CHAPTER II

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE: SOME THEORETICAL ISSUES

Theories of Democracy:

Men throughout history have grappled with the idea as to what is the best form of government. In quest of this ideal, they evolved different modes of governing themselves. Most of the modes of government evolved contain in them seeds of tyranny. Ultimately democracy is accepted in most of the countries as the best form of government.

Democracy has traveled through different stages of history. With every stage, a new concept of democracy was evolved and with it developed a new theory of democracy, which in turn enriched the subject of democracy. Few concepts in political theory are so enmeshed in controversy over scope and definition, as is the concept of democracy.

Classical Theory of Democracy:

The word democracy originated in the Greek writings around the fifth century B.C. 'Demos' referred to the common people, the masses; 'Kratos' meant 'power'.

The democratic theory originated in Greek political thought. In Greek city-states, democracy was placed in the perverted form of
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government. Plato decried democracy because the people were not properly equipped with education “to select the best rulers and the wisest courses.”

Aristotle placed democracy among perverted forms since it signified the rule of the mediocres seeking their selfish interests, not the interest of the state. The theories of Plato and Aristotle had great influence on the subsequent theories. Classical theories of democracy were mainly concerned with the classification of government and possibilities of best form of governance. The theories of Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau and Montesquieu were important among them. They had given their own classification of governments for the sake of comparing different governments and to find out the best form of government among them and presented their own theories. The theories of these scholars were the product of their own time. Each thinker pleaded for a form of government which in their view is very pertinent to the mankind and is called by them as democratic.

**Direct Versus Indirect Democracy:**

Direct democracy is one where citizens are taking direct part in the affairs of government. Direct democracy is possible in small and simple societies. These were is practice in Greek city-states. Though the theories of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau were in favor of direct democracy, the theory of Rousseau is different from the theories of Hobbes and Locke. Rousseau though strongly advocated direct democracy, critically analyzed
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representative democracy. To Rousseau, "representative system is not
democratic, because one's will can never be represented by another." 6

"Philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau contended that true democracy is
impossible unless all citizens gather together to make their own decisions
and to supervise their government. Rousseau said that decisions of
government should embody the general will and 'will cannot be
represented.'" 7 He argued that in representative democracy people enjoy
power only at the time of elections.

With the decline of city-states, there is also a gradual decline in the
direct democracy and representative democracy is gaining prominence. It is
obvious that the Greek style of democracy is inapplicable to modern
conditions. Modern political societies are large societies, and the greater the
number of the people involved, the less their participation can be effective
and meaningful. 8 "While Greek democracy can be defined literally as a
"government of the people over the people," modern democracy cannot, for
the people who are governed are not the same people who govern.
Therefore we should not be misled into believing that present-day "electoral
participation" resembles the real participation of the Greek citizen and even
less that the devices we call "direct democracy" (referendum, initiative,
etc.,) can bridge the gap between the Greek and the modern formulas." 9

With this change from direct democracy to indirect democracy or
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representative democracy, there was also a gradual change in the theories of democracy from direct democracy.

Modern Theories of Democracy:

With the emergence of representative democracy, political thinkers raised doubts about the success of democracy. In representative democracy, people's representatives formulate policies on behalf of the people. How far these representatives are successful in representing the interest of the people is the biggest question before the modern thinkers. A number of contemporary political theorists believe that we have come to rely too much on representative democracy and are now facing a weakening of citizenship of the sense of obligation to participate in civic life.\(^\text{10}\) "At the beginning of the century the size and complexity of industrialized societies and the emergence of bureaucratic forms of organization seemed to many empirically minded writers on politics to cast grave doubts on the possibility of the attainment of democracy as that concept was usually understood. Mosca and Michels were two of the best known and most influential writers to advance such a thesis."\(^\text{11}\) Both these scholars argue that in every society elites should govern. But, whether these elites especially political elites who are the chosen representatives of the people govern in the interest of the people or not is uncertain. If political elites take into consideration the interests and aspirations of the people, while formulating policies, that may lead to democratic governance.

\(^\text{10}\) Kenneth Janda, Jeffrey M. Berry and Jerry Goldman, Supra no.7, p.39.
To Shumpeter, “the basic problem of democracy is the need to institutionalize peaceful struggle among competing elites that offer the masses the opportunity to choose between alternative programs even as they expose one another’s weaknesses and failings.”12 “Joseph Shumpeter and many others, both before and after him, were not wrong in regarding such a system as a mode of domination by elites, which has always existed, tempered and this is where the novelty lies-by peaceful competition. Even if we accept that, as George Lavau has put it, democracy would develop as the autonomy of everyone and the autonomy of many different self-managed and ever expanding groups increased, there would be some who would always remain more active or skilful than the common run of citizens.”13

However, given this largely unquestionable basis, the practical problem consists in measuring the degree of vulnerability or invulnerability of the ruling class in relation to the people who are required to express their approval or disapproval of it from time to time by their vote.14 Dahl, though an advocate of Polyarchy, had critically analyzed representative democracy. According to him, elections are central to the democratic method because they provide the mechanism through which the control of leaders by non-leaders can take place; democratic theory is concerned with the process by which ordinary citizens exert relatively high degree of control over

leaders.\textsuperscript{15} When democracy operates through representatives its depth will depend partly upon the quality of the participation of the citizens in the election and partly upon the effectiveness of the influence of the constituents upon their representatives after election.\textsuperscript{16}

"There are two major schools of thought about what constitutes democracy. The first believes democracy is a form of government. It emphasizes the procedures that enable the people to govern—mainly to discuss issues, voting in elections, running of public office. The second sees democracy in the \textit{substance} of government policies, in freedom of religion and providing for human needs."\textsuperscript{17}

**The Procedural View of Democracy:**

"Procedural democratic theory sets forth principles that describe how government should make decisions. These principles address three distinct questions:

1. Who should participate in decision making?
2. How much should each participants vote count?
3. How many votes are needed to reach a decision?\textsuperscript{18}

Who should participate in decision making?

According to the procedural democratic theory all adults should take part in government decision making. Every citizen is allowed to participate in decision making. Only the foreigners, mentally retarded persons and..."
those who are unfit to take decisions are excluded from participation. Procedural democratic theory is based on the principle of universal participation.

How much should each participants vote count?

Universal participation is meaningless unless the vote of every citizen carry equal weight. There should not be such thing as votes of Prime Minister and other officials which carry more weight. Thus the second principle of procedural democratic theory is political equality.

How many votes are needed to reach decision?

"Procedural theory prescribes that a group should decide to do what the majority of its participants (50 percent plus one person more) wants to do. This principle is called majority rule. (If participants divide over more than two alternatives and none receives a simple majority the principle usually defaults to plurality rule, in which the group should do what most participants want.)"\(^\text{19}\) An article by Max Beloff in *The Fortnightly*, reached the striking conclusion that the time has come for a serious inquiry into the extent to which the principle ‘of majority rule under a regime of universal suffrage is an adequate method of dealing with the ever more intricate and technical problems of a modern industrial society in a competitive world’.\(^\text{20}\)

The three principles of procedural democratic theory namely universal participation, political equality and majority rule are considered by many scholars as essential for democratic decision making. In small and
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simple societies like Greek city-states these principles can be met in a direct
democracy. In representative democracy we adhere to these three principles
to guarantee that elections are democratic. "But what happens after the
election? The elected representatives might not make the same decisions the
people would have made if they had gathered for the same purpose. To cope
with this possibility in representative government, procedural theory gives
us a fourth decision-making principle: responsiveness." It is the duty of
elected representatives to respond to the aspirations, demands and interest
of the people. Democratic governance is concerned mainly with how best
the representatives of the people will respond to the various demands of the
people.

The Substantive View of Democracy:

According to procedural democratic theory the decisions are based
mainly on majority principle. But in some cases, for example, in case of
India where the Hindu population is more, obviously more number of
Hindu representatives are elected to the Parliament. There is possibility of
Hindus claiming more benefits for the development of their own group
some times at the cost of other groups. The substantive democratic theory
claims an answer to this problem.

