Democracy—Liberty, Equality and Fraternity. What is democracy ? In the words of Abraham Lincoln, it is a government of the people, for the people and by the people. Liberty, equality and fraternity are the corner-stones of democracy. Liberty and equality are indispensable conditions of democracy and the fulfilment of these conditions leads to fraternity.

The chief features of a modern democracy in its political aspect are (i) indirect popular rule on the basis of universal franchise, (ii) rule of the majority, (iii) responsible government, (iv) alternation of power and (v) decentralisation of power through the institutions of local government.

The party securing a majority of seats in the legislature at a general election held in accordance with law on the basis of universal franchise forms and runs the government. The minority party forms the opposition and keeps public opinion alert by its criticism of the government's policy and programme of work. If the party in power loses the confidence of the people by its unpopular acts, it is likely to lose its majority at the next general election when the minority party may step into its shoes by popular support. Under this system governments rest on popular support alone. The government is not only responsible to the people or to their elected representatives, but democracy does not also allow any of the parties to establish party dictatorship by monopolising political power for a long time. The normal and spontaneous working of democracy thus remains unimpaired by alternation of power. This democratic principle has been in operation in the working of the governments of the U.K. and the U.S.A. where alternation of power prevents monopolisation of power which implies an end of democratic rule. Democracy is a government by the people and as such it is in keeping with true democratic principle that the largest number of people should be directly associated with the working of the government. This is the reason why decentralisation of power is the fundamental principle of democracy. Decentralisation stands for dispersal of power and authority among a number of lower or subordinate units—it implies the process of transfer of power and decision-making authority to the bottom units of governments, i.e., local governments so that the latter may equally share power and responsibility. Central aid and advice may be helpful but freedom from central interference is more in keeping with democratic principle.

The above description relates only to the governmental organisation of a democracy. Behind this democratic structure of the government, full realisation of the democratic ideal may be impaired by the existence of an undemocratic social, economic and judicial order. Democracy in order to be real must be a combination of social, political and economic democracy with opportunity thrown open to all to get equal justice from its judicial organisation. The ideals of liberty and equality may be realised in the political field by giving one man one vote but that is not enough. The ideals of liberty and equality must be extended to the social and ecconomic life and more especially extended to the sphere of dispensation of justice.

Democracy in its social aspect re-affirms recognition of, faith in, and respect for, human personality regardless of caste, colour, creed, sex or rank. This recognition of human personality on the basis of equality produces a class of citizens who are equally conscious of their rights as well as duties. If everyone enjoys equal freedom and equal opportunity everybody becomes conscious of his reciprocal rights and obligations. This consciousness ultimately creates an atmosphere of fraternity by removing the causes of all conflicts.

Even political democracy supplemented by social democracy is not a perfect form of democracy. The right to vote or the right to use a public bath is a mockery to a hungry man and as such political and social democracy must be diluted with economic democracy. Economic democracy implies a condition in society which it is the duty of the state to create in which every able-bodied person gets the opportunity to earn his livelihood by fruitful labour. Economic democracy means freedom from hunger, freedom from unemployment and freedom from unkind employer. Given these freedoms, a person can work fearlessly and benefit society by his labour. Under this condition, a worker can also expect his just dues from society. Economic democracy presupposes an order of society in which nobody is allowed to enjoy superfluity before sufficiency for all is ensured.

Another indispensable condition of democracy is that the right to get equal justice against wrongs is guaranteed to all. The judicial system under a democracy is so organised that the rich and the poor, the noble and the common have the same opportunity to get justice or in other words rich and aristocratic people do not get greater advantages in this matter by lavish expenditure on litigation. In a true democracy, justice is not bought and sold.

