. Every individual is far-sighted and he knows what he wants. Every individual avoids pain and tries to secure happiness. Individualism puts emphasis on individual liberty. Individualist consider state as a necessary evil; evil because it curtails individual liberty and necessary because man is egoistic and selfish by nature and thus needs the protection of state. For individualist, it is desirable to have the state as little as possible. For them every restraint is evil and every extension of state power injurious to individual liberty. They envisage the role of the state primarily as a protective one. Primary duty of the state is to protect the individual from violence and fraud. State has to protect the country from internal disturbances and external aggression. In all other matters, individual should be free to decide for themselves. State should leave the individuals free to do whatever he likes provided, he does not injure the freedom of others. State should step in only when individual encroaches upon the interest of other individuals or when he endangers public peace.

Various arguments have been put forward in support of individualism by the advocates of the theory. They are as follows:

The Ethical Argument : Ethical argument is that the extension of state control beyond a necessary minimum will hurt the ethical development of man. Man can develop his faculties ,only if he gets ample opportunities for self reliance and initiative, but state control destroys his initiative and weakens his responsibility and character. For human personality

development, freedom of thought and action is essential. Each individual knows his interest and try to accomplish that aim, and if the state interferes in that, the individual will lose his responsibility.

Economic Argument: Individualist argue that, if left alone individual will follow his enlightened self interest and economic prosperity would result. Free competition and private enterprise would increase production, ensure efficiency and maximize economic welfare. Free competition would enable the producers to produce at least cost, the consumers to buy at the lowest prices and the labourers to dispose of their labour to their best advantage. Thus there is no conflict between individual self interest and social welfare. Adam Smith is the chief exponent of this argument of non-intervention. So the policy of *laissez faire* is beneficial to the individual as well as to the society. Individualist argue that state intervention in the form of licensing, fixing prices, labour laws etc., will harm the entire economy. For them state is an inefficient agency to conduct business.

Biological or Scientific Argument: Herbert Spencer is the chief exponent of scientific argument. He argues that the law of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, which operate in nature, should be allowed to operate in the case of man. In this struggle only the fittest have the right to survive. The incompetent and the weak must perish for the interest of society. State should not help the poor, Incompetent, inefficient and weak, and if the state does so, the state will be filled with such people. Any effort to regulate natural law and to modify the laws of nature by government is highly undesirable. Government should only accommodate nature and not try to modify it. State should not interfere with the process of natural selection.

The political Argument: political aspect of this theory developed as a reaction against the claims of kings to absolute power. John Locke is considered as the spiritual forerunner of individualism. According to John Locke men in the original 'state of nature' possessed certain natural rights and state was an artificial creation devised to protect the rights of man. Accordingly, the functions of state should be narrowed down to what is indispensable to protect his rights. Any further expansion of state rights would be an encroachment on the natural rights of man. Individualist support the theory of *laissez faire* not on the grounds of natural justice, but on the basis of practical reasons. They argue that modern state and its problems are so complex that it cannot be solved by the state alone. State is overburdened with its work and any additional functions will only lead to inefficiency. They argue that many functions would be better done, if left to private enterprise.

Criticism of Individualism

By the middle of 19th century individualism has lost its glory. Capitalism found its fullest expression under individualism and when the ills of capitalism began to manifest itself in society, the theory of individualism also came under severe attack. The arguments put forward in support of individualism has been shown to be weak and faulty by the critics. Major criticisms are given below:

Individualist considered state as a necessary evil. They failed to see the positive side of the state. Now it is well accepted that, state encourages the full development of personality of individuals. State helps in the realisation of good life of the people and lent a helping hand in individual's progress. Individualist have actually exaggerated the evils of state and belittled the importance of the state.

Individualism is based on the premise that every man is a best judge of himself and he knows his interest. This is true only to a limited extent. Garner observes that, in every country there exist ignorant people ,who are not far-sighted and cannot take precautions against dangers of which they are not aware of. Sometimes, state is a better judge of intellectual, moral and physical needs of man than he himself is. The fact that every individual is not of the same intellectual capacity or are far-sighted means that some people will always need the special care and attention of the state.

State is necessary for social control. This aspect of state received only scant attention of the individualist . Man being a social animal depend on the state for his physical and mental development. State is the guardian of common interest and rights of man. So the state ensures that no section of society takes undue advantage of the weakness of others.

Biological or scientific argument is misleading. The term 'fittest' is relative. The survival of the fittest does not necessarily mean survival of the best. Moreover, the theory that applies in the animal world is not fit to be applied to humans. Man is the noblest of creations and cannot be equated with animals.

By the end of the 19th century the theory of individualism declined in importance and other theories began to take shape. Individualism itself acquired new dimensions in the form of modern individualism under the writings of Graham Wallas, Norman Angell Follett and many other guild socialist. Modern individualism, like the traditional one, is a revolt against the despotism of the state but, unlike it, it focuses its attention on the group and associations, rather than on the individual. Modern individualism recognizes the heterogeneous character of the modern industrial societies. In a complicated society of today, the individual alone does not count, if he is to protect his interest, he must join some group or association for that purpose. At the same time, modern individualism condemns the omnipotence of the state and protest against the despotism of the bureaucratic government. It also criticize the tyranny exercised by the majority in parliamentary forms of government.

LIBERALISM

The doctrine of Liberalism was not propounded by any single thinker in any particular period of history. Origin of Liberalism can be traced back to the early Greek thinkers, who first evolved the two principles of classical liberalism- freedom of thought and political freedom. It is difficult to give a precise definition for liberalism. Liberalism may be

regarded as an idea, an attitude, a philosophy, or an ideology that recognizes the dignity and liberty of the individual. It may be defined as an idea committed to freedom as a method and policy in government, as an organizing principle in society, and a way of life for the individual and the community. Liberty of the individual is the heart of liberalism.

The implications of liberalism may be seen in three important directions- social, economic and political. In the social sphere liberalism stands for secularism. This means basically, man should be free from the shackles of religious orthodoxy. More importantly he should have a scientific temper and a critical disposition. He should change habits and customs that have outlived its usefulness or act as a chain on his real freedom. In the economic sphere, it means man should have economic freedom- he should be free to produce, distribute, carry on trade or profession, keep or dispose his property. Here a distinction is made between negative and positive liberalism. While the former desires least possible state intervention in the economic sphere, the latter desires more and more reasonable restrictions in mans economic freedom in social interest. In the political sphere liberalism entails democratic system with separation of powers, free and fair elections, freedom of thought and expression, universal adult franchise, freedom of press and judiciary and the like.

Classical Liberalism

Liberal theory of the nature and functions of the state can be discussed under two heads: classical liberalism and modern liberalism. The main difference between classical and modern liberalism lies in the degree of restraints that should be imposed on the freedom of man.

Broadly speaking classical liberalism stood for the liberty of the individual, democratic institutions and free enterprise.

According to the classical view, the sole purpose of the state is to preserve and protect the natural rights of an individual to life, liberty and property. The state is the creation of man and the relation between state and individual is contractual. Classical liberalist view state as a necessary evil. But for the restraining power of the state there would be no social peace and order. The guiding principle of liberal individualist “is the maximum possible individual freedom and minimum possible state action”. In the words of J. S. Mill “Over himself, over his body and mind, the individual is sovereign’.

John Locke is considered to be the father figure of liberal tradition. According to him state exist for the people who form it and they do not exist for the state. Basis of the state is consent and it exercise its power in terms of law. The state has primarily, negative functions. The only function of the state is to remove hindrances in the way of liberty.

Classical liberalism advocated the policy of *laissez-faire*, advocated non-intervention of the state in the economic activities of individuals. They consider property rights of individuals as a necessary condition of liberty and limits the power of state to regulate the social and economic life of man.

Hobhouse has mentioned nine principles of classical liberalism. These are the principles of civil liberty; personal liberty; social liberty; economic liberty; domestic freedom; administrative, geographical and racial liberty; international liberty and political liberty and popular sovereignty. It is evident that Hobhouse's enunciation of the principles of classical liberalism are not systematic and are loosely conjoined, yet it gives a fair idea of the nature of classical liberalism.

Modern Liberalism

By the middle of the nineteenth century, classical liberalism had lost its appeal. The concentration of wealth in the hands of a few on the one hand and mass poverty on the other hand posed a grave challenge to the assumptions of classical liberalism. J.S Mill took upon the task of revising the liberal doctrine to present a positive view of the nature and functions of the state, which were considered to meet the new challenge. A marked change witnessed after 1860 when Mill revised his earlier views and advocated more and more state interference in the liberty of individuals in the name of public interest. Under the impact of Marxian Socialism, liberalism changed its attitude without giving up its basic faith in reason and democracy. It recognized the necessity of protective legislation and social security legislation. Mill supported state regulation of private property and public ownership of and control of natural resources of the country. Prominent among those who advocated a positive role of the state in the life of man includes Laski, Barker, Hobhouse, Mac Iver, and Keynes.