Substantive Democratic Theory:

"Substantive democratic theory focuses on the substance of
government policies, not on the procedures followed in making those
policies. It argues that in a democratic government, certain principles must
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be embodied in government policies."22 Substantive democratic theory stresses on taking into consideration civil liberties and rights while making decisions in democracy. But guaranteeing social rights and economic rights is also equally important in democracy. This divided the substantive theories into two groups namely conservative theorists and liberal theorists.

"The political ideology of a theorist tends to explain his or her position on what democracy really requires in substantive policies. Conservative theorists have a narrow view of the scope of democratic government and a narrow view of the social and economic rights guaranteed by that government. Liberal theorist believe that democratic government should guarantee its citizens a much broader spectrum of social and economic rights."23

**Liberal Theory of Democracy:**

For the liberals, "as they have been called since the term was first used in early nineteenth-century Spain-who in their scale of values put liberty first, democracy means institutions through which the freedom of the members of the politically organized community is realized. Liberal democracy is the correct expression with which to designate democracy as the organization of liberty."24 Liberal Democracy may be taken to refer to the set of institutions-free elections, competing parties, freedom of speech-that make up the political system with which we are familiar in the west; or it may refer to the conception of democracy that underlies and justifies that
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Equal liberty to all citizens is the main base of liberal democracy. According to the followers of liberal democracy this equality of liberties is guaranteed to the people through representative government. “It is the purpose of government, wrote Mill, to maximize the happiness of each individual. Men always act in their own interest as far as they know them, and getting them to know their interests is simply a matter of education, so the best assurance of good government is to give each man an equal share of political power, through the device of representative government.”

Believers in liberal democracy have generally given credence to the existence of a natural harmony of interests. “Like John Stuart Mill, they assumed that man was such a social animal, so sympathetic toward the needs and interests of others that—quite apart from consideration of “objective” right—he would be led to subordinate his special interests to the general welfare.”

**Marxist Theory of Democracy:**

The followers of Marxist democracy criticize liberal democracy. “Marx himself believed in a natural social harmony. But for Marx this harmony of interests was something which could not be achieved as long as society permitted private ownership of the instruments of production.”

Marxist believe that in every society there exist two classes namely employees and workers, rich and poor, haves and have-nots and exploiters.
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and exploited. As long as this distinction of class exists, democracy is not possible. Equality in some sense is basic to any conception of democracy.\(^{29}\)

In the long run the working class or the exploited class, which is in large number revolts against the capitalist system. Further more it is held by followers of Marx that the revolution must be followed by the “dictatorship of the proletariat \(^{-30}\). Ultimately, it leads to withering away of state where no class distinction exist which leads to equality.

**Elite Theory of Democracy:**

“The classical Elite Theory was at once anti-Marxist and anti-democratic for the elite theorists considered that both these values, democracy and equality, were not adequate to explain political phenomena. Historically Elite Theory rose as a response to Marxism, a challenge to its ideology of equality. At the same time when Pareto and Mosca wrote, the liberal democratic political institutions seemed disintegrating.”\(^{31}\) Elites believe that in every society exist some people who possess special qualities to govern. “According to Mosca, societies are ruled by minorities, by oligarchies and there is a ruling minority which holds power. The ruling minority justifies its rule by certain theories or principles which are acceptable to those who are ruled.”\(^{32}\) Thus, according to the elites theory in every society we find two classes of people. Firstly the class that rules and second the class that ruled. “The first class, always the less numerous,
performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages which power brings, whereas the second, the more numerous class, is directed and controlled by the first, in a manner that is now more or less legal, now more or less arbitrary and violent.\textsuperscript{33} However, there is always a change in the ruling class, which is called by Pareto as circulation of elites. Pareto refers to circulation of elites which means the process according to which one elite is replaced by another.\textsuperscript{34} "In an ideal society such changes would take place peacefully and not be accompanied by vast social upheaval-the demise of one governing elite and the rise of another usually meant the replacement of one dominant type of individual by another (Foxes by lions or vice versa) as the old regime had become too rigid or the political formula which had held society together, no longer proved effective."\textsuperscript{35} "In a way, the elite theory is contrary to the democratic value such as equality. But the representative character of elites and the competition among the elites for replacement of one elite by another, indicate the democratic spirit. Elite theory believes in the rule of the best or excellent."\textsuperscript{36}

From the above discussion, it has become clear, whatever the views of scholars on democracy, party plays a significant role in representative democracy. Parties form the most important part of the representative
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Democratic character of any government is mainly determined by the manner in which the input and output functions of a particular political system are performed. If a government is able to articulate and aggregate the interests and aspirations of the people in proper manner and is able to formulate policies in the interest and well being of the people, then its governance is considered as democratic governance. The role played by political parties is significant in democratic governance, because, it is an important institution responsible for articulating and aggregating the interest of the people. It is also responsible for formulating public policies. Parties play a crucial role in the interest formulation and interest aggregation. Ultimate concern of democratic governance is to ensure good governance. How far the political parties are able to exercise their power in the interest of people is the primary concern of this study. So an understanding of political parties is essential in this study.

**POLITICAL PARTIES:**

The word party which is derived from part and refers to division or opposition within a body politic, first appeared in political discourse in the late Middle Ages. As given by Giovanni Sartori, the term party came into use gradually replacing the derogatory term “faction”, with the acceptance of the idea that a party is not necessarily a faction, that is not necessarily an
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evil, and that it does not necessarily disrupt the bonum commune, the common weal. (To Voltaire) Faction, he wrote, is an parti saditieux dons un etate" ("seditious party in a state"). The term party would thus seem applicable to the factions that are not seditious. From the beginning of party theory, political parties have been described as gatherings of politically like minded people (by Edmund Burke and Sir Ernest Barker) or as social units with common goals, a division of roles, communication channels, and a hierarchical authority structure (by Samuel J. Eldersveld).

The development of political parties is mainly linked with that of modern western democracy. As Daalder puts it: "The modern political party... can be described with little exaggeration as the child of the Industrial Revolution. Modern parties such as Jacksonian Democrats in United States emerged when legislatures were institutionalized and, most important, when broad segments of the adult population gained the suffrage.

According to Alan Ware, parties arose from two sources: (1) from within an existing legislature (as in the case of British Conservatives), and (2) by the mobilization of social groups and classes that had no representation in such legislatures and which sought to defend their own interests (one example being that of British Labour Party).
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To Ware, something to be recognized as a party, has to involve more persons than one. The goal of such parties may be different from each other. It may be the dissolution of an existing state rather than to exercise power within it or, its objective is to bring down a regime. And “there are political groups that call themselves parties, and which engage in some political activities with parties such as contesting elections but whose purpose is either to entertain or to ridicule politics as an activity."  

Sartori had also distinguished party into three types.

1. The party that remains external to and uninvolved with the sphere of government, the ambassador party, so to speak;

2. The party that operates within the ambit of government but does not govern; and,

3. The party that actually governs, that takes on the governing or governmental functions.  

Direct democracy is not possible in modern times as a result representative democracies are practiced by many states. Since three great ideals of progress came to be formulated during the French Revolution, namely, those of liberty, equality and fraternity, the world has witnessed the rise and development of a representative form of democracy and it is in this context that party system has grown and developed. Political parties got more prominence in the representative government. No free and large democracy is possible in modern times.  
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country is without them. We cannot think of modern representative democracies without political parties. It may be one party system, two-party system or multi-party system; party system is bound to exist in every political system. Of all the forces and factors, the role played by political parties has been most effective in bringing about a radical change in the powers and functions of the parliament.

MacIver in his treatise, “The Modern State” emphasized the importance of political parties. Defining political party as “an association organization in support of some principles or policy which by constitutional means it endeavors to make the determinant; he asserted that a party seeks to do more than influence or support the government, it seeks to make it.47

Parties play significant role in every democracy. To know why parties are playing such a crucial role in democracy it is essential to know about their functions. The kind of functions performed by political parties gave them significance in democracy. The first and foremost function of a political party is to influence the electorate. It is by their vote a political party can win the election.

