Introduction

CHAPTER-I

Problem of Building Democracy in Third World Countries
The end of Second World War heralded the dawn of a new era in international political scenario. Most of the countries liberated from the yoke of colonialism and imperialism adopted different political systems for governance. The adoption of different set of governments was meant to facilitate the process of transition and to make good of their socio-cultural and political milieu. Theoretically almost all the newly independent countries of Asia and Africa adopted democratic system of governance. But questions naturally arise, why almost each and every country adopted democracy as a form and means of governance? What is the significance that is associated with democracy?

Depending on the ideology, paradigm, culture or context, the notion of democracy implies different things. As David Lane points out, "the history of the idea of democracy is curious; the history of democracy is puzzling."

It should be noted that, political regimes from Asia, Africa to Latin America and Europe claim to be democratic. It provides an aura of legitimacy to the rules, regulations, laws and policies of the regime as democratic even though many of the characters of government in operation do not show the existence of real democracy. As has been pointed out by UNESCO report "for the first time in the world...practical politicians and political theorists agreed in stressing the democratic elements in the institution they defend and in the theories they advocate". But the term democracy has different connotations. In the classical sense, democracy was used either as a form of government or type of state or as

an order of state. The term “democracy” is generally used to denote a political system as distinct from the economic and social system. Conceptually this is done to keep distinct the socio-economic dimensions from the political one and also this can be helpful in analysing how political dimension is closely related to other dimensions. Unless the economic and social dimensions are kept conceptually distinct from the political, there is no way to analyse how variation on the political dimension is related to other dimensions. In recent years the most acceptable definition relating to democracy has been given by Robert A. Dahl who equates democracy with polyarchy. It denotes a system of government that meets three essential conditions:

1) Meaningful and extensive competition among individuals and organised groups (especially political parties) for all effective positions of governmental powers at regular intervals and excluding the use of force.

2) A highly inclusive level of political participation in the selection of leaders and fair elections.

3) A level of civil and political liberties-freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom to form and join organisations-sufficient to ensure the integrity of political participation.³

Unlike Dahl, Joseph Schumpeter describes democracy as an institutional arrangement for arriving at political, administrative and legislative decisions by

vesting certain individuals with the power to decide on all matters as a consequence of their successful pursuit of people's vote. Democratic life was the struggle between rival political leaders, arrayed in parties, for the mandate to rule. From the above analysis of Schumpeter, it can be pointed out that the main focus of democracy is fierce political competition among political leaders to grab political power. This limited focus creates serious problem regarding as how to judge a country, whether it is democratic or not. For example, whether countries like Turkey, Malaysia, Colombia, Zimbabwe etc. are democracies or not, have been subject to a lot of confusion. Hence, the need is to classify democracies. Juan Linz, Lira Diamond and S. M. Lipset have classified democracies into three categories:

1) Semi-democratic

2) Hegemonised party system

3) Authoritarian regime.

Semi-Democratic countries are those countries where effective power of elected officials is so limited, or competition among political parties is so restricted, or freedom or fairness of election is so compromised that electoral outcome deviates significantly from popular preferences. Here the civil and political liberties are so limited that some political orientations and interests are unable to organise and
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express themselves in different ways and degrees. Senegal, Zimbabwe, Malaysia and Thailand fit these categorisations.5

Another category of democracy is based on hegemonised party system like that of Mexico, in which opposition parties are legal but deprived through pervasive electoral malpractices and frequent state coercion. Descending further on the classification, authoritarian regime permits even less pluralism, typically banning organisations and competition.6

**Nature of Democracy**

For a proper analysis of democracy and Third World countries it is imperative to understand the nature of democracy, its various forms and various conditions that facilitate and hinder the development of democracy.

There is a wide consensus and growing belief among political scientists and practical politicians that “totalitarian” government in Third World countries has not served the people properly like providing material prosperity, stability, order and protection of human life. At the same time in countries such as, India, where a stable democracy is working continuously and successfully or South Korea, where there is a growing economic prosperity, the vast majority are struggling to achieve political stability. So the only alternative is to achieve a relative stability and to provide a form of government that can fulfil the needs and aspirations of
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the people and thus provide political stability. Dodd and Skaller offer a five fold classification of democracy and its suitability to Third World countries.⁷

Radical Democracy

Dodd traces the origin of this form of democracy to ancient Greece and later advocated by political philosophers like Tom Paine and statesmen like Thomas Jefferson and the Utilitarian political philosophers. In this form, democratic society is seen as an aggregation of individuals with common interests and resources, which distinguish them from other groups. All citizens are equal before law, but the same emphasis is not there as in liberal democracy on protecting the individual against the power of the state. State exists merely to protect and implement majority will. The existence of various groups having variety of interests of each group and the compulsion of government in maintaining support from various groups is one of the cardinal features of this type of government.

The compulsion of government to look for support amongst various groups in order to maintain its existence leads to various problems. This is especially true in countries that are multi-ethnic in nature. Ghana under Nkrumah and Guinea under Sekoh Toure were to some extent successful in adopting this form of government. Under the consensus of majority they pursued radical reforms. But this form of government despite its success did not last long. This may be due to authoritarian nature of government or due to the absence of any checks and balances, as the experience of different countries show. Vast majority of people may resent the

emergence of strong opposition groups who unitedly challenge the rule of the government. Sometimes, it may also happen that people want to restrict the power of those who claim themselves to be in majority.