Modern Liberalism stands for three basic principles. The first principle is that the channels of social communication should always be kept open. People should have the opportunity to be fully informed on all issues. There should be no restrictions on means and the agencies of public opinion. Majority groups have no right to suppress the minority groups. The second principle is that, monopolies or oligopolies in the industries should be abolished. The key industries should be owned and run by the state. The third principle is that, education and enfranchisement can bring about peaceful change in the economic and political structure. Thus, liberalism is an attitude which stands against the restrictions on individual liberty and is a programme favouring social and economic reforms. It stands for individual liberty, democratic institutions and freedom from exploitation.

MARXISM

Marxism has exerted tremendous influence on human thought and social movements from mid- nineteenth century onwards. The main tenants of Marxism are found in the Communist Manifesto, published in 1848 and Das Capital (3 volumes),the two monumental works of Karl Marx. Communist Manifesto is called the Bible of communism as it contains the most compact statement of Marx's theory.

The theory of socialism developed by Karl Marx is known as communism. It is a "dialectical theory of human progress". Marxism provides a theory of social change and a scientific philosophy which help in understanding the laws of social development. It also provides a revolutionary programme for the emancipation of the 'exploited classes' and suggest revolutionary methods for changing the existing society. It seeks to establish a 'classless' and 'stateless' society which Marx calls communist society.

Marxian philosophy came as a reaction to the failings of liberal ideology and the evils which were perpetrated by capitalism. Marxism challenged the whole liberal system based on private property, market model of society, unrestrained individualism and the capitalist mode of production. Prior to Marx, Utopian Socialist-Thomas More, Fourier, Robert Owen, Saint Simon etc., have all vehemently denounced capitalism, but they could not provide the means of ending capitalism or provide an alternative system. But it was Marx who provided both the means to wipe out capitalism and an alternative to capitalism. Marx was interested in creating a real socialist society.

The following are the main elements of Marxism:

Dialectical Materialism

Starting point of Marxism is Hegelian dialectic. Dialectic originally referred to the process in which ideas are formed and clarified in the course of intellectual debate. Dialectic is a method of discovering truth by discussion and logical arguments by considering ideas that are opposed to each other. According to Hegel, human evolution has not been in a straight line ,it moved in a zig-zag way. He describes three stages of growth- Thesis, Anti-thesis and Synthesis .According to Hegel, world moves and changes constantly, and the basis of this movement is the idea or spirit. Idea begins with thesis. Contradiction to the idea appears naturally, as every stage in history give birth to its opposite and it is called anti-thesis. And now, the tussle between thesis and anti-thesis begins and the new idea emerges- synthesis. Synthesis become thesis later on and is confronted by its antithesis . This way,according to Hegel human evolution moves on.

Marx was very much impressed with the Hegelian way of explaining social evolution. He accepted the Hegelian dialectic but substituted spirit with matter. Marx regarded matter as the ultimate reality and considered material object as the basis of this world. Marx felt that world by its nature develops in accordance with the laws of the movement of matter. He believed that different social theories and ideas which appeared at different periods of history, were merely reflection of the material laws of society. Matter is active and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. According to Marx evolution takes place through the dialectical process, ie, the matter evolves through thesis, anti-thesis and synthesis.

Historical Materialism

Historical materialism or Materialistic interpretation of history is the application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the study of development of society. It is considered as the “heart of Marxism” in the words of Plamenatz. According to this concept all phenomena of society have their origin in the material conditions of life.

To explain his concept Marx talks about base or infrastructure and superstructure. Forces of production (which include land, raw materials, tools, labour, capital and organisation) and the social relations of production (Relations of production are social relationship men enter into in order to produce goods) form the base or infrastructure. Ideas of society (political, legal, philosophical, religious etc.) and the institutions and organizations (state, church, political parties etc.) which arise on a given base, constitute the superstructure.

Marx explains all fundamental historical changes are determined by the mode of production or the economic forces. And any change in the mode of production brings about a corresponding change in the social relations of production. Major contradictions in society are between forces of production and relations of production. Superstructure of society is erected on the foundations of the productive forces. Mode of production determines the general character of social, political and spiritual process of life. Economic system thus explains the political institutions and practices of a country, its social structure its law, art, philosophy, religion and morality. A major change in the base brings about a corresponding change in the superstructure. According to Marx, the class which controls the material forces of society is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. According to the theory of historical materialism the ultimate cause of all social and political revolutions are to be sought in the mode of production.

Surplus Value

Doctrine of surplus value is a significant contribution of Marx and it is by this concept he explained the exploitative nature of capitalism. It is an extension of the Ricardos theory of value, according to which value of a commodity is determined by the value of labour spent on it. And to Marx labour is the sole creator of value. But the value which the labourer gets is much lower than the value he produces. The difference between the value paid to the labourer and the value received by the capitalist, Marx called it surplus value. This is actually the difference between the exchange value of the manufactured commodity and the price paid to the worker for his labour.

Surplus value created is appropriated by the capitalist and it is simple exploitation. The rate of surplus value indicates the degree of exploitation by the capitalist. According to Marx the essence of capitalist exploitation is the production of surplus value.

Class- War

Historical Materialism gave the theory of social change and class-war describes its actual mechanism. Marx says “history of all hitherto existing societies is the history of class struggles”. He views history as a succession of struggle between the oppressor and the oppressed classes. In every age, society is divided between two major contending classes-the privileged class which owns the means of production and the toiling class which earns by working for others. These two classes are always in conflict. The “haves” (privileged class) exploit the “have-nots” (working class) to appropriate the surplus value. In class societies there will be exploitation and it is inherent in the system, according to Marx.

The present day capitalist society consist of two classes whose interest are always in conflict- the bourgeoisie (capitalist class; though the literal meaning is ‘middle class’) and the proletariat (working class). Bourgeoisie exploit the proletariat by appropriating the surplus value. Capitalist pay the workers only subsistence wage, so as to earn more profit. But as soon as the workers become conscious of this exploitation they organize and rise in revolt. There comes permanent hostility between workers and employees. According to Marx in this inevitable struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the proletariat class will come out victorious.

Dictatorship of the Proletariat

After the success of the proletarian revolution and the overthrow of capitalism, it will not at once create communism, rather it will be succeeded by the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This transient dictatorship is necessary to complete the task of revolution, that is, to prevent the bourgeoisie from regaining its lost power and also prepare the way for the final victory of socialism.

Dictatorship of the proletariat is a quasi state. It is a class organization and function as a representative of the working class. It is not a free society. It will expropriate the bourgeoisie, centralize production and increase production as rapidly as possible.

Withering Away of the State

When the work of the dictatorship of the proletariat is over and all the remnants of capitalism removed, the proletariat state becomes superfluous . At this stage the state will wither away. State is not abolished or disbanded, but it just fades away. In its place socialist or communist societies will arise- a new society without classes and without contradictions.

The new society will be a classless society. Ownership of the forces of production will be collective and members share the wealth society produces. No longer will one social group exploit and oppress the other group. This will produce an ‘infrastructure’ without contradiction and conflict. Dialectical principle will cease to operate in communist societies as there are no contradictions. In such a society people will follow the principle “each according to his capacity, to each according to his needs”.

Appraisal of Marxism

Marxist philosophy has been criticized on many grounds.

A major criticism is that, Marxian philosophy suffers from one-sidedness. Marx exaggerated the importance of economic forces and oversimplified the complex social phenomena. According to Laski, Marxian theory is a denial of pluralism in historical causation. Bertrand Russell opines that, larger events in our political life are determined by interaction of material conditions and human passions. But for Marx economic considerations was supreme and ignored other factors.

It is pointed out that the doctrine of class war is fallacious as it is aimed more at capturing the mind of workers, than a theory regarding social relations. The capitalism in the west has not put the workers and the capitalist into hostile camps. Rather, they need each other for productive purpose. Moreover, Marx's prophecy about the increasing misery and degradation of the working class has been proved wrong. Workers are also enjoying the benefits of capitalism in the form of better working conditions and better standards of living. Marx also ignored the rise of middle class. Society is not composed of just two classes as Marx observed, but it has now three or more classes.

The concept of withering away of the state is misleading. This has not happened anywhere in the world where capitalist was removed from power. It is not right to view state as a means of exploitation as Marx did, for state is an ethical institution which provides good life to the individuals.

Finally, capitalism has adjusted itself to the changing circumstances. Now workers are encouraged in the management of industries and can be share holders of the company they work for and has thus become partners in the business. Today it is difficult to say who is a bourgeoisie and who is a proletariat.

FASCISM

Ideology of fascism emerged in Italy immediately after the first World War. Though Italy was on the side of the victors in the war, she was deprived of the gains of victory by the Treaty of Versailles of 1919. Besides the diplomatic defeat at Versailles, Italy also faced post-war social and economic hardships. There was widespread disappointment over the result of the war. The governments formed after the war was unstable and people were looking up to new leaders who could give the country stability and restore lost prestige. Benito Mussolini arrived on the scene championing the cause of united Italy. He exhorted the masses and formed a party in Milan in 1919. By 1921 Mussolini had a well organized fascist party under his control. In October 1922 Mussolini and his fascist party marched into Rome and occupied public offices including railways, post and telegraph offices. The democratic government of Italy failed to tackle the situation and the king of Italy invited Mussolini to form government. In due course of time Mussolini set up a fascist state in Italy.