Rod Mistry has given the following seven functions of political parties:

1. The parties unite, simplify and stabilize the political process.

2. Political parties generally compete for capturing power, they create stability out of chaos, they work as pressure groups.

3. Political parties provide levels between the government and its people.

4. They recruit political leaders.

5. They present issues, sets goals for the society.

6. Political party acts as a catalyst in the process of modernization.

7. They also perform social welfare functions.\(^{48}\)

According to S.S. Patagundi Political parties perform the following functions:

1. “Interest articulation and interest aggregation.

2. Expression of the will of the people.

3. Generation of ideas of common good, and

4. Acquisition of power.”\(^{49}\)

We can broadly classify the functions of political parties into two, participatory and responsive. In the participatory function of political party we can include contesting elections, campaigning, selection of candidates for election, interest articulation and interest aggregation, etc. and in the responsive functions we can include social welfare functions, providing stability, working as pressure groups, etc. However, it is not possible to separate these two functions into watertight compartments. Both the functions are interdependent. Participatory function has an effect on the responsive function. Winning election is the aim of all political parties. To
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achieve this they participate in elections. Only by participating in elections, they cannot win. Winning elections mainly depends upon their performance. Moreover, performance of political parties is determined by their responsiveness. How best a party is able to express the will of the people determines its future. Political parties are the intermediaries between the people and the government. They are concerned with the understanding of the grievances of the people and explaining them to the government. Government policies should represent the will of the people. Competition for power is nothing but competition to win peoples’ votes. And people vote for that party, which represents their interest in an effective manner.

Respondiveness of political parties towards people is very crucial in winning elections.

Scholars like Rosseau and others view that representative government cannot effectively represent the will of the people. People are not allowed to take part in decision-making. Representatives may not properly represent the will of the people. However, one cannot neglect the reality of representative government. The capacity to govern will not be improved automatically by moving from 'single old government to new 'governance', for it depends primarily on mode of governing which incorporates representative politics, instead of tries to avoid it. 
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Governance:

We have used the term governance to understand democratic governance. But, what do we mean by democratic governance? A clear understanding of democratic governance is not possible unless we study the concept of governance in detail.

The concept of governance is not new. However, it has gained particular significance in recent years when the literature of African development among other things, of the World Bank’s (1989) identifying the crisis on the continent as one of the governance. Governance has only recently entered the standard Anglophone social science lexicon and become a ‘buzzword’ in various lay circles.

Richard Joseph at the Carter Center of Emory University in Atlanta was instrumental in helping to popularize the concept among Africans by conducting annual seminars under the auspices of the Centers African Governance Program.

The anglophone term ‘governance’ can be traced to the classical Latin and ancient Greek words for ‘steering’ of boats. It originally referred mainly to the action or manner of governing, guiding, or steering conduct and overlapped with ‘government’.
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disciplines. "It is fair to say that since the end of 1970s, what the experts have been thinking about welfare state has also been applicable to governance. If one looks closely at the major international reports (OECD, 1981, 1984, World Bank, 1994) that have come out over the past two decades one can easily find a whole series of diagnoses, analyses and recommendations that parallels, in a striking way, those found in the literature on governance."\(^{55}\)

According to Gerry Stoker, "governance is ultimately concerned with creating the conditions for ordered rule and collective action",\(^{56}\) rather governance signifies "a change in the meaning of government, referring to a process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rule; or new method by which society is governed".\(^{57}\)

Bob Joseph has identified two closely related meanings of governance. "First, governance can refer to any mode of co-ordination of inter-dependent activities. Among these modes, three are relevant here: the anarchy of exchange, organizational hierarchy, and self organizing 'heterarchy'. The second more restricted meaning, is heterarchy (or self-organization)---."\(^{58}\) One of the main features of heterarchy is interdependence of various agencies, institutions and systems which are operationally autonomous from one another. This is a familiar form of governance in many different contexts. Each system has its own operational
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logic. The overall development of the system can be possible by taking into consideration their own internal codes and logics and adjusting them to the outside controls.

The main idea is that in an increasingly complex world where different sub-systems are emerging, the state has lost its capacity for action. Democratic governance to be effective should respond properly to the demands of the people. State finds it difficult to adjust itself to the demands put forward by the civil society which are too numerous and too contradictory. Social disorder, cultural cleavages, community pluralism are some of the problems faced by the state. In the old theory of governance state was very powerful and possessed all necessary resources to resist social pressures. With increasing globalization and with it increasing uncertainty state’s power has diminished.

To Francois-Xavier Merrien the solution to this problem can be found by forming partnership with private sectors. The state must act as a mediator between public and private sectors occupying an essential place in development. This he considers as a new theory of governance. Thus, public-private partnership, industrial, districts, trade associations, statecraft, diplomacy, interest in ‘police’(Polizei), policy communities and international regimes all involve aspects of what is now termed ‘governance’. In the new governance process development and welfare is not the sole concern of the state. The state has to work along with the
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private sectors and voluntary organizations. Thus, private sector, public sector and voluntary associations and organizations together form new governance process. Thus the "new (good) governance is characterized by the move away from supervision to contracting out; from centralization to decentralization; from state that redistributes to the state that regulates; from public services management to management following market principles; and from state 'guidance' to co-operation between the state and the private sector."61

Goran Hyden defines Governance, as the conscious management of regime structures with a view to enhancing the legitimacy of the public realm.62 To Hyden public realm encompasses both state and society. Government to be legitimate must be responsive to the needs of the people. The main aim of all governments should be the welfare and well being of the people. To achieve this aim the governmental structures and institutions should work in the interest of the people. Political party is one of the important institutions available to the people through which they elect their representatives who on behalf of people formulate the policies. The policies should be in the interest of the people. For this participation of people in the decision, making process is equally important. In representative democracy, direct participation of people in decision-making is not possible. People by organizing themselves in trade unions and in various organizations and associations can influence the outcome of the decision. Thus, not only the

61 Francois-Xavier Merrien, Supra no.55, P.59.
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management of the governmental structure but non-governmental structure is equally important in democratic governance.

Goran Hyden in his book "Governance and Politics in Africa" has provided four properties-namely, trust, reciprocity, accountability and authority-which bound the realm of governance. "Trust refers to normative consensus on the limits of action present in a political community. It sustained by socialization into the rules and not a contract. Indicators of trust in political community are the extent to which individuals and groups in society cooperate in associations that cut across basic divisions such as ethnicity, race, religion and caste."\(^{63}\) The differences of ethnicity, race, religion, and class are bound to exist in every society. In spite of these differences, there is a sort of co-operation among the individuals and groups in the society, which is the indicator of trust.

Reciprocity refers to an interaction among members of political community. Freedom of individuals to form associations to defend and promote their interests is an important indicator of reciprocity. Authority is mainly concerned with effective leadership who can very effectively implement the policies and be able to solve specific problems affecting them. Accountability refers to the control that people exercise on their leaders. Citizens judge political decisions along two lines: (1) how effective they are in solving specific problems affecting them; and (2) how these

\(^{63}\) Ibid. p.12.
decisions are carried out. The four variables mentioned above are considered by Goren Hyden as pre-requisites for effective governance.

Effective governance can maintain stability of the system. “But the real test of governance comes in situations where regime changes are needed to meet new demands or deal with new problems. The study of governance then involves the identification of the conditions that facilitate good governance and by implication, effective problem solving.” Hyden has suggested three conditions mentioned below:

1. **Citizens Influence and Oversight:**
   
   It refers to,
   
   a) Degree of Political Participation: To what extent people are able to take active part in the political affairs of the state.
   
   b) Means of Preference Aggregation: By participating in the political process people express their preferences about public policy. They not only express preferences about public policy but also see to it that they are properly aggregated for effective policy making.
   
   c) Methods of Public Accountability: It refers to the means, which are available to the people, which hold governors accountable for their decisions and actions.
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2. Responsive and Responsible Leadership:

Responsiveness and responsible leaders refers to the attitudes of political leaders toward their role as public trustees.66

a) Degree of respect for civic public realm: Political leaders have to give proper aspirations of the people while policy making. Attitude of political leaders towards people and their ability to represent the aspirations of the people depends on the degree of respect for civic public realm.

b) Degree of openness of public policy making: Political leaders should be ready to share information with citizens. They have to educate the people regarding the policies made in their favor. This knowledge is essential on the part of citizen to have effective control over leaders and policies.

c) Degree of adherence to rule of law: Laws are meant not only for the people but they are also applicable to the leaders in the same way. Every act of people and leaders should be within the framework of law.