Lastly, democracy brooks no regionalism, no parochialism. It has also an international aspect and the realisation of this international aspect makes democracy complete and perfect. Democracy creates a condition of liberty, equality and fraternity and protects the condition. Democracy claims to help the fullest development of individual personality by maintaining a condition of liberty, equality and fraternity in its capacity as the guardian of law and order within the country. If that be the case, democracy can by no means indulge in destructive activities by being involved in devastating wars. "The guardian of law and order within cannot be the destroyer of law and order without." Therefore democracy and war cannot go hand in hand. In its international aspect therefore democracy must not only be non-aggresive but also be co-operative. Democracy is creative in its function while militarism is a destructive force.

Kinds of Democracy : Pure or Direct Type. It is a form of government in which the will of the state is expressed directly through the people in a mass meeting rather than through their representatives. It is a sort of an open-air Parliament where the people assemble together for the purpose of electing their public officers, voting the taxes and adopting legislative and administrative regulations. Such a government is practicable only in small states where the number of citizens is small and whose political problems are few and simple. Direct democracy existed in ancient Athens where all the male citizens above the age of twenty used to meet together in their popular assembly known as the *Ecclesia*. Athenian democracy attained great success because the citizens had excellent political training and ample leisure enabling them to devote to the regular work of the state. The only surviving examples of direct democracy today are found in four of the mountain Cantons of Switzerland, namely, Appenzel, Uri, Glarus, and Unterwallen. But such a government cannot work in modern states with a much larger population and with diverse problems far more complex than those of the ancient world.

Indirect or Representative Democracy. Indirect democracy is so-called because it is a form of government in which the governing power is delegated to

a relatively small and select body of persons elected by the rest. The representatives thus elected from the Legislature and supervise the work of the government. John Stuart Mill defines this form of government as one in which "the whole people or some numerous portion of them, exercise the governing power through deputies periodically elected by themselves." It also attributes the ultimate source of authority to the people but as the people are incapable of exercising in a satisfactory manner that authority directly themselves, they act through the medium of representatives chosen by them. The reason for the emergence of this type of democracy is that it is not possible for the countless voters in a modern state to meet frequently in an assembly to decide upon questions of policy. Besides, the average citizen has neither the time nor the training to attend to public business of a highly complex character.

Elements of strength of Democracy. Democracy is regarded as the best form of government. The reasons are not far to seek, *First,* the efficiency of any form of government lies in its sense of responsibility. Democratic government is superior to all other types because it is the only form in which the responsibility of those who exercise public authority can be adequately enforced to those in whose interest they are chosen to govern. More than any other system of government, a democracy is likely to ensure a greater degree of efficiency by the methods of popular election, popular control and popular responsibility.

Secondly, as has been pointed out by Mill that this form affords ample opportunity to the citizens to stand up for their rights and therefore the rights and interests of the people are better safeguarded.

Thirdly, the sum-total of social welfare is the greatest in this form because all citizens, in proportion to the amount and variety of their personal energies, direct their individual efforts to promote general prosperity.

Fourthly, it makes no distinction between man and man and places every one on a footing of political equality. The fear of domination by one particular section over the other is minimised.

Fifthly, it allows everyone a share in administration, an opportunity for participating in public affairs. This promotes patriotic feeling and elevates his character. Thus it ensures the awakening of political consciousness in the masses.

But the greatest glory of democracy, in the opinion of Lord Bryce, is that "the manhood of the individual is dignified by his political enfranchisement and that he is usually raised to a higher level by the sense of duty which it throws upon him." It is a form of government which rests on the consent of the governed and upon the principle of equality and as such it is more immune from revolutionary disturbances than any other form. It also serves as a sort of training school for citizenship.

Elements of weakness of Democracy. In evaluating the strength of democratic government, we must not be blind to the obvious defects which experience has shown it to possess. Aristotle characterised it as a perverted form of constitutional government. In more recent times, no less a person than H. G. Wells refers to it as a government which can be "knocked to pieces in five minutes." While we do not share the views of those critics who have grossly exaggerated the defects of democracy, we admit that democracy is not without its defects.

In the *first* place, democracy suffers from a serious defect, namely, that it attaches greater importance to quantity than to quality. It fails to give due consideration to worth and special fitness. Government, being a high public duty, should be entrusted only to those who are best fitted for the task by their capacity and training. But in a democracy, all have equal voice in the affairs of the state with the result that it tends to degenerate into mob-rule.

