Dr. Chaya Bagrecha
Dr. Shavya Singh

ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL DECAY

ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL DECAY

ANALYSIS OF POLITICAL DECAY

Dr. Chaya Bagrecha
Dr. Shavya Singh

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

EXPLANATION OF POLITICAL DECAY

Dr Chaya Bagrecha, Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.chayabagrecha@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Political decay is a term used to describe how political institutions and processes progressively deteriorate and disintegrate over time. It is a process in which previously strong and efficient political institutions and processes lose their vitality, become less receptive to societal requirements, and struggle to preserve stability and legitimacy. This abstract examines the fundamental components of political degradation, its root causes, and possible effects on governance and social well-being. The phrase "political decay" refers to a variety of related elements that weaken political institutions. These include institutional inefficiency, corruption, deterioration of the rule of law, capture of governmental institutions by wealthy elites, and incapacity to adjust to changing conditions. These processes often result from a confluence of internal political system dynamics and outside pressures like economic crises, societal unrest, or outside meddling. Policymakers and academics who want to advance stable and successful government must comprehend the origins and effects of political deterioration. Strengthening accountability systems, increasing openness, and encouraging inclusive political processes are often part of efforts to stop political decline. Additionally, limiting or reducing the impacts of political decay requires creating resilient institutions that can adjust to changing socioeconomic circumstances.

KEYWORDS:

Forest, Institution, Political, Public, Service.

INTRODUCTION

How the U.S. Forest Service's focus on controlling wildfires came to be; why scientific management failed; how the Forest Service lost autonomy as a result of competing missions; what political degradation is and its two causes. The US Forest Service (USFS) was established by Bernard Fernow and Gifford Pinchot, and it is considered to be the best example of American state construction during the Progressive Era. Before the 1883 Pendleton Act was passed and merit-based bureaucracy began to take hold in American government, the country had a clientelistic system in which political parties distributed public jobs based on favouritism. The Forest Service, in contrast, employed agronomists and foresters with university degrees who were selected based on merit and technical proficiency. Its most significant conflict, described in chapter 11 above, included Pinchot's successful attempt to win the USFS control of the General Land Office in the face of adamant resistance from Joe Cannon, the illustrious Speaker of the House of Representatives. Bureaucratic autonomy the notion that USFS professionals, not politicians in Congress, should decide how to distribute public lands and should be in charge of hiring and promoting their own staff was at the center of this early stage of American state building. For many years following, the U.S. Forest Service remained the model of a top-notch American bureaucracy [1].

How the Forest Service Lost Its Autonomy, or Smokey the Bear

The fact that the Forest Service is now seen by many observers as a highly dysfunctional bureaucracy carrying out an outdated objective with the wrong tools may come as a surprise, though. Although it still has professional foresters working for it, many of whom are very committed to the organization's objective, it has lost a lot of the independence it had under Pinchot. It functions under several, sometimes incompatible judicial and congressional requirements that cannot all be met at once, and as a result, it ends up costing taxpayers a significant sum of money. The high level of worker morale and cohesiveness that Pinchot worked so hard to build has been eroded, and the internal decision-making process of the agency is often stymied. The situation is so dire that whole books have been published advocating for the complete abolition of the Forest Service. No political institution lasts forever, and the state of the Forest Service today reveals a lot about the forces at play in the fight against effective governance.

Academics and campaigners like Francis Lieber, Woodrow Wilson, and Frank Good now, who had a lot of trust in the capacity of contemporary scientific science to address human issues, championed civil service reform in the late nineteenth century. Wilson made a distinction between politics and administration, much as his contemporaries Max Weber. Administration was a field of execution that could be objectively analysed and the subject of scientific analysis, but politics was a sphere of ultimate objectives amenable to democratic contestation. With the advent of Frederick Winslow Taylor's philosophy of "scientific management," which used time-and-motion studies among other things to maximise the efficiency of manufacturing operations, a similar intellectual revolution had been taking place in the commercial sector. Many Progressive Era reformers believed that government could be transformed into a science and shielded from the irrationalities of politics if scientific management were introduced into it. They believed that the social sciences will someday be held to the same high standards as the sciences of nature.

This early confidence in science and the idea that management could be reduced to a science appear naive and misguided in light of the experiences of the 20th century. Natural science developed weapons of mass devastation during this time, while bureaucratic administration oversaw the operation of concentration camps. But like many developing nations today, these early reformers worked in an environment where political insiders or dishonest municipal bosses controlled the government. Today, no public institution would want the state legislature to decide who gets hired and gets tenure, and none would want Congress to choose the people who work for the Centres for Disease Control. So, demanding that candidates for public office be chosen on the basis of qualifications and education was quite logical [2].

The issue with scientific management is that periodically, even the most trained scientists get things wrong, and occasionally they get them wrong very, very wrong. The Forest Service experienced this in relation to what eventually became its primary function, putting out forest fires. The Great Idaho Fire of 1910, which destroyed three million acres in Idaho and Montana and claimed 85 lives, marked the beginning of the Forest Service's development in terms of its goal. The USFS has been concentrating more and more on wildfire control as a result of the political uproar over the destruction inflicted by this firestorm. According to William Greeley, a head of the Forest Service, "fighting fires is a matter of scientific management" i.e., easily accommodated within its current mission. This objective had grown significantly by the 1980s in what one observer referred to as a "war on fire." Tens of thousands of firemen were hired by the Forest Service, which had an estimated thirty thousand regular employees, a sizable fleet of aircraft and helicopters, and an annual budget of up to $1 billion for fighting fires.

Fighting wildfires is difficult since the founders of "scientific forestry" weren't aware of how important flames were to the ecosystem of woodlands. Natural occurrences like forest fires are crucial to the continued health of western woodlands. The woods were overrun by species like Douglas firs after fires were put out. Shade-intolerant trees like gigantic ponderosas, lodge pole pines, and sequoias need periodic fires to clear spaces in which new trees may recover. (In actuality, lodge pole pines need fires to spread their seeds.) These woods' high tree densities and massive accumulations of dry understory over time led to bigger and more catastrophic fires when they did occur. These flames now destroyed the bigger old-growth trees rather than the little invader species. After the massive Yellowstone fire of 1988, which ultimately burned almost 800,000 acres and required many months to contain, the public started to pay attention. Ecologists started to question the basic goal of fire suppression, which prompted the Forest Service to change direction and institute a "let burn" policy by the middle of the 1990s.

However, since the western woods had turned into enormous tinderboxes, years of wrong policy could not easily be undone. In addition, more people were residing in regions adjacent to woods in the West as a consequence of population increase, making them more susceptible to wildfires. According to one estimate, the wildland-urban interface grew by more than 52% between 1970 and 2000 and is expected to keep growing for a very long time. These folks were exposing themselves to unnecessary dangers that were eased by government-subsidized insurance, much like others who chose to live in floodplains and on barrier islands. Through their elected officials, they made a concerted effort to ensure that the Forest Service and other government organisations in charge of managing forests received the funding necessary to continue putting out fires that may endanger their land. The government could easily spend $1 million to safeguard a $100,000 property since it was politically hard to explain taking no action. In the end, it proved to be exceedingly difficult to do any type of sensible cost-benefit analysis.

In the meanwhile, the basic goals of the Forest Service, around which Pinchot built a top-notch organisation, had deteriorated. Remember, the goal of the mission was not primarily conservation or fire control, but rather the sustainable use of forest resources, or wood harvesting. The initial mandate's scope was significantly reduced since annual wood harvests in national forests fell from twelve to four billion board feet during the final decade of the 20th century. This was partially due to the economics of lumber, but it also represented a shift in national ideals during the preceding century, which was more significant. Natural forests were increasingly seen as preserves to be maintained for their own sake rather than as resources to be exploited for commercial gain as environmental awareness increased. This transition coincided with a number of other shifts in societal attitudes that were occurring at the time. Initially seen as gallant attempts to control nature, dams and other large hydropower constructions were eventually found to have significant unanticipated environmental repercussions. By the 1970s, almost no new dams were being constructed in North America. When President Lyndon Johnson signed the 1964 Wilderness Act, which mandated that the Forest Service, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service review and protect the more than nine million acres of land under their control, the Forest Service's mission was changed.

DISCUSSION

Many detractors pointed out that the Forest Service was failing even in its initial fundamental objective of collecting wood responsibly. The government was not getting the necessary benefit from what ought to have been a productive asset because timber was being sold at prices that were much below the cost of production. This was due to a number of factors: The

agency's pricing of wood was inefficient, and many of its fixed expenses were not taken into consideration when determining prices. The Forest Service, like all other government organisations, was unable to keep profits, thus there was no motivation for them to do so. Instead, it had a motivation to grow its own spending and employees each year, regardless of the additional income this would bring in.

The narrative makes hints about the larger dynamics that underlie the pattern of political deterioration. Because he gained a high degree of autonomy for a group of qualified professionals committed to a single primary goal the sustainable utilisation of American forests Gifford Pinchot's original USFS was considered as the gold standard of American bureaucracy. The goal of the clientelistic party-based nineteenth-century political system, of which the old Forest Bureau and the Department of Agriculture, of which it was a component, were a part, was to provide political rewards to members of Congress. For the Forest Service to accomplish its goals, it was essential that it be able to hire and promote its own employees and operate without interference from Congress.

The issue arose when several requirements that may contradict with one another replaced the Forest Service's distinct, singular objective. In terms of people and finance, the mission of combating fires started to take precedence over the one of wood extraction in the middle of the 20th century. However, firefighting later turned into a contentious activity and was itself replaced by a conservationist/environmentalist role. However, none of the old missions were abandoned, and each one had a tendency to connect with various outside interest groups that backed various factions within the Forest Service, including timber buyers, environmentalists, homeowners, western developers, and young people looking for temporary jobs as firefighters. Congress was reinserted into the micromanagement of land purchases after being expelled in 1905. Rather than via the traditional corruption exemplified by the Ballinger scandal in 1908, which resulted in President Taft removing Pinchot, this was achieved through the issuance of legislative mandates that drove the Forest Service to pursue various and sometimes incompatible agendas. For instance, the "let burn" policy advocated by environmentalists could not be easily put into practise due to the need to preserve the homes of the growing number of homeowners who reside along the wildland-urban interface. The parties to this process utilised their connections to Congress and the courts to attempt to compel the agency to defend their preferred interests since what was beneficial for the long-term health of forests was not good for specific homes [3].

The modest, unified organisation founded by Pinchot and lauded by Herbert Kaufman in The Forest Ranger gradually became larger and more fractious. Government officials started to become more concerned with preserving their budgets and employment than with carrying out their missions effectively, making it susceptible to many of the problems facing government agencies more broadly. And despite the fact that both science and the society in which they lived were evolving, they stuck to outdated rules. Like Pinchot, a lot of people sought out to interest organisations to safeguard their independence, but without a clear, unifying mission, they ultimately failed to prevent client recolonization.

Over The Board

One thing would be if the U.S. An exceptional instance of political degradation was the Forest Service. Public administration experts have found plenty of evidence to suggest that the general quality of the American government has been declining gradually for more than a generation. Paul Light stated that "the federal government has become a destination of last resort for [young people wanting to make] a difference"; Patricia Ingraham and David Rosenbloom assert that the federal service has been "decomposing" since the 1970s.9 This

assertion is backed up by the findings of the 1989 and 2003 Volcker Commissions on Public Service.

Many Americans believe that the size of the American government has been steadily increasing over the years. This is only partially accurate; the government has been given increasingly broad responsibilities to carry out tasks ranging from eradicating child poverty to combating terrorism. The federal workforce's real size, however, has been restricted to 2.25 million since the conclusion of World War II and has undergone several rounds of reduction; in 2005, it was about 1.8 million. A number of public authorities that carry out public duties while remaining independent of the government as well as an army of unaccountable contractors that handle everything from managing the National Security Agency's computer systems to providing cafeteria services have both grown.11

There are several ways in which the American bureaucracy has diverged from the Weberian ideal of a dynamic and effective organisation with staff members selected for their aptitude and technical expertise. The whole system has moved away from being merit-based. After two Middle Eastern conflicts, veterans make about half of all new hires in the government sector; a significant fraction of this group is handicapped. Although the Congressional legislation that led to this result may be comprehensible, most firms would not willingly choose to staff themselves in this manner. Federal employee surveys provide a sombre image. Federal workers "appears to be more motivated by pay than mission, trapped in careers that cannot compete with business and nonprofits, troubled by the lack of resources to do their jobs, dissatisfied with the rewards for a job well done and the lack of consequences for a job poorly done, and unwilling to trust their own organisations," writes Light.

"Those who enter the civil service frequently find themselves trapped in a maze of rules and regulations that thwart their personal development and stifle their creativity," according to the 2003 National Commission on the Public Service. Government work has always been motivated more by a service ethic than by monetary rewards alone, of course, but these same surveys show that young people hoping to serve the public interest are much more likely to go into a nonprofit than the government. The best are underpaid, the worst, overpaid. These tendencies have all escalated in the early decades of the 2000s. In one poll, when asked how successful their organisations were at punishing bad performance, just 9% replied "very good," while 67 percent responded "not too good" or "not good at all [4]."

Establishments Age

The difficulties facing the Forest Service are but one specific instance of a larger process known as political deterioration. Political institutions change throughout time, but political degradation affects them all equally. Once a society is prosperous and democratic, the issue is not resolved. Democracy itself, in fact, has the potential to degenerate. Oswald Spengler, Arnold Toynbee, Paul Kennedy, and Jared Diamond have all written extensively on decline, with a large portion of their work focusing on the systemic downfall of whole cultures or civilizations. Although I really doubt that one could draw anything like a universal rule of social behaviour from the existing data, it is plausible that there are broad processes of civilizational disintegration at work. The sort of degradation I'm concerned with here has to do with how particular institutions function and may or may not be connected to more general systemic or civilizational processes. One institution could deteriorate while others surrounding it continue to function well.

Traditional political systems that were undergoing fast transformation had crumbled into chaos all around the world, according to Samuel Huntington, who coined the phrase "political decay" to describe the political instability in many newly independent nations following

World War II. According to Huntington, socioeconomic modernisation eventually mobilised new social groupings whose participation could not be accommodated by the political structures in place at the time. Thus, the incapacity of institutions to adjust to changing conditions—specifically, the emergence of new social groupings and their political demands—was the root cause of political collapse.

Political progress must thus undergo political decay in certain aspects since the old must fall apart to create room for the new. There is no assurance that political institutions can continually, peacefully, and effectively adjust to new circumstances, however, since transitions may be very tumultuous and violent. This model may serve as the foundation for a deeper understanding of political deterioration. Huntington defined institutions as "stable, valued, recurring patterns of behaviour" whose primary goal is to support human group activity. Humans would always have to renegotiate their relationships if there were no clear and consistent norms. These laws' actual content changes throughout time and amongst various communities. However, the ability to make rules as such is encoded into the human brain genetically and has developed through generations of social interaction.

People may come to accept institutional restrictions as a result of considering their own self-interest. However, human nature has given us a range of feelings that promote rule or norm compliance regardless of the rationale of the standard. Observing norms is sometimes encouraged by religious conviction; other times, we do it out of habit and custom. We have a natural tendency to conform and look to our neighbours as models on how to act. Human civilizations have reached levels of social cooperation that are unsurpassed by any other animal species because to the enormous stability of normative behaviour, which also helps to construct long-lasting institutions. Political degradation also stems from institutions' inherent stability. Institutions are developed to satisfy the needs of certain situations. However, the initial setting in which institutions are developed is flexible. Huntington's description of social mobilisation is only one example of how the environment around an institution may change and become dysfunctional. Another is environmental change. According to anthropologists, the Maya civilisation and the Indian civilizations of the American Southwest both declined as a result of climatic changes [5].

Institutions often struggle to change with the times for a variety of reasons. Cognitive is first. Institutional norms are adhered to by people for irrational reasons. For instance, sociologists and anthropologists have hypothesised that diverse religious laws have logical bases in distinct functional purposes, such as the necessity to control sexuality and reproduction, the requirements for transferring property, the organisation of combat, etc. But ardent religious adherents won't just give up their beliefs because there is proof that they are incorrect or have negative consequences. Of fact, this type of cognitive rigidity goes well beyond religion. In spite of evidence to the contrary, everyone develops and utilises common mental models of how the world works. This was true of both modern neoclassical economics and Marxism, which was an explicitly secular and "scientific" theory. In the United States, we saw this clearly. The Forest Service insisted on its fire suppression programme despite mounting evidence that doing so was hurting its aim of forest sustainability because it believed it had "scientific" understanding about forest management.

The involvement of elites or established political players inside a political system is the second significant factor in institutions' failure to adapt. Political institutions grow when new social groupings emerge and threaten the status quo. Those who were formerly outside the system become insiders if institutional growth is effective. However, after acquiring an interest in the new system, the insiders start to defend it. Since they are insiders, they may influence the rules in their favour by taking advantage of their better access to knowledge and

resources. In order to defend their own positions and advantages, the newly categorised (merit-based) government officials established by the Pendleton Act started organising right away in the first decade of the twentieth century. This developed into a shield of defence not just against dishonest politicians but also against superiors who demanded more responsibility and performance.

As we have seen, natural human sociability is built around the twin principles of kin selection and reciprocal altruism—the favouring of family or of friends with whom one has exchanged favours. Modern state institutions, which are supposed to be impersonal even if not necessarily democratic, are particularly vulnerable to insider capture in a process that I labelled "repatrimonialization." People must struggle against their inherent tendencies to succeed in modern systems. Without strong institutional incentives, those who have access to the political system would exploit it to favour friends and family, undermining the impersonality of the state. The more chances they have to do this, the stronger the groupings will be. All contemporary institutions suffer from the sickness known as elite or insider capture. The reason patrimonial or premodern organisations don't have this issue is because they are seen from the beginning as the private property of the insiders.

I included a lot of repatriation instances in the first volume of this book. At the end of the Later Han Dynasty, China, which established the first modern state in the third century B.C., saw the state retaken by elite family networks. This dominance persisted long after the Sui and Tang Dynasties in the seventh and eighth centuries rebuilt a centralised state. Only during the Northern Song era in the eleventh century did the level of impersonality that existed under the Han Dynasty return. In a similar vein, the Mamluk slave-soldiers who established their legitimacy by defending Egypt and Syria against the Mongols and the Crusaders grew to become a powerful elite. By the end of the dynasty, the elder Mamluks actually found themselves in charge of affluent patronage networks built to prevent the ascent of their younger contemporaries. This resulted in their invasion by the Ottomans and the demise of the Mamluk state, along with their contempt for modern technology like weapons. And lastly, starting in the late sixteenth century, the French state under the Old Regime gradually handed itself off to powerful elites. Modernising the state was difficult due to the entrenched venal officeholders' influence; change could only take place when these people were forcibly ousted by the revolution [6].

Democracy, and more specifically the Madisonian concept of democracy, was established in the United States. The United States Constitution, in theory, should lessen the issue of elite capture by preventing the rise of a dominating group that may use its political influence to tyrannise the nation. It does this by distributing authority across a number of rival departments of government and fostering rivalry among various interests throughout a vast and varied nation. Madison reasoned that the size and variety of these factions or, as we would say today, interest groups would safeguard individual liberty rather than attempting to govern them. When one group abuses its power in a democracy, the other groups that are threatened by it may band together to provide a counterweight.

However, although democracy does provide a crucial check on elite power, it usually falls short of expectations. Elite insiders often have better access to materials and knowledge, which they employ to safeguard themselves. If the average voter is unaware that this is taking place, they won't be held accountable for stealing their money. Social groupings may also be unable to mobilise for their own self-interest due to cognitive rigidities. In spite of the fact that doing so would be detrimental to their own economic positions, many working-class voters in the US support politicians who make tax cuts for the affluent a campaign promise. They do this because they think that such measures would either cause economic

development that will ultimately benefit them or else make government deficits self-financing. Despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, the hypothesis has proven to be extraordinarily resilient.

Additionally, various groups might organise in different ways to protect their interests. Contrary to common customers or taxpayers who are scattered and for whom the prices of these commodities only make up a tiny portion of their budgets, sugar producers and maize farmers are geographically centralised and focused on the pricing of their goods. These factors, together with institutional norms that often support such interests (such as the fact that Florida and Iowa, where sugar and maize are farmed, are presidential election swing states), give such organisations a disproportionate amount of power over agricultural policy. For another illustration, middle-class organisations are often considerably more competent and ready to protect their interests than are the impoverished. One such example is the maintenance of the house mortgage deduction. In contrast to programmes that solely serve the poor, universal rights to social security or health insurance are considerably simpler to maintain politically [7].

Finally, market economies are almost universally associated with liberal democracies, which tend to produce winners and losers and magnify what James Madison called the "different and unequal faculties of acquiring property." This type of economic inequality is not inherently a bad thing, insofar as it stimulates innovation and growth, and when it occurs under conditions of equal access to the economic system. However, when economic winners try to use their riches to gain uneven political dominance, it becomes very troublesome politically. They may do this on a transactional level, for example, by paying a politician or government official, or more destructively, by altering institutional norms to their advantage, such as by preventing competition in markets they already control. Environmental or safety concerns have been exploited by nations like Japan, Brazil, and the United States to effectively safeguard local industries. Gradually tilting in their favour, the level playing field.

The phenomena of social or civilizational decline, which has become a highly politicised theme in the debate about America, is not the same as the fall of American political institutions. The quality of American government has never been one of the country's greatest assets; instead, the private sector has always been more dynamic and forward-thinking. New chances arise in industries like shale gas or biotechnology that serve as the foundation for future economic development, despite declining government quality. Political decay in this context simply refers to the fact that many particular American political institutions are now broken, and that the country's inability to repair them is due to a confluence of intellectual rigidity and the strength of long-entrenched political players. It is very difficult to bring about institutional transformation, and there is no assurance that it will be successful without seriously upsetting the political system [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

Political deterioration has significant effects on society and government. Trust and confidence in the political system may erode if institutions lose their ability to efficiently handle public demands and guarantee the equal allocation of resources. This may result in a loss of social cohesiveness, political polarisation, and generalised disenchantment. Political deterioration may also prevent the growth of the economy since corruption and inefficiency stunt progress and deter investment. In conclusion, the idea of political decay emphasises how political institutions gradually deteriorate and diminish, which affects their efficacy, legitimacy, and social well-being. Policymakers can improve the resilience and

responsiveness of political systems and, ultimately, promote more stable and affluent societies by recognising the causes and effects of political deterioration.

REFERENCES

[1]   N. W. Barber, 'Populist leaders and political parties', *German Law Journal*. 2019. doi: 10.1017/glj.2019.9.

[2]   S. N. Kalyvas, 'The decay and breakdown of communist one-party systems', *Annual Review of Political Science*. 1999. doi: 10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.323.

[3]   B. Miller, 'Failing to Recall: Examining the Effects of Trace Decay and Interference on Memory for Campaign Information', *Polit. Psychol.*, 2013, doi: 10.1111/pops.12002.

[4]   S. Ganguly, 'Explaining the Kashmir Insurgency: Political Mobilization and Institutional Decay', *Int. Secur.*, 1996, doi: 10.2307/2539071.

[5]   A. Aylward, 'R.A. Fisher, eugenics, and the campaign for family allowances in interwar Britain', *Br. J. Hist. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0007087421000674.

[6]   P. L. McCall, K. F. Parker, and J. M. MacDonald, 'The dynamic relationship between homicide rates and social, economic, and political factors from 1970 to 2000', *Soc. Sci. Res.*, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.ssresearch.2007.09.007.

[7]   S. Johal, M. Moran, and K. Williams, 'The future has been postponed: The great financial crisis and British politics', *Br. Polit.*, 2012, doi: 10.1057/bp.2011.30.

[8]   N. Raspudić, 'Human nature in machiavelli: Anthropological pessimism as the basis of political »realism«', *Filoz. Istraz.*, 2020, doi: 10.21464/fi40205.

[9]   S. S. F. Regilme, 'Does US Foreign Aid Undermine Human Rights? The "Thaksinification" of the War on Terror Discourses and the Human Rights Crisis in Thailand, 2001 to 2006', *Hum. Rights Rev.*, 2018, doi: 10.1007/s12142-017-0482-2.

CHAPTER 2

A STATE OF COURTS AND PARTIES

Dr Batani Raghavendra Rao, Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: br.rao@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The phrase "A State of Courts and Parties" describes a political setting where the court and political parties have a considerable influence on how a nation governs itself and makes decisions. The main characteristics and ramifications of a state defined by the impact and interaction of courts and parties are explored in this abstract. The judiciary and political parties have a significant impact on the political landscape in a state of courts and parties. The judiciary is in charge of interpreting and carrying out the law since it is a separate arm of the government. Its rulings might have a significant impact on public policy, individual rights, and the distribution of power among the several governmental departments. Political parties, on the other hand, play a crucial role in the democratic process by influencing public opinion, creating policy agendas, and vying for political power. They act as vehicles for bringing together and representing various social interests. The way courts and parties interact has a significant impact on government and democracy. On the one hand, a robust and independent judiciary can uphold the rule of law, safeguard individual rights, and act as a check on the executive branch. It may serve as a venue for settling conflicts and maintaining constitutional ideals. On the other side, political party influence may affect judicial selection, judicial judgement, and the general course of the legal system. Political parties may attempt to influence the court in order to further their party goals or gain political benefits, thus eroding the independence and integrity of the judicial system.

KEYWORDS:

Government, Legislative, Political, Public, Service.

INTRODUCTION

How mistrust of government leads to judicial remedies for administrative issues; how "adversarial legalism" lowers government efficiency, how the court and legislature continue to play outsized roles in American administration. The executive, judicial, and legislative branches of a contemporary liberal democracy represent the three types of political institutions—state, rule of law, and democracy [1]. Due to a long history of mistrust of governmental authority, the United States has traditionally placed a higher priority on the legislative and judicial branches of government than the executive in terms of institutional priorities. Stephen Skowronek described nineteenth-century American politics as a "state of courts and parties," where judges and elected officials carried out governmental responsibilities that, in Europe, would have been handled by an executive branch bureaucracy. Only in the late 1880s did a modern, centralised, merit-based bureaucracy begin to take shape, and it wasn't until the New Deal, more than fifty years later, that the percentage of classified public workers reached 80 percent and was able to exercise control over the whole nation [2].

Parallel to this transition to a more contemporary administrative state, the size of government also increased dramatically. The assumption made by a lot of the literature on American state formation, or the "rise of the modern administrative state," is that history is a one-way ratchet that, once cranked, cannot be undone. In terms of the reach of the government, this would appear to be supported. Despite Reagan and Thatcher's revolutions in the United States and the United Kingdom, and their attempts to halt the expansion of the state sector, taxes have generally continued to rise since the 1970s. Progressives are relieved, and conservatives are alarmed, because "big government" looks to be so tough to get rid of.

Considering simply the United States for the time being, a significant decline in the quality of government has gone unnoticed due to the seemingly unstoppable expansion of its reach over the 20th century. It has become much more difficult to bring budgetary deficits under control as a result of this decline in the quality of government. Before the quality, or strength, problem is resolved concurrently, it will be extremely difficult to handle the quantity, or scope, issue. In plainer terms, the American system of checks and balances makes decision-making more difficult in comparison to other democracies with differing institutional setups. This previously hampered the expansion of the welfare state in America. However, the lengthy nature of the procedure also makes reducing that condition difficult. Responsible budgeting the fundamental duty of every democratic system will be difficult to carry out unless administrative procedures are simplified and policy execution is made more effective.

The courts and legislature have taken over many of the proper functions of the executive, making the operation of the government as a whole both incoherent and inefficient. This return of the United States to being a state of "courts and parties" in some ways is the root of the decline in the quality of American government. The history of the courts is a tale of the constantly growing judicialization of tasks that, in other modern democracies, are handled by administrative bureaucracies, which has resulted in an explosion of expensive litigation, a sluggishness in decision-making, and wildly uneven application of the law. The courts no longer serve to restrain the government but rather serve as substitute tools for its growth.

A comparable takeover by Congress has occurred. Interest groups have discovered new, entirely legal ways to seize and exert power over politicians after losing their capacity to directly bribe legislators and fuel clientelistic machinery. Through their capacity to rig the budget in their favour, interest groups wield influence that is out of all proportion to their status in society, skew taxation and expenditure, and increase total deficit levels. Additionally, they cause Congress to adopt a number of conflicting requirements that lower the standard of public administration. All of this has resulted in a crisis of representation, where the general populace feels that their ostensibly democratic government no longer accurately represents their interests and is instead in the hands of several mysterious elites. Ironically and peculiarly, policies intended to increase democracy are partially to blame for this crisis in representativeness [3], [4].

The judicialization of administration and the growth of interest-group influence both have a tendency to erode the public's faith in the institution of government. This mistrust then grows and reinforces itself. Demands for stronger legal checks on administration stem from mistrust in executive agencies, which lowers the standard and efficacy of government. Because of the same mistrust, Congress often imposes conflicting new directives on the executive that are difficult, if not impossible, to carry out. Both procedures result in a decrease in bureaucratic autonomy, which in turn results in an inventive, inflexible, and rigid government. Ordinary people then accuse bureaucrats of being to fault for these issues, as if they love working under a plethora of intricate regulations, court rulings, earmarks, and complicated mandates that come from lawmakers and judges over which they have no influence. The issue with

American government is more with the broader system that gives political parties and judges control over matters that should be handled administratively.Therefore, there is an imbalance between the institutions that were initially intended to restrain the state on the one hand, and the power and competency of the state on the other, which is the root cause of the issues with American governance. In sum, there is too much "democracy" and legislation in relation to the capabilities of the American state.

DISCUSSION

A Diverse Method of Acting: The Supreme Court's 1954 decision in Brown v. Board of Education, which overturned the nineteenth-century Plessy v. Ferguson ruling that had sustained legal segregation on constitutional grounds, was one of the major turning moments in twentieth-century American history. This choice served as the catalyst for the civil rights movement that developed over the next ten years and was successful in removing the legal obstacles to racial equality and securing the rights of minorities, including African Americans. Many succeeding social movements in the late 20th century, including those for homosexual marriage, consumer safety, women's rights, and environmental preservation, adopted this strategy of using the courts to impose new social norms [5], [6].

Americans are so used to this heroic story that they seldom realise how oddly they approach social change. The National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP), a private nonprofit organisation, was the main force behind the Brown decision. On behalf of a small number of black parents and their children, it brought a class action lawsuit against the Topeka, Kansas, Board of Education. Naturally, private organisations had to take the lead because prosegregation forces controlled the state government. With the assistance of future Supreme Court judge Thurgood Marshall, the NAACP persisted in arguing the case all the way up to the Supreme Court on appeal. Undoubtedly one of the most significant changes in American public policy did not result from a decision by Congress, who represents the American people, but rather from lawsuits filed by private parties seeking to alter the law. Congress's action led to later modifications like the Civil Rights and Voting Rights Acts. However, even in these instances, the initiative of private parties who had the legal right to challenge the government and the execution of national law fell to the courts.

Other liberal democracies do not operate in this way. In the second half of the 20th century, there were comparable developments in the legal standing of women, homosexual people, and members of racial and ethnic minorities across all of Europe. However, in Britain, France, or Germany, a national justice minister acting on behalf of a legislative majority would have accomplished the same outcome instead of turning to the courts. The legislative rule change would have been the result of media and social group pressure, but it would have been implemented by the government itself rather than by individuals acting via the legal system [7], [8].

The historical progression of the three sets of American institutions is where the American method first emerged. In Britain, France, and Germany, the rule of law came first, then a modern state, and democracy came last. In contrast, the United States' pattern of development saw democracy come first, then a very strong heritage of English Common Law, and only afterwards a contemporary state. The American state has always been weaker and less competent than its equivalents in Europe and Asia, even if the last of these institutions were put in place during the Progressive Era and the New Deal. More importantly, American political culture has been based on a mistrust of executive power since the country's establishment, therefore judges and lawmakers often do tasks that would normally be assigned to administrative bureaucracy in other nations.

Reformers attempted to create an administrative state in the manner of Europe throughout the Progressive Era and the New Deal. The Roosevelt administration's attempt to load the Supreme Court and the ensuing outcry that forced it to back down placed them into direct confrontation with the conservative judges of the day. In the middle of the 20th century, more obedient courts allowed an ever-expanding administrative state to arise. Americans' mistrust of "big government" and new federal agencies, however, has not diminished. Conservatives are not the only ones who harbour mistrust of the government; many on the left share these concerns and prefer to use grassroots activism and the legal system to influence public policy. These concerns range from the capture of national institutions by influential corporate interests to an unchecked national security state.

Contrary Legalism

The legal scholar Robert A. Kagan refers to this history as the origin of a "adversarial legalism" system. Although attorneys have had a prominent place in American public life since the country's founding, their influence increased significantly in the tumultuous 1960s and 1970s as a result of societal upheaval. During this time, the Congress approved more than two dozen significant pieces of environmental and civil rights legislation, addressing everything from workplace safety and health to hazardous waste cleanup and product safety. This was a significant extension of the regulatory state established during the Progressive Era and the New Deal, a change that American corporations and conservatives are now quite fond of criticising.

But it's not only the amount of regulation in and of itself that makes this system so cumbersome; it's also how strongly legalistic it is. The EEOC, EPA, OSHA, and other new federal agencies were required by Congress, but it was unwilling to give these organisations the same level of rule-making and enforcement powers that state institutions in Europe and Japan had. What it really achieved was transfer control of law enforcement and oversight to the judiciary. By granting standing (the ability to sue) to more parties, many of whom were only marginally impacted by a given regulation, Congress inadvertently fostered litigation.

R. Shep Melnick, a political scientist, used the example of how Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act was changed by the federal courts, "turning a weak law focusing primarily on intentional discrimination into a bold mandate to compensate for past discrimination." "The key move of Republicans in the Senate... was to substantially privatise the prosecutorial function," according to the article, rather than giving a government bureaucracy enough enforcement authority. They created an engine that would, in the years to come, generate levels of private enforcement litigation beyond their imagination by making private lawsuits the preeminent method of Title VII enforcement. Private enforcement cases increased overall from less than 100 cases per year in the late 1960s to 10,000 cases in the 1980s and more than 22,000 instances in the late 1990s.4 During the same time span, spending on lawyers climbed by a factor of six. Aside from the rising direct expenses of litigation, expenditures were also spent as a result of the proceeding's growing sluggishness and lack of certainty over its results.

Thus, disputes that in Sweden and Japan would be resolved by formal litigation in the American court system instead of discreet talks between interested parties working through the bureaucracy. Public administration suffers from a variety of unpleasant effects as a result, creating a procedure that is marked by uncertainty and procedural problems, in the words of Sean Farhang. Complexity, duplication, a lack of closure, and excessive transaction costs. It also makes the system far less responsible by leaving enforcement outside of the bureaucracy.6 A new rule or regulation issued by a bureaucracy is subject to examination and

discussion in a European parliamentary system, and it may be altered by political action in the next election. In the United States, judges who are often not elected and have lifetime appointments make policy in a fragmented, highly specialised, and so opaque manner.

Many previously excluded groups, starting with African Americans, now have access and therefore influence thanks to the development of legal possibilities. Due to this, many on the progressive left have zealously defended the legal system and the ability to sue. However, it also came at a significant cost to the quality of public policy. Kagan uses the example of Oakland Harbor's dredging to demonstrate this. To prepare for the new, bigger classes of container ships that were then entering service, the Port of Oakland started making preparations to dredge the harbour in the 1970s. Numerous government organisations, including the Army Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Marine Fisheries Service, the EPA, and their Californian equivalents, had to approve the design. Each succeeding proposal for the disposal of harmful waste dredged from the harbour required longer delays and more money, and they were all subject to legal dispute. In response to these cases, the EPA retreated into a defensive crouch and did nothing. It took until 1994 for a complete proposal to be presented, at a total cost that was several times more than anticipated. The U.S. government engages in a wide variety of operations, and there are several instances like this. Many of the difficulties the Forest Service had as previously outlined might be linked to the possibility of judicial review of its decisions. Due to risks to the spotted owl under the Endangered Species Act, this had the effect of practically halting all logging on areas it and the Bureau of Land Management administered in the Pacific Northwest during the early 1990s.

The courts have changed from being systems through which the reach of government was restricted to ones through which it has been greatly enlarged when utilised as an enforcement tool. For instance, from the middle of the 1970s, special education programmes for children with disabilities and disabilities have multiplied in size and expense as a result of a broad mandate passed by Congress in 1974. The foundation for this requirement was prior federal district court determinations that children with special needs have "rights," which are considerably more difficult than ordinary interests to trade off against other people items or to be evaluated based on cost-benefit factors. Additionally, Congress left the interpretation and execution of the requirement to the courts, who are egregiously unsuited to working under financial limits or weighing complicated political trade-offs. As a consequence, school districts around the nation are allocating more limited education funds to special education.

The simple elimination of regulation and the closure of agencies, as urged by many American conservatives and libertarians, may not be the best answer to this issue. The goals that the government pursues, such as the control of hazardous wastes or environmental preservation, are significant goals that the free sector would not pursue on its own. Conservatives often miss the fact that the American system adopts a court-based approach to regulation that is significantly less effective than that of democracies with stronger executive branches because of the very mistrust of the government [9], [10]. Progressives and liberals in America, however, also participated in the development of this system. They were equally wary of bureaucracies that had led to the South's segregated education systems or that had been swayed by powerful corporate interests, and when politicians failed to provide enough backing, they were glad to bring in unelected judges. The second remarkable aspect of the American political system, its openness to the influence of interest groups, thus fits well with this decentralised, legalistic style to administration. Interest groups are able to influence laws by directly suing the government via the legal system. The U.S. Congress, however, is a

different, much more potent route that has considerable more authority and access to resources.

CONCLUSION

For evaluating the balance of power, the standard of democracy, and the efficiency of government, it is essential to comprehend the dynamics of a State of Courts and Parties. It necessitates a thorough investigation of judicial independence, the influence of political parties on the development of legal institutions, and the likelihood of partisan prejudice or conflicts of interest within the judicial system. In such a state, strengthening judicial independence, maintaining openness in judicial nominations, and establishing procedures for accountability and monitoring are common ways to improve the rule of law and democratic institutions. The political climate depicted in "A State of Courts and Parties" is one in which the judiciary and political parties have great influence over governance and decision-making. Maintaining the integrity of the legal system, safeguarding democratic norms, and fostering effective and transparent government all depend on balancing the power of courts and parties.

REFERENCES

[1]   S. Suparto and A. Admiral, 'The Existence of Party Court in Completing the Internal Disputes of Political Parties in Indonesia (A Case Study of Persatuan Pembangunan Party)', *J. Din. Huk.*, 2019, doi: 10.20884/1.jdh.2019.19.1.2497.

[2]   M. V. R. Wangge, A. A. S. L. Dewi, and N. M. S. Karma, 'Intervensi dalam Pemeriksaan Sengketa Tata Usaha Negara', *J. Prefer. Huk.*, 2021, doi: 10.22225/jph.2.2.3325.300-305.

[3]   M. R. Darajati, H. Adolf, and I. Idris, 'Putusan Sengketa Laut China Selatan Serta Implikasi Hukumnya Terhadap Negara Di Sekitar Kawasan Tersebut', *J. Huk. Pembang.*, 2018, doi: 10.21143/.vol48.no1.1594.

[4]   A. Imseis, 'State of Exception', *J. Int. Crim. Justice*, 2020, doi: 10.1093/jicj/mqaa049.

[5]   L. Anderlini, L. Felli, and A. Postlewaite, 'Should courts always enforce what contracting parties write?', *Rev. Law Econ.*, 2011, doi: 10.2202/1555-5879.1492.

[6]   R. H. . Limbong, I. G. B. Suryawan, and I. N. Sutama, 'Mekanisme Pembubaran Partai Politik di Indonesia', *J. Prefer. Huk.*, 2020, doi: 10.22225/jph.1.1.2165.239-242.

[7]   A. Kane, 'Breaking Down the State: Protestors Engaged', *Contemp. Sociol. A J. Rev.*, 2017, doi: 10.1177/00943061176925573l.

[8]   D. J. Birkett, 'Twenty Years of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court: Appraising the State of National Implementing Legislation in Asia', *Chinese J. Int. Law*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/chinesejil/jmz014.

[9]   M. Hanifah, 'Perbandingan Tugas Mediator Pada Pengadilan Agama Indonesia Dengan Mahkamah Syariah Malaysia', *ADHAPER J. Huk. Acara Perdata*, 2021, doi: 10.36913/jhaper.v6i2.134.

[10]   W. A. Schabas, 'The International Criminal Court and Non-Party States', *Wind. Yearb. Access to Justice*, 2010, doi: 10.22329/wyaj.v28i1.4488.

CHAPTER 3

RETRIBUTIONALIZATION OF AMERICAN POLITICS AND CONGRESS

Dr Gopalakrishnan Chinnasamy, Associate Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.gopalakrishnan_c@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The term "retributionalization of American politics and Congress" refers to a tendency in which the emphasis in political discourse and legislative procedures is shifting from collaboration and compromise to vengeance and punishment. This abstract examines the salient features and ramifications of the rising retaliatory tendency in American politics, especially as it relates to the U.S. Congress. Due to growing partisanship, paralysis, and a loss of decorum in Congress, the retributionalization of American politics has been clear in recent years. Legislators often give priority to punitive actions against political rivals rather than finding consensus and implementing policies that are advantageous to the whole country. This change may be seen in strategies like opposing nominees, obstructing legislation, and pursuing investigations and impeachment processes for vengeance rather than for the sake of the public. It is essential for the health of democracy and efficient administration to recognize and combat the retributionalization of American politics. It calls for initiatives to promote institutional changes that build bipartisan cooperation among parliamentarians, cultivate a culture of respect, empathy, and cooperation among them, and emphasize the shared duties and obligations of public service. Furthermore, improving political institutions like Congress via greater accountability, openness, and ethical standards might help lessen the harmful effects of retribution politics. How interest groups impact the quality of public policy; whether interest groups are beneficial or harmful for democracy; how interest groups have replaced the clientelism of the nineteenth century; and the repatriation of the American state.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Interest, Retributionalization, Politics, Political, Public.

INTRODUCTION

American politics during the most of the nineteenth century were utterly clientelist. Politicians encouraged people to cast ballots by promising them specific rewards, sometimes in the form of token favors or outright cash payments, but most often via offers of employment in federal, state, and local government agencies. It had significant spillover effects on official corruption, as political bosses and members of Congress would take use of the resources, they controlled to enrich themselves. Due to the civil service reform effort both historical types of clientelism and corruption were largely put a stop, and it is reasonable to state that neither pose the biggest danger to the American democratic system today [1]. Despite the fact that each new administration appoints more than 4,000 political officials to the federal government far more than in any other advanced democracy political parties are no longer in the business of giving their devoted followers access to a wide range of low-level positions in the federal government. Of course, there have been terrible instances of plain personal corruption, such as those that resulted in the convictions of Illinois governor

Rod Blagojevich in 2011 and California congressman Randy "Duke" Cunningham in 2006 [2]. However, there are many and stringent regulations against this kind of corruption, to the point that adherence to the broad disclosure and conflict of interest policies of the government has turned many talented individuals away from serving.

Relationship Altruism

Sadly, the practice of exchanging political power for cash has returned in strong force in American politics, this time in a form that is completely legal and far more difficult to remove. American law specifically defines a transaction in which a politician and a private party clearly agree upon a particular quid pro quo exchange as criminalized bribery. What anthropologists could refer to as a gift exchange or what biologists refer to as reciprocal altruism is not protected by the law. In contrast to an impersonal market transaction, in a relationship of reciprocal altruism one person bestows a benefit on another without explicitly expecting that it would instantly buy a return favor. In fact, the receiver is likely to feel upset and reject what is presented if someone offers them something and then asks something in return. In a gift exchange, the recipient develops a moral commitment to the other person and is compelled to repay the favors at a later date or location. The American lobbying business is based on the exchange of favors, which is not prohibited by the law, merely commercial transactions [3].

I previously claimed that the two naturally occurring forms of human sociability are kin selection and reciprocal altruism. They are genetically ingrained in our emotions and minds rather than taught behaviors. In every culture, a person who receives a gift from another community member will feel morally obligated to return the favors. Early states were said to be patrimonial because the king utilized his family, home, and friends as personal property. He often staffed his government with the warriors who had first assisted him in conquest. These organic sociability modes served as the foundation for such nations. To combat the propensity to favour family and friends, modern governments enact stringent laws and provide incentives. These consist of merit-based requirements, conflict-of-interest guidelines, civil service exams, and anti-corruption legislation. However, the force of natural sociability is so powerful that it continues coming back, much like the typical robber who tries the back door, windows, and crawl space in the basement after being stopped by a closed front door [4].

In much the same way as the Chinese state during the Later Han Dynasty, the Mamluk regime during the century before its defeat by the Ottomans, or the French state during the Old Regime, it seems fair to say that the American state has been renationalized in the latter half of the twentieth century. Although it is fascinating to observe how strong the drive to build political dynasties is, with all of the Kennedys, Bushes, Clintons, and others, the laws now against overt nepotism are still strong enough to keep this from becoming a frequent political transaction in American politics [5].

On the other hand, reciprocal altruism is pervasive in Washington, D.C., and it is the main method through which interest groups have been successful in influencing politics. According to legal expert Lawrence Lessig, interest organizations may legally influence members of Congress by making gifts and requesting a vague amount in exchange favours. Sometimes a member of Congress is the one to start the gift-exchange process, favoring an interest group in the hope of later receiving campaign donations in return. Frequently, no money is exchanged. Congressman will hear presentations on why the banking sector does not need to be regulated at a conference on, say, derivatives regulation in a posh resort without hearing convincing counterarguments. Since the politician will only have good associations with the

interest group's viewpoint, rather than being captured by money (although there is enough of that to go around), this time the capture will be intellectual [6].

The growth of interest groups and lobbying in Washington has been astounding. In 1971, there were 175 registered lobbying companies; 10 years later, there were 2,500. By 2013, there were more than 12,000 registered lobbyists, who had spent more than $3.2 billion. The tax system is only one of many places where this conduct has distorted consequences on American public policy. The least inefficient forms of taxation are those that are straightforward, uniform, and predictable so that firms can plan and make investments around them. Economists believe that all taxes have the potential to reduce the capacity of markets to allocate resources effectively. The precise reverse is true with the American tax law. Although American firms' nominal corporate tax rates are far higher than those of other industrialized nations, virtually few of them actually pay taxes at that level because they have secured unique exemptions and perks for themselves [7].

DISCUSSION

Despite how improbable it may seem considering the amounts freely spent in the process, some political scientists have suggested that all of this money and energy has not led to demonstrable changes in policy along the lines sought by the lobbyists. Interest groups and lobbyists often work to avert results that are unfavorable to them but in the best interests of the public rather than to promote new policies. In other instances, they significantly worsen the effects of current law. Comparing the American legislative process to that of other nations with parliamentary systems and organized parties, it has always been significantly more disorganized. The plethora of congressional committees with overlapping jurisdiction frequently results in multiple and conflicting mandates for action, such as the 1990 National Affordable Housing Act's "three separate proposals embodying radically different theories about the nature of the problem" or the plethora of mandated ways to enforce the Clean Air Act. This decentralized legislative process results in incoherent laws and essentially promotes participation from interest groups, even if they lack the influence to affect overall legislation but are still able to safeguard their own interests.

For instance, throughout the legislative process, Barack Obama's Affordable Care Act from 2010 became something of a monster due to all the concessions and side payments that had to be given to interest groups, such as physicians, insurance providers, and the pharmaceutical sector. Few members of Congress were able to read the whole nine-hundred-page measure in its entirety. Interest groups have successfully stopped legislation that would have hurt their interests in other instances. A law that set a strict limit on the size of financial institutions or drastically increased capital requirements would have had a similar impact as a response to the financial crisis of 2008–2009 and the wildly unpopular taxpayer bailouts of large banks. Such restrictions would prevent banks from recklessly taking risks from going bankrupt and requiring a government rescue. A legislation like this might have been prepared on a few pages of paper, much like the Glass-Steagall Act of the Great Depression.

However, this prospect was not given any thought by Congress when discussing financial regulation. Instead, the Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, often known as the Dodd-Frank Act, was created. While it was better than having no regulation at all, it still required hundreds of pages of law and demanded reams of additional intricate regulations that would cost consumers and banks a lot of money in the future. Instead of just regulating bank size, it establishes a Financial Stability Oversight Council with the massive responsibility of evaluating and managing firms seen to represent systemic risks. However, this does not ultimately address the issue of banks being too large to fail. It defies belief that

the banking industry's legions of lobbyists did not have a significant impact in preventing the simpler solution of simply breaking up the big banks or subjecting them to strict capital requirements. Even though no one will ever find a smoking gun linking bank campaign contributions to the votes of specific congressmen.

Affairs and Passions

The general public in America expresses broad disgust with interest organisations and their influence over Congress. Both Tea Party Republicans on the right and liberal Democrats on the left feel that special interests are wielding undue political influence and feathering their own nests. This belief that the democratic process has been corrupted or hijacked is not confined to either end of the political spectrum. Because of this, confidence in Congress is now at historically low levels, rarely rising beyond the double digits [8].

In The Rise and Decline of Nations, economist Mancur Olson presented one of the most well-known claims on the detrimental impacts of interest group politics on economic development and, ultimately, democracy. Olson maintained that democracies tended to amass ever-increasing numbers of interest groups during periods of peace and stability, focusing in particular on the long-term economic downfall of Britain over the twentieth century. Instead than engaging in wealth-generating economic activity, these groups used the political system to gain advantages or rents for themselves. These rentals cost the general public money and were ultimately fruitless. However, the general people had a difficulty with collective action or was unable to organise as well to safeguard their interests as, for instance, the banking sector and maize growers. Over time, energy was steadily diverted towards rent-seeking activities as a consequence, and only a significant shock such as war or revolution could stop the trend.

However, a far more uplifting narrative about the advantages of civil society, or volunteer organisations, to the health of democracy, contrasts sharply with this narrative's extremely negative portrayal of interest groups. In Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville remarked that Americans had a high inclination for forming private clubs. He said that these associations served as "schools for democracy" since they helped private persons learn how to band together for public goals. Individuals were helpless when acting alone; they could only withstand tyrannical rule by banding together with others for shared goals. Scholars like Robert Putnam have continued this line of thought, contending that the same tendency to organise that he terms "social capital" is beneficial to democracy and that it became threatened in the latter part of the 20th century.

James Madison, another founding father, likewise had a generally positive opinion of interest organisations. He reasoned that even if one disagreed with the goals that a specific group was pursuing, the variety of such groups over a big country would be enough to prevent any one group from gaining dominance. According to political scientist Theodore Lowi, "pluralist" political theory in the middle of the 20th century agreed with Madison that the clamour of interest groups would work together to produce a public interest, just as competition in a free market would result in individuals pursuing their specific self-interests to the benefit of the public. Since there was no higher authority that could identify a "public interest" rising above the specific interests of interest groups, there was no justification for the government to oversee this process. In Buckley v. Valeo and Citizens United, the Supreme Court effectively upheld the positive meaning of what Lowi called "interest group liberalism."

The most straightforward method is to attempt to differentiate between "good" civil society organisations and "bad" interest groups. The former could be a nonprofit group like a church group looking to build homes for the poor, or a lobbying organisation promoting a policy it

believes to be in the public interest, like protecting coastal habitats. The former could be said to be driven by what Albert Hirschman called the passions, while the latter by the interests. An example of an interest group is a lobbying firm for the banking sector or the cigarette industry, whose only goal is to increase the profits of the businesses that fund it. Robert Putnam made an effort to distinguish between "membership organisations" that just required a membership fee and tiny groups that encouraged active engagement by its members.

Unfortunately, theoretical examination does not support this differentiation. A organisation may claim to be operating in the public interest, but it does not guarantee that it is. Because it is stronger at public relations, a medical advocacy organisation that wants more money to be spent fighting a specific condition could actually skew public priorities by diverting money from more common and harmful diseases. A group of people's demands are not invalidated or denied the right to be represented in politics just because they are motivated by self-interest. An industry and its employees have a right to inform Congress if a poorly thought-out rule would substantially harm their interests. Indeed, some of the most significant sources of knowledge on the effects of governmental action are often lobbyists. As the Oakland Harbour dredging case demonstrates, environmentalists who claim to speak for the general people are not always correct on the trade-offs between sustainability, profitability, and employment in the protracted conflicts between environmental groups and companies.

Distorted representation is the main objection against the plurality of interest groups. In The Semisovereign People, E. E. Schattschneider contended that democracy in America did not really operate in accordance with the common notion that it was a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." He pointed out that actual choices are made by far smaller groups of organised interests, that involvement in politics is very low, and that political results seldom reflect broad preferences. Mancur Olson makes a similar point in his framework, noting that not all organisations are equally capable of banding together for collective action. In fact, The Logic of Collective Action, one of his earlier works, demonstrated why it is harder to organise big organisations than small ones since big groupings that benefit all of their members attract free riding. In a democracy, the entire population of citizens or at least significant majorities within them may share a long-term interest in something, such as a budget that is fiscally responsible, but an individual American may feel this interest much less strongly than an interest group that would lose its subsidy or tax break as a result of a budget consolidation. Therefore, the interest groups that compete for Congress's attention do not represent all Americans as a whole. They are a good representation of the most well-run and oftentimes the same thing wealthy sections of American society. This prejudice is not arbitrary; rather, it tends to be detrimental to the interests of the unorganised, who are often uneducated, underprivileged, or otherwise marginalised.

Morris Fiorina has shown compelling evidence that the American "political class" is far more divided than the general populace. He presents a wide range of data demonstrating that majorities of the American public support compromise positions on a number of supposedly divisive issues, such as the use of federal funding to support stem cell research on surplus embryos in fertility clinics. Other supposedly divisive issues include abortion, deficits, school prayer, and gay marriage. Whether on the left or the right, party activists are almost always more ideological and hold more radical views than regular party supporters. However, the majority who accept middle-of-the-road policies lack enthusiasm for them and are mostly disorganised. This implies that organised activists, whether in the media, lobbying and interest groups, parties and Congress, define politics. The combination of various activist organisations results in political polarisation and impasse rather than a compromise stance.

Unrepresentative interest groups are not only products of the Right and corporate America. Trade unions have historically been among the most influential groups in democratic nations, followed by environmental organisations, women's groups, LGBT rights activists, organisations for the elderly, the handicapped, indigenous peoples, and almost every other sphere of society. There appears to be an advocacy group fighting for more funding and attention for every illness or medical condition in modern America. According to pluralist philosophy, the overall conflict between all of these groups represents a democratic public interest. However, one may argue that they impair the potential for representative democracy to convey a real public interest because of their inherent overrepresentation of certain interests.

Interest Groups and Government Quality

When interest groups convince Congress to give agencies complicated, sometimes conflicting mandates, they erode bureaucratic autonomy because the agencies' capacity to exercise independent judgement or reach rational choices is severely limited. This has several examples. Congress requires a burdensome set of guidelines known as the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) on all government procurement agencies despite its desire for the federal government to buy products and services inexpensively and effectively. Government buying is minutely procedural and subject to an unlimited right of appeal, in contrast to private sector procurement. Individual members of Congress often take active action to ensure that procurement decisions are made in ways that favour their own constituency. This is especially true for the expensive equipment the Pentagon purchases and distributes to fortunate members of Congress as virtual employment programmes. Congress and the public complain about "waste, fraud, and abuse" in procurement, but imposing even more stringent regulations to address the issue would simply increase the cost of procurement and lower its quality.

Interest groups and the pluralist perspective, which reduces the public interest to the accumulation of private interests of individuals, have another issue: they weaken the potential of debate and the way that communication and conversation change individual choices. Citizens talked openly to one another about the shared interests of their society in both the traditional Athenian democracy and the New England town hall gatherings that Tocqueville praised. It is easy to romanticise these small-scale democratic examples or downplay the true disparities that occur in complex society. However, as any focus group facilitator will tell you, if participants are given a common understanding and clear ground rules that enforce civility, their opinions on contentious issues like immigration, abortion, and drugs can change after just 30 minutes of face-to-face discussion. If pushed to explicitly address such alternative requirements, few single-issue supporters would ever argue that their cause will take precedence over all other good things. Therefore, one of the issues with pluralist theory is the presumption that interests are unchangeable and that the legislator's role is to only serve as a conduit for them rather than to have personal opinions that may be formed via discourse.

It's a well-known fact that hardly one in Congress now deliberates. The "debate" in Congress is really just a succession of talking points delivered one after another to activist audiences who are delighted to retaliate against lawmakers who veer from their agenda as a consequence of consideration or new information. Deliberation takes place a lot in bureaucracy as well as legislatures in well-functioning governance systems. This involves a complex series of consultations between government representatives and businesses, outside implementers and service providers, civil society organisations, the media, and other sources of information about societal interests and opinions. It is not just a matter of bureaucrats talking to each other.19 In the historic Administrative Procedure Act of 1946, which

compelled regulatory agencies to publish proposed rule changes publicly and invite notice and opinion, Congress mandated consultation. However, these consultative processes often turn into highly formalised, pro forma processes, with real outcomes emerging from political conflicts between well-organized interest groups rather than internal discourse.

Decay in Politics

The rule of law provides fundamental protection for people against an oppressive government. However, in the latter part of the 20th century, legislation shifted from serving as a check on government to serving as a tool for expanding it. In the process, duties that a bureaucracy might have effectively and transparently performed were transferred to a combination of courts, executive agencies, and private citizens. The United States has ended up with a government that is similarly enormous but really less responsible since it is in the hands of the judiciary because of fear of strengthening "big government."

Similar to this, lawmakers are expected to work to ensure that policies reflect public aims in their capacity as representatives of the will of the people. However, strong interest groups that combined do not accurately reflect the American population have made political parties their pawns. These organisations have enough sway to prevent rational public policy on everything from bank regulation to agriculture subsidies. They have made any kind of impersonal governmental administration difficult and converted the tax system into a perplexing maze of privileges.

During the Progressive Era and the New Deal, the United States attempted to create a contemporary, Weberian state. It was a success in many ways, as shown by the fact that the Food and Drug Administration, the Centres for Disease Control, the armed forces, and the Federal Reserve are some of the most technologically advanced, efficiently managed, and independent governmental organisations in the whole world. But precisely because of the nation's continued dependence on courts and parties at the cost of state administration, the general quality of American public administration continues to be exceedingly poor.

Intellectual rigidity has anything to do with the decay phenomena. Other democracies may not share the belief that lawyers and litigation should play such a significant role in public administration, but in the United States, this perspective has grown so ingrained that no one sees any other options. In actuality, this is more of a political tradition that both the Left and the Right share than it is an intellectual one. Similar to the last example, few people starting with Supreme Court justices see that there is even a problem with the power of interest groups in Congress, and no one sees a practical method to reduce their influence [9], [10].

Intellectual rigidity and the sway of elite groups are the fundamental causes of political deterioration in all democracies. Indeed, whether they are democratic or not, these are issues that all governments confront. Other established democracies have the issues with excessive judicialization and interest groups that have been highlighted here. However, the unique characteristics of institutions have a significant influence on the impact of interest groups. Democracies arrange political actors' incentives quite differently, which makes their governments more or less sensitive to these influences. The issue of political deterioration affects the United States more severely than other democratic political systems, I shall argue in the next chapter, despite being the first and most developed liberal democracy in the world. An uneven form of governance has resulted from the long-standing mistrust of the state that has traditionally characterised American politics, undermining the chances for vital collective action.

CONCLUSION

The retributionalization of politics and Congress has far-reaching effects. It impairs legislators' capacity to participate in fruitful discussion, reach reasonable agreements, and successfully solve the problems confronting the country. The emphasis on retaliation hinders the effectiveness of the legislative process, maintains party differences, and undermines public confidence in the democratic system. Additionally, it fosters a hostile and poisonous political atmosphere that deters people from running for public office and prevents the hiring of skilled and talented leaders. In conclusion, there is a worrying tendency in American politics and Congress that favours retaliation and punishment above collaboration and compromise. For politicians to once again be able to govern and serve the interests of the American people, they must acknowledge and deal with this phenomenon. It is feasible to establish a better political climate and improve Congress' performance through encouraging bipartisan cooperation, fostering a culture of mutual respect, and improving democratic institutions.

REFERENCES:

[1]   K. Schake and M. Robinson, 'Assessing Civil-Military Relations and the January 6th Capitol Insurrection', *Orbis*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.orbis.2021.06.013.

[2]   R. S. Ross and M. P. Fiorina, 'Congress: Keystone of the Washington Establishment', *West. Polit. Q.*, 1977, doi: 10.2307/447661.

[3]   R. Truex, 'The returns to office in a rubber stamp parliament', *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2014, doi: 10.1017/S0003055414000112.

[4]   N. Kalaf-Hughes and R. W. Mills, 'Working Together: An Empirical Analysis of a Multiclass Legislative-Executive Branch Simulation', *J. Polit. Sci. Educ.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/15512169.2015.1111801.

