Real Factors Influence the Development of Democracy in India and Nepal

Bhagbati Chaudhary
CMJ University

Abstract: India The largest democracy in the world doesn't have a strong democratic past. As a result of a protracted relationship with the British as a component of the British Raj, India actually veered into democracy. It underwent numerous modifications. The social quirks of India add elements like language, regionalism, caste, diversity, and religious plurality. Similar to many other developing nations, Nepal's political structure changed from an absolute to a constitutional monarchy in the spring of 1990 following a popular uprising that overthrew the party-less panchayat rule. The government of Nepal, which was elected democratically, faces enormous obstacles. Some of the major obstacles are the politically charged and ineffective bureaucracy, the parliamentary opposition led by the numerous communist groups, and intra- and inter-party disputes. The opportunities and obstacles for democracy and development in India and Nepal are examined in this study report, which also makes some recommendations for institutionalising democracy and advancing the regional economies.

Keywords: Democracy, Caste, regionalism, economy, leadership, and etc.

Introduction

After reading through democratic studies, certain patterns emerge. First, the main or primary meanings of democracies are often used to refer to free and fair representative elections and individuals' ability to participate in the electoral system (limited to the act of casting a ballot and a basic degree of knowledge) (Zakaria, Huntington). The idea that popular sovereignty is a rich convergence of conditions embracing "government conducted by discourse" (Buchanan) or " the implementation of public reason" (Rawls)—of which elections that are free and impartial are but one part—is discussed far less. The degree to which economics effect the shift—or lack thereof—from autocratic to representational administration is a different significant subject.

Some contend that democracy must come after growth in the economy and a bare minimum reasonable means of existence (Kaplan, Lipset). This is commonly known as the "development-first argument." Upset pioneered this position with work done in the late 1950s and early 1960s, and it continued to have an impact on how people perceive the prospects for democratic today. However, a lot of people support the democratization-first viewpoint, which contends that authoritarianism is less beneficial for financial growth than democratization (Halperin et al.) and that historically, these two phenomena—economic growth and democracy—have evolved simultaneously (Barber). The next theme that runs through the research is that democratic change is often studied and addressed predominantly in terms of political systems and elites: how U.S. foreign policy better promote democracy based on relationships with foreign governments or aid dissemination? This debate about democracy versus advancement first highlights this theme (Diamond (see [9-12])), There isn't as much talk on how to cultivate a a

political culture in a way that will both facilitate and accelerate the establishment of representative governance.

The subject whether or not a specific culture, civilization, or religion is especially inclined toward, most appropriate for, or perhaps the inventor of democratization is the final key theme that merits consideration. While some contend that republicanism as a form of government originated in and is best suited to Western society, which is defined by Protestantism/Christianity and can be traced back to both Greece and Rome and their associated systems of government (Huntington, Stackhouse), others offer mathematical and past proof to the in contradiction (Sen, Schifter). Many of the disagreements over the definition and measurement of a free society, as well as the whys and how's of democratic change, will be brought to light in a study of Vaananen's work. There is a great deal of disagreement among those who research and write about these subjects. Lastly, the work of Carothers was the, Kaplan, and Barber highlights the fact that, regardless of the definition of the rule of law or the circumstances required for it to be successful, the world has recently lagged behind in preserving and advancing democratic governance. The procedure of establishing a democratically free world (both domestically and internationally) remains a formidable obstacle that calls for ongoing research and innovative thinking.

Christopher Barber. 'You Can't Export Mc World and Call it Democracy," which was (ch. 7) W.W. Norton, 2003: 145–154. Fear's Empire: War, Terrorism, And Democracies in An Age of Interdependence.