3. Social Reciprocity:

It refers to the type of interaction between the individuals and group of individuals. Social reciprocities refers to the extent to which citizens or groups of citizens treat each other in an equal fashion; how far such groups demonstrate tolerance of each other in the pursuit of politics; and how far

66 Ibid. p.15.
voluntary associations are capable of transcending the boundaries of such primary social organizations as kinship, ethnicity, or race.\(^\text{67}\)

a) Degree of political equality: Different groups in the society have their own interests different from the interests of other groups and how far these various groups treat others in an equal fashion.

b) Degrees of inter group tolerance: Degree of political equality mainly determined by how these various groups demonstrate tolerance of each other's interests.

c) Degree of inclusiveness in associational members: It deals with how far the associations bring people of similar interest together in spite of their differences because of kinship, ethnicity, race, etc.

Hyden is of the opinion that these indicators differ from country to country depending on the circumstances. Hyden in his classification has very systematically analyzed the role of an individual, group and leader in the process of governance.

Hyden has given the classification of regimes into four types—namely, communitarian, libertarian, corporatist and statists. By this classification, he has tried to identify the challenges to effective governance in different regimes. In the communitarian regime, community demands are not properly aggregated and articulated because of the hard civic public realm. Limited public resources on the other hand make effective governance hard, if not impossible.

\(^{67}\) Goran Hyden and Michael Bratton (ed.), *Supra* no.52, p.16.
In the libertarian regime, crisis of governance is mostly because of two reasons. "The first is the inability of the those in leadership positions to aggregate citizens preferences in an effective manner so as to deliver authoritative decisions. The second reason is the tendency for the utilitarian values to get enriched in such a way that citizen interest in politics wanes,"68

The corporate regime which consists of various groups faces crisis of governance when the interest of one community comes in clash with other or when the interest of any one is neglected by other groups. With so many differences among groups arriving at consensus on policy issue becomes very difficult.

In the statist regime where power is concentrated in the state, the leaders can become increasingly arrogant and unresponsive by ignoring citizens control dimension.

Dimensions of Effective Governance:

Joachim Ahren’s has given four dimensions of effective governance according to four principles in his book, Governance and Economic Development: A Comparative Institutional Approach. They are accountability, participation, predictability and transparency.

Accountability:

"Basically, accountability means making politicians and bureaucrats responsible for their actions and overall government policies and avoiding the capture of the state by narrow interests. With respect to policy reform,  

accountability refers to the design of development-enhancing reform programs, making these congruent with their implementation and enforcement and eventually ensuring an efficient use, stewardship, and allocation of resources.69 In democratic governance politicians are accountable to the people. Politicians who are representatives of the people are elected by the people. Hence they are accountable to the people for their actions in the government and for the overall governmental policies. Accountability ensures effective governance as it avoids the capture of the state by narrow interests.

**Participation:**

"Participation is often an objective of development in itself because it is expected to enhance citizens' independence, autonomy, and self-reliance. But participation also plays a critical role in strengthening governance structures. More specifically, it reinforces accountability because it provides the means by which citizens may exercise influence and control over decisions and actions of their governors."70 For effective governance, participation is essential because participation ensures accountability. By active participation, people can make their representatives accountable or answerable to them. This in turn makes the representatives more responsive towards the needs and aspirations of the people. Thus, "—the right to participate is an essential element of democratic government, inseparable from such other attributes of

---

70 Ibid. p.134.
democracy as consent, accountability, majority rule, equality, and popular sovereignty."71

**Predictability:**

Predictability relates to the clearly-defined laws and policies that regulate the economy and society as a whole, to the clear and explicit communication of the laws and other rules to the business sector and private actors (including citizens' rights and duties) as well as to their consistent and impartial application and enforcement.72

To enhance predictability effective organizations and institutions are required. As we all know the values of society are always changing. With this change there is also a change in the attitude of the people towards particular things. So, it necessitates that the existing laws must have some amendment procedure to adopt themselves to the changing conditions if they want to serve their purpose.

**Transparency:**

The transparent provision of information on policy making and implementation (in association with clear and straightforward decision-working procedures) help to reduce opportunities for corrupt behavior, improves the analysis and articulation of public policy choices, and enhance their acceptance.73

"These four principles are clearly interrelated and reinforce each other. Institutional arrangements that further these principles are expected to

72 Joachim Ahren, Supra no. 69, pp. 135.
73 Ibid, pp. 136.
provide those incentives that are conducive to effective policy making and developmental outcomes."\textsuperscript{74}

Governance is mainly concerned with how political power is exercised in the society. If the power is exercised in the interest of the people it may lead to democratic governance. As in the representative democracies power is exercised by the political parties, their participation and responsiveness is crucial to democratic governance. They should be responsive towards the interests and demands of the people. Responsiveness of political parties mainly ensured by their effective participation. Popular participation and responsiveness is equally important for democratic governance. Unless and until people actively participate in the political affairs and respond towards policy decisions of government we cannot ensure democratic governance. Because, "first of all, democracy cannot be foisted upon people. They must have the desire to be self-governing. Along with the desire for self-government must go the willingness to assume the responsibilities it entails. Democratic rights cannot be realized without the acceptance of their correlated duties; with the right to self-government go the duties of active citizenship."\textsuperscript{75}

\textbf{e-Government and e-Governance:}

The prefix ‘e’ suggests that an activity is ‘electronic’ or digital in nature. Thus, e-government would simply refer to the use of electronic information and communication technologies in undertaking all kind of

\textsuperscript{74} Ibid, pp.136.
\textsuperscript{75} J.Roland Pennock, Supra no.26, p. 212.
government activities. The key word in e-government is not electronic but
government e-government would be regarded as an alternative and
complementary approach to government administration and service
delivery, as well as a means to redefine the way it interacts with citizens and
the private sector.76 Electronic (or e) government is the process of
transformation of the relationships of government with its constituents—the
citizen, the business—and between its own organs, through the use of the
tools of Information and Communication Technology (ICT).77 Thus e-
government activities focus on four forms of interactions: Government-to-
Citizen (G2C), Government-to-Business (G2B), Government-to-
Government (G2G) and Government-to-Employee (G2E).

With the development of ICTs there have been improvements in the
efficiency and effectiveness of the service delivery to the citizens. It also
ensures transparent government, as the information is easily available to the
citizens about the policies and programmes of the government. This
information made possible the active participation of the people in the
governmental activities. “The ODA, World Bank and UNDP reports have
laid down ‘participation’, ‘legitimacy’, ‘accountability’, ‘transparency’, and
‘competence’ are the essential features of good governance. The major
objective of ICT should thus revolve around the outlined essential in order
to bring about efficiency, responsiveness, openness and participation in

76 Y. Pardhasaradhi, *Information Technology for Governance and Efficiency*, The Indian Journal of
77 J. Satyanarayanan, *e-Government: The Science of the Possible*, Prentice-Hall of India, New Delhi,
governance and arrest corruption at different levels.” In this context SMART government has gained popularity, which stands for, Simple, Moral, Accountable, Responsive and Transparent government. Essentially ‘SMART’ captures all the important attributes of good governance.

“ICTs, especially the Internet, enable gathering of model legislations and policies at international and national levels on any subject and the experience of nations and regions in the implementation of those laws and policies. It is therefore possible to formulate new policies or modify/review existing laws and policies in a quicker time frame and in a more informed manner.” With the development of ICTs the people will be informed as never before. “They can build powerful learning as well as opinion-and-value articulating groups by lateral communication on the Internet. These powerful opinion bodies will actually run the political system and the governance of nations.” Thus with the help of ICTs people will be in direct communication with the government or their representatives. This helps in democratizing the process of governance. “Internet will make democracy real. Complete access to all required knowledge, free consultations among people and unhindered communication channels for them to let their minds be known are the key to political power for the people.”