[5]   D. L. Kriner, ' The Contemporary Presidency Obama's Authorization Paradox: Syria and Congress's Continued Relevance in Military Affairs ', *Pres. Stud. Q.*, 2014, doi: 10.1111/psq.12115.

[6]   A. J. Clarke, 'Congressional capacity and the abolition of legislative service organizations', *J. Public Policy*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/S0143814X1800034X.

[7]   P. John, 'Frank R. Baumgartner and Bryan D. Jones, Agendas and Instability in American Politics', *The Oxford Handbook of Classics in Public Policy and Administration*. 2015.

[8]   C. Gay, 'The effect of black congressional representation on political participation', *Am. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2001, doi: 10.1017/S0003055401003021.

[9]   A. Coen, 'Securitization, normalization, and representations of islam in senate discourse', *Politics and Religion*. 2017. doi: 10.1017/S1755048316000808.

[10]   B. Canes-Wrone, ' Veto Bargaining: Presidents and the Politics of Negative Power . Charles Cameron ', *J. Polit.*, 2001, doi: 10.1086/jop.63.4.2691840.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF VETOCRACY IN INCLUSIVE STATES

Dr. Madhavi.R, Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: r.madhavi@jainuniversity.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In America, the term "vetocracy" describes a scenario in which the excessive use of veto power and other obstructionist strategies by different political players results in the obstruction or paralysis of political decision-making and policy execution. This abstract examines the sources, effects, and possible solutions of the vetocracy's influence on political degradation in the United States. The widespread use of vetoes, filibusters, and other obstructive practises at different levels of government in America has given rise to a vetocracy in recent years. Deepening party division, the power of special interest organizations, and institutional elements that allow for obstruction, such as gerrymandering or supermajority requirements, all contribute to this issue. As a consequence, the processes of governance and policymaking are often impeded, leaving important problems unsolved and eroding public faith in the democratic system. The effects of the vetocracy go beyond simple political inaction. It may result in a lack of reaction to urgent social concerns, obstruct the effective execution of policies, and fuel public discontent and disengagement. The vetocracy also challenges the legitimacy of democratic institutions by reinforcing the idea that partisan politics and entrenched interests come before the needs of the general public. How the American system of checks and balances has devolved into a vetocracy; how other democracies have more effective means of enforcing group choices; how substantial power is still handed to the executive in certain circumstances; how the European Union is imitating the United States.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Democracy, Parliamentary, Systems, Vetocracy.

INTRODUCTION

The intricate system of checks and balances in the American Constitution, which was purposefully created by the Founders to limit the authority of the state, safeguards individual liberty. The American government emerged as a reaction to British monarchical rule and relied on even earlier sources of opposition to the king during the English Civil War. Since then, the politics of the United States have been characterized by a deep mistrust of the federal government and a dependence on the impromptu actions of scattered people. There are several ways that the American constitutional structure limits authority. The American presidential system divides power between an elected president and a Congress that have equal democratic legitimacy and whose survival is independent of one another, in contrast to a parliamentary system, in which a unified executive that is, an executive centralized under a single authority carries out the wishes of legislative majorities.

The Constitution also creates a judicial branch, which over time came to have the authority to void congressional laws. It also gives the states more power, however the states, who were the original power holders, only slowly and reluctantly ceded power to the federal

government over the period of the 200 years that followed the Constitution's adoption. The upper house of Congress, which is split into two chambers, was once intended to be a stronghold of governmental authority. In many democratic systems, such as the British one, the upper house only has mostly ceremonial jurisdiction; in the US, however, it is quite powerful and has particular authority, including the ability to declare war and peace and approve presidential nominations. There are various regulatory commissions in the United States that are governed by commissioners chosen by the political parties in Congress, which means that the executive branch itself does not always answer to the president [1].

Powers in America, according to Huntington, are not so much functionally separated as they are copied throughout the branches, which often results in usurpations of one branch by another and disputes over which branch should have the upper hand. Recent instances of this include congressional control over national security policy and judicial sway over social issues like abortion. American federalism sometimes replicates powers at several levels of government rather than clearly transferring them to the proper one, giving federal, state, and municipal authorities authority over, for instance, the disposal of hazardous waste. A redundant and nonhierarchical arrangement of authority makes it simple for various branches of the government to obstruct one another [2].

Polarization

The unsustainable nature of modern democracies' welfare-state promises is one of the biggest issues they face. Generations ago, when birth rates were greater, lifespans were shorter, and economic development was stronger, the social contracts that underpin modern welfare states were signed. All contemporary democracies have been able to continue deferring this issue due to the availability of financing, but eventually the underlying demographic realities will take hold. These issues can be resolved. Coming out of World War II, both the United States and Britain had larger debt-to-GDP ratios than they have now.1 During the 1990s, the huge welfare states of Sweden, Finland, and other Scandinavian nations were in difficulty, but they were able to modify their tax and expenditure rates. Even before the massive resource boom of the 2000s, Australia was able to pay off practically all of its foreign debt [3].

Early in the twenty-first century, the American political system was unable to address this problem. The two major political parties, which have seen an increase in ideological polarisation from the late eighteenth century, are the root cause of this failure. Since the 1960s, there has been a significant regional sorting of the parties, with almost the whole South switching from the Democratic to the Republican Party, and Republicans practically becoming extinct in the Northeast. The two parties have been more equally balanced since the fall of the New Deal coalition and the end of the Democrats' monopoly in Congress in the 1980s, and they have often switched power of the president and the two chambers of Congress. This greater level of political rivalry has spurred a fundraising arms race between the parties and damaged their ability to get along personally. As was said in the preceding chapter, social scientists dispute on the extent to which this polarization is ingrained in American culture. But it is certain that the political parties and activist movements that are behind their actions have organized themselves into far more strict and ideologically unified organizations. Because they have power over redistricting in the majority of states, they may gerrymander voting districts to boost their chances of winning reelection, which has enhanced their homogeneity. The development of primaries has given the very small number of activists who participate in these polls the power to choose the party candidates [4].

However, polarization is not the end of the tale. Democratic political systems are intended to reduce conflict by peaceful means and agreed-upon laws, not to abolish it. America has long

been split on a range of topics, including abortion, slavery, and gun regulation. An effective political system reduces underlying polarizations and promotes the formation of political results that reflect the interests of the greatest number of people. However, the impact of polarization on America's Madisonian check-and-balance democratic system is especially severe [5].

Reject Players

Every member of the political community should have an equal chance to participate in a democracy. Democratic choices should be made by consensus, which requires unanimity among all community members. Families, as well as communities at the band and tribal levels, often follow this pattern. However, as organizations get larger and more varied, the effectiveness of consensus decision making gradually deteriorates. As a result, most organizations make choices based on the agreement of a small fraction of the whole group rather than a majority vote. The decision-making process is simplified and made more effectively the lower the proportion of the group required to make the choice. the trade-off between the number of votes needed and the time and effort necessary for decision-making. Decision costs increased tremendously if one requires unanimity across large groups, as anybody who has presided over a meeting of a club or committee is aware of. By having the potential to disenfranchise almost half of the people, decisions made under the majority voting rule (50 percent plus one), which is often utilised in democratic nations, diverge greatly from the ideal democratic process. In fact, choices made on behalf of the whole community under plurality voting also known as first-past-the-post can be made by a small minority of voters [6].

It is clear that procedures like majority voting are used more as a convenience to lower decision costs and enable vast groups to reach some form of choice than on the basis of any fundamental notion of fairness. Other methods are imposed in democracies to compel choices and reduce the number of individuals who may exercise veto power. These include "reversionary" rules, which are used in the event that the legislature cannot agree on crucial issues like budgets, rules that limit members' capacity to submit amendments, and closure rules that permit the cutting off of discussion. If the Diet couldn't come to an agreement on a new budget under the Meiji Constitution, the budget from the previous year was automatically approved. Failure to approve a budget resulted in the president and executive regaining control of the budget under the reversionary procedures used in Chile and other Latin American nations.

Other policies are designed to maintain stability, which they accomplish at the cost of the rights of minorities. Because the Weimar Republic's democracy had flaws, the postwar German Federal Republic established rules for what is known as a "positive" vote of no confidence. Under these rules, a party cannot overthrow a coalition government (i.e., exercise a veto) unless it can form a substitute government. One of the best mechanisms for forcing legislative decisions ever created has evolved in parliamentary systems: if there is impasse or significant disagreement over a particular issue, the government can dissolve parliament and call for new elections, allowing a democratic electorate to directly address the issue at hand [7].

DISCUSSION

The phrase "veto players" was created by political scientist George Tsembelis to compare various political systems. All institutional regulations that provide authority to various political actors inside the system are potential veto points where a single veto player might prevent the whole body from taking action. While operationally distinct from one another,

almost every aspect of a constitution presidentialism, bicameralism, federalism, and judicial review can be seen as a possible veto point in the process of obtaining a consensus. The power of minority to thwart the will of majorities is also affected by a number of other constitutional provisions, such as the legislative procedures for proposing changes. Simply put, a "veto player" is political science jargon for what Americans have historically referred to as checks and balances [8]. It is feasible to arrange many political systems on a linear scale using the idea of veto players, ranging from an absolute dictatorship, in which there is only one veto player (the dictator), to a consensus system, in which each citizen has the power to reject a decision made by the group as a whole. The reason democratic political systems are democratic is because they provide system participants much greater veto power than do authoritarian regimes. However, there are significant variations in the number of veto players allowed across democracies. The Buchanan-Tullock curve, except instead of the proportion of the electorate required to make choices, the horizontal axis shows the number of veto players who can prevent them.

The American political system differs from other modern democracies in the sheer number of veto players. It is now out of balance and has too many checks and balances in certain areas, which drives up the cost of collective action and sometimes renders it completely impractical. One may call it a vetocracy because of the way it operates. This system was used to restrain the majority's desires and make it more attentive to minority than it could have been in past times of American history when one or the other party predominated. However, it has turned into a recipe for impasse in the more balanced, fiercely competitive party system that has emerged since the 1980s. Comparing the American system to that of another long-standing democracy, Britain, reveals how many veto players there are in America. Because it generates a considerably smaller number of veto players when used in its purest form, the Westminster system, which developed in the years after the Glorious Revolution, is one of the most decisive in the democratic world. The power of British voters to formally and often elect Parliament serves as the main check on the government. (A free media that is not a part of the official political system is another crucial check.) But in every other way, the system concentrates power instead of dispersing it. In a pure Westminster system, there is just one all-powerful legislative chamber, no separate executive branch, no written constitution, which precludes judicial scrutiny, no federalism, and no legally required devolution of authority to communities. Its plurality, or first-past-the-post, voting method often results in a two-party system and substantial parliamentary majorities, even when the dominant party only receives a majority of the vote.8 Party discipline is essential to the operation of this system; by preventing rebellious MPs from standing for office in the subsequent election, the leadership of the Conservative or Labour Party may compel its members of Parliament to vote in accordance with their views. American-style filibustering is not permitted under the British counterpart of the closure rule, which merely requires a simple majority of the present MPs to compel a vote. A government with broad executive powers is then selected by the parliamentary majority; when it takes a legislative decision, it is often unaffected by courts, states, municipalities, or other entities. Because of this, the British system is sometimes referred to as a "democratic dictatorship [9]."

It makes sense that governments under the Westminster system have greater formal authority than those in the United States. The budgeting process is a good example of this increased degree of decisiveness. National budgets are created at Britain's Whitehall, the bureaucracy's headquarters, where professional civil servants work under the direction of the government and prime minister. The House of Commons then votes to approve the budget in a single up-or-down vote after being presented with it by the chancellor of the exchequer, which is the

British counterpart of the U.S. treasury secretary. This often occurs within a week or two following the government's promulgation.

The procedure is very different in the US. According to the Constitution, Congress has primary control over the budget. The executive branch Office of Management and Budget, through which presidents create budgets, often takes on the role of another lobbying group in favour of the president's views. The budget, which was presented to Congress in February, passes through a convoluted network of committees over several months, and what, hopefully, makes it to the two houses for ratification by the end of the summer is the result of countless deals made with individual members to win their support. In order to provide Congress more technical assistance in developing budgets, the impartial Congressional Budget Office was founded in 1974; yet, in contrast to the British system, the creation of an American budget is ultimately a highly decentralised and nonstrategic process. The American budget process is transparent and never-ending, which provides lobbyists and interest groups with many chances to wield influence. Since the party discipline laws in most European parliamentary systems offer an individual MP little to no influence on the stance of the party leadership, it makes little sense for an interest group to persuade that MP. In contrast, committee chairmen and party leaders in the United States have significant influence on legislation, making them the subject of lobbying efforts.

Despite its concentrated authority, the Westminster system is nonetheless inherently democratic. It is democratic because people have the freedom to choose another government in the event they don't like the policies or the performance it generates. In fact, they may overthrow a prime minister right away with a vote of no confidence, rather than having to wait until the conclusion of a presidential term or legislature session. The capacity of governments to provide specific pork barrel advantages to certain interest groups or lobbyists is significantly less important when judging them than their overall performance.

Nowhere in the world, including Britain itself, which has steadily increased checks and balances, does the traditional Westminster system still exist. However, in terms of the number of veto players, Britain continues to be located well to the left of the United States on Figure 23's horizontal axis. Even while modern democracies may see the Westminster system as a bit of an extreme, most parliamentary systems in Europe and Asia provide their governments more effective means of imposing choices than the US does. The United States often coexists at the right end of Figure 23's horizontal axis with those Latin American nations that had comparable stalemate and politicised administration issues after replicating the United States' presidential system in the nineteenth century.

Budgeting is not the only area of American government where the proliferation of veto players consistently sets it apart from its democratic rivals. In a parliamentary system, the executive branch draughts a significant amount of legislation with significant technical assistance from the permanent civil service. Through the ministers who lead them, ministries are answerable to parliament and subsequently to voters, but this form of hierarchical organisation may adopt a longer-term strategic perspective and result in far more cohesive legislation. For instance, Sweden has a tiny civil service whose primary duty is to assist parliament in the preparation of laws; this service is distinct from the implementing organisations that carry out the actual service delivery.

A system like that is completely alien to American political tradition, where Congress zealously preserves its authority to pass laws. A team of professionals working in the executive branch under the direction of First Lady Hillary Clinton developed Bill Clinton's health care proposal out of the immediate public spotlight. This was a key factor in why it

abjectly failed to pass Congress in 1993. The only reason Barack Obama was able to enact the Affordable Care Act in 2010 was because he essentially gave up all control over the legislation's creation and left it up to various congressional committees.

An expansive, disorganised, and often unaccountable government is the result of the absence of legislative consistency. The several committees in Congress sometimes generate overlapping and redundant programmes or establish various entities with identical purposes. Additionally, American federalism causes a system that is already divided at the centre to become much more so. Our system of public administration and decision-making suffers from having too many levels of concurrent jurisdictional governance, according to legal professor Gerhard Casper. We enable two, three, or four levels of government to participate when one would laboriously create a regulatory labyrinth that is so complicated and internally inconsistent that it would need armies of handholding attorneys. several persons acting as private attorney generals with the authority to file private lawsuits have a voice in addition to the several government entities that are involved. When private parties are given enforcement powers over issues involving the public interest, government decision-making is further warped.

Under this method, the Pentagon is required to submit about 500 reports to Congress each year, more than one for each day of the year. These regulations take up a lot of bureaucratic time and effort since they often duplicate one other and never expire. In addition to eighty-two initiatives to improve teacher quality, Congress established fifty-one unique programmes for worker retraining. The New York Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Reserve Board, the Treasury Department, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the National Credit Union Administration, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Office of Thrift Supervision, the Federal Housing Finance Agency, and a host of state attorneys general who have expanded their mandates to take on the banking sector all share responsibility for financial sector regulation. Different legislative committees that oversee the federal agencies are hesitant to cede control to a more cogent and united regulator. When the financial sector was being deregulated in the late 1990s, it was simple for the banking industry to manipulate the system; however, it was much more difficult to rein it in after the crisis.

The Dangers of Presidency

Only a portion of the American political system is characterised by vetocracy. In other ways, Congress gives the executive branch broad authority, enabling it to act quickly and sometimes with very little oversight. Therefore, we must balance our assessment of the system's overall performance with an understanding of the circumstances in which it might respond forcefully and decisively. Numerous responsibilities are delegated to bureaucracy with significant levels of autonomy. The Federal Reserve Board, the military, the intelligence community, and specialised organisations like NASA and the Centres for Disease Control are among these.15 On the state and municipal levels, attorneys general or prosecutors have far greater latitude in deciding whether to file criminal charges against suspects and are free to negotiate plea deals than, say, their German counterparts. In terms of operational affairs, the military normally has a high degree of autonomy. And since September 11, 2001, the National Security Agency has been granted full permission to gather information not just on foreign operations but also on American residents, as the world has seen thanks to Edward Snowden's disclosures.

While many American libertarians and conservatives would prefer to completely abolish these agencies, it is difficult to see how one could effectively rule in the present day without

them. America's economy is huge, diversified, and complicated today. It is a part of a globalised, very fast-moving economy that requires a tremendous lot of skill to understand. Its external security is seriously threatened. The Federal Reserve and Treasury Department were forced to make enormous decisions practically overnight during the acute phase of the financial crisis that developed following the failure of Lehman Brothers in September 2008. These decisions involved flooding the market with trillions of dollars of liquidity, supporting specific banks, and enacting new regulations. Due in great part to the Treasury Department's and Bush administration's recommendations and the severity of the crisis, Congress approved an emergency allocation of $700 billion for the Troubled Asset Relief Programme. There has been a lot of after-the-fact questioning of certain choices made during this time. But it is absurd to think that any other department of government, particularly Congress, which is responsible for comprehensive scrutiny, could handle such a catastrophe. The same holds true for national security matters, where it is effectively up to the president to determine how to handle terrorist and nuclear threats that might endanger the lives of millions of Americans. For this reason, Alexander Hamilton emphasised the necessity for "energy in the executive" in Federalist No. 70.

There is a strong populist mistrust of elitist institutions, and there is a call for either their abolition (as in the case of the Federal Reserve) or the broadcasting of its internal discussions to the public and on television. Ironically, however, Americans who are surveyed express the greatest levels of support for the organisations that are least susceptible to direct democratic control, such as the CDC, NASA, and the military. They are revered in part because they genuinely accomplish their goals. The U.S. Congress, on the other hand, obtains appallingly low levels of approval as the institution most directly answerable to the people (see Figure 24). Most people think of Congress as a talking shop where only lobbying influence gets things done and politics thwarts common sense fixes.

The American political system therefore paints a complicated picture in which checks and balances unduly restrict majorities' ability to make decisions, as well as instances of excessive or potentially risky transfers of power to institutions with a poor track record of holding themselves responsible. A delegated authority as straightforward as prosecutorial discretion is vulnerable to misuse, especially when utilised by high-profile prosecutors in response to political pressure to crack down on crime. The NSA seems to operate in a similar manner.

These delegations are seldom done in a clean manner under the American system, which is a concern. Congress regularly falls short of its obligation to offer unambiguous legislative direction on how a certain agency is to carry out its duties, leaving it to the agency to create its own mandate. Congress thinks that by doing this, the courts will intervene to address abuses if things don't work out. This process was demonstrated in the case of the ICC, the first national regulator in the United States. The ICC was given a very ambiguous mandate regarding its authority over railroads, and for the first twenty years of its existence, it was the subject of legal disputes as various private parties contested its right to make decisions. The Dodd-Frank financial sector regulation bill's passage in the early twenty-first century is causing the same process to take place: Many of the specific restrictions were written by regulators on behalf of Congress, but they will unavoidably face legal challenges. Ironically, vetocracy and excessive delegating go hand in hand.

Many of these issues have their roots in the American presidential system. In a parliamentary system, the majority party or coalition directly controls the government. Members of parliament are appointed as ministers, and they have the power to oversee the bureaucracies they are in charge of. If coalitions are unstable and parties are too fractured, as has repeatedly

happened in Italy, parliamentary systems might be hindered. The transfer of power to an executive agency, however, occurs in a rather clear manner after a legislative majority has been created. Such simple delegations are more difficult to do under a presidential system, because the two branches often find themselves in conflict with one another. The issue caused by the initial division of powers cannot be solved by just bolstering one branch at the cost of the others.

At various points in its history, the United States has need presidential power, but it has always been wary about possible abuses of executive power. When there is a split government and a different party controls the president and one or both chambers of Congress, this is especially true. Congress must assign responsibility, but it does not want to relinquish power. Therefore, despite the fact that the Constitution expressly grants the executive branch authority over foreign policy and national defence, Congress continues to summon the secretaries of state and defence, impose strict regulations on things like embassy security, and ask them to submit hundreds of reports each year on everything from environmental damage to human rights. The odd independent commission structure that characterised the Interstate Commerce Commission and other regulators was brought about by mistrust of presidential power. Early regulatory agencies instead reported to a committee of commissioners evenly split between the two parties, rather than directly giving authority to a single agency head who is then answerable to the president. Congress effectively gave the executive authority while also tightly regulating that delegation. As commissioners cycle through their set terms, an election that in a European parliamentary system would prompt a fast change in policy slows slowly in the United States. The independent commission system protected party power but ultimately reduced democratic accountability for regulators.

The United States: How Different

When it comes to how well the American system of checks and balances combines the necessity for robust state action with the rule of law and accountability, it often compares unfavourably to parliamentary systems. These systems have fewer government agencies, more cohesive laws, and a tendency to not judicialize administration to nearly the same a degree. They are also less susceptible to influence from special interest groups. Higher levels of confidence in the government have been maintained in Germany, Scandinavia, the Netherlands, and Switzerland. As a result, public administration is less adversarial, more consensus-based, and, at the start of the twenty-first century, better equipped to adapt to the changing circumstances of globalisation. High-trust institutions, such as the corporatist framework within which salaries and benefits are established throughout the whole economy, for instance, helped to ease the privatisation of many social services and the concessions by trade unions on job security. These claims are accurate, but only at the level of certain nations. The parallels are not at all favourable when we look at the European Union as a whole.

Consider interest groups' influence on governmental decision-making. The scholarly literature makes it abundantly evident that both in America and Europe, lobbying organisations have grown significantly in size and complexity. Since Europe does not have the same stringent criteria for the registration of lobbyists as the United States does, numbers are impossible to compare. However, businesses, trade organisations, and organisations advocating for consumer, labour, and environmental rights all continue to function at the national and EU-wide levels in a manner similar to that which they do in the United States. The overall structure of the European system is starting to mirror that of the United States to a greater and greater extent as a result of the expansion of the European Union and the transfer of policymaking from national capitals to Brussels. Compared to the American

system of checks and balances, Europe's separate parliamentary systems may allow for fewer veto players, but with the inclusion of a significant European layer, many more veto points have been added. As a result, European interest groups have a greater ability to switch jurisdictions: if they cannot get favourable treatment at the national level, they may move to Brussels, or the opposite is true. Interest groups still have many more opportunities to present their case before policy makers and regulators than they did when they were restricted to their own national systems, despite the fact that "outside" groups representing social movements have considerably less access to European institutions than they do in the United States, as political scientist Christine Mahoney has noted.

In fact, since the EU is a consensual organisation, its institutions are weaker than certain federal ones in the United States. These flaws were severely exposed during the 2010–2013 European debt crisis. With the $700 billion TARP, a second $700 billion stimulus package in 2009, and ongoing asset purchases by the Fed under various iterations of quantitative easing, the Federal Reserve, Treasury, and Congress of the United States responded quite forcefully to its financial crisis. In times of need, the executive branch was successful in pressuring Congress to back its plans. In contrast, the European Union has approached the euro crisis in a far more cautious and fragmented manner. European policymakers have had fewer instruments than American counterparts to cope with economic shocks due to the lack of a monetary authority with the same jurisdiction as the Federal Reserve and the continued dominance of national-level governments in fiscal policy.

The expansion of the EU has also Americanized Europe in terms of the judiciary's function. After the Second World War, several European states started including bills of basic rights in their legal frameworks and gave constitutional courts the jurisdiction to stand up for these rights in the face of governmental authority. The establishment of the European Court of Justice, which is entrusted with interpreting European law, and the European Court of Human Rights, which resulted from the European Convention on Human Rights, added a greater level of judicial scrutiny. Additionally, courts in several European nations have asserted universal jurisdiction in unique ways, like when a Spanish court convicted former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet for crimes committed on Chilean land. The institutional framework of jurisprudence has evolved towards the proliferation of judicial vetoes rather than the opposite, despite the fact that European judges continue to be generally more reluctant than their American counterparts to intervene in political concerns.

America's Madisonian Republic

Due to the conventional system of checks and balances becoming more inflexible and entrenched throughout time, the American political system has degenerated. This decentralised system is becoming less and less able to serve the interests of the majority as political polarisation increases, but it offers excessive representation to interest groups and activist groups whose opinions do not sum up to those of the American people as a whole.

The polarised and uncoordinated nature of the American political system is not new. The early nineteenth-century clientelistic, party-driven political system and the Madisonian system of checks and balances were suitable for running a mostly agricultural nation where the majority of people lived on solitary family farms. However, it was unable to end the severe political crisis brought on by the institution of slavery and its spread throughout the territories. This decentralised structure was also unable to handle a national economy on a continental size that was becoming more interconnected as a result of post-Civil War developments in communications and transportation. Political alliances were formed to establish a contemporary, merit-based civil service, but these reforms were consistently

rejected by the powerful political players. Given these challenges, the state-building that took place during the Progressive age and the New Deal was exceptional; otherwise, with entrenched clientelism and personal corruption extending into the contemporary age, the United States may have become like Greece or Italy. In the years that followed, the American state developed dramatically into the bloated, ineffective beast it is today. However, the fact that law and democracy, which are so ingrained in American political culture, continued to dominate the state even as it grew, had a significant role in this conclusion.

The US is stuck in an unfavourable balance. Due to their long-standing mistrust of the government, Americans are often unwilling to provide it the same power to make choices as other democratic countries. Instead, Congress imposes intricate regulations that limit government discretion and increase the time and cost of decision-making. The subsequent poor performance of the government further strengthens the populace's initial mistrust. They are hesitant to pay greater taxes in this situation because they believe the government would misuse the money. Although resources are not the sole or even the primary cause of government inefficiency, the government cannot operate effectively without them. As a result, mistrust in the government turns out to be true.

Is it feasible to alter the system and stop these trends towards decay? There are two impediments along the road, both of which are connected to the deterioration process itself. The first is a straightforward political issue. Even though many political figures in the United States are aware of how poorly the system is functioning, they have a strong incentive to preserve things as they are. Both interest organisations and political parties are opposed to a system in which money can no longer purchase influence. Neither political party has any motive to deny itself access to money from interest groups.

Similar to the 1880s, a reform coalition must develop by bringing together parties with no interest in the status quo. However, getting these out-groups to work together is highly challenging; they need leadership and a well-defined objective, which are not always present. External shocks like the Garfield murder, the demands of America's emergence as a superpower, enlistment in the wars, and the Great Depression crises were crucial in setting the stage for change.

The second issue is a cognitive one involving concepts. Increasing democratic engagement and openness has always been the normal American response to perceived government dysfunction. After the contentious Vietnam and Watergate eras, reformers fought for more open primaries, more public access to the legal system, and 24-hour media coverage of Congress. The use of ballot initiatives has increased in California and other states as a means of avoiding an unresponsive government. Nearly all of these changes fell short of their goals of establishing more responsible governance at higher levels. According to Bruce Cain, this is because democratic publics are not naturally equipped to make a significant number of complicated public policy decisions. Instead, well-organized activist organisations that don't accurately reflect the general public have filled the breach. Rolling back some of the purportedly pro-democratic measures would be the obvious answer to this issue, but no one has the guts to say that maybe what the nation needs is a little less involvement and transparency.

I made a commitment in the opening chapter that this book would not make recommendations for specific laws or a quick fix for the issues discussed here. Long-term goals and political realities would need to be balanced in a practical reform strategy. A system of checks and balances that favours special interests above the interests of the majority cannot be rectified with a few simple adjustments. For instance, the inclination in

presidential systems to add more executive powers to avoid legislative impasse sometimes causes more issues than it resolves. The removal of earmarks and tighter party control may make it more difficult to reach broad legislative accords. Although using the courts to carry out administrative decisions may be very wasteful, there may be no other option in the absence of a stronger and more cohesive bureaucracy. It makes little sense to give the executive branch additional authority until that branch's capabilities have been improved and the bureaucracy has been transformed.

The United States could switch to a more united parliamentary style of government, which would alleviate many of these issues, but such a drastic change in the country's institutional framework is unthinkable. To get Americans to reconsider the Constitution's fundamental principles would be a difficult task since they see it as a quasi-religious text. Any credible reform plan, in my opinion, would aim to reduce the number of veto points or introduce parliamentary-style methods to strengthen hierarchical authority within the current structure of divided powers.

The Madisonian check-and-balance mechanism that makes decisions so difficult postponed the development of the American welfare state and made sure it never got as large as its European equivalents. This has freed the American economy from many of the harmful rules and incentives imposed by European social policy, which is something that many Americans would consider to be a godsend. But it also implies that system reform reducing its size and improving its operation is considerably more challenging. The many veto points that jam the gears and prohibit the shaft from moving forward also prevent the shaft from moving backward.

CONCLUSION

A diversified strategy is needed to address the vetocracy in America. This includes attempts for fair representation in redistricting and campaign funding reform that seek to lessen political polarisation. Additionally, initiatives to improve openness, accountability, and public engagement may support more inclusive decision-making processes by balancing the power of special interest groups. In order to lessen the consequences of the vetocracy, institutional changes that simplify decision-making processes, do away with undemocratic veto points, and promote collaboration across various departments and levels of government are also crucial. For preventing political degradation and restoring the effectiveness and credibility of democratic institutions, it is essential to recognise and combat the vetocracy in America. It is feasible to counteract the negative impacts of the vetocracy and develop a more responsive and effective political system by fostering a culture of cooperation, removing obstacles to efficient government, and bolstering democratic norms and procedures. In conclusion, the vetocracy in America poses a serious threat to political disintegration, which is shown by an overuse of veto power and obstructive behaviour that impedes governance and decision. The implementation of changes that advance inclusion, accountability, and responsiveness, eventually reviving the democratic process and thwarting political deterioration, depends on an understanding of the sources and effects of the vetocracy.

REFERENCES

[1]   M. P. Hitt, 'Judicial Independence and the American Constitution: A Democratic Paradox', *Polit. Sci. Q.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/polq.12810.

[2]   A. Gordon-Reed, 'The Second Creation: Fixing the American Constitution in the Founding Era by Jonathan Gienapp', *J. Early Repub.*, 2020, doi: 10.1353/jer.2020.0075.

[3]   R. A. Dahl, *How democratic is the American constitution?* 2003. doi: 10.5860/choice.40-0581.

[4]   R. Cordell, K. S. Gleditsch, F. G. Kern, and L. Saavedra-Lux, 'Measuring institutional variation across American Indian constitutions using automated content analysis', *J. Peace Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0022343320959122.

[5]   A. Zorin, 'The intellectual adventures of a russian anti-federalist: Radishchev, condorcet, and the american constitution', *Quaestio Ross.*, 2021, doi: 10.15826/qr.2021.2.603.

[6]   J. R. Bond, K. B. Smith, and L. M. Andrade, 'The American Constitution', in *Analyzing American Democracy*, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9781003164432-3.

[7]   J. P. Kaminski, L. W. Levy, and K. L. Karst, 'Encyclopedia of the American Constitution', *J. Am. Hist.*, 1988, doi: 10.2307/1894525.

[8]   E. Larkin, W. Riker, R. L. Calvert, J. Mueller, and R. K. Wilson, 'The Strategy of Rhetoric: Campaigning for the American Constitution', *J. Early Repub.*, 1997, doi: 10.2307/3124651.

[9]   L. Strauss, 'World War I and the American Constitution', *J. Am. Hist.*, 2018, doi: 10.1093/jahist/jay095.

CHAPTER 5

A STUDY ON SUBORDINATION AND AUTONOMY

Dr Mansi Kukreja, Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.mansi_kukreja@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The dynamics of power, control, and agency within societal and organizational institutions are at the centre of the ideas of subordination and autonomy. This abstract examines how subordination and autonomy interact, underlining the importance, ramifications, and possible conflicts they may have in different situations. Being under the direction or authority of another is referred to as subordination. When people or groups are subject to the domination or orders of those in positions of authority, it entails the uneven distribution of power. Hierarchical connections, structural inequities, or societal practices that uphold marginalization and discrimination are just a few examples of how subordination may appear. On the other side, autonomy describes a person's or group's ability to act freely, make decisions, and exercise control over their own lives or endeavors. It stands for independence from outside restrictions and self-government. The ability of autonomy to promote personal initiative, creativity, and self-determination is appreciated. When people or groups try to express their independence and exercise their autonomy under repressive or hierarchical organizations, a conflict between subordination and autonomy results. While being subordinated might restrict an individual's agency and freedom, pursuing autonomy can challenge established power dynamics, norms, or authority structures. Resistance, social movements, and demands for equal rights and opportunities may all be part of autonomy struggles. Differences between commercial and public sector governance; bureaucratic autonomy and state capacity as metrics of government quality; and how successful governance necessitates striking the right balance between competence and democratic oversight.

KEYWORDS:

Autonomy, Capacity, Governance, Government, Public.

INTRODUCTION

A successful modern government strikes the right balance between a powerful and competent state and the institutions of law and accountability that constrain the state and compel it to act broadly in the interests of its constituents. This is the issue with "getting to Denmark" that was mentioned before. However, since the Third Wave of democratisation began, democratic institutions have expanded more quickly and further than powerful, functional contemporary nations. Therefore, many nations must simultaneously strengthen their democratic institutions while also developing their own states. Over time, these two processes should assist one another because they are complimentary. However, as we have seen, they might clash in the short term.

So how can we achieve a condition of productivity and administrative prowess? Recognising the significance of having such governments, several foreign development organisations have supported initiatives to repair dysfunctional public sectors. The assumption is that increasing

openness and democratic accountability is the best approach to build nations. According to this hypothesis, people will utilise the power of the ballot to remove corrupt or inept public officials from office if they have reliable information about them. Additionally, several reform initiatives have aimed to scale down the size of government to cut down on corruption possibilities. They have also attempted to impose more regulations on officials, such as those pertaining to conflicts of interest. It is anticipated that decreasing official discretion would also minimise corruption.

These practical strategies for enhancing public sector performance are linked to a wider body of theoretical research, most of it developed by economists who see the efficiency of bureaucracies in terms of the so-called principal-agent theory. The principle is the primary decision maker who directs the agent, or to a hierarchy of agents, whose duty it is to carry out the principal's intentions (I've made multiple references to this notion in discussions of particular examples previously in the two volumes). The principal in a private-sector firm is the owner of the company (or the shareholders in a publicly traded firm), who delegated authority to a board of directors, then to a CEO, and finally to the administrative hierarchy of the company. In a democracy, the general populace acts as the principal, delegating power to the legislature, the president, or other elected officials via elections. These officials then create bureaucratic structures to carry out the general populace's objectives.

The agents are reported to often behave selfishly, such as transferring funds to their personal bank accounts or advancing their careers at the cost of the organisation, which is supposed to generate organisational disorder. This is where corruption originates in both public and private organisations. According to the theory, the solution is an alignment of incentives that encourages the agents to correctly carry out the principal's instructions. Principals must make agent behaviour more transparent in order to better monitor it, and they must then create incentives that allow them to be held strictly accountable to their wishes. This is a version of the transparency and accountability path to good government that is supported by principal-agent theory.

This hypothesis suggests that greater democracy should result in less corruption and better governance in the political realm. Officials that are dishonest or incompetent shouldn't be able to conceal their behaviour, and without some kind of accountability system, they won't be very motivated to alter their behaviour. There are a lot of reasons, nevertheless, to believe that this idea is terribly lacking [1], [2]. First of all, it makes the assumption that common citizens would unavoidably want programmatic public policies that will distribute commodities on an impersonal basis, as democratic theory suggests they should, if they are informed about the corrupt or clientelistic allocation of public resources. This overlooks the reality that voters in many cultures, especially in impoverished ones, support clientelistic resource allocation because they believe it would benefit them directly. In fact, the clientelism may have originated from the public need for rewards.

Furthermore, the notion that improved bureaucracy requires increased accountability and transparency runs counter to much of history, which shows that very clean, contemporary bureaucracies were developed in nondemocratic conditions. Many of the most prosperous contemporary governments were founded in authoritarian settings, often by nations facing serious challenges to their national security. Ancient China, Prussia/Germany, contemporary Japan, and a few more nations are examples of this. The quality of governance is often weakened when democracy is implemented before the establishment of a modern state, on the other hand. The best illustration of this is the United States, which after granting citizens the right to vote in the 1820s established clientelistic party governance and was thereafter forced to deal with a patronage-filled bureaucracy for the majority of the next century. The

development of complex clientelistic systems by Greece and Italy, both of which hampered the development of contemporary state administrations, is also part of this theme. Clientelism still permeates democratic nations in the developing world and degrades the effectiveness of governments everywhere from Kenya and the Philippines to Mexico and India. And lastly, the notion that public servants should be subject to stringent regulations and deprived of administrative discretion goes counter to the most frequent criticism of government, namely that it is too regimented, inflexible, and devoid of common sense. The bureaucrat who demands mounds of documentation before even the tiniest decision can be taken is the contemporary nightmare. Dismantling regulations and allowing more latitude for government decision-making have been central to several attempts to reform the American public sector. So how can we reconcile this with the idea that strong regulations produce excellent government?

All of this implies that creating a state and creating a democracy are not the same thing, and that they often coexist in conflict with one another in the near term. There may be other paths to effective governance, and democracy itself could in certain cases work against us rather than for us. We need a more sophisticated theory of public administration, one that focuses specifically on the intersection of government operations, legal requirements, and democratic accountability.

DISCUSSION

National Capacity: The fact that the principal-agent framework assumes state capability to exist is one of its major flaws. This means that it frames the issue of managing an organisation largely in terms of incentives and will: the principle orders the agents to carry out particular tasks, but the agents refuse to do so because they are opportunistic or self-interested. But even the most devoted and driven agents might fall short when it comes to carrying out the intentions of the principle because they lack the necessary skills, expertise, or training. The modern government is not only tremendously big, but it also offers a broad range of intricate services. Weather predictions, aircraft carrier operations, derivatives regulation, pharmaceutical safety oversight, agricultural extension services, management of public health crises, sophisticated criminal and civil case judging, and monetary policy control are all responsibilities of the government. High degrees of expertise and education are necessary for many of these activities: the personnel of the [3], [4]

U.S. For instance, whereas the Centres for Disease Control is governed by physicians and biological experts, the Federal Reserve Board is mostly composed of PhD economists. The first factor that sets good administration and democracy on a collision path is this need for technical ability. As we have seen, Andrew Jackson claimed that every position in the federal government could be filled by an average American. He then filled the federal government with a large number of average Americans who also happened to be his political allies. Jackson, a populist, was elected in part due to mistrust of the Harvard-educated elites that his opponent, John Quincy Adams, represented. This mistrust still exists today. The Pendleton Act's establishment of a merit-based civil service was an attempt to shield government hiring from democratic political contestation and to develop ever-larger technocratic competence islands.

It takes more than merely sending bureaucrats to a few weekend executive training sessions to increase the government's technocratic capability. Massive expenditures are needed in higher education systems. Without the concurrent founding of new universities by reformers like Wilhelm von Humboldt, who founded the new University of Berlin, the Stein-Hardenberg reforms in Prussia could not have had the positive impact they did, and the

Northcote-Trevelyan reforms in Britain were accompanied by Benjamin Jowett's restructuring of Oxford and Cambridge. The Meiji oligarchs' establishment of a network of contemporary colleges across Japan, whose graduates went on to serve the new bureaucracy in Tokyo, was among their most notable achievements in the late nineteenth century. While the human capital of individual bureaucrats forms the foundation of bureaucratic capacity, the effectiveness of real government agencies is largely reliant on the kind of organisational culture, or social capital, that they have.

Depending on the amount of internal cohesiveness two organisations have, they may function at radically different levels while having the same manpower and resources. Because of the strong unit cohesiveness that was fostered under the direction of its noncommissioned officers, the German Wehrmacht was able to prove to be such a powerful combat force throughout World War II. German regiments were picked from the same area, trained, fought, and died together, and when worn out, were removed in groupings, as military historian Martin van Creveld has shown. Compared to the American approach, which constantly established and reorganised units and replaced losses on an individual basis, this led to strong unit identity and noticeably superior combat strength.

Civilian organisations may not have the same power to mould their workforce, but they may still benefit from a cohesive workforce built on common values. A united dedication to scientific forestry served as the foundation for the contemporary Forest Service. Like the British bureaucracy before them, the modern Japanese and South Korean bureaucracies were filled by alumni from the same prestigious universities who knew one another from their time as students. They joined the government in classes that were later promoted together, and since their ministries forbade political appointees from entering the bureaucracy laterally, they formed a close-knit community. Bureaucratic capacity is therefore much more than the sum of the capacities of the officials who make up a bureaucracy; it also depends on the social capital they have. However, even in the United States with its weak traditions of bureaucratic solidarity, there are pockets of excellence that demonstrate astonishing levels of commitment to public service, like the federal prison system described by political scientist John DiIulio4.

State capacity is a function of resources, to sum up. Even the most skilled and devoted officials will leave their positions if they are not compensated fairly or do not have the resources they need to execute their duties. This is one of the causes of the ineffective governance of developing nations. Melissa Thomas points out that whereas a wealthy nation like the United States spends over $17,000 year per person on all types of government services, Afghanistan barely spends $17 when international donor contributions are taken into account. The money it does manage to collect is mostly squandered due to fraud and corruption. Therefore, it is not surprising that the central Afghan government scarcely exercises sovereign authority over a large portion of its own country [5].

Official Autonomy

By itself, state capacity is a poor indicator of the effectiveness of a government. The value of bureaucratic autonomy for the efficient operation of government has been one of the book's recurring themes. No matter how talented they are as people or as organisations, agents who are not allowed enough room to use their own judgement in the formulation and application of policies will not do a good job at their tasks. In ancient China, the Legalists and Confucians engaged in a protracted discussion about what modern administrative lawyers would refer to as the "rules versus discretion" debate. The Legalists believed that society needed unambiguous legal rules to regulate behaviour, help stabilise expectations, and

remove any doubts regarding the state's intentions. Contrarily, the Confucians disapproved of law (or fa), arguing that no written law could ever be entirely accurate. Knowing the specifics of the case would be necessary to make an informed decision, including who committed the crime, their motivations, and how a certain choice might affect the interests of the larger community. According to the Confucians, only an educated sage who fully considered the situation could provide an accurate decision. This kind of view is comparable to how Aristotle described the "great-souled man" in the Nicomachean Ethics as someone who is capable of making morally sound decisions.

Chinese law itself developed as a synthesis of Legalist and Confucian principles. Chinese culture has long favoured discretion over rigid laws, which is a reflection of the poor legal system in Chinese tradition. But the Confucians had a point: too many rigid regulations can make it difficult to make wise choices. The manner in which leaders impose instructions or guidelines on their agents is a key indicator of bureaucratic autonomy. The quantity and kind of directives issued by the principal, or, to put it another way, the level of power delegated to the agent, will determine the degree of autonomy enjoyed by the organisation. An organisation that is entirely subservient will have no independence at all and will be compelled to mechanically execute the principal's intricate instructions. In contrast, an independent organisation will be able to make judgements without the principal giving it a close second-look.

Principals have a broad range of authority to assign various tasks. Staffing is one of the most significant issues. As we saw in Volume 1, the investiture debate, which focused on the Catholic church's right to choose its own priests and bishops, was one of the most significant milestones in the foundation of the rule of law in Europe. The church was compelled to submit to the Holy Roman Emperor's political dominance until the eleventh century because of his power to influence personnel choices, including the election of popes. The church's autonomy as a body that made laws was therefore inextricably linked to its command over its own cadres. Similar battles for civil service reform in nineteenth-century America concerned the bureaucracy's independence from political favour and the power to define its own criteria for hiring and advancement [6].

Political leaders often give overlapping, and perhaps outright incompatible, mandates. There are in fact often numerous principals political powers with equal authority issuing perhaps incompatible orders. State-owned utilities, for instance, often have mandates to perform cost recovery, provide universal service to the underprivileged, and provide commercial customers effective pricing, each supported by a separate sector of the political system. It is evident that these requirements cannot be fulfilled while also causing bureaucratic dysfunction. If it weren't for legislative rules requiring it to service numerous low-volume rural areas, the quasi-public train Amtrak might develop into a successful and efficient railroad. The outcome is inconsistent and ineffectual policy. In China, there are sometimes duplicate functional agencies, one reporting to a chain of command that runs via national ministries and the other reporting to city or provincial governments.

In a bureaucracy, creativity, experimentation, and risk-taking are only possible with a high level of autonomy. In a well-run company, the manager issues broad directives and the employees work out the best way to carry them out. High-quality military organisations are aware that younger officers need to be allowed the "freedom to fail" since no one would ever take chances if even the smallest error might be the end of a career. This understanding was included into FM 100-5, the field manual for combined weapons operations of the United States army. In reevaluating combined arms doctrine in light of the Vietnam War, the manual's authors placed less emphasis on centralised command and control and more on

more flexible mission orders, which call for the commander to only set broad objectives and delegate implementation to the lowest rung of the command structure. In other words, younger officers were given a lot of autonomy, including the ability to try something new and fail if they did. Poor administration is mostly a result of a lack of autonomy. People despise bureaucracy's rule-bound, inflexible, and paperwork-driven attitude all over the globe. The capacity to alter regulations gives bureaucrats themselves power and authority, thus they are interested in extending their influence. However, their political overlords are complicit in this procedure, as seen by the volume and variety of directives they issue. The answer to this issue is to modify the mandate to allow for more bureaucratic autonomy.

Bureaucracies, on the other hand, may have too much autonomy. I discussed the German and Japanese military bureaucracies before the first and second world wars, which were perhaps the two most infamous examples of this in contemporary history. In both instances, a strong history of autonomy produced elite military organisations but also saw them seize the power of the officially its key political figures to decide policy. In the early decades of the 20th century, the German navy and general staff coopted the emperor and established a foreign policy that pitted the whole nation against Britain and France. Even more actively engaged in starting an attack against China was the Japanese Kwantung Army in Manchuria, which finally assumed complete governmental control over Japan in all but name. Tightly knit, highly autonomous bureaucratic organisations may be very resistant to political direction; they can also become inbred, resistant to change, and insensitive to society requirements, even when not experiencing these extreme situations.

Ironically, too many regulations may often lead to a highly unhealthy rise in bureaucratic autonomy rather than a reduction. The complexity of bureaucratic red tape makes it often impossible to truly check compliance with the regulations. Since only them are capable of navigating the system, this enables the bureaucrats to determine for themselves which ones to enforce. This is often stated of the Indian bureaucracy, which is renowned for being both rule-bound and capricious. Thus, the curve would represent the optimum level of autonomy required to create high-quality governance. At one extreme, full submission, the bureaucracy is entirely constrained by the specific regulations established by the political leader, with no space for discretion or independent judgement. Because the bureaucracy has escaped all political supervision and determines not just its internal processes but also its aims, governance results at the opposite end of the horizontal axis, that of total autonomy, would likewise be quite poor. However, there is a universal understanding that the risks of excessive micromanagement are often larger than those presented by excessive autonomy, which causes the inflection point of the curve to be pushed to the right [7], [8].

Capacity and independence are mutually reinforcing. An agent's behaviour may be influenced by both explicit formal rules and incentives as well as informal conventions and habits. The latter has much lower transaction costs of the two. Due to the difficulty of assessing the quality of their work by others outside their field, many highly talented professions are essentially self-regulating. Therefore, one would want to give a bureaucracy greater autonomy the more powerful it is. Therefore, we are interested in both the competence and the autonomy of the bureaucrats when evaluating the effectiveness of the government.

In many private-sector companies, the endeavour to provide employees more autonomy based on increasing levels of capability has already been made. Like Henry Ford's Highland Park complex, the early twentieth-century classic car factory used a very unskilled blue-collar labour. In 1915, the majority of Detroit's autoworkers were new immigrants; half of them were illiterate, and most had only completed elementary school. This environment allowed "Taylorism" to flourish. White-collar managers in scientific management controlled a blue-

collar workforce by issuing specific instructions regarding where to stand, how to use the machinery, and how many toilet breaks a worker may take. This division of labour concentrated the organization's brains at the top of a hierarchy. The lowest levels of the organisation were unable to exercise any independent judgement at all in this kind of low-trust environment.

A far flatter kind of organisation has taken the place of this kind of work environment. The assembly-line employees in the Toyota-developed lean manufacturing facility are given far more discretion and are encouraged to strategize about how to better organise their shared output. In businesses that depend on highly educated people, autonomy is considerably greater. Taylorite organisational principles are unable to apply to institutions like law firms, architectural firms, research facilities, software corporations, and universities. In such organisations, the managers who seem to have power over their highly educated "workers" are really less knowledgeable about the tasks at hand than those at the bottom of the organisational structure. The agents themselves are often engaged in goal planning and utilise their knowledge to influence the principals in such flat organisations, where power does not just pass from principals to agents. It goes without saying that these organisations demand far greater levels of trust than the previous Taylorite ones did.

Thus, the competence of the organisation determines the ideal amount of autonomy. The ideal autonomy curves for four fictitious organisations with various degrees of capability are shown in Figure 26. Because any bureaucracy might have either too much or too little autonomy, the curve for each one dips downward at the extremes. However, the inflection points change in higher-capacity organisations, shifting to the right, whereas in lower-capacity organisations, they change to the left. A high-tech corporation like Google would be at level 4, whereas the Ford plant from the early 20th century would be at level 1.

The same rules that apply to private sector businesses also apply to the public sector businesses that make up a state. Societies can afford to give their governments a lot more autonomy as they get wealthy and more capable. The underlying claim that the ideal level of autonomy is pushed to the right is only accurate in high-capacity nations. The situation is the contrary in nations with extremely poor capacity; one would prefer to impose more regulations on government officials' behaviour than fewer ones since one could not rely on them to apply sound judgement or abstain from corrupt practises. On the other hand, one would feel more comfortable granting them significant autonomy if they were filled with professionals with graduate degrees from internationally renowned universities rather than political cronies. In addition, one would want to reduce rule-boundedness in order to promote the use of discretion and innovative behaviour.

We may assess the general effectiveness of state institutions by placing nations on a grid that contrasts state power with bureaucratic autonomy. Each nation is really shown as an oval rather than a single point since it consists of several government organisations with various powers and levels of autonomy. The inflection points on the diagonal line, which are taken, show the ideal level of autonomy for a given level of capability. The vertical axis should be moved higher by all organisations, but doing so requires expensive long-term expenditures. Their plan should be to move as near to the queue as they can in the short term. There is no unique formula for improving the efficiency of all governments. The path to improved performance is determined by a country's position on the matrix. Indeed, because the several agencies that make up a government will have varying capabilities and levels of autonomy, pathways may vary even within the same nation.

CONCLUSION

Understanding social dynamics, organisational behaviour, and the operation of democratic societies depends on an understanding of how subordination and autonomy interact. Promoting fairness, inclusion, and respect for individual rights while recognising the need of group decision-making, social cohesiveness, and governance frameworks are necessary to strike a balance between these ideals. In conclusion, understanding power dynamics and agency within social and organisational settings requires a knowledge of the ideas of subordination and autonomy. In order to build more equitable and inclusive societies where people and groups may exercise their agency and actively participate in forming their own lives and communities, subordination must be acknowledged, addressed, and autonomy must be promoted.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. Pinto-Garay, G. Scalzo, and I. Ferrero, 'Autonomy and Subordination', *Bus. Prof. Ethics J.*, 2021, doi: 10.5840/bpej20201227104.

[2]   P. Contreras and S. S. Pizarro, '"Obedient and Non-Deliberating": Armed forces, autonomy and democratic control in Chile', *Ius Prax.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/POLYM12081647.

[3]   J. Pinto-Garay, G. Scalzo, and I. Ferrero, 'Autonomy and subordination: Virtuous work in light of aristotelian practical knowledge in organizational theory', *Bus. Prof. Ethics J.*, 2021, doi: 10.5840/bpej20201227104.

[4]   S. J. Khader, 'The feminist case against relational autonomy', *J. Moral Philos.*, 2020, doi: 10.1163/17455243-20203085.

[5]   P. C. Lai, 'Subordination, Separation, and Autonomy: Chinese Protestant Approaches to the Relationship between Religion and State', *J. Law Relig.*, 2020, doi: 10.1017/jlr.2020.3.

[6]   M. Retallack, 'Paradigmatic policy change or unintended subordination of rural autonomy: the case of source water protection in Ontario, Canada', *Policy Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1007/s11077-020-09369-0.

[7]   D. Camacho, 'Paid subordination and economic autonomy: Modalities of work specialization of africans and their descendants in the city of la plata, 17th century', *Fronteras de la Historia*. 2020. doi: 10.22380/20274688.823.

[8]   S. Madhok, 'Autonomy, gendered subordination and transcultural dialogue', *J. Glob. Ethics*, 2007, doi: 10.1080/17449620701728055.

CHAPTER 6

A STUDY ON ACCOUNTABILITY OF DEMOCRACY

Dr Avijit Bakshi, Assistant Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.avijitbakshi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Democracy's means and procedures for ensuring that elected representatives, public servants, and institutions are held accountable for their deeds and decisions are referred to as its accountability mechanisms and procedures. In this abstract, accountability in democratic government is examined in terms of its significance, difficulties, and dimensions. In order to promote openness, honesty, and responsiveness in governance, accountability is a key democratic value that acts as a check on authority. Vertical accountability is a component of it, wherein voters hold elected representatives and public authorities responsible via elections, open examination, and civic participation. Along with vertical accountability, horizontal accountability refers to the process through which the legislative and judicial arms of government hold each other responsible via checks and balances. In democratic systems, establishing accountability is hampered by a number of issues. These issues include graft, a lack of transparency, the concentration of power, weakened institutions, and restricted information access. The deterioration of democratic norms and principles, political power, partisan interests, and other factors may also weaken accountability procedures. Political accountability is one of the facets of accountability, which involves holding elected officials responsible for their actions and policy decisions. Legal and judicial accountability makes ensuring that government activities are legal and that they may be examined and contested. Administrative accountability places a strong emphasis on the performance and behaviour of public servants, ensuring that they are held responsible for the timely and effective provision of public services. Social accountability entails active participation from people and civil society groups in observing and influencing governmental activities.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Authority, Democratic, Government, Governance.

INTRODUCTION

The issue of accountability in democratic government is thoroughly examined. It examines the significance of accountability, its primary components, difficulties, and the numerous tools and techniques used to improve accountability in democratic institutions. In order to illuminate the intricacies and nuanced nature of accountability in democratic systems, the study synthesizes and assesses current literature. It also provides recommendations for future research and policy concerns. This in-depth review study synthesizes several viewpoints on democratic accountability and offers a sophisticated knowledge of its philosophical underpinnings, dimensions, difficulties, and methods. The study adds to the ongoing discussion on enhancing democratic governance by examining new techniques and evaluating the efficacy of current accountability measures. For policymakers, academics, and practitioners looking to advance effective and responsible democratic government, it

emphasizes the importance of accountability in maintaining trust, transparency, and legitimacy in democratic institutions.

Enhancing public accountability via public review might be one strategy to address governance issues and enhance public policy. The audit or review society's consequences must also be rigorously examined, however. It is the duty of policy analysts and evaluation researchers in particular to explain the accountability trend and assess its effects. In order to avoid accepting the audit society's presumptions without question, it is necessary to examine the consequences of current public reviews from several angles [1].

As democratic governance evolves, it is important to explain and debate the prerequisites for democratic accountability in various forms of government. Developing an effective system of accountability is necessary " in a world of decentralized governance, shared power, collaborative decision processes, results-oriented management, and broad civic participation," according to Edward Weber, who is concerned about the evolving conditions for accountability. Currently, conventional forms of government and innovative forms of governance coexist. However, as compared to conventional administration, the issue of responsibility is different in new models of governance. While democratic government has evolved in a variety of ways, voters' ability to hold those in power accountable has largely remained the same. Voting in elections is seen as a way for people to hold the government responsible for how it exercises its authority. This is the official mechanism for voters to hold elected officials accountable for public policies that were put into place during the previous three to four years.

Between elections, it is thought that voters have given elected officials and the media, as well as public reviewers like state inspectors and auditors, the responsibility of holding elected officials accountable. In other words, people often do not have the option to act as a principle and a bearer of responsibility. The formal accountability system is, nevertheless, under attack in the realm of public policy. Citizens look for methods to hold people in authority responsible rather than waiting for the next election, reclaiming their primary role in the process. Accountability and deciding what course of action to pursue are more or less interwoven in participatory policymaking. Therefore, it is not entirely suitable to employ the usual concept of a principle and agents.

In a representative democracy, the political assembly serves as the primary venue for democratic accountability. However, it is insufficient to confine the conversation about democratic accountability to the formal, prescribed institutions that assign elected representatives the responsibility of holding the administration accountable for policy implementation and citizens the responsibility of holding the elected to account for the general direction of public policy in elections. The general perception among people is that there are other responsibility holders outside the elected officials. They have a tendency to believe that professionals and administrators should be directly held responsible for policy execution since they both share accountability. In reality, many individuals look for straightforward means to hold administrators and professionals as well as politicians responsible for choices made on policies and programs [2].

From the viewpoint of the citizen, democratic responsibility may be carried out in two ways: directly and indirectly. In addition to participating in elections, citizens may engage in direct accountability actions, such as writing to a responsible politician or speaking with them personally to draw attention to poor performance. A citizen association might, for instance, organise a public hearing or conduct a citizen inspection of the conditions in local nurseries, schools, or traffic patterns. The term "indirect way" refers to the process wherein public

reviewers examine government officials and elected officials on behalf of the general population.

The formal democratic accountability function is primarily centered on written political accounts, whereas the conventional accountability system strongly depends on required public reviewers inquiries and accounts. Sadly, from the viewpoint of the public, these accounts are largely created for the elected officials to utilise in keeping the government accountable. Of course, voters may use the same accounts, but their use to them as voters is limited. For instance, audit reports for local governments are difficult to acquire, issue-focused, and difficult to contextualise. Few people are aware that such accounts exist, and the reports are not written in a manner that the average citizen can comprehend. The reports' value to people as a resource for evaluating accountability is minimal. It is clear that the existing accountability framework was not mainly created to address the requirements of the general public. This paper will address democratic accountability under decentralised government and make a contribution to the technique of public review and policy assessment. The paper is divided into three sections. The first section discusses several concepts of democratic accountability. The second section goes into more detail about democratic accountability in decentralised governance, and the third part examines how public reviewers working in Sweden's decentralised government affect local government policies and democracy.

Discussion of various democratic accountability linkages and methods is not the purpose of this paper. The main focus is on how people can hold those in charge of public policy accountable, and more particularly, how they can hold those in charge of public policy under decentralised governance accountable. Due to modifications in democratic government, accountability has to be reevaluated from fresh angles. Rethinking democratic accountability entails considering how to hold and hold responsible people who participate in public policy and co-create it with other decision-makers. The idea of democratic accountability is then expanded to encompass democratic debate. The notion of democratic accountability must be adjusted for a changing context. The definition should then include citizens who share responsibility and participate in public governance [3].

Over the last several decades, the concept of responsibility has expanded in a number of ways. The Latin word compute has origins in the English word accountability. Com stands for together and implies to count or take into consideration. The presumption of a separate separation between politics and administration is the foundation of the conventional concept of accountability, which refers to external observation and counting. There is a fundamental definition of democracy that has been expanded in many ways. Generally speaking, "democracy" refers to a system in which the populace, or "demos," controls public affairs. Three types of democracy may be distinguished today: elitist, participatory, and deliberative or discursive. These ideas of democracy point to three various paths that a democracy might pursue, rather than being in opposition to representative democracy. Because the requirements for accountability change across various forms of democracy, accountability should be seen in connection to these distinct conceptions of democracy [4].

The concept of democratic accountability as it has historically been understood relates to the means through which the people may influence their government. The definition of the term has evolved over time, and each conceptualization, according to Edward Weber, "emphasises different institutions and locates the ultimate authority for accountability in differing combinations and types of sectors, processes, decision rules, knowledge, and values". He makes a distinction between five conceptualizations of democratic accountability, and Grassroots Ecosystem Management accountability is his main focus. The 'GREM' paradigm

of responsibility entails shared power across governmental tiers as well as between the state and its constituents. This paper does not seek to cover every facet of democratic accountability. The main emphasis is on how individuals may hold public policy makers accountable.