**Guided Democracy**

In this type of democracy, society is considered as an organic whole having common interests. Political leaders think that they know the interests of people and they try to implement it without any constitutional checks. Political and economic equality are enjoyed by the citizens to the extent, the ruler seems desirable. In this form, elections are permitted as long as they do not threaten the power of the executive. The above feature of this type of democracy is in contrast to totalitarian form of government. A number of examples in this regard can be cited. For instance, former President of Pakistan General Ayub Khan once openly proclaimed his system in then Pakistan as ‘basic democracy’, in which competitive elections were held at regular intervals and it provided the base of a pyramid for the election of higher authorities. The political executive also tries to justify existing system and to perpetuate their rules advocating different reasons like the unwillingness of people to rule themselves (in fact most of the colonial countries used to perpetuate their rule). Others argue that why should countries of Asia and Africa follow the ‘Western Model’, when the socio-cultural conditions of these countries do not possess the classical class structure, which form an important part in ‘Western Countries’. Political elites of these countries argue that
the existing ethnic polarisation will increase and threaten the very concept of the state.

Like radical democracy, this kind of democracy also degenerates into dictatorship. Zambia in Africa, Brazil in Latin America, and to some extent Indonesia and Philippines in Asia have already moved from guided democracy to a form of democracy in which top political office depends on popular elections. Pressures from within the countries and from external powers may also push the countries in this direction. Even in pure form they leave the governed with only limited control over the government.

**Liberal Democracy**

The concept of liberal democracy became the principal form of government in Europe after the French revolution, which marked the end of papal supremacy and the beginning of modern polity and the modern world. The theoretical roots of classical theory of democracy can be traced back to the writing of Hobbes and Locke.

According to Hobbes, government merely exist to maintain peace and order in the society, so that the society cannot turn back to state of nature. Further, theory of voluntary consent of the people remains fundamental in the making of corporation or of an institution. The theory of liberal democratic tradition which started from the writing of Hobbes got reinforced in the writing of John Locke. He believed that government is like a trust, and it is bound to work within the terms and conditions under which it came into existence. Unlike Hobbes, Locke advocated
limited surrender of rights and there are some rights like, right to life, liberty and property is so fundamental that if the government tries to encroach upon these rights then the people have every right to overthrow the government.

In the economic sphere, the foundation of classical liberal democracy was laid down by Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Malthus. All the above writers advocated non-interference by state in the economic affairs and pleaded for a laissez-fair state, which ultimately led to minimal state.

These political thinkers argued that, owners of property, should be free to accumulate as much property as they can by whatever means they chose, because private property is a natural right of man; or because free competition in the pursuit of wealth is the only way of maintaining natural relations of supply of demand; or it is the only way of conserving the effects of a natural selection and reproduction of the fittest individuals in a competitive struggle for existence or because of experience, illumined by our common sense, shows us the harmful moral and practical consequences of governmental attempts to minimise the effects of an unequal distribution of wealth.\(^8\)

The classical liberal democracy excessively focused on the individual and his freedom. Eventually they succeeded in replacing democracy with liberal democracy. The concept of liberal democracy is markedly different from democracy even though it has significant affinities to it, for example, in the notion of government by the consent of the governed, formal political equality,

inalienable human rights including the right to political participation, accountability of power to the power of the governed and the rule of law. Instead of the collectivity, liberal democracy focuses on the individual whose claims are ultimately placed above those of collectivity.

However, this classical notion of democracy, which emphasised minimum state, has undergone a sea change. As a result of industrial revolution, the gap between rich and poor widened. This led to the marginalisation of poor. As David Smith has pointed out "Great inequalities in market power made one man's economic freedom another's oppression". Similarly, free trade in commodities such as child labour, slum housing, poisoned meat and bad gin- made the common benefits of regulation obvious. The increasing assertion of the working and poor strata of the society, growth of new ideologies- Marxism, provided opportunity to the workers to organise themselves against the exploitative capitalist system. Similarly, during First World War, the sphere of state activities increased. It is in this context, laissez faire theory of liberal democracy changed its objectives to suit new circumstances.

The 19th Century definition of liberal democracy has changed its objectives in order to cater to the needs of the whole society. It basically puts emphasis on pluralistic nature of the society. It aims to safeguard the interests of various groups without sacrificing the individual. It emphasises society consisting of
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diverse groups, the need of the group to protect themselves from other groups and associations and to secure representation. All the citizens are equal before law and their rights are protected by various constitutional provisions which may be written as it is in the case of India and USA or unwritten, developed through customs and conventions like in England. Peter H. Merkl has pointed out the following four principles of liberal democracy.¹⁰

Government by Discussion

Democracy as basically government of the people is based on their consent and opinion. In recent years due to increase in the complexities of governmental function, increase in the size of territory and urgency of governmental decisions, it is not possible to obtain their consent on each and every issues. The discussion is generally held at two levels: first, among the representatives of people in the legislative assemblies where members of opposition have enormous power to oppose any arbitrary provisions; second, at the public level, where there is direct communication between the leadership and people, political leaders always try to formulate their policies with the consent of the people in order to ensure the legitimacy they need.