Meaning of Fascism

The term fascism is derived from the Italian word “Fasces”, which means “bundles” denoting in ancient Rome a bundle of rods with an axe. Those were used as a symbol of authority. This term was used by the followers of Mussolini in Italy.

Fascism does not represent a coherent theory. It is a body of ideas taken from various sources and put together to fit the exigencies of circumstances. As a theory fascism arose as a reaction against the inefficiency and failure of democratic liberalism and it stands for an absolute state.

According to Ebenstein “Fascism is a revolutionary totalitarian revolt against the liberal way of life. Stripped to its essentials, Fascism is the totalitarian organization of government and society by a single party dictatorship, intensely nationalist, militarist and imperialist”. Fascism is defined as the most anti-democratic, oppressive, reactionary, and counter-revolutionary form of dictatorship. It was a curious mix of deception, orthodoxy, hero-worship, aggressive nationalism, irrationalism and spiritualism. Fascist dictators came to power through mass action.

Salient Features of Fascism

Fascist considered state as an end in itself. State was glorified at the cost of individuals. State according to fascist is an independent entity with a real will of its own. Its existence and ends are more important than those of its individual members. They regard the state as a spiritual being and an ethical entity. They consider state “as a spiritual inheritance of ideas and sentiments which each generation receives from those preceding it hands it down to the succeeding generation”. State has a will and personality. Mussolini calls it “the ethnic state”.

Fascist believed in authoritarian, totalitarian and omnipotent state. They were opposed to democracy, liberalism and popular sovereignty. They emphasized on duties of the citizens and not on their rights. They did not believe that the individual had some inherent or inalienable rights. Authority of the state is absolute. They did not favour the composition of government based on universal suffrage. They were opposed to parliamentary form of government. They advocated that government should be administered by a few strong and capable men. Sovereignty rest not with the people, but with the state. Only elites are competent to speak for the nation. Masses are not competent to govern themselves. People had no right to criticize the government and their only function was to perform the duties assigned to them by the state. There was to be military discipline and blind obedience in every walk of life. According to fascists there should be only one party in the state and the government should be controlled by the leaders of that party. Fascist party alone is regarded as the conscience keeper of the state. Government should control the press and the education system. Fascist state is both autocratic and aristocratic.

In theory and in practice fascism was opposed to democracy. For them democracy is the worst form of government and compare it to a “decaying corpse”. They consider democracy as stupid, corrupt, slow-moving, impractical and inefficient. In their opinion, in democracy people are deluded to believe that they exercise sovereignty, but in reality sovereignty resides in and is exercised by irresponsible and secret forces.

Fascism glorified war and violence and emphasized on violence and lies. It defended violence as a means of achieving political ends. Violence played a major part in Mussolini capturing and sustaining power in Italy. Violence was considered morally necessary and they believed that enemies must be annihilated. They justified the mass murders in concentration camps. For them war was considered not only necessary but even inevitable. Mussolini said “war is to man, what maternity is to women”.

Fascism did not believe in reason. They consider man as an irrational animal and his social and political activities were based on that principle. Fascism was a revolt against reason. It stood in favour of superiority of the instinct over reason, action over talk. They believed in blind obedience and the leadership principle. Reason was discouraged and emotions and sentiments which were blind, and faith which was orthodox in nature, were encouraged.

Fascist were opposed to internationalism. For them “international peace is a cowards dream”. They openly advocated aggressive warfare and imperialist expansion. Imperialism for Mussolini “is the eternal and immutable law of life”. Italian expansion was a matter of life and death for Mussolini. His exhortation to the people was “Italy must expand or perish”. Duty of the state was only to itself and not to the world as a whole.

Fascist did not believe in basic human equality. Fascist society not only accept the fact of human inequality, but also go further and affirm inequality as the ideal. In fascist code, men are superior to women, soldiers to civilians, party members to non-party members, one’s own nation to that of others, victors in a war to the vanquished and strong to the weak.

GANDHISM

Teachings and principles enunciated by Gandhi received wide recognition in India and outside during his life time and even after his passing. Gandhi himself said on many occasions that he did not start any ‘ism’, if the ‘ism’ implies the existence of a set of principles or dogmas stated in set formula. Gandhi was always experimenting with truth and non-violence. There was no rigidity about his ideas , so, the principles he preached and modes he practiced never became rigid. But, Gandhi had a definite philosophy of life and also a technique of solving national and international problems. Gandhi expressed his views on political, social, economic and religious matters from time to time according to the need of the occasion and political situation. Different people collected his views and gave the name Gandhism. His ideas and ideals form a distinct school of thought, a distinct philosophy of life and is known by the name Gandhism.

Gandhi was Influenced by the writings of Ruskin, Thoreau and Tolstoy. John Ruskin's book *Unto This Last* had an enormous influence on the life of Gandhi. Same was the case with Thoreau's essay on Civil Disobedience which left a deep impression on Gandhi. Gandhi was also influenced by Tolstoy, particularly his book *The Kingdom of God Within You*. Gandhi himself admitted that "its reading cured me of my skepticism and made me a firm believer in Ahimsa". Bhagvadgita had a profound influence on him. He was also influenced by the Bible, the Koran, Zend Avesta and the Vedas.

Now let us proceed to examine the basic principles of Gandhism.

Non- Violence

Non- violence (*Ahimsa*) is one of the cardinal principles of Gandhism. It was not just a philosophical principle or a matter of intellect, but it was a matter of the heart for Gandhi. Gandhi was an ardent follower of this principle and exhorted people around him to follow suit.

Literally, Ahimsa means non-killing; but for Gandhi it has a much wider meaning. For Gandhi ahimsa meant "avoiding injury to anything on earth in thought, word or deed". A non-violent man should not consider any one as his enemy nor he should harbour evil against anyone. In the Gandhi's concept of non- violence, any act which injure not only an individual but also a society is violence. Ahimsa is not just a negative concept- avoiding harm to others- but it has also got a positive meaning, as it involves doing good to others . For Gandhi Ahimsa is supreme love, supreme kindness, and supreme self sacrifice.

In Gandhi's opinion, non-violence is the quality of the brave and strong. One cannot practice it without fearlessness. Cowardice and ahimsa do not go together. According to Gandhi, non-violence is superior to violence. Victory in a non-violence struggle is sure. Moreover, no one harbours hatred against a non-violent man. A non-violent man strikes a responsive chord in the heart and conscience of his opponent.

For Gandhi, requisites of non-violence are truth, inner purity, fearlessness, non-possession and perseverance. Truth is the basic factor of non-violence. According to Gandhi, though victory in a non-violent struggle is sure , but it would not come promptly. So, an advocate of non-violence should cultivate a divine patience and perseverance.

Gandhi talks about three levels of non-violence. The highest form was the non violence of the brave(Gandhi called it enlightened non-violence of the resourcefulness). It was the non-violence one adopted out of inner conviction, based on moral considerations and not because of any painful necessity. This non-violence was not merely political but pervaded in every sphere of life. The second level was, nonviolence of the weak or the passive non-violence of the helpless. It is weakness, rather than moral conviction which rules out the use of force. This non-violence is capable of achieving result to a certain extend, if pursued honestly and with real courage. However, Gandhi says, it is not as effective as the non-violence of the brave. Finally, there is, the passive non- violence of the coward and the effeminate. The non-violence of the coward is really violence in suspension or inactive violence. A coward runs away from danger instead of facing it, and Gandhi says, it is unmanly, unnatural and dishonourable. According to Gandhi "cowardice and ahimsa do not go together any more than water and fire".

According to Gandhi there is nothing like failure in non-violence as there is nothing like success in violence. Being soul force, all can practice it, including the masses though they may practice it, without the full knowledge of its implications.

Satyagraha

The idea and practice of satyagraha is considered as the heart and soul of Gandhism. Technique of Satyagraha was Gandhi's unique and distinctive contribution to the world. Gandhi called it "love force or Soul force"

Satyagraha is the technique of resisting all that is evil and unjust impure or untrue by love, self suffering, and self purification by appealing to the divine spark in the soul of the opponent. Satyagraha is the opposite of coercion and it is the weapon of the strongest and the bravest. A satyagrahi seek to resist evil through love and takes suffering upon himself, instead of inflicting the same on the opponent. A satyagrahi never injures the opponent, and always appeal to the reason of the opponent by gentle argument or appeal to his heart by self suffering. A satyagrahi aims at weaning the opponent from error by love and patient suffering. For Gandhi, satyagrahi is twice blessed, it blesses him who practice it, and also against whom it is practiced. As styagraha is based on the concept of suffering, it serves three purposes. . First it purifies the sufferer. Secondly, it helps to intensify favorable public opinion for the cause for which satyagraha it is undertaken. And finally, satyagraha makes a direct appeal to the soul of the oppressor.