Democratic accountability may, as was previously said, be used to describe either financial, equitable, or performance responsibility. Controlling how successfully the accountable parties or departments have carried out their duties and activities is key to financial accountability. How well the resources have been used in accordance with defined policies, procedures, and standards is a crucial consideration in this sort of accountability. Democratic people are also interested in learning if those in authority individuals or departments have given ethical principles like justice and equality the attention they deserve. According to Robert Behn, the process of establishing financial responsibility and that of establishing accountability for justice are quite similar. For the ideals we want an organisation to give enough attention to, rules, standards, and processes are established. The norms and guidelines are established in each of these types of accountability to set expectations. It is expected that public organisations would uphold their financial and fairness commitments, and that bureaucrats and other professionals will be held responsible if they fail to adhere to the standards of behaviour.

 Holding the government and public institutions responsible for the performance, results, and effects of public policy is also necessary. There must be expectations against which performance may be judged, just as in the previous two categories of responsibility. But performance cannot be assessed in the same way as responsibility for money and justice since it is not about rules and compliance. Setting performance standards is an important issue in a democracy. Whom and what should be used to measure the effectiveness of the government or governance? In all interpretations of democracy, it is not fair to let those in authority define the standards before determining whether or not they have been satisfied. It is acceptable from a participatory or deliberative democratic standpoint to allow all persons impacted by a policy to "contribute feedback" about performance. When referring to input from the concerned accountability environment, Behn uses the phrase "360-degree accountability".

DISCUSSION

Whatever else it may suggest, giving decision-making power to "experts" who somehow understand the needs of the general public better than anybody else is not what bureaucratic autonomy entails. To use another military example, the independent platoon commander should not have any say in overall strategy; generals should be the ones to accomplish it. The generals in a democracy are ultimately the people [5], [6]. Since democratic accountability is ultimately the foundation for authority, or the rightful exercise of power, it is essential to the efficient operation of political institutions. Coercion may be used to enforce compliance with the state's desires, and history is full with instances of this. But when individuals willingly follow laws and policies because they have faith in the fundamental legitimacy of the system, governments function considerably better when power is transformed into authority.

In Volume 1, the difference between England and France after the Glorious Revolution of 1688–1689 served to highlight the significance of legitimacy. England adopted the idea of "no taxation without representation," which stipulated that the state may only access funds that were authorised by Parliament, which at the time was made up of the richest taxpayers in the country. Both the proportion of taxes collected by the government and the perceived security of English public debt increased dramatically in the decades after 1689. While the

affluent might exempt themselves from paying taxes, France's tax system was far more forceful, and the army was regularly used to force uncooperative peasants to pay. French taxes as a percentage of GDP were far lower than those in England. French national finances collapsed as a result in the seventeenth century. With less resources at its disposal, Britain was able to beat France in a series of conflicts that lasted until the eve of the French Revolution.

Government efficiency depends on perceptions of legitimacy since non-state entities have always assisted governments in carrying out their mandates. Many individuals think that the late 20th century saw the innovations of outsourcing, public-private partnerships, and governmental dependence on religious organisations to provide social services. Public-private partnerships, however, have a long history. Churches historically provided social services in Europe, such as population registration and poverty assistance; it wasn't until the 20th century that these duties were taken over by the state. In addition to the government, semi-private organisations like the East India Companies of the English and Dutch carried out colonisation. Stein Ringen notes that while the military administrations in charge of South Korea after 1961 significantly depended on a range of private organisations to carry out its objectives, including several private voluntary groups in addition to large enterprises like Samsung and Hyundai.

The difficulty of wielding power rises as people grow richer, more educated, and have greater access to knowledge thanks to technology. People are far less likely to accept an order just because it was given by an official once they realise they can think for themselves or know stuff the government doesn't. Over the last forty years, formal democracy has been embraced by people all over the globe thanks to a wide social movement that reflects the growth of the middle class. However, it poses a problem for democratic regimes as well, since they are seen to be out of touch and insensitive to their constituents.

To establish democratic accountability, formal processes like routinely free and fair elections were created. Elections, however, do not by themselves ensure that the result will be a government that is really responsive to the interests of the people. Elections and electorates can be rigged; entrenched parties may not provide voters many options; voter turnout could be poor. There is a significant information problem. While voting every few years may indicate my general support or opposition to the policies of a party or administration, what really worries me is a specific regulation that affects my business or the fact that my child's public school lacks effective teachers. Theoretically, there is a chain of responsibility that runs from the voter to the government and then, through a bureaucracy, back to the citizen. However, it is a very long trip, and while conveying selections, there is sometimes a lot of noise that drowns out the signal.

There are many formal, procedural methods intended to solve these problems and improve the responsiveness of governments. The most apparent is to reduce the distance between authority and responsibility by distributing power to the lowest level feasible, where it can respond more immediately to public demand. This has been classified as federalism from the time of the American Founding Fathers. Another strategy involves pitting the executive and legislative branches against one another and utilising the court system to pressure the administration to act on popular requests. There has long been a hierarchy of administrative courts in the civil law systems of Europe that permit anyone to sue the government. I've previously spoken about how the American legal system offers private persons the ability to sue government entities to compel them to enforce the law or to stop them from doing so. The historic Administrative Procedure Act, created in 1946, is one such mechanism that compel federal agencies to publish rule changes openly and invite feedback. Similar procedures,

including participatory budgeting, which was invented in Brazil, are widely used to improve democratic involvement at the state and municipal levels.

Many of these strategies deliver on their promises and make governments more receptive. However, all formal processes have a propensity to grow in number and then be subverted over time by significant players in the system. Federalism often creates additional layers of government rather than really devolving authority; decentralisation, particularly in developing nations, just transfers authority to local elites. The effect of adversarial legalism on the standard of public administration in the United States has previously been mentioned. Over time, the Administrative Procedure Act's notice-and-comment procedures have transformed into an often pointless process where well-paid lobbyists for influential interest groups make predetermined remarks.

All of these formal processes aim to improve decision-making's democratic legitimacy by increasing accountability. However, they also add to the number of regulations, increase transaction costs, and delay down government action. The cumulative effect of these processes often deprives administrative agencies of the independence they need to perform their duties successfully. As in the US Congress, excessive openness may and has undermined the prospect of discussion. Accountability demands will not succeed if they are used as merely another tool in partisan political warfare. Formal systems that meticulously monitor performance and penalise subpar performance often result in "sanction-based accountability," a contemporary variant of Taylorism that is more rooted on fear than loyalty. Such systems are a proven way to eliminate risk taking and creativity on the side of those being assessed since they are predicated on the concept that employees cannot be trusted to execute their jobs without thorough external supervision. Paradoxically, the legitimacy of the government is undermined by these processes, which are intended to promote accountability and, by extension, legitimacy.

The Centre: Therefore, the expansion of formal accountability systems or complete government openness are not always the answers to the challenge of strengthening democratic accountability. The Confucians were correct to assert that no set of guidelines can ever be sufficient to bring in positive outcomes in every situation. Trust is an intangible element that is necessary for the political system to function. Governments must win the confidence of their citizens by being attentive to their needs and keeping their commitments in order to make the majority of the time that they represent the interests of the people. Peter Evans sees a truly autonomous bureaucracy as "embedded" in society and sensitive to its needs rather than one that is walled off from people. This results in a high-level equilibrium where good governance breeds trust, which in turn fosters trust on both sides [7], [8].

In the opposite situation, known as a low-level equilibrium, people withhold from the state both the cooperation and the resources essential for successful government operation because of the poor quality of the government, which in turn generates mistrust among them. Such regimes use coercion in the absence of appropriate authorities to enforce compliance. Because it is far simpler to observe how a political system rises out of a low-level equilibrium than it is to see how one falls into a high-level one, the latter may be why they are so much more common worldwide. It's also likely that all governments are moving towards the low-level trap as people' demands and expectations rise.

If there is a way out of this predicament, it is connected to the ability and autonomy, the two traits of successful governments mentioned above. Governments need organisational capital in addition to human, financial, and financial resources to perform their duties effectively. Additionally, when democratic principles transfer power to bureaucratic agents, the latter

must be given a measure of autonomy commensurate with their current capabilities. This kind of change has never been accomplished by an existing administration overnight; it often happens gradually and via political conflict. Thus, reaching Denmark is a very distant objective.

CONCLUSION

A multifaceted strategy is needed to improve democracy's accountability. This entails boosting openness and information availability, supporting an impartial and independent court, encouraging a culture of morality and honesty, and empowering individuals via civic engagement. It also calls for the creation of strong supervision measures, such independent auditing organisations and anti-corruption authorities. Promoting trust, legitimacy, and efficient government requires democracy's accountability. It improves how responsive governments are to the demands and aspirations of their constituents, guards against the misuse of authority, and supports inclusive and equitable decision-making. Accountability must be sustained by public involvement and participation, adherence to democratic ideals and principles, and ongoing examination and enhancement of accountability procedures. In conclusion, democracy's accountability is essential for sustaining the values of openness, honesty, and responsiveness in government. For democratic institutions to be strengthened and to advance the welfare and confidence of people, it is essential to address the difficulties and facets of accountability. Democracies may thrive and successfully represent their citizens' interests by cultivating an environment of accountability and putting in place strong procedures.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Wang, Y. S. Kim, and C. Y. Kim, 'Causality between logistics infrastructure and economic development in China', *Transp. Policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.10.005.

[2] K. Strøm, W. C. Müller, and T. Bergman, *Delegation and Accountability in Parliamentary Democracies*. 2005. doi: 10.1093/019829784X.001.0001.

[3] R. C. Alves, 'Watchdog Journalism in South America: News, Accountability, and Democracy', *Journal. Mass Commun. Q.*, 2000.

[4] B. M. Wilson and C. Gianella-Malca, 'Overcoming the limits of legal opportunity structures: LGBT rights' divergent paths in Costa Rica and Colombia', *Lat. Am. Polit. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1017/lap.2018.76.

[5] J. Esarey and L. A. Schwindt-Bayer, 'Women's Representation, Accountability and Corruption in Democracies', *British Journal of Political Science*. 2018. doi: 10.1017/S0007123416000478.

[6] Y. Papadopoulos, 'Accountability and multi-level governance: More accountability, less democracy?', *West Eur. Polit.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/01402382.2010.486126.

[7] T. Mkandawire, 'Aid, accountability, and democracy in Africa', *Soc. Res. (New. York).*, 2010, doi: 10.1353/sor.2010.0004.

[8] R. Filipova, 'Democracy beyond elections. Government accountability in the media age', *Democratization*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2019.1703110.

CHAPTER 7

POLITICAL STABILITY AND DECLINE

Dr Geeti Sharma, Assistant Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.geeti_sharma@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In order to comprehend the durability and resilience of political systems, it is essential to grasp political stability and decline. This abstract looks at how political stability develops, what influences it to remain stable or deteriorate, and what happens when political instability occurs in a nation. The capacity of a political system to sustain continuity, functioning, and order across time is referred to as political stability. The lack of significant disputes, societal discontent, or interference with the operation of governmental institutions characterizes it. Economic growth, social cohesiveness, and good government all benefit from political stability because it creates predictable conditions. The collapse of political stability, however, may be caused by a variety of circumstances since it is not a static phenomenon. Political stability may be undermined by a variety of circumstances, including economic crises, social inequality, corruption, bad administration, ethnic or religious conflicts, and outside interference. These elements may trigger large-scale demonstrations, political polarization, power conflicts, institutional instability, and finally the dissolution of political order. It is vital for politicians, academics, and people alike to comprehend the mechanisms of political stability and decline. It calls for a thorough examination of the root causes and precipitating factors of political instability as well as actions to solve these issues via efficient government, inclusive political processes, social fairness, and conflict resolution methods. A dedication to democratic ideals, the rule of law, and the defense of human rights are necessary for promoting political stability, together with a focus on the underlying causes of instability.

KEYWORDS:

Democratic, Development, Economic, Government, Political.

INTRODUCTION

Political evolution and biological evolution, political evolution and its relationship to other facets of development, the significance of global influences, reaching a modern state, the function of violence in political evolution, and whether liberal democracy is a developmental universal are all discussed. This book's two volumes chart the historical development, progress, and decline of political institutions. In many ways, political evolution resembles biological evolution. The latter is predicated on how two principles, variation and selection, interact. The same is true of politics: political institutions vary in nature; as a consequence of competition and interactions with the physical environment, certain institutions endure throughout time while others turn out to be insufficient. Political deterioration happens when institutions are unable to adapt, just as certain organisms turn out to be poorly suited when their habitats change [1].

While biological evolution is subject to random fluctuation, humans have considerable control over the institutional design. It is accurate to say that humans are never intelligent or clever enough to be able to forecast the effects of their attempts to construct institutions or

plan policies with complete ex ante knowledge of the results, as scholars like Friedrich A. Hayek have maintained.1 Humans learn from their errors and act to fix them in an iterative process, thus exercising human agency is not a one-time event. Because the Germans had learnt from the failure of democracy during the 1930s, the 1949 constitution enacted by the Federal Republic of Germany varied significantly from the constitution of the Weimar Republic.

There are distinct pathways for particular and general evolution in biology. Organisms adapt to various surroundings and diversify in their traits under specialized evolution. Charles Darwin's renowned finches were created as a consequence of the birds' adaptability to a variety of microenvironments; this results in speciation. In the course of universal evolution, dissimilar species develop comparable traits because they must find solutions to similar challenges; as a result, sensory organs like the eye have independently developed across many species.

And the same is true of people. About 50,000 years ago, a small group of behaviorally advanced humans left Africa and crossed into the Middle East. Since then, there has been a significant genetic and cultural divergence. The biblical account of the Tower of Babel has a true historical precedent: as people migrated over Europe, Asia, South Asia, Oceania, and finally the Americas, their languages and cultural norms started to diverge as they inhabited a variety of ecological niches. However, there was also a broad process of political development going on at the same time. People from different cultural backgrounds faced parallel issues and developed parallel answers while having little to no physical touch with one another.

There have been a number of significant changes to political institutions in many civilizations across the globe, including: from band-level communities to tribal societies, then from tribal societies to states, from regal to contemporary states, % the introduction of institutional institutions of accountability, the creation of autonomous legal systems. Independent of one another, these political changes took place in civilizations with extremely different cultural standards. Tribalism, a segmented lineage, emerged in almost every region of the globe at a certain point in human evolution. All are founded on the idea that everyone descended from a common ancestor, and they are all supported by a religious conviction that the dead ancestors and unborn offspring have the ability to influence the living. Despite the minute differences in family organisation that are the cornerstone of anthropology, the fundamental makeup of tribal societies is strikingly consistent across civilizations that are geographically apart [2].

Similar to Mesopotamia, China, Egypt, and Mexico, nations started to emerge at around the same time in history and had broadly comparable political systems. They made up bigger, richer civilizations with the ability to produce enough military might to defend their independence against less well-organized rivals. To do this, however, they were all confronted with the challenge of getting rid of family as the fundamental organising element of politics and substituting it with a more impersonal system of governance. From the Chinese creation of the bureaucratic state to the Arab-Ottoman system of military slavery to the weakening of kinship itself and its replacement with a feudal contract in the countries of Western Christianity, various civilizations found different solutions to this issue. In the end, autonomous legal systems emerged as religious law, which was governed by a hierarchy of priests and had at least symbolic power over secular authorities, in ancient Israel, the Christian West, India, and the Muslim world. The type and extent of institutionalisation, as well as the substance of these rules, differed greatly amongst cultures. However, all of these cultures had a fundamental framework of law as a system of social norms restricting the authority of those with the capacity for force. Laws governed family life, inheritance, and

property and offered a forum for resolving disputes that was largely shielded from the state. Because it never established a transcendental religion that might serve as the foundation for a legal system, China is the only major global civilisation that did not produce rule of law in this sense.

None of these changes were successfully implemented throughout all human communities. In isolated environments like the Kalahari Desert and the Arctic, there are still a few band-level communities that have persisted, and there are a lot more tribal groups in hilly, desert, and forest areas. One level of political organisation is never completely replaced by another; as a result, segmentary lineages persisted long after the state was created in China, India, and the Middle East. Prior to the creation of modern governments, segmentary lineages were almost eradicated only in Western Europe. Other civilizations merely overlaid existing lineage systems with political power, and when that power weakened, the lineages' influence reappeared. Tribalism is still a significant factor in the Middle East and contends with nations for dominance.

DISCUSSION

Individuals compete with one another under natural selection, and those that are better suited to their circumstances survive. However, Charles Darwin also discussed a second evolutionary process, sexual selection, which sometimes worked against the first. In order to get access to females, males often acquire traits that serve as indicators of the species' general reproductive fitness, such as bucks' antlers. But when a new kind of predator is brought into the ecosystem, these same traits become a disadvantage since they are not always adaptable towards other species. As local "arms races" between males of the same species take place, sexual selection often overrides natural selection as the driving force for specific development inside a protected niche.

There is a political parallel to sexual selection, as economist Robert Frank has noted. Not every political or social institution that develops results from an unrelenting battle for the survival of the group. Existing institutions might direct their rivalry towards other venues. Therefore, affluent hedge fund managers don't engage in knife and club fights or physical demonstrations of strength to compete. They compete based on the size of their art collections or financial resources. As Frank points out, many of these contests are zero-sum in nature and are fought for relative standing. That is, consumption only has value when it is noticeable, which causes unwinnable competitions for showy display. As a result, the Italian minor lords of the Renaissance fought it out to be patrons of the arts. Even while these investments were of tremendous importance to succeeding generations, they did nothing to aid them in their military conflicts with more powerful and well-prepared foreign adversaries like the kingdoms of Spain and France.

Area of Development

This book examines a time period that saw the beginning of the Industrial Revolution in Europe and America as well as the very high sustained rates of economic development both revolutions enabled. The first volume's descriptions of agricultural communities in Europe, China, India, and the Middle East, in contrast, took place in a Malthusian economic environment where predation was an economically sensible course of action. Although technological development did occur, it did so slowly that population growth rapidly offset per capita gains in productivity. Political activity was centred on one group organising itself to take agricultural surpluses from another group since there were limited chances for productive investment. The great bulk of the people was forced to have harsh lives as subsistence farmers while this system generated wonderful artistic achievements and

extravagant lifestyles for the few. A certain level of security and political tranquilly were the key advantages it brought back to the nonelites.

This was not a minor benefit. The sovereign's assurance of peace was a crucial public benefit at a time when populations may decrease by half or three quarters due to famine, sickness, and sheer butchery caused by war and invasion. Because of the self-reinforcing gap in organisational skills between the elites and everyone else, this system may remain stable for many generations. Peasant uprisings occurred on occasion in agricultural cultures all throughout the world, from China and Turkey to France and Germany, but they were always put down and were often brutally put down by the landowning elites. These regimes' prevailing ideology aggressively impeded social mobility and justified the division of people into various status groups or castes.

Many of the world's most impoverished developing nations are now living in this low-growth, zero-sum economy. While it could theoretically be conceivable for a nation like Sierra Leone or Afghanistan to transform itself into an economic powerhouse like South Korea with wise investment, these nations' weak institutional framework effectively eliminates this possibility. A young entrepreneur is considerably more likely to become wealthy by becoming involved in politics, forming a militia, or devising various schemes to take advantage of the nation's resource riches rather than by founding a firm.

As we've seen, the beginning of industrialization in the nineteenth century severely disrupted this agricultural balance. Societies underwent a significant reorganisation as a result of persistently strong economic development that was fueled by productivity advances brought on by technology. Prior centuries' politically inactive peasants relocated to cities or other regions with manufacturing jobs, where they became an industrial working class. Greater education was attained by city dwellers, who later became members of the emerging middle class. As Adam Smith argued, throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, advances in communication and transportation technologies centred on rivers started to significantly increase the size of markets. The fundamental force behind social transformation in Britain, Belgium, Germany, and France was a significant shift in the division of labour, which was made possible by this. This process also took place in East Asia in the late 20th century and is currently going on in China in the early 21st century.

The development model explained how the state, the rule of law, and accountability the three main political institutions come under strain as quick social mobilisation encourages calls for political involvement. The political structures of the agricultural system must now decide whether to change to meet calls for involvement or fall apart. Large landowners and other traditional social groupings, as well as governmental institutions that are supportive of them the military, for example, will work to thwart participation demands. The degree of organisation within the more recent social groupings affects their capacity to exert political influence. This happened in two steps in Europe and America: first, trade unions were formed, and then new political parties were formed to reflect their interests. The political system will stay stable if such parties are allowed to participate in a wider political system, but if their demands are suppressed, there will be significant political instability [3].

The resolution of these conflicts depends heavily on the circumstances and is never completely predetermined by structural considerations. The ancient agricultural elites in Britain either silently merged into the emerging bourgeoisie via marrying or else discovered new strategies to preserve their political standing while their economic position was being undermined. They sided with the state and used authoritarian authority to repress these new players in Prussia, Argentina, and other Latin American nations. In modern-day China, the

state has worked to thwart this process by preventing the creation of autonomous trade unions that would enable employees to take collective action and by sustaining rapid job growth to satisfy workers.

Class concerns might be somewhat alleviated in Italy, Greece, nineteenth-century America, and modern emerging nations like India, Brazil, and Mexico by established political parties enlisting new social players into clientelistic political apparatuses. The system's overall stability benefited from these computers' exceptional capacity to meet the growing demand for political involvement. Clientelism, on the other hand, promoted open corruption within the political elite and prevented the creation of programmatic demands for laws that ultimately would have served the interests of the new socioeconomic groupings being included into the system far better.

Western Europe, North America, and East Asia have all gone through various stages of modernization. However, it is not the only path towards modernisation that might be taken. A situation known as "modernization without development" has often taken place in the absence of consistent economic growth. According to this scenario, rural poverty exerts more of a push on social transformation than new industrial employment does. Peasants go to cities because they appear to provide more options and chances, but unlike in the traditional industrialization scenario, they are not exposed to the pressures of a growing division of labour. Kin groupings and rural villages relocate intact to urban slums but maintain much of their rural social organisation and values under highly precarious economic situations. This is different from Gemeinschaft being changed into Gesellschaft. This is the kind of modernization that took place in Greece and southern Italy; it has also happened in a great number of developing nations, including the Middle East, Latin America, the Indian subcontinent, and sub-Saharan Africa, where huge cities have grown in the absence of a thriving industrial economy.

Many emerging nations outside of East Asia have seen considerable modernization without growth. Comparing it to the conventional route of modernisation via industrialisation has significant political ramifications. It has the potential to undermine conventional political structures already in place that don't provide avenues for political engagement—the typical Huntington scenario of political deterioration. However, it may also result in a long-lasting system of clientelism and elite alliances centred on the division of rents. When a capitalist industrial sector does not vigorously grow, the division of labour is considerably less widespread, which leads to the emergence of various social classes than in Europe in the 19th century. There is no significant developing middle-class population, no highly educated professionals, and no robust industrial proletariat. Instead, these societies are home to a sizable, amorphous minority of urbanised poor who scrape by in the unofficial economy. When given access to money and markets, many of these individuals may be very successful entrepreneurs.

The provision of such instruments to the underprivileged is the foundation of the modern microfinance sector and property rights campaigns. However, there is no direct route from unofficial work to real industrialisation that creates development and jobs. Under these circumstances, clientelism flourishes because the public sector's capacity to produce rents and the individualised advantages promised by politicians are often much more effective routes to financial stability than the private sector. The focus of politics therefore shifts from programmatic objectives to zero-sum battles over rent distribution. The dotted lines show that this kind of clientelism is a significant barrier to public sector reform and the expansion of state capacity [4].

Legitimacy conceptions are a distinct aspect of development and have a significant impact on how political institutions develop. Their main effect is on how social mobilisation is conducted. Class has often been overshadowed by identity politics—based on nationality, race, or religion—or substituted as the focal focus of social mobilisation. When workers were mobilised in nineteenth-century Europe, nationalism was more effective than their employment situation. It also holds true in the modern Middle East, where religion serves as a potent political motivator. As a result, political debates on matters like the implementation of sharia law and the status of women have taken precedence over concerns about economic policy. Politics in Kenya and Nigeria has deteriorated into interethnic disputes over rent. This was not a natural or unavoidable conclusion, as the experiences of Indonesia and Tanzania demonstrated: political leaders in these nations developed alternative national identity ideas that diminished the importance of ethnicity.

Not Every Good Thing Must Come Together

The state, the rule of law, and accountability are the three pillars of political order that make up contemporary liberal democracy. State operation must be governed by law in order for it to be efficient and impersonal. The absolute monarchies that ruled through bureaucracy, like the Chinese Empire, which could control vast swaths of land and a sizable population, and the Prussian Rechtsstaat, which established clear property rights and provided the framework for Germany's economic growth, were the most successful ones. Accountability is essential to a state's efficient operation, whether it be formal via democratic elections or informal through a government that meets the real needs of its citizens. States acquire and exercise power, but if they exercise lawful authority instead and have voluntarily compliant citizenry, they are significantly more effective and stable. Governments that stop holding themselves responsible open the door to protest, violence, and, in the worst situations, revolution. State, law, and accountability all support one another in liberal democracies.

Nevertheless, there is a persistent conflict between the three pillars of political order. The conflict between the requirements of democracy and state creation has been well shown. Effective contemporary states are based on technical proficiency, mastery, and independence. They were thus able to be founded under authoritarian regimes, from Meiji Japan and Prussia to Singapore and China today. On the other side, democracy necessitates political authority over the state, which in turn reflects public sentiment and calls for increasing levels of engagement. Regarding the political objectives that nations seek, this control is legal and essential. However, political control may come in the shape of conflicting or too specific regulations, and it often aims to exploit the state as a source of wages and rents. Because the state and its resources act as effective piggy banks for democratic politicians looking to mobilise followers, clientelism develops in fledgling democracies. Democratic leaders seized control of the fledgling American state, which they then repatriated via their power over Congress. Countless democracies in the developing world have experienced this similar pattern [5].

Additionally, there is conflict between the rule of law and a high-quality state. Although formal legislation may itself become a barrier to the exercise of an adequate amount of administrative discretion, effective governments function via the rule of law. The conflict between Legalists and Confucians mirrored this tension, which was widely acknowledged in ancient China. The same is true of contemporary discussions on administrative law's norms and discretion. Rules must be unambiguous and impersonal, yet every legal system modifies how they are applied to meet specific situations. Judges have discretion in sentencing, while prosecutors have discretion in whether and how to prosecute offenders. The most effective bureaucracies are free to make decisions on their own, take chances, and innovate. The worst

follow intricate rules created by others mechanically. Bureaucrats who lack common sense and insist on slavish rule compliance drive regular people insane. Sometimes it's necessary for policymakers to take chances and attempt new things.

Additionally, there has always been a conflict between democratic accountability and the rule of law. Rule of law must be applicable to all people, even democratic majorities, in order for it to survive. In many democracies, majorities regard legal requirements to be unpleasant roadblocks to their objectives and are happy to violate the rights of people and minority. On the other hand, the extent to which a law represents the social standards of fairness in a society determines its final validity. Moreover, the judicial and executive departments of government are run by people who administer the laws. These people each have their own thoughts and perspectives, which may not line up with what the general population wants. Just as risky as weak or politically compliant judiciaries is judicial activism.

Finally, democracy may conflict with itself: attempts to raise democratic participation and transparency levels may actually make the system less democratically representative as a whole. The majority of people in democracies lack the background or temperament necessary for them to make complex decisions about public policy, and when they are repeatedly asked to do so, well-organized interest groups frequently take control and use it to further their own specific agendas. Excessive openness might make decision-making difficult. All positive things do not always complement one another due to the conflicts that exist between the various elements of the political system. A healthy liberal democracy maintains some kind of equilibrium among the three elements. But the growth of the state, the law, and accountability may also be hampered. The order in which various institutions were implemented becomes crucial because of this.

The Global Perspective

The interaction of the six elements of growth within the framework of individual societies in a closed system. However, the reality is that everything that occurs on a global scale has a significant impact on each and every one of these dimensions. This is particularly clear when it comes to concepts of legitimacy. Ideas could go from one community to another, from one civilisation to another, even before the Industrial Revolution, and they were often the principal drivers of societal change. Islam's influence reached as far as Southeast Asia and turned a small, underdeveloped tribe on the Arabian Peninsula into a significant international force. Chinese Confucianism spread to the nearby countries of Vietnam, Korea, and Japan, where it encouraged the creation of institutions in the Chinese model even in the absence of invasion and occupation. Buddhism was brought from India to Southeast and East Asia, where it often evolved into something similar to a state religion, unlike in its native land.

Naturally, the intensity of ideological dispersion has increased significantly with the development of contemporary communications technology. The development and dissemination of nationalism as an organising concept depended heavily on books and media. Due to advancements in electronic technology, from radio and television to the Internet and social media, liberalism, Marxism, fascism, Islamism, and democracy all easily transcended international boundaries in the 20th century. Without the impact of the global pictures of the Berlin Wall down, it is difficult to imagine the democratic transformations that took place in sub-Saharan Africa in the early 1990s. Similar to how social media platforms like Twitter and Facebook, as well as television networks like Al Jazeera, influenced the timing of demonstrations against despotic governments during the Arab Spring, as well as internal issues. Early in the twenty-first century, democracy had really gone worldwide.

Unfortunately, many of the methods used to spread institutions across boundaries were far less tactful: they often included the actual slavery or eradication of indigenous people as well as invasion, occupation, and other forms of armed conflict. The topography, climate, local populace, and indigenous institutions all combined to develop new forms that deviated from those in the home nation, and even the most oppressive colonial powers discovered that they could not re-create their own institutions in various areas at will.

The colonial powers who inhabited sparsely populated areas with their own people saw the greatest institutional transfer success. The colonial powers came upon pastoral and hunter-gatherer peoples who, with a few notable exceptions, were not organised into state-level societies in North America, Australia, Argentina, Chile, and portions of South Africa. Even though the conquest was sometimes drawn out, nasty, and bloody, only a small number of the indigenous political structures were left behind. The Spanish came upon highly populated state-level communities in Peru and Mexico. However, the Inca and Aztec state structures were neither ancient nor well developed, and they fell apart even more quickly than the tribal societies of North and South America under the burden of invasion and illness. Although the Creole populations in the Spanish conquests were less than those of the indigenous peoples they controlled and intermarried with, they still formed colonial colonies. Therefore, the institutions introduced to Latin America at the time of colonisation were comparable to those of Spain and Portugal, whether mercantilist in Peru and Mexico or liberal in Argentina.

However, since settlers had to deal with local circumstances that were sometimes quite different from the ones they left behind, settler regimes seldom simply copied the institutions of their home nations. There is a lot of variance in the results of specific evolution. Therefore, location and climate had a significant impact on the development of slave society in various regions of Latin America, the Caribbean, and the American South. Because of this, imported European traditions of hierarchy and authoritarian rule were perpetuated, and the American South saw a reversal of the national trend towards greater social equality.

The form of prior institutions had a significant role in determining the types of political order that finally evolved in those regions of the globe that were not largely inhabited by Europeans. In this regard, East Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa are on opposing extremes of the spectrum. At the time of colonisation, a large portion of the former area lacked powerful state-level institutions, and the few state-level societies that did exist were not well developed in terms of state scope or strength. With the exception of South Africa, diseases and a lack of lucrative economic prospects kept Europeans from settling Africa in large numbers, therefore the colonial powers did not think it was worthwhile to make significant investments in establishing their own institutions there. Thus, the brief time of European colonialism in Africa was successful in eroding regional traditions but failing to replace them with more contemporary ones [6].

China, Japan, and Korea, on the other hand, had stately traditions that, in some instances, went back further and deeper than those of the Europeans themselves. They were able to fend off invasion and colonisation far more successfully as a result. All nineteenth-century attempts to colonise or annex their territories were thwarted or abandoned until Hong Kong was returned to Chinese control in 1997. Despite the fact that all traditional East Asian governments fell after facing the West, they were finally able to reestablish robust new state structures by fusing local political traditions with contemporary norms. The governments that developed were heavily inspired by Western ideologies: Japan and South Korea are liberal democracies in the Western tradition, whereas China is controlled by a dictatorship ostensibly founded on Marxism-Leninism. Despite China's promotion of its own governance model, Western and international practises have significantly influenced both its legal system and

micro level institutions in East Asia. However, the great East Asian republics were built around bureaucratic centres that owe more to their own historical experience than to anything brought over from the West [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

Political unrest has a variety of effects that may be detrimental to both a nation's economy and people. Economic downturns, a decline in foreign investment, disruptions to social services, an increase in poverty, and a weakening of democratic principles and human rights may all be consequences of instability. In addition, political instability may foster circumstances for conflict, violence, and even civil wars, which can result in human casualties, population displacement, and regional instability. Political stability, which lays the groundwork for economic growth, social cohesion, and efficient government, is, thus, a crucial component of a functional political system. Wide-ranging repercussions, including an effect on all facets of society and a possibility for conflict and instability, might result from a loss in political stability. To advance sustainable development, peace, and democratic government, it is essential to identify and solve the elements that contribute to political stability and decline.

REFERENCES

[1]   O. Lyulyov *Et Al.*, 'The Impact Of The Government Policy On The Energy Efficient Gap: The Evidence From Ukraine', *Energies*, 2021, Doi: 10.3390/En14020373.

[2]   A. Christianto, 'Dampak Ekstradisi Terhadap Ekonomi Masyarakat Indonesia: Mahal Atau Manfaat?', *Dialogia Iurid.*, 2020.

[3]   E. Petrenko, N. Iskakov, O. Metsyk, And T. Khassanova, 'Ecosystem Of Entrepreneurship: Risks Related To Loss Of Trust In Stability Of Economic Environment In Kazakhstan', *Entrep. Sustain. Issues*, 2017, Doi: 10.9770/Jesi.2017.5.1(8).

[4]   S. A. Asongu, T. P. Y. Kossele, And J. Nnanna, 'Not All That Glitters Is Gold: Political Stability And Trade In Sub-Saharan Africa', *Crime, Law Soc. Chang.*, 2021, Doi: 10.1007/S10611-021-09936-3.

[5]   A. Thier And S. Worden, 'Political Stability In Afghanistan A 2020 Vision And Roadmap', *United States Inst. Peace*, 2020.

[6]   W. Veenendaal, 'When Things Get Personal: How Informal And Personalized Politics Produce Regime Stability In Small States', *Government And Opposition*. 2020. Doi: 10.1017/Gov.2018.30.

[7]   A. Christanto, 'Mengidentifikasi Dampak Ekstradisi Terhadap Perekonomian Indonesia', *Litigasi*, 2020, Doi: 10.23969/Litigasi.V21i1.2090.

[8]   T. Rayner, 'Keeping It In The Ground? Assessing Global Governance For Fossil-Fuel Supply Reduction', *Earth Syst. Gov.*, 2021, Doi: 10.1016/J.Esg.2020.100061.

CHAPTER 8

POLITICAL CHANGE AND VIOLENCE

Dr Selvi. S, Associate Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.selvi@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Violence and political transition are closely related phenomena that often interact in intricate ways in countries going through considerable upheaval. This abstract investigates the connection between political instability and violence by looking at the many manifestations, root causes, and effects of violence. Political transformation refers to substantial changes in a political system's structure, institutions, and power dynamics. These adjustments may result from events like government changes, social movements, revolutions, or democratization phases. Political change may provide chances for advancement, but it can also lead to tensions, disputes, and violent outbursts as rival interest's battle for control and influence. In the context of political change, violence refers to a variety of activities and behaviours that aim to subvert, repress, or oppose the current political system. This may encompass both state-sponsored and non-state violence, such as that which results from armed conflicts, repression, or other violations of human rights. The causes of violence during political upheaval might range from ideo logical disagreements to socioeconomic grievances, identity-based disputes, or power battles between opposing groups. The effects of violence during political upheaval are wide-ranging and varied. Violence may cause short-term deaths, bodily and mental harm, population relocation, and a decline in faith in institutions. Persistent violence may stymie democratic and inclusive institutions from being established, as well as the process of political reform itself. A society's general stability, economic growth, and social cohesiveness may all be negatively impacted by violence.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Development, Economic, Political, Violence.

INTRODUCTION

The terrible reality of human existence is that violence has played a major role in political evolution in a variety of contexts, especially when it comes to the founding of modern governments. Cooperation and competition are two sides of the same coin; humans compete to cooperate and cooperate to compete. Additionally, competition is often brutal. Unfortunately, there are no historical accounts of the early shifts from band to tribe or from tribe to pure state, so we can only make educated guesses as to what drove them. Naturally, the transition to larger-scale communities was influenced by technical advancements, the economic surpluses they enabled, and the physical environment. However, it doesn't seem that economic incentives by themselves were enough to bring about these changes. Similar to how peasants today in developing nations routinely reject productivity-boosting innovations, these early cultures were frequently hampered by institutional rigidities in production processes and social organisation [1].

Instead, the archaeological evidence points to military struggle as the driving factor behind the significant shifts from band to tribe to state to contemporary state. To protect the

community's physical existence, there was only a great need for new political organisations when violence was a concern. The Tilly axiom that "the state made war and war made the state" was intended to be used in relation to the establishment of states in early modern Europe. However, in ancient China, military rivalry was a factor in the development of contemporary governments as well. In the early Zhou Dynasty of ancient China, violence is prominently mentioned as the main driver of state formation and state development [2], [3]. As we have shown, building sophisticated bureaucracies under absolutist rules was crucial in forcing France, Prussia, and Japan to compete militarily. The military failures of the Crimean War helped Britain pass the Northcote-Trevelyan reform; in the United States, many significant state expansions during the two world wars, the cold war, and the so-called war on terrorism were motivated by national security concerns. On the other hand, the rarity of interstate conflict in Latin America contributes to the region's nations' relative weakness. Given that political order was created in the first place to address the issue of violence, it may appear paradoxical that violence plays a role in generating political order. However, no legislative decree has ever completely eradicated violence; rather, it has just raised the degree of organisation of violence. Today's state authority may provide fundamental security and tranquilly to people living in civilizations with more than a billion people. However, such nations may still plan very damaging acts of violence against one another, and they will never be totally capable of upholding domestic tranquilly.

Violence or the prospect of violence has influenced the development of political institutions in more ways than just external competition. Violence has often been required to combat political deterioration and institutional rigidity. When governing political figures firmly establish themselves inside a system and obstruct opportunities for institutional reform, decay results. These performers can often only be defeated violently because they are so strong. The corrupt officials of the ancien régime in France, who as a class had to be forcibly ejected during the revolution, fit this description. Only via war and revolution did other strong agricultural oligarchies—the Prussian Junkers and the landowning elites in Russia and China—lose their possessions. Amidst the background of American military might, the landowning aristocracy in Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan were compelled to sell their holdings. Other times, nonelites stood in the way of progress towards modernity. According to Barrington Moore, the parliamentary enclosure movement in England, which was necessary to establish a modern capitalist land tenure system, required a slow-motion revolution in which peasants were forcibly evicted from the lands their families had lived on for generations [4].

The creation of national identities, which is often a crucial adjunct to effective state construction and political order in general, is the last area in which violence or the fear of violence is significant for political growth. Redrawing borders or physically displacing people were necessary to implement the premise that geographical bounds should correspond to cultural units, neither of which could be done without significant bloodshed. Even in countries like Tanzania and Indonesia, where national identity was consciously intended to be inclusive and non-ethnic, lingua francas and compelling narratives of nationhood had to be enforced by authoritarian political means. All of the successful liberal democracies in Europe that emerged in the second half of the 20th century were a result of centuries of bloody nation-building.

Fortunately, war is not the only way to establish a modern state. Although Britain and the United States built state bureaucracies in response to demands for national security, both countries overhauled their state administrations during times of peace by forging reform coalitions. These alliances were mostly, but not completely, made up of new social groupings

that had no stake in the previous patronage structures in politics. In Britain, it was the middle classes that yearned to join the exclusive club of the former nobility. The nation's relatively tiny elite quickly changed direction after concluding that the outdated system was ineffective and was not meeting the demands of the empire. Because of the country's Westminster system's concentration of power, the change might be implemented in less than two decades. The reform coalition in the US was more intricate. On the subject of patronage, the emerging middle and professional classes themselves were split. Some corporate interests had managed to function within the pre-existing framework. In opposition to those same interests, some of the more established agricultural interests that industrialization had left behind joined the reform alliance. Additionally, culture had a significant but difficult to measure effect. In order to mobilise support for change, the moralism of a Protestant elite jealous of the corruption generated by urban party machines with their immigrant customers joined forces.

These examples demonstrate that the transition from a patrimonial or clientelistic state to a contemporary one might begin with economic progress on its own. However, growth is hardly a guarantee that contemporary nations will form. Clientelism may still exist in the modern world despite high levels of per capita income, as shown by the examples of Greece and Italy. Middle-class professionals and other newly active social groupings may or may not support state change; they might just as easily fall victim to clientelistic politics. This is especially true when an unreformed state takes the lead in fostering economic development and when economic growth is not based on market-centered entrepreneurship. As a result, there are several routes to modernity. Violence had a significant role in historically motivating political innovation, but it is no longer a prerequisite for change in situations when it occurs later. These cultures have the option of drawing lessons from the past and modifying previous models to fit their own.

DISCUSSION

Universal Politics: General political development progression above particular political development evolution throughout the two volumes of this work. In other words, when civilizations adapted to the particular environmental niches they inhabited, their systems of political organisation began to vary. But as was previously said, they have produced very comparable answers to organisational issues in many contexts [5]. I have argued that the three sets of political institutions state, law, and accountability must be in some kind of equilibrium if a political system is to be effective. This claim makes a normative choice implicit. In my opinion, liberal democracies with institutions of restraint based on the rule of law and democratic accountability as opposed to those in which the state predominates are more fair and better able to serve their population.

This is because, regardless of the calibre of administration that such a system generates, the form of political action entailed by democratic politics serves a vital aim of human existence in and of itself. I agree with Aristotle's claim in the Politics that people are naturally political and can only grow to the fullest degree when they take part in a shared existence. An analogous case may be made for the inherent worth of market-based economic systems. A citizen "may still have very good reasons to prefer the scenario of free choice over that of submission to order," according to Amartya Sen, who points out that the latter are not simply more efficient.4 The exercise of political and economic agency is an important end of human life itself, apart from the effects of that exercise.

Independent of whether such rights are helpful in fostering economic progress, the rule of law that bestows rights on people also has inherent worth. Individual freedoms, such as the ability to gather, criticise, and engage in political activity, represent the state's acknowledgement of

the worth of its people. At best, an authoritarian state sees its people like stupid, immature kids who require parental supervision for their own welfare; at worst, it considers them as resources to be used for profit or as rubbish to be thrown away. In practise, a rule of law that upholds individual rights acknowledges that people are adults with the capacity for moral autonomy. Because of this, so many despots, from ancient Chinese unifier Qin Shi Huangdi through Mubarak and Qaddafi during the Arab Spring, have finally been overthrown by revolts of outraged dignity led by their own people. This research raises the issue of whether liberal democracy, which strikes a balance between the state, the law, and accountability, represents some kind of political universal in and of itself or only reflects the cultural preferences of those who reside in Western liberal democracies.

Since this kind of rule just emerged a few centuries ago a minor blip in the timeline of human political order it is obvious that it does not represent a universal for all people. We would have to contend that liberal democracy, to the extent that it does constitute a more broadly applicable form of government, does so as a result of general political evolution, much as band-, tribe-, and state-level institutions came to be the predominant forms of political organisation across various cultures and regions at various historical junctures. The other aspects of development economic growth, social mobilisation, and changes in ideas are what make this kind of government essential. Band and tribal cultures may have had a strong kind of responsibility, but they lacked a state or laws that were enforced by outsiders. Agrarian economies governed by state-level societies might last for generations, sometimes with the rule of law but never with democratic accountability. Only when high rates of economic development take hold and nations modernise along their economic and social dimensions does the functional necessity for a balanced regime combining all three components become apparent.

Large-scale civilizations with highly active inhabitants may be exceedingly challenging to manage without proper legal frameworks and accountability systems. Large markets are necessary for economic development and efficiency, and they need for stable, predictable, and strictly adhered-to norms. Free press and elections may be considered as key information conduits through which governments can remain current of this kaleidoscopic process. Highly mobilised and constantly changing populace make continual demands of rulers. Moreover, even if many governments do not really uphold the concept of human equality, Tocqueville noted that it has been expanding steadily over the last few centuries. People will seize any chance to claim their rights because they feel they have them.

Under these circumstances, the requirement for a balance between state authority, the rule of law, and democratic accountability transforms from a normative choice into a need for a healthy political system if a society is to be considered contemporary in other ways. In hindsight, it seems clear that Huntington was mistaken in thinking that authoritarian parties could meet the needs for involvement of the populace. But even though a regime that balances the state, the law, and accountability is in fact a necessary element of effective modern politics, we must acknowledge that there is a wide range of institutional configurations that law and accountability can take; the institutional models followed by specific nations like the United States do not serve as general guidelines. These institutions may be implemented in various ways by various civilizations.

Instead of focusing just on their rigid procedural forms, we should pay close attention to the fundamental purposes that law and responsibility are supposed to fulfil. The goal of law is to fairly and equitably define the standards of justice for the community and to make them public. In the modern world, the massive procedural machinery that is the speciality of the legal profession serves as a tool to achieve impartial justice rather than as a goal in and of

itself. However, protocol often comes first and impedes the pursuit of substantive justice. Numerous cultures that uphold the rule of law have too cumbersome and expensive legal systems that work to the advantage of those who can exploit their familiarity with the process at the expense of the administration of justice.

Similar to this, democratic practises including free and fair elections do not provide accountability on a real level. It is possible to manipulate the election process itself, from overt fraud and vote rigging to more covert attempts to redesign electoral districts in favour of one party or to invalidate votes from the opposing party. Politicians may employ clientelistic tactics to woo followers and can utilise identifiers like race and religion for their own ends even in the finest election systems. In other situations, strong interest groups may use current laws to their advantage to safeguard particular interests and obstruct larger public objectives. Under these conditions, public interest often encounters a collective action issue and is not well represented [6], [7].

In modern liberal democracies, the worship of form over content is a significant contributor to political decline. Any government may experience political degradation due to the very nature of institutions. Institutions are laws that continue to be followed beyond the lives of their creators. They continue in part because they are valuable and in part because it is thought that they have inherent worth. Rules are stable for a long period of time because people have a tendency to give them emotional significance, but when conditions change, their rigidity becomes a problem. When change comes after a protracted time of tranquilly and stability, the issue is often worse. Furthermore, there is a natural propensity for elites with access to the political system to revert to the default type of sociability, one that prioritises family and engages in reciprocal benefit exchange with friends. As a consequence, both the law and procedural responsibility are exploited to subvert the main goals that they were intended to achieve.

In the early twenty-first century, there are a few governments that regard themselves as moral alternatives to liberal democracy. These include the People's Republic of China, Russia, and the monarchies of the Persian Gulf, as well as Iran. However, Iran is deeply split, with a sizable middle class that disputes many of the regime's justifications. The monarchies of the Gulf have always been unique instances, only remaining in existence in their current forms due to their abundant petroleum supplies. Putin's Russia, like other rentier states, has grown to be a regional powerhouse mostly due to its oil and gas riches; outside of the world of Russian speakers, no one considers it to be a political system worth imitating.

China represents the most significant threat to the notion that liberal democracy serves as a global evolutionary model among the non-democratic alternatives. As often mentioned in these volumes, China is one of the few state-level civilizations that has never evolved an indigenous history of rule of law. It draws on a two-millennia-long legacy of strong centralised administration. Confucian morality has been used as a restraint on rulers in place of formal procedural standards in China's vast and complicated heritage. This legacy was passed down to other East Asian nations and is a significant factor in the post-World War II prosperity of Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan. Sometimes, authoritarian administrations are better equipped to make a clear rupture with the past than democratic ones. One of the major benefits of post-Mao China was the presence of a very independent Communist Party.

The main concern for China now is whether, just 35 years after Deng's reforms were started, the Chinese system is already experiencing political disintegration and losing the independence that gave rise to its previous success. The policy priorities of China in the next ten years will be considerably different from those of the previous generation. It currently has

a middle-income status and is working to become a high-income status. The outdated export-driven economy must shift its focus to domestic demand far more substantially. China is no longer able to take advantage of rapid economic expansion and populace mobilisation to build an industrial economy. In its pursuit of rapid economic development, China has accumulated significant environmental liabilities that are now visible in the country's unhealthy air, "cancer villages," weak food safety regulations, and other grave issues. Uncertainty exists over China's educational system's capacity to provide the kind of skills required to maintain broad-based increases in productivity. The ability of genuine innovation to persist in the absence of more personal freedom is a more fundamental challenge. The amount of information needed to manage the Chinese economy has increased along with the system's complexity. A top-down command-and-control system's capacity to keep up with what is really occurring in the society is in doubt, just as it was in dynastic China. The mobilisation of China's own people has been huge and has happened faster than the movement in Europe throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The educated and growingly rich residents of China have different needs and goals than the peasants who formerly made up the majority of Chinese society.

The key issue is whether the Chinese leadership has the freedom to change course towards a more liberal system that would promote more economic rivalry and enable a freer flow of information across society in light of these difficulties. Even in the lack of a legislature and lobbyists, China's fast expansion has produced new vested interests that are strong and have a say in the party's decision-making. The state-owned businesses are more numerous and prosperous than ever. Reform is a personal risk for members in the party leadership because the party leadership has developed corrupt behaviour patterns. Even if the majority of Chinese people stopped believing in Marxism-Leninism many years ago, the party nevertheless holds onto it as an ideology.

The most significant test of liberal democracy's universality in the coming years will be how the emerging middle class in China acts. One would have to claim that China is culturally unique from other cultures across the globe in its support for authoritarian leadership if it continues to increase in absolute and relative size while being willing to live under the benign tutelage of a single-party dictatorship. But if it leads to participation expectations that are incompatible with the current political structure, it is just acting in a way that is typical of middle classes across the globe. The Chinese system will be put to the true test of its viability not when the economy is growing and there are plenty of jobs available, but rather when development slows and the system experiences its inevitable collapse.

The availability of a different, more desirable system of political organisation may not be the biggest developmental obstacle, but rather the reality that many nations will strive to be wealthy, liberal democracies but will never succeed in doing so. Some commentators have stated that since political and economic progress are interwoven, impoverished nations may be "trapped" in poverty. Certain basic political institutions are necessary for economic progress, but they are very difficult to establish in situations of acute poverty and political polarisation. How can I escape this trap? We have seen how accident and contingency—fortunate leadership, the haphazard sequencing of the introduction of institutions, or unintended consequences of actions taken for other purposes, like fighting wars—led certain countries to evolve in unexpected ways throughout the two volumes of this book. Could it be that nations who historically avoided falling into this trap were just lucky, and that others who weren't so fortunate could never advance?

This point of view is overly negative. It is true that accidents and good fortune have historically contributed to the beginning of political and economic transformation. However,

it's possible that accidents and good fortune had a bigger role in the founding of new institutions in the early civilizations than in those that followed. There has been a lot of institutional experience gained over the years, and there is a developing global community that exchanges information, expertise, and resources. Additionally, there are several routes and sites of entrance into development. When progress fails to manifest along one dimension, it may eventually occur along another, at which point the interrelated causal chains will begin to operate. The overall framework for understanding development offered here, with its economic, political, social, and ideological elements, makes all of this suggestion.

Does the occurrence of political degradation in contemporary democracies imply that the general conception of a system that strikes a balance between the state, the law, and accountability is fatally defective in some way? My conclusion is that all cultures, whether authoritarian and democratic, are susceptible to deterioration over time. Their capacity to adapt and finally correct themselves is the true problem. There isn't, in my opinion, a widespread "crisis of governability" among mature democracies. Such crises have previously beset democratic political systems, most notably in the 1930s when they experienced an economic depression and were confronted by fascist and communist rivals, or again in the 1960s and 1970s when they were rocked by widespread unrest, economic stagnation, and high inflation. It is highly difficult to assess a political system's long-term prospects based on how it performed in any one decade since issues that seem insurmountable in one era disappear in another. Democratic political systems often take longer than authoritarian ones to react to escalating issues, but when they do, they frequently take more decisive action since the choice to act is supported by more people.

If there is one issue that contemporary democracies, both emerging and established, have to deal with, it is their inability to deliver the core services that the public expects from government: personal security, shared economic growth, and high-quality infrastructure, education, and health care that are necessary to achieve individual opportunity. For reasonable reasons, proponents of democracy concentrate on restricting the authority of dictatorial or predatory nations. However, they don't spend as much time considering how to run the country efficiently since, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, they are more concerned in "controlling than in energising government."

This was the reason why the Orange Revolution in Ukraine in 2004 which initially deposed Viktor Yanukovich failed. Long before Vladimir Putin was powerful enough to challenge it, an effective democratic government that eliminated corruption and strengthened the reliability of state institutions would have solidified its legitimacy throughout not only Russian-speaking eastern Ukraine but also the western Ukraine. Instead, the Orange Coalition spent its time and energy on murky business dealings and internal squabbles, which helped to create the conditions for Yanukovich's 2010 comeback and the catastrophe that followed his departure in 2014.

In comparison to totalitarian China, India has lagged behind in performance. India's remarkable ability to maintain an elected democracy from its foundation in 1947, with the exception of one short period, is quite outstanding. On closer scrutiny, Indian democracy, like preparing sausage, does not seem to be that enticing. The electoral process is plagued with patronage and corruption; 34% of the election victors in India in 2014 are now facing criminal accusations, including grave offences including murder, abduction, and sexual assault. Although there is a rule of law, it operates so slowly and ineffectively that many litigants pass away before their claims are tried. The nation's capacity to provide its inhabitants modern infrastructure or services like clean water, power, or basic education has been severely restricted in comparison to China. This is why Narendra Modi, a Hindu

nationalist with a checkered history, won an overwhelming majority of votes to become prime minister in 2014 in the belief that he would be able to somehow break through the drivel of standard Indian politics and really do anything.

Unfortunately, this lack of efficient governance extends to the US itself. The nation's Madisonian Constitution, which was created with the intention of preventing tyranny by increasing the number of checks and balances at all levels of government, has turned into a vetocracy. Political polarisation makes it impossible for it to advance or retreat in any meaningful way. Even if the United States has a very severe long-term budgetary issue, it may be resolved with the right political agreements. However, in accordance with its own rules, Congress hasn't enacted a budget in a number of years, and in autumn 2013, it shut down the whole government because it couldn't come to an agreement on how to pay off previous debts. While the American economy continues to be a source of amazing innovation, the American government now inspires few people throughout the globe.

Therefore, no one should feel complacent about the survival of their established liberal democracy. There is no built-in historical process that ensures advancement or stops decay and regress. Democracies only exist and endure because people want and are prepared to fight for them; they are successful only through strong leadership, effective organisational skills, and often just plain good fortune. As we've seen, there is a trade-off between the degree of public engagement and the efficiency of government; it is not easy to conceptually figure out how to strike that balance. Therefore, although broad institutional forms may evolve throughout time due to general evolution, no unique political system will ever be in constant harmony with its environment due to specific evolution [8]–[10].

However, even while there is sometimes a shortage of excellent democratic administration, there is a significant and constant demand for it. All around the globe, new social groupings have been mobilised. Mass demonstrations that continue to sporadically break out in cities like Tunis, Kiev, Istanbul, and So Paulo are proof of this. These rallies are driven by the desire of the populace for governments to uphold their equal human rights and fulfil their promises. Millions of needy individuals who desperately want to emigrate each year from locations like Guatemala City or Karachi to Los Angeles or London are another indication of it. These statistics alone imply that political progress has a definite path and that transparent governments that respect the equality of all individuals are popular across the world.

CONCLUSION

A comprehensive strategy is needed to address the link between political transition and violence. It calls for actions to address the underlying causes of violence, such as injustice, marginalisation, and inequality. It is crucial to encourage discourse, atonement, and inclusive democratic procedures in order to avoid and reduce violence during times of transition. It's also crucial to strengthen democratic institutions, uphold the rule of law, and defend human rights in order to foster an atmosphere that supports peaceful political transitions. Policymakers, academics, and activists wishing to advance peace, justice, and stability must comprehend the processes of political change and violence. Stakeholders may design strategies and interventions that promote peaceful transitions and minimise conflict escalation by understanding the root causes and effects of violence during periods of political change. To build a solid basis for political transformation, efforts to combat violence should also be backed by programmes that advance social justice, equality, and inclusive governance. In conclusion, violence often manifests as a reaction to or a stimulus for transformational political processes, illustrating the complexity of the link between political change and violence. Understanding the origins, manifestations, and effects of violence during political

upheaval is essential for averting conflict, establishing inclusive government, and advancing lasting peace and prosperity.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. Graef, R. da Silva, and N. Lemay-Hebert, 'Narrative, Political Violence, and Social Change', *Studies in Conflict and Terrorism*. 2020. doi: 10.1080/1057610X.2018.1452701.

[2]   M. A. Mirdad, 'Taliban insurgency and transnational organized crime nexus', *Masyarakat, Kebud. dan Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.20473/mkp.v33i32020.266-277.

[3]   W. Berenschot, 'Patterned pogroms: Patronage networks as infrastructure for electoral violence in India and Indonesia', *J. Peace Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1177/0022343319889678.

[4]   O. M. Theisen, 'Climate Change and Violence: Insights from Political Science', *Current Climate Change Reports*. 2017. doi: 10.1007/s40641-017-0079-5.

[5]   L. Rothenberger, 'Terrorist Groups: Using Internet and Social Media for Disseminating Ideas. New Tools for Promoting Political Change', *Rom. J. Commun. Public Relations*, 2012.

[6]   E. T. Hoddy, 'Peasants' rights and agrarian violence in transitional settings: From transitional justice to transformative agrarian justice', *J. Hum. Rights*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/14754835.2020.1850242.

[7]   V. Le Masson, C. Benoudji, S. S. Reyes, and G. Bernard, 'How violence against women and girls undermines resilience to climate risks in Chad', *Disasters*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/disa.12343.

[8]   S. Xenakis, 'A new dawn? Change and continuity in political violence in Greece', *Terrorism and Political Violence*. 2012. doi: 10.1080/09546553.2011.633133.

[9]   A. Hasan, 'Residential segregation in Mithi and Karachi, Pakistan', *Environ. Urban.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0956247818812331.

[10]   B. M. Schumpe, J. J. Bélanger, M. Giacomantonio, C. F. Nisa, and A. Brizi, 'Weapons of peace: Providing alternative means for social change reduces political violence', *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1111/jasp.12546.

CHAPTER 9

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON DEMOCRACY EXPAND

Dr Shalini.R, Associate Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.shalinir@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The process through which democratic values, institutions, and behaviours extend and develop across many nations and areas is referred to as "democracy expansion." This abstract examines the idea of democracy growth, its causes, difficulties, and consequences for social advancement and global government. The desire for participatory governance and human rights, as well as social movements, political upheaval, external standards and pressures, are some of the variables that influence the spread of democracy. It entails the adoption and application of democratic procedures, including the holding of free and fair elections, the observance of civil freedoms, and the application of the law. Expanding democracies are often linked to greater political liberties, pluralism, and citizen empowerment. Expansion of democracy, nevertheless, is not without its difficulties. Economic disparity, corruption, political polarisation, and the emergence of populism are some factors that might hinder the development and efficacy of democratic institutions. Furthermore, opposition to the democratisation process from well-established power structures may result in setbacks and conflicts over the consolidation of democracy. The evolution of society and international governance are significantly impacted by the growth of democracy. Because they provide channels for peaceful dispute settlement, uphold human rights, and promote social and economic advancement, democracies tend to be more stable, peaceful, and successful. Additionally, democracy extension encourages inclusive decision-making, improves accountability and transparency, and gives marginalised groups greater clout, resulting in more resilient and equitable communities.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Democratic, Development, Economy, Law.

INTRODUCTION

The Third Wave of democratisation; theories of why democratic waves occur; how democracy is rooted in the interests of particular social groups; social mobilisation as the link between economic change and democracy; political parties as key players in the fight for democracy Japan, China, and other East Asian societies were heirs to a long tradition of government and could presuppose the existence of a strong state as they started to industrialise in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. They had previously been very unequal agricultural societies where a tiny elite had a monopoly of power over a sizable majority of mainly unorganised peasants. The authoritarian system in modern China will confront enormous problems as new social groups get mobilised and start to seek a share of political power, I said, noting that the state-society balance started to alter with the advent of fast economic development. Will this eventually result in China implementing formal democratic accountability? We are unable to foresee such a result. What we can do is make

an effort to comprehend the process of democratisation in other areas of the globe and any potential future ramifications.

In what Samuel Huntington dubbed the Third Wave of democratisation, the number of democracies expanded from around 35 to almost 120, or about 60% of all nations, between 1970 and 2010. The Second Short Wave occurred in the immediate aftermath of World War II, the Third Wave started with the democratic transitions in Spain and Portugal in the early 1970s and continued through the end of military rule in Greece and Turkey, followed by a series of Latin American countries including Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Bolivia, and Chile; then it moved to the Middle East and North Africa. According to democracy specialist Larry Diamond, the Third Wave had a recession in the 2000s. Although the Arab Spring's beginning in early 2011 gave some observers hope for the beginning of a Fourth Wave, failures in Egypt, Libya, and Syria have made this less convincing.1 Why did these waves of democratisation take place? Why did they happen in certain civilizations and locations but not others? Why did some waves succeed in building more stable democracies while others had their gains reversed? And why, in the nearly 400 years before to that in human history, did democracy not become a universal reality until the twentieth century?