79 J.Satyanarayana, Supra no.77, p.2.
82 Ibid. p.21.
Most often, the word e-government and e-governance are used interchangeably. So, it is essential to know the difference between the two. "But whereas the government is the formal apparatus for this objective, governance is the outcome as experienced by those on the receiving end—. e-government can be more productive version of government in general, if it is well implemented and managed. E-governance can evolve into participatory governance if it is well supported with the appropriate principle, objectives, programs and architectures."83 In other words we can say that e-government is the electronification of the government processes.

"e-governance has different interpretations:

- E-governance implies a smoother interface between the government and citizens.
- E-governance is nothing but good governance. The ‘e’ is only a tool.
- E-governance is to enhance the use of Information technology and to help enhance peoples’ lives.

e-governance enables active citizen involvement by:

- Informing the citizens
- Representing the citizens
- Encouraging the citizens to vote
- Consulting the citizens

83 J.Satyanarayan, Supra no.77, p.22.
• Encouraging in participation from the citizens.\(^8\)\(^4\)

"India’s information technology vision has passed through a series of formulation processes. However, Shri. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, India’s former Prime Minister has provided the political will and support. This has motivated the bureaucracy and the private sectors to embrace information technology.\(^8\)\(^5\) In order to give scope to the use of information technology in governance, the ‘Centre for E-governance’, a new division within the Ministry of Information Technology, was set up on 15 August 1999. The year 2001 has been declared by the information and technology minister as ‘the year of e-governance’. This indicates the commitment of the government to develop information technology in all sectors of the Indian economy. When we are considering the e-governance of India we cannot neglect Andhra Pradesh. "The state of Andhra Pradesh had designed e-government architecture in 2000 and published the standards at its web site www.ap-it.com in February, 2001. The standard document was updated in April 2002. The architecture and standards were ‘mandated’ for all major e-government projects through an executive order though not a regulation or legislation.\(^8\)\(^6\) But the efforts of Andhra Pradesh government towards developing an e-government architecture in 2000 was neither comprehensive nor complete. "It was heavily biased towards defining technology standards and identification of core business processes and e-government initiatives. It fell short of building a service-oriented-


\(^8\)\(^5\) Ibid. p.18.

\(^8\)\(^6\) J. Satyanarayan, *Supra no.77*, p.43.
Architecture that included Process, People and Technology in the right proportion.87

It was not only the case with Andhra Pradesh but in most of the developing countries the e-government projects have failed. A survey done by ‘egov4dev’ during 2002 revealed that only 15% of the e-government projects in the developing countries are really successful while 50% are partial failures and 35% are total failures.88 In most countries including India, the digital divide remains the primary barrier to the take-off of electronic government services. Peoples’ habit of utilizing ICT is more likely to be exposed on the receiving end rather than initiative ones. According to the survey conducted by different agencies in year 2003, India has 1,65,80,000 persons accessing the Internet, accounting for 1.65 per cent of total population in the country and Internet impact on nearly six per cent of population.89 Robert Schware, Lead Informatics Specialist, the World Bank, remarked that, “The failures and partial success of e-governance initiatives should be studied to make better use of technology for governments to deliver services to citizens. He said 33 per cent of all e-governance initiatives in developing countries had failed, which 50 per cent had succeeded partially.”90

Efficiency of e-governance can be understood in terms of information the people get which enables them to make good choice about

---
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90 The Hindu, November 6, 2004.
government and makes government more accountable. Thus, it also helps in empowering the people.

**Participation Theory:**

From Aristotle to John Dewey, political philosophers have extolled popular participation as a source of vitality and creative energy, as a defense against tyranny, and as a means of enacting the collective wisdom.\(^91\) Participation ensures accountability and responsiveness of the representatives. The first modern observer to consider seriously both practical and the theoretical significance of the citizen participation in politics was Alexis de Tocqueville.\(^92\) According to one writer, 'meaningful participation may be defined as occurring when a person has a sense of his involvement in a total experience, a sense of where his efforts fit into an overall plan, when he identifies with respect to the accomplishment of the goals, and has state in the results of the total experience.'\(^93\)

Right to participation, exist in almost all kinds of democracies. It is one of the major elements of democratic governance. Procedural theory of democracy considered participation as one of the important principles of democracy. Most of classical writers advocated direct democracy with the maximum participation of people in the affairs of the state. Some of the modern writers were not in favor of maximum participation of the people. The popularity of the concept provides a good reason for devoting some

---

\(^91\) David L. Sills (ed.), Supra no.8, p.253.
\(^93\) David L. Sills (ed.), Supra no.8, p.253.
attention to it, but more importantly, the recent upsurge for demands for more participation can raise a central question of political theory; the place of 'participation' in modern, viable theory of democracy.  

Significant role of participation in democracy made some scholars to give participatory theories of democracy. Among them, the theory advocated by Rousseau, J.S.Mill and Cole is very important. Rousseau might be called the theorist par excellence of participation, and an understanding of the nature of the political system that he considers in The Social Contract is vital for the theory of participatory democracy.  

In his theory, he has given more importance to the participation of individuals in the political process. To Rousseau, for a participatory system favorable economic conditions such as economic equality and economic independence are very essential. He has not advocated absolute economic equality but he argued that the inequalities prevailing in the society should not lead to political inequality. According to him there should be a situation where no citizen shall be rich enough to buy another and none so poor as to be forced to sell himself.  

He believes that the voice of majority cannot be easily neglected by the leader. As the leaders are accountable to the people, the leaders should take it into consideration the will of the majority. To him general will which is based on the will of the majority is always rightful because it promotes the happiness of majority of people. The will of each individual is merged

[94] Carole Petmen, Supra no.11, p.1.
[95] Ibid. p.22.
[96] Ibid. p.23.
in the general will and contributes for effective decision making. Rousseau’s participatory system makes two points clear; first, that ‘participation’ for Rousseau is participation in the making of decisions and second, that it is, as in theories of representative government, a way of protecting private interests and ensuring good government. By participating in decision making individuals protect their private interests and contribute to democratic governance.

The theory given by Rousseau forms the basis for participatory theory of democracy given by many scholars. The major limitation of Rousseau’s theory is that it is confined mainly to the City States. The theories given by J.S.Mill and Cole are not confined to city-states but highlight on modern political system.

J.S.Mill was very much influenced by the theories of his father James Mill, Jeremy Bentham and de Tocqueville’s “Democracy in America”. To Mill one of the greatest dangers to democracy is the sinister interest of the holders of power. “He says in Representative Government— which expressed the principles ‘to which I have been working up during the greater part of my life’—that one of the greatest dangers of democracy lies in ‘the sinister interest of the holders of power: it is the danger of class legislation... And one of the most important questions demanding consideration...is how to provide efficacious securities against this evil’.”

The necessary condition for democratic governance is the promotion of
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right kind of individual character through right kind of institutions. Only participatory institutions can develop such characters. Mill like Rousseau believes that with the development of such qualities the political system acquires self-sustaining character. He remarked that to representative government political sophistication and public spiritedness are necessary qualities.

"Mill argues that, it is no use having universal suffrage and participation in national government if the individual has not been prepared for this participation at local level; it is at this level that he learns how to govern himself. A political act, to be done only once in a few years, and for which nothing in the daily habits be done only once in a few years, and for which nothing in the daily habits of the citizen has prepared him, leaves his intellect and his moral dispositions very much as it found them."99

A discussion of Cole's theory is significant in this regard because it is connected with the modern industrialized society. Rosseau's theory of participatory democracy is of little relevance today but Cole attempted to translate the insights of Rousseau's theory to suit to the modern conditions.