Secondly, democracy upholds the despotism of the majority over the minority, the majority being constituted by the most incompetent and the most ignorant. Such a rule can ensure neither better government nor greater liberty.

Thirdly, it is said that democracy recognises no privileged class and puts everyone on a footing of equality. But actually the administration is carried on by few manipulators who manage to secure votes of the ignorant masses. These unscrupulous manipulators are guided more by motives of self-interest than by public good.

Fourthly, it produces a tendency of class legislation. The dominant class, under this form, captures political power for promoting their own interests at the expense of national interest.

Fifthly, Leckey, Maine and others have criticised democracy on the ground that it is unfavourable to the development of higher forms of intellectual life, such as, literature, art and science. As it is the government by the ignorant masses, it is incapable of appreciating character and intelligence.

Sixthly, experience shows that it is a form of government characterised by fragility. It implies short tenure of office, rotation in office and in many cases honorary service. Therefore this government is quite unfit to secure stability and continuity in government policy.

Modified Direct Democracy. At the present time, people in many countries have lost their confidence in the efficiency of the representative form of government and consequently there is a growing distrust in it. The defects in the actual working of the representative system coupled with the growing political consciousness of the masses have made them cautious and have induced them to extend their authority over the field of legislation by means of certain direct methods known as the Referendum, Initiative, Plebiscite and Recall. In Switzerland, in Ireland and in some other states, the principle of direct democracy has been engrafted, to some extent, on representative government. Thus the difficulties and evils of parliamentary government by parties have been to some extent mitigated by the direct action of the people.

(a) *Referendum.* The word literally means 'must be referred'. It is a method by which legislative proposals or constitutional questions are submitted to the popular vote for reconsideration after they have been passed by the legislature. If they are ratified by the required majority, they become valid. Referendum may be *optional, compulsory,* or *financial.* It is compulsory when it is provided by law that every bill passed by the legislature must be submitted to popular vote for its approval by the people. It is optional when a bill passed by the legislature will have to be submitted to popular vote provided a required number of voters demand it. In respect of constitutional laws in Switzerland, referendum is compulsory; in respect of ordinary laws, it is optional.

(b) *Initiative.* The initiative is a method which affords an opportunity to the Electorate to make independent proposals for legislation. If a certain number of voters so desire, they may, by petition, ask the Legislature to introduce certain types of law. The initiative is used in the Swiss Federation in respect of constitutional laws only in two forms, the *formulated* and the *unformulated.* If 50,000 citizens demand a certain amendment and their demand is made in the form of a bill complete in all details, it is called formulated initiative. If, on the other hand, the popular demand is of a general nature couched in general terms and not complete in all details, it is called unformulated initiative.

(c) *Plebiscite.* It provides for the submission of certain questions of great public importance and highly controversial character to the votes of the people. The verdict of the people thus expressed may not be binding upon the government but it helps the government shape its future policy.

(*d*) *Recall.* The system of recall provides for compelling an elected officer either to resign or to submit to re-election. Thus elected officers are made responsible to those by whom they are elected.

Of the methods of direct democracy mentioned above, the referendum and the initiative are perhaps the most remarkable among all democratic institutions for they embody the principle of popular sovereignty by providing channels of direct action by the people. The classical home of the Initiative and the Referendum is Switzerland where they have been used for a long time and from here they have spread to other countries. The two institutions supplement each other ; the intent of the initiative is positive while that of the referendum is negative. The former demands the enactment of laws which the legislature may ignore or refuse to pass while the latter provides a popular veto upon laws which the legislature seeks to impose upon the people against their will. Both the initiative and the referendum may be used in their compulsory or optional forms and they may be used as compulsory in some cases while optional in others. In some countries, they are applied in their compulsory forms to constitutional laws only, in others, to ordinary laws as well.