The cause of satyagraha should be legitimate and just. Satyagraha is an effective way of resisting coercive authority by an individual or a group in a non-violent manner. Gandhi first experimented it in South Africa where he met with commendable success. After returning to India, Gandhi tried it on an extended scale in India in his struggle for national independence.

The technique of satyagraha may takes many forms, like, non-cooperation, civil disobedience, fasting, Hijrat and strike.

Non-Cooperation- Gandhi believed, withdrawal of cooperation by the people would paralyze even the most despotic of governments .Non-cooperation takes many forms like, Hartals, social ostracism or picketing. Hartals means stopping the business as a mark of protest and it should be observed voluntarily and non-violently. In the case of picketing no force should be used and only persuasive methods are to be employed. Social ostracism is social boycott and can be used against those who defy public opinion. All these measures, Gandhi suggested , should not be used frequently and be employed with great care.

Civil- Disobedience- Gandhi regarded civil disobedience as "a complete, effective and bloodless substitute of armed revolt" He defined it as the "breach of unmoral statutory enactments". Gandhi was of the opinion that civil-disobedience should be practiced only by a select few and not by all. Great care should be taken in the practice of civil -disobedience to ensure that it does not leads to violence and the leader, and not the satyagrahis were to decide which law were to be broken.

Hijrat- Hijrat means voluntary exile from the permanent place of residence. Hijrat was to be done by those people who could not live without loss of self-respect in a particular place and lack the strength to defend themselves in a non-violent manner.

Fasting- Gandhi considered fasting as a very potent weapon and thus recommended great caution in using it. Fasting is meant for only rare occasions and it should be practiced only by those who possessed spiritual fitness, purity of mind, discipline, humility and faith. Fasting, Gandhi believed, "touches and strengthens the moral fibre of those against whom it directed". It stirs the sluggish conscience and moves people into action.

Strike- To Gandhi, strike was a voluntary purificatory suffering undertaken to convert the erring opponent. It can be a weapon of the workers for the redress of their grievances. The strike must be non-violent and the demands of the strikers must be clear, feasible and just.

Gandhi's Views on Private Property and Trusteeship

Gandhi was not in favour of people holding property beyond their needs. He felt that people have to change their attitude towards property. Rich should be persuaded to act as trustees of property. Rich should utilize their property for the benefit of the community. Land lords and capitalists were to use their talents and riches for the good of the society. Gandhi believed that non-possession and trusteeship would lead to economic equality and equitable distribution.

Concept of trusteeship as explained by Gandhi involves the following aspects : (1) trusteeship is a means by which a capitalist order of society can be transformed into an egalitarian one (2) It does not recognise any right of private property except in as much as permitted by the society for its own welfare. (3) In trusteeship, an individual will not be free to hold or use his wealth for selfish interest or against the interest of society. (4) There will be a fixed minimum wage as well as a maximum wage and the difference between the two will be as reasonable as possible (5) Character of production will be determined by social necessity and not by personal whim or greed.

Gandhi's view that if capitalists failed to act as trustees, their industries were to be taken over by the government. And those industries were to work for the benefit of humanity. Workers were to be given a share in the management of industries.

Non-Violent Society

Gandhian society is a non-violent, stateless, classless and a socialist society.

Gandhi's non-violent society will be a stateless society as he does not consider state a necessity. Gandhi believes state is rooted in violence and hurts individual freedom. Gandhian society will be consisted of a number of self-contained and self-regulated village communities. Every village will have a panchayat, having full powers of administration and

capable of meeting all its essential needs, even to the extent of defending itself. These self-sufficient villages will be voluntarily bound in a federation. There will be no centralization of authority and decentralization will be the marked feature of the Gandhian society. Federation will have no police or military force. There will be no big cities, law courts, jails or heavy industries. Rather villages will have cottage industries, khadi, and agriculture. Life will be simple and civilization rural. Villages will be self-sufficient and autonomous for all purpose and there will be real *Swaraj*.

Gandhian society will be socialist society. In this society every one will have food to eat and cloths to wear and every one will get sufficient work to earn his living. Gandhi expected everyone to do a bit of manual labour, even the intellectuals, so that the stigma attached to manual labour will be removed and raise the status of working class. He wanted to achieve economic equality by affecting change in the mentality of capitalist and landlords through love and persuasion.

Gandhi was realistic enough to realize that the goal of a stateless, classless society was for the present unrealizable. But he believed in the possibility of a predominantly non-violent society.

Means and Ends

For Gandhi means and ends are inseparable and both must be equally pure. For him not only the end be high and laudable, but the means should also be moral. He believed that immoral means cannot lead to truth and justice. He explained the relation between means and ends thus: "As the means so the end. The means may be likened to a seed, the end to a tree; and there is just the same inviolable connection between the means and the end as there is between the seed and the tree".

Gandhi believed that moral means will inevitably lead to moral ends. He insisted that our means must be as pure as our end. He said with regard to our means, we must take our stand on the firm and solid ground of unadulterated good. Loyalty to moral values was a supreme consideration for Gandhi. According to him, what cannot be justified by conscience, cannot be justified in political or patriotic grounds. Thus insisting upon the moral quality of means, Gandhi spiritualized politics.

Gandhi's view on Religion and Politics

Religion was the very breath of Gandhi's life. He was a seeker of truth and his god manifested Himself in truth and love. Gandhi based all his social and political doctrines on the spiritual or religious way of life. Gandhi was not prepared to separate religion from politics. In the words of Gandhi "those who say that religion has nothing to do with politics do not know what religion means". Gandhi believed that politics bereft of religion are death-trap because they kill the soul. Gandhi did not want any political exploitation of religion.

Gandhi's belief in religion was not dogmatic; religion to him meant recognition of the superiority of moral law. He stood for a religion purified of superstitions and customs. He believed in the inherent goodness of all religions. He was a secularist and did not subscribe to the concept of state religion. His religious views were not derived out of any particular religion. His religion was cosmopolitan. He believed in the principles of Islam, Hinduism, Christianity, alike

MODULE – V

A: DEMOCRACY

The origin of the term democracy can be traced back to ancient Greece. It is derived from the two Greek Words 'demos' and 'kratos', the former meaning people and the latter meaning power. Hence democracy means power of the people. There are many definitions of democracy given by various writers at various points of time. And these definitions vary in their meaning too. But now, we generally accept democracy as a form of government in which people rule themselves directly or in indirectly.

When we define democracy as a form of government of the people, we need to understand the meaning of the term 'people'. Although the Greek word 'demos' is used to refer people, it originally had the meaning 'the poor' or 'the many'. So, the Greeks regarded democracy as the government of the many. The classical model of democracy existed in the ancient Greek city- state of Athens in the fourth and fifth century BCE. Athenian democracy was a kind of direct popular rule , where it amounted to a form of government by mass meetings. But, here majority of the population- slaves, women and foreigners- were excluded in the whole exercise. Like wise, only in the later half of the twentieth century did most countries of the world allowed participation of all the people in the democratic process. For instance, universal adult suffrage was not established in UK until 1928, when women gained full voting rights. Only in the 1960s did African- Americans in the Southern States of USA could vote for the first time. And in Switzerland, women had to wait until 1971, to exercise their right to vote. Now, most democratic countries follow universal adult franchise, where adult people are entitled to vote without restrictions of gender, religion, caste, race, language, property or other such considerations.

Definitions of Democracy

As mentioned earlier Greeks regarded democracy as government by the many and Aristotle considered it as a perverted form of government. Modern writers generally do not subscribe to Aristotles' view. Modern writers do not employ the numerical criterion ,but emphasis that all persons who are fit to perform the duties of citizens should have a share in the governance of the state.

Seeley writes "Democracy is a form of government in which everybody has a share".

According to S.M. Lipset, "Democracy may be defined as a political system which supply regular constitutional opportunities for changing the governing officials and a social mechanism which permits the largest possible part of the population to influence major decisions by choosing among contenders for political office".

According to Dicey “Democracy is a form of government in which the governing body is a comparatively large fraction of the entire nation”. According to Gettell, “Democracy is that form of government in which the mass of the population possess the right to share in the exercise of sovereign power.”

Mac Iver opines, “Democracy is not a way of governing, whether by majority or otherwise, but primarily a way of determining who shall govern and broadly, to what ends”. This involves a freedom of choice in elevating the rulers and the consent of the electors that those who receive the mandate should alone rule. It means the democracy has a popular base and it hinges upon the consent off the governed.

The most popular and widely quoted definition was given by Abraham Lincoln. He defines Democracy as “a government of the people, by the people and for the people”. Government is always of the people, but it need not be by the people. Monarchies and aristocracies are government of the people but not by the people. A government by the people means that people either directly or through their representatives govern themselves and their will remains supreme on all policies of the government. Democracy is a government for the people. It means that democracy stands for the welfare of the people.