Participation constitutes a major part of his theory. Men by associating with other individuals learn how to adjust their self-interest with community interest and arrive at certain decisions that are commonly acceptable to all. "I assume', he says, echoing Mill's criticism of Bentham's political theory, 'that the object of social organization is not merely material efficiency, but also essentially the fullest self-expression of

99 Ibid. p.30.
all the members.’ Self-expression ‘involves self-government’ and this means that we must ‘call forth the people’s full participation in the common direction in the affairs of the community’.” 100 Such decisions are in the interest of the larger community as a whole. This involves fullest freedom to the individual citizen who participates in decision making because, the laws, which he is supposed to obey are self imposed and not forced on him externally.

Associations got more prominence in Cole’s theory. The theory of association got significance in his theory of democracy. According to Cole, real democracy can be possible only when it is conceived in terms of functions and purposes. Moreover, the associations have to function in such a manner which should lead to the fulfillment of their interests for the attainment of which it was formed. By pursuing the objects of associations, it is possible to pursue general object of a community as a whole. The decisions arrived at the associations are represented in the parliament by the representatives of the associations.

In Cole’s view, existing forms of representation are misrepresentation for two reasons. First, because the principle of function has been overlooked, the mistake has been made of assuming that it is possible for an individual to be represented as a whole and for all purposes instead of his being represented in relation to some well-defined function. Secondly, under the existing parliamentary institutions the elector has no real choice of, or control over, his representative, and the system actually

100 Ibid. p.36.
denies the right of the individual to participate because 'having chosen his representative, the ordinary man has, according to that theory, nothing left to do except to let other people govern him'.

Cole argues that functional representation is the best form of representative government where there is the constant participation of the ordinary man in the conduct of those parts of the structures of Society with which he is directly concerned and which he has therefore the best chance of understanding. If the representation is organized on functional basis individual can certainly, advise, criticize and if necessary recall the representatives.

The participatory theory of democracy mainly based on the notion that we cannot separate the individuals from institutions. The existence of a national institution at the center is not the sufficient condition of democracy. The success of such institution depends on maximum participation of all the people. Moreover, this is possible only through social training, which he gets by participating in other spheres of activities as Cole pleaded for guild socialism and J.S.Mill advocated the role of associations. By participating in such institution individuals, attitude and psychological qualities can develop which contribute to the maximum participation at the national level. Therefore, for a democratic polity to exist it is necessary for a participatory society to exist, i.e., a society, where all

---

101 Carole Pateman. Supra no.11, p.37.
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political systems have been democratized and socialization through participation can take place in all areas.\textsuperscript{103}

**Variables Affecting Political Participation:**

Forms of participation differ from country to country. The concept of participation is very complex, which depends on many variables. Therefore, it may be difficult to develop a general theory of participation or evolve an approach to this ideal. Individual’s action to participate or not to participate mainly influenced by the environment in which he lives. Three types of environments-namely, social environment, psychological environment and political environment play a crucial role in determining political participation.

In the social environment, we can mainly include education, occupation, income, age, race, religion, sex, mobility and residence. "Research in the United States and elsewhere shows that most of these variables correlate to some degree with participation. In general, participation tends to be higher among the better-educated, members of the higher occupational and income groups, the middle-aged, the dominant ethnic and religious groups, men (as opposed to women), settled residents, urban dwellers, and members of voluntary associations."\textsuperscript{104} But, the influence of these factors on participation varies from one political cultural context to another. For example if we say participation tends to be higher

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid. p.42.
\textsuperscript{104} David L. Sills(ed.), Supra no.8, p.256.
among the better educated in some countries, this may not be so in some other countries.

In the psychological environment man’s need for power, competition, achievement, affiliation, aggression, status, money, prestige, sympathy, responsibility and such other factors are responsible for participation. Political observers throughout the ages have variously attributed man’s political activity to his need for power, competition, achievement, affiliation, aggression, money, prestige, status, recognition, approval, manipulation, sympathy, responsibility- in short, to virtually every need that impels human behavior. While the relation between the cognitive states of low self-esteem are strongly correlated with political apathy.

In the political environment, it was a general belief that, national and international crisis makes people to participate. Scholars who tested these hypotheses found that election turnout did not increase during crisis but the popularity and unpopularity of a candidate had an effect on the election turnout.

In addition to the general variables touched on, the party system, the nature of the campaign, and issues and ideology are three areas that shape participation in modern societies.

105 David L. Sills (ed.), Supra no.8, p.257.
Dimensions of Participation:

Sidney Verba, N.H.Nie and Jae-on Kim, had given five dimensions of participation.

1. **Type of influence exerted:**

   Citizen activity can affect the behavior of governmental leaders in two ways: They can communicate information about the preferences of citizens and/or they can apply pressure on political leaders to conform to these preferences. It may be the gain or loss of votes or with some material loss or reward.

2. **The scope of the outcome:**

   Verba, Nie and Kim argue that most of the time political scientists focus mainly on the policies of the government, which have a collective impact and affect entire society or large segment of it. Importance is given to government policies, outcome of an election, a tax reform bill or governmental decision on foreign policy and many others, the outcome of which has a collective impact on all citizens. "But governments do not make decisions only about broad social policies. Often they produce outcomes that will affect only a particular citizen or his immediate family. The government issues a zoning variance to an individual so that he may enlarge his home, provides a license, grants an exemption from the army because of family hardship, provides a job, offers agricultural assistance, or
agrees to provide a better water supply to a given home.” Thus, they argue that rather than emphasizing more on collective impact on all citizens the political scientists also have to highlight on those policies or acts, which though not have much impact on collectivity, may have an intense impact on the individual or his family.

3. The conflict dimension:

Insofar as governmental benefits are limited, activity by one group to obtain something for itself may injure the interests of others. The policies of the government are always not in favor of all the people. The governmental benefits are limited. The activity of one group to attract the attention of the government to fulfill its own interest may injure the interests of others. This leads to the conflicting situation in the society.

There are views that conflict dimension is related to the scope of potential outcome. “The wider the impact of the outcome, the more likely is it that there will be opposing groups active in relation to it. If the governmental outcome that the participants seek has a narrow impact, having a noticeable effect on the participants alone and affecting others only indirectly, this increases the likelihood that the participatory situation would involve just one set of participants attempting to achieve one particular policy outcome”.

110 Ibid. p.311.
111 Sidney Verba, Norman H. Nie and Jae-on Kim, Supra no.108, p.312.
4. **The cooperative dimension:**

This refers to the extent to which individuals work along with others. To what extent individual co-operate with other individuals in the attainment of their interest determines cooperative dimension. Collective action of individuals is likely to bring fruitful results. “Effective political action often depends upon the ability of citizens to work collaboratively. This dimension also relates to the potential outcome.”

5. **Initiative required:**

“This dimension is similar to the criterion for differentiating political acts that has been the usual one within the literature: How “difficult” is the act? We are interested in the amount of time and effort needed for an act of participation, but more so in how much initiative is needed by the individual in choosing when and how to act.”

**Modes of Political Participation:** Verba, Nie and Kim have given four modes of political participation. They are as follows:

1. **Voting:**

It is the most popular mode of participation. Citizens cast their vote in elections. The citizens mainly through voting elect their leaders. In order to gain votes leaders adjust their policies according to the demands of the people. Voting determines election outcome.

---
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exerts influence over leaders through pressure: Leaders adjust their policies in order to gain votes, and of course, the vote determines who holds elective office.114

2. **Campaign activity:**

Next to voting, campaign activities are more popular. It can communicate more information about the participants' preferences because campaign activists are a more clearly identifiable group with whom candidates may be in close contact.115 Campaigning is the second variable which contributes to political participation. Campaigning should be face-to-face. The effect of campaign on participation is also dependent upon the popularity, character and charisma of the candidate.