Majority Rule

Merkl has pointed out that all the decision making bodies, from the electorate to the last committee and the issues are to be resolved by voting. Political equality is secured by the principle of ‘one man one vote’, which implies that there will be neither privileged sections claiming special weightage, nor any underprivileged section whose voice is ignored. No discrimination is allowed on the ground of religion, race, caste, class and even on educational qualification. It relies on the value of wisdom of the majority to check the authoritarian tendencies.

Recognition of Minority Rights

The principle of majority rule does not imply suppression of minority rights. In modern times, the social structures of all the states are pluralistic in nature. It is not possible to practice a policy of oppression over the minority, which may consist of religious, racial, linguistic or cultural minority. In order to protect their rights every democratic country has legal and constitutional provisions which help to raise the level of awareness of both majority and minority and create a conducive atmosphere to nurture democratic politics.

Constitutional Government

The existence of constitutional government which basically means government based on law is one of the cardinal features of democratic politics. In order to fulfil the needs and aspirations of the people a complex set of procedure, process based on law and constitution is required for the stability of a democratic government. Despite the theoretical merits of liberal democracy a frequent
criticism that has been levelled against liberal theory of democracy is that it is elitist in nature. An elite enjoying superior wealth, contacts, education or political skill may be able to perpetuate its privileges at the expense of the majority by manipulating the key political institutions and media and influencing public opinion. In most of the Western countries, the haves of the society are over-represented in every aspect of polity which leads to perceived inequality. Vilfred Pareto and Gaento Mosca, the exponents of elitist theory of democracy, have pointed out that there may exist a minority of population in any society which takes the major decisions in society. The dominant minority may or may not hold political office but its decisions are of wide scope and affect all aspects of the society.\footnote{For details, G. Mosca, }\textit{The Ruling Class}, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1939 \textit{and V. Pareto, The Mind and Society, London, 1935, Vol. III.}

\textbf{Marxian Concept of Democracy}

In contrast to Liberal Theory of Democracy which identifies democracy with institutional arrangements through which rules are made, principles implemented and people participate in the affairs of governance. Marxists treat these institutional arrangements (legal and political structure) and social institutions (religion and moral) merely as superstructure, which serves the interests of bourgeoisie which they use to perpetuate their exploitation. Unlike the liberals the Marxists believe that the society is divided into two fundamental classes which primarily have antagonistic relationships. The foundation of Marxist theory of democracy was laid down by Marx and Engels and further developed by Lenin,
Stalin and Mao Tse Tung. Marx and Engels were greatly influenced by the revolutionary developments and industrial revolution, the two dual forces which greatly influenced the revolutionary development in Europe. The chief beneficiaries of those revolutionary movements were the bourgeoisie. Parliamentary democracy was most suitable for the development of Capitalist system. They held political democracy to be a desirable goal for the workers because it enhances their chances of organising to defend their interests.

Marxists believe that any form of state power leads to dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The character of the state is determined by the character of the ruling class. Therefore, the first task is to overthrow the exploitative capitalist political structure and to establish true democracy.

The function of a social programme, Marx held, is to show wage workers how to convert their potentiality into an actual superiority or how to prepare themselves for transforming an automatic economic struggle into a "consciously designed political struggle". The workers must organise as an oppressed class which will raise them "to the position of ruling class". The wage earners in each country should form a political party and through ordinary electioneering methods would seek to become the majority party in the electorate and in the national parliament. In a country where the group in control of government persists in maintaining constitutional barriers, supported by military force, to deny to a proletarian majority its rightful title to political control, the workers will have to resort to organised force. Having acquired control, peacefully or by violence, they must
then make their supremacy secure; and this is to be accomplished through the familiar devices of an advanced democracy, universal suffrage, a direct popular election and recall of principal political officials—legislative, executive and judiciary, an armed 'people' in place of a standing army, free public education, payment of political officers (and this is the only distinctively socialistic feature in the political scheme at the rate of wages for manual workers).\textsuperscript{12}

Marx envisaged a two stage development in industrial society that presaged the victory of socialism. The first was democratic revolution and second was social revolution. Marx meant the victory of the middle classes over the remnants of the aristocracy and the clearing away of feudal remains to achieve the successful development of capitalist production and of political right for all in the society. By "social revolution", Marx meant the economic victory of the proletariat, who will take over the ownership of the means of production.\textsuperscript{13}

After Marx, Lenin made relentless efforts to develop, shape and spread Marxian thought. In his thought and thinking, Lenin was not only influenced by Marxian theory of democracy but also by Russian revolutionary traditions, especially in his scheme for a relatively small, highly centralized revolutionary organization.