Meaning of Democracy

Democracy means rule by the people as contrasted with rule by a person or a group. It is the people who are both rulers and the ruled. It is a system of government in which everyone who belongs to the political organization that makes decisions, is actually or potentially involved. Democracy for Sartori is one in which, no one enjoys unconditional and unlimited power. In democracy, power is scattered, limited, controlled, and exercised in rotation, in contrast to autocracy where power is concentrated, uncontrolled, indefinite and unlimited. In a democracy no one can declare himself ruler, and no one can hold power irrevocably in his own name.

Democracy also means government by consent that can be elicited through elections that register voters’ decision. A democratic government is a government by the representatives of the people. Voters are free to vote, according to their choice without coercion or pressure from any quarter.

Liberty and equality are the foundations of democracy. Democracy binds people in bonds of fraternity and fraternity among people is possible, only if there is equality. It is form of government that does not discriminate people on the basis of race, language, religion, gender, class, caste or any other such considerations. Democracy guarantees individual freedom, which is essential for the expression of ones views without fear of repercussions. But this freedom one should enjoy without hurting the freedom of others. Democracy assures social, political and economic freedom to all.

Democracy is based on the principle of tolerance. Every individual is free to have their separate ideas and ideologies and democracy does not believe in crushing them. Democracy can be successful only when minorities fell that they are not subjected to oppression by the majority and they feel that their concerns are well taken care of by the majority.

Democracy means a form of government and also a way of life.

Democracy is a way of life. Democracy is a way of line in the sense that it treats everybody equal and also recognizes the dignity of human personality. It provides equal opportunities to all, so that everybody can develop to their full potential. People in turn can then contribute to the welfare of the society. In democracy, Individual is an indispensable part of society; like organs of a human body. According to Dewey "Democracy is nearest to that social organization in which individual and society have organic relation".

In democratic societies people are tolerant to the views of others, even if they do not agree with their views. Criticisms of all kinds are tolerated and even encouraged in democracies. Decisions are taken after free discussion and criticism of all kinds. People in democracies practice values like tolerance, equality, justice, freedom, law abidingness, civil consciousness etc. Democratic society aims at the happiness of all and makes sure that no section of the population is exploited in society.

Democracy is also a form of government. It is a government of the people. People are free to participate in the affairs of the state, as there is no discrimination. Modern democracies follow indirect or representative democracy. People elect their representative and delegate power to them for a specified period. Elected representatives form governments that take care of the administration of the state. People are the ultimate source of authority in a democracy.

Democracy guarantees civil, political and economic rights to its citizens. Democracy allows rights relating to person and property. It allows maximum possible individual liberty to its citizens in matters concerning his private life. Political rights – right to vote, right to hold public office, Right to be informed about public matters – are assured to its citizens. Freedom of speech and expression along with the right to assembly and association is guaranteed to citizens in a democracy. Universal adult franchise is an essential characteristic of a democracy, where adult people are given the right to vote without any discrimination based on caste, colour, religion, sex, language or Status. Right to work, right to receive adequate wages and right to leisure are all important economic rights that are enjoyed by the citizens of democracies.

Democratic government implies people are sovereign. It is the people who decide who should govern. Governments thus formed would have to act according to the wishes of the people.

Direct and Representative Democracy

As a form of government, there are two types of democracy-

- (a) Pure or direct democracy, and
- (b) Representative or Indirect Democracy.

Direct Democracy

Direct Democracy (sometimes called 'participatory democracy') is based on the direct, unmediated and continuous participation of citizens in the tasks of government. Here people themselves formulate and express their will in mass meetings, which are often convened for this purpose. This device enables the public to express their own views and interest without having to rely on politicians.

Direct democracy existed in the Ancient Greek and Roman city-states. Now it has become a thing of the past. Direct democracy can only exist in small states inhabited by a few thousand people and can easily meet at a place and deliberate and formulate policies on the spot. Now, direct democracy is impracticable as modern nation-states are characterized by large population and vast territories. But, direct democracy is practiced in a limited way in some of the cantons of Switzerland even today. Direct democracy, actually, now assumes the form of referendum and initiative which are now practiced in Switzerland and the USA.

Representative or Indirect Democracy

The prevailing system of democracy is indirect or representative democracy. Here, will of the people is formulated and expressed by their representatives, whom they have delegated the power of discussion and decision making. Representatives are periodically elected by the people for a specific period. J S Mill defines representative democracy as one in which "the whole people or the numerous portion of them, exercise the governing power through deputies periodically elected by themselves".

In a representative democracy ultimate source of authority rests with the people. They delegate this authority to their representatives for a limited period. This system is called indirect democracy because public do not exercise power themselves; they merely select those who will rule on their behalf. This form of rule is democratic only in so far as representation establishes a reliable and effective link between the government and the governed.

There are some obvious merits associated with representative democracy. One, it offers a practicable form of democracy, since direct democracy is impracticable in the modern nation-states. Two, it relieves ordinary citizen of the burden of decision making. Three, it allows government to be run by people with better education, knowledge and experience. And finally, it maintains stability by distancing ordinary citizens from politics, there by encouraging them to accept compromise.

Conditions Necessary for the Success of Democracy

The successful functioning of democracy requires certain essential conditions. They are as follows:

(1) Sound System of Education- People should possess high level of intelligence and a good system of education can contribute much in this respect. Illiteracy makes the working of democracy difficult. Education improves the general awareness of the people and also makes them broad minded and tolerant. People should have a basic understanding about the politics of their country and its political institutions. Education provides them with the basic knowledge and understanding about these aspects. Education also makes people aware of their rights and duties and thus, increase their civic sense which ultimately improves the quality of the individual and society. Education instills in the people qualities like discipline, selfless service to the country, fraternity etc. which are of much help in the successful working of democracy. As far as possible education should be free for all and everybody should have access to quality education.

(2) Social and Economic Equality- This is an important requirement for the success of democracy. Absolute economic equality may not be achievable, as it has not been achieved anywhere in the world. But wide inequality among people whether it is social or economic is harmful for democracy. Economic equality does not mean that everybody should be paid equal emoluments rather, it essentially means that all should have equal opportunity and there should be no discrimination. Caste and class differences, and social distance between people wreck a democracy. Democracy entails equality before law and there can be no discrimination based on caste, religion, sex or economic status. People should have the right work and government should prescribe minimum wages and ensure better working condition of the workers. Freedom from fear of unemployment, reasonable wages, lessening of disparities in income and wealth etc., help in creating a social climate in which people can actively participate in the public affairs.

(3) Decentralisation of Power And Local Self Government- Democracy works well, if there is no concentration of power. Concentration of power makes governments autocratic. With decentralization power is divided between the centre and the provinces. This relieves the centre from the burden of heavy workload and the centre can concentrate on matters which are more important. On the other hand provinces become autonomous and it increases the efficiency of the provincial governments. With the introduction of self government, people take active interest in the local affairs and provides support to the government. Participation of women and weaker sections of the society can be enhanced by reserving seats for them in the local bodies. All this contributes in the success of democracy.

(4) Sound Party System- political parties systems are indispensable for the working of democracy. Political parties aggregate and articulate the interest of the people. In a democracy differences of opinion are not only tolerated but are even encouraged. Constructive criticism has an important place in a democracy. In a democracy many parties crop up based on ideology or circumstances . So, some countries have two party system and some others multiparty system and a few countries have single party system. Party which gets the majority form the government and others make the opposition. An affective opposition play a big role in the success of democracy as it is always vigilant and checks the ruling party, if it abuses power.

(5) Tolerance And Spirit of Unity-It is the responsibility of people to make democracy a success. For this, the spirit of tolerance and unity is needed. In a country where there are many diversities of caste, religion, language, culture etc., the quality of tolerance among the people is an absolute necessity, if democracy is to function successfully. The people must be tolerant enough to appreciate and respect the views of others. The majority should be considerate and kind towards the minority, and the minority in turn, should not be obstinate and suspicious of the majority opinion. All arguments should be based on reason and aimed at the general welfare of the society.

(6) Written Constitution And Independent Judiciary-written constitutions guarantees the rights of the people in the form of fundamental rights. Governments of the day cannot encroach upon these rights. In countries with written constitutions, judiciary acts as the guardian of the constitution and fundamental rights of the people. Democracy will be seriously threatened, if the rights of the people are not secure. So it is absolutely essential that the judiciary is independent and free from the control of the executive. Where judiciary is not independent, people will not be sure of their rights and it hampers democracy.

(7) Freedom of Press-Another important condition is the existence of a free, fearless and independent press which is ready to criticize the government if it goes wrong. Duty of the press is to provide unbiased information to the people on the affairs of the state. People gets frustrated and disillusioned when the government makes policies by keeping people in the dark. A free and impartial press not only keeps the people in touch with government activities, but also ventilates the grievances of the people

(8) Independent Impartial and Periodic Elections-Not only the election be conducted periodically in a democracy, it should be independent and impartial as well. This go a long way in establishing the faith of the general population as well as the opposition in the system of democracy. If elections are not conducted periodically, the opposition will not have an opportunity to form government .Most importantly, the public opinion will have no value if there is no election. Another danger is that, in the absence of periodic elections, the opposition may resort to violent methods including revolution and military coups to overthrow governments.