Many various explanations for why democracy expanded have been put out, but one of them is that it did so because of the strength of the democratic principle itself. In his preface to Democracy in America, Alexis de Tocqueville made a strong case for this. Other authors have agreed that ideas were critical and have traced them to specific historical and cultural roots, either in ancient Athens or in Christianity. He noted that the idea of human equality that underlies modern democracy had been gaining ground for the preceding eight hundred years, and it had acquired an unstoppable momentum that aroused in him a "kind of religious dread." Hegel and Nietzsche both believed that secularising the Christian notion of the equality of human dignity resulted in contemporary political democracy. In particular, Hegel considered the French Revolution and the formation of the equal recognition principle to be manifestations of the underlying logic of human reason at work. Ideas undoubtedly spread quickly across international boundaries during the Third Wave itself, as well as during the more recent Arab Spring, thanks to radio, television, the Internet, and flows of activists carrying word of political unrest abroad. It is obvious that the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the tremendous changes happening in Eastern Europe just before it served as inspiration for the wave of democratic revolutions that occurred in sub-Saharan Africa in the early 1990s.

Though ideas are definitely potent and may help to explain many aspects of political institutions, this kind of justification raises more issues than it answers. Why, for instance, can concepts like democracy or human equality gain traction in certain eras but not in others? Democracy as a concept has existed at least since the time of ancient Athens, although it wasn't institutionalised until the end of the eighteenth century. With the exception of speculating that it was a divine act, Tocqueville offers no explanation for why the concept of human equality gained ground throughout time. Democracy did not emerge in every region of the world, nor has it spread equitably over the world. This has led to the claim that liberal democracy is not a global tendency but rather a product of Western civilisation, which has been stated by groups as disparate as Samuel Huntington, the modern Chinese government, and various Islamists. If this is the case, it still raises the issue of why the West was the only region where this specific thought originated [1].

An other school of thinking views democracy as the result of powerful structural forces at work in countries rather than the representation of an ideology or a set of cultural ideals. The majority of today's wealthy industrialised nations are democracies, but the majority of authoritarian regimes that are still in existence are far less developed, as social scientists have

long observed. According to a well-known research, although nations may go from authoritarian to democratic rule at any stage of development, they are considerably more likely to do so if their per capita income exceeds a specific level. This implies at first glance that there could be something about economic progress that increases the likelihood of democracy.

When individuals reach a particular degree of prosperity, do their values suddenly change to favour democracy? The statistical connections between democracy and development don't provide any information about the precise causal processes connecting the two. Additionally, there are numerous exceptions to each of these connections. For instance, this viewpoint holds that rich Singapore should be a stable democracy whereas destitute India should not.

Another mechanism through which economic expansion could influence democratic institutions is social mobilisation. The division of labour is the main idea here. In other words, Adam Smith claimed that as markets grew via increasing trade in a commercial, and subsequently an industrial economy, a new division of labour would emerge and develop. Adam Smith also claimed that the division of labour is limited by the size of the market. The development of new social groupings was a result of this labour division. It follows naturally that these new groups, barred from participation in the political institutions of the old agricultural society, would want a share of political power and therefore raise pressure for democracy, even if Smith himself never stated this point directly. In other words, economic prosperity stimulated social mobilisation, which in turn increased calls for political engagement. One of the key ideas that concerned the leading social theorists of the nineteenth century was Smith's analysis of the shifting division of labour. The first was Karl Marx, who turned the division of labour into a theory of social classes and incorporated it into his own teaching.

DISCUSSION

The following is a summary of Marx's framework. The bourgeoisie, townspeople who were despised by the old landlords but who gained wealth and harnessed new technology to bring about the Industrial Revolution, is the first new social class to be mobilised out of the old feudal system. A second new class, the proletariat, whose excess labour the bourgeoisie unfairly plundered, was in turn mobilised by this revolution. The traditional landowner class desired to maintain the previous authoritarian system; the bourgeoisie desired a liberal (i.e., rule of law) regime protecting their property rights, which may or may not have included formal electoral democracy (they were always more interested in the rule of law than in democracy); and the proletariat, once it came to recognise itself as a class, desired a dictatorship of the few. Electoral democracy in the form of universal suffrage may have the support of the working class, but this was a tool to achieve control over the means of production rather than an objective in and of itself [2].

Barrington Moore, whose 1966 book Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy has previously been mentioned in relation to Japan (see chapter 23 above), was one of the most significant researchers working in a post-Marxist tradition. This complicated book attempted to explain why democracy developed in certain nations but not in others using a number of historical case studies, including those from Britain, Germany, Japan, China, Russia, and India. He did not intend to imply that the growth of the bourgeoisie necessarily led to democracy when he made the direct statement, "No bourgeoisie, no democracy." This is arguably the statement for which he is most recognised. For instance, in Germany, the authoritarian Junker landowning nobility and the industrial bourgeoisie formed the infamous "iron and rye" marriage, which supported Bismarckian authoritarianism and subsequently

contributed to the emergence of Hitler. Moore suggested that democracy would instead be possible if a fast growing bourgeoisie was able to replace the previous system of landowners and peasants. He pointed out that this occurred in England, where a pioneering rural bourgeoisie was successful in commercialising agriculture, displacing peasants, and utilising the profits to finance the Industrial Revolution. The ancient landed aristocracy's influence was reduced as a result of this painful process, which also gave rise to the contemporary working class.

In contrast to Marx, Moore also paid close attention to how agriculture was produced. Marx primarily neglected the peasants because he believed that, like in England, industrial capitalism would eradicate it. However, in Russia and China, where peasants made up the great bulk of the population, uprisings began. Peasants helped Lenin and Mao gain power, despite Marx's belief that they were a class that would eventually vanish. Moore said that under the circumstances of what he termed "labor-repressive" agriculture, in which peasants were bound to the land in large, concentrated estates, democratisation faced unique challenges. As a consequence, a tyrannical landowning class survived, giving rise to revolutionary uprisings led by worker and peasants. There was little chance of a middle-class democracy between these two extremes. This scenario has already taken place in the aforementioned Latin American nations.

Many of the arguments presented in Barrington Moore's book have been refuted in a large body of scholarship, but especially his claim that the rise of democracy was dependent on the bourgeoisie or middle classes. Without getting into the specifics of the academic debate, it is obvious that his theory would need to be changed in a number of significant ways. For instance, the bourgeoisie is not a cohesive social class. The interests of these various segments varied according to circumstance; in many cases, important middle-class groups did not always support democracy. It includes large industrialists like the Thyssens and Rockefellers as well as small shopkeepers and urban professionals that the Marxists frequently referred to contemptuously as "petty bourgeois." And despite the fact that the working class may be drawn into extreme anti-democratic Communist or agricultural movements, many working-class organisations stood firmly in favour of the right to vote and the rule of law.

The two pillars of liberal democracy liberal rule of law and widespread political participation—must be seen as distinct political objectives that, at first, tended to be supported by various socioeconomic groupings. Therefore, contrary to what many historians have noted, the middle-class leaders of the French Revolution were not ardent democratic supporters who desired the speedy extension of the ballot to peasants and workers. The Rights of Man were intended to provide legal protections for the bourgeoisie's property and liberties, limiting the authority of the state but not necessarily empowering the vast majority of French people. Similar to the Whigs, who pushed the English monarch to accept the constitutional settlement during the Glorious Revolution in the previous century, the gentry, upper middle class, and certain members of the aristocracy were among the rich taxpayers who supported the Whigs. The increasing numbers of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie, as well as middle-class attorneys, physicians, civil employees, teachers, and other professionals who were distinguished from the working classes by their education and property ownership, joined their ranks during the course of the next two centuries. During the nineteenth century, these organisations served as the British Liberal Party's core constituency. The rule of law, or the legal protection of private property and individual rights, as well as policies like free trade, meritocratic civil service reform, and public education that would

enable upward mobility, tended to be the major priority of liberals considerably more than democracy [3].

But as time went on, the liberal and democratic agendas started to merge, and democracy was adopted as a middle-class objective. After all, the rule of law and democratic accountability are complementary methods of limiting power and often work together in actuality. Expanding the franchise is one way to build the political strength necessary to defend property rights against arbitrary governmental predation. Similar to how a rule of law that limits the power of the government to suppress people may safeguard citizens seeking the right to vote. Voting rights eventually became simply another legal right that was safeguarded. Thus, liberal democracy—a form of government that upholds both the rule of law and universal suffrage evolved into a package that appealed to both middle-class groups and a sizeable portion of the working class.

Barrington Moore was not a Marxist in the sense that he desired the triumph of communism on a global scale. While acknowledging the strong social constraints that often prevented liberal democracy from being achieved, he considered it as a desirable end. In this sense, the Moore-modified Marxist analytical framework is still very helpful for figuring out how and why democracy grows. The most important realisation is that the middle class is the social segment in society that values democracy the most. The strength of the middle class should be compared to other social groups that favour different forms of government, such as the old landed oligarchy, which is more likely to support authoritarian systems, or radicalised groups of peasants or urban poor who are focused on economic redistribution, if we are to understand the likelihood of democracy emerging. Modern democracy has a social foundation, and if we ignore it, we won't be able to assess the chances of democratic transitions in a meaningful way. The key social players whose relative power and interactions impact the chance that democracy will develop in a particular country may be summed up. These are the groups that still predominate in many modern developing nations. They were the dominating groups in Europe throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth century while the continent underwent democratisation.

1. The middle classes are those who are classified by their occupations and levels of education rather than their money. They often favoured liberal democracy's liberal wing. They want laws that would safeguard their rights, especially their property, against an encroaching government. They may or may not have supported democracy, defined as the involvement of all people in political life, and they were far less supportive of, if not outright hostile to, economic redistribution that would have an impact on their own property and income. Middle-class groups played major roles in coalitions that pushed for full democratisation in Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Belgium, Germany, and Britain in the early twentieth century. They were also the primary leaders of the democratic transitions that occurred in Denmark, Greece, France, Argentina, Portugal, and Spain in the nineteenth century.

2. In contrast, the working classes Marx's infamous industrial proletariat were more concerned with the democratic aspect of liberal democracy, namely their own right to vote. Together with middle-class organisations, they pushed for the franchise to be fully expanded in Denmark, Belgium, Finland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Germany, and Britain.7 However, they were often more concerned with redistribution than liberal safeguards of property rights and showed more interest in it than the middle classes did. Due to their promises of redistribution at the expense of liberal individual rights, anarchosyndicalist parties in the nineteenth century (such as those in Southern

Europe or much of Latin America) and Communist or Fascist parties in the twentieth were supported by sizable segments of the working class throughout the world [4].

3. Large landowners have often been authoritarian foes of democracy, especially those that use repressive labour (slavery, serfdom, or other nonmarket conditions of labour). Barrington Moore made several profound observations, one of which was the need of dismantling this specific social group's dominance in order for real democracy to advance.8

4. The political goals of the peasants were convoluted and even contradictory. They were a very conventional group in many civilizations, upholding traditional social ideals and prepared to live in submissive roles as the landowner class's servants. The Vendée peasant insurrection of 1793, which fought the revolutionary government in Paris, was one of the first counterrevolutionary uprisings. They might be mobilised by conservative parties employing clientelistic tactics, as we saw in the examples of Greece and Italy. But given the appropriate conditions, they may become radicalised and band together with the working classes to support a revolution. They ended up serving as the Bolshevik, Chinese, and Vietnamese revolutions' foot troops.

5. The interplay between these four groups which together made up the key social actors determined how politics and the transition to democracy developed in the nineteenth century. The final two of these categories, a landowning aristocracy and the peasants, ruled the majority of the world's most developed nations at the beginning of this century. Peasants joined the working class as a result of increased industrialisation, becoming the biggest socioeconomic class at the start of the 20th century. The number of middle-class people started to rise as a result of increased commerce, first in Britain and the United States, then in France and Belgium, and towards the end of the nineteenth century in Germany, Japan, and other "late developers." The main social and political conflicts of the early 20th century were then put in motion by this.

The Political Parties' Centralization

Despite its usefulness, Marx's analytical framework has a flaw in that he uses "class" as a primary deciding factor. Marx sometimes presents social classes the bourgeoisie, the proletariat, and feudalists as distinct political actors with the capacity for logical decision-making with a purpose. Social classes are really intellectual abstractions that may be valuable for analysis but cannot produce political action until they are actualized in particular organisations. Newly mobilised social groupings may take part in politics in a broad range of methods, including via strikes and protests, media usage, or these days, platforms like Facebook and Twitter. Civil society organisations may be formed by citizens to advocate for certain issues or for one another. However, involvement must be institutionalised if it is to be long-lasting, which for the last 200 years has meant the creation of political parties.

Therefore, unlike Athena who sprung from Zeus's head as a coherent political actor, none of the four groupings mentioned above emerged from nothing. Political parties had to mobilise them politically and act as their representatives. Political parties have been seen as essential to the development of any democracy for this reason, despite the fact that many early democratic thinkers did not foresee them. Conservative political organisations like the British Tory Party and the German Imperial Party began as elitist political groups that were only later compelled to form into mass parties that could run in elections. Different liberal parties, such as the Liberals in Britain or the Progress Party, the Left Liberals, or the National Liberals in Germany, represented the middle classes. Socialist parties like the British Labour Party and the German Social Democratic Party, or by the early 20th century, the various Communist parties that had started to emerge on the periphery of the political landscape in

virtually all industrialising societies, mobilised the working class. The least organised social segment was the peasantry. By the late nineteenth century, they had all but vanished in Britain, the United States, Denmark, and Sweden as a result of being forced off their property or transformed into independent family farmers. Peasants were really controlled by conservative parties in Greece and Italy that employed patronage; in Bulgaria, they were successful in founding their own party [5].

Any straightforward explanation of democratisation based on class has a fundamental flaw: there were many cross-cutting problems that brought people together despite their differences and muddled the class identities of political parties. Ethnicity, religion, and foreign policy were a few of the most significant. Thus, the Centre Party, which represented Catholic interests and had left and right wings of its own, was present in the German Reichstag in the late nineteenth century along with parties for the Polish and Danish minority. Conservative issues favoured by the working class included imperial policy and the development of a fleet. Sharp disagreements in Britain over Irish Home Rule and empire often influenced election results more than class factors. Islamist parties often have a social foundation in the lower classes and rural parts of the modern Middle East, but its overt message is centred on religion rather than class. Therefore, despite the fact that political parties may attempt to represent the interests of specific social classes, they are frequently also independent political actors that can gain power by enlisting the support of voters from various social classes by switching their agendas from economic to identity, religious, or foreign policy issues. The real interests of the socioeconomic strata that support them do not really have to be represented by them. At one extreme, the Communist Parties in China and Russia were among the most repressive regimes in human history against labourers and peasants. Working-class voters who support the Republican Party primarily for cultural reasons rather than economic ones make up a significant portion of the electorate in the United States, where it has historically been the party of commercial interests.

Political parties are not only automatons controlled by underlying socioeconomic classes, like governmental bureaucracies. Instead, they have a lot of freedom in how they choose to represent their constituency. Political entrepreneurs build fan bases around certain ideologies and then set up actual political machinery to become political parties. To gain power, communist parties needed the organisational prowess of leaders like Vladimir Lenin. The concepts of tradition, religion, monarchy, and stability served as the driving forces behind conservative parties. Some, like the British Conservatives, were able to adapt their agendas to make themselves more palatable to middle- and working-class electorates when their fundamental socioeconomic bases declined and they were forced to fight for large electorates. Others, like the Italian Christian Democrats, managed to organise significant clientelistic networks and thrive. Conservative parties faced the temptation to use undemocratic tactics to maintain their hold on power, such as the Argentine coup of 1930 (see chapter 18 above), if they failed to adjust to these new electoral politics circumstances. Clientelistic party structure was often accompanied with a personalistic political approach, in which followers gathered behind certain charismatic individuals like Juan and Eva Perón rather than a well-defined agenda. Thus, it was difficult to forecast an organization's capacity based just on the relative power of its various social strata. It was reliant on historically dependent elements including leadership, character, and ideologies [6].

Democracy, Social Mobilisation, and Economic Growth

Why did democracy expand, and why may it do so again? There are many factors that influence democratic institutions, but economic development is one of the most significant ones. Through the expanding division of labour, economic progress fosters social

mobilisation, which in turn results in calls for more democracy and the rule of law. The old agricultural elites usually strive to prevent the integration of the younger groups into the system. Only if these newly mobilised groups are effectively integrated into the system and permitted to engage politically will a stable democratic system develop. Conversely, if such groupings lack institutionalised involvement mechanisms, there will be instability and unrest.

Ideas may still be crucial in this situation, but they relate to changes in the other growth factors. The notion of the equality of human dignity, for instance, has been around for ages, but in static agricultural civilizations it never really took off because of the extraordinarily low level of social mobility seen in such societies. Periodically, peasants rose up in rebellion and opposed the governmental order. It's possible that some egregious violation of their rights or pure hunger and despair are what motivated them to do this. However, even while some of the leaders of these uprisings may have had aspirations to join the oligarchy, it never occurred to them to overthrow the class-based society as a whole. As a result, they were never real revolutionaries. Only until a developing capitalist economic system began rearranging the social structure in certain areas of Europe throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did the concept of social equality come to possess a wide galvanising force. Social mobility was both necessary and created by modern capitalism, and as a result, demands for access and opportunity equality increased. Thus, there are several causal chains that connect popular mobilisation to democracy and the rule of law. Though ideas were significant and autonomous neither Adam Smith nor Karl Marx could be seen as just representing the social class from which they emerged idea receptivity was influenced by social context and significant economic shifts. As a consequence of conflicts between the middle classes, working class, old oligarchy, and peasants, which in turn were affected by underlying changes in the economy and society, democracy gradually arose in Europe during a 150-year period. With a few modifications [7], [8].

CONCLUSION

The spread of democracy requires a multifaceted strategy. This entails promoting a democratic culture, encouraging civic participation and education, aiding civil society organisations, and bolstering democratic institutions. International players play a significant role by offering support, advocating for democratic government on a global scale, and promoting democratic norms and principles. In conclusion, democracy expansion is a transformational process aimed at bringing democracy's advantages to additional cultures and areas. Despite its difficulties, democracy's growth has a lot of promise to advance peace, stability, and inclusive development. Stakeholders may help create a more democratic environment where the views and aspirations of people are heard and honoured by removing barriers and promoting democratic procedures.

REFERENCES

[1]   R. Eckersley, 'Ecological democracy and the rise and decline of liberal democracy: looking back, looking forward', *Env. Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/09644016.2019.1594536.

[2]   M. S. Bell and K. Quek, 'Authoritarian Public Opinion and the Democratic Peace', *Int. Organ.*, 2018, doi: 10.1017/S002081831700042X.

[3]   B. Bornemann and S. Weiland, 'Editorial: New perspectives on food democracy', *Politics and Governance*. 2019. doi: 10.17645/pag.v7i4.2570.

[4]   S. Borzutzky and S. Perry, '"It is not about the 30 pesos, it is about the 30 years": Chile's Elitist Democracy, Social Movements, and the October 18 Protests', *Lat. Am.*, 2021, doi: 10.1353/tla.2021.0016.

[5]   M. Mietzner, 'Authoritarian innovations in Indonesia: electoral narrowing, identity politics and executive illiberalism', *Democratization*, 2020, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2019.1704266.

[6]   M. Grimley and J. Farrell, 'Mighty Microgrids', *ILSR's Energy Democr. Initiat.*, 2016.

[7]   K. Gründler and T. Krieger, 'Using Machine Learning for measuring democracy: A practitioners guide and a new updated dataset for 186 countries from 1919 to 2019', *Eur. J. Polit. Econ.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2021.102047.

[8]   W. Yao and G. Wang, 'Grassroot Democracy is an Important Element in the Modernization of Grassroot Governance', *Sci. Soc. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.36922/ssr.v3i3.1144.

CHAPTER 10

TRAIL TO LONG DEMOCRACY

Dr Vedantam Seetha Ram, Associate Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: vedantam_seetharam@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The road to democracy is long, twisting, and sometimes paved with many difficulties and impediments. This abstract examines the challenging path to democracy, the influences that create it, and the importance of tenacity and group effort in realising democratic ideals. The process of moving from autocratic or authoritarian leadership to one that is characterised by political freedoms, the rule of law, and the defence of individual rights is known as the "trail to democracy." Establishing democratic institutions, holding free and fair elections, encouraging civic engagement, and upholding human rights are all part of it. However, nations often face obstacles and failures on the road to democracy, making it uncommon for it to be a straight route. Democracy can only be attained via a confluence of internal and external elements. Internally, it involves citizen demands for political change, grassroots movements, and involvement in the civil society. Overcoming structural obstacles including corruption, inequality, and political polarisation is necessary. External factors that aid in and maintain democratic transitions include international cooperation, diplomatic pressure, and universal standards. The path to democracy is often paved with hardships and losses. Fighting for democratic rights, brave people and social movements often experience persecution, incarceration, or even violence. Navigating complicated power relations, managing political changes, and developing inclusive governance systems that reflect societal variety are all necessary throughout the move from autocracy to democracy.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Democratic, Law, Public, Universal.

INTRODUCTION

How European democracy developed in the nineteenth century in response to societal change, the challenges it faced before winning, and how conservative parties often shaped democratic progress. Described how responsible governance grew in both England and the United States. A feudal institution, the mediaeval estate or parliament, almost accidentally survived into the modern period, and accountability was the outcome. These estates, which stood for the oligarchic class of landowners in mediaeval society, were given taxation power. From the late sixteenth century on, the monarchies in France, Spain, Sweden, Prussia, and Russia were successful in weakening the influence of the estates and establishing absolutist authority. In contrast, the estates overthrew the monarchy in Poland and Hungary, establishing a weak, decentralised political order that was quickly militarily overrun by foreign invaders. The power of the Parliament and the crown were only equally balanced in England. Throughout the seventeenth century, the former was successful in battling the latter to a stalemate; this impasse finally led to the constitutional solution of 1688–1689, or the Glorious Revolution [1].

Accountable governance is more complicated than merely putting pressure on a government to do what the opposition wants. Throughout human history, out-groups have engaged in conflict with in groups, and when they were successful in ousting the dominant in group, they turned into the new repressive in group. In contrast, an accountable government formally acknowledges the validity of the opposition and the idea of responsibility to a larger public. Ideas started to become crucial in this situation. According to John Locke, all governments have the power to preserve the civil liberties of their people, not because they have a divine right to do so. The main potential offenders of such rights are governments. He went on to say that "no government can have a right to obedience from a people who have not freely consented to it," and that, as a result, "the right of the people to choose their government and governors" was the source of what we now refer to as legitimacy. The Glorious Revolution and the American Revolution, which occurred less than a century later, were driven by the ideas of "consent of the governed" and "no taxation without representation." Because of the conceptual change from "rights of Englishmen" to "natural rights", these new revolutions were never going to be about the simple replacement of one elite group by another.

At the start of the eighteenth century, England was still extremely far from anything like actual democracy, even if the Glorious Revolution established the notion of parliamentary responsibility. As late as 1830, just a tiny, wealthy portion of the nation no more than 3% of the total population elected the members of Parliament. Therefore, the history of democracy's emergence, as opposed to that of accountability, occurs in the centuries that followed the settlement of 1689. It is not unexpected that the rule of law and democratic accountability have traditionally been tightly linked and supported together since both may be seen of as different methods of restricting the government. One of the main complaints of the parliamentary side against the king during the English Civil War was that he was violating the Common Law. The early Stuarts tried rivals using tribunals with dubious legal standing, such as the King's Court of the Star Chamber. The monarchs had to follow the law and answer to them in tax concerns, according to the legislative demands. Respect for the law ensures that an out group that is successful in ousting an in group won't use its newfound authority to retaliate on its rivals by bringing legal action against them [2].

Despite their frequent association, the liberal rule of law component and the democratic accountability component the two elements of liberal democracy that restrain the state— remain conceptually distinct. As was mentioned in the previous chapter, other social groupings often support them. This implies that liberal democracy was often not established in a tidy manner but rather gradually through time. Additionally, it makes it exceedingly difficult to pinpoint the beginning of democracy. For instance, when did the United States transition to a liberal democracy? The Common Law was introduced into the colonies far before the revolution and the Constitutional Convention, establishing the rule of law considerably earlier than democracy.

But it took decades to put equal access to the law into practise. Although most Americans believe democracy began with the ratification of the Constitution in the late eighteenth century, the right to vote was severely restricted in 1787 and slowly opened up to African Americans, women, and white men without property until the Nineteenth Amendment was ratified in 1920. The Voting Rights Act's enactment in 1965 allowed black people in the South to vote fully for the first time after years of restrictions on their ability to do so.

Applying these various liberal democracy standards to the nineteenth century reveals that the First Wave's democratisation of Europe and other nations was a very drawn-out process. Table 6 shows the dates on which important franchise expansion milestones were reached in various countries. It also shows the time it took to reach universal suffrage as well as the

variation across nations. Authoritarian administrations in nineteenth-century Europe tried numerous more methods to restrain democracy in addition to restricting the right to vote. For instance, Prussia achieved full male suffrage in 1849 but did so with a three-tier voting structure and an open ballot that wasn't eliminated until 1918. Some nations, like Britain, Italy, and Denmark, had upper chambers that were not elected and had the power to veto or otherwise change laws. Many nations put limitations on political association, especially for newly formed working-class organisations that carried socialist or communist flags. Furthermore, democracy in this era was not a one-way street; in a cyclical process, some nations, like France, gave their people rights only to take them away when authoritarian governments came back to power.

The Business

The path to democracy in Europe came about gradually, with extended periods of stagnation or aggressive retreat. The simplest explanation for this convoluted path is that it took until the latter part of the nineteenth century for Europe to become socially prepared for democracy. As stated in the introduction, the French Revolution achieved a modern administrative state in France but did not create democracy, even if it delivered the Code Napoléon to most of Europe. After Napoleon's defeat, the Austrian-Prussian-Russian Holy Alliance oversaw a protracted period of authoritarian reversion during which conservative monarchical administrations attempted to return to the era before 1789. Absolutism was shown in a gradient from west to east. Only a few German city-states and Swiss cantons had republican governments. There were constitutional monarchs in France, the Netherlands, Belgium, Norway, some of the other German nations, and, of course, in Britain, where the king's official powers were constrained by law. There were much less restrictions on monarchs' authority in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, Prussia, Italy, and Russia, yet most of these countries had bureaucracies that were based on some kind of civil law.

With the Revolutions of 1848, democracy had its second major rise, igniting aspirations that were swiftly shattered. According to historian Eric Hobsbawm, "1848 appears as the one revolution in the modern history of Europe which combines the greatest promise, the widest scope, and the most immediate initial success, with the most unqualified and rapid failure."3 The "Springtime of Peoples," which has been likened to the Arab Spring, had an impact on almost all of the key European nations. With the overthrow of the July Monarchy and the declaration of a Second Republic in France in February, it first took hold there before spreading the following month to Bavaria, Prussia, Austria, Hungary, and Italy. Only the peripheral nations of the continent—Sweden, Britain, Greece, Spain, and Russia—were unaffected. The uprisings were subsequently swiftly put a stop, starting in May with the Habsburg recovery and spreading by the end of the year throughout the rest of the continent. Revolutionary ideas spread quickly, proving that the "contagion effect" of democratic awakenings was not only a phenomenon of the Internet and social media but was also possible in the era of newspapers [3].

The start of these uprisings and their eventual demise revealed the insufficient character of the social upheavals taking place in Europe. The majority of Europe was remained agricultural at the start of the nineteenth century, with landlords and peasants serving as the main players. Only in Britain and the Netherlands were middle-class populations of any size or political influence to be found. However, by the middle of the century, a tiny commercial and industrial bourgeoisie had essentially appeared everywhere, and with the growth of reading and education, newspapers and public conversations increased significantly. Continental Europe began to develop what we now refer to as "civil society" during the 1840s: voluntary private associations where like-minded people could congregate, share

opinions, and criticise governments. These associations were frequently centred around banquets or public festivals. However, political parties were often prohibited. In the most oppressive areas, campaigners were forced to form covert organisations like Giuseppe Mazzini's Young Italy. These middle-class organisations, both legal and illicit, would lead the 1848 Revolutions.

Even in the most economically developed European nations, the middle class still made up a small proportion of the population at this time in the social transition. These middle classes themselves were divided between those who desired extensive democratic involvement and those who want robust legal safeguards for their personal and property rights. Peasants, craftspeople, and an emerging, mainly unorganised working class continued to make up the bulk of the population of Europe. Thus, the situation in Europe was akin to that of contemporary developing market nations like Thailand and China. By dividing the middle class via nationalistic appeals and by capitalising on its fears of anarchy, the conservatives were able to stop the revolution in its tracks in 1848. The years immediately after the conservative order was reinstated in 1848 would turn out to be the most economically and socially transformational in both European and American history. On the eve of World War I, the more developed nations Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and the Netherlands transformed from being mostly agricultural society into urban-industrial ones. This had a significant impact on socioeconomic classes and laid the groundwork for new mass democratic politics.

Therefore, Hobsbawm's assessment of how completely the Revolutions of 1848 failed is unwarranted. All authoritarian leaders in the second half of the nineteenth century had the breakout of revolution in the back of their minds, and this set the stage for political upheavals that would take place in the next two generations. For instance, from 1847 to 1867, Prussia used a universal franchise, but with an open ballot and tiered voting. Following its unification in 1871, Germany enacted a written constitution that, for the first time, established the position of an elected Reichstag. The Social Democratic Party was able to organise thanks to the legalisation of political parties, and by the time World War I was about to start, they had surpassed the staunchly conservative Republicans as the biggest party in the Reichstag. To compete with the emerging working-class parties, Bismarck established the first social security and health insurance systems in Europe in the 1880s [4].

Similar to this, Louis Napoleon, who overthrew the government in France in 1851 and proclaimed himself Emperor Napoleon III, thought that he had to hold a plebiscite to legitimise his authority. Even though voting took place in tightly controlled settings, the French had become used to the concept. Additionally, the Second Empire was liberal and allowed for the unfettered expression of a variety of political viewpoints. The Third Republic, which was established after defeat in the Franco-Prussian War and the Paris Commune, was more authentically democratic as a result of the economic boom that occurred under it. Thus, conservative leaders who lived through 1848 and were aware that they confronted society mobilised in ways they had not been previously in the century were responsible for many of the efforts towards more liberal societies and more democracy.

However, the democratic urge was subverted by nationalism in many nations, making the middle-class proponents of constitutional governance at the start of the 20th century unreliable Democrats. The democratisation of the existing German states was seldom more important to the German liberals sitting in the Frankfurt and Berlin parliaments than the construction of a unified Germany. Without truly desiring to let their fellow people the opportunity to vote, they were prepared to let themselves "represent" the country as elites. When it became apparent that Bismarck was the only person capable of uniting Germany,

many of them eventually came to accept him and his totalitarian Reich. They did not hesitate to reject economic liberalism when the state extended tariff safeguards to their businesses since they were the architects and beneficiaries of German capitalism. Similar to this, many liberals in the Austro-Hungarian Empire's constituent nations were more concerned with maintaining their own privileges as national elites than with expanding the vote. The conservatives in Britain were able to win over the working class in the late nineteenth century because to their opposition to Irish Home Rule and support for the empire. In Europe, nationalism would not always take precedence over class interests.

DISCUSSION

Reasons Opposing Democracy: Both the world of ideas and the tangible interests of Europe's established elites opposed the development of democracy. The idea of one man, one vote, or the universal franchise, was opposed by a number of prominent thinkers in the nineteenth century. Even if few individuals are ready to express them publicly now, some of those points are still relevant and need examination.

Philosopher John Stuart Mill offered one of the most incisive criticisms of democracy in his book On Liberty, which has been a key classic for liberals since its release in 1859. Before the Second Reform Act was passed in 1861, John Stuart Mill wrote Thoughts on Parliamentary Government, which included various reasons against a universal and equal franchise. In his opening statement, he made the traditional Whig claim that "the assembly which votes the taxes, either general or local, should be elected exclusively by those who pay something towards the taxes imposed."6 The antithesis of the theory that "no taxation without representation" served as the rallying cry of both the English and American Revolutions was the notion that only taxpayers should be allowed to vote. Therefore, Mill thought it was preferable to levy direct taxes as opposed to indirect ones since doing so would serve as a reminder to the public of their responsibility to keep an eye on how their tax dollars were being spent. More specifically, it was indicated that "receipt of parish relief should be a peremptory disqualification for the franchise." In other words, because they were effectively freeloading off of taxpayers, persons receiving assistance should not be allowed to vote.

The qualifications and feeling of responsibility of voters were the subject of Mill's second argument against equal voting rights. Since "the possession and exercise of political, including electoral, rights, is one of the chief instruments both of moral and intellectual training for the popular mind," he did not challenge the idea of universal suffrage. But he did raise the issue of one man, one vote. He said that "if it is asserted that all persons ought to be equal in every description of right recognised by society, I answer, not until all are equal in worth as human beings," which seems especially alien to modern ears.7 Based on their degree of education, this led to the conclusion that various classes of individuals should have varied numbers of votes: an unskilled labourer should have one vote; a foreman should have three; and a lawyer, doctor, or priest should have five or six. Millions of "peasants who could neither read nor write, and whose knowledge of public men, even by name, was limited to oral tradition," he said, had just chosen Louis Napoleon to lead France.8 In the decades after the Civil War, when Jim Crow laws proliferated, whites in the American South would use very similar reasons to limit or deny African Americans' ability to vote.

Others argued that elites should be trusted to represent people without the right to vote since only they are capable of serving as impartial guardians of the public good. For instance, Edmund Burke argued in the eighteenth century that members of the House of Commons elected from corrupt boroughs or other unequal franchises did not benefit from better roads, jails, or police than those who were underrepresented because that privileged class was able

to "stand clearer of local interests, passions, prejudices, and cabals, than the others" and produce "a more general view." The working classes were not fit to govern in and of themselves: "Working as a hairdresser or a tallow-chandler cannot be a subject of honour to anybody. If people like them are allowed to reign, the state experiences oppression.

In The English Constitution, a classic book written by Walter Bagehot and released in 1866 just before the Second Reform Bill was introduced, Bagehot adopted this viewpoint and stated, "I do not consider the exclusion of the working classes from effectual representation a defect in this aspect of our parliamentary representation. Since the working classes make a little contribution to our corporate public opinion, their lack of power in Parliament has no impact on the correlation between Parliament and public opinion. They are absent from both the representation and the object it represents. The monarchy and the House of Lords, which Bagehot referred to as the "dignified" portions of the government, really had significant popular support and served as a foundation for legitimacy in the absence of the working classes and the poor actively participating in politics.

A number of conservative Italian intellectuals used a different kind of justification to argue against democracy, claiming that expanding the franchise was useless since actual democracy was unachievable. Gaetano Mosca was the first to express this viewpoint, arguing that all regime types monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy made little difference to daily life since they were ultimately under the authority of elites. The "political class" uses many different institutions to keep itself in power and will simply utilise democratic ones to do the same. Even "collectivist and communist societies would unquestionably be run by officials." The economist Vilfredo Pareto, who created the Pareto optimum and is well-known to economics students, argued similarly for the continuation of elite dominance under all regimes. He developed "Pareto's law," which claimed that 20% of the population owned 80% of the world's wealth, based on statistical analyses of income distribution. It was useless to try to change this by political actions like expanding the vote or redistributing money since this was similar to a natural rule.

These conservative Italian philosophers were advancing a variation of Marx's claim that the emergence of formal democracy and a wider distribution of voting rights would not improve the lives of the majority of people but would instead only maintain elite control in a new way. Mosca and Pareto advocated for maintaining the status quo because they thought that other institutions would not alter this circumstance. Of course, Marx thought that a proletariat revolution offered a remedy. After the Bolshevik and later Communist Revolutions of the 20th century, his adherents would attempt to create a genuinely equitable society. In a certain way, the Italians were proven correct: communism did not abolish the divide between rulers and ruled or put an end to elite tyranny; it only altered who was in power [5].

The fact that Marx, Mosca, and Pareto recognised the issue ongoing elite control despite the introduction of formal democracy and that a Communist remedy to it ended in failure does not imply that the initial criticism was totally incorrect. Regular elections and press freedoms are examples of democratic processes, but they do not ensure that the public will be fairly represented. The growth of universal public education, which most European cultures started to adopt around the end of the nineteenth century, made the claim that illiterate people could not use the vote responsibly weak. The same could hardly be said of recent anti-democratic justifications based on biology. Following the 1859 release of Charles Darwin's On the Origin of Species, a school of "scientific" racism developed to explain and justify not only the continued colonial subjugation of non-European peoples but also the denial of equal rights to black people, immigrants, and ethnic minorities.

In addition, it was believed that women lacked the necessary level of reason to be allowed the right to vote and were biologically predisposed to being unfit for jobs traditionally occupied by males in the workplace. Note that many of the contemporary intellectual underpinnings of democracy were recognised in all of these nineteenth-century antidemocratic arguments. They accepted the idea that individuals should hold their governments responsible and that everyone who is capable of making wise political decisions should be allowed to participate in politics. In assessing how well certain kinds of people the impoverished or propertyless, the illiterate, Blacks and other racial and ethnic minorities, women could properly use political power, they diverged from modern standards. This made them vulnerable to certain empirical facts, such as the fact that society did not fall apart as a result of granting the right to vote to workers or women, or that poor people or people of colour could receive an education and advance in society, making it much more difficult to maintain moral arguments in favour of their continued political exclusion. Very few politicians now would dare to openly support limiting voting rights or requiring voters to meet certain economic or educational requirements. This is especially evident in a nation like the United States where racial hierarchy has been reflected in franchise limits.

But the political language of today still contains echoes of almost all of these conservative arguments from the nineteenth century. For instance, elites often gripe that democratic citizens like "populist" ideas. Democratic electorates, in their opinion, don't always make the best decisions: they might favour immediate gratification over long-term sustainability; they frequently base their votes on personalities rather than policies; they occasionally cast their ballots out of clientelism; and they might want to redistribute income in ways that kill incentives and growth. In the end, these worries don't amount to a strong case for systematically restricting franchises. Elites are often adept at passing off their own specific self-interest as universal truths, just as they were in the eighteenth century.

However, voters in democracies can make mistakes sometimes, particularly in the short term. Furthermore, it is unclear if ever-increasing levels of public engagement are the answer to today's governance issues. Bruce Cain, a political scientist, contends that the majority of voters just lack the time, effort, or knowledge necessary to commit to the detailed analysis of complicated public policy matters. When more issues are put before voters through channels like public referenda to encourage higher levels of democratic participation, the outcome frequently is not an accurate reflection of the popular will but rather the dominance of the public space by the best-organized and most well-funded interest groups.15 One manifestation of the worries expressed in these long-forgotten arguments against the extension of democracy is the establishment of merit-based bureaucracies, which are ultimately answerable to the public but are shielded in many ways from the whims of democratic politics [6].

Conservatives Rule the World

The battle for democracy has been reduced by both traditional Marxists and modern economics to a conflict between the affluent and the poor, in which the poor organise and intimidate the rich with the intention of transferring wealth and income to themselves. When the danger is great enough, the wealthy are forced to make political rights and direct redistribution concessions.16 Although the middle classes may form coalitions in any way, they are often coerced by the wealthy to embrace, at best, a very restricted kind of democracy. Any defences of fairness or legality are only a "superstructure" covering for underlying economic self-interest. According to the Marxist interpretation of this narrative, the affluent never make sufficient concessions to achieve real democracy; instead, this occurs only when the people violently seize control. According to a statistical analysis by Adam

Przeworski, the majority of franchise expansions were actually carried out in reaction to public protests, demonstrating that democracy was really won rather than given.

However, conservative social groupings may interpret their self-interest in a number of ways, some of which are far more favourable to peaceful transitions to democracy than others. In contrast to countries like Germany and Argentina, liberal democracy was peacefully established in Britain by the third decade of the twentieth century in large part due to the British Conservative Party's strategic actions. Similar to the parties that represented the Junkers in Prussia or the great estate owners in Argentina, the Conservatives were the party of the old landed aristocracy at the start of the nineteenth century. But the British Conservatives reinterpreted their own self-interest in ways that enabled the maintenance of their political authority while enabling the extension of the franchise, rather than attempting to thwart the rise of social and political mobilisation by violence or authoritarian control. One of the European nations that took the longest to completely democratise was Britain. Franchise extension was spread among three significant reform laws passed in 1832, 1867, and 1884. Universal adult male suffrage did not occur until 1918, and female suffrage did not occur until 1929, as seen in Table 6.18 In fact, the 1832 Reform Act may be understood as a fearful conservative reaction to dissent and concerns brought on by economic development. However, a Conservative prime minister named Benjamin Disraeli and a Liberal one named William Gladstone, who were acting under a very different political calculus and not under the prospect of an impending revolution, respectively, were responsible for the 1867 and 1884 Acts, which actually democratised Britain.

Almost all observers of the time recognised that popular unrest was not what led to the "Great" Reform Act of 1867. The elites believed that "silent changes were taking place in the minds of members of the working classes, not unlike movements of the earth's crust," and it was generally believed that the 1832 reform would be followed by later political moves. This change was not brought about by the Liberals under Gladstone; rather, it was his Conservative competitor Disraeli who sponsored a radical reform law that resulted in an instant increase in the number of voters. Since then, many have argued about Disraeli's motivations. Many of his fellow Conservatives accused him of betraying their class interests or, at best, of being an opportunist who compromised his principles during a heated political contest. However, according to historian Gertrude Himmel farb, Disraeli's activities were motivated by a different type of principle: the conviction that the Tories stood for a national party that represented a natural order in which the aristocratic and working class were partners. Because of "the belief that the lower classes were not only naturally conservative in temperament but also Conservative in politics," the Tory faith had an impulse towards democracy.20 In other words, Burke's assertions from the previous century that the conservative oligarchy could "represent" the interests of the whole country weren't merely intellectual smokescreens for class interests; individuals in Burke's social class really held this belief [7].

And not only had the rich Tories shared this belief. The Conservatives went on to control British electoral politics for a large portion of the next generation after agreeing to a second extension of the vote in 1884. Disraeli was correct: despite their class interests, many working-class and impoverished rural people supported the Tories in successive elections. Working-class supporters identified with the Conservatives' set of principles, which revolved on the church, tradition, monarchy, and British national identity. Later, the party was able to refocus attention on other matters, like as foreign policy. The Tories were able to shift their social basis as a result; they were no longer the party of powerful landowners but rather of a growing urban middle class. These voters supported the old oligarchy on certain issues, but

the new middle-class electorate agreed with proponents of a wider franchise on others. These patterns, together with the Conservatives' strong preference for political organisation, helped them become a successful party. It was not unusual for elite parties to start democratisation in Britain rather than having grassroots mobilisation drive it from below. According to political scientist Ruth Collier, top-down processes that she refers to as "electoral support mobilisation" propelled the "ins" to enfranchise the "outs" in Switzerland, Chile, Norway, Italy, and Uruguay in addition to Britain. These examples show how institutional arrangements may reinforce one another. Once the idea of electoral politics is established within a restricted franchise, incumbent parties may try to maintain their hold on power by recruiting new supporters, changing their focus to new problems, and appealing to people of all social classes.

Of course, some elite groups choose to play by other rules and instead used the military or other nondemocratic means of mobilisation to further their own agendas. This is what happened in Argentina in 1930, Italy and Germany in the 1920s and 1930s, and several other Latin American nations after the Cuban Revolution in 1959. Any number of variables affected their decision, including whether Conservatives thought they could maintain control of a democratic opening, their level of unity, how unified and therefore dangerous the democratic forces were, and what elites in other nations had done. Aside from the fact that its capital was more mobile than that of the old landed oligarchy, the newer industrial middle class was also more urbanised, better educated, and more likely to interact with other cultural and international elites who held more progressive views. The British landed upper classes were much more willing to accept their daughters marrying wealthy up-and-coming commoners than their Prussian Junker counterparts, and they were also much more receptive to Whig ideas that the rise of literacy and education would make it safe to grant their working-class compatriots the right to vote.

Unfortunately, the tale of democratisation in the majority of Europe did not conclude with the spread of franchises gradually and amicably. As the continent was engaged in two global wars, the national issue trumped the class question for all of Europe. As the working masses in Germany, Austria, Britain, France, and Russia lined up behind their individual governments in August 1914, the Second Socialist International's unity was weakened. Full adult male suffrage had to wait until the conclusion of the Great War in 1918 in many nations, including Britain, since it was immoral to deprive the working classes the right to vote in light of their sacrifices in the trenches. The Weimar Republic was founded when the German monarch abdicated, and the Austro-Hungarian Empire was dissolved as a result of Germany and Austria's military defeat [8], [9].

The sociological foundations of the political right in Central and Eastern Europe were not eradicated, despite the governmental institutions of the previous totalitarian regime being destroyed. Due to their influence over the army and civilian administration, the ancient landed oligarchies still held sway in the background. The middle classes were open for recruitment into the new Fascist groups that cropped up in the 1920s because their savings and sense of security were devastated by the postwar inflation and economic unrest. The war and the recent example of the Bolshevik Revolution had radicalised the working masses, who were drawn into new Communist parties with scant regard for liberal democracy. The polarisation that followed helped Hitler and Mussolini gain power and led to the outbreak of World War II by hollowing out the political establishments in Germany, Austria, and Italy. Stable liberal democracy did not fully take hold in Western Europe until the second half of the 20th century, and it was not extended to Eastern Europe until the fall of communism in 1989–1991. The path to democracy in Europe was a very lengthy one.

CONCLUSION

Gaining ground on the path to democracy requires tenacity and group effort. Protecting democratic institutions, ensuring accountability, and including individuals in participatory decision-making are continual activities that are necessary to maintain democratic processes. It requires dedication to democratic principles, the rule of law, and the defence of human rights. Democracy's importance goes beyond just political administration. It affects a society's capacity for social advancement, economic growth, and general well-being. Democracy offers chances for social justice, fair resource distribution, and the empowerment of disadvantaged groups. It facilitates communication and cooperation, develops invention, and promotes peace. The path to democracy is, in the end, a difficult but transformational trip. Governments, civil society organisations, individuals, and the global community must all work together. Societies may move on the path to democracy and eventually enjoy freedom, justice, and inclusive government through overcoming challenges, upholding democratic norms, and taking collective action.

REFERENCES

[1]   P. Arun, 'Uncertainty and insecurity in privacyless India: A despotic push towards digitalisation', *Surveill. Soc.*, 2017, doi: 10.24908/ss.v15i3/4.6618.

[2]   J. T. Martelli, 'The politics of our selves: Left self-fashioning and the production of representative claims in everyday Indian campus politics', *Mod. Asian Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1017/S0026749X2000013X.

[3]   A. Banerjee*, A. Tewari, and D. R. Bhandari, 'Secure Radio Frequency Transmission for Paperless Voting System', *Int. J. Innov. Technol. Explor. Eng.*, 2020, doi: 10.35940/ijitee.g5626.059720.

[4]   A. Kosmopoulos, 'Aspects of regulatory and legal implications on e-voting', *Lect. Notes Comput. Sci. (including Subser. Lect. Notes Artif. Intell. Lect. Notes Bioinformatics)*, 2004, doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-30466-1_54.

[5]   M. Lips, A. Rapson, and T. Hooper, 'E-mail management knowledge and recordkeeping behaviours of New Zealand public servants', in *Proceedings of 4th International Conference on e-Government, ICEG 2008*, 2008.

[6]   M. Fennema and J. Tillie, 'Civic Community, Political Participation and Political Trust of Ethnic Groups', in *Multikulturelle Demokratien im Vergleich*, 2001. doi: 10.1007/978-3-322-85129-1_9.

[7]   J. Cotterill, 'South Africa counts the cost of its worst unrest since apartheid | Financial Times', *Financial Times*, 2021.

[8]   N. F. Bugay and T. S. Bushueva, 'On the eve of the decay of the USSR: the history of one discussion.', *Hist. Soc. ideas*, 2021, doi: 10.17748/2075-9908-2021-13-2-19-48.

[9]   D. Billis, 'Towards an organisational approach to the third sector: a response to Antonin Wagner', *Volunt. Sect. Rev.*, 2013, doi: 10.1332/204080513x673353.

CHAPTER 11

FUTURE OF DEMOCRACY AND THE MIDDLE CLASS

Dr Rajiv Umeshchandra Kalaber, Assistant Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: prof.rajiv@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Democracy's future is closely related to the welfare and social function of the middle class. The problems and possibilities that the middle class faces in a time of fast socioeconomic change are examined in this abstract as it examines the changing dynamics between democracy and the middle class. In the past, the middle class has been essential to the upkeep and support of democratic institutions. Its development is often linked to growing economic possibilities, social mobility, and a need for political responsibility and representation. Generally speaking, a robust middle class is seen as a stabilising factor that fosters ideals like pluralism, moderation, and support for democratic institutions. The middle classes and democracy's futures do not, however, come without difficulties. Growing income inequality, employment instability, and the concentration of wealth among the top are the results of globalisation, technological development, and economic change. These developments have the potential to weaken the middle class, undermining its social position and economic stability as well as its capacity to actively participate in democratic processes. But the middle class also has a big influence on how democracy develops in the future. Its demands for inclusive policies and changes may be fueled by its hopes for social fairness, access to high-quality education, and upward mobility. The middle class often acts as a link between various socioeconomic classes, promoting social cohesiveness and mass action in support of democratic values.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Democratic, Economic, Education, Inequality.

INTRODUCTION

Technology, globalisation, and the future of middle-class societies are among topics covered in this paper, along with some observations on the role of violence in bringing about contemporary democracy and how the working class defied Marx's expectations by becoming the middle class in the developed world. Karl Marx asserted that the current capitalist system was doomed to an eventual crisis of what he termed "overproduction." By using technology to extract surpluses from the proletariat's labour, capitalism would increase wealth concentrations and gradually impoverish workers. The proletariat, whose labour made this system possible, was too impoverished to purchase its goods, while the bourgeoisie who controlled it could not consume all it created despite their affluence. A shortage of demand brought on by steadily rising inequality would cause the system to collapse in on itself. Marx believed that the only way out of this dilemma was a revolution that would provide the proletariat political power and redistribute the benefits of the capitalist system [1].

Throughout the middle decades of the nineteenth century, all industrialising nations found Marx's vision to be fairly believable. Large new agglomerations of underprivileged workers suddenly developed, and the working conditions in these manufacturing towns were dreadful.

Rules governing working hours, safety, child labour, and similar issues either didn't exist or weren't effectively implemented. In other words, the circumstances in Europe at the beginning of the twenty-first century were remarkably similar to those in certain sections of China, Vietnam, Bangladesh, and other emerging nations [2].

However, a lot of unanticipated events happened en route to the proletariat revolution. The first was that labour earnings started to increase. Early benefits were the result of rapid economic expansion as new employees were drawn from the agricultural population, but when that process came to a natural end, the cost of labour in relation to capital started to rise. Due to the significant increase in labour costs in the early decades of the twenty-first century, this dynamic is now present in China. Second, many nations, starting with the US, started implementing public education systems that were open to all citizens as well as expanding their spending in higher education. This wasn't just a case of the public being kind; new sectors needed hourly employees with rudimentary reading and numeracy abilities as well as engineers, accountants, attorneys, and secretarial personnel. If higher labour costs were accompanied by increased productivity, which in turn resulted from improved technology and growing human capital, it would be simple to justify the higher prices.

Third, the development of the working classes' political influence was a result of the franchise's growth, as detailed in the chapter before this one. This was accomplished via the fights to legitimise and strengthen labour unions as well as the emergence of political parties linked to them, such as the British Labour Party and the German Social Democratic Party. As well as changing in character, conservative parties started to gain support among the new middle-class elites rather than rich landowners. The growing political strength of the working classes was subsequently exploited to enact social laws governing working conditions, which sparked opposition to more extensive welfare state initiatives like pensions and publicly funded healthcare. Fourth, the working class simply ceased expanding by the middle of the twentieth century, both in terms of raw numbers and as a percentage of the workforce. Indeed, when workers saw significant rises in their quality of living that permitted them to enter the middle class, the relative number of Marx's proletariat fell. They were more inclined to vote for political parties that could defend their advantages than for those trying to alter the status quo since they now owned property and had superior educations.

Fifth, underneath the industrial working class, a new class of impoverished and disadvantaged individuals arose, often made up of recent immigrants, members of racial and ethnic minorities, and other marginalised groups. These groups were either jobless and reliant on government assistance or they worked in lower-paying service employment. Trade unionised employees in industrial sectors developed into a kind of nobility within the labour force. The great majority of employees lacked such representation; in nations where pensions and other benefits were dependent on holding down regular employment, they joined the informal economy. Such people often lacked legal ownership to the land or homes they lived in and had few legally recognised rights. The informal sector makes up around 60 to 70 percent of the total labour force in Latin America and many other developing nations. It has historically been difficult to organise this category of "new poor" for political activity, in contrast to the industrial working class. They don't reside in massive barracks in manufacturing towns; rather, they are dispersed around the nation and often work for themselves.

Finally, the rise of identity politics caused the political Left to lose sight of economic and class problems and split into many groups. I've previously mentioned how nationalism during World War I weakened working-class unity. However, the emergence of new forms of identity centred on homosexual rights, feminism, ecology, immigrant and native rights, and

black empowerment in the developed world by the middle of the 20th century led to a whole new set of issues that transcended class boundaries. Many of these groups were led by members of the economic elitist class, whose cultural values often clashed with those of the working-class population, who had formerly been the foundation of progressive politics [3], [4].

Older Marxists, who for many years adhered to the old industrial working class as their favoured category of the disadvantaged, have found the replacement of class politics by identity politics to be quite perplexing. They made an attempt to justify this change using what Ernest Gellner called the "Wrong Address Theory": Marxists essentially prefer to believe that the spirit of history or human consciousness committed a catastrophic error, similar to how fanatical Shi'ite Muslims believe that Archangel Gabriel erred in delivering the Message to Mohamed when it was meant for Ali. The wakeup message was conveyed to countries while being meant for classrooms due to a horrific postal blunder. Gellner continued to make the case that in the modern Middle East, faiths rather than states were now receiving the same letter. However, the fundamental societal dynamic remained the same.

DISCUSSION

The transformation of the working class into a sizable middle class is at the centre of the first four of these six changes that Karl Marx did not foresee. The developed democracies of Europe and North America eventually found themselves in a comfortable situation towards the end of the turbulent first half of the twentieth century. Their politics were no longer starkly divided between a wealthy aristocracy and a sizable working class or peasant majority, who fought over the allocation of resources in a zero-sum manner. In many industrialised nations, the ancient oligarchies had either become more enterprising capitalist elites or had been physically destroyed by revolution and conflict. Through unionisation and political conflict, the working classes gained more rights for themselves and developed middle class political views. The radical Right was disgraced by fascism, while the communist Left was discredited by the escalating cold war and the danger posed by Stalinist Russia. Due to their broad support for a liberal democratic framework, the center-Right and center-allowed parties were allowed to play out politics. The median voter, a favourite idea of political scientists, was now a middle-class person with a stake in the status quo rather than a poor person seeking structural changes to the social order.

Not many areas were as fortunate. High levels of inequality have historically existed in Latin America, and the old landowner oligarchies had not been dismantled there as a result of the political conflicts that devoured Europe. The organised working classes received the advantages of economic expansion, but the majority of workers in the informal sector did not. As a consequence, polarised politics like those of nineteenth-century continental Europe formed. A manifestation of this basic class war was the continuation of radical, antisystemic movements like the FMLN in El Salvador, the Sandinistas in Nicaragua, the Tupamaros in Uruguay, the Communist parties headed by Cuba, and most recently the Bolivarian movement of Hugo Chavez in Venezuela.

Since Aristotle's day, scholars have concluded that stable democracies must be supported by a sizable middle class since societies with extremes in wealth and poverty are more prone to oligarchic rule or populist upheaval. Karl Marx felt that in contemporary countries, the middle classes will always be a tiny and privileged minority. But by the second half of the 20th century, the middle class made up the great majority of people in the most developed economies, undermining Marxism's appeal.

The rise of middle-class societies also improved liberal democracy's standing as a political system. I mentioned in chapter 28 how critics of liberal democracy, like Mosca, Pareto, and Marx, said that it was ultimately a hoax that covered up the continuous dominance of the elites. But in the 20th century, the benefits of formal democracy and a wider range of voting rights became clear. Democratic majorities exploited the voting process to enact laws that benefited them, regulating big enterprise and establishing redistributive welfare state features.

It is vital to take a step back and define the middle class before continuing to analyse the political effects of the emergence of the middle classes. There are differences in how economics and sociologists approach the topic. In the former, middle class is often defined in terms of income. The most common method is to simply choose a range, such as the middle three quintiles of the income distribution, or to count those whose incomes are between 0.5 and 1.5 times the median. Because of this, the definition of middle class varies depending on the degree of income in a community, making it impossible to compare between countries. For example, being middle class in Brazil implies having far lower spending than in the US. Some economists choose for an absolute amount of consumption to get around this issue, ranging from a low of US$5 per day, or $1,800 per year in parity buying power, up to a range of $6,000–31,000 per year in 2010 U.S. dollars. Since an individual's idea of class rank is often relative rather than absolute, this addresses one issue while creating another. A poor in eighteenth-century England may have lived like a king in Africa, as Adam Smith remarked in The Wealth of Nations.

Sociologists, following a tradition that dates back to Karl Marx, often focus on how one's money is earned occupational status, amount of education, and assets—rather than on measurements of income. The sociological method is more superior for determining the political ramifications of a rising middle class. Simple metrics of income or consumption, whether relative or absolute, may provide some insight into a person's spending patterns but only a limited amount into their political leanings. According to Huntington's hypothesis, social and professional standing are considerably more closely related to destabilising effects than any specific quantity of money. A person who experiences short periods of wealth and knowledge and then falls back into poverty is likely to be more obsessed with day-to-day survival than political involvement. Contrarily, a middle-class individual who, let's say, has a university degree and struggles to find employment "sinks" to a social level they see as beneath their dignity is much more difficult politically.

Therefore, from a political perspective, the key indicators of middle-class status would be employment, degree of education, and ownership of potentially vulnerable assets like real estate or consumer goods. The ownership of the means of production was the original meaning of the term "bourgeoisie" according to Marx. The fact that this kind of property has been greatly democratised via stock ownership and pension plans is one of the hallmarks of the contemporary world. Working in a management position or profession frequently confers a very different sort of social standing and viewpoint from that of a wage earner or low-skilled worker, even if one does not have significant financial resources [5].

Property rights and democratic accountability are more likely to be needed in a robust middle class with some possessions and education. One is more likely to have time to engage in politics (or to demand the right to participate) since more money affords a larger margin for family survival. One wishes to preserve the value of one's property against greedy and/or inept governments. Numerous international studies have shown that middle-class individuals vary from the poor in terms of their political beliefs: they place a higher importance on democracy, want more personal freedom, and are more accepting of alternative lifestyles. Political scientist Ronald Inglehart has argued that economic modernization and middle-class

status produce what he calls "post-material" values, in which democracy, equality, and identity issues become much more prominent than earlier concerns with economic distribution. Inglehart oversaw the extensive World Values Survey, which aims to measure value change throughout the world. William Easterly has connected the "middle class consensus" to better stability, economic development, and other favourable consequences. Economically, it is hypothesised that the middle class embodies "bourgeois" qualities such as self-control, diligence, and a long-term outlook that promote saves and investment. However, it should be obvious from the prior study of Europe in the nineteenth century that middle-class people are not always in favour of democracy. This is often the case, especially when the middle class is still a minority in the population. In these situations, allowing all citizens to participate in politics may result in significant and maybe unsupportable demands for redistribution. In this situation, the middle classes may decide to support authoritarian leaders who provide stability and the safeguarding of property rights.

One may argue that this is the situation in modern China and Thailand. Between 1992 and 1997, Thailand's political system underwent a transition from an authoritarian military rule to a comparatively open democracy, paving the stage for the ascent of populist politician Thaksin Shinawatra. One of the wealthiest businessmen in the nation, Thaksin, established a large-scale political party based on government initiatives to provide rural Thais access to healthcare and debt relief. The middle classes turned against Thaksin and backed a military coup that removed him from office in 2006, despite the fact that they had been ardent supporters of the democratic opening in the early 1990s. Since being accused of corruption and misuse of power, he has had to wield his authority from a distance. Following a severe polarisation between Thaksin's Red Shirt followers and middle-class Yellow Shirt supporters, the military overthrew an elected government in 2014 as a result.