Lenin advocated democracy in its literal classical meaning. For him democracy represented the rule of the people. But in as much as all advanced societies contained conflicting classes and all states involved suppression, really democratic state would involve the rule of the majority over the minority unlike

\textsuperscript{12} F. W. Coker, op.cit, p. 54.
liberal democracy. Lenin says, "Democracy for the vast majority of the people and the suppression by force, i.e. exclusion from democracy for the exploiters and oppressors of the people- this is the change democracy undergoes during the transition from Capitalism to Communism".14

The second proposition Lenin made about socialist democracy was that it involved representative institutions, although not parliamentarism. Soviets, he said, were superior representative institutions to parliaments because they represented more directly and fully the majority classes, the proletariat and peasantry, and because they excluded the bourgeois. As he said, "the old i.e. bourgeois democracy and parliamenatarism were organised in such a manner that it was precisely the toiling masses who were mostly alienated from the apparatus of administration. The Soviet government i.e. the dictatorship of the proletariat, on the contrary is organised in such a way as to bring the toiling masses closer to the apparatus of administration. The same aim is pursued by the unification of legislative and executive authorities under the Soviet organisations of the state and by the substitution of production units like the factories and works for the territorial electoral constituencies."15

The third assumption that Lenin made about Soviet democracy was that its socialist basis enhanced the freedom of ordinary people because it removed them from economic exploitation by the capitalist and landlord classes and made them

the owners of means of production. This resulted in the ending of exploitative socio-political system. As Lenin pointed out in his own word, only in communist society, when the resistance of the capitalist have disappeared, when there are no classes (i.e. when there is no difference between the members of society as regards their relations to the social means of production), only then does the state... ceases to exist; and 'it becomes possible to speak of freedom'. Only then will really complete democracy, democracy without any exploitation, be possible and realised. And only then will state itself begin to wither away owing to the fact that, freed from capitalist slavery, from the untold horror, savagery, absurdities and infamies of capitalist exploitation, people will gradually accustom to the elementary rules of social life that have been known for centuries and repeated for thousand years in all copy-book maxims. They will be accustomed to observing them without force, without compulsion and without the special apparatus for compulsion which is called 'the state'.

The Communist notion of democracy developed by Marx and later modified by Marx and Lenin to suit the situation in Soviet Union was further developed and modified after the end of Second World War. With the development of Revisionism in Europe its advocates sought to replace the highly dogmatic
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16 *The State and Revolution*, op.cit, p. 81.
ideology of command economic structure to a market oriented economy where a market and profit system also operates. Dogmatic ideology was eroded and tended to be replaced by pragmatic and instrumental policies and force and violence were discouraged as a means of fostering regional change in non-Communist countries.

The second development was the rise of the peasantry as a revolutionary force. Peasants became a force to reckon with under the unbridled leadership of charismatic Mao Tse Tung. Marx never foresaw the role of peasants in organising revolution but Mao Tse Tung realised the immense potential of peasants and successfully organised them to overthrow the exploitative political system of China.

Consociational Democracy

The term Consociational Democracy was first time used in the context of Third World by David Apter to describe the way in which culturally diverse countries ensure that all significant groups were incorporated in the government without being frozen out by crude majoritarianism.¹⁷

Unlike Liberal Democracy or Socialist Democracy, in this type of democracy, state exists not to promote any liberal idea for the benefit of society, but to act only as a mediator in the inter-group relations. The major objective of Consociational Democracy is to achieve a consensus between the different groups through a political process that brings leaders of different groups, whether through

a carefully tailored form of proportional representation or federalism, or by
specially reserving offices of state for member of different groups. In this way
each group will have an ultimate veto power over the others. Citizens’
participation will be mainly within each group and their respective leaders
negotiate with each other for the allocation of resources. Electoral competition is
open to all citizens as in Liberal Democracy. Each group is not monolithic in
nature. Groups themselves are internally divided as in Europe where the classes
are divided into upper class, middle class and working class. In culturally diverse
countries such as Asia, Africa, there are many divisions even within each group.
In India though Hindus as a religious community represent one, there is a four
fold division of Hindu society along caste lines. Similarly, in some countries each
group has a geographical area in which it predominates. In legislature it gains its
representation in proportion to its population even without having a form of
proportional representation. Lijpart mentions seven structural factors which are
necessary for the success of consociationalism. They are:

1) A multiple balance of power among the segments rather than a dual balance of
power or the hegemony of one of the segments.

2) Small rather than large countries.

3) The power of the elites to get the acceptance of their followers to the process of
elite accommodation.

4) Homogenous and isolated segments rather than internally divided and scattered
segments.
5) The existence of over-reaching loyalties to the state beyond those to the segments.

6) A trait on of accommodation prior to the coming of mass democracy.

7) The existence of cross-cutting divisions [e.g. class, religion, language] across the segments.\(^{18}\)

However, there are certain major difficulties in Consociational Democracy. In rejecting majoritarianism, consociationalism may give space to the minority groups to influence and enable them to retain resources, disproportionate to their size. Another major demerit of this form of democracy is loyalty, which is very difficult to achieve. The major objective of political elites is to promote and to take care of their group interests. Other problem that may be associated with the Consociational Democracy as far as its suitability to Third World countries is concerned, is that, normally accepted requirements of the legitimacy of ruling elites for well-established institutions and procedures, a spirit of compromise and an over-reaching sense of national loyalty may be less strongly developed.\(^{19}\)

Although theoretically there are various models of democracy, each model has its own merits and demerits. It is too difficult to determine applicability of a single model of democracy to the Third World countries. The practical problem in achieving any one form of democracy is immense. Different types of democracy


having different features are coalesced together to give a policy option to Third World countries, which frequently face a combination of problems like authoritarian rule, social inequality and unequal distribution of wealth.