(9) Inculcation of Faith In Democracy- Democracy succeed in a country only if vast majority of people have a genuine faith in democracy as a form of government and way of life. People should be ready to sacrifice their time and resources for the preservation of democracy. The democratic beliefs and values like worth of the individual, the need for toleration of differences and the advantage of arriving at decisions through discussions etc., should all be accepted and followed by the people.

(10) Vigilance of the People- For the success of democracy peoples vigilance can play an important part. People who are disinterested in the affairs of the state cannot be the guardians of democracy. People must cherish the principles of democracy and must have a determination to keep alive the flame of democracy.

(11) Free Expression of Opinion and Free Discussion- people should have the freedom to express their opinion without fear. Connection between freedom of discussion and democracy is straight forward. What we call public opinion cannot evolve, if there is no opportunity for free discussion and expression of one's opinion.

(12) Strong And Effective Opposition- strong and effective opposition is considered the essence of parliamentary democracy. Democratic governments may get careless and even abuse its power, if there is no opposition to point out its mistakes and expose it on the floor of the house. The fear criticism of the opposition is often enough to keep the government on the right track. Generally, opposition is consulted on all vital issues by the government. The Leader of Opposition has an important role in democracy and he is given the rank of a cabinet minister in India.

(13) Honest Administration-It is considered as an important requisite of democracy. People lose faith in democracy if the administration is corrupt and dishonest. It should have the combination of popular rule with skilled administration. The administrative machinery in a democracy must be prompt and smooth and should be free of corruption.

Basic Postulates of Democracy

Democracy, as we mentioned earlier can be direct or indirect. Modern democracies follow indirect or representative democracy. Here power lies with the people and they play a decisive part in the organization and working of government. Here we proceed to examine the basic postulates of democracy.

Government of the People

Democracy is undoubtedly the government of the people. Here people are the ultimate source of authority. In representative democracy, it is the people who decides who should govern. Representatives are chosen by the people and they are to represent the views of the people whom they represent. People chose their representatives through periodic elections that are free and fair. It is a kind of government in which those who rule are accountable to the people. People have the right to express their views and grievances without the fear of being victimized. No governments would dare to ignore the power of public opinion for the fear of becoming unpopular. In places where direct democratic devices like Referendum and Initiative were introduced people have the power to decide on legislation. This have considerably reduced the chance of governments becoming authoritarian. Recall gives people the power to call back corrupt or inefficient public officials. All this makes democracy truly a government of the people.

A free legislative bodies to make law and a government based on democratic order.

Democracies are characterized by legislatures that are elective in nature. In democracies role and functions of the legislature would be clearly laid down in the constitution. This, in one hand protect the independence and freedom of the legislature and on the other hand, prevent the legislature from exceeding its powers. A free legislature alone is not enough, it is also needed that the executive functions according to the

established norms of a democratic order. Political executive and the permanent executive functions with close cooperation and the latter works under the overall guidance of the former. In democratic system permanent executives are expected to be politically neutral and the political executives to be democratic. Then only the people in a democratic system can enjoy the real freedom and rights which the democratic governments assure their citizens.

Limited government

In democracies power is not concentrated in one person or body of persons. Governments are organized into three organs- Legislature, Executive and Judiciary- each with separate set of functions and powers. Though the organs are separate they are interconnected by the institution of checks and balances. Absolute separation of powers is not practical in the working of governments or is it desirable to have in the interest of efficiency of administration. In parliamentary systems where legislature is the creator of the political executive the, principle of separation of powers is not strictly followed. In the presidential system, which is based on the principle of separation of powers executive and the legislature are kept apart. All these measures are devised to make sure that power is not concentrated in one source. Apart from this there are also certain inner checks within the organs of government. Bi-cameral legislatures are devised to check the tendency of conservatism of the upper house and the radicalism of the lower house. Likewise, in a federal system power and authority is divided and distributed between the centre and the states and this arrangement provides autonomy to the states and unity to the federation.

DIRECT DEMOCRATIC DEVICES

Modern states have adopted indirect or representative democracy as a preferred system of governance. It is based on the principle that sovereignty rest with the people and it is exercised by the representatives on behalf of the people. Democracy has come to be accepted as the best form of government compared to other forms of governments that have been practiced in various parts of the world. But, democracy is not without any short comings. In fact, critiques of democracy have listed many defects. One major defect with democracy is that, once people have elected their representatives, they have very little control over them. Same is the case with governments- once elected, people have no other option other than to wait for the next election, even if the governments are inefficient, corrupt or authoritarian. Governments often do not fulfill the promises made to the electorate during the time of elections. Worse, governments may ignore the wishes and needs of the people. In such situations people in democracies have no proper recourse to rectify the defects. The remedy lies in introducing certain devices of direct democracy. So, certain countries like Switzerland and United States of America have introduced in a limited way, direct democratic devices like Referendum, Initiative, Plebiscite and Recall to overcome the defects of representative democracy. These devices are not a continuation of direct democracy, rather they are modern adaptations of direct democracy to meet the new requirements of representative democracy.

Referendum

The French word referendum literally means 'refer to'. Referendum is a device by which, public opinion can be ascertained by a direct reference to the people. It is a process by which verdict of the people is sought on a proposed law or amendments on which the legislature has already expressed its opinion. If it is approved by the majority of people it becomes law, and if not approved by the people the proposed law or amendment will be given up. Thus, according to R.C. Brooks, "Referendum is a device where by the electorate may veto an act which a legislative body has already passed". Munro regards referendum to be "a device where by any law which has been enacted by the legislature may be withheld from going into force, until it has been submitted to the people and has been accepted by them at the polls". Referendums are used in some states of America and in some cantons of Switzerland to a limited extent.

Referendums are of two kinds:

- (a) Compulsory or Obligatory referendum, and
- (b) Facultative or Optional Referendum

Compulsory Referendum- Certain type of bills can only become law after it has been referred to the electorate and accepted by it. Here, people can effectively prevent a law from coming into force even after it has been passed by the legislature. In Switzerland and Australia all constitutional amendments requires compulsory referendum. In some Swiss cantons even ordinary bills have provision for compulsory referendum.

Optional Referendum- In Switzerland a certain number of people (usually, thirty thousand) can ask for the bill passed by the legislature to be submitted to them for referendum. The question whether a bill may be held for referendum or not, is left to the option of the people. After it is referred to the people, if it is accepted by majority of the people it becomes law and if rejected by the people the bill is given up.

We can list out many merits associated with referendum. One, it upholds the sovereignty of the people. People decides for themselves what law they need and what they do not need. It is the best way to discover the genuine public opinion as Bonjour describes it as "an excellent barometer of the public atmosphere".

Two, referendum is a safeguard against the despotism of a majority party. In democracies sometimes when a party gets a huge majority it ignores the opposition and even the public opinion. It may bring out laws that are authoritarian. But with referendum this danger is averted as people can effectively turn down laws that are arbitrary and authoritarian.

Three, it reduces the importance of political parties and curtails partisan spirit considerably as they know it is the people who ultimately decides the fate of the bills. Even when a party has a brute majority in legislature it has to always take the people along if they wish to pass a particular legislation. This situation considerably reduce the importance of political parties.

Four, People are expected to know the intricacies of a bill before they vote. Thus, it educates the masses politically and promotes a sense of responsibility and stimulates patriotism.

The process of Referendum has been criticized on many grounds. It is argued that referendum undermines the authority and status of the legislature. When laws passed by experienced legislatures are rejected by the people, the sense of responsibility of legislatures is lost. This may result in legislatures passing laws without much care and deliberation as they know that if any defect is detected later, then it will be corrected by the people.

Modern legislations are highly complicated and technical. It may be beyond the comprehension of laymen. Referendum, therefore places before the people a power that they are not qualified to handle it in an intelligent manner.

Referendum does not truly represent public opinion, since the voters who participate in a referendum are often small. Voters develop poll fatigue when they are frequently required to participate in referendums. Often opponents take part in referendum than its supporters. Large absenteeism is witnessed in Switzerland during referendums, which points to the fact that either the people are disinterested or they are incompetent to understand the complex legislations.

Initiative

Referendum gave people the power to approve or reject a bill that has already been passed by the legislature. In the initiative, people has the power to propose or initiate a legislation. The process of proposing legislation by citizen is called initiative. Here certain number of voters (fifty thousand Swiss citizens can initiate a bill) can call upon the legislature to introduce, consider and pass a particular legislation. It is then mandatory for the legislature to consider the initiate and after that it must be referred back to the people for their approval or rejection. In Swiss cantons initiative is practiced for both ordinary and constitutional measures.

Initiative are of two kinds- Formulated and unformulated.

Formulated initiative is in the form of a proper bill, complete in all respects. In this case legislature considers the bill as it is submitted to it and after its approval it is referred back to the people for their final approval or rejection. Usually, these two devises- Referendum and Initiative- supplement each other.