In the following section, Barber argues that democratic change and open markets are not mutually exclusive, even though the term "market a democratic system" is frequently used. Neither democratic change nor neo-liberal monetary policy are synonymous with a neo-liberal a position to the financial advancement. Barber emphasizes that representative government and free trade have historically coexisted and that democratic organizations are ultimately intended to control the free market as a whole. In the following section, Barber argues that democratic change and open markets are not mutually exclusive, even though the term "market a democratic system" is frequently used. Neither democratic change nor neo-liberal monetary policy are synonymous with a neo-liberal a position to the financial advancement. Barber emphasizes that representative government and free trade have historically coexisted and that parliamentary bodies are ultimately intended to control the free market.

"Civil Organization and the democratic process: Methodological and Methodological Difficulties," in Prosperity and Democracies: What have we obtained, and how, is authored by Catherine Broussard. Ole Elgstrom and Goren Ryden, editors.

Since the term " civil society " is used differentially according to various circumstances, Boussard aims to define it precisely and examine its potential and current roles in the democratic process. She notes that social interactions may grow in an environment in extremely inefficient and destructive ways. She wonders what role that civil society plays in democracy; how civil society interacts with other elements that affect democracy and precisely what the "civil" in civil society refers to. Though it has a varied role in each phase, Landry believes that the public sector has the ability to play a significant role in consolidating democracy and transformation. Broussard asserts that civil society contributes to democracy in two ways. It serves as an oversight agency by first acting as a balancing power to the authorities. In this capacity, a wide range of organizations—not all of them democratic or reliable—make up civil society, yet they all contribute to democratization. Additionally, and perhaps more crucial to the process of democratic change, society at large actively promotes democratic. In this second capacity, the value that organizations provide comes from their explicit consideration of the common good (in the broadest sense) and their internal democratic processes. This adds to their value beyond just being partnerships. The ability to "simultaneously...resist subornation to government and demanding membership into national governmental frameworks" is essential for civil society to play its second role. Lastly, Benoit contends that for nonprofit groups to successfully advance

democracy, they must be able to continue operating independently of the institutions and governments that provide them with funding.

The conflict that the Bush administration faces between attempting to contain the threat of extremism and advance democracy abroad is covered in Carothers and colleagues' piece. On the one hand, the United States requires the assistance of autocratic regimes like Pakistan's in order to combat the terrorist threat. According to Carothers (see [16]) and colleagues, there are a number of situations in which the US tolerates not democratic or semi-democratic regimes because pressing for a democratic shift would jeopardize the vital assistance that the US requires from these nations. The conflict that President Bush faces between attempting to contain the threat of extremism and advance democratization abroad is covered in Carothers (see [17]), who' piece. On the one hand, America requires the assistance of autocratic regimes like Pakistan in order to combat the terrorist threat. According to Carothers and colleagues, there are a number of situations in which the US tolerates undemocratic or semi-democratic regimes because pressing for a democratization would jeopardize the vital assistance that the US requires from these nations.

As a result, the government continues to pursue a policy of advancing democratization in nations where it is believed that doing so would successfully lessen the likelihood of terrorist acts, such as Afghanistan, Iraq, and more generally. Carothers (see [18]) contends, however, that using advancing democracy in an artificial and contradictory manner undermines its trustworthiness and that this strategy has no prior record of effectiveness. He uses the former president's administration's 1980s attempts to promote the term "demo in South and Central America as an illustration of how ineffective these initiatives may be. Carothers (see [10]) also notes that the significant restrictions placed on civil freedoms following 9/11 in the United States—liberties that were thought to be essential to democratic until recently—add to the issue of legitimacy. It is hard to make a convincing case that other nations cannot modify democracy to the degree that they feel fit if the United States may do so to suit its supposed needs for security. While acknowledging that it is a tough balancing and that "George W. Bush is...scarcely the first American leader to evidence a conflicting viewpoint on democratic advancement," Carothers (see [11]) criticism of the Bush presidency is nuanced. He does, however, argue that the stakes for this government are exceptionally high and that it must show an ongoing devotion to promoting genuine democracy abroad—rather than one that is theoretical or instrumental—while maintaining its principles of democracies at here.