There could be a comparable trend in China. Obviously dependent on definition, the number of middle-class Chinese citizens in 2014 is projected to be between 300 and 400 million out of a total population of 1.3 billion. These rising middle classes are often the driving force behind opposition to authoritarian rule; they are the ones who use Sina Weibo, China's version of Twitter, and are more inclined to expose or denounce government misconduct. When questioned about the precise substance of democracy, many respondents either equate it with more personal freedom or with a government that is attentive to their demands, according to survey data from sources like AsiaBarometer, despite the fact that these statistics indicate that there is broad support for democracy in China. Many people do not criticise the system as a whole because they feel that the present Chinese government already gives them these things. Although it is exceedingly difficult to get reliable polling data on this topic, middle-class Chinese are less likely to voice support for a rapid transition to multiparty democracy with universal suffrage [6], [7].

The middle class's size in relation to the rest of society is one key factor in deciding how it would act politically, according to the Thai and Chinese situations as well as the ones from the eighteenth century in Europe. Because it fears the intentions of the vast majority of impoverished people below it and the populist policies they may follow, the middle class, which makes up only 20–30% of the population, may support antidemocratic forces. The threat is lessened, though, as the middle class grows to be the dominant social class. In fact, at that moment, the middle class may be able to vote for different welfare-state programmes and gain from democracy. Given that the middle class often grows in size compared to the poor with increasing wealth, this may assist to explain why democracy becomes more stable at higher per capita income levels. The foundation of democracy is the middle class, as opposed to middle class societies.

By the early post-globe War II decades, such societies began to emerge in Europe, and ever since then, they have been progressively expanding across the rest of the globe. The Third Wave of democratisation was not "caused" by the growth of the middle class since many democratic transitions took place in nations with small or nonexistent middle classes at the time, notably those in sub-Saharan Africa. Transitions to democracy were mostly sparked by imitation, contagion, and the failures of prevailing authoritarian governments. But compared to nations where a relatively tiny middle class is wedged between a wealthy elite and a sizable destitute population, countries with substantial and wide middle classes have a higher potential to establish a stable liberal democracy. By the early 1970s, Spain, the nation that launched the Third Wave, had evolved from a backward rural culture at the time of the civil war in the 1930s to one that was much more modern. It was much simpler to think about a democratic transition then than it had been a generation before since the European Union was full with examples of successful democracies. This shows that despite the setbacks that happened throughout the early twenty-first century, the prospects for democracy across the world remain positive. The European Union Institute for Security Studies projects that the number of people in the middle class will increase from 1.8 billion in 2009 to 3.2 billion in 2020 and 4.9 billion in 2030 (out of a projected global population of 8.3 billion).6 The majority of this growth is expected to occur in the developing world, where spending is currently projected to account for 31 percent of total income.

If it is not well distributed, economic development alone will not be adequate to maintain democratic stability. Since the mid-1990s, China's income inequality has grown rapidly, reaching Latin American levels by 2012, which is one of the biggest threats to China's social stability today.7 Although Latin America had already attained middle-income status long before East Asia, it was still plagued by high levels of inequality and the populist policies that resulted from it. However, as noted by economists Luis Felipe López-Calva and Nora Lustig8, the large decline in income inequality in the 2000s has been one of the region's most encouraging trends. This has led to major benefits for the region's middle class. According to the UN Economic Commission for Latin America, 32 percent of the region's population was considered poor in 2010 compared to 44 percent in 2002. The reason for the decline in inequality is not fully understood, but a portion of it can be attributed to social policies like conditional cash transfer programmes that have purposefully given benefits to the poor [8].

Class Interests and Clientelism

The emergence of a sizable middle class could also have significant influence on the practise of clientelism and the related types of political corruption. I have claimed that clientelism is an early type of democracy: in nations with large populations of uneducated and unemployable voters, the simplest method of electoral mobilisation is often the supply of personal advantages like handouts, political favours, or employment in the public sector. This shows that as voters get richer, clientelism will begin to wane. Additionally, voters see their interests as being related to wider public policy rather than specific rewards, which increases the cost of bribing politicians.

Where it has occurred, civil service reform has often coincided with the growth of the middle class. In chapter 8, we saw how the Northcote-Trevelyan reforms in Britain benefited the newly emerging middle classes in Britain who were cut off from the traditional aristocratic patronage networks. A middle class supported by capitalist expansion is one that values meritocracy virtually by definition. Similar to how middle-class organisations outside the current patronage structure in the United States led the civil service reform campaign during the Progressive Era. These well-educated, often Protestant businesspeople, attorneys, and intellectuals looked down on the opportunistic politicians who organised huge voter

registration drives among immigrants in the nation's expanding cities. Additionally, business owners required a capable civil service to provide the increasingly complicated services that people were expecting from the government. Modern anti-corruption campaigns are widely supported by the middle classes in China, India, and Brazil.

The sheer creation of a middle class, however, does not imply that this group will automatically embrace transparent governance and an end to clientelistic politics, just as it does not in the case of democracy. Existing patronage networks are fully capable of enlisting new social actors and paying them off. The railways, which served as technical modernity's role models in the United States throughout the nineteenth century, swiftly mastered the art of buying politicians and taking advantage of the patronage system for their own gain. It was said that railway interests controlled several western state legislatures outright. Older agricultural groups, such as farmers in the Midwest, were willing to join the Progressive alliance in favour of civil service reform because of the railways' capacity to play this political game [9], [10].

while a result, there is a competition among various interests to win over the emerging middle classes while economic expansion takes place. The traditional patronage politicians are more than eager to give their followers from the middle class free money. Their inclination to support the reformist side in this conflict will rely on their numbers, their feeling of financial stability, and their social standing, much as in a democracy. They are considerably more inclined to channel their outrage towards the reform or overthrow of the current clientelistic system if they feel alienated and unrecognised by those above them, as in Britain, or by those below them (who yet possessed political power), as in America.

CONCLUSION

Policymakers must address the unique difficulties this group faces if they want to guarantee a strong middle class and a thriving democracy in the future. This entails putting in place fair economic policies that support income redistribution, the development of high-caliber jobs, and social safeguards. Supporting upward mobility and lowering inequality requires improving access to affordable housing, healthcare, and education. Furthermore, it is critical to promote a diverse political climate that supports middle-class involvement and representation. Restoring trust and confidence in the political system may be accomplished through strengthening democratic institutions, encouraging accountability and openness, and tackling corruption. The middle class may play a greater role in determining democratic government through fostering meaningful civic engagement, assisting civil society organisations, and using technology for public involvement. In conclusion, the destiny of the middle class is closely related to the future of democracy. Maintaining a strong middle class is essential for guaranteeing the durability and vitality of democratic regimes as socioeconomic developments continue. Societies may create a future in which a robust middle class continues to play an active role in defining the democratic environment by addressing the issues that the middle class faces, advocating inclusive policies, and bolstering democratic institutions.

REFERENCES

[1]   I. Salehyan and C. S. Hendrix, 'Climate shocks and political violence', *Glob. Environ. Chang.*, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.07.007.

[2]   F. Fukuyama, 'The future of history: Can liberal democracy survive the decline of the middle class?', *Foreign Affairs*. 2012.

[3]   C. Cramer and P. Richards, 'Violence and War in Agrarian Perspective', *J. Agrar. Chang.*, 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1471-0366.2011.00312.x.

[4]   M. Uribe-Castro, 'Expropriation of church wealth and political conflict in 19th century Colombia', *Explor. Econ. Hist.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.eeh.2019.03.001.

[5]   B. Nolan and D. Weisstanner, 'Has the middle secured its share of growth or been squeezed?', *West Eur. Polit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/01402382.2020.1727173.

[6]   B. Leventoğlu, 'Social Mobility, Middle Class, and Political Transitions', *J. Conflict Resolut.*, 2014, doi: 10.1177/0022002713478563.

[7]   M. Y. Madrah And M. Mubarok, 'Netizen Dalam Kampanye Pilpres Ri 2014', *Interak. J. Ilmu Komun.*, 2018, doi: 10.14710/interaksi.7.1.16-25.

[8]   M. T. Clarke, 'In the Ruins of Neoliberalism: The Rise of Antidemocratic Politics in the West by Wendy Brown', *ariel A Rev. Int. English Lit.*, 2021, doi: 10.1353/ari.2021.0007.

[9]   I. Marandici, 'A Middle Class Without Democracy. Economic Growth and the Prospects for Democratization in China', *Eur. Asia. Stud.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/09668136.2014.934141.

[10]   Herdi Sahrasad, 'Oposisi Anwar Ibrahim Dan Politik Malaysia', *Konfrontasi J. Kult. Ekon. dan Perubahan Sos.*, 2020, doi: 10.33258/konfrontasi2.v1i2.81.

CHAPTER 12

ROLE OF PROSPECTS FOR DEMOCRACY

Dr Sireesha Nanduri, Assistant Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: sireesh_n@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

There are constant discussions and doubts around the possibilities for democracy, the form of government based on the involvement of the people and political liberties. The problems, possibilities, and prospective routes for democratic growth are all taken into account as this abstract analyses the democracy's present situation and its prospects for the future. Democracy has shown to be capable of fostering economic progress, human rights protection, and political stability. However, democratic regimes have recently experienced a number of difficulties, such as the development of populism, the deterioration of democratic institutions and norms, and the influence of technology improvements on political processes. Concerns concerning the viability and efficiency of democratic government have been raised in light of these difficulties. Despite this, there are still many prospects for democracy to flourish. Younger generations in particular are becoming more outspoken and active citizens that want accountability, inclusion, and openness from their governments. Civic engagement and democratic rights are still supported by grassroots movements and civil society organisations. Globally enhancing democratic governance may also be accomplished via international collaboration and solidarity. Democracy's future depends on its capacity to successfully handle its present problems. This necessitates respecting basic rights and freedoms, maintaining the rule of law, and safeguarding democratic institutions.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Democratic, Development, Economic, Education.

INTRODUCTION

A large middle class is neither a pre-requisite nor a sufficient condition for the establishment of liberal democracy. However, it really aids in keeping it going. Because his global proletariat evolved into a worldwide middle class, Karl Marx's Communist paradise did not materialise in the developed world. In the developing world, growing middle classes have improved democracy in countries like Indonesia, Turkey, and Brazil and have the potential to overthrow China's authoritarian system. But what if the middle class begins to shrink and reverse course? What then happens to liberal democracy?

Sadly, there is a lot of data that suggests this process may have started in the industrialised world, where income disparity has dramatically expanded since the 1980s. In the United States, where the wealthiest 1 percent of households received 9 percent of the GDP in 1970 and 23.5 percent in 2007, this is particularly remarkable. The flip side of the problem of the stagnation of middle-class earnings during the 1970s is the fact that so much of the economic development during this time went to a very small number of individuals at the top of the distribution [1].

This stalemate was concealed from view in the United States and other nations by other considerations. Large numbers of women entered the workforce at this time, boosting family income at the same time as many middle-class males saw a decline in real wages. Additionally, governments all around the globe supported housing booms by offering cheap, subsidised loans as a viable alternative to outright income transfer. The 2008–2009 financial crisis was one effect of this tendency. This rising disparity has several causes, but only some of them are within the control of governmental policy. Globalisation is one of the most often named villains, since it has contributed hundreds of millions of low-skill workers to the global labour market and driven down salaries for those with equal abilities in developed nations. A considerable amount of manufacturing has begun to move back to the United States and other developed nations as a result of growing labour costs in China and other emerging-market nations. However, this has only been possible in part because labour costs as a share of overall production costs have decreased significantly as a result of advancements in automation. This implies that the enormous number of middle-class jobs lost during the first deindustrialization phase will not likely be replaced by fresh onshore industry.

This emphasises the long-term influence of technical development, which is, in a way, the fundamental enabler of globalisation. Over the years, technology has steadily replaced human labour, which in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries delivered enormous advantages to the general populace in industrialising nations as well as to elites. Large numbers of low-skill employment were produced by the enormous technical advancements of this era in a variety of sectors, including coal and steel, chemicals, manufacturing, and construction. The Luddites, who resisted technological advancement, were shown to be terribly mistaken inasmuch as new, better-paying employment options emerged to take the place of those they lost. The assembly line, developed by Henry Ford in his facility in Highland Park, Michigan, reduced the average skill level needed to build an automobile by breaking down the intricate operations of the earlier carriage craft industry into straightforward, repeatable steps that anyone with a fifth-grade education could complete. This was the economic system that paved the way for the development of a sizable middle class and the democratic politics it underpinned.

But the societal impacts of more recent developments in information and communications technology are considerably different. Indeed, it is impossible to separate technology from globalisation: without high-speed broadband communications and declining transportation costs, it would not be possible to outsource customer support and back-office operations from the United States and Europe. Automation has eliminated a large number of low-skill assembly-line jobs, and with each passing year smart machines move up the skill ladder to take away more occupations formerly performed by middle-class workers.12 As in previous eras, newer, higher-paying employment are replacing the lower-skill ones that are being lost in this process. However, since Henry Ford's time, both the skill requirements and the quantity of such positions have changed significantly [2], [3].

Because people vary naturally in terms of skill and temperament, inequality has existed for all time. However, the technological world of today further accentuates such inequalities. Strong mathematicians didn't have many opportunity to use their expertise in nineteenth-century rural culture. They may now specialise in fields like finance, genetics, or software engineering and take home ever-increasing shares of the nation's wealth. Additionally, because to contemporary technology, we now live in what Robert Frank and Philip Cook refer to as a "winner-take-all" society, where the very best professionals in any field whether they be CEOs, physicians, professors, singers, entertainers, or athletes earn an outsized and

increasing amount of the revenue. There were many opportunities for persons farther down the ladder in the past when the markets for these talents and services were localised because of the high costs of communications and transportation. This was because large audiences did not have access to the best of the best. But nowadays, anybody can watch a live performance by the Metropolitan Opera or the Royal Ballet on a high-definition screen; many people would choose to do this over going to see a third- or fourth-tier local organisation.

A Revisited Malthus

The unfortunate timing of Thomas Malthus' Paper on the Principle of Population's publication in 1798, on the cusp of the Industrial Revolution and just when a technological tsunami was building, was unfortunate. In the two centuries that followed, his forecast that productivity development would outpace population expansion was shown to be completely false, and human cultures were able to achieve historically unparalleled levels of per capita wealth accumulation. Since then, Malthusian economics has been mocked alongside the Luddites as being archaic and unaware of the nature of contemporary technology. Malthus did not, however, provide an exact timeline for when population increase would exceed production. In the roughly 50,000 years that the human species has lived in its present form, the developed world has only been on a high-productivity trajectory. We now expect that cutting-edge new technologies, comparable to steam power and the internal combustion engine, will keep emerging in the future.

However, such a conclusion is not guaranteed by the rules of physics. It is very likely that although future inventions will continue, the pace at which they increase human wellbeing will decline. Tyler Cowen calls this the "low-hanging fruit" of productivity advancement, which the first 150 years of the Industrial Revolution managed to catch. In fact, a number of physical principles imply that the planet's ability to support expanding people while maintaining high levels of life may have fundamental limitations. Furthermore, even if technical innovation keeps happening quickly, there is no assurance that it will create a lot of middle-class employment, similar to the way the assembly line did in the early 20th century. The people who design the machines and find out how to use them get the new jobs and incentives, and they are nearly invariably more educated than those whose occupations are eliminated [4], [5].

In fact, since so many breakthroughs in the foreseeable future are in the field of biomedicine, the productivity situation will only become worse. Many economists and politicians make the unquestioned assumption that every new technology that increases lifespans or cures sickness is beneficial. It's also true that the longer lifespans that people in wealthy nations have grown to enjoy have had a positive impact on the economy. However, numerous biological advancements have enhanced life expectancy at the price of quality of life and a markedly greater reliance on carers. End-of-life care expenses are on track to overtake all other government expenditure in all industrialised nations since they have grown more quickly than the general pace of economic expansion. Classic examples of events that are negative for individuals but beneficial for society as a whole are death and generational change. The fact that generational turnover is essential to social change and adaptation, both of which will occur at a slower pace as average life expectancies rise, is the first of many reasons to believe that societies will be worse off overall if life expectancies are increased another ten or twenty years on average.

Future technological development cannot be predicted in terms of its type, pace, impact on employment in the middle class, or other social ramifications. However, contemporary countries run the danger of being plunged back into a Malthusian environment, which would

have significant repercussions for the durability of democracy if technological advancement fails to provide widely shared economic gains or if its general pace slows. The unavoidable inequities that come with capitalism are politically bearable in a shared-growth society since everyone eventually wins. People live in a zero-sum environment where one person's success always entails the demise of another. The scenario that human societies were in for the most of their existence prior to the Industrial Revolution makes predation as feasible a strategy for self-enrichment as investment in constructive economic pursuits.

Adjustment

Karl Polanyi stated in The Great Transformation that there was a "double movement" in which civilizations battled to adapt to the disruptive change that capitalism economies continuously created. Public policy must thus be taken into account when determining the future of middle-class countries since private markets and people alone were usually unable to deal with the effects of technological development. A variety of answers have been made in the developed world to the problems posed by globalisation and technological advancement. The governments of the United States and Great Britain are at one end of the scale, offering regions undergoing deindustrialization little assistance with transition outside of short-term unemployment insurance. Indeed, the transition to a postindustrial society has often been supported by governmental officials as well as commentators in academia and press. Public policy promoted privatisation and deregulation at home while promoting open markets and free trade abroad. Politicians acted, particularly in the United States, to reduce the influence of unions and generally boost the flexibility of labour markets. People were taught to embrace disruptive change and that they would have greater prospects as knowledge workers in the new economy working on fascinating and innovative projects.

At the opposite end of this spectrum, France and Italy imposed strict regulations on businesses looking to fire employees in an effort to safeguard middle-class employment. They prevented job loss in the near term but lost competitiveness to other nations in the long run by failing to see the need for changes in labour laws and standards. They often have very antagonistic management-labor relations, similar to those in the United States, but in contrast to the Anglo-Saxon world, where capital owners typically prevail, Latin European labour has done far better defending its advantages. The nations that navigated a medium path between the laissez-faire policies of the United States and Britain and the strict regulatory systems of France and Italy were those like Germany and the Scandinavian nations, which emerged from the 2008–2009 financial crisis with the greatest success. In exchange for better benefits and job retraining, unions were ready to give corporations greater latitude when it came to layoffs thanks to their corporatist labor-management systems [6], [7].

The capacity of industrialised nations to address the issue of a vanishing middle class will determine the future of democracy in those nations. New populist organisations, such as the Tea Party in the United States and several anti-EU, anti-immigrant parties in Europe, have risen as a result of the financial crisis. All of them share the conviction that the ruling classes in their nations have betrayed them. The elites who shape the intellectual and cultural milieu in the industrialised world have been largely insulated from the repercussions of the middle-class collapse, and in many respects they are right. There has been a lack of fresh ideas for solving the issue, ideas that don't only include going back to the old welfare state fixes.

The current German system or any other particular set of policies are not always the best way to handle the issue of the declining middle class. An educational system that was successful in moving the great majority of inhabitants towards higher levels of knowledge and skill sets would be the only long-term option that would really work. State and commercial institutions

must be equally adaptable in order to assist individuals in adapting to the changing nature of the workplace. However, one of the characteristics of contemporary industrialised democracies is the accumulation of many rigidities over time that make institutional change more and more difficult. In actuality, both previous and contemporary political systems are subject to deterioration. A system's past success and stability as a liberal democracy does not guarantee that it will continue to be such in the future.

DISCUSSION

Since the time of the Cuban invasion, nothing has changed in terms of our knowledge, as seen by recent nation-building initiatives in Haiti, Afghanistan, and Iraq. The issue is not that our idea of nation-building is flawed. A flawed hypothesis may be improved and changed. The issue is that American politicians lack a theory. They steadfastly believe that democracy can be brought to thrive wherever American soldiers are stationed as a consequence of one foreign policy endeavour or another. This point of view is stated by Undersecretary of State Paula Dobriansky: "One should not make the mistake of believing that there is anything inherent in Islam, or any other faith or culture, that will prevent the emergence of democracy". Perhaps Dobriansky is accurate that Islam does not exclude democracy, but her blanket assertion that there cannot possibly be any cultural hurdles to democracy everywhere, at any time is in direct opposition to the American experience. There are sure to be nations where establishing a democratic government is impossible, at least not in a reasonable amount of time. If we started to comprehend what the boundaries of democracy are, we may be able to avoid irritation and make better informed policy decisions.

The Bare Minimum of Democracy

The intellectuals have taken the opposite stance from that of the nation builders, who blithely presume that democracy can be built wherever. They see democracy as a fragile flower that needs a variety of social and institutional preconditions in order to bloom. They have amassed a lengthy list of standards throughout the years. According to one academic, democracy needs a population that has nine psychological attributes, including tolerance, realism, adaptability, and objectivity. Additionally, the nation must have economic prosperity, economic equality, and educated citizens. Seven prerequisites for democracy are listed by another political scientist, including "a strong concern for the mass of people" and "high social mobility" . According to two more academics, democracy is based on seven fundamental ideals, such as "respect for individual personality," "belief in rationality," and "equality of opportunity" [8], [9]. Such exhaustive lists, however, vastly overshoot the goal. They constitute an attempt to define the ideal democratic environment, or, more precisely, the ideal democratic environment. They are thus entirely unrelated to the challenge of comprehending actual democracy, which is inherently faulty and compromised. Instead of highlighting all the ideal characteristics, we should concentrate on the absolute need for even a flawed democracy to survive.

Which minimum is that? I'd phrase it as a limitation on the use of force in domestic political disputes. We often take for granted that a democracy is operating well. We think that opposition leaders don't often attempt to seize power by using violence. We suppose that presidents do not often imprison and assassinate their detractors and rivals. However, this presumption regarding peaceful participation is unfounded in many foreign countries. In political debates, many individuals are inclined to use violence. They are prepared to take lives and run the danger of doing so to correct a perceived injustice, carry out what they see as right, or simply seize power. In "high-violence" nations like this, democracy cannot flourish.

This description of Haiti in the early 20th century, before the United States invaded the country in 1915, paints a clear picture of a high-violence society: "No man in those times ventured on the public roads for fear of being drafted in a revolutionary or, perhaps worse, a governmental army. They remained in their hills, and the women handled all of the marketing to the cities. No life was secure and no justice existed once the ruling authority designated a man as its adversary and could use force against him, as was the case with each revolution, cities were pillaged, and whole neighbourhoods were set on fire. By the way, another instance of a failed US nation-building effort is Haiti. U.S. soldiers departed the nation in 1934 after spending eighteen years battling neighbourhood terrorists and attempting to run the government. Since then, the nation has seen the father-and-son Duvalier dictatorship and other waves of political violence, which led to a second U.S. involvement from 1994 to 2000 and a third in 2004.

That a society with a high level of violence cannot maintain democracy does not imply that there must always be absolute internal tranquilly. Violence that is unrelated to the political elite may nevertheless thrive. There is a huge difference between an assassination carried out by a lone murderer and one organised by political leaders and approved by a sizable portion of the people, a fact that outsiders often overlook. The former has the same political impact as a deadly car accident. The latter which I refer to as a "political murder" lays the groundwork for a civil war or a repressive dictatorship. A high-violence society cannot be determined by murder, riots, or acts of terrorism. The defining characteristic of certain leaders is their purposeful use of these acts of violence as weapons in their conflict with others.2 Leaders who commit such crimes are not condemned; their followers justify their heinous actions as essential, rational strategies.

Democrats are unwilling to defend democracy. It takes some getting accustomed to the notion that countries vary in their propensity to utilise political violence. One reason is that implying that one group of individuals may vary greatly from another now looks politically unacceptable. We are not, however, referring to a biological or genetic distinction. It is a cultural attitude to use violence when necessary. It is passed down from generation to generation and may be undone, as shown by historical records. Because we believe that motivations alone fully account for violence, we reject the idea that certain cultures are more violent politically than others. We have been trained to see violence as the reasonable reaction to a "intolerable" circumstance at least since the time of John Locke. One well-known example is the American Revolution. According to legend, this violence was started by the colonists' justifiable rage at King George's "long train of abuses and usurpations." Using the same reasoning, we assert that if people are rebelling in a foreign country, they do so for a good reason, such as because they are starving, a marginalised minority, or zealots trying to impose their religion or philosophy [10].

Of course, political violence is influenced by reasons, beliefs, and ideologies. Nobody picks up a sword without a purpose. In any nation, there are always potential triggers for violence. People all throughout the globe detest some wrongdoings and abuses, and some will always hold extreme beliefs and worldviews. What we fail to notice, however, is that although the identical complaints may not result in violence in more peaceful societies, they do in certain cultures where individuals are quick to respond violently to their grievances.

A typical grievance of people who initiate civil wars, for instance, is that they were "cheated" out of their just win via an illegitimate election process. This complaint first seems to be a good reason for a revolution. However, a deeper examination indicates that significant mistakes and ambiguities routinely occur during elections in democracies, anomalies that the losers think cost them the win. However, they avoid using violence. One instance is the 2000

election of George W. Bush. This election violated a fundamental democratic principle in that the candidate who received the most votes globally was denied victory, in addition to giving rise to allegations of tainted ballots in Florida. Many Democratic Party officials were upset about the election and still are, but they refrained from using force to get revenge.

The idea is deeply paradoxical: in a functioning democracy, citizens do not raise guns in protest against even the slightest violation of democratic values, such as actual or hypothetical election fraud. These cultures stand out for having a comparatively low propensity to use political violence for whatever purpose. In contrast, all kinds of complaints, even those that appear unimportant, tend to incite violence in a high-violence culture.

CONCLUSION

The public's confidence in democratic institutions must be preserved by initiatives to lessen inequality, advance social fairness, and provide economic opportunity. By embracing technology innovations, democratic processes may be strengthened and public engagement can be increased. Additionally, promoting democratic ideas and active participation requires civic education and a democratic culture. Deepening democratic legitimacy and efficacy may be achieved through promoting inclusive political systems that guarantee the representation and involvement of different groups, including women, minorities, and marginalised populations. Building robust democratic systems may also benefit from strengthening democratic governance at the local, national, and international levels. Opportunities exist for democracy's regeneration and growth, notwithstanding the obstacles it faces. The chances for democracy may be enhanced by addressing the current issues, embracing public involvement, and fostering inclusive government. To safeguard and enhance democratic institutions and principles, governments, civic society, and individuals must work together. Through coordinated efforts and a common commitment to democratic ideals, a future characterised by strong, inclusive, and successful democracies is attainable.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. Mahoney and T. Vanhanen, "Prospects of Democracy: A Study of 172 Countries," *Contemp. Sociol.*, 1999, doi: 10.2307/2654889.

[2]   V. N. Rudenko, "Prospects of Democracy in Modern Constitutionalism," *Her. Russ. Acad. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.1134/S1019331620020082.

[3]   D. Schultz, "Reflections on the prospects for democracy in Africa and on the impediments to that happening," *Dev. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.21511/dm.17(2).2019.04.

[4]   H. A. Idowu, "Biometric technologies and the prospect of sustainable democracy in Africa," *J. African Elections*, 2021, doi: 10.20940/jae/2021/v20i1a2.

[5]   C. Balderacchi, "Political leadership and the construction of competitive authoritarian regimes in Latin America: implications and prospects for democracy," *Democratization*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2017.1388229.

[6]   H. Albrecht, K. Koehler, and A. Schutz, "Coup Agency and Prospects for Democracy," *Int. Stud. Q.*, 2021, doi: 10.1093/isq/sqab079.

[7]   B. E. Moon, "Long Time Coming: Prospects for Democracy in Iraq," *Int. Secur.*, 2009, doi: 10.1162/isec.2009.33.4.115.

[8]   D. Guthrie and D. Guthrie, "Prospects for Democracy," in *China and Globalization*, 2021. doi: 10.4324/9780203894064-14.

[9]   K. Koehler and H. Albrecht, "Revolutions and the Military: Endgame Coups, Instability, and Prospects for Democracy," *Armed Forces Soc.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/0095327X19881747.

[10]   A. Jibran and M. K. Afridi, "The connection between economic development and democracy: Prospects of democracy in contemporary China," *FWU J. Soc. Sci.*, 2019.

CHAPTER 13

POLITICAL ORDER: CONSTITUTION AFTER COERCION

Pujari Sudharsana Reddy, Assistant Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: pujarisudharsana_reddy@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

A crucial part of transitions to democratic government is the formation of political order, especially constitutions following periods of coercive or authoritarian leadership. This abstract examines the difficulties, procedures, and effects of drafting and enforcing constitutions after force, looking at how they affect political stability and order. Constitutions act as basic frameworks that outline power relations, safeguard individual rights, and set governing principles. Constitutions serve a critical role in enabling a transition towards democratic systems and sustaining the ideals of rule of law, accountability, and inclusion when they are constructed after periods of coercion, such as authoritarian regimes or times of conflict. Constitution-making after coercion is a difficult and diverse process. Deliberative procedures, constitutional assemblies, and public consultations are just a few examples of inclusive and participatory techniques that are often used. By addressing past injustices, resolving competing interests, and including many perspectives, these approaches hope to give residents a feeling of legitimacy and ownership. However, this method is fraught with difficulties. Convergence and compromise may be hampered by the legacy of coercion, ingrained differences, and a lack of faith in institutions. In order to further their own agendas, political elites may attempt to consolidate power or influence constitutional procedures, weakening democratic values. The difficult challenge of balancing the desire for stability and resolving old resentments calls for cautious navigation.

KEYWORDS:

Constitution, Democratic, Government, Politics, Political.

INTRODUCTION

English author L.P. Hartley said in the middle of the 20th century that "the past is a foreign country: they do things dierently there." Hartley offers a view of history that is far and alienating, like to travelling to a strange country. Exploring European cities some of which are more than a thousand years old is a voyage through time, through centuries, and therefore across several countries, whether it takes place over a few city blocks or just involves ascending a museum's stairs. This is especially true in Italy, where amazing Roman ruins coexist alongside astounding Renaissance artwork and architecture. All of the contemporary conveniences that, in some instances, have to be adjusted to their historical surroundings are there in between. Rome's amazing subterranean archaeological riches, for instance, have long prevented plans to extend the metro system from moving forward [1].

According to Hartley's theory, people who appreciate the wealth around them now while on vacation, with their families, or while riding a Vespa around the city are not travelling back in time. Instead, they are living in the present. They are really travelling through time. One of the major advancements in the understanding and writing of history was the realisation of this basic and immovable difference between the past and the present, even though their objects

are on the same physical ground. Mediaeval authors examined their finds more for what they may be able to say about their present than for what they can express about the past as a quest for ancient Roman writings and art developed into a frenzy in thirteenth-century Italy. Aristotle's Politics and ancient law writings were read to analyse their current situations, and they appealed to leaders to restore Rome's splendour as they stared at old manuscripts like lost brothers. The remnants of their history were all around them. They had access to touch it.

Then humanism, one of the greatest Italian Renaissance accomplishments, appeared. When the Italian poet Petrarch ascended a mountain in 1336 and penned a manuscript lauding the tremendous beauty of human connection with its natural surroundings, the humanism movement was formed. It is now a major artistic, literary, and philosophical movement. In contrast to the grim outlook of his day, which placed a heavy emphasis on Man's fall in Christian theology, Petrarch offered a positive view of mankind, a celebration of humanity that later became known as humanism. The person in its natural surroundings was the centre of intellectual movement.

Humanism evolved into a cultural renaissance during the next centuries, inspiring works of literature, art, scientific discovery, and sculptures by Donatello, Michelangelo, Leonardo da Vinci, Niccol Machiavelli, and many more. Then, in the sixteenth century, it spread to northern Europe, where it reached its pinnacle in Erasmus of Rotterdam's cutting sarcasm and the breathtaking beauty of the paintings created in the Dutch United Provinces in the seventeenth century. By that time, the humanities had taken centre stage in the curricula of Europe's top institutions, and their influence can still be seen in our current university curriculum.

Petrarch was a talented poet, but more. He reintroduced the notion that the present is not the same as the past and that people and eras change to Europe. A comparable understanding of history had been formed by ancient historians in Greece and Rome, but it had been lost to the area after Rome's collapse in the fifth century. Most notably, Petrarch used periodization, a crucial historical craG technique. He characterised the time from the collapse of Rome to the present as the "Dark Ages" or "middle age," looking back with disapproval on the era that came before him. In his view of historical time, there was no continuity between modern Italy and ancient Rome. Rome has long since fallen. In order to establish a new future that respected human accomplishments and fostered the pursuit of greatness in all spheres of life, as the Romans had done, the job of the present was not to recreate antiquity but to learn from it. By proclaiming the start of a new era, he inadvertently started one himself [2], [3].

Petrarch's classification of history into three eras not only served as a catalyst for the Italian Renaissance, but it also established a framework for teaching and learning about European history that historians still largely accept today. Historians now divide the period into the Low Middle Ages, roughly from the 400s to 1000, and the High Middle Ages, roughly from 1000 to 1250, during which there was a new wave of civilizational expansion. The following generation of humanists developed a new confidence even conceit about how to interpret history and what the right approach to comprehending the past ought to be. Italian humanists sometimes had to hide their scorn when they engaged with authors from other intellectual traditions, particularly scholasticists who were influenced by Thomas Aquinas' theory of natural law. They believed that writings must be analysed in the situations in which they were created. The only thing that should have been said about authors who took old writings out of context is scorn. Humanists were ultimately persuaded that Scholasticism was simply making stuff up.

But it is unusual for one intellectual tradition to triumph completely. As 'two languages of politics,' in the words of historian J.G.A. Pocock, humanism and scholasticism engaged in conflict and interaction throughout European thought for centuries. The state, a notion that became more complex between the 1200s and 1500s and is crucial to our modern understanding of politics and international relations. A traditional view places this in Renaissance Italy, however other academics believe it began in the two biggest mediaeval kingdoms in Europe, France and Spain, before spreading to Italy. Nevertheless, the idea was expanded upon when it arrived in Italy, which is paradoxical considering that Italy was one of the regions of early modern Europe with the least support for centralised control. Following the breakdown of the pope's authority in the 1100s, hundreds of republican city-states, many of which had written constitutions and elected administrations, such as those in Florence, Milan, and Venice, sprung up across northern Italy. These tended to become oligarchies throughout time, dominated by rich families most notably the Medici family of Florence.

DISCUSSION

During the Italian Wars in the late fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when French forces entered, northern Italy fell into a destructive cycle of conflict, instability, and collapse. The Florentine Republic was abolished by the Medici in the sixteenth century, as they did elsewhere, and a hereditary system of family power was put in place. Republicans, who adhered to an ideology that championed ideals of popular sovereignty and exalted the 'freedom' of the Italian republics, were horrified by these developments. They developed a new branch of political science that was influenced by comparative history as a result of their more sophisticated analysis of their current problems. The information that Renaissance academics could gather about historical and contemporary populations. Instead of seeing it as their heritage, they embraced the Roman Republic as an example. A 'cult of Brutus,' the man who killed the Roman emperor Julius Caesar, permeated Northern Italy's popular culture. In the beginning, Renaissance humanists focused on the virtues for example, those of Brutus or lack of virtues for instance, those of Julius Caesar of rulers to explain the success or failure of political communities. They assessed the merits of rulers by whether or not they carried out God's purpose, deeply inspired by mediaeval Christian ideas even as they departed from some of them. The web of social relations the framework and frameworks that let a ruler to rule became the focus of their curious gaze throughout time as opposed to just the governing figure itself. This fundamental shift, from a subjective to an objective view of how institutions carry out the art of governance, entailed a secular shift in how to study politics.

It also made room for the development of a fully formed notion of "a state" as something distinct from both rulers and subjects, a governing body that may survive its current occupants, albeit this notion was still nascent. The theory that a civitas, the Latin term for city or community, and corporation by which they meant a university, a municipality, or another recognised institution were more than the sum of their members was first put out by Italian attorneys in the 1200s. Instead, they were distinct, self-contained entities with their own legal identities that may be 'represented' by people who had the authority to speak on their behalf. The idea was used for governmental and territorial divisions starting in the 1300s, such as in the statue of Venice at the Palazzo Ducale, which depicts a lady seated on a throne [4].

The Prince (1513) and The Discourses on Livy (1516) by Niccol Machiavelli represent the pinnacle of Renaissance political thought. The Prince has been reframed in part as a job application by historians after placing Machiavelli in his historical setting. When Lorenzo de Medici invaded the Florentine Republic, he was fired from his official position and tried to win over the new ruler with his book. Despite his failure he was even tortured on the pretence of a conspiracy his ideas had a significant influence on the evolution of political philosophy

and notions of the state in early modern Europe. Machiavelli, in an astonishing way, centred his politics on power and raw force. He began a comparative history of ancient Roman emperors, drawing on the republican humanism heritage he shared, and urged the prince to take his lead from a role model in history. His grasp of politics led him to believe that what mattered is a ruler's "appearance" rather than the good intentions and good will that had previously been valued in a ruler, which had been the prevailing norm. He stated that a ruler is acting more out of vanity than virtue when they pursue their own virtue at the cost of the society. Not that one should act poorly, but rather that one should know when it is essential to behave badly, was his main message. According to Machiavelli, a ruler's main responsibility is to ensure his own security and the security of those under his control, not to follow God's will.

As a result, the king lost his or her responsibility to practise Christianity under Machiavelli. When required, he ought to behave like a "beast" and emulate the lion's might and the fox's cunning. The ruler's primary responsibility became "maintaining his state," to which everything else was subservient. 'Maintaining his state' was a cliche that appeared often in late Renaissance Italian literature, but Machiavelli advanced the language by separating the idea from its possessive form and writing about 'a state' and 'the state' in The Prince. Machiavelli's secular conception of the state, which emphasised self-preservation as the highest virtue, was to have a tremendous amount of influence on European politics and history. This chapter's core thesis is that the establishment of political order was a protracted and contentious process. Numerous ordering theories, including religious, dynastic, and legal ones, were devised and tested along the process.

European Political Thought in History

Quentin Skinner, a key figure in the twentieth-century "Cambridge School" of history, made this early "genealogy of the state" a significant component of his life's work. One of Skinner's most important contributions is his identification of the conceptual underpinnings of "the state" in the republican humanist traditions of the Italian Renaissance. Midway through the 20th century, this was a unique approach since art and metaphysics, not politics, had hitherto been the centre of intellectual history and the history of ideas. The main contribution of the Cambridge School was their insistence that political philosophy could only be understood in the context of its historical time period. It was ahistorical and gave rise to incorrect academic claims, the most significant of which were anachronisms, to bring historical people far apart in time and place into dialogue with one another as philosophers do in a type of transhistorical pantheon of great minds [6].

History Research:

Studying how Machiavelli engaged with the people who lived nearby, i.e., his contemporaries, would be considerably more illuminating than putting him in a protracted discussion with old and classical authors like Aristotle and St. Augustine. Machiavelli did interact with and learn from ancient and classical texts, but only within the modes of thought and in the contexts of interpretation and understanding of sixteenth-century Italy, as elite thought in early modern Europe was primarily communicated through texts and Renaissance authors had recovered many Roman texts.

Political philosophies that use a historicist perspective have caused some controversy in the past. The first chapter describes how historicism seeks to comprehend history within its own context, time, and location. For instance, Peter Laslett's analysis of John Locke's Two Treatises demonstrates the potential of historicism to provide fresh perspectives on long-

studied characters. The classic work by John Locke defined liberalism as a system of limited representation and constitutional restraints on monarchical authority.

Idea of A Definition

Since Locke's work was published in 168g, it was assumed that it had been written to commemorate and defend the English Glorious Revolution of the previous year, in which the 'absolutist' government of James II had been overthrown in favour of William I, who had pledged himself to constitutional monarchy in return for the throne of England in alliance with the 'Whigs' or liberals in Parliament. By closely reading the Two Treatises and using the historical method to identify how Locke discussed his own work in letters and other publications, Laslett successfully refuted this misconception. In other words, rather than merely studying Locke as a brilliant thinker, Laslett chose to examine Locke as a real historical character. He was able to convince everyone, to their surprise, that Locke had written the Two Treaties between 1673 and 1683, a long time before the 1688 Glorious Revolution. Two Treatises, according to Laslett, "turn out to be a demand for a revolution yet to be brought about, not the rationalisation of a revolution in need of defence."

The historicist contention that ideas can only be understood in the context of other ideas and historians' duty to explain the roots of our current time, such as the beginnings of European democracy, are in conflict here. It should be obvious by now that individuals in the past routinely engaged in political conflict via the use of history. Who controls the present controls the past, and who controls the past controls the future, according to George Orwell, who was astute in this respect. Although Orwell was anticipating a dystopian future, historians have long struggled with his fundamental argument that the person in power affects how history is presented.

Particularly in the nineteenth century, there was a romanticist school in history that depicted heroic national histories in the manner of early nationalism. These had been superseded with stories that concentrated on the rise of liberal democracy by the early 20th century. Such advancements were dated to the Glorious Revolution and the ensuing Age of Enlightenment by historians. The way people thought about history was changing; liberalism replaced nationalism as the dominant narrative of what constituted progress. with The Whig Interpretation of History (1g31), historian Herbert Butterfield criticised the propensity of early-modern histories to conclude with the triumph of liberalism in the English and Glorious Revolutions and labelled them as "victors' history" in this context. The phrase "Whig history" then came into use to criticise ideologically contaminated teleology and the use of history as propaganda on behalf of a government or ruling class reasoning in light of the anticipated result. Evidence is interpreted to support the presumptive result of occurrences. In his paper on Locke, a Whig hero, Laslett dealt a significant blow to Whig history. Therefore, in a broader historical perspective, the constitutional monarchy and property-based rights to representation that Locke championed in the Two Treatises were less significant [6], [7].

The persistent assertion in popular discourse that the Protestant Reformation was the genesis of democracy and freedom (mediated subsequently via Locke and constitutional liberalism) is a potent example of "Whig history." Recent conceptual history research demonstrates how these historical myths still influence how our politics are organised in the twenty-first century. Our idea of freedom as the government leaving us alone is shockingly fresh, according to Annelien de Dijn. She contends that Italian humanists interpreted freedom to entail people's right to popular sovereignty and political participation. This idea of freedom predominated for many years until it was reinterpreted by conservative opponents of the American and French Revolutions in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century. We

won't be able to see the power structures hiding behind the politics we inherit unless we rediscover this conceptual history and the writers' 'antidemocratic' motives for redefining freedom as limited government.

Political Organisation in Early Modern and Mediaeval Europe

Universal vs. Territorial Order: The Middle Ages' Birth of Europe Charlemagne was designated the western heir apparent to the powerful Roman Emperors in 800 by Pope Leo III, who had lost trust in the eastern Byzantine Emperors stationed in Constantinople. Charlemagne was given the title "King of the Romans" by Pope Leo III. The pope held that St. Peter was designated head of the Christian church by Jesus Christ, who was the source of the papacy's power. As a result, the lineage of Christian popes was established when Peter in turn granted this power to the Bishop of Rome. The pope served as the spiritual head of the church and hence of Christendom the "Holy See", but with the fall of the Roman Empire in the 400s CE, he also assumed control over papal lands that were dispersed across Italy. By making Charlemagne Emperor, the mediaeval church ventured even farther into the world of secular authority. In addition to claiming for the pope the right to appoint emperors to their thrones, it established the political framework for the restoration of the Roman Empire.

The pope's primary goal was to impose universal rule over all of Christendom by uniting spiritual and material power in support of a reborn kingdom. Modern-day France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Switzerland, northern Italy and Spain, as well as portions of Croatia and Czechia, all fell under the dominion of Charlemagne's Carolingian Empire, which he founded. His form of government, known as feudalism, was based on a network of personal connections with important power brokers (magnates) and loyalty vows between king and subject that tied them together in legal arrangements of reciprocal rights and obligations.

Feudalism

Rule that is built on a hierarchy of patrons and clients, with clients having the power to become patrons to others. Goods, labour, and favours go up and down this hierarchical structure to support assertions of power, legitimacy, and rule. This still holds true in several other places of the globe and was the dominant form of government in mediaeval Europe up to the "Age of Revolutions." After his death, the Treaty of Verdun (843), which divided Charlemagne's Empire into three parts, saw Eastern and Western Frankia grow into what are now France and Germany. A compelling argument that rulership was not connected to a geographical state may be made by examining the division of Charlemagne's empire into personal kingdoms. From this division, Western Christendom emerged diminished. As a result of AGer Otto of Saxony's victory against a series of Hungarian invasions, the pope installed him as Holy Roman Emperor in g62, establishing an imperial reign that lasted for more than 800 years. However, the rupture with France was now irreversible. By the year 1000, there were many political entities that made up western Christendom. Kingdoms and city-states were the most significant political entities in Europe throughout the High Middle Ages (1000–1250), next to the pope [8], [9].

The Frankish and Gothic kingdoms that succeeded Rome in the 400s and 600s believed that God had bestowed royal authority, but that it was also subject to the rule of custom. The paradigm for mediaeval royalty was offered by these two bases of power. Kingly authority in the Middle Ages seldom extended much beyond than the vicinity of the royal court. Frankish warriors brought Christianity and the sword to Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and Scandinavia. Theoretically basing their power on the "right to conquest," they built hundreds of castles across Europe. Because they were hubs of communication that collected rents and tolls and

extended power into the countryside, castles had economic purposes in addition to political and military ones. The areas west of Byzantine gained an exceptional degree of cultural, social, theological, and political uniformity between 1000 and 1300, according to historian Robert Bartlett, and this is how Europe was created. Mediaeval monarchs developed early notions of territorial and local power that we would later come to term sovereignty in response to the universal pretensions of the Holy See.

The most contentious issue was whether kings required papal anointment to be legitimately enthroned and, therefore, whether popes could "de-crown" kings. The Holy Roman Emperor Henry IV was excommunicated by the pope during the Investiture Controversy (1075–1122), and his people were released from their allegiance pledges. Defenders of the monarchy retorted that since monarchs are given "two swords," a secular and a holy one, monarchical power originated from God rather than the Vatican. Pope Boniface VIII's insistence that only the church might tax or jail French clergy and bishops sparked controversy once again in the fourteenth century. Not to be scared, French King Philip the Fair called for the first time an Estates General of prominent Parisian burghers, nobles, and bishops to rally support on his side. Unam Sanctum, the most severe expression of papal authority in history, which asserted that kings are completely submissive to Rome, was Boniface's response. A disgraceful outcome resulted from Boniface's excess. He was captured by French troops, died in prison, and Philip installed a rival puppet pope at Avignon under his watchful eye to challenge the one in Rome. Papal claims to have universal, secular authority were disproved. The pope concentrated on keeping its hold on power in Italy after Rome had been completely recovered.

These were the perfect circumstances for the growth of mediaeval and early Renaissance city-states, which were more condensed and compact but more effective and inventive territorial entities. The dynamism of Italian city-states in the 1000s and 1200s could not be more representative of the failure of the papacy's attempt to establish universal rule or the constrained scope of the Holy Roman Empire (whose leaders repeatedly failed to capture northern Italy). Quintin Skinner and Annelien de Dijn identify the beginnings of European traditions of liberty and freedom there rather than in seventeenth-century England. In the northern Mediterranean, a number of city-states established commercial empires, including Venice and Genoa. Among other cities, Florence and Padua had citizen assemblies. They produced the humanist movement and the Renaissance, two very influential cultural and political movements, and had written constitutions, which were uncommon outside of Italy. Republican city-states were conquered, ruled by tyranny, and oligarchy during the 1200s and 1500s. Italian humanists increased their value of republican rights as they were being lost. A Ger treatise argued for the restoration of the liberties enjoyed during the early republics and denounced the evil of monarchs. Even in defeat, republicans left a significant legacy that succeeding constitutionalists and revolutionaries would pick up in different contexts.

CONCLUSION

Political order and stability are aided by constitutions that have been successfully implemented after compulsion. A well-crafted and respected constitution sets checks and balances, safeguards human rights, and makes sure that power is transferred peacefully. It also offers a foundation for government. It strengthens democratic principles, cultivates a culture of constitutionalism, and increases public confidence in institutions. By addressing the institutional and structural reasons that made coercion possible, constitutional order also tackles the fundamental causes of coercion. In order to stop the resurgence of coercive practises, it enshrines systems for accountability, transparency, and the safeguarding of basic freedoms. Constitutional measures that rectify past wrongs and foster social solidarity may

also help to maintain peace and harmony over the long run. In conclusion, a crucial element in the transition to democratic administration is the formation and enforcement of political order via the enactment of constitutions. A dedication to democratic values, wide engagement, and consensus building are requirements for the process. The cornerstone for political stability, accountability, and the defence of individual rights is a well-written constitution. Societies may create the conditions for a more democratic and fair future by addressing the issues and making sure the process is open to all participants.

REFERENCES

[1]   N. Mark, 'Off the Map: On Violence and Cartography', *Eur. J. Soc. Theory*, 2003.

[2]   C. Fiedler, J. Grävingholt, J. Leininger, and K. Mross, 'Gradual, cooperative, coordinated: Effective support for peace and democracy in conflict-affected states', *Int. Stud. Perspect.*, 2020, doi: 10.1093/isp/ekz023.

[3]   J. Abbink, 'The Ethiopian second republic and the fragile "Social Contract"', *Africa Spectr.*, 2009, doi: 10.1177/000203970904400201.

[4]   G. G. Orfanel, 'The measures and how should be applied the content of 155 constitutional section in Catalonia', *Rev. Esp. Derecho Const.*, 2020, doi: 10.18042/cepc/redc.120.12.

[5]   J. L. Woolard, K. Henning, and E. Fountain, 'Power, Process, and Protection: Juveniles as Defendants in the Justice System', in *Advances in Child Development and Behavior*, 2016. doi: 10.1016/bs.acdb.2016.04.002.

[6]   T. G. Rodgers, 'Reconciling Coercion in the Constitution of the American Republican State', *Journal of Early American History*. 2018. doi: 10.1163/18770703-00803004.

[7]   J. S. Sidhu, 'For the general welfare: Finding a limit on the taxing power after NFIB v. sebelius', *California Law Review*. 2015.

[8]   M. Tolley, 'Protecting Sovereignty in the Peripheries: Boundary Maintenance by Courts in Australia, Canada, the United States, and the European Union', *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2476076.

[9]   E. Ryan, 'Environmental Law after Sebelius: Will the Court's New Spending Power Limits Affect Environmental State-Federal Partnerships?', *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2479110.

<div align="center">

CHAPTER 14

KINGDOM DEVELOPMENT IN RENAISSANCE AND MEDIAEVAL EUROPE

</div>

Dr V Y John, Assistant Professor,
Department of Finance, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University), Bangalore,
Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.vy_john@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In Renaissance and Mediaeval Europe, the rise of kingdoms signalled a crucial era of political, social, and cultural change. The main driving forces behind the expansion and conquest of kingdoms over various historical periods are explored in this abstract, along with how they affected society, government, and the course of European history as a whole. Classical education, creative expression, and intellectual pursuits all saw a renaissance during the Renaissance, which approximately corresponded to the 14th through the 17th centuries. Consolidation and expansion of kingdoms simultaneously played a crucial part in reshaping political environments. Monarchs often used military conquest or diplomatic alliances to achieve their goals of consolidating power, establishing robust administrative structures, and exercising authority over certain regions. During the Renaissance, significant changes in governmental institutions were brought about by the growth of kingdoms. When feudal institutions predominated in previous ages, monarchs like Henry VIII of England or Louis XIV of France strove to exert their absolute power as rulers. The formation of bureaucracies, the fusion of legal and political institutions, and the execution of laws were all made possible by the centralization of power.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Kingdom, Laws, Loyal, Religious.

<div align="center">

INTRODUCTION

</div>

The foundation for societal organisation and the exercise of political authority was feudalism, which was characterised by the trade of land for allegiance and military service. Through dynastic unions, conquests, and inheritance, feudal kingdoms evolved through time into more cohesive and centralised states. Both throughout the Renaissance and the Middle Ages, the rise of kingdoms had a tremendous social and cultural impact. It caused the creation of a unique governing elite that had a significant impact on political decision-making and often included nobles and clergy. Kingdoms promoted patronage of the arts and sciences, fostering accomplishments that represented the status and authority of the ruling class.

During the 1100s and 1200s, monarchical rule began to flourish again, first in England, then in France and the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon which would later join to become Spain. Kingdoms were the primary political entity wielding power in early modern Europe as a result of their rise during the next centuries. Kingdoms initially expanded their political authority domestically by establishing a judicial system of courts as well as a fiscal system of taxing and tax collectors. At first, they were nothing more than royal courts that might be called upon to create troops when necessary. Importantly, kingdoms were able to win the allegiance of the majority of the people they ruled over through time. As a consequence of

professionalisation, royal administrations hired attorneys and accountants, and kingdoms transformed into administrative monarchy. Previously, monarchs had only been able to use their executive authority to uphold existing laws and traditions. However, during this time, monarchs began to face challenges from constitutionalists. By that time, the big kingdoms had developed into stable political institutions, a necessary component of statehood. It's interesting that one of the last areas to emerge was the establishment of permanent institutions with knowledge of international policy [1], [2].

In no other region of the world than mediaeval and early modern Europe, legal order played a significant role in the concentration of political power in territorial entities. Ad hoc meetings of power brokers were the first courts, and they were summoned to decide matters. The king heard and made decisions on the most crucial matters. Locals were included in the actual administration of justice under England's jury systems, which added to their rising popularity. As the practise of law grew more professionalised in the 1200s, situations could now be assessed in light of prior decisions. Jury systems were not implemented in France and Spain because of the assumption that local power brokers in those countries' more fragmented democracies would manipulate the court system for their own ends if leG were uncontrolled. However, rather than just mediating between personal disagreements, their judicial systems started looking for criminal offences like heresy to punish in the sake of the "common good." Building a legal system proven to be a very effective way to win over the public and increase royal authority in remote areas of a kingdom. Low nobility, townsfolk, and commoners all used royal courts to seek justice from their regional lords, which was a strong incentive for people to embrace kingly rule.

The creation of fiscal order was the second aspect of early state centralization. This initially manifested itself in the shape of the king's private estate managers who served as personal accountants. They managed the creation of tax systems and created balance accounts for royal income and spending. Like law, accounting evolved and became a profession. Kings began to place equal weight on legal, financial, and military competence. In the 1200s, authority progressively shifted from knights sent to defend the monarch to "magistrates," or government professionals including administrators, accountants, surveyors, and attorneys. University graduates dominated royal courts, and kings hurried to create schools with concentrations in law, finance, and religion. The handling of royal an airs was standardised and predictable thanks to the promotion of professional norms and routines. Thus, administrative monarchy emerged in England, France, and Spain. However, since England was more centrally located, it was able to impose uniform laws and taxes throughout the realm, while the French employed royal officials to impose local laws and taxes in accordance with regional norms.

Castile selected governors, but owing to provincial opposition, its efforts to enforce a unified set of laws were unsuccessful. While courts increased monarchs' favorability, taxes sparked hostility. External adversaries and battle proven to be a potent foundation to tip the scales in favour of a kingdom winning the allegiance of the people they controlled. Long-bow-wielding English attacked, pillaged, and colonised France during the Hundred Years War (1337–1453). To provide their forces with food, the English devised vast logistical operations. The Treaty of Brétigny (1360), which forbade the French king from selling or dividing crown territories going forward, marked a significant advancement towards the modern idea of statehood in France. While a French national identity formed against the despised "foreigners," who were held responsible for widespread public suffering in the 1300s and 1400s, the invaders showed scorn for their helpless adversaries. The struggle gave rise to the legend of Joan of Arc, a young woman who believed she had been ordered by God

to drive the English out of France and incited divine wrath among the French to fight the English before being captured and executed by English soldiers [2], [3].

For Joan of Arc, believing in God meant believing in France, which was a potent indication that the French monarchy had come to be revered by the populace. After finally defeating England, the French king ascended to power in the 1400s and 1500s, established a permanent tax system to pay for the first standing army in peacetime in Europe.

DISCUSSION

Constitutional Order and Religious Order: Early modern Europe saw conflict and revolution. Major European kingdoms had the financial means by 1500 to support global naval expeditions that paved the way for colonial colonisation in the Americas, Asia, and coastal Africa. Despite such political accomplishment, fundamental questions about the nature of nations and their obligations to their citizens remained unanswered. Did a political region need a religious hierarchy? Was it the responsibility of rulers to make all of their people follow the same religion? Did kings have the authority to alter the religion in their domains? The debates over religious order and another unsolved issue of European statehood constitutional order met at the end of the 1500s. Did kings have the customary authority to both uphold and alter existing laws and customs? Did assemblies whose approval was often necessary to levy additional taxes share legislative authority with the executive branch, or did monarchy eventually adopt absolutist forms of rule? It took two centuries of (oGen brutal) battle to resolve these issues.

Most significantly, political events in the Holy Roman Empire diverged from those in the kingdoms of Western Europe. After several disputes over the succession to the throne, the Empire adopted the Golden Bull (1346), according to which the Holy Roman Emperor would be chosen by a majority vote of the princes and archbishops who made up the college. Although the Emperor was seen as being superior, he was constrained by laws and conventions that permitted some provinces to disregard his rulings. Princes made an effort to impose their authority on all residents of their domain during the political vacuum. Many German rulers responded favourably to pastor Martin Luther's proposal for a Protestant Reformation when he published his g5 theses in 1517 denouncing Catholic practises. Luther commanded them to renounce the papacy in Germany and reorganise the church. Charles V, Holy Roman Emperor and King of Spain, faced a significant threat from this. Lutheranism and John Calvin's doctrines both spread quickly. Calvin established a strict Calvinist theocracy in Geneva where heretics were executed by burning at the stake. Luther stated that an area should only permit one religion, and any who disagree with it should depart. German Protestant and Catholic nations went to war. After the Protestant Revolt, the Peace of Augsburg (1555) established the principle of cuius regio, eius religio (whose kingdom, their religion), which gave kings the freedom to choose the religion of their domain [4], [5].

In the 1500s, disputes about religious order grew across Europe, resulting in civil conflict, governmental persecution, and much suffering and death. Even before the Protestant Reformation, Spain had stepped up government sanctioned religious violence by establishing the Spanish Inquisition in 1478 to track out and punish heretics. The Edict of Fontainebleau, issued by the French monarch in 1540, instructed local parliaments to seek out Protestants, which led to one of the most heinous instances of public anti-Protestant violence, the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in 1572. Known as "Bloody Mary," the Arch-Catholic Mary Tudor ascension to the English throne saw the restoration of Catholicism and the execution of Protestants for heresy. On the other side, radical Scot John Knox proclaimed a Christian obligation to fight oppression and led the first successful Calvinist revolt in 1557. When the

Spanish monarch refused the Dutch nobility's plea for a policy of toleration in 1566, widespread upheavals and iconoclastic rage against Catholic statues and effigies swept the Low Countries. The Eighty Years' War—a series of civil wars—began as a result. Spain acknowledged its independence in 1648 after it had been declared independent from the Spanish Crown in 1581. Over the course of the seventeenth century, this new Dutch Republic rose to become the richest nation in Europe[6].

A new intellectual tradition that claimed that it was not the job of government to compel religious conformity prompted leaders to embrace policies of tolerance, which ultimately put an end to religious bloodshed. French Protestant Huguenot Sebastian Castellión contributed to the idea's introduction. While others advocated for tolerance out of need, Castellión elevated tolerance to the status of a moral virtue. He insisted on the value of uncertainty and made the case that belief could never be completely assured. Thus, killing motivated by belief was wrong. Elizabeth I restored Protestantism to the realm when she ascended to the throne in 1558, although she handled the religious issue with restraint. When King Henry IV of France issued the Edict of Nantes (15g8) declaring that Protestantism would be accepted by the French crown, calmer heads eventually triumphed in France. The Edict, which serves as the chapter's major source, was in force until Louis XIV, often known as the "Sun King," annulled it in 1685. The Edict of Nantes was significant because it established a degree of religious freedom and signalled the separation of civil from private rights. It offered a solution to the country's ongoing religious conflict [7], [8].

When protestants had positions of authority, they exhibited the same intolerance as Catholic leaders, but when they were a minority, like in France, they began to advocate religious tolerance. The second significant threat to statehood in early modern Europe was constitutionalism, which attracted religious minorities. In England, when protestants fought to prevent the king from reinstalling Catholicism, constitutionalism arose as a conflict between the King and Parliament as well as between Catholicism and Protestantism. In the English Civil War, Parliament killed King Charles II and founded a republican Commonwealth; nevertheless, this quickly turned into an authoritarian Protectorate. In light of this, Thomas Hobbes created a secular defence of monarchical authority in The Leviathan (1651), arguing that law and order depended on a powerful state. The monarchy was reinstated in 1660, but the Tories and Whigs, who supported absolute monarchy and constitutional monarchy, respectively, were split in parliament. The Glorious upheaval (1688), which produced a constitutional monarchy and the English Bill of Rights, brought an end to England's century of upheaval. Although the English Bill of Rights protected civil liberty, Catholics were not allowed to occupy public office.