In Unformulated initiative, the initiative is in the form of a general demand and not in the form of a proper law. In this case in Switzerland, the legislature approves the proposal and then it prepares its draft. It is then finally, submitted to the people for their verdict.

Arguments regarding the advantages of referendum and initiative are very similar, however, there are some additional advantages associated with referendum.

One, people willingly obey a law as it is proposed by the people themselves. There is hardly any chance for civil disobedience and disturbances when people are permitted to shape their laws. Even in cases where the legislature refuses to consider a particular law

desired by the people, people can take the route of 'initiative' and bring the desired legislation. Two, it removes the danger of sectionalism. A law emanating from legislature may be backed by sectional or party interest. But when people themselves pass a law sectionalism and party interest are likely to be forgotten and the welfare of the people receives prior consideration. Three, it rectifies acts of omission on the part of legislatures. Legislatures can at times be apathetic to needs of the people and initiative is a device by which such acts of omission of the legislatures can be rectified.

As regards the disadvantages of initiative, it can be said that through initiative, authority of legislature is undermined and initiative virtually supersedes the legislature. Popularly initiated measures could suffer from the defect of unsound legislation. Bill drafted by the people are generally crude in conception, often faulty and marred by obscurities and omissions. Hence its adoption may lead to confusion, uncertainty and ambiguity. Finally, the Swiss experience shows that initiative has not improved the work of legislation. Moreover, it has failed to promote progressive legislation in Switzerland, where it is practiced.

Plebiscite

The term plebiscite is French in origin. It is derived from the French word *Plebiscitum*, which means decree (*seitum*) of the people (*plebis*). According to Leacock, Plebiscite is used for any kind of popular vote on an issue. According to strong, plebiscite is taken on a matter of political importance, chiefly in order to create some more or less permanent political condition. Plebiscite is thus, not concerned with law making and is not part of normal legal process. Rather, it is the democratic method of ascertaining the opinion of the people on a policy matter of public importance.

In modern times, plebiscite was made use of by Napoleon in 1804 to circumvent the constitution. Since then it has been frequently made use of. In the twentieth century plebiscite has been often used to ascertain the wishes of the people in connection with the right of self-determination struggles waged all over the world. Plebiscite has also been used by political leaders to get endorsement for their action when legitimacy of their acts has been in some doubt.

Recall

Recall is a direct democratic device by which voters possess the right to call back any elected officer or representative before the expiry of their term, who fails to carry out his duties faithfully or conscientiously. According to Leacock, "The system means that all persons who hold office, must do so only so long as their tenure of office is sanctioned by the people; at any time, when a majority of the voters desire it, the office holder is removed from his function".

The system of recall prevails in some western states of USA and in some cantons of Switzerland. In the state of Oregon even the judges can be recalled.

The Recall as a direct democratic device has many advantages. It is a very effective method to restrain the authorities from abusing power. Moreover, the authorities become more responsive to people's concerns as they know that they can be removed from office by the aggrieved section of the population. It is also a weapon against political corruption as it will not allow the continuation of corrupt and incompetent persons in office.

There are certain disadvantages associated with 'recall'. In this method the possibility of an honest officer or legislator being victimized by the people cannot be completely ruled out. Fearing victimization officers will cease to be independent and may become timorous or servile. They may lose independence of judgment, which in the ultimate analysis, will be a great loss to the public. Personal grudges may lead to recall. Interested persons having a personal grudge may exploit the people and maneuver votes into recall of an honest and efficient officer.

MODULE – VI

PUBLIC OPINION

It is not precisely known when the concept of public opinion originated, but the idea behind it had existed even in the ancient time and it commanded great prestige. The Greeks held that there was divinity in the voice of the people and the Romans used the term *concensus populi* to mean consent of the people though they applied it only in the juridical sense. During the middle ages, the dictum *vox populi, vox dei*, the voice of the people was voice of the god, was common belief and norm of political behavior. Machiavelli in his 'discourses' portray voice of the people as the 'voice of the god.' The concept attained definite shape and political content in the work of Rousseau especially on the eve of the French Revolution. Since then it has become a democratic process and driving force of governmental actions and policies. It is considered as the guiding force of democracy.

The concept of public opinion attained much importance during the early part of the 19th century as a result of many circumstances. First of all, there was the increasing acceptance of the belief that public opinion is an essential matter of politics. This is evident from the remark of Napoleon that "opinion rules every where". Second is that, it was a time when most of the social sciences were still in the early stages of development. Thirdly, governments were relaxing censorship control over publicly expressed political criticism.

Though the term 'public opinion' is often used by all, there is no agreement as to its precise meaning and functions.

According to Morris Ginsberg "Public opinion is a social product due to the interaction of many minds. According to Kimbal Young "Public opinion consist of the opinion held by a public at a certain time". To Leonard Dobb public opinion refers to peoples attitude on an issue when they are members of the same social group.

Public opinion can be defined as the opinion which the people in general hold on a question of common interest at a certain time.

The term public opinion is a combination of two words-public and opinion. Now, the question arises who constitute 'people'? According to E M Sait not everyone contribute in the formation of public opinion. Minors and mentally challenged persons must be excluded. His opinion is that whole adult population, irrespective of voting rights and citizenship should share in the formulation of public opinion. And now comes the question of opinion; opinion refers to a belief which reflect peoples attitude and personality on a matter of great public importance.

Traditional concept of public opinion held the notion of political man as a rational being who distinguished between right and wrong and honest guided his decision on public matters. The enlightened opinion of people represented the will of the community and it reflected a single soul aiming at the good of all. This Homogeneous opinion was free from all taints of factional and sectional interest.

Contemporary view is that there is no single but multiplicity of opinions held by different groups. There are as many opinions as there are politically articulate groups each commanding its own public support of that opinion. Opinion of the people is seldom unanimous. And a pragmatic view is that at no time in history has absolute unanimity been achieved among the people of a state upon any weighty matter of public importance.

In the view of Rousek, public opinion implies four things. In the first place, there is a group of members or public. Secondly, these members of the group have issues of common interest about which they communicate with each other, although at times they may differ from one another to some extent. Thirdly, there is a leader or leaders of the group who take upon themselves the task of formulating opinion on certain important issues at a given time and of drawing the attention of the members of the group to that opinion. Finally, the members of the group adopt that opinion and acquiesce in the action necessitated by such opinion.

Criteria of Public Opinion

A public opinion must be public rather than individual or sectional. Individual or sectional opinion is neither public nor opinion, as it does not aim at the good of the people as a whole or even a majority of them. And an opinion must be firm and convincingly held; it must have a stabilising effect. Public opinion must be stable and enduring. Secondly, it should be an opinion held as widely as possible. An opinion cannot be regarded as constituting public opinion, if it is not shared by the dominant portion of the community. However, it does not mean an opinion of the majority, nor is unanimity required.

A true public opinion is one which is promoted by due regard to public welfare. When a particular opinion is accepted by a huge majority and the minority is convinced of it after through discussion, that it is aimed at public good, it is public opinion. Lowell is of the opinion that, if the minority does not give full support or unwillingly agrees to an opinion, it cannot be termed public opinion.

Formation of Public Opinion

Public opinion formulated on matters of public importance occurs through the process of crystallization and formation. It is only a small section of society, educated, intellectually alive and well-informed citizens who show a keen interest in solving an issue, when it arises. When an issue of great importance arises, intelligent people start expressing their views and reactions on that issue. This small segment of society comprise of different groups and their thinking and solutions to an issue may also differ. They present their

views to the people either by pen or word. Some views are discarded in the very beginning, some views are modified and some views get more strength. Now, a comparatively larger section of society, who are passive in politics but understand the issues involved, listen and read what elites have to say, and present their own views and suggestions. The elites think and judge the views so expressed and may modify and even correct their own views. In this process a definiteness is achieved and opinion is crystallized. If the majority of people are convinced that the opinion that had taken a final shape is for the good of the community, it becomes a public opinion. Even if the opinion so crystallized is held by a minority, it still becomes a public opinion, if it is for the general welfare of the community.

Role of Public Opinion In Democracies

Public opinion is considered as the guiding force in democracy. It is a truism that democracy means government by public opinion. Not only political parties, all groups in society, be it interest and pressure groups or even governments, generating favourable public opinion is of utmost concern of all of them. In democracies, people are regularly called upon to elect their representatives, and the party or the parties in a coalition which gets the majority form governments. So it becomes essential for all political parties to generate public opinion in their favour, if they wish to come to power. To win people in their side, parties vie with one another by placing before the electorate policies and programmes which are likely to be get he maximum support of the people.

A government formed by the support of the people in a democracy cannot afford to ignore the public opinion, as they know that those who have entrusted them with power can also take back the power in the next general election. Responsibility and vigilance of people in the form of public opinion keeps the government on the right track. Peoples power ensure that government does not exercise arbitrary authority and ensure democratic rights to its citizens.