In recent years, eminent political scientist Skaler sees emergence of a new form of democracy that is 'Developmental Democracy'. It accommodates the goals of social reconstruction implicit in Socialist Democracy, resistance to authoritarianism implicit in Liberal Democracy, as in the struggle for trade union autonomy in Zambia and the recognition of cultural diversity implicit in consociationalism as in federal experiments in Nigeria. Glickman, sees mingling of different types of democracy, as seen in Africa where there is a mingling of ‘left-wing and right-wing’ ideologies, rejecting authoritarianism.

The disintegration of Soviet Union and subsequent de-ideologisation of politics further reduced the differences among various types of democracy, which might be suitable to countries in the region of East Europe, Central Asia and Baltic republics.

**Democratisation in Post-Soviet Phase**

Since the disintegration of Soviet Union a wave of democratisation is blowing across the globe embracing all the continents. Samuel Huntington termed it as a ‘wave of democratisation’. As he points out, wave of democratisation is a group of transitions from non-democratic to democratic regimes that occurs within a
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specific period and that significantly outnumbers transitions in the opposite direction in the same period.\textsuperscript{22} He mentions three waves of democratisation. The first wave of democratisation began in America in early 19th Century and culminated at the end of First World War, in which only three countries were democratised. The second phase of democratisation began after the end of World War II and decolonisation movement in which about thirty-six countries had democratic regimes.\textsuperscript{23}

He asserts that, a third-wave of democratisation is sweeping across the globe, beginning in mid-1970s and ending in 1990 in which about thirty-six countries were democratised.\textsuperscript{24} However, the third-wave of transitions was more complex and varieties of actors are involved in it for struggle for power and other goals. Even within the government coalition some groups came to favour democratisation, some opposed it, while some wanted limited form of democratisation. The groups involved in the process of democratisation despite having conflicting objectives have one common aim that is, to replace the existing authoritarian system. Even during the process of democratisation, the attitude and goals of groups are changed in the democratisation process. The groups shape the nature of the democratisation process. Similarly, the process of transition to democracy is facilitated when groups favouring pro-democratic form of government dominate both the opposition and the government. But the

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{24} Norman \textit{The Third Wave: Democratisation in the late Twentieth Century}, University of Oklahoma Press 1991, p. 113
differences between the power of reforms and opposition shaped the scope of democratisation process.\textsuperscript{25}

Despite the above factor involved in transition, a major element of transition namely ideological vs. organic transition needs to be kept in mind while analysing post-Soviet transition. The “organic model” of transition means gradual social transformation serving as a “pre-condition” of the political shift. Britain and USA presents a classic case of this model. The “organic model” of transition involves gradual development. For example, the American and English revolution was based not on the idea of revolution but on the urge to protect the existing rights and liberties from infringement by despotic regimes and derives its inspiration from the natural rights which developed through a natural process of evolution. The tradition of a predominantly ideological transition began with the French Revolution in 1789. Those who stormed the Bastille were not inspired by the desire to protect anything that they already had; rather, they wanted to destroy the old world and build new one. This new world existed only in imagination, and was based on general ideas and principles, or the revolutionary project. The latter first had to be elaborated in the minds of the intellectuals and afterwards implemented by the deliberate efforts of idealised revolutionary elite.\textsuperscript{26} The countries that adopted democratisation as a form of governance in the post-Soviet phase adopted democracy in a peaceful manner rather than revolutionary means as it happened in many countries of the former Soviet Bloc. What is needed is the

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid, pp. 121-123-

capability of political elites in these countries to carry out smoothly the transitional process from Communist countries to democratised one in the post-Soviet phase. The elite should also try to fulfil the needs and aspirations of the people which will make the democratisation process quite a successful one. What is however important in post-Soviet transition, is how to consolidate democracy which came into being through transition. By “consolidation” is meant a political regime in which democracy as a complex system of institutions, rules and patterned incentives and disincentives, becomes in the words of Linz and Stephan, “the only game in town”.

Democracy, becomes the “only game in town”, when, no social and political group seriously makes any attempt to overthrow the democratic regime or makes any attempt to overthrow the existing government even in the face of severe political and economic crisis and general people believe that any change in government can be done through constitutional procedure and political conflict within the state can only be solved through established norms. 27

In order to achieve the consolidation of democracy certain pre-requisites are required. First, in a modern polity, free, fair and authoritative elections cannot be held, winners cannot exercise the monopoly of legitimate force and citizens cannot effectively have their rights protected by a rule of law unless a state exists.
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In some parts of the world, conflicts about the authority and domain of politics and the identities and loyalties of the people are so intense that no state exists.

Second, democracy cannot be thought of as consolidated until a democratic transition has been brought to completion. A necessary but by no means sufficient condition for completion of a democratic transition is the holding of free and contested elections (on the basis of broadly inclusive voter eligibility) that meet the seven institutional requirements for elections in a polyarchy that Robert A Dahl has set forth. Such elections are not sufficient to complete a democratic transition. In many cases (Chile of 1996) where free and contested elections were held, the government resulting from election lacked *de-jure* and *de-facto* power ... the executive, legislative and judicial powers are still decisively constrained by an interlocking set of 'reserve domain', military prerogative or authoritarian enclaves.  