Meanwhile, religious strife returned to the Holy Roman Empire, where it erupted into the terrifying Thirty Years War (1618–1648), which raised issues of constitutional law and religion. In this battle of starvation, pestilence, dislocation, and even cannibalism, around 40% of the German people perished. It started as a conflict between Catholics and Protestants in Bohemia but turned into a conflict between German princes and the Habsburg emperors. The Emperor attempted to use the struggle as an excuse to establish "absolute rule" over the princes, declaring his right to remove princes, convert Protestant regions to Catholicism, expropriate Protestant estates, and change laws at leisure without consulting the Imperial Diet or parliament. The actions of France under Cardinal Richelieu and King Gustav Adolphus of Sweden led to the cross-section of this theological and political war becoming an international one. They swung the war in the Emperor's favour as enemies of the Habsburgs. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) put an end to the conflict by resolving issues of religious order by providing local German rulers the freedom to choose their faith while requiring

religious tolerance in all regions (but only for Calvinism, Catholicism, and Lutheranism). With a few modest modifications, the traditional German constitutional arrangement of shared sovereignty between local areas and imperial institutions like the Diet and Emperor was maintained [9], [10].

A state-based system of political organisation emerged in Europe between the 1000s and 1600s, first in England, France, and Spain, and then, partially as a result of imitation, in Scandinavia and other regions of Central and Eastern Europe. Even though the Holy Roman Empire existed until 1806, the rejection of global ideals of uniting all of Europe under a Christian empire by mediaeval popes and the Holy Roman Empire was a necessity for the creation of a state-based political system. The development of a legal system and a system of taxes in the Middle Ages laid the groundwork for the notion of a permanent state to whom people were obedient. As occurred in England and France during the Hundred Years War, external conflict was crucial in boosting citizens' devotion to the new kingdoms. As states progressively grew out of kings' private estates, concepts of rulership progressed. Instead of pursuing one's own interests or defending one's beliefs, a ruler's ultimate responsibility became the defence of the state. The rising states' religious and constitutional order was under attack in the 1500s to 1600s as a result of a series of connected debates. Concepts of political toleration and, less recently, the separation of powers (a phrase first used in 1748 by French political thinker Montesquieu) emerged as a result of these conflicts. The emergence of republican principles had to contend with monarchical claims to power at the same time, which ultimately resulted in the great American and French Revolutions in the late 1700s that overthrew Europe's ancien régime.

Before the 1800s, imperial or decentralised kinds of government were more common in other regions of the world, particularly territories governed by the European empire. The idea of a "Westphalian order" in international affairs, which was originally extensively explored in the eighteenth century, gained popularity in the 2000s. Statehood became the highest organising principle of the international system during the time of the Peace of Westphalia, which is often portrayed as a turning point in the study of international relations. States were theoretically equal under the international system, which was based on a theory of external nonintervention, despite the fact that they differed widely in their capacity to impose their will. Finding this system's genesis in Westphalia su ers from teleology and anachronism. According to a professor of international relations' historicist interpretation of the Westphalian peace talks, the Swedish and French motives behind the treaty's international provisions were to undermine their rival, the Holy Roman Empire. No attempt was made to radically alter the international system. Furthermore, as we've shown, conceptions of domestic sovereignty have existed for a very long time prior to Westphalia, but ideas of international sovereignty defined as the legal equality of states in the international sphere were developed in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

Only if we are able to replace them with new historical interpretations, as Skinner and De Dijn have done for the notion of freedom, is it useful to dissect international relations interpretations of the Peace of Westphalia, as historians did to "Whig History." But in this instance, a completely different interpretation is not required. As long as it is clear that it did not occur at Westphalia, the central tenet of the Westphalian argument that the international order was developing towards a states-based system based on nominally equal sovereignty is persuasive historically. Like the idea of the state, what is now known as the "Westphalian Order" developed gradually over centuries. The term "Westphalia" is better understood as a metaphor for what was really a long-term historical progression, a significant but not pivotal point.

After Westphalia, the multiethnic, multilingual Holy Roman Empire lasted for an additional 158 years. Even so, it was eventually superseded by nations that were first a part of the imperial Napoleonic order and then a member of the Concert of Europe, which was characterised by foreign intervention rather than nonintervention. Latin America did adopt a states-based structure after gaining independence in the early 1800s. Later, a "third-worldist" agenda claimed national independence from European colonialism and the establishment of independent nations as their admission tickets into the international system in Asia and Africa in the 1950s to 1970s. In a process known as European integration, Western European governments were creating supranational organisations to which they ceded portions of their national sovereignty.

When the European Union (EU) was founded in the gg0s, several academics likened it favourably to the Holy Roman Empire because of its shared sovereignty concept, which was arguably similar to that of the HRE. The African Union, ASEAN, and Mercosur are just a few of the regional organisations that have grown as a result of the EU's example, despite the fact that they are built more on national sovereignty than the EU is. Regional organisations try to balance the world's growing interconnectedness with the persistence of national ambitions for autonomy or independence. We will remember that Machiavelli said that protecting one's people is a ruler's ultimate responsibility. One of the most significant issues we confront in the twenty-first century is whether the state-based system still offers the greatest method of safeguarding human life in the face of contemporary problems like terrorism, migration, and climate change.

CONCLUSION

While some areas saw stability and unification as a result of the consolidation of kingdoms, it also led to battles and power struggles. The geopolitical environment of Europe was shaped by kingdom rivalries and wars of succession, which had an impact on historical events. Both locally and globally, these power dynamics had long-lasting effects. In conclusion, political, social, and cultural history saw significant changes throughout the formation of kingdoms in Renaissance and Mediaeval Europe. The expansion and unification of kingdoms facilitated the concentration of authority, the development of governing institutions, and the encouragement of artistic and intellectual accomplishments. Although it contributed to stability and advancement in certain ways, it also led to wars and rivalries that influenced the course of European history. Understanding the dynamics of kingdom formation throughout these periods will help us better understand the intricacies of European civilization and how governing systems have changed over time.

REFERENCES

[1]   A. Ryabokon, "The Research Methodological Approaches Of The Problem Of The Hibernoroman Traditions Development In The Medieval European Education System," *Pedagog. Sci.*, 2021, doi: 10.33989/2524-2474.2021.77.239301.

[2]   B. Albert, *Sir Banister Fletcher's Global History of Architecture*. 2019. doi: 10.5040/9781474207775.

[3]   C. Wickham, *Sleepwalking into a new world: The emergence of Italian city communes in the twelfth century*. 2015. doi: 10.1215/0961754x-3815894.

[4]   "The Encyclopedia of apocalypticism," *Choice Rev. Online*, 1999, doi: 10.5860/choice.36-3283.

[5]   R. G. Witt, *The two Latin cultures and the foundation of renaissance humanism in medieval Italy*. 2012. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511779299.

[6]   J. J. Todesca, *The emergence of León-Castile c.1065-1500: Papers presented to J.F. O'Callaghan*. 2016. doi: 10.4324/9781315615998.

[7]   G. H. Herb and L. R. Johnson, "Central Europe: Enemies, Neighbors, Friends," *Geogr. Rev.*, 1997, doi: 10.2307/215242.

[8]   D. V. Dubrovskaya, "Speaking with birds in Chinese. Franciscan thought on the middle kingdom proselytization," *Vost.*, 2020, doi: 10.31857/S086919080011148-9.

[9]   A. Hong, "Reviews And Short Notices," *History*, 1975, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-229x.1975.tb02032.x.

[10] H. Hasim, "Reviews and Short Notices," *History*, 2007, doi: 10.1111/j.1468-229x.1981.tb01378.x.

CHAPTER 15

CONCEPT ON POVERTY POLITICS

Dr.Shakeela Banu, Adjunct Faculty,
Department of General Management, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed to be University),
Bangalore, Karnataka, India,
Email Id: dr.shakeelabanu@cms.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

In order to address challenges associated to poverty, governments, political actors, and civil society all use different policies, discourses, and methods. This is referred to as poverty politics. The notion of poverty politics is investigated in this abstract, along with its dynamics, ramifications, and the difficulties in successfully tackling poverty by political means. The creation and execution of policies aiming at eradicating poverty, resolving socioeconomic disparities, and advancing social welfare are all part of poverty politics. It includes a variety of strategies, such as social safety nets, initiatives to reduce poverty, labour market changes, and focused interventions to increase access to fundamental services including healthcare, education, and basic needs. But poverty politics also includes the politics of poverty itself and goes beyond just selecting policies. This covers the terms used to describe, quantify, and frame poverty in political discourse. The narratives around poverty are shaped by various political ideologies and interests, which have an impact on public opinion, policy agendas, and resource allocation.

KEYWORDS:

Community, Development, Governance, Policy, Poverty.

INTRODUCTION

The way that poverty is framed may either support stigmatization and blame or encourage empathy, camaraderie, and a sense of shared responsibility for addressing poverty. Numerous difficulties confront poverty politics. The prioritization and efficacy of attempts to reduce poverty are often influenced by political interests, power relations, and few resources. In order for poverty-focused policies to be implemented and have an effect, political will, institutional capability, and accountability mechanisms are essential. For long-term poverty reduction, it is crucial to combat political polarization and promote multi-stakeholder cooperation. Beyond the immediate reduction of poverty, poverty politics has wider repercussions. Addressing poverty is intimately related to more general social, economic, and political objectives such enabling inclusive development, social cohesion, and inequality reduction. Effective poverty politics may support social harmony, economic development, and human rights fulfilment. Additionally, it may support social fairness, increase social mobility, and give marginalised populations more influence [1].

Donors began to recognise throughout the 1990s that development needed a plan for enhancing state capacities so that governments could provide the circumstances and provide the services required to combat poverty. In DFID's 2001 governance plan, the necessity for improved "governance" political systems and public institutions that could provide the required policies and services and fight corruption was emphasised. However, there was no agreement or clarity among the international community at that time over how to create the essential political structures and public institutions. Many development organisations found it

difficult to admit that politics is at the heart of many governance concerns. The developed world's blueprints and "best practises" were often unsuccessfully attempted to be implemented here. The transplantation of Western public sector reform models often failed, and the adoption of multi-party elections failed to produce true democracy. Early on, DFID saw the need to collaborate with the academic community in an effort to pinpoint ways to strengthen governance for better development results [2].

Research on governance influences development thinking and practise. Our ability to participate in our societies and have a say in how they are run, as well as our opportunities to further our education and become economically productive, which will ensure a better future for both ourselves and our communities, depend on the type of governance in place. The impact of excellent or especially bad governance on the lives of the poorest and most vulnerable is significant: the failure of governmental institutions to avoid conflict, provide minimal protection, or deliver minimal services may have life-or-death repercussions;

Lack of opportunity may hinder generations of impoverished families from escaping poverty, and a nation's incapacity to develop economically and raise taxes can keep it mired in a cycle of assistance dependence. Therefore, attaining progress and resolving conflict depend on understanding government. Why can nations with comparable circumstances have radically different levels of development? Researchers and policymakers are both interested in knowing why certain nations establish long-lasting safe governments while others devolve into violent conflict. We need to understand why one country's tax collection may be successful while seemingly identical tax collection systems elsewhere may not work, or why one country's electoral process may result in coalitions for change while another's may result in political unrest and even conflict.

This paper offers a succinct summary of some of the solutions to these pressing issues. It summarises the conclusions and practical applications from the significant governance research projects (see Box 1) sponsored by DFID over the previous ten years. Less than 0.5% of DFID's spending on governance reforms was invested in this study, which has contributed to the intellectual depth and consistency of DFID's governance activities. Due to the significant cross-cutting role that governance plays in all country and sector programmes and due to DFID's leadership role in influencing global governance thinking through engagement with the World Bank, OECD DAC, EU, UN, and other international and bilateral organisations as well as partner governments. When, for instance, increasing the political legitimacy of the state in Africa is estimated to be worth up to 2.5% GDP per year and certain governance changes give extremely high returns immediately, the long-term benefit and rate of return on investment in governance research looks to be significant [3].

Development is Political

The importance of politics in creating functional states and determining the course of development has been the overarching lesson from all four study initiatives. It demonstrates that "politics" is not an amorphous idea but rather a crucial factor in achieving the Millennium Development Goals, which call for more educated, healthier, and wealthier people. This message has been conveyed by the study in several ways. It shows that politics is the "driver of change" and the root of issues with people's safety and access to justice. It demonstrates how local political economy has an impact on taxes, instability, and residents' capacity to take part in their own development.

Insights on the role of citizen participation (in promoting health outcomes) helped improve the design of a $200 million World Bank health reform programme in Brazil. At the national

level, it has deepened understanding of how horizontal inequalities created conflict in Nepal and the need to redress them in post-conflict work.

The study has influenced a shift in funders' perspectives on development. The focus on technocratic aspects in the administration of the international community ten years ago. These included policies to create an atmosphere where skilled officials could work more effectively, resource management, personnel processes, and administrative structures for the government. Although the importance of governments in providing services was recognised, economic reform programmes continued to promote technological fixes and were based on the notions of economic liberalisation and state reduction. The "promotion of democracy" was predicated on unrealistic expectations.

Due to the programmes' mixed results, there is a need for a deeper comprehension of governance, which grounds public administration in the much larger framework of societal legitimacy and political power. The governance research that DFID funds has been essential in addressing this issue. In constructing the public institutions that carry out development, it has underlined the importance of conflict and compromise between the state, elites, and people. It has shown the crucial significance of domestic political systems in shaping a nation's own institutions, which transfers of plans from other nations or the industrialised world are unable to do. In doing so, it has brought to light the challenging issues and trade-offs that donors must consider when they create programmes meant to combat poverty and advance development.

The political environment and process are crucial in determining whether politicians and policymakers support or oppose progressive reforms that might result in legitimate, competent, responsible, and responsive governments, according to research. It has contributed to the understanding of why certain nations have political stability and economic prosperity while others are mired in war and destitution. While all of this has been helpful in the design of country programmes and projects, we still need to understand the politics of development and how to influence it in order to accelerate the reduction of poverty. It has provided evidence and analytical tools to demonstrate how to work with the structures, relationships, and interests that support or undermine change. In order to meet this new governance agenda, donors must invest in their own ability.

DISCUSSION

The study has produced a lot of results. More than 600 working papers, monographs, briefing notes, and articles for peer-reviewed academic journals covering a broad range of governance themes have been published by the four research institutes during the last ten years. These have encompassed both theory and fieldwork in Asia, Africa, and Latin America - from low-income, "fragile," and post-conflict states like the DRC and Afghanistan or the "failed" state of Somalia to middle-income nations like Brazil. This synthesis provides a quick summary of the main findings. We anticipate that it will pique interest in the comprehensive scholarly results and policy suggestions in and of themselves. It seeks to inspire you to review the synthesis of results that each programme has generated as well as the original study. Additionally, it aims to support the widespread need for stronger proof of "what really works" in terms of achieving cost-effective international development [4], [5].

With the international development policy community, the research programmes and the academic researchers participating have consistently participated in both informal and formal dialogues, forging extremely fruitful iterative relationships. These conversations have been backed by the kind of data, study, and theoretical creativity that can only be accumulated over time via extensive research projects. Many of the findings have been adopted, not just

by DFID but by the international development community more broadly. The research has also provided intellectual capital, helping DFID engage effectively in international approaches to dealing with governance issues, including those relating to fragile states. The development of expertise and knowledge networks has been made possible through long-term research collaborations between northern and southern academics, which have been a crucial component of these initiatives. These connections should last well beyond the lifespan of the research programmes themselves.

The importance of politics in creating successful states was underlined by the international community as it increasingly put governance at the centre of global development during the 2000s. One recent OECD Development Assistance Committee document, for instance, reads as follows:Because it establishes control by agreement rather than force and converts power into authority, state legitimacy is important. Lack of legitimacy under precarious circumstances impairs healthy relationships between the state and society and exacerbates precarity.

This open acknowledgment of the significance of politics in historical context by the international community is much owed to the knowledge gleaned from the studies presented here. The goal of this study results synthesis is to highlight the most important and useful policy statements. Politics is a major issue, although it is not only limited to elite politics. Instead, it demonstrates how the political interactions between elites and commoners determine development outcomes.15 Working with these political dynamics is necessary to provide development. This is accomplished through tackling social fairness and excessive inequality as 'bottom-up' as well as 'top-down' political, social, and economic processes that support successful governments, successful markets, and thriving communities.

Transversal Themes

There are three overarching themes that are especially noteworthy. The ever-closer connection of the global, regional, national, and local levels of political and social structure and analysis is the first theme that emerges from many of the results. The research initiatives have also looked at the key links connecting the local and state level to much bigger regional and global trends and actions, in addition to examining the important role that local context plays in shaping development outcomes. As a result, it is noted that the international features of war, poor governance, and unstable and unresponsive nations are a crucial area where foreign donors may have the greatest influence. The second subject deals with how and to what degree informal institutions promote or obstruct state-building. In many developing nations, informal procedures are crucial to political decision-making, service delivery, and public participation [6], [7].

Gender is the third. The gender dimensions of conflict and inequality; the role of women as recipients, providers, and promoters of social assistance; the relationships between gender, participation, and citizenship; and the fact that few studies specifically addressed gender issues. Some foundational, groundbreaking, and reputable works are among the most original and impactful discoveries to come out of this corpus of DFID-funded governance research:

1. Professor Mick Moore and colleagues from The Centre for the Future State authored the first book ever on the contribution taxes make to the development of states.
2. Jonathan Di John presented research from the Crisis States Research Centre innovative political economics concepts via his thorough research

He and his colleague Antonio Giustozzi both produced very relevant work on the political dynamics and economic significance of warlords in Afghanistan, as well as the many effects

of oil on the growth of Venezuela's economy. With a wealth of original, in-depth case studies from southern contexts demonstrating how citizens mobilise to express their voice, realise their rights, and hold states accountable, the Citizenship Research Centre provided possibly the most significant body of evidence on how active citizens can shape development outcomes. CRISE researchers authored a prestigious scholarly article under the direction of Professor Frances Stewart.

The research initiatives discussed in this study do, however, not all share the same essential policy messages. This is not shocking at all. Future governance research projects must address the complex and challenging problems that are the focus of the DFID-funded research. These include, for instance, the relative significance of informal institutions or how to stop democracy from escalating conflict and bloodshed instead of serving as a benign force for development, especially in post-war nations.

Report Organisation

The main body of this synthesis is grouped around eight important policy concerns, emphasising significant results and outlining any knowledge gaps that call for more study. The emphasis is always on the policy solutions how we should all act differently as a consequence of these messages, whether by better understanding the trade-offs of challenging policy decisions or by seeing new possibilities. According to the study, political agreements are essential to all progress and are more likely to defuse tension if they do not exclude influential parties. Settlements must reflect the interests of social groupings at the local level as well. Development requires security, which must be emphasised in post-conflict nations since it is a question of existence. The evidence given here demonstrates that conflicts are more likely to occur in nations where cultural or ethnic groups perceive economic, political, and social imbalance. Civil conflicts are only one aspect of the future of insecurity; more and more individuals are also losing their lives to societal violence, especially in urban areas. The study examines the best ways for governments to be more stable and inclusive. States that solely answer to certain groups or that do not consider certain sections of society to be "citizens" produce disparities that might lead to conflict. Both the state and society gain from people actively participating in society via local organisations and movements outside the state.

More than any other group, the poor are dependent on fundamental public services. Access to healthcare and education is a key component of a family's ability to escape poverty. The word "improve security" should be used instead of "improve security" since politics matter. Research supported by DFID has played a significant role in highlighting the significance of taxes in creating efficient nations. Taxes that are increased in a manner that fosters political responsibility and economic progress help the state become more politically legitimate and provide an eventual "exit strategy from aid." States may prioritise their own (rather than donor) policy interests while still providing security and public services thanks to tax resources. A crucial negotiation process between the state and citizen-taxpayers who believe they may have a legitimate stake in improved governance may be facilitated by tax changes, which can inspire societal interest groups to become politically active [8].

People may break out of cycles of poverty thanks to economic progress, and nations can stop depending on charity. However, the results shown here call into doubt several of the growth strategies suggested by contributors. China and Vietnam, two of the developing world's most successful cases of fast economic expansion, have most definitely not adhered to the 'investment climate' recommendation. Donors may need to appreciate the political dynamics of development, particularly the fact that certain informal business-government connections

in developing nations may be successful in fostering and maintaining rapid growth. The paper ends with a suggestion for how the international community might commission and utilise governance research more effectively, explains the need for further governance research, and outlines how DFID intends to react.

CONCLUSION

Promoting participatory decision-making procedures that include marginalised people and give them a voice is crucial for improving poverty politics. Governments may be held responsible for their efforts to reduce poverty by strengthening social accountability structures, encouraging openness, and guaranteeing the meaningful engagement of civil society organisations. The development of poverty politics on a global scale may also be significantly influenced by international collaboration, information sharing, and advocacy. In conclusion, policies, discourses, and techniques used to address challenges connected to poverty are all included in the field of poverty politics. It concerns not just legislative decisions but also how poverty is framed and told in the media. The ability to work with many stakeholders, institutional strength, and political will are necessary for overcoming obstacles and improving poverty politics. Societies may move towards more equitable and sustainable development by prioritising poverty reduction, promoting inclusion, and tackling the causes of poverty.

REFERENCES

[1]   V. Abufhele, 'La política de la pobreza y el gobierno de los asentamientos informales en Chile', *Eure*, 2019, doi: 10.4067/S0250-71612019000200049.

[2]   M. Beckley, 'Economic development and military effectiveness', *J. Strateg. Stud.*, 2010, doi: 10.1080/01402391003603581.

[3]   J. K. Burns, 'Poverty, inequality and a political economy of mental health', *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*. 2015. doi: 10.1017/S2045796015000086.

[4]   A. Källstig and C. Death, 'Laughter, resistance and ambivalence in Trevor Noah's stand-up comedy: returning mimicry as mockery', *Crit. African Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/21681392.2020.1743191.

[5]   J. T. Muderedzi, A. H. Eide, S. H. Braathen, and B. Stray-Pedersen, 'Exploring structural violence in the context of disability and poverty in Zimbabwe', *African J. Disabil.*, 2017, doi: 10.4102/ajod.v6i0.274.

[6]   D. Brady, A. Blome, and H. Kleider, 'How Politics and Institutions Shape Poverty and Inequality', *Oxford Handb. Soc. Sci. Poverty*, 2016.

[7]   A. F. Akwara, J. E. Udaw, N. F. Akwara, and J. Onimawo, 'The impacts of culture and religion, Ethnicity, politics and poverty on ethnic violence in Plateau State of Nigeria', *Mediterr. J. Soc. Sci.*, 2013, doi: 10.5901/mjss.2013.v4n14p657.

[8]   C. McFarlane, 'Repopulating density: COVID-19 and the politics of urban value', *Urban Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.1177/00420980211014810.

CHAPTER 16

A BRIEF DISCUSSION ON ELITES AND DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Shavya Singh, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: shavyasingh@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Significant intellectual and policy arguments have been held on the topic of elites and development. The importance of elites in development processes is explored in this abstract, which also looks at how they affect social, political, and economic consequences. It also takes into account the dynamics, difficulties, and possible directions for using elite participation to advance inclusive and sustainable development. Elites may affect growth in both good and bad ways because of their concentration of money, power, and influence. Elites do, however, have access to networks, resources, and expertise that may support economic development and investment. They may promote innovation, job creation, and productivity increases by engaging in entrepreneurial activities, advancing technology, and using their management skills. The concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a small number of people may result in governance issues, exclusion, and unfairness. Elites may put their own interests first, act in a rent-seeking manner, and maintain structures that favour a small number of people while marginalizing the others. This may limit social mobility, deepen poverty, and obstruct fair growth.

KEYWORDS:

Authority, Development, Elite, Policy, Systems.

INTRODUCTION

Navigating these intricate interactions is necessary to include elites in development processes. Promoting inclusive development models, ensuring equitable resource allocation, and improving transparency and accountability systems are all ways to utilise elite involvement. Policy changes, rewards for ethical company conduct, and the promotion of a corporate social responsibility culture may all help to empower and motivate elites to support larger societal objectives. Addressing power imbalances, lowering corruption, and creating inclusive governance frameworks are some of the difficulties faced by elite participation in development. In order to overcome entrenched interests and make sure that marginalised groups get the rewards of development, inclusive policy-making procedures, strong institutions, and active civil society engagement are necessary. Creating an environment that is conducive to sustainable development requires strengthening the rule of law, advancing anti-corruption initiatives, and enhancing access to justice [1].

Elites are defined as "a distinct social group within a society that enjoys privileged status and exercises decisive control over the organisation of society" in the introduction by DiCaprio. A "power elite" is a group of people who have the capacity to influence all aspects of society and government, according to C Wright Mills' definition of an elite (1956). DiCaprio impressively traces the lengthy intellectual history of this power lite thesis from its Italian origins in the 19th century to the present while glaringly avoiding tackling the significant arguments against the idea that a power elite has ever existed. That is, according to a different school of elite theory, there are groups that may control certain contentious sectors rather

than a single group exercising decisive power over how society is organised. The clearest description of this school of "diffuse elite theory" may be found in Robert Dahl's Who Governs? (1961), a classic work that is not even referenced once in this whole collection. Dahl's meticulous analysis of a small American city revealed the spaghetti bowl that is American local politics: rather than a small cabal dictating how society is organised, nested elite groups come to dominate certain niche areas of policymaking with little overlap. According to Dahl's definition of elites, elites who decide on sanitation policy are different from those who decide on education policy, and those kinds of elites are different from those who decide how justice is administered, for instance [2]. Those who attend the power-elite school, however, would anticipate that choices on sanitation and education policy would be made by the same select set of individuals.

The need for elite-focused research to move beyond arguments over whether the "power elite" is the best model or whether Dahl's disaggregated understanding of elites is more useful. Instead, these scholars investigate the circumstances that lead to the emergence and maintenance of a cohesive elite decision-making body. To achieve this, it is also necessary to consider the polar opposite question: under what circumstances should we anticipate an incoherent and fragmented battle amongst elites? This collection demonstrates how elite studies in the twenty-first century are moving beyond Mills and Dahl in a hopeful and rewarding new path.

Elite Persistence

Since the time of Machiavelli, political scientists have struggled with the following conundrum: When do persons in positions of authority misuse their positions for their own benefit, and when do they choose to erect structures of government that prioritise society above individual gain? How elite politics has long-term effects on institutions, lay the stage for examining this conundrum. Robinson explains how elites may sometimes design institutions that are especially suitable for a specific setting. In certain circumstances, this implies that elites will create dynastic institutions through which their offspring will create later generations of elites. Robinson has shown that in other situations, elites will create institutions that will spawn new elite classes and alter existing ones. Therefore, the motivations, coherence, and general dynamics of the elite must be taken into account if one wishes to understand institutions and institutional durability. Such a statement from a prominent proponent of the "new institutionalist" speaks volumes about the value of elite studies [3].

Amsden similarly drives home the point that elites need more academic investigation. Amsden gives the elites a good level of agency, as she does in most of her prior work, and examines how various elites react to analogous but unexpected problems. She makes the case that national elites failed in Argentina but succeeded in Korea by contrasting the indigenization of German firms in Argentina with Japanese enterprises in Korea. For a number of historical reasons, Korean elites had an understanding of their inherited sectors and a skill set that Argentinian elites lacked. As a consequence, the Korean industrial elite had a more unified focus on promoting industrialization. The good growth outcomes that are a feature of the traditional developmental state were produced by this elite-level cohesiveness.

Differentiating Elite Groups

For instance, divide elites into three categories: entrepreneurial elites, who travel for business; knowledge-based elites, who travel for academia; and political elites, who travel for political reasons, in order to examine how international circulation affects national-level

elites. They contend that each of these elite groups travels abroad for various reasons and that when they return to their home nations, they bring new networks and skill sets with them. However, Solimano and Avanzini don't go into detail about how or when these elite groups will compete or work together. The contrast between political elites (cadres), economic elites (entrepreneurs), and non-elites in China made by Gustafsson and Ding is comparable in this regard. Thus, even though the authors patiently demonstrate that these groups have varying degrees of wealth, they do not address whether we should anticipate that elites from the various groups would have distinct preferences or if contestation or collaboration is probable. Similar to this, Wolf's discussion of the rise of the "new female elite" (Chapter 6) conveys the positive message that female elites are appearing more frequently in the developing world, but she avoids addressing the issues of whether female elites offer fresh perspectives or challenge the structures of the male-dominated elite, nor does she address the implications of these changes for economic development. Female elites, particularly in the developing world, might use household assistance to suit both their personal and professional demands. However, female elites are more likely to wed male elites than vice versa. When taken as a whole, Wolf's argument that women entering the elites may lead to a less class-equal elite raises the possibility of a hidden cost to gender-based inclusion.

DISCUSSION

Why do comparable political organisation and management structures result in stunningly disparate levels of development? The capacity of nations to put an end to violence and establish stable governments is influenced by the distribution of power among elites and social groupings, which is something that both policymakers and scholars are interested in. We need to understand why one country may have effective tax collection while ostensibly identical tax collection systems elsewhere may not work, as well as why one electoral process may result in coalitions for change in one country but political instability and even conflict in another. The term "political settlement" refers to a variety of informal and formal political agreements that, when successful, may bring about a lasting peace, advance reform, development, and the eradication of poverty. Recognise that political negotiations between elites and between the state and organised groups in society are the means through which effective, accountable public authority develops [4].

A political settlement thus establishes the relationship between formal and informal institutions as well as the distribution of power in society. Political settlements are defined as "the forging of a common understanding, usually between elites, that their best interests or beliefs are served by a particular way of organizing political power". The combination must also have a minimal level of economic and political performance to be sustainable, and the underlying politics can allow some "pockets" of effective governance to exist even in contexts of overall failure. Powerful groups will work to change institutional structures if they do not receive an acceptable distribution of benefits.

The differences in performance across nations with ostensibly comparable endowments or disadvantages are explained by the historically distinct dynamics of political settlements. Every state's development has included political compromises. Every state is built on a political settlement that is the result of conflict and negotiation between elites, as well as between social groupings and those in positions of power within the state and society at large. In Uganda and Rwanda, civil wars were won by unified political groups, which thereafter had complete control over the state's reconstruction and the norms that would govern it. Contrarily, the Tanganikya African National Union in Tanzania won a political settlement via elections, securing agreement from a significant part of elites and at least tacit support from their masses over the rules governing state-making.

Very similar sets of formal institutions, such as those governing macroeconomic management, trade liberalisation, or industrial policy, can produce wildly different results, which have significant ramifications for development policy. This is due to the nature of political settlements. Long-lasting effects of historical patterns on governance are all too often misunderstood or disregarded by external development organisations.

Whether or whether the elites involved agree to pursue their own interests via a formal institutional apparatus (the state), the necessity to consolidate elites inside the state's formal institutions influences the long-term success of such deals. The process of state consolidation is hampered if they just agree to cooperate but continue to exercise their own informal systems of power. Traditional institutions and those of liberal democracy have engaged in a number of political battles in South Africa during the last ten years. Similar to this, Kampala, the capital of Uganda, is governed by politicians forming informal "bargains" that strengthen their ties to certain social groups but regularly compromise official state laws, norms, and regulations, having negative impacts on the city.

Negotiating or renegotiating political agreements to lessen exclusion is especially crucial in war and post-conflict circumstances since exclusionary politics are linked to high levels of violence and poor development results. When the state and elite interests hold the reins of power, this may include payment in exchange for their consent to renounce claims to power. In fact, comparative case studies indicate that it is crucial who is involved in the political settlement. The onset of civil wars in several Sub-Saharan African nations, like Uganda and Cote d'Ivoire, where important groups were permanently barred from power, may be greatly explained by patterns of inclusion or exclusion within the political institutions that rule the state. On the other hand, inclusive agreements may account for the lack of violence in nations like Tanzania and Ghana [5], [6].

The success of negotiations to terminate civil conflicts will have a significant impact on how long political agreements last. The inclusivity of the negotiation process and its results, such as new political, economic, and constitutional arrangements, have a significant impact on the post-war system's long-term legitimacy and stability. However, in war-torn, sharply divided countries, it is very challenging to achieve enough inclusivity and create durable alliances among elites. In these circumstances, several non-state organisations have their own institutions and legitimacy claims. In other nations, like Zambia, inclusive elite deals have been reached via political parties. Elections, however, may not be a useful tool to secure long-lasting elite agreements in the absence of parties with defined platforms or legal or informal standards for inclusion. In nations like Ghana, the presidents often include members of the main regions and ethnic groups in their administrations as a result of an unofficial tradition. In Nigeria, where the 'Federal Character Principle' guides nominations to guarantee that significant groups participate in power, more explicit procedures for inclusive administration are in place.

Understand how the 'political settlement' affects efficient, dependable governmental authority. Political settlements sustaining the state should be a first-order priority in fragile nations, especially those that have recently experienced a war, even if doing so would delay growth. Long-term development results can only be achieved if state authority has been sufficiently entrenched. This has the following implications for policymakers: Without understanding the political settlement that a state is based on, development aid projects may have all kinds of unexpected repercussions. Foreign aid itself may have an influence on the political settlement, in addition to the political settlement setting limitations on what can and cannot be done with it.

Elite Rewards

Discuss how the global environment could provide political leaders unfavourable incentives to maintain the fragility of nations. Elite motivation to achieve developmental objectives is essential. Too often, the list of variables influencing elite incentives has been characterised only in domestic terms, where overseas donors frequently have little clout and domestic elites are simply characterised as "lacking political will," "intransigent," or "venal." However, studies have demonstrated that some aspects of the global environment may provide political elites perverse incentives to maintain the fragility of states and to undermine state capability. Because of the perverse incentives created by globalisation, politicians may choose to purposely rule poorly. The favourable incentives for the state-builders of the past, like those of South Korea or Taiwan in the 1960s and 1970s, may be lessened since modern elites live in a globalised world.

Behavioural incentives produced by wealthy nations in a globalised world serve as crucial signals to ambitious individuals in nations like Nigeria, Colombia, Haiti, Zambia, or Pakistan as well as what the developed world recommends, even when that is supported by assistance money. First, wealthier nations' willingness to pay such high prices for in-demand goods like oil, gas, diamonds, and coltan sends a strong message that obtaining a piece of the enormous surpluses generated by their extraction and exportation is a smart way for developing nations to advance. Second, despite their governments outlawing them, some individuals in the industrialised world are ready to pay high prices for recreational drugs, which fuels the growth of a sizable global business. This sector of the economy relies on armed conflict, tainted governments, and blocking access to legitimate government representatives in places where there are abundant natural resources. Third, despite attempts to stop it, international firms continue to offer bribes in exchange for contracts. Fourth, a number of wars have included foreign assistance for armed organisations.

'Political entrepreneurs' may engage in organised violence and theft thanks to other global circumstances. Technology has advanced significantly, allowing for the creation of affordable, very deadly weapons that are kid-friendly. This gives individuals significant incentives to arm themselves if they want to make a little money from oil, diamonds, coca, or coltan. Because of this, they are able to seek power by violent methods rather than through peaceful political competition, often using Western and other highly skilled mercenaries. Furthermore, sophisticated global financial systems have made it possible for people who plunder their own nations to invest the money overseas securely so that their family can be financially comfortable for centuries even if things go bad at home [7], [8].

Further international action is possible to address these perverse incentives, and foreign donors may have far greater influence over factors affecting elite incentives at the global level than at the local level. Actions against international tax evasion, money laundering, the recovery of stolen assets, corruption, and funding of terrorism are some that have already made significant progress. Several active projects are intended to lessen the detrimental effects of natural resource profits. They include the Extractive Industries openness Initiative (EITI), which promotes openness about the payments made by oil firms to producer governments, the Kimberley process to stop the trade in conflict diamonds, and several bilateral and regional efforts to stop illegal forestry. All of them have room to be improved. The worldwide control of drugs is one of the most important gaps.

The State and Society

Relatives between the state and society play an important part. Political settlements must, in the long run, achieve more social legitimacy since they cannot function apart from their

communities. Elites in politics and society need to be able to organise their followers. If a top-down political settlement between elites at the national level excludes some groups or is not reflected at the local level, it may not be enough to support state-building because this may encourage rival elites to mobilise their supporters against the settlement.

When a sizable portion of the population residing inside a state's borders is cut off from state institutions or when state institutions are solely answerable to an elite minority, states are extremely "fragile." This was the situation in South Africa during the apartheid period, and it is also the case in several modern-day Latin American republics where indigenous groups are still not included in political processes. In addition to representing elites as fairly as possible, long-lasting political agreements should demand that the relationships between the state and society, or "the social contract," be solid and genuine. Political settlements' social legitimacy is a key factor in determining how long they last. Tanzania serves as a prime example of how the long-lasting effects of post-colonial nation-building still have an impact on current political processes.

Informal Organizations

Recognise the significance of informal institutions in settling political disputes. The function of informal institutions and whether (and how) donors should interact with them is a crucial subject that arises when addressing political settlements and state-building and which is addressed that follow in this synthesis. According to research, individualised connections and informal institutions are common, effective, and in certain cases may help impoverished nations achieve positive results. Thus, clan leaders were in charge of persuading the major clans to disarm and negotiating the inclusion of minor clans, as in Somaliland and to a lesser degree Puntland. Contrarily, new warlords in southern Somalia have been systematically undermining clan systems, compromising the legitimacy and importance of traditional authority.

These political structures, which are sometimes derided as "relics of "old" institutions that haven't entirely vanished," may really be quite adaptable. The degree to which these various informal institutions exercise effective and respectable public authority depends on both their historical background and the environment in which they currently function. "Some of these unorthodox organisational arrangements are of recent origin, and constitute (smart) adaptations to prevailing local circumstances,". Donors have used informal institutions in nations like Afghanistan and Sierra Leone to support and enable elite deals at the national and local levels. These institutions are crucial for assuring the durability of political settlements at the subnational level.

Recognize the pervasiveness, strength, and potential for delivering progressive results in developing nations through informal institutions and individualised connections. However, other studies are less certain about the appropriateness of using informal institutional structures, seeing many of them as incompatible with state-building, particularly in post-conflict circumstances. An uncritical approach to using informal institutional arrangements in fragile and conflict-affected countries to achieve "progressive development outcomes" runs the risk of promoting governance systems that are ad hoc in nature and could threaten the legitimacy and authority of a state.

Formal institutional systems sometimes have the power to interact favourably with established power hierarchies. An effective administrative apparatus was able to contain customary authority structures within a larger polity, political structures and processes that channelled the ambitions and grievances of traditional leaders, and a system of local

government that drew on the presence and experience of chieftains to bring development to difficult-to-reap areas, according to a case study in Greater Durban.

CONCLUSION

International collaboration and collaborations may also be very important in influencing elite behaviour and advancing progress. Initiatives for ethical investment, technology transfer, and knowledge exchange fall under this category. Through norm-setting, monitoring, and accountability systems, multilateral institutions, civil society organisations, and international advocacy networks may also influence the behaviour of the elite. In conclusion, elites play a complicated role in development that has both advantages and disadvantages. Utilising elites' knowledge and resources while guaranteeing inclusive and fair results must be carefully balanced in order to engage elites in development. Societies may use the power of elites to contribute to inclusive and sustainable development through supporting inclusive growth models, transparency and accountability, and power imbalances.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Brouwers, P. Sotiriadou, and V. De Bosscher, 'An examination of the stakeholders and elite athlete development pathways in tennis', *Eur. Sport Manag. Q.*, 2015, doi: 10.1080/16184742.2015.1067239.

[2] N. Boberg-Fazlic, P. S. Jensen, M. Lampe, P. R. Sharp, and C. Skovsgaard, '"Getting to Denmark": The Role of Elites for Development', *SSRN Electron. J.*, 2020, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3578366.

[3] K. (Popi) Sotiriadou and D. Shilbury, 'Australian Elite Athlete Development: An Organisational Perspective', *Sport Manag. Rev.*, 2009, doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2009.01.002.

[4] B. Selwyn, 'Elite development theory: a labour-centred critique', *Third World Q.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/01436597.2015.1120156.

[5] W. Wu, P. W. C. LAU, and J. ZHENG, 'A Historical Review of Elite Sport Development in Hong Kong', *Int. J. Hist. Sport*, 2021, doi: 10.1080/09523367.2020.1826442.

[6] L. R. Galatti, J. Côté, R. S. Reverdito, V. Allan, A. M. Seoane, and R. R. Paes, 'Fostering elite athlete development and recreational sport participation: A successful club environment', *Motricidade*, 2016, doi: 10.6063/motricidade.6099.

[7] M. Green and B. Oakley, 'Elite sport development systems and playing to win: Uniformity and diversity in international approaches', *Leis. Stud.*, 2001, doi: 10.1080/02614360110103598.

[8] T. C. Tan, J. Zheng, and G. Dickson, 'Policy transfer in elite sport development: the case of elite swimming in China', *Eur. Sport Manag. Q.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/16184742.2019.1572768.

CHAPTER 17

CONCEPT OF FRAGILE STATES

Dr. Anil Bundela, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: anilbundela@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Fragile nations provide serious obstacles to international development, peace, and security since they are characterised by poor governance, political unpredictability, economic vulnerabilty, and social unrest. This abstract examines the idea of fragile situations, as well as its sources and effects. It also emphasises the need of understanding and tackling the complex problems linked to fragility in order to maintain stability, advance sustainable development, and avoid conflicts. Fragile states are those that lack strong government institutions, experience internal strife, and have a limited ability to provide basic public services to their population. These states often struggle with linked issues including poverty, inequality, corruption, poor institutions, and a lack of social cohesiveness. These elements foster a vicious cycle of instability that stunts economic development, impedes social advancement, and exposes communities to extremism, violence, and humanitarian catastrophes. A comprehensive strategy that takes into account political, economic, and social factors is needed to address fragility. Building resilient nations requires strengthening governance frameworks, encouraging inclusive and accountable institutions, boosting access to justice, and improving public service delivery. For addressing the underlying socioeconomic imbalances that lead to instability, sustainable economic growth, job creation, and poverty reduction methods are essential.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Economic, Fragile, Political, State.

INTRODUCTION

Designing successful solutions requires an understanding of the underlying factors that contribute to state fragility. These factors may include inherited traits from the past, racial or religious conflicts, economic inequalities, poor management of natural resources, and outside influences. Additionally, variables like population expansion, globalization, and climate change exacerbate already existing vulnerabilities and increase the likelihood of armed conflict, further complicating the dynamics of fragility. State fragility has repercussions that go beyond a country's boundaries. Threats to regional and global stability may arise from fragile nations acting as havens for transnational organized crime, terrorism, and illegal commerce. Refugee and migrant movements that arise also put extra strain on neighboring nations and lead to humanitarian crises.

In the area of international development, fragile nations, which are characterised by poor governance, political unpredictability, and social vulnerabilities, continue to be a major source of worry. This review article offers a thorough explanation of the idea of fragile states, investigates the major factors that contribute to fragility, and looks at different methods and tactics for fostering resilience in these situations. This study seeks to improve our understanding of fragile states and guide effective policy and practise for fostering stability and sustainable development by synthesising the body of current literature and research. The

introduction of the study defines fragile states and emphasises their multifaceted character. Political instability, shaky institutions, societal divides, economic vulnerability, and environmental deterioration are only a few of the interconnected problems that are included in the concept of fragility. These elements often interact and reinforce one another, weaving a complicated web of dangers and limitations that restrict development and raise the potential of conflict and instability [1].

Identifying the causes of fragility is essential for creating focused therapies. The review highlights a number of important causes, such as inherited traits from the past, governance shortcomings, social isolation, economic constraints, environmental stresses, and outside influences. Through processes including state-society interactions, institutional strength, resource management, and social cohesiveness, these characteristics contribute to fragility. Investigating these factors offers insights into the underlying causes of fragility and helps in locating therapeutic entry sites. The report also looks at the many methods and tactics used to combat fragility and foster resilience. These include methods focused on development, peacebuilding, state-building, and conflict prevention. While peacebuilding initiatives concentrate on post-conflict rebuilding, reconciliation, and social cohesion, conflict prevention techniques try to identify and solve the conflicts' underlying causes before they worsen. While development-oriented initiatives aim to address socioeconomic inequality and promote sustainable development as a way of decreasing fragility, state-building approaches place an emphasis on developing governance structures and capability.

The review also emphasises how crucial context-specific and locally motivated initiatives are in unstable nations. Designing efficient treatments requires an understanding of the variety and individuality of each fragile condition. Making ensuring that initiatives are relevant, owned, and sustainable by the appropriate political, social, economic, and environmental settings is a good first step. In order to overcome fragility, the study emphasises the necessity for a thorough and coordinated strategy. This entails encouraging transparent and inclusive government, making investments in the advancement of human capital, supporting economic opportunity and social cohesion, and addressing environmental sustainability. To further strengthen fragile nations and achieve lasting results, international collaboration and partnerships among governments, civil society organisations, and multilateral institutions are essential. It advances awareness of fragility and provides information for evidence-based policy and practise by synthesising current research. In the end, we may endeavour to promote stability, peace, and sustainable development in fragile nations by addressing the issues of fragility [2].

DISCUSSION

Fragile and failing nations are at the top of the list for international development, and they are also a major issue for global security and diplomacy. However, despite the fact that different analysts of these ideas point to comparable "symptoms" and phases of fragility and failure, there is no unified description of what separates fragile states from those that are not. The majority of emerging nations are fragile in some aspects, and even those that are struggling in certain areas may be running well in others. stages may also enter and exit stages of instability. Therefore, since fragile states are only a subgroup of very vulnerable nations, it follows that our assistance and development strategies shouldn't necessarily change for them. State fragility cannot be defined or approached in a generalised way; context is crucial. Nevertheless, frameworks that provide the organisation and structuring of knowledge on fragility are necessary for researchers and policymakers alike. The study highlighted the significance of context and history, but it also highlighted characteristics of various forms of

state fragility. This makes it clear whether or not we should approach fragile nations differently.

A failing state is one that is incapable of carrying out even a few fundamental tasks. The use of the phrase "failed state" has a long history of creating conceptual uncertainty. It is crucial that the term "state failures" only be used to refer to failures to carry out the fundamental duties of states in order to prevent it from degenerating into a mode of routinely criticising governments for failing to do one or all of the many things we would like them to do, such as achieve the Millennium Development Goals, promote economic growth, advance gender equity, ratify and observe any one of dozens of international agreements and codes of conduct. A failed state is one that is unable or unwilling to maintain control over its people and territory, provide essential public services, uphold law and order, and stop those in positions of power from preying on those in less powerful ones.

Whether we realise it or not, when we discuss the "failure of the state" to maintain control over its borders or to offer "public goods," we are relying on varying conceptions of what a state is and what it should do. The traditional "Hobbesian" concept places a strong focus on the use of force as the basis of a state. In his explanation of the concept of statehood, Max Weber clarified that "a state [is] a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory." The concept of a "social contract," which concentrates on the connection between the state and the citizen, is part of a wider definition of the state. These theories of the state were founded on the study of European state formation, but they continue to have an impact on intervention and assistance policies today, as well as debates about which state model is best for achieving particular objectives such as the transformational tasks of sustainable economic development and growth or the transition from war to a stable peace.

The research underscores how crucial it is to differentiate between various types of state instability. There are fragile states or crisis states that are under extreme political stress. These nations' institutions are subject to fierce competition and may be unable to control shocks and conflict. Then there are failed nations, which are no longer capable of carrying out fundamental security and development tasks, lack effective control over their borders and territory, and are unable to maintain the circumstances necessary for their own survival. The division of states into various levels of effectiveness emphasises that state creation is an open-ended, constantly contested historical process, especially in the case of new/post-war nations and low levels of development. State efficacy operates along a continuum, and rather than being pigeonholed as either successful or unsuccessful, conflict and violence are an inherent part of state creation and evolution [3], [4].

Fragility Measuring

Recognise the limits of the available governance indicators. Many governance indices that are obtained from subjective polls may be fundamentally faulty. They may only provide oblique indicators of ability, overlook the significance of legitimacy, and fail to take into account how differently capable nations and state functions are from one another. To determine if a condition is fragile, failing, or failed, indicators are required (if not adequate). For instance, the characteristics of state failure that are often assessed by the majority of state failure indicators include:

Violence

Territorial control and the delivery of government services. Continuing violence, especially when it's aimed towards an established government or system, seems to indicate a failed

state. But there is no guarantee that political or criminal violence will result in failure, and the lack of violence does not imply that the state in question has not collapsed. Territorial control, or the state's incapacity to maintain control over its boundaries or the loss of power over some portions of its territory, is a second sign of failed states. Last but not least, a widely utilised indication is the state's inability to provide supportive state services that support the social contract. These might include: infrastructure provision and upkeep; security; education; health; economic opportunity; environmental monitoring; creation and enforcement of institutional frameworks; and security.

The goal of public policy towards fragile nations is to assist them in overcoming their vulnerability. However, depending on the cause of fragility and the makeup of the state, what this really implies for public action will vary greatly. In cases when a state is failing in more than one area, there is also a broad debate about which form of fragility should be prioritised. The failure of state authority and service delivery have been strongly linked, and this suggests that these two aspects should be prioritised:

Enhance the methods for calculating state fragility and capacity. The validity of using cross-country data as a tool to assess state capacity inadequacies has been questioned by some DFID-funded studies on state fragility. For a variety of reasons, current paradigms for evaluating state strength and fragility may be fundamentally wrong. Current measurements are aggregate based on subjective surveys, a process that loses accuracy even more when linking two ill-defined or ill-defined variables. Therefore, current metrics overlook the degree to which capacity varies across nations and among state functions and only give indirect estimates of capacity, often producing findings that may be full of abnormalities. Higher degrees of complexity must be included into measurement instruments, and they must be utilised in conjunction with sound qualitative and historical analysis.

Establishing States and Promoting Peace

Service entitlement may not take into account group disparities. Such failures may be decreased with help and policy discussion, particularly when aid makes up a substantial fraction of GDP. Group disparities must be expressly taken into account, assessed, and addressed because when many types of inequality exist at the same time, conflict often arises. To be successful, policy must target the primary cause(s) of the issue, whether it be a lack of money, an inefficient use of resources, or a lack of population-wide possibilities for productive work [5], [6]. Politics that help nations transition to inclusive democracies with widely recognised civil and political rights may be necessary for legitimacy. However, there could be compromises in this regard. Under external pressure, a premature transition to democracy may result in discriminatory policies and the repression of human rights.

Furthermore, in situations when peace is being sought, upholding human rights, especially calling for criminal prosecution of serious offenders, may make it more difficult to come to an agreement. A human rights approach may help hold the government accountable when it is the cause of these failures, which may even be an intentional result of government policy, particularly in cases where the country has ratified international human rights accords. Excessive military or police autonomy, entrenched political interests opposing inclusive policies, and high levels of corruption are further significant barriers to addressing the core causes of fragility. Recognise that one of the biggest threats to the state's resilience comes from challenges posed by competing institutions.

A state that is in a fragile condition is one that is especially prone to crises economic, social, political, or environmental, where crises may quickly degenerate into violence. The ability of state organisations to maintain basic security to be able to put down armed challenges to state

authority and protect the state's population from organised violence against their persons and property, including violence coming from the state itself, the ability of state organisations to raise revenues to finance the fundamental operations of their businesses, and the ability of state organisations to maintain basic stability are the most significant indicators of state resilience.

States that are resilient are not necessarily Developmental

Recognise that state growth is not a guarantee of resilience. The danger posed by non-state institutions to state-building is still up for debate. The existence of several alternative sources of authority, such as "traditional" and other informal institutions, may weaken the state and fuel conflict in fragile nations when the official institutions have not yet attained predominance. These organisations "provide chances for political entrepreneurs of all stripes to thwart state consolidation or challenge state authority in ways justified by competing sets of rules and values." Warlords, criminal gangs, regional power brokers, traditional authority, and religious groups all have their own institutions and stake their claims to legitimacy there, as research on Afghanistan has demonstrated. A robust state, however, may not support development if it can only provide basic safety, basic taxation, and the primacy of its institutions. Some academics come to the conclusion that policies should be implemented in a certain order to account for the fact that there might often be a trade-off between resilience and quick growth, particularly in fragile regimes. Long-term state-building and economic development may be significantly impacted by short-term actions to maintain peace, both positively and negatively.

Recognise and keep an eye on donor initiatives' unforeseen implications. The typical "Washington Consensus" changes that typified development aid in the 1980s and 1990s may have been economically "correct," but they often made states more fragile from a political standpoint. Economic "structural adjustment" was promoted without consideration for how it can upend political agreements by eroding elite incentives to follow the law and public loyalty to the government. It didn't even touch on the political ramifications for how resources are allocated. In order to secure basic food security and livelihoods in ways that are politically viable, inclusive, and constructive, market liberalisation in fragile nations requires careful preparation. Policy talks need to place a lot more emphasis on comprehending the economic causes of state fragility and failure as well as their political dynamics [7].

Residents of Fragile Nations

Recognise governmental failings from the viewpoint of the populace. It is risky to believe that nations have a monopoly on violence and that they carry out their security responsibilities in all people' best interests. Many people believe that government security forces exist to protect the interests of particular population groups, the state itself, local or foreign private capital, or a variety of other interests, rather than to serve the interests of the entire population. This is known as "violently defending the interests of one sector while using violence against another." "This fosters an atmosphere of uncertainty that allows state elites to propose despotic power as a remedy while they maintain their privileged access to wealth and resources," the author writes.66 In some situations, when official state security is weak or insufficient in specific geographic pockets, security is effectively entrusted to non-state groups, with varied degrees of involvement or tolerance. These often use a combination of protection and violence to maintain political, social, and economic dominance. When there is widespread war or more common types of criminal violence, insecurity not only makes nations more fragile but also makes citizenship more fragile. This affects how individuals see their political community and, as a result, how eager they are to participate in public life.

State elites who employ violence to maintain an unfair distribution of wealth may make it last. These elites could support covert alliances between private violent organisations, allow or even support regular abuses by state security forces, refuse to address the root causes of societal violence, and even profit from the illicit wealth accumulation that results from it.This fosters an atmosphere of unease that allows state elites to propose autocratic authority as a remedy while maintaining their exclusive access to money and resources.

Citizens in fragile nations are less likely to have access to basic services, accountable institutions, and other resources since there are few possibilities for organising, civil society is weakened, and participation in formal political systems is often banned. Support for nonviolent civil society groups in these situations is crucial for developing successful state-society relations [8], [9].

CONCLUSION

Supporting fragile nations is mostly dependent on international collaboration, which includes alliances between governments, civil society organisations, and multilateral organisations. Such collaboration must include crucial elements like effective aid, conflict prevention, peacebuilding efforts, and long-term development support. For long-term peace and development, it is also essential to invest in conflict-sensitive strategies, advance human rights, gender equality, and environmental sustainability. In conclusion, it is critical for advancing world peace, security, and sustainable development to recognise and confront the problems that fragile nations present. The international community may strive to create more resilient communities, lessen poverty, and promote inclusive governance by taking a comprehensive and multifaceted strategy, eventually leading to a more stable and prosperous world.

REFERENCES

[1]   S. Grimm, N. Lemay-Hébert, and O. Nay, '"Fragile States": introducing a political concept', *Third World Quarterly*. 2014. doi: 10.1080/01436597.2013.878127.

[2]   S. Barakat and A. Larson, 'Fragile States: A Donor-serving Concept? Issues with Interpretations of Fragile Statehood in Afghanistan', *J. Interv. Statebuilding*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/17502977.2013.770263.

[3]   O. Nay, 'International Organisations and the Production of Hegemonic Knowledge: how the World Bank and the oecd helped invent the Fragile State Concept', *Third World Q.*, 2014, doi: 10.1080/01436597.2014.878128.

[4]   S. Ingram, 'State-building: Key Concepts and Operational Implications In Two Fragile States', *Fragile Conflict-Affected States Gr. Bur. Cris. Prev. Recover.*, 2010.

[5]   S. Grimm, N. Lemay-Hébert, and O. Nay, '"Fragile States": Introducing a political concept', in *The Political Invention of Fragile States: The Power of Ideas*, 2016.

[6]   P. Shine, 'Concepts and dilemmas of State building in fragile situations', *OECD J. Dev.*, 2009, doi: 10.1787/journal_dev-v9-art27-en.

[7]   O. Nay, 'Fragile and failed states: Critical perspectives on conceptual hybrids', *Int. Polit. Sci. Rev.*, 2013, doi: 10.1177/0192512113480054.

[8]   B. Jones, R. Chandran, E. Cousens, J. Slotin, and J. Sherman, 'Concepts and dilemmas of state building in fragile situations: From fragility to resilience', *J. Dev.*, 2008, doi: 10.1787/journal_dev-v9-art27-en.

[9]   Z. Da Song, L. Elcoro, and B. Andrei Bernevig, 'Twisted bulk-boundary correspondence of fragile topology', *Science (80-.).*, 2020, doi: 10.1126/ science.aaz7650.

CHAPTER 18

A STUDY ON SECURITY AND VIOLATIONS

Dr. Anil Bundela, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: anilbundela@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Violations and security are closely related issues with important ramifications for people, society, and the global community. This abstract analyses the intricate relationship between security and violations, looking at the many aspects of security and the different kinds of violations that may happen. In order to advance peace, justice, and human rights, it emphasises the complexity of security as well as the effects of violations and the significance of resolving and avoiding them. National security, personal security, and social security are only a few of the many facets that make up security. Protecting a country's territorial integrity, sovereignty, and defence against foreign threats is part of maintaining national security. Human security prioritises the safety and well-being of people, including their freedom from fear, from hunger, and from the inability to live indecently. Societal security addresses issues like social cohesiveness, economic security, and environmental sustainability by focusing on the stability and adaptability of communities. Contrarily, violations describe deeds or conduct that endangers the safety and rights of people or communities. These transgressions may take many different forms, including violence, abuses of human rights, oppression, discrimination, and structural injustices. They may take place on a variety of scales, from interpersonal offences committed inside relationships to state-sponsored offences that uphold societal injustices and repression.

KEYWORDS:

Community, Security, Social, Society, Violations.

INTRODUCTION

Security transgressions have far-reaching repercussions that have a significant influence on both people and civilizations. They erode societal cohesiveness, stability, and trust while fostering conflict and violent cycle. Violations may cause bodily pain, fatalities, relocation, emotional anguish, and the breakdown of social structures. Additionally, they may obstruct attempts to advance development, advance social progress, and uphold justice and human rights. When combating transnational issues like terrorism, organized crime, and cyber threats, cooperation and coordination on the international level are crucial. To avoid and address transgressions, global institutions should be strengthened, international human rights norms can be encouraged, and transitional justice mechanisms can be supported.

Development and Violence

Why are certain nations more vulnerable than others to armed conflict and civil war? Violence is a major sign of fragility that, as was already established, may either directly undermine the state or lead to isolated instances of state collapse. Low income countries are particularly vulnerable to violent conflicts and civil wars, though not all conflicts are confined to the poorest regions of developing countries. When this happens, some societal segments may benefit, but the conflict typically results in a dramatic slowdown in the

country's overall development process. Because of this, decision-makers are eager to understand and solve the sources of conflict.

Recognise the root causes of conflict

Several scholarly hypotheses on the origins of civil war have been produced throughout the period covered by the study initiatives below, each with its own policy implications. In effort to comprehend the origins of conflict and the reasons why certain civil wars persist longer than others, academics from a number of fields have concentrated on several issues. Others relied on statistics including a wide range of nations, while others employed case studies and political economic analyses.

To explain the origins of conflict, several hypotheses have been developed. Some supposed causes of conflict are said to repeat often, including:

1. Natural resources, particularly exports of basic commodities.
2. Wartime gains for individuals (typically strongly tied to the issue involving natural resources).
3. Extreme disparities across identity groups or between the affluent and the poor.
4. The significance of racial variety and, in particular, racial elites.
5. The 'youth-bulge,' or the presence of a lot of young guys.

The 'Resource Curse'

Recognise the 'natural resource curse''s occurrence and causes. Primary 'point source' commodity exports, such as those of metals, precious stones, and gas and oil, significantly increase the likelihood of violence and civil conflicts. Natural resources provide potential for extortion, which contributes to this increased danger. Due to the greater'spoils' that come with having control over the state,' natural resources stimulate intensified rivalry for power among the elite. However, there is disagreement on the specific causal links between risk of violence and basic goods. In reality, the significance of natural resources in a given conflict's explanation is debatable since the majority of developing nations are marked by a lack of industry and a disproportionate reliance on mining and/or agriculture. These industries make up the main economic activity in these nations for rebels, regular businesses, domestic or foreign corporations, and the government. Dependence on extractive resources cannot explain why extraction is sometimes conducted peacefully and at other times under the hands of warlords. Conflict is influenced by the spatial distribution and exploitation of natural resources as well as the distribution of economic rents [1], [2].

Where primary commodity exploitation results in significant horizontal disparities, there seems to be a correlation between the existence of primary commodities and the possibility of conflict. Conflict on a local level as well as separatist conflicts might result from the interaction between these two variables.78 The discovery of natural resources can lead to rapid rises in regional inequality. Separatist strife may develop when these resources are found in ethnically or religiously diverse areas of a nation. This is especially true if the people in question are relatively impoverished or feel like they aren't profiting from the exploitation of the resources.