'The democratic system's Sobering State', Thomas Carothers and colleagues (see [12]), Contemporary the past, December 2004. In his succinct evaluation of the global political situation, Carothers and colleagues (see [13]) points out that the hope and advancement witnessed in the democracy movement's expansion in the early to mid-1990s has not only stalled, but has actually reversed in many areas. He provides multiple justifications for this. First, it is increasingly evident that the changes did not get very far into the institutions of the states in which it seemed that the autocratic administrations were being replaced by nascent but sincere authorities with a preference for democracy. The ability of dictatorial rule to reemerge has been demonstrated, especially in light of the economic and social challenges from which the nations suffer. This brings up a second issue: these new progressive administrations have failed to improve living circumstances for their constituents. Carothers (see [13-15]) refers to this as the "effectiveness issue." Third, things have gotten more complex as a result of the alleged war on terrorists. Because it believes that tight terrorism collaboration with administrations like Russia's and Pakistan's is necessary, America has been less likely to push for democratization in these nations. Furthermore, the US has not done a good job after 9/11 of striking a balance between the necessity of increased security and the protection of fundamental liberties that are essential to a democratic. Events like the Abu Ghraib torture scandal and the covert erosion of civil rights safeguards in the US have conveyed the idea that many people view as essential elements of a democracy as replaceable. Lastly, Carothers was points to the Middle East's electoral shortfall and the discrepancy among American rhetoric and policy as threats to democratization that will

persist in the future. In closing, he poses what he views as the primary issues that need to be taken into account: how can democratization be sustained when it is under attack due to poor outcomes, and how can it be encouraged in areas where totalitarianism has surpassed the parliamentary trend?

Factors affecting democracy (see [1-8])

Indian democracy has succeeded despite numerous dominant ideologies that list prerequisites. The best way to understand Indian democracy is to concentrate on the distribution of government.

Religion

Politics is significantly influenced by religion, a significant cultural force. Dividing the voters along religious lines is a major factor in determining which parties' voters support. The three largest religious groups are Sikhs, Muslims (who are further divided into Shias and Sunnis), and Hindus, who are not a monolithic group. Several political organizations can also be recognized by the faith of their constituents. A lot of national spiritual issues are crucial to winning the election. Some political leaders even turn to spirituality as a source of self-justice and its political viability.

Caste

The caste system affects Muslims and Hindus alike, regardless of their respective religions. There are hundreds of sub-castes within the four primary castes of Hindus. Certain castes or sub-castes are the source of support for different political organizations. Brahmins, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas, and Shudras are the four major castes. Traditionally, members of the upper caste who oversaw religious ceremonies were known as the brahmins The Kshatriyas were warriors and kings. Vaishyas were traders, entrepreneurs, etc. The most downtrodden group was the Shudras, who were primarily employed by other castes in 'impure' occupations such as body cleanliness and grooming.

Population

India is the world's third biggest population a nation after China. The state's ability to provide jobs, healthcare, education, and other governmental services to everyone is hampered by the more than one billion people living in the country. For administrations, reducing the rate of growing populations has long been a top priority. Since India is a democratic nation, its population growth can only be halted by deliberate efforts and informed permission of the populace. By 2025, with the current rate of growth, India will overtake China.

Development

The Indian economy is still in its infancy and is driving the direction and speed of advancement. India was founded as an openly communist country, and it still has a sizable state sector and numerous limitations on private entrepreneurship, though some of these have been loosened by more recent administrations. Faster revenue growth has been their reward, especially through the expansion of trade-oriented industries. A recession has resulted in the election of several subsequent administrations.

Regions

India has a high population density. About twenty-eight countries and seven territories within the union should be separated, according to some.

Other factors

Both national and local politics are influenced by elements like styles of leadership, political institution design, women's problems, schooling. dishonesty, and politics among students. Other relevant aspects include the caste system, environmental regulations, recent foreign direct investment in the financial sector, and so on.