3. **Citizen-initiated contacts:**

This involves popular participation in between elections. Individuals with particular interests in mind contact the government official to discuss about these interests or to make these interests known to the government. Here, individuals choose their own agenda, time and substance of the act of participation. “Here we have the individual vis-à-vis the government—or some small segment of the government. He determines the timing, target, and substance of the act of participation. This type of participation—which we call citizen-
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114 Sidney Verba, Norman H. Nie and Jae-ong Kim, Supra no. 108, p. 313.
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initiated contacts-represents a third type of political activity.116

4. Cooperative activity:

Cooperative activity is significant because it can combine information about citizen preferences (since citizens come together to work on a particular issue) with pressure (since leaders are more likely to respond to a number of citizens than to a lone contractor).117

It is a group activity to solve their problem. Cooperative activity may get effective response because leaders are under pressure from a large number of citizens. This may not be so under citizen-initiated contacts. Most of the time the outcome of cooperative activity affects large number of people.

The characteristics of these four modes of activity in relation to the dimension of participation are listed in the below table.

Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode of activity</th>
<th>Type of Influence</th>
<th>Scope of outcome</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Initiative required</th>
<th>Cooperate With others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>High pressure/low information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Confictual</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campaign activity</td>
<td>High pressure/low To high information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>Confictual</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Some or much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communal activity</td>
<td>Low to high pressure/ high information</td>
<td>Collective</td>
<td>May be yes/ May be no</td>
<td>Some or Much</td>
<td>Some of Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacting official on personal matters</td>
<td>Low pressure/high information</td>
<td>Particular</td>
<td>Nonconfictual</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


117 Sidney Verba, Norman H. Nie and Jae-on Kim, Supra no.108, p.315.
From the above table it is clear that voting exerts high pressure on leaders but communicates little information about individual preferences. While communal activity and particularized contacts communicate high information about individual preferences but, exerts low pressure. While, campaign activity exerts high pressure but some campaign activities communicate lot of information about preferences and others less.

The scope of outcome is collective in the case of voting, campaign activity and communal activity. The scope of outcome is confined to a particular individual in case of particularized contacts. Voting and campaign activities create conflictual situation. People are divided based on party and group interests. The interest of one group may collide with other. Communal activity sometimes creates conflicting situation. But, particularized contacts are nonconflictual.

For voting little initiative is required but for contacting official on personal matters lot of initiative is required on the part of individual. For voting and particularized contacts little cooperation of other individuals is required. But, it may be some or much in case of campaign and communal activity.

"Rush and Althoff have presented a political participation scale, where they have divided the political activity into ten hierarchically placed levels. These are in the following descending order:

ii. holding of administrative and political office,

iii. seeking political or administrative office,
active membership of political organization,

v. passive membership of a political organization,

vi. active membership of quasi-political organization,

vii. passive membership of a quasi-political organization,

viii. participation in public meetings, demonstrations,

ix. participation in informal political discussions,

x. general interest, and

xi. voting.\textsuperscript{118}

More number of people participate in voting than in holding of administrative and political office.

"Milbrath’s conceptual analysis of political involvement includes the following activities:

1. Voting;
2. Discussion and opinion leadership;
3. Wearing a button or purring a sticker on the car;
4. Petitioning political leaders;
5. Making a monetary contribution;
6. Attending a political meeting;
7. Campaigning;
8. Active party membership;
9. Soliciting political funds;
10. Office-seeking and holding; and
11. Protests and demonstrations."\textsuperscript{119}

Milbrath’s Hierarchy of Political Involvement was given by Anthony M. Orum in his book, \textit{Introduction to Political Sociology}.

\textsuperscript{118} J. Roland Pennock, Supra no. 26, p. 440.

\textsuperscript{119} Dhirendra K. Vajpey, \textit{Modernization and Social Change in India}, Manohar Publications, New Delhi, 1979, pp. 73-74.
According to Milbrath more number of people participate in spectator activities; and as we move upward peoples’ participation tends to decline.

By actively participating “citizens pool their information and their insights, deliberate together, criticize each others ideas and arrive at a collective and near unanimous decisions”.\(^{120}\) By active participation, people will be motivated to get more information and also feel more responsive. According to the textbook model of democracy, an alert, informed and wise citizenry rationally assesses the men who offer themselves for election, chooses the best, and removes or reappoints them after carefully weighing their performance.\(^{121}\)

\(^{120}\) J.Roland Pennock, Supra no.26, p.443
\(^{121}\) David L Sills(ed.), Supra no.8, p.262,
Modes of Political Parties Participation:

Of all the influences on participation, the influence of party is the most potent one. It is an important institution, through which people made known to the government about their preferences. The following are the important modes of political parties participation:

1. Participating in Elections:

The main function of political parties in this mode of participation is to contact the voters and register them, select candidates for election, organize the campaign and educate the voters regarding the issues and how to vote. The more active forms of participation include formal enrollment in a party, canvassing and registering voters, speech writing and speechmaking, working in campaigns, and competing for public and party office.122

2. Interest Aggregation:

"Every political system has some way of aggregating the interests, claims and demands which have been articulated by the interest groups of the polity. Aggregation may be accomplished by means of the formulation of general policies in which interests are combined, accommodated, or otherwise taken account of, or by means of the recruitment of political personnel, more or less committed to an particular pattern of policy."123 A political party is an institution that (a) seeks influence in a state, often by attempting

122 Ibid. p.253.
to occupy position in government, and (b) usually consists and so to some degree attempts to ‘aggregate interests’. Interest aggregation is the activity in which the political demand of the individuals and groups are combined by the political parties into policy demands.

3. **Interest Articulation:**

As every political system has some way of aggregating interests it also has some way for articulating interests, claims and demands. Political party is an important institutional mechanism, which performs the work of interest articulation. The party system aggregates interests and transforms them into a relatively small number of alternative general policies. To occupy position in government political party has to seek votes. If votes are to be sought, grievances must be attended to, and demands must be, to some extent, satisfied.

Pennock in his book *Democratic Political Theory* has discussed relation of various types of democratic theory with participatory theory.

1. **Motivational Theories:**

The radical individualism would not favor the attempts to increase participation. Individuals can participate for the sake of participation but if he feels that he had certain desire which the polity can satisfy, then he can exercises his democratic right for the attainment of the same. “The rational man theorist is quite conscious of the costs of political action and is likely
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to conclude that they would exceed the probable reward. He is not likely to assume, although logically he might, that citizens will place a positive value on political activity for its own sake. Also this theorist is forced, by his assumption of the incommensurability of values, to accept the valuation that each citizen places upon the satisfaction of desires and the costs of achieving such satisfaction.127 But, the radical individualist is not likely to assume that institutions are so perverted that revolutionary action by a self-selected minority is required to effect substantial change and to create the conditions for the rational behavior.128

To Tocquevilly individualistic participation is simply a means to attain self-protection and self-advancement and does not feel the necessity of encouraging political participating.

The modified individualists do not seem likely to differ substantially from the radical individualist in respect of political participation. The modified individualists participate in the political activity for the sake of participation and are more responsive to the appeals of vote.

The romantic individualist believes that individual has great potentialities for development. Mill stressed the role of political activity in contributing towards the development of individual personality. They believe that political participation contributes to the individual development.
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The public interest theories believe that participation gives recognition to individual interest which might otherwise be neglected. "Beyond this, he has a special concern for those interests—they might be called political externalities—that tend to be overlooked by individuals acting independently. For this reason he would favor at least enough participation get individuals involved in thinking and talking about public policies so that interests like the satisfaction which may be produced by conjoint activity and common accomplishments are given due recognition, not to mention the private interest each person has in avoiding economic externalities, such as polluted atmosphere or water supply."129

The rights and duties theorists are somewhat similar to the public interest theory but have a bit more lenience towards individual interest. They demand enough participation to protect private rights of an individual.

The collectivists, mainly egalitarian collectivists support extensive political participation because it contributes to the development of community as a whole.

2. Power Theories:

According to Pennock, Democratic Elitism is not in favor of participation of all people in government. Always in every society, a small group governs. "The elitist is not only content with representative government, he believes that the process of selecting representatives provides an important, not to say crucial, opportunity for those who possess the best political talents to be selected for governing, while allowing the

less active and less politically qualified sufficient power, by choosing between competing elites, to protect and advance their interests. The elitist puts little stock in the value of participation as a means of contributing to individual development. He sees it as a tool, which the average man can use when he sees the need for it. Policies are formulated by representatives of people. People do not have any role in making policies. Elitist believes that running the government is not the job of all citizens. It requires special skill to perform that job and this skill is possessed by a minority group in the society.