The discovery of natural riches in the Indonesian province of Aceh was a crucial event in the shift of Acehnese dissatisfaction, according to a study79 of separatist movements in Southeast Asia. The aim of the struggle moved from gaining local rights to independence from Indonesia. The regions where natural resources are found in Indonesia have developed a "aspiration to inequality." The discovery of oil in Sudan has changed the country's conflict,

and natural resources also played a significant role in stoking ethnic separatist claims in post-communist Russia.80 In Bolivia, ongoing conflicts over natural resources, including land, gas, and forests, have polarised society and resulted in increasingly violent opposition from civic committees and property owners in the lowlands.

In the Niger Delta area of Nigeria and often in Peru, where mining operations have been tied to disputes over claims, natural resources are related to local-level violence. The presence of natural resources is frequently thought to be a negative factor, above and beyond the risk of conflict, in militating against improving governance by feeding corruption and supporting unfair and unsustainable growth patterns. Here, too, the distribution of resources among local groups, or between local groups and companies, is often unequal and can do so by feeding local-level conflict.

Therefore, in resource-rich nations like Indonesia and Nigeria, effective exploitation of natural resources for development is the subject of intense policy discussion and a significant political conundrum. Do residents in these areas have unique rights to the resources available there? Horizontal disparities will develop as resource-rich areas become much wealthy than their neighbours if these rights are given. As an alternative, could the government redistribute the funds, which, although reducing horizontal disparities, may also cause instability (as, for instance, with the INPRES (Instruksi Presiden) programme in Indonesia under President Suharto and the redistributive formula in Nigeria)? Therefore, in regions where high-value natural resources are found, revenue-sharing arrangements that are viewed as fair are an essential part of peace accords [3].

The evidence, it is argued, suggests that rebellions are not primarily caused by the opportunity for rebel predation of natural resources, but rather by more complex political economy dynamics.84 Some of the research casts doubt on some highly influential theories of the economic cause ('greed') of civil conflict in natural resource dependence. These ideas, which have been widely reported in the media and by policymakers,85 underplay the political rationale for violence.86 Injustice and authoritarianism are among the many political, social, economic, and historical reasons why people rebel.88 The internal dynamics of specific civil wars, as well as the war and peace economies that fuel them, have various and contentious "rules of the game." For state-building initiatives in nations like Afghanistan to be successful, it is crucial to comprehend how these work. The political economics of state and non-state armed forces in Afghanistan demonstrates that uncertainty restricts ruling coalitions' incentives to solidify state authority in preference to building up their own reserves in preparation for potential war.

Violence and Unfairness

As possible triggers of conflict and violence, pay attention to and alleviate horizontal imbalances. Most research on the topic of inequality and conflict has looked at how 'vertical inequalities', such as income disparities between people or plain old rich and poor inequality, are related to conflict. Generally speaking, these studies have found little correlation.90 Group dimensions of inequality have been ignored in these studies. However, there is currently some research that shows that disputes are more frequent when there is discrimination, inequality between groups that are characterised by their culture, or horizontal inequality. Inequalities between groups that see themselves as differentiating on four dimensions are known as "horizontal inequalities"

1. **Economic:** In terms of opportunity, income, and asset ownership.
2. **Social:** In terms of results for education and health as well as access to services including housing, health, and education.

3. Political: The distribution of political opportunity and influence, as well as political voice and involvement, within the group.
4. Cultural Status: Disparities in how various groups' cultural norms, habits, and practises are acknowledged and (de facto) ranked in hierarchies.

DISCUSSION

Where there exist concurrent economic, social, political, and cultural forms of horizontal inequality and where certain groups are disadvantaged in these spheres, conflict is more probable. An econometric study of 55 countries found that political exclusion has a very strong impact on the relationship between socioeconomic horizont and group membership. In these situations, group leaders or elites who experience political exclusion, and their potential followers or ethnic constituents, who perceive themselves as receiving unequal treatment with regard to assets, jobs, and social services, are more likely to be inspired to mobilise along ethnic group lines and possibly engage in violence.

Also important is how inequality is perceived. Instead of 'real' statistically quantifiable inequities that they may not be aware of, people are more worried about perceived injustices. 'Objective' horizontal disparities are crucial to political action since one would often anticipate a relationship between perceived and observed inequality. However, political perceptions are important because authorities, the media, and educational institutions may affect how people see inequality even though the underlying fact does not change. Despite school records revealing significant variances, perception polls conducted in Ghana and Nigeria revealed that the majority of persons questioned thought there to be minimal difference in educational access by group [4], [5].

In international development policy, horizontal disparities have been disregarded, and none of the key strategies poverty reduction, economic promotion, or structural adjustment takes them into consideration. But the research indicates that inequality and exclusion must be addressed if conflict is to be resolved permanently. Purely military action to destroy people who incite violence may not be effective since new leaders will be able to rally support as long as injustices and grievances persist. Not only are strategies to alleviate horizontal disparities obviously necessary in nations that have experienced violence, but they should also be included in development programmes generally. Such laws serve as a means of preventing conflicts as well as a contribution to the development of a fair and inclusive society.

Conflict in Regional Dimensions

Recognise the geographical influences on conflict more. Due to their mutually reinforcing nature, civil conflicts and regional instability cannot be adequately understood or managed as distinct phenomena. When it comes to controlling the flow of violence into and out of their borders, weaker states typically fail. Rebels in nearby nations are often supported by states that are experiencing internal turmoil. Additionally, boundaries created by colonial rulers that separate ethnic groups continue to be a key cause of inter- and intra-state conflict.

The strength of regional security agreements depends on the common interests that exist. It's possible that the UN and donor organisations have an unduly optimistic view of the function of regional bodies in resolving intra- and inter-state conflict and promoting regional security and development. Regional groups' track records are quite inconsistent in this area. Since many of them have weak member states, no shared principles, and major internal conflicts, they are weak organizationally and politically. However, in order to build the crucial command and control and logistical capabilities needed, initiatives like the African Standby Force will need major political support in addition to outside funding.

Long-Term Development and Security

Recognise when ensuring security is the state's top priority in order to achieve long-term development goals. 99 In some stages of state-building, "security needs may need to trump all other development needs." State collapse and conflict are a part of the difficult and contentious process of development, transforming "neo-patrimonial" societies into contemporary capitalist societies that demand a logical and bureaucratic state. The monopolisation of coercive authority is the main issue when the construction of a modern state is still in progress. State construction can only go on to constructing other types of state legitimization, such as service provision and the grant of political entitlements, after a state has built security forces that operate under a coherent chain of command. Prioritising security must not, however, be used as an excuse for activities that violate human rights, humanitarian obligations, or the formation of new types of democratic citizenship. Security sector reform in post-conflict nations is a priority for the UN and donor states because they see security as a crucial public good. However, if the concept of national ownership is not followed, their efforts may be undermined. The security process must be owned by the state in question since the temporary solution of externally provided protection is unsustainable in the long term [6], [7].

Fragile Citizenship and Fragile States

Recognise that violence not only makes nations more brittle, but also makes citizenship more brittle. Because of the dread and distrust that follow acts of violence, people's perceptions of their political community are constrained. This leads to a "fragility of citizenship" on many different levels, which has an immediate impact on the effectiveness of democratic government. Violence greatly reduces people's sense of agency. The victims of violence often lack the ability or desire to speak out against the abuse they have experienced. In many cases, dehumanising people and designating them as dangerous, unwelcome, or inconsequential serves to justify violence. This may be accomplished by using racial and religious prejudices to excuse violence or by bolstering disparities between wealthy people who can afford private protection and others who cannot. Violence also discourages citizen involvement in more overt ways. Citizens are prevented from gathering and organising because non-state security outfits have physically taken over space.

However, active citizenship may still develop in violent environments. If given the necessary assistance, many of these already-existing, but sometimes unrecognised organisations might serve as the foundation for individuals to exercise their rights in nonviolent, socially acceptable ways. It takes an honest acknowledgment of the state's role in violence, a better comprehension of how communities coexist with violent groups and individuals, and tools to combat the pernicious effects of violence on people's perceptions of their community to create such spaces for active citizenship. After 25 years of strife, war, and authoritarian government, Angola's civil society looked to have been completely destroyed. However, research reveals that local civil society organisations began to form throughout the war and in the camps for displaced people, and they often still exist today.

Indigenous groups convened in Mexico to talk about how various forms of violence impact their communities. They then shared their thoughts with organisations that concentrate on health, justice, and education. Understanding how violence restricts access to each of these regions has been a crucial first step in figuring out how the state may more effectively interact with disadvantaged and desperately underdeveloped rural indigenous communities. Youth movements, religious institutions, and other local civil society organisations have facilitated communication amongst riot-scarred communities in Northern Nigeria. Because it

is seen to be a contributing factor to the issue, the state has been unable to address the escalating tensions. As a result, these local organisations have a special role in promoting communication among the population's disparate factions. This dialogue may also serve as a foundation for the state to respond to requests for more security and services without escalating existing tensions. Local civil society organisations in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, are often taken over by militias and drug trafficking gangs, making governmental involvement and engagement with favelas (slums) more challenging. The state often finds it difficult to successfully act inside the favela in terms of enhancing security, enhancing infrastructure, and providing other services. This is because there aren't any genuine, nonviolent civil society organisations operating at the community level.

These spaces have been filled by undemocratic and unaccountable non-state influences, ranging from gangs and drug lords to youth militias and rebel groups, in many places that are characterised by conflict and violence. While they perpetuate violence and steal from the community, they also provide services and some forms of security to poor communities. Understanding the nature and function of these intermediates is crucial. If not, there is a chance that the very actions meant to support state capability and civil society involvement would instead strengthen the standing of the unofficial, often armed organisations that have the power to control local government mechanisms. For instance, violent gangs in the favelas in Brazil have taken control of the conditional cash distribution scheme Bolsa Familia, which represents roughly 2.5% of the nation's overall spending. The monthly payment in each community is decided upon by gang leaders, a discretionary decision that strengthens gang authority rather than that of the government [8], [9].

Spend more time figuring out what causes 'social violence'. There is reason to be sceptical about the ability of civil society to support the goals of state-building in fragile regions of otherwise effective states110. Field research carried out in Ahmedabad, India, offers a specific example of serious failure on the part of civil society, state officials, and organisations to effectively respond and protest the commission of violence and human rights abuses between Muslim and Hindu factions in the city. Therefore, we cannot assume that all civil society groups would be democratic or that civil society will be unable to monitor and address violations until people join together across religion, caste, and other ethnic divisions. While civil society is a necessary pre-condition for democracy and is important in fostering sociability, solidarity, shared experiences, and identities, its effectiveness in fragile contexts may depend on the state having a monopoly over violence and making a clear effort to neutralise political initiatives along ethnic lines.

Recognise that failing nations may not pose a larger danger to human wellbeing than states that are unable or unwilling to provide a minimum degree of security for all of their residents. Even though some forms of violence are not overtly political, violence is frequently directly related to the political environment, including: the effectiveness of political institutions in a nation; the ability of states to provide for the necessities of life for their citizens; and the level of vertical inequality that exists in a nation. Disgruntled urban populations have the potential to incite violent protests and spark civil unrest in areas where authorities are unable to effectively regulate their cities. In such case, violence may rise in tandem with the fast urbanisation process. Governmental and civil conflicts wars and insurgencies are being surpassed by social violence such as gang activity and societal instability that result in high murder rates. Social violence claims the lives of about five times as many people annually as wars, insurgencies, and political conflicts do. This raises the possibility of 'weak' states, which may function well overall but are characterised by pockets of failure as opposed to failed or failing states.

There are gendered aspects to urban violence. According to one research, there is a consistent pattern of interconnected bad things that have led to a downward spiral and increased women's susceptibility to conflicts in quite different cultural and political contexts. There are five interconnected variables that cause the downward spiral, according to evidence from Colombia, Palestine, the Balkans, Sudan, Angola, and Central and West Africa. These are: Displacement, HIV and psychosocial health, Economic destitution, Destructive effects on education, Sexual assault. Only through enabling women to transcend the pervasive patterns of psychological and social oppression that have been imposed upon them can the cycle be stopped. Separate studies looked at the effects of the major rift in KwaZulu-Natal politics in the middle of the 1980s on post-apartheid society and politics. Here, political violence was disproportionately directed at women and concentrated in certain neighbourhoods.

CONCLUSION

Security infractions need an all-encompassing, holistic strategy to be addressed. It demands defending the rule of law, making sure wrongdoers are held accountable, and advancing procedures for settling disputes and encouraging amity. By addressing the underlying causes of violations, such as poverty, inequality, social exclusion, and the collapse of institutions, prevention plays a critical role in minimising violations. For the purpose of avoiding and resolving breaches, it is essential to create inclusive and resilient societies, promote communication and understanding, and uphold human rights. In conclusion, fostering peace, justice, and the defence of human rights requires an awareness of the complex link between security and transgressions. We may work towards a world where security is preserved and violations are averted by addressing the underlying causes of violations, guaranteeing accountability, and promoting inclusive communities, eventually establishing a more peaceful and fair global order.

REFERENCES

[1]   A. C. Johnston, M. Warkentin, M. McBride, and L. Carter, 'Dispositional and situational factors: Influences on information security policy violations', *Eur. J. Inf. Syst.*, 2016, doi: 10.1057/ejis.2015.15.

[2]   H. M. Al-Mukahal and K. Alshare, 'An examination of factors that influence the number of information security policy violations in Qatari organizations', *Inf. Comput. Secur.*, 2015, doi: 10.1108/ICS-03-2014-0018.

[3]   S. Farshadkhah, C. Van Slyke, and B. Fuller, 'Onlooker effect and affective responses in information security violation mitigation', *Comput. Secur.*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cose.2020.102082.

[4]   H. Chen, P. Y. K. Chau, and W. Li, 'The effects of moral disengagement and organizational ethical climate on insiders' information security policy violation behavior', *Inf. Technol. People*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/ITP-12-2017-0421.

[5]   S. Sarkar, A. Vance, B. Ramesh, M. Demestihas, and D. T. Wu, 'The influence of professional subculture on information security policy violations: A field study in a healthcare context', *Inf. Syst. Res.*, 2020, doi: 10.1287/isre.2020.0941.

[6]   A. Vance, M. T. Siponen, and D. W. Straub, 'Effects of sanctions, moral beliefs, and neutralization on information security policy violations across cultures', *Inf. Manag.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2019.103212.

[7]   K. Njenga, 'Understanding internal information systems security policy violations as paradoxes', *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*. 2017. doi: 10.28945/3639.

[8]   M. Siponen and A. Vance, 'Guidelines for improving the contextual relevance of field surveys: The case of information security policy violations', *European Journal of Information Systems*. 2014. doi: 10.1057/ejis.2012.59.

[9]   K. H. Guo and Y. Yuan, 'The effects of multilevel sanctions on information security violations: A mediating model', *Inf. Manag.*, 2012, doi: 10.1016/j.im.2012.08.001.

CHAPTER 19

STATES WITH GREATER EQUITY AND INCLUSIVITY

Prof. Rita Arora, Director
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: ritaarora@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

States that place a high priority on fairness and inclusion in their governance structures are essential for promoting social cohesion and sustainable development. This abstract examines the idea of governments that are more equitable and inclusive, emphasising its value in advancing fairness, equality, and prosperity. It explores the salient features and advantages of such nations and highlights the need for coordinated efforts to provide the groundwork for just and inclusive communities. States that priorities equitable access to opportunities, resources, and rights for all people, regardless of their origin, identity, or social standing, are characterised by governance systems that value equality and inclusion. Through laws and initiatives that guarantee an equitable allocation of resources, authority, and opportunities, these governments work to resolve ingrained inequities, fight discrimination, and advance social justice. Greater equality and inclusion can only be attained via various strategies. It entails putting policies into place that address structural obstacles like prejudice, poverty, and uneven access to fundamental services like healthcare, education, and the government. Affirmative action, social protection schemes, and anti-discrimination legislation may assist level the playing field and open doors for disadvantaged populations. To create inclusive societies, it is essential to strengthen institutions, provide transparent and responsible government, and advance participatory democracy.

KEYWORDS:

Democracy, Government, Political, States, Traditional.

INTRODUCTION

In order to promote fairness and inclusion, education is vital. States may empower people with information, skills, and critical thinking abilities, allowing them to engage fully in society and contribute to economic progress. This is done through providing high-quality education that is accessible to everyone. Investments in infrastructure, social welfare, and healthcare also contribute to the creation of favorable conditions for people to prosper and reach their full potential. Promoting fairness and inclusion on a global scale requires international collaboration and partnerships. The international community may help governments lay the groundwork for greater justice and inclusion by exchanging best practices, information, and financial and technical assistance. Additionally, creating justice and inclusion globally requires supporting fair trade, eliminating resource access disparities, and tackling global issues like climate change and migration. "Having inclusive government, in which all major groups are represented, is essential for stability and socioeconomic equity [1]."

States That Are Responsive and Accountable

The necessity for the state to be responsive and responsible is implied by inclusion and equality. But to whom are you sensitive and responsible? And what does 'society' signify to

donor organizations or partner governments? The phrase "the poor" is used frequently in the international development community as a "catch-all" concept to describe their concerns. However, the term implies an economic description that obscures the deeper development goal of fostering empowered citizens who live in an effective democracy. Other titles, such as "civil society" and "NGO," falsely suggest entities apart from the state rather than coexisting with it.

Successful "developmental states" like South Korea, Taiwan, or Botswana were not always ones where people could hold public institutions or leaders to account via democratic processes, either directly or through civil society or the private sector. Therefore, it is important to comprehend how governments and elites plan, impede, or react to social reform networks or movements (sometimes with members or followers in the government). Having inclusive government, in which all significant groups are represented, is essential for stability and socioeconomic fairness. This may be achieved by informal agreements, but constitutional design can play a significant role.

Therefore, all significant groups must be represented in parliament and government, as required by constitutions. 'Westminster-style' constitutions, which may lead to one group monopolising power, were passed down to several states. Political stability is at risk, and fair development may become improbable as a result. Power-sharing may be ensured through constitutional design, which may be done by different voting methods or proportional representation, reserved seats and places in the cabinet, or a system that includes both a presidency and a prime minister.

Responsible Citizens

A citizen is someone who has rights, goals, and obligations in connection to other members of the society and the government. It refers to politics. It indicates a link between citizens themselves and the state and everyone residing inside its borders. This stands in stark contrast to a view that sees residents of aid-recipient nations as either consumers deciding between services or welfare recipients. However, government assistance organisations still seldom ever use the phrase citizen. One reason is that some of the most disadvantaged people, including migrants and refugees, are sometimes left out of the discussion since the word is often associated with legal, recorded citizenship in a nation state. Another explanation is that, up until recently, those who get help were either seen as 'beneficiaries' who get what others thought was best for them or as 'users' who get to choose what they want from the services offered. The fact that the term "citizenship" has overlapping meanings is a further justification. Therefore, citizenship may be interpreted in a variety of ways, such as a sense of belonging (to a particular location, group, or community), of status (in comparison to a non-citizen), of national identity (Swedish rather than Swiss), and of responsibilities [1], [2].

Many different forms of citizen involvement contribute to the formation of an active sense of citizenship that extends beyond the legal status of a citizen and involves the growth of people capable of asserting their rights, even when they were previously ignorant of them. Large-scale NGOs have replaced many state-run operations in Bangladesh. These NGOs may help its members develop a feeling of citizenship in addition to providing services, however how they approach their job will have a big impact on this. This feeling of citizenship will be essential in developing closer ties between the people and the government as well as strengthening the Bangladeshi state's ability to act (and democratic nature).

Although the phrase "citizenship" might have positive connotations and even serve as a weapon of exclusion in certain situations, particularly in unstable nations, it can also have negative implications. Given that citizenship in certain ethnically diverse nations might be

seen as the 'tyranny' of the ethnic majority, there are risks in seeing citizenship as an inherently good idea. When a state determines who is and is not a citizen, disparities between groups are often institutionalised. People or organisations may sometimes be viewed as foreigners, even in the nations in which they reside. Definitions of citizenship that exclude some groups may exacerbate existing injustices and grievances amongst groups, serving as a catalyst for conflict escalation or perpetuation. In certain circumstances, authorities may use the ethos of citizenship to uphold minority rule or suppress loud minorities [3], [4].

Exclusion from citizenship is a kind of horizontal inequality in and of itself, and it is a significant contributor to disparities in terms of resources and political rights. It may occur on both the national and local levels. People who are not citizens, for instance, may not be able to work, join a union, or get government aid. Deliberate political actions are regularly done to deny citizenship for a variety of reasons. Indigenous peoples have historically been denied political and economic citizenship rights in Latin American nations. Different things may result in citizenship loss. Migration, both legal and illegal, and forcible relocation are typical causes, both of which have a significant influence on the citizenship rights and identities of persons impacted.

DISCUSSION

In rare circumstances, citizenship is also denied to later generations. Less often, authorities may expressly rescind citizenship privileges, as occurred to Asians in Uganda and Jews in Nazi Germany. When the state itself changes shape, it is a third way citizenship may be lost. For instance, when the Czech Republic split from Slovakia in the 1990s, the Roma minority became stateless. On a national scale, citizenship denial has been a key factor in stoking revolt in Côte d'Ivoire of local violence in Ghana. Three ideal guidelines for enhanced civic engagement may be as follows: Everybody should have citizenship someplace, and those who don't should give it in the nation in where they are situated; Why Citizenship should be granted to those who are de facto members of a state, where de facto membership is determined by links to the community and contributions; and Citizenship privileges should be granted after a prolonged stay.

Denying citizenship may lead to conflict when any or all of these three criteria are violated for a sizable population, especially if they come from the same ethnic or religious background. Even persons who are not granted formal citizenship by a specific state nevertheless retain some rights as members of the global community that are derived from international conventions and accords, such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights [5], [6]. The spread of authority and influence from local to global levels, as well as the increased number of state and non-state organizations that have an effect on their lives, have concurrently offered some chances for participation and involvement for residents of impoverished nations.

but shut others down. The much-awaited development of the global citizen, who may utilise global solidarity to create local and national forms of citizen empowerment and governmental responsiveness, is sometimes made possible by transnational forms of activity. In other instances, however, the changing patterns of international power work to exacerbate existing precarious forms of citizen involvement and to foster new kinds of exclusion. Examples like the Va Campanian campaign, the Global Campaign for Education, and the anti-asbestos movement show how this new authority environment has significant effects on social mobilization, rights, and responsibility.

Decentralization

Federalism and decentralization may both support political stability and power sharing. Federalism shares power across society, and in big, varied nations, it may significantly aid in distributing power and preserving peace. However, the constitution's layout is crucial because ethno federalism where a single tribe resides in each region can result in secession. This was the case with Biafra in Nigeria; the country's newly established federal structure, which includes a considerably greater number of minor, multiethnic states, has been essential for maintaining political stability. Decentralization may also assist in the distribution of power. For instance, it has significantly reduced conflict on a national scale in Indonesia.

Be cautious of the drawbacks of decentralization, including the potential for elite capture and the consolidation of local inequities. An efficient state is necessary for successful decentralization. Local governments get funding and duties from the national government via decentralization. The term refers to a range of policies. They include moving government operations away from the capital, moving decision-making and administration of public functions away from the center, and full devolution, which gives local governments significant political and financial autonomy. The goal of decentralization is typically to bring the government closer to the people it is supposed to represent. It may seem that local governments are intrinsically more responsible to their constituents than regional or federal ones. The research, however, demonstrates that decentralization, which has been frequently used since the 1990s, has produced a broad range of results. Too frequently, a "strong central state" and a "highly centralised state" have been used interchangeably. Strong local governments may coexist with strong central governments and are often dependent upon one other [7]. A system of municipal institutions, representation, and administration that produces a coherent vision for city growth is necessary for effective urban government. Decentralisation may have drawbacks since it does not guarantee greater accountability on its own. Politicians at higher levels of government sometimes utilise decentralisation strategies to win over obstinate regional or local leaders. The end consequence is occasionally to enhance the role of central states in local administration at the expense of local empowerment.

Additionally, vulnerable people of society might be excluded just as readily and with greater ruthlessness at the local level as at the national or international level. The role of traditional authorities in local government was crucial here. The variable success of decentralisation in different districts and municipalities in Bolivia depended on local political and economic dynamics - the incentives for powerful local elites to capture decentralised powers, were the key. For instance, research in South Africa revealed that competing interests remained clustered around local government in ways that tended to exclude women.

A similar mixed picture emerges from research on how decentralisation affects group inequality and conflict in multiethnic communities. Decentralisation into smaller units, especially if these smaller entities cross ethnic lines, seems to assist avoid the creation of national-level violence. Decentralisation is attributed for reducing demands from ethnic groups in post-Suharto Indonesia and Nigeria. In contrast, Pakistan's ongoing ethno-regional tensions are mostly related to the concentration of power in Punjab state, where more than 50% of the country's population resides. Smaller decentralised units, even if they are generally preferable from the standpoint of conflict avoidance, are not without issues. Local elections for increasingly prominent local posts in smaller units have the potential to exacerbate ethnic tensions and fuel ongoing push to form smaller units.

Competition for local political position during decentralisation was a major element in the formation of communal violence in Indonesia and Uganda. However, in both nations, the process of redistricting has been more directly tied to ethnic violence connected to local elections than the actual holding of local elections. A recent ban on the construction of new provinces and districts in Indonesia has been followed by a decline in intercommunal hostilities. In the meanwhile, Museveni's advocacy of gerrymandering in Uganda has been followed by an increase in violence, which is connected to the need to develop patron-client relationships. In other words, local elections may not necessarily lead to violence, but they can if the boundaries are susceptible to manipulation. Decentralisation, however, may lessen conflict on a national level while provoking conflict at the local level.

Informal Organisations

Think about ways to support the local informal organisations that assist the disadvantaged. Public power is often exerted via 'informal' or 'traditional' institutions in several Southern states. Local youth vigilante organisations defend people and property and punish offenders. Traditional leaders resolve conflicts and distribute territory. The funds required to bribe irrigation engineers and distribute water are collected by informal councils. Traditional chiefs bargain for access to government cash in exchange for voting blocs or pledges to keep militants out of their country. Researchers and politicians often disagree on how best to counteract the effect of these traditional, informal institutions. Should they be supported, repressed, collaborated with, reformed, or ignored by governments? These discussions can become quite emotional and divisive. Some believe that traditional authority are more competent than state bureaucracy to adapt to local cultures and conditions.

Others decry them as representatives of painfully "pre-modern" patriarchal, hierarchical, and superstitious attitudes and accuse them of falling short of accepted norms of legality and responsibility. Additionally, the fact that a single organisation may present several distinct faces makes it much more perplexing. Young men from low status families may be driven away by the traditional chiefs, who maintain their society free of hard drugs, by delaying marriage until they have worked for years to pay the "customary" exorbitant bride costs to community elders [8].

Recognise that informal or "traditional" local government institutions important for development results since they are enduring, powerful, and very varied. Depending on their historical background and the current institutional environment in which they function, informal sometimes mistakenly referred to as "traditional" local government organisations are able to and often do exert legitimate and effective public power. According to thorough study, informal institutions are:

Diverse in character, impact, and 'acceptability', or how closely they adhere to standards of equality, pluralism, and accountability. Their pasts are quite unlike. The majority of Punjabi villages still have hereditary wealthy landowners who have immense power over the lives of the peasants and often buy their votes. However, other villages have informal councils made up of small landowners that administer them in a more diverse manner. So-called "traditional village councils" compete openly with political parties in certain areas of Karnataka state, India, often urging their members to skip voting. In exchange for voluntary, uncontested nominations, costly electoral campaigns are held for seats on official local government organizations.

Surprisingly, informal institutions improve in effectiveness and "acceptability" not in areas where official state institutions are the worst off, but rather where they interact and support strong formal institutions. Comparing informal local governance institutions (ILGIs) in India

and Pakistan suggests that how they link to official state institutions both historically and today is a key factor in determining their acceptance. ILGIs with a history of being primarily accountable to local landowners during the colonial era had a tendency to be more hierarchical and exclusive. It is more probable that those having origins in organisations with ties to the official colonial state will be inclusive, representative, and successful. The ILGIs that interface with official state institutions the closest tend to be the most active. The best informal institutions are those that coexist with improved formal governance, not those that take the place of the worst governments.

Sometimes helpful to the poor and vulnerable; it's vital to weigh the advantages of informal institutions against those of other institutions with which they compete or overlap. Reformers should specifically inquire about the chances that informal organisations provide to the underprivileged. Rural residents are more inclined to seek official or informal institutions for various choices and services in areas where informal local institutions are successful. Do traditional-informal institutions provide a better, more accessible option if access to official courts is cumbersome and expensive? What options do impoverished people have, on the other hand, if they are concerned that their informal local council will not resolve a land issue fairly?

Weakening traditional authority could provide individuals more options if a traditional leader functions as a bottleneck, preventing people from utilising their own relationships to secure secondary school spots for their kids. But does it help the poor if there is an unofficial political agreement to not run in the election if a fought election for a local government body costs a lot of money, which the voters would pay later in bribes for access to government services or "leakages" from the official budget?

Democracy

Recognize that developing a true democracy is a difficult task. Why does democracy often struggle to succeed? A long-term objective of state construction, democratic governance is the best example of governmental responsiveness and accountability. Nevertheless, explicit democracy promotion efforts seem to have often failed to "export" models of democratic institutions and processes since the great post-Cold War optimism of the early 1990s. Experience has shown that although many nations may have copied democratic institutions, electoral politics, and functional civil society groups in form, they lacked democracy in its truest sense. The implementation of new democratic procedures in Iraq and Afghanistan was accompanied by violence and intimidation, which further weakened the case for universal applicability of Western-style democratic institutions. A "democratic deficit" or "democratic recession" has been described as a worldwide decline in the quality of participatory politics and democracy, both in the North and the South. There is debate about whether the democratic institutions that developed in the North are suitable for the historical circumstances of the South and if democracy itself is capable of addressing issues like severe poverty, rising inequality, and social justice.

DFID-funded governance research has made a significant contribution to this crucial discussion by demonstrating the potential drawbacks of democratic systems. By establishing effective institutional avenues for the rightful voicing of complaints, a fully functional democracy lowers the likelihood of interethnic violence. Elections, however, are often the cause of violence, especially in recently created democracies where voting is predominantly done along ethnic lines. Recognize that 'top down' political systems do not build democracy. The idea that democracy could be eroding has led to new ideas in the area of promoting democracy, moving away from a one-size-fits-all approach. The data points to the need for a

"societal" perspective that considers how social mobilization, NGOs, and common people also contribute to establishing the circumstances necessary for democratic institutions to function. Examples of citizen mobilization in support of democracy highlight the significance of organized people participating actively. However, it was civil society organizations, who received relatively little outside funding, that mobilized to monitor the elections themselves and who have since organized into powerful grassroots campaigns calling on congress to adopt reforms, such as a much-needed law to make electoral fraud a criminal offence. In Nigeria, Africa's largest democracy, the 2007 election saw donors' spending focus on the government-appointed commissions to oversee fair elections. Research on citizenship shows that democracy is not created solely through political institutions or developmental initiatives, but also through organized citizens who articulate demands for new rights, raise awareness of the need for policy change, and keep tabs on government performance. However, the structure of political institutions has a significant role in a variety of countries, notably democracies. Institutions that let one party to solely hold power are more likely to be linked to election fraud and violence.

How can we gauge how well our democracies are working? Whether we like it or not, politicians and the people they represent inherently evaluate democracies based on economic progress. The Freedom House Index, Afro barometer, and Mo Ibrahim Governance Index are more overt assessments of democracies that place a strong emphasis on institutional standards. The study introduces a brand-new, additional criterion: the extent to which democracy promotes a feeling of citizenship. We need metrics that demonstrate that. In addition to the formal process of becoming a citizen, acquiring citizenship entails the growth of citizens as actors who may assert their rights and take independent action.

CONCLUSION

States that are inclusive and equitable profit greatly. They benefit from improved social cohesiveness as a result of residents' feelings of inclusion, belonging, and shared responsibility. These states promote economic stability and progress by minimising inequities since a varied and empowered populace fosters innovation, productivity, and entrepreneurship. Furthermore, they see enhanced governance and political stability as a result of more effective policy results and institutional trust brought about by inclusive decision-making procedures. In conclusion, fairness and inclusivity-focused nations are essential for social cohesion and sustainable development. These governments promote wealthy, just, and peaceful communities by removing obstacles, eliminating prejudice, and guaranteeing equal opportunity for everyone. We can all work together to provide the groundwork for more fair and inclusive nations and a more inclusive world by implementing targeted policies, inclusive governance, and international collaboration.

REFERENCES

[1] J. L. Johnson, C. A. Spivey, and M. Chisholm-Burns, 'Comparison of black student enrollment in us schools and colleges of pharmacy, medicine, and dentistry', *Am. J. Pharm. Educ.*, 2021, doi: 10.5688/ajpe8493.

[2] Candice Harrison-Train, Carmel Marock, and Sally Field, '"What's Your Story?" Building Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion', *Think.*, 2021, doi: 10.36615/thethinker.v87i2.530.

[3] L. V. Piggott, 'Gender and social inequity in and through sport leadership', in *Research Handbook on Sports and Society*, 2021. doi: 10.4337/9781789903607.00020.

[4]   P. M. Wehi, J. R. Beggs, and B. J. Anderson, 'Leadership and diversity in the New Zealand ecological society', *N. Z. J. Ecol.*, 2019, doi: 10.20417/nzjecol.43.16.

[5]   A. Das, 'Is innovative also effective? A critique of pro-poor shelter in South-East Asia', *Int. J. Hous. Policy*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14616718.2016.1248606.

[6]   S. T. Romano and C. W. Daum, 'Symposium: Transformative practices of teacher-scholar-activists in the era of trump: Introduction', *New Polit. Sci.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/07393148.2018.1487114.

[7]   A. Howe, M. Marshall, and V. Vaughan-Dick, 'Better for us all — recent learning on how the Royal College of General Practitioners can reduce racism', *BJGP Open*, 2020, doi: 10.3399/bjgpopen20X101150.

[8]   K. Jones, D. Tobin, and J. D. Bloom, 'Double movement in hybrid governance: Contestations in market-oriented agricultural development', *Sociol. Dev.*, 2017.

CHAPTER 20

ENSURING BETTER PUBLIC SERVICES

Prof. Anshu Bhatia, Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: anshubhatia@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Better public service delivery is a crucial component of good government and the wellbeing of citizens. This abstract discusses the significance of providing high-quality public services, looks at the obstacles that stand in the way of their efficacy, and offers techniques for doing so. Governments may increase public trust, advance social progress, and encourage inclusive and sustainable development by tackling these concerns. For the wellbeing of people and the general growth of societies, access to high-quality public services including healthcare, education, infrastructure, and social welfare is crucial. Effective service delivery helps to lower inequality, increase living standards, and reduce poverty. By providing equitable opportunity and attending to the needs of marginalized and disadvantaged groups, it also strengthens social cohesion and encourages inclusive development. However, a number of obstacles prevent the efficient provision of public services. These difficulties include a lack of ability, corrupt practises, insufficient infrastructure, little financial resources, and ineffective administrative processes. In especially for isolated and marginalised populations, geographic inequalities, social marginalisation, and cultural obstacles might further impede access to services. A thorough strategy that takes into account both systemic problems and particular difficulties facing the service industry is needed to overcome these obstacles.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Public, Services, Social, State.

INTRODUCTION

Governments should establish policies that place a high priority on citizen engagement, accountability, and openness to guarantee improved public services. To increase accountability and provide customers a way to hold service providers responsible, explicit service standards, performance monitoring systems, and feedback channels should be established. Transparency in service delivery, procurement procedures, and budgetary results fosters confidence and lessens potential for corruption. Promoting public involvement and participation is essential for providing responsive, citizen-centric services. Public services are more relevant and efficient when people are involved in decision-making processes, frequent consultations are held, and input is taken into account when designing and delivering services [1], [2].

The effectiveness, accessibility, and responsiveness of services may all be enhanced by embracing technology and digital solutions. Enhancing human capital and increasing capacity are essential for enhancing service delivery. Service delivery and customer satisfaction are strengthened when public employees, especially frontline staff, have better skills and abilities. A motivated and skilled staff is a result of effective training programmes, performance incentives, and career development possibilities. Poor people depend on public services to provide them the education, access to healthcare, and support for their livelihoods

that they need to exercise their fundamental human rights and be successful in the job market [3].

Improvement of Public Services

Recognise that improving basic services for the poor has not always been the result of market-oriented changes in service provision. A persistent development concern is expanding the availability and quality of essential services for the underprivileged. More than any other group, the poor depend on public services to provide them the education, access to healthcare, and support for their livelihoods that they need to exercise their fundamental human rights and prosper in the job market. While a lack of healthcare is one of the primary causes of family poverty, access to education is the main path out of it.

In terms of service delivery development strategies, trends come and go. In the 1990s, 'New Public Management' strategies intended to alter provider incentives by offering service consumers greater choice. These strategies were a response to support for public service reform aimed at enhancing direct supply of services. As services were decentralised, outsourced out, and privatised, there was a significant increase in both the quantity and variety of suppliers.

However, there is scant evidence that these market-oriented reforms were successful in underdeveloped nations. Donors then started highlighting the need of improving the "direct accountability" of service providers to consumers. These included plans to boost the 'voice' of the underprivileged via mechanisms like citizen charters, complaint systems, and other measures, and to promote their involvement. However, these methods of improving direct responsibility, which put the emphasis on consumer action, may not do much to assist the poor, who already lack access to services and are too susceptible to take on the associated risks.

In more recent attempts to increase public involvement in service delivery, the emphasis has shifted from citizens' roles in ex-post accountability to those of ex-ante participants in the creation of policy. This has lately been the case with the Brazilian health care reform for the indigenous community. Such initiatives have a great deal of potential to include individuals, particularly the impoverished, in discussions about public policy on a variety of levels, from local to national. When three criteria are met, these chances assist provide for the needs of the poor:

1. Internal political will
2. Powerful, legally sanctioned design
3. Effective citizen mobilisation and representation

Recognise that public sector changes may limit organisations' ability to influence public policy and set up efficient service delivery monitoring. Research conducted in two major cities (Sao Paulo and Mexico City) and focusing on the health and social assistance sectors showed how public service delivery changes impact the capacity of the poor to organise and make demands of the state. These took place against the backdrop of significant changes that have transpired during the previous 20 years, such as decentralisation, the development of participatory institutions, and significant growth in the quantity and variety of service providers. Reforms like cash distribution schemes in Brazil and Mexico, for instance, might stifle prospects for public participation.

A good example is the Renda Minima, or Minimum Income Guarantee, which was implemented in So Paulo in the early 2000s. A political party in this example, eager to seem

as if it was providing services to the needy, created a system of income guarantee subsidies that specifically excluded civil society groups that had previously provided services to the poor. A crucial source of accountability and supervision was undermined as a result of the state's efforts to increase its capacity to serve its inhabitants. Participation of the populace may also be hampered by top-down change or very fragmented service (like the health sector reform in India).

A conditional cash transfer scheme called PROGRESA/Oportunidades provides money to the heads of disadvantaged families (often women) so they may increase their family's access to nutrition, healthcare, and education. Social programmes like PROGRESA were created to run under rigorous central supervision as a response to decades of corrupt, one-party rule by the Partido Revolucionario Institucional in an attempt to reduce chances for clientelism at the local level. The program's planning and implementation purposefully avoided officials at higher levels of government, and beneficiaries were chosen based on mathematical score in order to remove judgement.

Even a formal procedure for beneficiaries to express requests to the central authority was lacking for many years. A residents Complaint System was not created until 2003, allowing residents to contact the National Coordination office by phone or writing. When this system malfunctioned, central administrators reacted by eliminating some of the limitations that had been put in place when the project first started. Local authorities and volunteers were introduced as new middlemen to aid in facilitating accountability inside the system. These new players quickly took advantage of the many possibilities to extract "rents" from their positions of power by requesting give-and-takes, bribes, and work-in-kind in return for enabling the transfers to continue. One type of accountability had been compromised by the program's design in favour of another. The Mexican government attempted to limit chances for corruption, but did so at the expense of feedback loops and public demand, both of which are essential for efficient service delivery, especially in the setting of urban-rural, center-periphery differences [4].

DISCUSSION

Implement changes in a manner that makes room for group action. There is little doubt that prospects for collective action are impacted by how services are reorganised or provided. This emphasises the need of comprehending how various public policy initiatives affect the motivations and capacity for mobilisation of various groups. Public officials in Delhi, for instance, were able to demand better performance in the Public Distribution System, which provided food grain at a subsidised price, without having to publicly criticise their own coworkers.184 In Mexico, the federal government as well as many state-level governments have formal agreements with social organisations to cooperate on the creation and implementation of social policy. The most important of these partnerships is reproductive health policy, in which NGOs and the government would cooperate to enhance services and coverage range. The Inter-Institutional Group on Reproductive Health provided special access to forums for policy formation and monitoring for the Mexican women's movement. A successful application of social responsibility for beneficial policy change can be seen in the fact that many of the services offered and promoted by NGOs have now fallen within the purview of the government as a consequence of the close ties between public institutions and NGOs.

Improve accountability by including people in service delivery change, but be cautious that formal participatory processes may exclude the poor. Groups are more likely to have an impact on the creation of institutional processes when they are participating in key public

reform events. This enables them to continue participating in implementation monitoring. When local organisations take part in policy improvements and/or are connected to public authorities via networks, they are also more likely to engage in accountability initiatives. This discovery is significant because it is often believed that when organisations participate in policymaking, the state would eventually co-opt them. However, official connections to increase citizen 'voice' don't always serve the greater good. Participatory procedures introduced in Delhi as part of the Bhagidari initiative were originally only available in the wealthier "planned" neighbourhoods. This made it easier for resident welfare societies in such places to seek more money from the government on the basis of limited class interests, which hurt the urban poor.

Success depends on the degree to which people are free to choose the conditions of their participation, including the topics they discuss and the format of their deliberations. Participants in Brazil's Health Councils serve as excellent examples of the rules that should be followed to make discourse and decision-making more effective and inclusive. Accept that'strengthening civil society' alone won't result in pro-developmental results. Participatory procedures, which were a crucial component of the health and social assistance reforms in So Paulo, have been crucial in defining chances for group action. Nevertheless, the issue networks that facilitated many official and informal interactions between members of the public and decision-makers were shown to have more influence.

This shows that external entities should exercise some care when trying to construct fast institutional solutions. Strengthening civil society organisation does not inevitably result in collective action that helps the disadvantaged. The extent to which strengthening certain organisations results in increased ability to influence policy and for whom will depend significantly on the networks already in place. For instance, it's likely to have little effect to boost groups that are marginal to the network and have minimal connections to the government. Strengthening people who are important to the network and have connections to the state, on the other hand, is likely to have a far higher influence. It could be especially crucial to encourage the development of connections between already-existing organisations and between them and the state. To increase social responsibility, it may be a good idea to invest in networks that have a broad vertical reach from politicians to the grassroots.

Accountability

Recognise the potential benefits of informal accountability systems for the underprivileged. Attempts to enhance service delivery via formal accountability systems, such as elections and institutional checks and balances, often fall short. In these situations, collective action by, or on behalf of, poor people to demand accountability from policymakers and service providers may be effective. While groups engaging in this type of "social accountability" lack the authority to impose formal sanctions, they can still have an impact by drawing attention to the shortcomings of the government and service providers. This may result in reputational and political costs, and in some cases, trigger formal accountability mechanisms, such as the establishment of a governmental commission.

Such action must be focused, maintained over time, and supported by organisations that have power, such as informational access, for it to be successful. The study presents a wide range of strategies and practises that people have utilised to exercise their agency and affect health policy. Examples of non-violent protest and resistance include direct action and demonstrations, letter writing, petitioning, internet campaigns, strategic non-participation, undermining official efforts to gather information, filing legal claims, striking, occupying, holding officials hostage to demand things, and a number of other non-violent actions [5].

Activists in South Africa relied on these and other strategies, using cultural repertoires that included songs, dances, and images from their prior experiences fighting against apartheid. Before interacting with government representatives, individuals should consider autonomous entities that are not connected to any governmental organisations. This is particularly true for marginalised groups, who may make advantage of these settings to discuss shared goals, concepts, identities, and tactics while also employing more open-minded communication techniques. Finding subtle methods to promote these places, or at the very least stop them from being degraded, is thus necessary to encourage public engagement in the delivery of services.

Poor people benefit from social responsibility because collective action increases their political power. As a result, it may provide a more incisive and focused type of accountability than elections. By drawing attention to shortcomings in current provisions or rights, it may also assist in addressing the question of what grade of services should be offered. Social accountability offers a platform for customers and service providers to assess results and, if required, bargain for higher standards, in contrast to formal accountability systems that place a focus on procedure and conformity to current standards [6], [7].

Private Sector Service Providers

Recognise the significance of informal and non-state service provision. The bulk of services are often provided by non-governmental groups in unstable conditions due to the lack or inadequacy of official services. Donors must weigh the trade-offs between providing adequate public services through non-state means and letting people go without basic services, even though this may lead to the fragmented and uneven provision of services and potentially undermine long-term state legitimacy and credibility. The challenge of assisting the state's ability to shift from non-state to direct supply in the long run is raised by this tension.

Co-production models have emerged in various situations when the state is restricted and unable to fully supply services, and individuals and public agencies share responsibility for service delivery. Now, in order to meet service requests, a public agency creates with and collaborates with people as co-producers. Co-production may actively engage individuals in a participatory and democratic fashion as an alternative type of service delivery. In instances when public agencies must function with lower income while still facing increased service delivery expenses, it might offer them with the chance to educate service providers about the requirements of their communities. It may also be the most economically feasible approach [8].

Rights and Inequalities

While addressing group disparities in service delivery, be mindful of the risks of enforcing divides. Initiatives for improving service delivery should strive to lessen social exclusion and address horizontal inequities everywhere, but notably in unstable nations. There is a wide variety of possible strategies, both indirect and direct, for reducing socioeconomic disparities, which have been enacted in various regions of the globe. This occasionally takes the form of "affirmative action." Indirect approaches are appealing because they prevent entrenchment of difference, but they often have a gradual and uneven impact. As with the Indian policies towards women and dalits, affirmative action schemes may help include certain communities in politics. Targeting and programming for disadvantaged and vulnerable populations in the delivery of services, however, is very difficult and politicised, and it may intensify already-exisiting conflicts. The privileged groups that stand to lose, at least proportionally, may fiercely oppose such measures, which may stop them from being implemented. In extreme

situations, poorly implemented affirmative action programmes themselves may contribute to the development of conflict. These policies may sometimes reinforce ethnic differences, particularly if they have been in existence for a long time193. Nevertheless, they can also be quite helpful in easing tensions and correcting horizontal disparities, as they were in Malaysia after riots in the late 1960s, for instance. Adopting a mix of direct, indirect, and integrationist measures is often the best strategy for lowering horizontal inequality. The latter may mitigate some of affirmative action's negative impacts.Include rights-based strategies where doing so is politically feasible. It's also crucial to use rights-based service delivery strategies. They have an impact on people's access to institutions, resources, and services. Responsive institutions are important if poor and disadvantaged populations are to enjoy their rights to water, health, housing, and a livable wage. Institutions that are more responsive may help individuals achieve their rights and get the resources they need. Therefore, rather than the state imposing and the people objecting, a rights-based approach has the potential to enable dialogue between the state and the people; it enables people to think about both their own responsibilities and the responsibilities of the state.196 In India, education is a right that is guaranteed by the state and was codified in the Right to Education bill in 2002. Citizens now have a strong legal means of demanding access to a broadly fair education thanks to its statutory acknowledgment. There is a legal procedure that allows anybody to hold the state accountable if they believe they are being denied their right to education or are getting a subpar education [9].

The state is often better equipped to defend and uphold human rights when social movements exist that can integrate global discourses on rights with regional symbols and values and when participatory spaces enable citizen groups to assert their rights. Workers in the garment industry in Bangladesh benefitted from a worldwide campaign in favour of workers' rights in developing nations. As a consequence, several multinational corporations adopted codes of conduct. HIV/AIDS activists in South Africa were able to circumvent a hostile local political climate and demand better recognition and care for HIV/AIDS patients by connecting with international patient rights advocacy networks.

CONCLUSION

Better public services are fostered via global collaboration and information exchange. Building capacity, innovating, and implementing effective service delivery models may be facilitated by collaborating with foreign partners, exchanging best practises, and using knowledge. Governments may overcome obstacles and execute successful changes by learning from successful experiences in other situations. In conclusion, improving public services is essential for the welfare of citizens, social advancement, and sustainable development. Governments may improve service delivery and satisfy the various demands of their people by solving difficulties, encouraging accountability, openness, and public involvement, as well as investing in human resources. The development of public services throughout the globe is further aided by creating successful alliances and using global experiences. In the end, providing better public services helps to improve government, boost citizen confidence, and promote inclusive and affluent communities.

REFERENCES

[1]   J. Cumming and S. Forbes, 'Better Public Services: the case for monitoring and evaluation', *Policy Q.*, 2012, doi: 10.26686/pq.v8i3.4425.

[2]   E. H. Susanto, 'Kelambanan Reformasi Birokrasi dan Pola Komunikasi Lembaga Pemerintah', *J. ASPIKOM*, 2017, doi: 10.24329/aspikom.v1i1.11.

[3]   K. C. Sahoo, S. Pati, S. Negi, K. Patel, B. K. Mishra, and S. K. Palo, 'Challenges in maternal and child health services delivery and access during pandemics or public health disasters in low-and middle-income countries: A systematic review', *Healthcare (Switzerland)*. 2021. doi: 10.3390/healthcare9070828.

[4]   M. Kanyangarara, S. Allen, S. S. Jiwani, and D. Fuente, 'Access to water, sanitation and hygiene services in health facilities in sub-Saharan Africa 2013-2018: Results of health facility surveys and implications for COVID-19 transmission', *BMC Health Serv. Res.*, 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12913-021-06515-z.

[5]   M. Ibrahim Mohamed Irfan, 'Survival and Dysfunctions of Bureaucracy: A Critical Analysis of Public Bureaucracy in Sri Lanka', *Adv. Sci. Humanit.*, 2016, doi: 10.11648/j.ash.20160204.11.

[6]   J. Wamukoya, 'The role of record keeping and open government data initiatives in fostering a critical development of open government policies and public services in sub-Saharan Africa', *Mousaion*, 2012.

[7]   D. M. Aritonang, 'The Impact of E-Government System on Public Service Quality in Indonesia', *Eur. Sci. Journal, ESJ*, 2017, doi: 10.19044/esj.2017.v13n35p99.

[8]   G. Improta *et al.*, 'Agile six sigma in healthcare: Case study at santobono pediatric hospital', *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17031052.

[9]   A. Androniceanu, 'Transparency in public administration as a challenge for a good democratic governance', *Adm. si Manag. Public*, 2021, doi: 10.24818/AMP/2021.36-09.

CHAPTER 21

TAXATION AS STATE-BUILDING

Prof. Grishma Shukla, Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: grishmashukla@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Taxation is a crucial component of state formation, promoting efficient government, economic growth, and social advancement. This abstract investigates the idea of taxes as state construction, emphasising the significance of creating and executing effective tax systems. It highlights the potential for taxes to promote inclusive governance and sustainable development, investigates the advantages of strong tax systems, and looks at the difficulties encountered in their construction. Taxation is a vital instrument for producing money, allowing governments to pay for public services, the building of infrastructure, and social welfare initiatives. States may lessen their dependency on outside assistance and promote self-sufficiency by implementing comprehensive and fair tax systems. As a result, governments have more autonomy, legitimacy, and ability to address the needs and ambitions of their constituents. For the development of states, effective tax systems provide various advantages. Since people pay to public finances and have a role in demanding transparent government, they foster accountability and transparency by defining the connection between them and the state. Additionally, taxes promote social solidarity, a feeling of shared citizenship, and improved state-society interactions.

KEYWORDS:

Government, Public, State, Tax, Taxation.

INTRODUCTION

Strong tax regimes also support the growth of the economy. Governments may establish a fair and predictable business climate, draw investments, and promote entrepreneurship by expanding the tax base, preventing tax evasion, and assuring progressive taxation. Tax revenue increases may be used to fund infrastructure projects, healthcare, education, and other critical services, which will promote economic development and lessen inequality. But creating efficient tax systems is not without difficulties. Successful taxation is hampered by insufficient capability, inadequate institutions, tax evasion, corruption, and informality. Comprehensive changes that address legislative frameworks, administrative capacity, taxpayer education, and enforcement mechanisms are necessary to overcome these obstacles. Building the capacity of tax administrations, encouraging information exchange, and combatting cross-border tax evasion and illicit financial flows may all benefit greatly from international collaboration and assistance. By motivating interest groups to organise in favour of, against, or proposing changes, tax reforms may improve government accountability [1].

Tax is Politics

Identify tax reform as a highly political "state-building" endeavour. One of the most innovative and significant areas in governance research financed by DFID over the last ten years has been the role of taxes in governance. This interest was initially sparked by the recognition of the significant historical evidence for taxation as being essential to state-

building. DFID-funded governance researchers also felt that, while the current international aid and development community was paying helpful attention to issues of the quality of public spending in developing nations, issues of the quality of revenue management were largely being ignored despite being essential to establishing a legitimate state. Neither do "quick impact projects," which aim to meet immediate requirements of assistance organisations. Government service delivery of services that people desire and need is a major source of legitimacy. Citizens may express their desires via elections. To meet such expectations, one must have the ability to both raise and spend public resources wisely.

The strongest evidence that state-society bargaining over taxation helps strengthen government capacity, accountability, and responsiveness to citizens is found in the history of Western Europe, particularly in Britain in the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries202. The situation in developing nations today is different and less clear-cut. Governments no longer confront the kinds of external dangers that traditionally provided strong shared interests for rulers and the people to negotiate about taxes. Taxpayers are more varied, have less common interests, and often gain from public expenditure or employment. Rents from natural resources and foreign assistance are alternate sources of income for many governments.

Taxation is a highly political activity that is inextricably related to a nation's political dynamics and development. Government accountability may be improved by tax changes by motivating interest groups to mobilise in favour of, against, or proposing policies. A notable example is the recent history of taxes in Ghana. During times when governments had large levels of "public goodwill" after winning elections, efforts to increase revenue met with little overt popular resistance. The adoption of extensive taxing measures, on the other hand, was noticeably more difficult to undertake when there was widespread disapproval of the administration or significant political disagreement between parties. This supports the idea that tax willingness and public opinions of politics are strongly related.

Another essential aspect of governance that has a big impact on the state's power and capability is taxation. It has the capacity to significantly and uniquely reshape the relationship between the state and society, sometimes acting as an essential catalyst for public demands for responsiveness and responsibility. States may offer security and public amenities with the use of tax income, potentially in a progressive and redistributive way. In light of the fact that "politics matters," international development organisations may utilise the topic of taxation to not only provide technical assistance but also help for successful state-building [2], [3].

A contemporary nation state's ability to extract resources is a key characteristic. As a result, by increasing the state's knowledge base and geographical scope, taxes and the administrative framework needed to support it aid in state-building. For instance, agricultural taxes typically led to the state's geographical reach being increased and political parties being connected to rural interest groups, even though they weren't always an efficient strategy for fostering output development. Since more than 80% of total tax revenues often come from these sources, it is critical to increase tax capacity outside of the capital or major city.

The variety of the tax base is a good measure of the state's capacity to interact with various areas and industries, as well as the extent to which the state's power pervades society. By effectively seizing these resources, the central government in unstable and post-conflict nations like the DRC and Afghanistan not only expands its source of income but also stifles competition from competing taxes by local political leaders or warlords. Taxation and security policy are often linked in this manner.

Create tax structures to increase the state's economic and administrative capacities. The primary barrier preventing states from raising money via general and direct taxes is often

characterised as administrative restrictions. However, a deeper examination indicates that constrained taxing capability is often the purposeful outcome of political agreements and elite deals. Providing economic rents, often in the form of tax exemptions, is one of the key ways that political stability and order are maintained, notably in Africa. Tax systems and taxing patterns in many nations provide a window into the character of political systems, and tax collecting capability reflects the nature of politics and elite deals.

DISCUSSION

Production tactics have an impact on taxation capacity as well. States have a tendency to prioritise the growth and development of those industries and activities that will bring in the greatest money. Privatisation and mining contracts that only require modest royalty rates from multinationals in order to attract foreign direct investment are often to blame for the tax base's underwhelming growth. Examples of countries with low real tax growth, particularly in business taxes, are Zambia and Mozambique.

International financial institutions and aid donors have developed the theory that revenue collection authorities in weak states are more effective when they operate independently from the state and particularly the finance ministry when they behave as a business at arms-length from the government rather than as a department within the government administration. Evidence, however, shows that the creation of independent revenue agencies does not always result in a noticeable or long-lasting increase in the efficiency of tax administrations. Although it may not have much of an impact long term, it may suggest and promote change. Despite the term being frequently used, independent revenue authorities differ greatly, particularly in how they interact with political authorities. They often only have true autonomy from governments when they can prove that doing so is in the latter's best interests [4], [5].

Taxation and the Shadow Economy

The issue of taxing the informal sector has been a recurring issue for several governments in the South. The informal economy is by definition unregulated by the government. Taxing the informal economy means formalising it, which is a challenge for state formation rather than merely a technological one. In many of the world's poorest nations, the informal sector may account for over 80% of all economic activity, and informal companies are not necessarily tiny or in need of funding. Additionally, since informality seems to be expanding both totally and proportionally in the majority of developing nations, the state's ability to provide fundamental services for the poor is being weakened. The informal economy is often undertaxed and virtually always subject to arbitrary taxation. There hasn't been much advancement in this field over the last 20 years in emerging nations' tax administration reform. Many 'traditional' methods and experiences, particularly in Africa, may be more broadly applicable when trying to identify politically viable approaches of taxing the unorganized sector.

Local Government and Taxes

Create tax structures that bolster local government power. In underdeveloped nations, property taxes are often underutilised. Land and property taxes, however, play a particularly significant role as local governments seek to increase income in the context of decentralisation changes. In medium-sized and bigger towns and cities, there is a particularly good opportunity to increase effective taxes. One of the few important potential sources of revenue for local governments is property and land taxes. The case for involving a central government agency in property tax assessments to lessen the influence of local elites is

stronger the smaller the jurisdiction (such as the cities of Kampala, Dar es Salaam, and Managua) is.218 Property taxes have the potential to provide the financing for urban infrastructure investment, which is essential to enhancing the production and export capacity of light manufacturing plants, many of which are found in urban centres. Additionally, they might act as a catalyst for the development of urban property databases, which can enhance the interplay between local taxes and urban planning.

Tax Effort and Dependence on Aid

There is a considerable connection between domestic taxes and overseas assistance. Given the dependence of many low-income nations on help, donor policies should work to increase the incentives for government officials to increase tax collection efforts. Donors should refrain from evading taxes and social service delivery by the government. According to research on Afghanistan, if assistance were to flow via the central government, it would do more to strengthen the country's ability for policy planning and implementation. In Afghanistan now, there is a parallel public sector, with most expenditures done directly by donors and just a tiny part passing via the budget and parliamentary processes. This includes spending on procurement, payments, and service delivery. While providing services internationally could be more successful and efficient in the short run, state-building is more likely to suffer in the long run. Through a centrally managed fiscal system, the state is unable to establish reciprocal ties and mutual commitments with interest groups.

Since many project aid inflows remain off-budget and are not reported to the Ministry of Finance, they can cause problems for revenue projections. To the extent that the budget is a political flashpoint, donors could improve accountable governance by mandating that project aid be reported by line ministries to the finance ministry. Take into account how taxes might enhance true nation ownership by serving as the "matching funds to aid" for regional political agendas. The connection between domestic taxes and overseas assistance has to be carefully considered. Given how heavily many low-income nations rely on assistance, donor policies must strengthen the incentives for political leaders to increase tax collecting efforts. The data points to the need for donors to sign a multi-year agreement with the post-conflict government that commits them to provide matching amounts for direct budget assistance. If contributors match a portion of the money the government raises up to a certain amount, the matching funds strategy may allay these worries. As the government's ability to generate income grows, the matching proportion may gradually decline. The key benefit of this strategy is that it improves the incentives for tax collection since state authorities will be aware that earning more money will result in more donations coming in [6].

The strategy of matching funding can: Tighten the connection between rising taxes and rising spending. Increase the level of certainty to encourage developing better cash-flow abilities in the treasury. Shorten the time that ministers spend contacting and convincing funders to convert pledges of assistance into payments. A strategy like this encourages those in positions of authority to implement changes that may strengthen the capability and state. Create tax structures that encourage political responsibility. One key nexus that links state officials' interests with those of interest groups and individuals is taxation. When taxation serves as a focal point around which interest groups (such as producer organisations, labour unions, and consumer groups) may organise to support, oppose, and even propose tax policies, it improves government accountability. Strong evidence supports the idea that accountability effects occur in modern-day African nations in reaction to changes in the amount and prominence of tax demands as well as the source of government revenue. Increased political demands from governments result from their increased domestic tax demands, which they use

to explain to voters and politicians why they need more money and to entice them with promises of reciprocity.