Merits. These methods of direct democracy as applied to representative government serve some useful purposes. They induce the people to take increasing interests in political affairs and make them conscious of their rights and duties. Moreover, they prevent legislative tyranny of the legal sovereign and check party factions and sectional legislation.

Demerits. But these methods are not without their defects. The voters are neither anxious nor do they possess sufficient knowledge to understand either the technicalities of law or the intricacies of a political problem. Besides, popular legislation does not always ensure the enactment of good laws. These methods tend to make the legislature irresponsible by shifting responsibility from it to the electorate. These methods may be practicable in small countries like Switzerland but not quite so in big countries like the U.S.A. or the U.S.S.R.

Essential conditions for successful Democracy. Democratic government requires for its success certain conditions, in the absence of which, it is destined to perish. Even the worst critics of this form have admitted that democracy may succeed if the 'turbulence' of democracy is restrained and made as "calm as water in a reservoir". The most fundamental condition essential to its successful working is therefore that "the people who work it shall possess a high degree of

political intelligence, and abiding interest in public affairs, a keen sense of public responsibility and a readiness to accept and abide by the decisions of the majority." *Secondly,* the people must zealously guard their rights and stand up to fight for their preservation. In the absence of a determination on the part of the people power is likely to slip into the hands of a small body of men, thus giving rise to oligarchies or dictatorships. *Thirdly,* the success of democratic government depends to a great extent on the straight-forward supply of news. If the citizens are ignorant or misinformed, they cannot possibly make correct decisions on matters of public interest. The *fourth* condition is that the citizens should receive a certain standard of education which will enable them to contribute their instructed judgment to common good. The duty of the state is, therefore, to provide free and compulsory education to its citizens. *Lastly,* it is highly desirable that there should be a general agreement among the citizens regarding the fundamental issue. No government can carry on with its work successfully if there are differences between different groups. Thus the success of a democratic government depends, in the last analysis, on the character and capacity of the people who work it.

But the conditions enumerated above do not certainly exhaust the list. As has been emphatically asserted by Prof. Laski, political democracy without its economic counterpart is meaningless. People can stand up for their rights only when they are free not only politically but also economically. This economic freedom implies the right to be employed, the right to reasonable wage and reasonable hours of work with provision for leisure, recreation and rest and lastly, a reasonable share in determining the conditions of work. Without these conditions citizens even if armed with political rights will be reduced to the position of slaves.

Liberal Democracy and Socialist Democracy.

In the words of Bernard Crick, "Democracy is perhaps the most promiscuous word in the world of public affairs". In fact, no other political term has been subjected to such wide application as democracy, since it has become fashionable and profitable for almost every regime to consecrate itself with this holy description. In order to prove themselves as real democracy different political regimes add some adjective before the term democracy. Thus we find the use and application of the terms Liberal Democracy, Socialist Democracy, Bourgeoisie Democracy, Prolitarian Democracy, Western Democracy, People's Democracy. True Democracy, New Democracy, Guided Democracy, Facade Democracy and so on and so forth.

Liberal Democracy and Socialist Democracy are regarded as two contradictory forms of democracy.

Liberal Democracy.

About one-third of the world's population are under the liberal democratic form of government. The U.K., the U.S.A., Canada, Australia, Switzerland. France, Japan, Holland, Belgium, New Zealand, the Scandinavian countries and a number of states today are certainly liberal democracies.

Liberal democracy in not easy to define. But today liberal democracy is distinguished from other types of governments by certain principles and characteristics. According to S. E. Finer, Liberal democracy has four characteristic features,

First, this type of governments contain a representative organ in an elected legislature—and in some cases, too, an elected head of state. Free elections, freedoms of speech, press, assembly and association are essential conditions of a legislature to 'represent' public opinion in the real sense. *Secondly,* accountable to this representative organ there exists a stabilizing and expert organ, both advising it and implementing its policies and decisions. *Thirdly,* there exists a system of social and economic checks and balances, a network of centres of private power which acts as a check on the governmental activities. Medical Council, Bar Councils etc. are examples. *Fourthly,* there also exists a system of political checks and balances. This has three forms. *First,* separation of powers i.e., the government should be organised into three organs, the Executive, the Legislature and the Judiciary, each manned by separate persons and each has its district sphere of activity. *Secondly,* division of the legislature into two Houses—the Upper House and the Lower House. *Thirdly,* division of governmental powers between two sets of authorities, one national or general government whose authority extends to the whole of the national territory and a number of regional governments, each with a restricted area to govern.