Third, no regime should be called democratic unless its rulers govern democratically. If freely elected executives (no matter what the magnitude of their majority) infringe the constitution, whisk away the rights of individuals and minorities, impinge upon the legitimate function of the legislature and thus fail to rule within the bounds of a state of law, their regimes can never be called democracies.  
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29 Juan A Linz and Alfred Stepan, op.cit, pp. 14-15.
Most of the Third World countries which attained independence after the Second World War and the post-Soviet republics faced certain common problems which had hindered the process of consolidation of democracy.

Factors Facilitating and Hindering the Establishment of Democracy in Third World Countries

Before analysing the problems and factors which facilitate the establishment of democracy in Third World countries, it is necessary to analyse the changes that have taken place in Third World countries where this transition is taking place. The social, economic and political elements of every Third World country have experienced tremendous changes. For example, in social sphere, most of the relations between different social groups are less bounded by tradition and mores likely to be characterised by conflicting demands. Due to industrialisation vast changes took place in the economic sphere which in turn induced structural changes in social sphere like migration of rural workers to urban area, changes in the social values system, breakdown of the traditional social structure like joint families into nuclear families, weakening of kinship ties etc. Similarly, new political institutions came up to facilitate harmony in social and economic sphere. The challenges which Third World countries face while adopting democracy as a form of government are partly cultural based, partly due to nature of post colonial history and also due to the process of transition itself.
Economic Development

One of the most significant factors which facilitates the establishment of democracy is the level of economic development. One of the pioneering advocates of this aspect has been S. M. Lipset. He argues that with increase in wealth, who rules become less important, because that government has less power to affect the crucial life chance of the most powerful groups who now enjoy sources of wealth independently of the state and poor can be able to secure the redistribution of wealth, without any great sacrifice from rich. In such a circumstance the mass will likely integrate with the polity.\textsuperscript{30}

The thesis of S. M. Lipset has been supported by a number of studies carried out by political scientists like Adam Prezeworski and Fernando Limongi, who found that poor democracies particularly those with annual per capita income of less than $1,000 are extremely fragile. They found that democracy can be expected to last an average of 8.5 years in a country where per capita income was under $1,000 per annum, 16 years in one with income between $1,000 to $2,000, 33 years between $2,000 and $4,000 and 100 years between $4,000 and $6,000.\textsuperscript{31}

Other theorists like Larry Diamond and Juan Linz have supported Lipset’s work. They argue that “economic crisis represents the most common threat to


democratic stability”. Larry Diamond even argues that political actors in more developed countries may be more likely to adopt a superior institutional framework at the moment when democracy is established.

A contrast can be made in case of India. Despite its economy being in bad shape, India has been a functioning democracy without many hindrances. Despite exceptions like India, it has been proved that success of democracy in countries of Europe and North-America can be to some extent attributed to its superior economic performance.

**Rising Material Expectation and High Aspiration**

Closely related to economic development, it has been found that in many newly independent countries, independence led to rising material expectation of people from the government and when the government fails to provide satisfaction to their needs and aspirations, it creates a negative reaction from the masses. The consequences have been that high material expectation goes hand in hand with rising frustration, which in turn gives rise to the growth of political violence and a climate of mass unrest that undermine political stability of new state.

**Political Culture, Attitude and Behaviour**

The stability of political system of any country is always determined by the attitude, orientation, belief, value of the people towards political system of the
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33 Przeworski, et al., op.cit, p. 41.

country which constitute the political culture of the country. The emphasis from material wealth to political culture and willingness of the people to accept consent as a means of resolving conflict was emphasised by Almond and Verba.  

S. E. Finer has analysed three types of political culture and its relation to stability and instability of political system.

Mature Political Culture

As practiced in countries like USA, England and other Western European countries, where political consensus and degree of organisations are very high and people accept democracy as a way of life.

Developed Political Culture

It refers to a society where the public is highly organised. From time to time people become sharply divided on issues like legitimacy of its institutions and procedure or the incumbents, who hold office as a consequence.

Low Political Culture

It is found in countries where public are often self-divided to offer any sustained resistance to authoritarian rules, countries like Iraq, Kenya, Syria, Indonesia, may be placed in this category.

This shows that attitude and orientation is as important as economic condition in
the success of democracy. Like Almond and Verba, Rustow also emphasises
compromise among various groups by subscribing to democratic rules for the
success of democracy. But, Rustow also emphasises the role of elites in leading
the group and in playing a decisive role in arriving at a consensus in decision
making. In Rustow’s model, a prolonged and inconclusive struggle between
groups ends when neither genocide nor expulsion is possible. Decisions are thus
taken to come to terms with the situation by agreeing to peaceful competition.
What compels the groups to compromise despite initial differences? External
threat might be a significant factor, as in many underdeveloped countries or
economic factor might act as a potential motivating factors in solving the group
conflict. 37 This is especially true in many Third World countries where society is
divided on class, ethnic and religious loyalty. Some times, it has been found that
“cry of national unity” in danger might be raised by ruling elites, in order to
distract attention from harsh and discriminatory treatment of ethnic, religious,
regional and other minorities.