Detailed data from Ghana demonstrates that the difficulty of obtaining tax income does result in a negotiation process between the government and society. Over the last 20 years, tax disputes seem to have had a considerable impact on political changes. Small business tax demonstrations were among the first indications of public opposition to the Rawlings dictatorship. Only by designating the money for well-liked public expenditure initiatives have progressive administrations been able to enact new tax legislation. Disputes over taxes have sparked the creation or growth of a number of significant civil society organisation. Additionally, a significant contributor to the government's election failure in 2000 was its inability to increase money in the late 1990s in the face of widespread resistance.

Although there seems to be a direct link between taxes and accountability, it's crucial to recognise the influence of other variables. These include the overall condition of politics, the function of elites, the ability of civil society to mobilise, the justifications for the tax hike, and the specific tax in issue. Although certain tax changes have made responsibility seem to be quite apparent, true accountability is less assured and mainly depends on the ongoing monitoring function of citizen organisations. These initiatives seem to be regularly mediated by elite political forces in Ghana right now, raising concerns about citizen organisations' independence and capacity to successfully demand responsibility over taxation problems. Taxation may mobilise the populace and pressure the government to make significant concessions to the public interest, but these beneficial effects are dependent on the political and social environment.

Taxation and Unfairness

Recognise the areas where redistribution that addresses politically unstable inequities might increase legitimacy via taxes. Any exit plan from assistance must start with an efficient tax system. In order to support economic growth and development, governments must be able to provide sustainable financing for social programmes and public investments. In order to maintain these institutions and initiatives, domestic resources are required since assistance often declines over time and is frequently unstable. Fiscal measures that are well thought out may be useful instruments for addressing social and economic inequality. Inequality between people or families (vertical inequality) and inequality between groups (horizontal inequality) are two separate types of inequality that may be addressed through fiscal policy (the quantity and composition of a government's taxes and spending). When it comes to resolving social and economic inequities, taxes are especially important. By becoming more progressive, the tax system may directly reduce inequality, as well as indirectly by generating more income to support spending aimed at eradicating inequality [7], [8].

Raising taxes has political implications as well, which are particularly significant in post-conflict nations and metropolitan regions. Taxpayers have a stake in the government, especially representative government, and feel they do. The urban middle class must be persuaded that it is worthwhile for the state to collect its taxes. In order to integrate taxes and welfare, as well as to collect and spend money, there must be an urban emphasis. People will avoid paying taxes if they do not see any advantages in urban areas, particularly in security and basic health.

<div align="center">

CONCLUSION

</div>

It is critical to make sure that tax systems are equitable and inclusive. For a society to grow fairly, progressive tax systems and policies that lessen the tax burden on the most vulnerable

and underprivileged groups are essential. Additionally, including people in tax policy debates, fostering openness in taxation collection and use, and bolstering accountability systems promote confidence and public involvement in government. In conclusion, taxes is an effective tool for creating states since it enables administrations to raise money, improve governance, and foster economic growth. States may lessen their reliance on outside financing sources, promote independence, and create solid and durable institutions by developing efficient tax systems that are fair, transparent, and inclusive. However, tackling the problems with taxes requires extensive changes, global collaboration, and a dedication to equity and inclusion. States can build the basis for equitable governance and sustainable development by using the potential of taxes.

REFERENCES

[1]   Y. Xu and X. Xu, 'Taxation and state-building: The tax reform under the Nationalist Government in China, 1928-1949', *Accounting, Organ. Soc.*, 2016, doi: 10.1016/j.aos.2015.10.008.

[2]   D. Rodríguez-Franco, 'Internal Wars, Taxation, and State Building', *Am. Sociol. Rev.*, 2016, doi: 10.1177/0003122415615903.

[3]   W. Prichard, 'Taxation and State Building: Towards a Governance Focused Tax Reform Agenda', *IDS Work. Pap.*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.2040-0209.2010.00341_2.x.

[4]   M. Everest-Phillips, 'State-building taxation for developing countries: Principles for reform', *Dev. Policy Rev.*, 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7679.2010.00475.x.

[5]   D. A. Bräutigam, 'Introduction: Taxation and state-building in developing countries', in *Taxation and State-Building in Developing Countries: Capacity and Consent*, 2008. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511490897.001.

[6]   O. H. Fjeldstad and M. P. Moore, 'Taxation and state-building: Poor countries in a globalised world', *Work. Pap. - Chr. Michelsen Inst.*, 2007.

[7]   D. A. Bräutigam, O. H. Fjeldstad, and M. Moore, *Taxation and state-building in developing countries: Capacity and consent*. 2008. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511490897.

[8]   M. R. Revkin, 'What explains taxation by resource-rich rebels? Evidence from the islamic state in Syria', *J. Polit.*, 2020, doi: 10.1086/706597.

<center>CHAPTER 22</center>

<center>GOVERNMENT AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT</center>

Prof. Rita Arora, Director
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: ritaarora@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

One of the most important factors in comprehending the sources of success is the connection between governmental activity and economic growth. The significance of competent governance in fostering economic growth and sustainability is examined in this abstract. It looks at the different ways that governments affect economic results, identifies important elements of governance that support sustainable development, and stresses the significance of inclusive and responsible governance for long-term prosperity. Governments are essential in fostering an atmosphere that fosters economic growth. Governments influence the economic environment, encourage investment, and support commercial operations via the creation and execution of laws, regulations, and plans. They provide the legislative and regulatory frameworks that safeguard property rights, guarantee the performance of contracts, and create a stable economic environment that promotes initiative and innovation. However, obstacles still stand in the way of good governance for economic growth. Sustainable development is hampered by weak institutional capability, corruption, unstable policies, and a lack of cooperation amongst government departments. These problems must be overcome, and key approaches include creating reliable institutions, investing in capacity building, fostering openness, and making evidence-based policy decisions.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Economic, Government, Growth.

<center>INTRODUCTION</center>

There has been a great deal of study and discussion on policies related to the link between government and economic growth. This study examines the many relationships, frameworks for policymaking, and consequences for both established and developing countries in order to give a thorough overview of the role of government in economic growth. It explains the complicated dynamics and difficulties governments encounter in promoting sustainable economic development and prosperity by examining theoretical viewpoints, empirical data, and important debates on the subject. The discussion of theoretical frameworks explaining the function of government in economic growth opens the review. It contrasts the perspectives of developmental economists and neoclassical economists, who argue for different roles for government in directing economic activity and resolving market failures. Neoclassical economists emphasise minimum government involvement and laissez-faire policies. The relevance of institutions and governance in determining how successful government interventions are also highlighted in the report.

The next section of the paper explores the numerous ways that governments influence the economy to foster economic growth. It examines how the government can promote innovation and entrepreneurship, provide public services and infrastructure, and create business-friendly environments. The analysis points out the benefits of government interventions, including how they lessen information asymmetry, deal with externalities, and

foster social inclusion and fairness. Economic growth depends heavily on policy frameworks, and this analysis looks at some of the important areas where governments have a big say. It talks about macroeconomic policies that try to contain inflation, stabilise the economy, and encourage investment. These policies include fiscal and monetary ones. The effects of sector-specific policies on the structure and course of economic activity, such as industrial policy, trade policies, and investment incentives, are also examined.

The assessment also discusses the social and environmental aspects of economic growth that governments need to take into account. In order to guarantee that the advantages of economic growth are fairly distributed, it highlights the significance of policies encouraging inclusive growth, poverty reduction, social security programmes, and human capital development. The study also emphasises the role played by governments in tackling issues like climate change mitigation and the management of sustainable resources. The effects of government involvement in economic growth are examined, along with any dangers and difficulties that may arise. The assessment looks at problems including rent-seeking, inconsistency in policy, political instability, and corruption that might obstruct good governance and economic development. The relevance of good governance practises, openness, accountability, and institutional changes in resolving these issues is also covered in the study [1], [2].

The study uses empirical data from several nations and areas to provide a comprehensive understanding of the intricate connection between political structure and economic growth. It examines both success and failure tales while underlining the contextual elements that influence how government initiatives turn out. A consideration of new developments, such as how technology, globalisation, and international collaboration are influencing government policy and how that has an influence on economic growth, finishes the overview. In conclusion, this review paper offers a thorough examination of the function of government in economic growth. It draws attention to the many interconnections, theoretical underpinnings, and effects on both established and developing economies. The review adds to a fuller understanding of the complex dynamics and difficulties encountered by governments in their efforts to promote sustainable economic development and prosperity by evaluating theoretical views, empirical facts, and important debates [3].

For economic growth to be fair and sustainable, inclusive governance is crucial. Long-term prosperity is a result of governments placing a high priority on social inclusion, addressing inequality, and making investments in human capital development. Ensuring that people have access to high-quality programmes for social welfare, healthcare, and education allows them to fully engage in economic activity, which promotes productivity and creativity. Additionally, inclusive government promotes societal well-being through reducing disputes, promoting social cohesiveness, and fostering social cohesion. For economic progress, the government's participation in infrastructure development is crucial. Investments in communication, energy, and transportation networks promote market access, boost connectedness, and lower transaction costs.

Governments may be crucial in organising public-private partnerships and allocating funds to support infrastructure development, which will in turn boost economic activity and draw in investment. Fostering an atmosphere that is favourable to foreign commerce and investment is another aspect of effective governance. Businesses have more opportunity to grow internationally when their governments adopt open and liberal trade policies, take part in regional and international trade agreements, and simplify border and customs processes. Additionally, via investment promotion programmes, incentives, and open investment rules, governments may actively entice foreign direct investment. The traditional strategy for enhancing the investment environment may have the proper long-term objectives, but the

tactics it uses to get there are dubious since in actuality, such strict regulations seldom succeed.

DISCUSSION

Political aspects of economic expansion: Why does economic development often succeed in "wrong" circumstances yet frequently fail in "right" institutional settings? The link between governmental power and private capital operates in highly industrialised nations under generally recognised formal standards, and interactions are often indirect and impersonal. However, a lengthy history of political turmoil and socioeconomic upheaval led to these arrangements. They are difficult to duplicate and may not be a good short-term solution to encourage investment in poor nations. Therefore, policy recommendations have been determined to be as follows:

It is simple to provide national politicians with a list of "orthodox" changes necessary to replicate the existing situations in industrialised nations, such as enhancing the legal protection of property, creating legally binding economic contracts, and cutting "red tape".It's challenging to explain how to really put some of these ideas into practise within the average five-year tenure of an administration.It is impossible to predict whether significant improvements in investment and growth would occur even if the government managed to enact the measures. Without the ideal institutions in place, it is impossible to understand why certain parts of the globe have had high levels of investment and economic progress.

Do not undervalue the influence of informal connections on the investing environment. Reforms of the "investment climate" often depend more on formal norms than on unofficial connections. Focusing on institutional change is necessary in order to ensure the legal protection of property rights and the enforcement of business contracts, for example. The long-term objectives of this "orthodox" approach to enhancing the investment environment may be sound, but the strategies and tactics used to get there are dubious since in actuality such formal regulations seldom "work." The traditional investment climate approach recommends adjustments, although doing so is often challenging [4], [5].

Know your history and avoid putting the horse before the wagon. Formal legal institutions may not be impartial or effective in situations where the quality of public institutions is poor, where governments may be unstable, capricious, or solely represent certain interests and hence lack credibility. Governments may be attempting to achieve too much, too soon, by enacting relatively ambitious but uniformed reform agendas. Therefore, although a lax legal and regulatory environment may discourage international investors with inadequate political connections, it is not a deterrent for local businessmen with strong political connections. Such domestic investors often develop into the most powerful and important constituencies over time, pushing true, locally 'owned' politics and, therefore, genuine transformation. Consequently, it is more important to understand how institutions like the "rule of law" or property rights grow in response to actual political demand rather than seeing OECD-type formal institutional arrangements for an investment environment as a necessity for a market economy. This necessitates that policy-makers have a far better understanding of both economic theory and the actual processes that led to economic development in today's industrialized nations.

Study examples of 'unorthodox' development success. The clearest illustration of success in the "wrong" setting may be the spectacular rise in the Chinese economy over the last two decades. China has benefited from significant investment levels that have been fueled by investment circumstances that are considerably unlike from and even in some ways in opposition to the traditional rule of law formal policies and institutional arrangements that are

recommended by the majority of international organisations. When China initially allowed foreign investment, there was a dearth of commercial law, few courts to enforce it, and weak property rights as they were typically understood. ones, particularly Chinese ones, remained undaunted, nevertheless. The highly centralised institutional framework was used and manipulated by the Chinese government in order to provide investors suitable guarantees. Strong political commitment was shown by the reformist leaders, and competitive markets were only gradually incorporated.

It was often local government-owned businesses that made the initial investments in the non-state sector, which facilitated the eventual development of individual capitalists who remained members of the Communist Party. Local governments' ownership of new businesses (as units of the Party) offered significant defence against possible extortion from higher echelons of government and concentrated political efforts on chances to foster economic development. This obviously refutes the idea that limiting governmental authority is necessary for a favourable business environment. Policymakers in China and Vietnam took advantage of and influenced the interactions between the various levels of the state to make it appealing to investors.

China's involvement as an emerging investor in Africa looks to be less state-driven than generally believed since it has itself supported investment in a state-driven way. The popular understanding that the investment was mostly resource-focused, carried out by large State-Owned Enterprises, and motivated by Chinese state objectives rather than market forces has been refuted by research in three African nations and eight Chinese provinces. Instead, the research demonstrates the value of Chinese small and medium-sized enterprises in Africa. Therefore, the idea of a Chinese "top-down model" has to be tempered, and more positive interactions might support the development objectives of both China and Africa.

Relationships, Power and Economic Development

Realise the importance of power relations for both political and economic progress. The differences in investment success across sectors or areas within a single nation demonstrate the significant role that relatively short-term, often transitory, personal ties between politicians and investors played in explaining various results. A study of the political economy of two Indonesian cities demonstrated how relationship-based collaboration, as opposed to rule-based cooperation, between government officials and local businesses provides a useful mechanism to increase investment in areas with poor governance. However, it also implies that, in order to maintain development over the medium run, institutions based on norms could be required.

Another research looked at how relationships between public officials and private investors affected national investment results in Egypt. Along with regulatory and other changes, the informal relationships between policymakers and private investors contributed to an increase in productive private investment in Egypt after 2004, when the regime appointed business leaders to the cabinet and made economic expansion a top political priority. Then, where corporate and political leaders already had tight relationships, investment flourished in certain industries. Although informal state-business links were not the only direct factor in the rise in private investment, the study indicated that they were crucial in triggering the explosive growth of some industries. When there was a shared awareness of the issues and a desire to find solutions, these relationships became productive. This gave room to develop industry-specific solutions. As a result, investors had fewer challenges and dangers and had a better chance of making a profit, and the image of politicians and policymakers who promoted development and job creation was improved. Of course, these informal interactions aren't

always favourable depending on the political environment. In Nicaragua, the government seems to be neglecting the larger global economic environment in favour of monopolies over protected sections of the local market, rather than promoting economic progress [6].

Even while more inclusive and formalised procedures may be required to maintain it over the long run, informal connections and exclusive deals might assist increase investment in the short term. However, informal connections may - and have in the past - helped the emergence of more law-based economic governance. They also encourage effective collaboration between political and economic power, which improves economic development and employment creation. Because it suggests short- to medium-term ways to change incentives and increase productive dialogue between public officials and private investors, policymakers should understand that informal arrangements can offer effective transitional ways of increasing productive investment. Additionally, according to the results, external organisations must acknowledge that they have little direct control over these crucial but unofficial procedures. Furthermore, promoting changes that improve the "ease of doing business" or the normative investment environment of the OECD may even be ineffective in specific political economic circumstances [7].

Natural Resources

Helping to manage natural resources in a way that is politically appropriate: Only when income sharing agreements have the backing of political leaders are formal processes successful. Formal methods of managing natural resource earnings, such as earmarking, decentralisation, or independent monitoring agencies, only function when political elites are on board with the revenue sharing arrangements.240 Oil windfalls and other unexpected discoveries of natural resources do not always herald the start of a "resource curse" that results in dishonest government. The political economics of Venezuela's economic development since the discovery of oil in 1920, for instance, demonstrates how Venezuelan usage of oil "rents" results in dramatically different affects on productivity and growth.

Encourage both Political Stability and Economic Growth

Encourage economic development and employment creation in unstable nations while also bolstering the legitimacy of the government. A different political economic paradigm is provided by the Venezuelan instance to explain how politics has shaped the significant variances in economic development over the last century. It contends that the degree to which the political process has made the nation's development objectives and political settlements compatible explains both Venezuela's growth and deterioration. This political economics of industrial strategy and economic development is far from unique; it is relevant to Latin America and beyond. It also holds true in unstable regimes where promoting the productive economic sectors requires a political solution that promotes development. This is especially true in the fields of agriculture and cattle, because doing so helps to advance the economy, provide employment, and strengthen governmental control [8].

CONCLUSION

Economic progress is significantly influenced by effective government. Institutions of transparent and accountable government increase confidence, draw in investment, and combat corruption, giving firms a fair playing field. Stability is promoted and ideal circumstances for growth are created by prudent fiscal and monetary policies, which are part of sound macroeconomic management. The ease of doing business is facilitated by effective regulatory and governmental administration, and businesses have less administrative load. In conclusion, it is impossible to overestimate the importance of government in economic

progress. For an environment to be conducive to investment, innovation, and fair development, effective governance, characterised by inclusive, transparent, and accountable practises, is essential. Sustainable prosperity is a result of governments placing a high priority on infrastructure development, promoting international commerce and investment, and making investments in human capital. Unlocking the full potential of government in supporting economic growth requires addressing governance issues and implementing good governance practises.

REFERENCES

[1]   C. Diebolt and R. Hippe, 'The long-run impact of human capital on innovation and economic development in the regions of Europe', *Appl. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/00036846.2018.1495820.

[2]   M. V. L. Badgett, K. Waaldijk, and Y. van der M. Rodgers, 'The relationship between LGBT inclusion and economic development: Macro-level evidence', *World Dev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.03.011.

[3]   J. B. Carr and R. C. Feiock, 'Metropolitan government and economic development', *Urban Aff. Rev.*, 1999, doi: 10.1177/10780879922184031.

[4]   H. Hasdinawati, E. Ernawati, and A. Wahid, 'The Role of The Village Government in the Economic Development of Fisherman Communities in Pulau Harapan Village', *J. Ad'ministrare*, 2021, doi: 10.26858/ja.v8i1.18023.

[5]   Peterson, *et al.*, 'Changes of Government and Economic Development: is There an Interconnection?', *J. Institutional Stud.*, 2021, doi: 10.17835/2076-6297.2021.13.1.060-075.

[6]   C. Wang, Y. S. Kim, and C. Y. Kim, 'Causality between logistics infrastructure and economic development in China', *Transp. Policy*, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.tranpol.2020.10.005.

[7]   M. Turner, S. Sermcheep, S. Anantasirijkiat, and P. Srisangnam, 'Small and medium-sized enterprises in Thailand: government policy and economic development', *Asia Pacific J. Public Adm.*, 2016, doi: 10.1080/23276665.2016.1256545.

[8]   N. M. K. Lam, 'Business-government relationship in economic development', *Asian Educ. Dev. Stud.*, 2016, doi: 10.1108/AEDS-08-2016-0067.

CHAPTER 23

CONCEPT OF POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Shavya Singh, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: shavyasingh@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

Political development is a broad notion that includes the procedures, structures, and results of societal political change. The notion of political development is examined in this abstract, emphasising its major aspects, theories, and ramifications. In order to promote political growth and stability, it highlights the significance of competent governance, democratic institutions, and public engagement. Political development includes changes to the rule of law, power structures, and decision-making processes as well as the growth and transition of political systems. It entails the creation of democratic institutions including fair and free elections, an independent judiciary, transparent government, and a commitment to human rights. Political growth depends on robust institutions and effective governance, both of which support inclusive communities. Theories of political development provide insightful information about the variables and procedures that influence political growth. According to modernization theory, economic and political progress are inextricably intertwined, with socioeconomic achievements raising expectations for political responsibility and engagement. The idea of democratic transition places a strong emphasis on the role of civil society involvement, institutional changes, and the spread of democratic principles in promoting political growth.

KEYWORDS:

Accountability, Economic, Law, Politics, Rule.

INTRODUCTION

Political growth has a big impact on the stability and well-being of society. It improves political representation and public engagement, ensuring that many viewpoints are taken into consideration throughout decision-making processes. By offering tools for nonviolent dispute resolution and societal division management, it promotes political stability and social cohesiveness. Additionally, political development supports the progress of democratic principles, social fairness, and human rights protection. Many cultures face difficulties and barriers to the development of their political systems. The advancement of political development may be hampered by authoritarian governments, political corruption, inadequate institutions, and low civic involvement. It is necessary to promote openness, establish a culture of political responsibility, and build democratic institutions in order to overcome these obstacles. In order to support political development initiatives, international assistance, capacity building, and information exchange may be very important.

Why all civilizations are susceptible to political deterioration; the three pillars of political development the state, the rule of law, and accountability; the design for the book; and the benefits of having a well-balanced political system. Political development is the evolution of political structures through time. This is distinct from changes in politics or policy because although presidents, prime ministers, and lawmakers may change office and laws may be

amended, a political order is defined by the fundamental principles that guide how societies are organised [1].

The state, the application of the law, and the systems of accountability were the three fundamental types of institutions that made up a political order. The state is a centralised, hierarchical organisation that has exclusive use of legal power over a certain region. States may be more or less impersonal in addition to having traits like complexity and adaptability: early states were similar to the ruler's home and were referred to be "patrimonial" because they supported and operated via the ruler's family and friends. The public interest of the whole community is distinguished from the rulers' personal interests in modern, more advanced governments. They work to provide citizens with a more impersonal level of service by hiring impartial personnel, enforcing impartial laws, and implementing impartial policies.

There are several ways to define the rule of law, including straightforward law and order, the protection of property rights and contractual obligations, or the contemporary Western view of human rights, which includes equal rights for women and members of racial and ethnic minorities. Instead, it serves as a set of guidelines for conduct that are obligatory on even the most influential political figures in the society, such as monarchs, presidents, and prime ministers. These guidelines represent a wide agreement among the community. Even if rules are enforced consistently to the rest of society, the rule of law cannot exist if rulers are free to alter them to suit their own needs. A distinct judicial institution that has the ability to operate independently of the government is often required for a rule of law to be successful. According to this definition, the rule of law is not connected to any specific substantive body of legislation, such as those that are now in effect in the United States or Europe. Rule of law existed in ancient Israel, India, the Muslim world, and the Christian West as a check on governmental authority. It is important to differentiate between the rule of law and what is sometimes referred to as "rule by law." In the latter scenario, legislation serves as a representation of the king's orders but is not enforceable against the sovereign himself. As we shall see, rule by law may sometimes start to satisfy some of the purposes of the rule of law by limiting the ruler's discretionary power as it becomes more institutionalised, regular, and visible.

Accountability entails that the government responds to the common good, as defined by Aristotle, rather than merely to its own narrow self-interest. Today, accountability is most often defined in terms of procedural accountability, i.e., regular free and fair multiparty elections that provide the people the power to elect and remove their leaders. However, accountability may also take a substantive form. Leaders don't always have to follow the rules in order to be held accountable. Aristotle differentiated between monarchy and tyranny in his work Politics because the responsiveness of unelected rulers might vary drastically. However, there is often a close relationship between procedural and substantive accountability since unrestrained rulers, even if they are receptive to the common good, can seldom be relied upon to stay that way indefinitely. The majority of the time, when we use the phrase "accountability," we are referring to contemporary democracy as characterised by the processes that make the governments accountable to their constituents. But we must keep in mind that correct substantive outcomes are not always the consequence of excellent methods [2], [3].

The state's institutions serve to concentrate power and provide the populace access to it so they may use it to uphold the law, maintain the peace, protect themselves from external threats, and deliver essential public services. Contrarily, the rule of law and accountability procedures restrain the state's authority and make sure that it is only used under strict

supervision and with consent. The wonder of contemporary politics is that we may have powerful, competent political orders that are also restricted to operate only within the bounds set by the rule of law and democratic choice.

These three types of institutions may exist separately from one another and in diverse combinations in distinct polities. Consequently, the People's Republic of China has a robust and well-developed state but nothing in the way of democracy or strong legal systems. Singapore has a state and a system of law, but its democracy is severely constrained. In addition to having democratic elections, Russia also has a state that is effective at quelling dissent but less effective at providing services and a lax rule of law. Even though the latter two have had democratic elections, many failed nations, such as Somalia, Haiti, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the early 21st century, have weak or nonexistent governments and a rule of law. The state, the rule of law, and procedural accountability are all present in some balance in a politically evolved liberal democracy, in contrast. A dictatorship is a strong state that lacks meaningful balances; a weak state that is restrained by several minor political factions is ineffectual and often unstable.

Even the most ruthless dictators today would not claim, as did certain early monarchs or sultans, that they truly "owned" their nations and could do as they pleased. Everyone acknowledges that there is a difference between public and private interests. As a result, patrimonialism has given way to a phenomenon known as "neopatrimonialism," in which political leaders pretend to run contemporary nations with bureaucracies, legal frameworks, elections, and the like while really ruling for their own benefit. Election campaigns may emphasise the public good, but the state is not impersonal: favours are given to networks of political supporters in return for votes or rally attendance. From Nigeria to Mexico to Indonesia, this pattern of behaviour may be seen. The term "limited access order," coined by Douglass North, John Wallis, and Barry Weingast, describes neopatrimonialism as a coalition of rent-seeking elites using their political influence to thwart open competition in both the political and economic spheres. James Robinson and Daron Acemoglu both use the word "extractive" to refer to the same phenomena. All governments at one point in time in human history might be categorised as patrimonial, access-restrictive, or extractive.

How such political systems ever become contemporary states did is the issue. The writers previously mentioned do a better job of explaining the transition than they do of offering a dynamic theory of change. We'll see that a number of factors are working to modernise the state. Military rivalry has traditionally been a significant one because it produces incentives that are significantly more effective than economic self-interest in spurring political change. The social mobilisation sparked by industrialisation served as a second force for transformation. New social groupings are created as a result of economic expansion, and these groups eventually organise for group action and attempt to engage in politics. Modern states are not necessarily the result of this process, although they sometimes are and have been [4], [5].

DISCUSSION

Decay in Politics

Political institutions advance in accordance with Samuel Huntington's concept by becoming increasingly sophisticated, flexible, independent, and cohesive. He counters that they may

likewise deteriorate. Institutions are developed to address specific societal demands, such as waging war, resolving economic disputes, and policing social conduct. However, since they are recurrent patterns of behaviour, they run the risk of becoming inflexible and unable to alter when the original conditions change. Human behaviour has an innate conservatism that causes people to give institutions emotional value once they are in existence. It will be very difficult to replace the British Monarchy, the American Constitution, the Japanese emperor, or any other institution with something newer and better.

In addition to institutions' inability to adjust to changing conditions, there is another factor contributing to political degradation. Kin selection and reciprocal altruism, or the desire for family and friends, are the foundations of natural human sociability. Elites in most cultures often rely on networks of family and friends, both as a means of preserving their positions and as the recipients of their labours, despite the fact that contemporary political institutions strive to encourage impersonal authority. Elites are considered to have "captured" the state when they are successful, which diminishes its legitimacy and decreases its accountability to the general populace. Long stretches of stability and prosperity often provide the circumstances for elite capture to expand, which may trigger a political crisis if it is followed by a decline in the economy or an external political shock.

The mighty Han Dynasty of China fell in the third century A.D. when wealthy families reclaimed control of the government, continuing to rule Chinese politics during the succeeding Sui and Tang Dynasties. When the slave-rulers started having families and caring for their own children, the Mamluk authority in Egypt, which was based on Turkish slave-soldiers, fell. The same thing happened to the Sephahis and Janissaries, the cavalry and infantry upon which Ottoman supremacy was based. From the middle of the seventeenth century on, France's Old Regime attempted to create a modern, centralised government. However, the monarchy's ongoing financial requirements compelled it to corrupt its administration by overtly selling public posts to affluent people, a practise known as venality.

Political degradation may affect modern liberal democracies just as it does other kinds of governments. Although it is unlikely that any modern society would ever totally return to a tribal one, we are surrounded by instances of "tribalism" on a daily basis, from street gangs to patronage cliques and influence peddling at the highest levels of contemporary politics. In spite of the fact that everyone in a contemporary democracy speaks the language of equality, many people are content to accept privilege in the form of exclusive exemptions, subsidies, or advantages for themselves, their loved ones, and their friends. According to some academics, responsible political systems contain mechanisms for self-correction that guard against disintegration. If governments don't function well or corrupt elites seize power, the general populace may simply vote them out of office. There have been instances like this throughout the development of contemporary democracy. However, there is no assurance that this self-correction will take place. This might be due to the nonelites' disorganised nature or a misinterpretation of their own interests. Institutional conservatism often makes change impossible. Either steadily rising levels of corruption and proportionally decreasing levels of government efficiency result from this form of political degradation, or violent populist responses to perceived elite influence [6].

The first part of this book outlined the history of the American and French Revolutions via the establishment of the state, the rule of law, and democratic accountability. These uprisings signalled the emergence of all three types of institutions what we refer to as liberal democracy somewhere in the globe. The dynamics of their relationship up to the beginning of the twenty-first century will be followed in this book. The start of a third revolution, the Industrial Revolution, which was far more significant, occurs at the intersection of the two

volumes. The lengthy continuity patterns mentioned in the first book appear to imply that civilizations are constrained by their historical pasts, which will restrict their options for future forms of political organisation. This was a misinterpretation of the evolutionary narrative presented in that book, but as industrialization gains traction, any underlying historical determinism loses even more of its validity. The political, social, and intellectual facets of progress are intricately intertwined with one another. The next chapter will focus on these relationships.

The Industrial Revolution significantly accelerated the pace of development of per capita production in the countries it affected, a phenomenon with profound societal repercussions. The pace of change rose along all of the development aspects with sustained economic expansion. In the second century B.C., between the previous Han Dynasty. The fundamental characteristics of Chinese agricultural life and the structure of its political system didn't alter all that much between the Han Dynasty in the first two millennia A.D. and the Qing Dynasty in the eighteenth century A.D. Much more change would happen in the next two centuries than in the first two millennia. The twenty-first century sees a continuation of this quickening of change. Is it true that certain nations, like Germany, have contemporary, comparatively clean state administrations while others, like Greece and Italy, continue to struggle with clientelistic politics and high levels of corruption? And why was it possible for Britain and the United States to transform their 19th-century patronage-ridden public sectors into more contemporary merit-based bureaucracies?

As we will see, the response is, in some ways, depressing for democracy. The bureaucracies built by authoritarian nations in the name of national security are the most advanced in existence today. This was true of ancient China, as we saw in Volume 1, and it was also true of Prussia later to become the unifier of Germany, the leading example of modern bureaucratic government, whose poor geopolitical position obliged it to make up for it by developing an effective state administration. On the other side, nations that had early democratic transitions before setting up contemporary institutions found themselves with clientelistic public sectors. The United States, which opened the vote to all white men in the 1820s, was the first nation to suffer this destiny. Greece and Italy, who for various reasons never became powerful, contemporary governments prior to opening the franchise, were other examples of this.

Therefore, sequencing is quite important. Achieving high-quality governance has been significantly more difficult in nations where democracy came before the creation of modern states than it has been in nations that inherited modern states from the era of absolutism. After the arrival of democracy, state creation is still conceivable, but it often requires the mobilisation of fresh social actors and strong political leadership. This was the tale of the United States, where a combination comprised of commercial interests harmed by subpar governmental administration, western farmers opposed to crooked railway interests, and urban reformers who came from the rising middle and professional classes overcame clientelism [7], [8].

Strong, competent nations and democracy might also clash in another area. Nation building, or the development of shared national identities that act as a centre of allegiance that supersedes loyalties to family, tribe, region, or ethnic group, is ultimately the basis upon which states must be built. As in the case of modern public administration, strong national identity is frequently most effectively formed under authoritarian conditions. Nation building can sometimes bubble up from the grass roots, but it can also be the product of power politics—indeed, of terrible violence, as different groups are annexed, expelled, merged, moved, or "ethnically cleansed." Democratic societies that lack a strong sense of national

identity usually struggle to come to grips with a unifying national story. In truth, many of today's seemingly calm liberal democracies have benefited from decades of authoritarian control and protracted conflict in the past, which they have conveniently forgotten. Thankfully, there are other ways to achieve national unity than using violence. For example, identities may be changed to reflect the reality of power politics or built around broad ideals like democracy itself that reduce the exclusion of minorities from the society.

In the background of a non-Western world that had been largely colonised and overrun by the European powers, with the emergence, or nonemergence, of modern nations. Societies throughout Latin America, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa had developed their own forms of social and political organisation, but as soon as they came into contact with the West, they were suddenly faced with a fundamentally different system. In many instances, the colonial powers defeated, conquered, and enslaved these nations, wiping off the native populations through conflict and disease, and populating their territory with outsiders. However, even when the use of physical force was not a concern, the European style of governance eroded the authority of established institutions and sent many communities to a netherworld where they could neither be really traditional nor properly Westernised. Therefore, it is impossible to discuss institutional evolution in the non-Western world without including imported or foreign institutions.

Over the years, a variety of hypotheses have been put up to explain why institutions emerged differently in various regions of the globe. They were predetermined, according to some, by the physical factors of location and climate. According to economists, the exploitation of servile labour was encouraged by extractive sectors like mining and tropical agriculture that favoured big plantations owing to economies of scale. It was believed that these economic production methods produced authoritarian political regimes. Contrarily, places that encouraged family farming tended to promote political democracy by dividing money among the populace more fairly. An institution was "locked in" once it was created and continued to exist even after the initial geographic and climatic circumstances were no longer relevant.

However, there are still a lot of other elements than geography that affect political results. Postcolonial institutions were significantly impacted by the colonial powers' policies, the period of time they ruled, and the kind of resources they allocated to their colonies. The little Central American nation of Costa Rica should have turned into a classic banana republic, but it is now a pretty well-run democracy with strong export sectors and a crucial ecotourism industry. This is true of every generalisation about climate and geography. Contrarily, Argentina has been endowed with terrain and a climate comparable to that of North America, but despite this, it has become a developing nation prone to military dictatorship, extreme swings in economic performance, and populist misrule. Geographic determinism ultimately obscures the many ways that individuals in colonised nations exerted agency; despite foreign dominance, they played significant roles in forming their own institutions. Today's most prosperous non-Western nations are those that had the most advanced indigenous institutions before coming into touch with the West [9].

The disparity between East Asia and sub-Saharan Africa, the world's worst- and best-performing areas in terms of economic growth during the last 50 years, illustrates the nuanced causes for various development trajectories most starkly. Prior to interaction with the West, Sub-Saharan Africa had no robust national institutions at the state level. The late nineteenth-century "scramble for Africa" by the European colonial powers quickly revealed that their new colonies were barely covering the expense of their own administration. In response, Britain developed a strategy of indirect rule, which allowed it to make only a little financial commitment to the establishment of state institutions. Thus, rather than being an act

of commission, the horrific colonial legacy was one of omission. The colonial powers did not leave behind powerful institutions, least of all "absolutist" ones capable of infiltrating and dominating their populace, in contrast to places with more political investment like India and Singapore. Instead, countries with weak state histories saw their long-standing institutions undercut and were left with few alternatives to replace them. The area had an economic catastrophe in the generation that followed independence.

East Asia stands in stark contrast to this. As we've seen, China is the country that created the modern state and has the world's longest history of centralised administration. This custom was passed down to the neighbouring nations of Vietnam, Korea, and Japan. Japan was able to completely avoid colonisation by the West because to its robust governmental heritage. During the revolutions, wars, and occupations of the twentieth century in China, the state disintegrated and the tradition was seriously disturbed, but since 1978, the Communist Party has reconstructed it in a more contemporary manner. Effective public institutions have been the cornerstone of economic prosperity in East Asian nations. Asian nations have been designed around well-trained technocratic bureaucrats that have been allowed sufficient authority to direct economic growth while eschewing the kind of blatant corruption and predatory behaviour that have been hallmarks of governments in other parts of the globe.

Between these two extremes is where Latin America is located. Large pre-Columbian civilizations did exist, but the area never gave rise to strong state-level institutions like those seen in East Asia. Conquest and illness decimated preexisting political systems, and settlement groups that carried with them the authoritarian and mercantilist institutions then dominating in Spain and Portugal replaced them. The expansion of extractive industries and exploitative agriculture was aided by geography and climate. At this moment, much of Europe was authoritarian, but in Latin America, the hierarchies were also based on race and ethnicity. Even in Argentina, whose temperature, geography, and cultural makeup should have made it easier to achieve equality along North American lines, these traditions have shown to be very resilient.

Therefore, the makeup of the native state institutions existing before they came into contact with the West had a significant impact on the very different current development results in sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America, and East Asia. After a time of upheaval, those who had strong institutions before were able to rebuild them, while those who did not struggled longer. The colonial powers significantly influenced the spread of their own institutions, especially in areas where they could attract large numbers of people. Today's least developed regions are those that lacked strong native state institutions or ones that had been imported from settler-based regions.

CONCLUSION

Political growth is a dynamic, continuing process that calls for constant adjustment and advancement. It entails encouraging inclusive government, giving voice to disadvantaged groups, and encouraging citizen involvement in decision-making processes. Political polarisation, socioeconomic inequality, and the preservation of basic liberties are all challenges that should be addressed in the course of strengthening political growth. Political development, then, is the process through which political systems change and advance towards efficient government, democratic institutions, and citizen engagement. Political stability, social well-being, and the defence of human rights all depend on it. Societies may encourage political evolution and set the stage for inclusive, just, and stable political systems through fostering effective governance, democratic institutions, and citizen participation.

REFERENCES

[1]   S. C. Henneberg And N. J. O'shaughnessy, 'Theory And Concept Development In Political Marketing: Issues And An Agenda', *J. Polit. Mark.*, 2007, Doi: 10.1300/J199v06n02_02.

[2]   L. W. Pye, 'The Concept Of Political Development', *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 1965, Doi: 10.1177/000271626535800102.

[3]   S. Kumar, 'The Concept Of Political Development', *Polit. Stud.*, 1978, Doi: 10.1111/J.1467-9248.1978.Tb01308.X.

[4]   N. K. Han And G. S. Kim, 'Concept Development Of Political Competence For Nurses', *J. Korean Acad. Nurs.*, 2020, Doi: 10.4040/Jkan.2020.50.1.81.

[5]   M. Karimi And S. S. Darshan Singh, 'Political Development Concept By Looking Briefly At The Iran's Mohammad Reza Pahlavi Rule', *J. Public Adm. Gov.*, 2014, Doi: 10.5296/Jpag.V4i4.6627.

[6]   C. J. Kambites, '"Sustainable Development": The "Unsustainable" Development Of A Concept In Political Discourse', *Sustain. Dev.*, 2014, Doi: 10.1002/Sd.1552.

[7]   J. E. Lane And S. Ersson, 'Unpacking The Political Development Concept', *Polit. Geogr. Q.*, 1989, Doi: 10.1016/0260-9827(89)90003-7.

[8]   W. Schaffar, 'Alternative Development Concepts And Their Political Embedding: The Case Of Sufficiency Economy In Thailand', *Forum Dev. Stud.*, 2018, Doi: 10.1080/08039410.2018.1464059.

[9]   K. Von Vorys, 'Toward A Concept Of Political Development', *Ann. Am. Acad. Pol. Soc. Sci.*, 1965, Doi: 10.1177/000271626535800103.

CHAPTER 24

A BRIEF INTRODUCTION ON DEVELOPMENTAL DIMENSIONS

Dr. Anil Bundela, Assistant Professor
School of Education, Jaipur National University, Jaipur, India
Email Id: anilbundela@jnujaipur.ac.in

ABSTRACT:

The vast spectrum of interrelated elements that contribute to societal and economic advancement is included in the developmental aspects. This abstract examines the multifaceted nature of development by emphasising important elements and how they relate to one another. In order to achieve sustainable and equitable development, it emphasises the significance of addressing economic, social, environmental, and institutional factors. One of the main elements of the developmental aspects is economic development. It entails increasing entrepreneurship, innovation, and productivity as well as lowering poverty and inequality while creating strong and inclusive economic development. Effective macroeconomic management, infrastructure spending, and the construction of business environments that encourage both local and international investment are all necessary for sustainable economic growth. The social development is a crucial component of the developmental dimensions and includes topics like gender equality, social protection, healthcare, and education. Social advancement is facilitated through investments in human capital, guaranteeing access to high-quality healthcare and education, and resolving social inequities. strengthening a fair and equitable society also requires strengthening social cohesiveness, inclusive institutions, and participatory government. How the world evolved after 1800; the economic, social, and ideological elements of development; how political development fits into the greater picture of development; why Huntington's theory has to be adjusted but is still useful in interpreting events like the Arab Spring.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Economic, Growth, Social, Society.

INTRODUCTION

Sustainability in the environment is yet another crucial aspect of progress. Long-term wellbeing depends on striking a balance between economic development, environmental protection, and resource management. A resilient and ecologically sustainable future is facilitated by policies that support sustainable resource use, climate change mitigation and adaptation, and environmental conservation. Effective governance and development results are built on a foundation of institutional growth. Trust, stability, and successful service delivery are fostered by strong institutions that are characterised by the rule of law, openness, accountability, and good public administration. Achieving sustainable development objectives requires promoting good governance practises, combating corruption, and making sure institutions are efficient. The developmental aspects are linked and reinforce one another. While social development supports the creation of human capital and boosts economic productivity, economic growth may result in better social indices. Protecting natural resources and preserving the long-term viability of economic operations depend on environmental sustainability. Effective institutions foster social and economic advancement by creating a supportive environment for growth [1].

One facet of the larger phenomena of human socioeconomic growth is political development, which includes the evolution of the state, the rule of law, and democratic accountability. Political institution changes must be understood in the context of societal mobilisation, economic development, and the influence of notions about justice and legitimacy. In the years after the French and American Revolutions, the interactions between these several development-related characteristics underwent a significant transformation. Simply stated, persistent gains in production per person over time constitute economic progress. Since per capita GDP only considers money and ignores health, opportunity, justice, distribution, and many other factors of human flourishing, there are numerous disagreements among economists and other people as to whether this is an accurate approach to measure human well-being. For the time being, I wish to set these objections aside since per capita GDP has the benefit of being simple to understand and has been the subject of much research.

The emergence of new social groupings throughout time and modifications in the nature of the interactions between and among these groups are the focus of social mobilisation, the second crucial aspect of development. In order to organise for collective action, various segments of society must become aware that they are individuals with common interests or identities. Early in the nineteenth century, the most developed economies in the world Europe and China were still essentially agricultural cultures where the great majority of people worked as farmers and lived in tiny communities. Peasants left the countryside, cities grew, and an industrial working class emerged by the end of that century in Europe. German social theorist Ferdinand Tönnies called this change from Gemeinschaft to Gesellschaft, or what is commonly translated as "community" and "society."2 Other nineteenth-century theorists created new dichotomies to explain the change from one form of society to another. Each of these models aimed to explain how Gesellschaft, the large metropolis with its variety and anonymity, replaced Gemeinschaft, the little community where everyone knows one another and identities are cemented. In the latter part of the 20th century, the late-developing nations of East Asia underwent this shift, and it is now taking place in South Asia, the Middle East, and sub-Saharan Africa [2], [3].

New social groupings like employees, students, professionals, managers, and the like are continually being formed as a result of industrialization and economic expansion. People are more mobile, live in more varied and heterogeneous cultures, and have flexible identities in the nameless metropolis where they are no longer constrained by the traditions of their own village, tribe, or family. As we shall see, these new social links give birth too many new identities, such as nationalism or new types of universalistic religious attachment. The foundation for alterations to political institutions is laid by societal mobilisation. Along with economic development and social mobilisation, attitudes about legitimacy are evolving. Legitimacy is the widely held belief that certain social structures are fair. Legitimacy concepts change with time. The various aspects of development are often driven by changes in the economy or society, but there are many points when these changes also function as independent drivers of this evolution.

So, when Marie de Medicis, the French regent, convened the Estates-General in 1614 to demand greater taxes, it revealed to be a feeble and obedient assembly incapable of halting the ascent of absolutist monarchy. However, the intellectual climate in France had significantly changed by the time it was called again in 1789, with the Enlightenment in full bloom and the ideals of the Rights of Man spreading across society. It goes without saying that this change contributed to the second Estates-General opening the door for the French Revolution. Similar to this, English political actors underwent a significant shift in thinking during the seventeenth century. Initially, they advocated for the feudal rights of Englishmen,

which had been passed down from generation to generation; however, a century later, under the influence of authors like Hobbes and Locke, they began to demand their basic human rights. The kind of regime that would be established there and in North America would significantly change as a result.

DISCUSSION

The acceptance of these novel notions of universal rights, according to a Marxist historian, marked the emergence of the bourgeoisie in both France and England and served as a superstructure to conceal economic interest. However, the bourgeoisie might have built a case for itself on the basis of the exceptional advantages of the old feudal system, rather than a philosophy that opened the way to universal human equality. Karl Marx himself is credited with calling religion the "opiate of the people." Its decision to defend itself in these terms was reminiscent of several other concepts, such as Christian universalism and the changing views of contemporary scientific science. The history of the twentieth century without Marx also raises some interesting questions. Of course, there were a lot of Socialist philosophers both before and after him who represented the desires of the developing working class. But no one was able to analyse the circumstances of early industrialization so eloquently, connect them to a more comprehensive Hegelian theory of history, and justify the proletariat's eventual triumph in self-described "scientific" terms. Marx created a new secular philosophy that, when used by leaders like Lenin and Mao, replaced religion and was successful in inspiring millions of people and fundamentally altering the course of history. Despite the fact that each of the six aspects of growth might alter on its own, they are all intricately connected. An explanation of these causal relationships would make up a hypothesis for a model of political growth. By describing the series of events that followed the industrialization of England, the United States, and other early modernizers, we may identify some of the most significant connections.

With the start of the Industrial Revolution around the year 1800, the pace of economic expansion drastically increased. Prior to that, which corresponds to the historical era covered in the first volume of this book, a large portion of the world was governed by the circumstances outlined in Thomas Malthus' 1798 paper on the principle of population, which painted a doomsday scenario in which population growth would eventually outpace available economic resources. An estimate of per capita income in England, the country where the Industrial Revolution first took place, during an eight-hundred-year span. The latter era witnessed continuous year-on-year improvements in productivity that far outpaced the rate of population expansion, as seen by the hockey-stick shape of the curve and the abrupt change to a much faster rate of growth. We are lucky to still be living in a post-Malthusian society, despite the possibility that this golden period of fast progress may one day still be overcome by population growth and the ultimate limitations of the resources that can be made accessible.

A commercial revolution that began in the sixteenth century and greatly increased commerce both inside Europe and across the Atlantic came before the Industrial Revolution. The development of reliable property rights, the emergence of modern governments, the development of double-entry bookkeeping and the modern corporation, as well as new communications and transportation technology, all contributed to this growth. The methodical application of the scientific method and its absorption into an institutional framework of universities and research organisations, which could subsequently be translated into industrial advancements, laid the foundation for the Industrial Revolution.

Through a widening division of labour, the abrupt transition to a greater level of development had a significant impact on society. Adam Smith opened his Wealth of Nations book with his famous description of a pin factory, and the third chapter of the book is headed "The Division of Labour is Limited by the Extent of the Market." The factory's production is significantly increased since each duty is delegated to a specialist employee rather than a single artisan pulling, cutting, and sharpening individual pins. However, Smith argues that if there was no sufficiently big market, there would be no incentive to raise productivity in this way. Smith contends that growing markets and advancements in transportation and communication both contribute to the division of labor's expansion. The Industrial Revolution that would shortly take place was sparked by the commercial revolution of Smith's day. The growing division of labour then becomes a major concern for later philosophers, starting with Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, who discuss how once-proud artisans are now degraded to robotic cogs in a massive industrial machine in The Communist Manifesto. They see specialisation and the division of labour, in contrast to Smith, as a negative force that drives people away from their actual selves.

The following passage, which was written in 1848 as England's Industrial Revolution was kicking into high gear, gives one an idea of how different this modern world was from the agrarian one that came before it: "The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionising the instruments of production, and thereby the relations of production, and with them the whole relations of society." On the contrary, all prior industrial classes were required to survive on the condition that the ancient processes of production be preserved in their original form. The bourgeois period is distinct from all prior ones due to constant production revolutionization, continuous disruption of all social situations, and constant uncertainty and unrest. All fixed, quickly frozen relationships are destroyed along with their legacy of venerable, long-standing biases and ideas. Likewise, all recently created relationships age before they can ossify. All that is solid dissolves into the air, all that is sacred is profaned, and at last man is forced to confront his true circumstances of existence and his relationships with his species with sober senses [4].

Silicon Valley believes it developed "disruptive innovation," but in reality, social change in Europe and America during Marx's time was, if anything, more rapid than it is now at the dawn of the twenty-first century. By forming new organisations that demand involvement in the political process, social mobilisation brings about political transformation. Workers started banding together in trade unions in late nineteenth-century industrialising Europe and America and battled for greater salaries as well as better and safer working conditions. They campaigned for the freedom to organise, to speak out in public, and to cast ballots. The British Labour Party and the German Social Democratic Party, two new political parties that received support from the working class, started to succeed in winning elections. In nations without elections, like Russia, they started joining clandestine Communist organisations.

Another significant transformation that took place during this time was facilitated by the development of an early version of globalisation, which enabled ideas to traverse political borders in ways they had not done before. Even though some of these societies were rather big, the emergence of political institutions before 1800 generally took place within the setting of single societies. For instance, in the third century B.C., the Chinese introduced a merit-based administration. Early Arab state-builders may have looked to nearby Persian or Byzantine models, but they did not try to imitate feudal systems seen in modern-day Europe, much less those found in India or China.

The Mongols set the groundwork for a global system by transporting goods and illnesses from China to Europe and the Middle East, followed by the Arabs who expanded their

networks from Europe to Southeast Asia. Then, trading with the Americas and with South and East Asia was made possible by the Europeans. For those who believe that globalisation is a unique aspect of the early twenty-first century, consider the following quote from The Communist Manifesto: "The bourgeoisie pursues over the whole surface of the globe the need of an ever-expanding market for its products. The same was true of ideas about political and economic structures as it was of commodities: if something seemed to work in one region of the globe, it was quickly imitated in another. For instance, Adam Smith's theories on the effectiveness of markets were extensively disseminated across Europe and even made it to Latin America, where Spanish Bourbon reformers had prior mercantilist trade prohibitions loosened. On the opposite end of the ideological spectrum, Marxism was an ideology that non-European revolutionaries from China to Vietnam to Cuba accepted from the beginning and was self-consciously global.

After 1800, political growth took place under significantly different circumstances from those described in the first volume of this book for the earlier time periods. New social mobilisation movements were being quickly driven by sustained economic expansion, giving rise to new players who later sought political system engagement. The printing press, and then the telegraph, telephone, radio, and, finally, the Internet, allowed ideas to travel quickly from one community to another. Political order under these circumstances became very difficult to maintain since the institutions designed to govern rural society suddenly oversaw industrialised ones. Political institutions and technical and economic transformation are still linked, and social media is helping to create new kinds of mobilisation in places like China, the Arab world, and others.

Britain was the first nation to industrialise, and from Karl Marx on, it served as the model for modernization in general for many social thinkers. In Britain, a causal chain ran from economic expansion to social mobilisation, value shifts, participation demands, and, eventually, liberal democracy. Early in the 20th century, European social theory crossed the Atlantic and established itself in American academia as modernization theory. The latter claimed, in essence, that everything positive eventually coexists. All six of the boxes in Figure 1.5 would experience change concurrently as a result of modernization, meaning that everyone would arrive in Denmark quickly. When Europe's colonies gained their freedom in the past, modernization theory first emerged, and it was assumed that they would follow the same pattern of growth as Europe [5].

This hypothesis received some cold water in Samuel Huntington's 1968 book Political Order in Changing Societies. Huntington vehemently disagreed with the notion that all things positive must coexist. According to his theory, social mobilisation was a byproduct of economic growth, and political order collapsed when the pace of social mobilisation outpaced the ability of the institutions in place to meet growing participation demands. Huntington emphasised the "gap" that developed between newly mobilised masses' aspirations and their government's capacity or inclination to support their political engagement. According to him, both underdeveloped traditional civilizations and completely modernised society were stable; instability, however, was a feature of modernising societies when the many modernization-related elements failed to move in a coordinated manner.

Scholars like James Fearon, David Laitin, and Paul Collier have conducted a tonne of research into conflict and violence in developing nations in the forty plus years since Huntington published his book.7 As a result, Huntington's theory would need to be revised in many different ways. He was correct that a lack of institutions was reflected in instability. Since institutions are set of norms that organise behaviour, this is practically true by definition. However, he did not always see the instability and violence he saw in the 1950s

and 1960s as the consequence of industrialization disrupting previously peaceful traditional communities. His assertion that these societies were stable was false since, prior to the time he wrote, the majority of emerging nations had been ruled by colonial empires, whose power was imposed from outside. On the overall levels of war in, say, sub-Saharan Africa prior to the advent of the colonisers, we have very little trustworthy evidence, quantitative or otherwise. Many of the emerging nations that developed during this time, such as Nigeria and the Belgian Congo/Zaire, had never before existed as sovereign polities and had any kind of national traditional institutions. Therefore, it is not unexpected that they started fighting soon after gaining independence. Whether or whether a country modernised, it would have been unstable if its institutions were poor or nonexistent.

Huntington's claim that instabilities predominantly affected modernising nations caught between poverty and development is refuted by more current assessments of the causes of war. In fact, they demonstrate how closely conflict and poverty are related and how conflict frequently both causes and results from poverty.8 Nearly all authors who have systematically studied the phenomenon of conflict have identified weak institutions and weak governments as the root causes of both conflict and poverty. Thus, a lot of failed or fragile governments are locked in a low-level trap wherein weak institutions fail to regulate violence, which leads to poverty, which further erodes the capacity of the government to rule. While many people think that ethnicity is the root of conflict when studying the Balkans, South Asia, Africa, and other regions in the wake of the cold war, William Easterly demonstrates that any connection between ethnic diversity and conflict vanishes when one controls for the strength of institutions. When adjusting for level of per capita wealth, James Fearon and David Laitin demonstrate that greater levels of ethnic or religious variety were not more likely to result in conflict. Since the middle of the eighteenth century, Switzerland has remained stable despite being split among three language groups because to its robust institutions.

Economic development and modernization did not always result in rising levels of unrest and violence; in fact, some societies were able to handle demands for more involvement by strengthening their democratic institutions. In the years after World War II, this is what occurred in South Korea and Taiwan, when rapid industrialization was supervised by oppressive authoritarian regimes. However, these administrations were successful in meeting public expectations for employment and economic progress, and they finally gave in to calls for more democracy. The People's Republic of China, like South Korea and Taiwan in a previous period, has been able to maintain a high degree of general political stability without allowing for formal political engagement in part due to its capacity to provide stability, development, and employment to its inhabitants [6].

In the years after the release of Political Order in Changing Societies, both the economy and what Huntington himself dubbed the "Third Wave" of democratic transformations saw remarkable growth. Between 1970 and 2008, the world's economic production about quadrupled, rising from $16 to $61 trillion10; at the same time, the number of electoral democracies worldwide expanded from around 40 to over 120. Despite the fact that some of these transitions, such as those in Portugal, Romania, the Balkans, and Indonesia, featured bloodshed, this enormous change in the nature of world politics happened fairly smoothly overall.

Huntington's gap between rising social mobilisation and institutional development, however, has really been a significant contributor to instability in certain parts of the globe. The 1950s, 1960s, and early 1970s witnessed a great number of coups, revolutions, and civil wars in the Middle East, but the following decades saw the rise of remarkably stable authoritarian governments throughout the Arab world. Dictators in Tunisia, Egypt, Syria, and Libya strictly

supervised civil society and forbade the operation of opposition political groups. The only region of the globe to not take part in the Third Wave of democratic transitions was the Arab Middle East.

With the overthrow of Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, the civil war in Libya, the killing of Muammar Qaddafi, and the significant political unrest in Bahrain, Yemen, and Syria in the early months of 2011, everything drastically altered. A lot of things contributed to the so-called Arab Spring, including the growth of middle-class populations in Egypt and Tunisia. According to the United Nations' compilation of Human Development Indices, which combines data on income, health, and education, Egypt and Tunisia saw increases of 28% and 30%, respectively, between 1990 and 201013. There was also a significant rise in the number of college graduates, particularly in Tunisia. Even while these social strata were unable to maintain control over later events, the emerging middle classes, who were inspired by new technologies like as satellite TV stations (Al Jazeera) and social media (Facebook and Twitter), led the revolutions against the Ben Ali and Mubarak dictatorships [7].

In other words, what happened in the Arab world was a Huntingtonian event: social change was taking place beneath the surface of seemingly unstoppable authoritarian regimes, and newly mobilised actors vented their resentment at governments that did not make provisions for incorporating them through new institutions. The emergence of political structures to steer participation in peaceful directions will be completely crucial for the future stability of that area. This entails the expansion of political parties, the openness of the media to a wide range of political discourse, and the adoption of constitutional provisions that govern political strife.

Huntington was right in his fundamental observation that modernisation is not a smooth and inevitable process. There is no reason to assume that the growth of the economic, social, and political spheres will necessarily occur simultaneously since they follow various timelines and development paths. Particularly, political development operates according to its own logic apart from economic expansion. Therefore, for modernization to be successful, political institutions must simultaneously evolve alongside economic growth, social transformation, and ideas. This means that political institution development cannot be assumed to follow naturally from the other facets of progress. In fact, it is often required to kickstart economic development with strong political institutions. They are specifically what prevents failed or weak regimes from escaping the vicious cycle of war, bloodshed, and poverty [8], [9].An administratively competent government is the first and most crucial institution lacking in weak or failed governments. A state must first be established before it is subject to legal or democratic restrictions. This first entails the creation of a bureaucracy and a centralised executive.

CONCLUSION

The developmental aspects must be attained by a thorough and coordinated strategy. Development agendas are mostly driven by governments, international organisations, civil society, and the corporate sector. To solve the intricate and linked difficulties of development, collaboration, coordination, and partnerships are required at the international, regional, and national levels. In conclusion, the developmental dimensions include factors that affect institutional, social, economic, and environmental advancement. All of these elements must be taken into account in order to achieve sustainable and equitable growth. Societies should strive for holistic development that enhances people's lives and assures a successful and resilient future by concentrating on economic growth, social well-being, environmental sustainability, and good governance.

REFERENCES

[1] V. Torres, 'The developmental dimensions of recognizing racist thoughts', *J. Coll. Stud. Dev.*, 2009, doi: 10.1353/csd.0.0088.

[2] B. Galliot, W. Buzgariu, Q. Schenkelaars, and Y. Wenger, 'Non-developmental dimensions of adult regeneration in hydra', *Int. J. Dev. Biol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1387/ijdb.180111bg.

[3] V. Bermejo, P. Ester, and I. Morales, 'A Constructivist Intervention Program for the Improvement of Mathematical Performance Based on Empiric Developmental Results (PEIM)', *Front. Psychol.*, 2021, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.582805.

[4] M. C. Vogg, W. Buzgariu, N. S. Suknovic, and B. Galliot, 'Cellular, Metabolic, and Developmental Dimensions of Whole-Body Regeneration in Hydra', *Cold Spring Harb. Perspect. Biol.*, 2021, doi: 10.1101/cshperspect.a040725.

[5] R. Hermans, J. van Braak, and H. Van Keer, 'Development of the Beliefs about Primary Education Scale: Distinguishing a developmental and transmissive dimension', *Teach. Teach. Educ.*, 2008, doi: 10.1016/j.tate.2006.11.007.

[6] E. Neri *et al.*, 'Developmental Dimensions in Preterm Infants During the 1st Year of Life: The Influence of Severity of Prematurity and Maternal Generalized Anxiety', *Front. Psychol.*, 2020, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00455.

[7] K. Boardman, 'The Publishing House: From being to becoming – the developmental dimension in realistic work environments', *Educ. + Train.*, 2010, doi: 10.1108/00400911011037328.

[8] A. Manzini, E. J. H. Jones, T. Charman, M. Elsabbagh, M. H. Johnson, and I. Singh, 'Ethical dimensions of translational developmental neuroscience research in autism', *J. Child Psychol. Psychiatry Allied Discip.*, 2021, doi: 10.1111/jcpp.13494.

[9] W. Świergiel, M. Pereira Querol, B. Rämert, M. Tasin, and I. Vänninen, 'Productivist or multifunctional: An activity theory approach to the development of organic farming concepts in Sweden', *Agroecol. Sustain. Food Syst.*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/21683565.2017.1394414.