Prof. Alan Ball has identified some features of the liberal democratic system which are as follows :

First, existence of a number of political parties who compete for political power.

Secondly, the competition for political power is open.

Thirdly, entry and recruitment to the posts of political power are open to all.

Fourthly, elections at regular intervals on the basis of universal adult franchise forms another characteristic of this system.

Fifthly, the system ensures civil liberties like freedom of speech, freedom of movement and freedom of religion. Agencies of mass media like the press, the cinema, the radio and the television are not under the exclusive control of the state.

Sixthly, pressure groups are able to exert their influence on the decisions of the government. Associations like the trade unions and other voluntary groups are not controlled by the state.

Seventhly, there exist some form of separation of powers between the executive and the legislative organs and judicial independence and integrity are maintained under this system.

Socialist Democracy

Socialist Democracy may be regarded as a general political form of the socialist state. Though at present there exists different forms of socialist states, reflecting specific socio-economic and political conditions and maturity of socialism, Socialist Democracy is the socialist states' universal political form.

According to Marxists in a society divided into antagonistic classes the benefits of democracy are enjoyed mainly by the dominant exploiter class. Thus bourgeois Democracy is of a limited character, being based on private ownership of the means of production with its inherent exploitation of man by man. The Marxists argue that genuine democracy is socialist democracy, which is based on public ownership of the means of production and on labour freed from all kinds of exploitation. Socialist Democracy proclaims and guarantees to the citizens a full range of civil and political rights and freedoms along with economic and social rights.

The Marxists also believe that as a form of state socialist democracy will be ultimately transformed into a system of 'communist social self government.'

According to Alan Ball the following may be said to be the main characteristics of socialist democracy :

First, there is an official socialist ideology.

Secondly, there is practically no distinction between public and private spheres of activity. Private associations are controlled to a great extent by the government.

Thirdly, the concept of separation of powers does not exist and thus the judiciary does not enjoy distinct independence.

Fourthly, there is a single political party which monopolies political power.

Democratic Socialism and Socialist Democracy. It is not difficult to distinguish between Democratic socialism and Socialist democracy. Democratic socialism implies dilution of democratic principles with the socialist programme. It means the attainment of socialist ideal by avoiding altogether the method of violence and by socialisation of the means of production in bigger areas of production. Individual or group enterprise is allowed to stay side by side with public enterprise.

Socialist democracy, on the other hand, implies an order of society which is a product of socialism in practice. The advocates of socialist pattern of democracy assert that it is only in a socialist state that democracy in its fullness can thrive and function properly. For in liberal democracies or under democratic socialism, only civil and political rights of the citizens are guaranteed and these also may be curtailed whenever necessary but in socialist democracy, not only civil and political rights but also full economic liberty is guaranteed to the people. Socialist democracy is a better social order than any other order of society.

The difference between the two types may be illustrated by way of a reference to the working of the British, and the American system on the one hand and that of the U.S.S.R. on the other. In Great Britain, in the U.S.A. where democratic socialism is in operation, there is plenty or even an excess of civil and political rights by virtue of which a citizen can regulate his life freely. He can marry and divorce as many times as he likes. He can acquire, hold, bequeath his property as he likes. In the sphere of economic activities of a citizen, a citizen can oust his rival by unfair competition. In Great Britain and in the U.S.A. freedom of action, that is, competition has been allowed to a degree which enables only the fittest to survive. So under democratic socialism, only the rights of the fittest have been guaranteed at the cost of those who are unfit for the struggle for existence. But under democratic socialism, there is no guarantee even to the most essential economic rights of the citizens, such as, the right to work and to reasonable wages far less the right to rest, leisure and cultural pursuits.