Unstable Political System

A political system is marked by instability when there is marked social, regional,
class etc. disparity in the society. A political system becomes unstable when there
is an unbridgeable gulf between the ruler and the ruled. The ruling elite continues
to enjoy great material privileges in stark contrast to the mass poverty and squalor

37 D. A. Rustow, “How does Democracy Come into Existence”, in P. G. Lewis and D. C. Patter
of the masses and when one part of the country is progressing while the ruling elites continuously neglect other part of the country. In such political system if the conflicts are not resolved in an equitable and impersonal manner, there is a likelihood of widespread mass protest and consequent de-legitimisation of the political institution and process which may imperil the unity and integrity of the country itself. A good example of this can be cited from the secession of Bangladesh from Pakistan. Such struggle can be acrimonious when national elite become identified with a segment or segments of populations and where other segments are excluded from the mainstream or from exercise of power and allocation of resources. The elements of insecurity and instability in the system may induce forces that further decrease the prospects of democratic stability, individual security and liberty.

The emergence of authoritarian rules in most of the new states, which may be in the form of single party rule or military dictatorship, is closely associated with political instability. The emergence of authoritarianism in Third World countries and use of a number of 'coercive techniques' that put down organised opposition posed a serious challenge to development of democracy in these countries. Denial of basic human rights, gross violation of constitutional provisions, censorship of press and preventing opposition to perform its true role hinder development of democracy. Most of the countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America faced the above mentioned problems.
Another notable feature of Third World political system is the lack of development of institutionalised, organised and competitive party system, which in turn contributes largely to the persistence of unstable political system. As most of the Third World countries, remained under the colonial ruler for a long period of time there emerged mass movement against the colonial master led by a group of people who championed the cause of nationalistic struggle. Initially there was a semblance of unity among the diverse section of colonial people during the struggle against colonial rule. After attaining independence, societal cleavage among the newly independent countries re-emerged. This cleavage was sharpened when the dominant group at the fore front of the anti-colonial struggle tried to monopolise power and the consequent benefits of this are denied to other groups in the society. They claim that since they fought against the colonial master, they were the only party to rule and those opposed to their programmes and policies were unpatriotic and anti-state. A good example in this regard can be cited from Awami League in Bangladesh, Muslim League in Pakistan and Golkar Party in Indonesia. This amounted to serious confrontation among the various political forces in the country often leading to breakdown of nascent constitutional system, which in turn bred authoritarianism and dictatorship. Hence political parties failed
to perform their role of interest articulation and interest aggregation and subsequently an appropriate political culture conducive to a liberal democratic political framework failed to strike root. Further related to this is the emergence of parties with divisive agenda and narrower outlook, like identifying with particular group whether religious or linguistic. The proliferation of such types of parties put a great strain on the political system, especially new one, which tried to forge unity in a diversified society.

The unstable political system often leads to a lack of political consensus in most of the 'new nations' on crucial issues. The rapid transition from traditionalism to modernity is likely to destroy the consensus on law and moral values of the old society without replacing it with effectively new one, which ultimately leads to breakdown.

**The Nature of Political Institutions**

The nature of political system either facilitates or hinders the development of democracy in many countries. Juan Linz analysed why parliamentary democracy proves to be more durable than the presidential ones.\(^38\)

Linz argues that the stakes are higher under presidential system, since a race for the presidency can have but a single winner. Linz observes that a defeated presidential candidate has no official role in politics, most likely will not even be
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a member of the legislature, while in a parliamentary system the defeated candidate for the premiership could be leader of opposition. Similarly, under the presidential form the chief executive is at the same time the head of state, thus being able to portray the president’s partisan interest as the national interest and thereby undermine the legitimacy afforded to the opposition.

Finally the reasons why the presidential democracies may be less durable is that they are more likely to generate legislative paralysis. Such paralysis can occur under any system. But under parliamentary system such paralysis occurs when no political party has a clear majority. Similarly such paralysis can occur in a presidential system when the legislature is controlled by a majority that is hostile to the president but not large enough to override presidential vetoes routinely.

Under presidential systems, the executive by virtue of fixed term of office can survive along side hostile legislatures, leading to stalemates between the executive and the legislative branch. Linz found that, 14 democracies (or 28 percent of the 50 cases) died under a parliamentary mixed system and 24 (52 percent of 46 cases) died under presidential.

A general question naturally arises why many Third World countries adopted presidential form of government even though they know that parliamentary form

---
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of government is more likely to be durable? The answer can be found through a glance of historical experiences. Countries in which monarchies were abolished (France in 1848 and again in 1875, Germany in 1919) and colonies that rebelled against monarchical powers (the US and the Latin America in the 18th and 19th centuries) replaced monarchies with presidential system.