Public opinion plays an invaluable role in the working of political institutions and serves as the most important agency of coordination. In the Presidential system, it smoothens the functioning of the executive and legislative departments and brings harmony between the two, without one being responsible to the other. Public opinion also ensures that deadlock or delay arising out of disagreement between legislature and executive branches are resolved at the earliest.

Freedom of speech and expression is the most important requirement for the generation of public opinion. By giving people an opportunity to express their feelings, the governments in democracies not only provide an opportunity for the public opinion to develop but it also in a way, enhances peoples belief in democratic governments.

Public opinion enables democratization of political institutions and keeps them true to the constructive role they are obliged to perform. The premise of democracy is that people rule themselves. So it is only natural that all important public offices are run by people who are democratically elected; which means opinion of the people is the deciding factor here.

Democracy lives and thrives on public opinion, provided it is honest, forceful and vigilant. A common man cannot be expected to know the intricacies of all the important issues in a country but if he has a keen interest in the affairs of a state and an open and inquisitive mind that will help him to form informed opinion on issues plaguing the nation.

Agents of Public Opinion

There are various agents that help generate public opinion in society. Prominent among them are listed below.

Press

Print media includes news papers, periodicals, journals, magazines and such other kinds of printed matter that are circulated among people. Among these, news papers are the most prominent agent of formation of public opinion. Walter Lippmann attached so much importance to the daily press in educating people and formation of public opinion that he called it the "Bible of democracy." Rapid spread of mass education coupled with the innovations in printing technology and better transportation have made news papers reach every nook and corner of the country at affordable prices of common man. Reading newspapers have become a habit of most people so much so that it has become part of their daily. Readers are attached to one news paper or the other which caters to their taste and leanings.

The daily press reports national and international news, proceedings of the legislative discussions and debates, major policy decisions of the government, publishes views of statesmen, eminent scholars and columnist on various issues of public importance. Presentation of facts is only part of the function of dailies. News papers also carries comments and analyses of various news that are of much importance to the country and public at large. Editorials of the news paper largely reflect the policy of the management and the taste and predilections of those to whom they are addressed. The news and views projected in the daily of his choice generally form the basis of the opinion of the people.

News papers also functions as a forum for the expression of views and opinion of the people on matters of public importance, policies of the government and ventilation of grievances. Most news papers reserve space for the expression of such views and generally for the ventilation of grievances of the people. News papers play a vital role in the crystallisation of public opinion. No government would like to ignore the opinion of the people and they can do so only at its own peril in a democracy.

There is also the danger of press manipulating opinion by suppressing facts and distorting news. News papers nowadays are controlled by powerful media groups and business interest, and they have their own vested interests to protect. Naturally independent and unbiased reporting of news have become a casualty. Moreover dailies are dependent on advertisements for their existence and this weakens the position of the newspaper as a vehicle of dissemination of information, knowledge and opinion. Governments have also been know to control press in an indirect way by way of controlling access to facts and also by the threat of denial of government advertisements.

People

Among the various agencies that help in the formation of public opinion, the people must be considered as an important one. All people in a society does not help in the formation of public opinion. Rather, some people play a more prominent role than others. People who are involved in public affairs such as legislators administrators, journalist or politicians make or mould opinion by expressing their views on policies and events as they occur. Again there are people who are knowledgeable and experts in their own fields, who out of sense of civic duty and interest in public affairs express their views. They also have the capacity to mould public opinion. Well respected social activists, literary personalities, eminent intellectuals, scientists, pubic figures etc., all have the capacity to influence public opinion.

Platform

Though in modern times print and electronic media are the preferred choice of opinion makers, they have not forgotten the importance of platform to influence the views of the people. Among the most cherished rights of man are freedom of association and the freedom of speech and expression and both these rights are at the core of formation of public opinion. Public meetings provide the leaders to establish direct contact with the masses. Platform as a means of formulating public opinion assumes significance in countries with huge section of uneducated and illiterate population exists. In places where the penetration of print and electronic media is weak is also a favoured area of the leaders to use the means of platform to reach out to people. Skillful orators among the leaders can flare up emotions and choke the thought and reason of the masses and guide them in the path determined by the leader. Rhetoric is often employed by the speakers to influence the public mind. Facts are seldom discussed and realities rarely explained in public meetings. The platform is generally used as to reiterate one's own point of view and falsify those of others.

In modern times, the importance of platform has progressively been reduced with the simultaneous advancement in the reach of mass media among the people. But it is still widely used in times of elections, especially as a means to showcase the strength of a party.

Electronic media

Electronic media which includes Television, Radio, Cinema, and Internet play a very prominent role in the formulation of public opinion .Apart from being an excellent means of entertainment, Television and Radio have become an important source of reliable information for the public. In developing countries, where the percentage of illiteracy is fairly high, electronic media exert an overwhelming influence on the formulation of opinion of people. Television and radio devote a fair amount of time on the analysis of news and events. And with the advent of channels dedicated exclusively to news, the events happening in the country reach people without any delay. Parliamentary debates and discussions are followed keenly by the masses live on Television and Radio. All this has greatly aroused the interest of common man in the affairs of the state.

Of late, internet have become a very potent organ for the formulation of public opinion. Internet, especially for the youth, have become the window to the world. The advantage of internet over other electronic media is that it is not easy for the governments to impose censorship over the contend in the sites .This helps in the free exchange of information and analysis of news without the fear of being victimized. The role of internet, especially that of the social networking sites, in formulating public opinion have been well established. The 'Arab Spring' that swept Middle East in 2011 saw people using social networking sites to organize mass protest against 'oppressive regimes'. Internet came in handy for the protesters when the states in West Asia imposed severe restrictions on the media in reporting events in their countries.

Political parties

In democracies political party is without doubt, the foremost agency in the formulation of public opinion. It is the endeavour of all political parties in a democracy to win the opinion of the people to their cause. Various methods are employed by the political parties to generate public opinion. Parties regularly organize public meetings where the leaders of the party through their oratorical skills and intelligent arguments try to convince the people and formulate opinion desired by the party. Apart from public meetings parties they also conduct seminars, release books, pamphlets, leaflets, reports, pictures, , posters etc., to generate opinion. Parties also indulge in agitations, demonstrations, strikes etc., to highlight issues that needs the support of the people.

Legislature

Legislature reflect as well as mould or shape public opinion. It is a place where opinion of the people is reflected through their elected representatives. All shades of opinion and different interest representing various sections of the society finds its expression in the legislature. Parliament act as a deliberative body, where public affairs of high importance are debated and discussed. This arouses the interest of the common man and help in the generation of opinion.

A bill in parliament goes through 'three readings' and passes through different stages including legislative committees. A bill passed in one house is transferred to the other house for its consideration. People get enough time to know about the proposed bill and people can propose suggestions through proper channels. Opposition parties may force governments to amend or modify or even drop the original bill if there is considerable public opinion against the bill.

Educational institutions

Educational institutions such as schools, colleges and universities exercise indirect influence on public opinion. These educational institutions act as training grounds that mould responsible citizens of the future. Apart from reading books and attending lectures students take part in symposiums, seminars, debates etc. Thus as part of the curriculum when students learn about their country and world they change their prejudices, views and outlooks .They develop new convictions based on their better understanding and wider knowledge. The views and outlook of their teachers also influence the students in moulding opinion on the issues they come across. Students acquire civic consciousness and generally become aware of their rights and duties. Education inculcate in them an attitude of inquisitiveness and independent thinking which enable them to develop opinion on vital issues concerning the nation.

Interest and Pressure groups

Interest and pressure groups also play a vital role in the formation of public opinion. The aim of these groups is to protect and promote specific interest. Pressure groups exert pressure on the government to receive decisions that favour the interest of the group. To achieve this objective one of the favoured tactic employed by pressure groups is to generate favourable public opinion. So, interest and pressure groups are always in the process of generating public opinion as they know that no government can ignore the public opinion for long.

Government

Government also tries to create public opinion in favour of their policies and programmes by propaganda and publicity. Every modern governments have a well functioning department for information and publicity .They try to project the achievements of the government to impress the people and create public opinion in support of the government.

Propaganda

Propaganda has an important role in the formation of public opinion. In every country there are numerous groups that compete with each other for protecting and promoting their interest. These groups know that the best method to build up influence in the realm of public policy is to indulge in activities of propaganda. So every group has its own publicity and propaganda wing and try to influence people to one's own views through various methods which it thinks fit. Even governments indulge in propaganda to counter the criticism of the opposition and to explain and to convince people the positions taken by the government. According to Walter Lippmann, "the most significant revolution in modern times is the revolution that is taking place in the art of creating consent among the governed. Within the life of the new generation now in control of affairs, persuasion has become a conscious art and regular organ of popular government."

Various methods are employed by these groups ranging from open and straight forward methods to outright hidden and dubious methods. Sometimes propaganda involves much of falsehood but in a democratic country falsehood is taken head on by counter propaganda. Even if some agencies propagate falsehoods or distort facts that would be countered by other agencies by revealing the true state of affairs. In this way propaganda plays a positive role in society.