But, if the policies are not in the interest of the people then they can ask for a change in the policy.

The populists' ideology is opposite to that of elitists. While elites give importance few in the society who posses special quality to rule, the populists favor general, active and informed participation of all. Their concern is more on the wisdom of the people. They believe initiatives and referendum are most acceptable methods to the individuals. "Somewhat paradoxically, the populist tends to favor centralization, especially as between legislature and chief executive. The legislature, a deliberative body, tends to develop ideas of its own, to "refine" the popular will, perhaps beyond recognition. An elected chief executive, on the other hand, is seen more as the chosen instrument of the people".
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The constitutional democrats do not attach any special importance to participation. Whatever freedom the individual enjoys to participate should be within the limits of constitution.

To the social pluralist popular participation in all kinds of organized groups, though it has no any political objectives is important. They contribute to the development of the personality of individual and concern for the interest of others. "In his view, human wants, needs, and values are (and he might add "ought to be") so various that they cannot receive adequate expression through a single set of institutions. Moreover, they must have outlets through associations that are not solely, or perhaps even mainly, political. This variety of groupings is important not only to provide for people of different natures and for the differing interests and purposes of the same people, but also to check the abuse of power."132 The role played by non-governmental organizations is important through which people participate in the political affairs of the country. Not only they are giving representation to the various interest of the people but they also act as a check on the abuse of power. Theorists of this type would, like the populists, favor the widest possible distribution of actual political power, but with emphasis upon a great deal of decentralization and with the aim of changing the participants fully as much as changing the governmental output.133

133 Ibid, p.452.
Responsiveness:

Apart from participation, the concept of responsiveness is also equally important in understanding the democratic governance. All the above-mentioned theories of democracy are revolving around participation and responsiveness in one way or the other. However, responsiveness is mostly used in the criticism of democracy's operation. One of the main criticisms of democracy is not being sufficiently responsive.

The dictionary meaning of responsiveness is “reacting easily and readily to suggestions or appeal”. The word ‘responsive’ has to do with responding or answering. In representative democracy, there is a possibility that the aspirations of the people are not properly represented. The elected representatives might not make the same decisions, which the people would have done if they would have gathered for the same purpose. To cope with this problem the procedural theory of democracy has given the principle of responsiveness. Responsiveness means following the general contours of public opinion as complex pieces of legislation are formulated.134 Responsiveness might be said to be the counter part of influence. The person or group that exerts influence is influential; the person or group on whom it is exerted is responsive.135 In democracy, people are influential and government should be responsive to the aspirations of the people. Democratic governance is concerned with how best government responds to the aspirations of the people. Unless and until the government responds to
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the aspirations of the people adequately, it cannot called as democratic. It is very difficult to arrive at consensus on public affairs. In this respect, society is divided. Each group in the society has its own perception with regard to the issue of public importance.

This is one of the major problems in understanding public opinion. As a result, it may be difficult to understand the popular responsiveness on issues of public importance. Pennock has pointed out such problems as follows: firstly, he points out the problems of splintered will and demands. "It is not only that wills or demands, even when they exist and are known, are often splintered, so that no majority supports any one proposal; but also, popular demands may conflict with each other. The same people may demand lower taxes and increased benefits of services entailing increased expenditures. Or two pressures (demands), while being in the strictest sense compatible with each other, may lead to mutually self-defeating results."136

In every society different groups pursue their own interest and demands and try to fulfill them. Such demands may co-operate or contradict with the demands of other groups in the society. Majority people may or may not support proposal on public affairs. Some groups may agree to a proposal but there are some who hold totally opposite views on the proposal. This creates a difficult situation to government to decide which proposal is legitimate. Negligence of any such proposal by the people may affect governance.
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The second problem is that in democratic society there may be a number of problems (demands). But how far these proposed demands are reasonable? "Demands, desires, may vary greatly in their intensity. Is the responsive government simply to count demands, or should it somehow measure their strength? And how should it respond to a situation in which 35 percent of the electorate strongly favor a certain proposal, 55 percent mildly oppose it, and the remaining 10 percent are indifferent?" Responsiveness provides no answer to such questions.

The third problem given by Roland Pennock is concerned with the defect of representative system. "To whom should government be responsive? To the majority of "the people"? Apart from the fact that on most issues no such majority exists, if we are speaking of representative government, as for practical purposes we must be, this question raises issues regarding the role of the representative." Representative system may not properly represent the will of the people. If government responds to the majority will then the question arises, who compose this majority? Whether it consists of all the people or only representatives of the people? In a representative government the role of people is only to elect the representatives and not participate in decision-making. And the representatives who are supposed to respect the will of the people may not give proper representation to the aspirations of the people. How then can we expect effective responsiveness from government?
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The fourth problem in democracy's task of being responsive to the popular demands is that in some cases, representatives of the people themselves decide what is in the interest of the people and such decisions are enforced. "Moreover, it appears that even apart from any conscious governmental policy to influence opinion, in fact public opinion often changes to accord with existing public policy. It would be highly unrealistic to think that government acts simply in response to wants and demands."\textsuperscript{139}

Pennock believes that in representative democracy it is highly unrealistic to believe that government is acting in accordance with the wants and demands of the people. More often people are satisfied by something other than what is wanted. The wants of the people are satisfied by their very expression what is called as "expressive demands" by Pennock.

By the above discussion about the difficulties in responsiveness, it is quite clear that what people want is not simply responsiveness but responsiveness to needs, wants, demands, grievances, aspirations or preferences. However, the question is should democracy give the people what they want? The demands of the people may or may not be reasonable. Do the legislators represent genuine aspirations or opinion of majority of the people? Unless the legislators represent the genuine aspirations, it is not possible to expect the effective responsiveness of governance. Without this governance cannot be democratic.

\textsuperscript{139} Ibid, pp.263.
Generally, legislators belong to one or the other political parties. Therefore, the responsiveness of government significantly influenced by the political parties. Performance of political parties mainly judged by the type of policies formulated by them. By responding towards the policy outcome of the government, people are providing feedback to a particular policy. Popular responsiveness contributes to political parties responsiveness. Awareness about the particular issue and ideology of parties affect quality of popular responsiveness. Data indicate that the politically aware are usually better able to relate their social values to their political opinions to achieve stable, internally consistent belief systems; and to comprehend and act upon the constitutional rules of the game. Popular responsiveness is required to democratize the governance process.

**Political Parties Responsiveness:**

Governance is the capacity to establish and sustain workable relations between individuals and institutional actors in order to promote collective goals. Here, individuals are the citizens and institutional actors are the political parties, various public and private institutions and voluntary organizations, etc. Political parties constitute a major institutional actor in democratic governance. They function as the important mediators between the people and the policy makers. Effectiveness of any policy primarily determined by the nature of interaction among political parties.

---
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As given by Giovanni Sartori, parties can be only linkages between the people and a government. During the eighteenth century, the English began practicing party government. However, what English did start practicing during the eighteenth century was not actually party government, but responsible government. In this government, ministers are responsible to parliament also called as parliamentary system. Burke made this point clear. His stance was: “The virtue spirit and essence of a house of commons consists in its being the express image of the feelings of the nation. It was not instituted to be a control upon the people”. The government can become democratic when people legitimate its position in all respect have control over the policy outcome as well as their leaders.

A Government responsible to the house also becomes, in the long run, a government responsible to the people and thereby a responsive government, a government attentive to, and influenced by the voice of the people. Responsiveness of political party to the aspirations of the people legitimates its position in all respects.

People aspire to have democracy to get good governance in which people can choose the representatives and have control over them. They should also possess the right to affect the decisions. Democratic governance is the government of the people, which works for the fulfillment of the interest of the people. By the above mentioned theories of democracy, participation, responsiveness, governance and political parties it become