Generally countries of Asia and Africa that emerged from the colonial domination after the World War II inherited parliamentary form of government from their colonial master. A good example in this regard can be cited from the experiences of parliamentary democracy in India. Apart from political experience inherited from colonial masters, level of economic development at which transition to democracy occurs does appear to have some impact on the institution that are chosen. Between 1950 and 1990 the average level at which countries adopted parliamentary democracies had a per capita income of US $2,945, while presidential institutions were adopted by the countries having a per capita income of US $2,584.\textsuperscript{43}

**Social Structure**

Social structure of a country plays a key role in the success of democracy. Some of the important aspects of social structure of a society are its family structure, kinship organisation, authority structure etc. In a traditional society kinship bonds are stronger than those found in a modern society. The authority structure is more hierarchical than democratic in nature. The value system of a traditional society is

\textsuperscript{43} Ibid., p. 48.
more inegalitarian in nature. For example, in a traditional society joint family structure involves joint ownership of property, common responsibilities, strong group loyalty not only to the members of one's own family but also to the near kins. The nature of leadership is hierarchical. The decision making authority is under the person who is head of the family and his decision is final. At the community level it is the traditional clan or religious structure that enjoys a preponderant say in decision-making. The individual is totally subservient to the ascriptive group. Thus a traditional society has a social structure and value system that is not considered as suitable for the success of a modern democratic political system. Further it has been observed that the process of modernisation rather than breaking the old social structure, itself undergoes modification. The traditional social structure adapts itself to the modern structures. The traditional authority structure under modernisation simply cannot go away rather they reinforce their authority. This ultimately leads to creation of duality of decision making authority. This type of social structure and decision making process to a large extent contributed to the growth of authoritarian attitudes, values and norms and also shaped the mental framework of the people. This element plays a crucial role in impeding the success of democracy in many Third World countries.

Role of Bureaucracy

Another important element which hinders the development of democracy is bureaucratisation. As F. W. Riggs points out, the utmost significance in transitional societies is the lack of balance between political policy making-
institutions and bureaucratic policy implementing structure. In Western countries, bureaucracy acts as an instrument mainly to implement policies of the government and its powers are quite limited, but in developing countries there has been a phenomenal expansion of the power of bureaucracy due to the weakening of political institutions and expansion of welfare activity of state. Despite enjoying wide powers bureaucrats never want to take responsibilities and there is continuous rift between political authority and bureaucrats over policy-making and policy implementation which halt the developmental process in the country. Without firm political guidance, bureaucrats have weak incentive to provide good service, whatever their formal pre-entry training and professional qualifications; they tend to use their position for safeguarding their interests. Hence the bureaucracy in a developing country not only fails to accomplish the administrative goals set for it but also stands as a stumbling block in the way of political growth.

Role of Outside Factors

External powers which are themselves practicing democracies do play a role in fostering democratic form of government. For example, the occupying Allied power in Western Europe after the end of Second World War oversaw the
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transition of erstwhile fascist states like Italy and Germany [West Germany] into
democratic countries. Similar role was played by US in establishing and
supervising a democratic political structure in Japan after the Second World War.
The external power can use various instruments in prodding a non-democratic
country to become democratic. Some of these instruments could be invoking
sanctions against non-democratic governments, in the form of trade boycotts and
withholding of aid and investment, actual or threatened as done in case of Chile
and South Africa or it could be through attempts to influence the political opinion
through propaganda.

In the contemporary world, democracies which emerged after the end of cold war
and disintegration of Soviet Union face challenges. In the wake of globalisation
the traditional assumption that nation-state is an inevitable political organisation,
has become highly problematic because, globalisation is undermining the nation­
state. With the globalisation more and more decision which affect people’s lives
and public policies are made in different places and by forces who hardly
understand the ground realities of the country. Closely related to globalisation is
the emergence of market as an important element in the domain of political
structure of a country. As the market is self- seeking, the private concerns become
the moment of particularity. Democratic politics, on the other hand, professes
universality. It is about how common concerns are to be addressed. This creates a
fundamental imbalance in approach between the two processes of globalisation
and strengthening the nation state which ultimately affects democratisation and masses.\footnote{Claude Ake, The \textit{Feasibility of Democracy in Africa}, CODESRIA, 2000, pp. 7-32.}

\textbf{Multi Ethnic State and Democracy}

Disintegration of Soviet Union witnessed the emergence of a number of new multi-ethnic states. Such multi-ethnic states have an even greater need than other polities to explore a variety of non-majoritarianism, non-plebiscitarian formulas. For example, if there are strong geographical concentration of different groups within the state, federalism might be an option worth exploring. The state and society shall also allow a variety of publicly supported common institutions such as media and schools in different languages, symbolic recognition of cultural diversity, a variety of legally accepted legal codes, and political tolerance for parties representing different communities. Typically proportional representation rather than the large single member districts with first past the post elections can facilitate representations of geograhical dispersed minorities.\footnote{Linz and Stephen (eds.), op.cit. p. 26.}

As the experience shows, competitive electoral politics in a multi-ethnic state tends to strengthen nationalistic, ethnocentric, regional tendencies. As society passes from one stage to another generally some forms of democracy are likely to emerge; this may be either due to charismatic political leadership or due to the compulsion of maintaining plural identity. So democracy is likely to consolidate
at a later stage. The example of nascent democracies in US, Switzerland, India shows how in a multi cultural society functioning democracy can be possible.

The Central Asian Republic of Uzbekistan is also facing these challenges in its insatiable quest for democracy. Uzbekistan is facing same problems like an undeveloped political culture, an unstable political system, an underdeveloped economy, a social milieu steeped in tradition. These factors possess a great challenge to Uzbekistan in its quest for democracy. So, the question naturally arises whether democracy is possible in Uzbekistan. Before analysing this it is necessary to focus on the political development of Uzbekistan during Soviet period.