Criticisms

Misuse of Authority by Government Officials

The British notion of democratic representation, which was originally believed to be able to free the world from monarch and dictatorship, is the central tenet of the Indian election process. For the past sixty years, the parliamentary system of government has been successful in leading the country, but it is still not entirely functioning in actuality. Influence selling, nepotism, cronyism, and deliberate incompetence all go unchallenged when elected officials enjoy all their benefits without taking responsibility for their actions. Their ability to get away with it, accept responsibility for their actions, and win election after election is evidence of their demeaning of the democratic systems of India.

Elitism of Dynasties

Over 60% of the 70 years of following independence rule have been held directly by prime ministers who hail from the Nehru-Gandhi family, and another 12% are currently served in that capacity by a member of the same family, who rules by proxy while ignoring thousands of other qualified, effective, but unfavorable political activists. At the state level, this trend is also present. Prominent politicians are frequently charged with designating and launching their sons, daughters, and other offspring as heirs obvious providing them with an early advantage in the political power structure.

Conclusion

India, the world's largest democracy, did not have a strong history of democratic governance due to its long colonial relationship with Britain as part of the British Raj. Over time, however, India shifted toward democracy, undergoing many changes shaped by its unique social factors, such as language, regionalism, caste, diversity, and religious pluralism.

Similarly, Nepal's political landscape transformed from an absolute monarchy to a constitutional one in 1990, following a popular uprising that ended the party-less Panchayat system. Nepal's democratic government faces significant challenges, including a politically influenced and inefficient bureaucracy, opposition from various communist groups, and conflicts within and between political parties.

This report examines the challenges and opportunities for democracy and development in both India and Nepal, offering recommendations for strengthening democratic institutions and promoting economic growth in the region.

References:

1. Khadka, N. (1993), "Democracy and development in Nepal prospects and challenges pacific affairs", Vol. 66, No.1 44-71.

2. Diamond, L. (1992), "Promoting Democrac" in foregn policy, no. 87, p. 26.

3. Anderson, L. (2013), "Searching for security: India's Role in the post war federal democratic republic of Nepal, Himalaya", the journal of association for Nepal and Himalayan studies Vol.33, No.1, P.13

4. Nayak, N.R. (2014), "Strategic Himalayas: Republican Nepal and external powers (New Delhi) Institute for defense studies and analysis", p.11

5. Gharti, N. (2014), "Hindu Rajya Nabhaye: Sambidhanko Maswauda chyatchuu" (Nepali), Onlinekhabar.com

6. Banerjee, M. (2012), "India: the next superpower? Democracy", London: London School of Economics and political sciences.

7. Rao, A. (2010), "Democracy and Human right", Delhi: Pacific Publications.

8. Sharma, S.R. (2010), "Role of Media in Indian Democracy", New Delhi: DPS Publishing House.

9. Diamond, L. "Can The Whole World Become Democratie?" Center for the Study of Democracy, 2003.

10. Diamond L. "The Democratic Rollback," Foreign Affairs, March/April, 2008.

11. Diamond, L. "Universal Democracy?" Polict Review, June/July, 2003. Retrieved June 2008 from http://www.hoover.org/publications/policyreview/3448571.html.

12. Diamond, L. The Spirit of Democracy. Times Books, 2008.

13. Carothers, T. "The Sequencing Fallacy," Journal of Democracy, January, 2007.

14. Carothers, T. "US Democracy Promotion During and After Bush, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2007.

15. Castaneda, Jorge, and Navia, Patricio. "The Year of the Ballot," Current History, February, 2007.

16. Carothers, T. "A League of Their Own," Foreign Policy, July/August, 2008.

17. Carothers, T. "Debating Democracy," The National Interest, July/August, 2007.

18. Carothers, T. "Is a League of Democracies a Good Idea?," Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, May, 2008.