In sharp contrast to the British and the U.S.A. systems, stands the Soviet system in which the citizens enjoy full civil and political rights but these rights are not unbridled as under the system of democratic socialism. The rights are restrained by the state in consonance with the collective interest of society. Thus a soviet citizen has a right to life, to freedom of speech, freedom of opinion, of religion, to acquire, hold and dispose property, to marry and divorce, to drink but all these rights are to be exercised in a way conducive not only to his personal interest but also to social interest. He can drink but he is strictly forbidden to be a drunkard causing nuisance to others. A citizen may acquire, hold and

bequeath property but within limits imposed by the state so that one citizen cannot by virtue of his affluence reduce a fellow citizen to the position of a slave. Competition is the watch-word of democratic socialism whereas co-operation is the basic principle of a socialist democracy. Besides these, economic rights of citizens, such as the right to work and reasonable wages, the right to rest, leisure, recreation and cultural pursuits have been fully guaranteed in a socialist democracy. It is further to be remembered that the above-mentioned civil, political and economic rights are not empty claims only but these rights have acquired a special significance in view of the corresponding duties, such as, the duty of work and maintain labour discipline, to protect public socialist property, etc., which have been made obligatory to the citizens. Democratic socialism is based on free competition and as such it has given rise to capitalism, aristocracy and an elite for whom civil and political rights are mainly intended and these classes have a monopoly of economic rights by virture of their wealth. A socialist democracy prevents inequality of income by limiting the area of private property and by large-scale socialisation of property and means of production and also by limiting the scope of the law of inheritance. In the absence of rent, interest and profit, no class living on unearned income can arise in society. Thus inordinate greed of a person or of a group or of a class is curbed by means of socialisation and limitation supplemented by the development of the co-operative outlook and spirit under democratic socialism. Democratic ideal is not and cannot be fully realised in the absence of a guarantee to economic rights. Democratic ideal in its entirety is achieved only under a socialist democracy because it guarantees not only civil and political rights but gives greater guarantee to a citizen's economic rights by putting an end to exploitation, inequality and class-conflict.

Now the question is : which system is better—the Anglo-American or the Soviet ? Each system is the product of its environment, genius of the people and contemporary needs. Judged from this point of view, it may be said that the English system works well in England, the American system works well in America and the Soviet system in the Soviet Union. But this observation is not applicable to the case of India which claims to be a liberal democracy with a socialist bias. The reason is that like the Holy Roman Empire which was neither holy nor Roman nor an empire, the Indian system is also neither Indian nor a compact system. It is not indigenous—its different parts have been imported from abroad only to be assembled here.

Liberal Democracy and Socialist Democracy : a comparison

The main differences between liberal democracy and the socialist democracy are as follows :

First, liberal democracy maintains and protects private ownership of the means of production and distribution, whereas in socialist democracy there is collective and public ownership of the means of production and distribution.

Secondly, in liberal democracies only civil and political rights of the citizens are guaranteed. Thus liberal democracies put emphasis on the right to property, freedoms of speech, press and association, freedom of religion, freedom from arbitrary arrest and detention etc. But in a socialist democracy not only civil and political rights but also full economic rights are guaranteed to all the citizens. Thus socialist democracies put emphasis on the right to work, the right to rest and leisure, the right of assistance in case of old age, illness, disability, etc.

Thirdly, in liberal democracies agencies of mass media like the press, radio and television are formally free from governmental control. But in a socialist democracy mass media is usually controlled by the government.

Fourthly, in liberal democracies associations like trade union and voluntary associations are not subject to the close control of the government. But in a socialist democracy private associations are subject to a greater degree of governmental control than in liberal democracies.

Fifthly, the existence of a number of political parties and open competition for political power is regarded as a basic feature of liberal democracy. But in a socialist democracy political power is monopolised by a single political party.

Lastly, liberal democracies accept the principles of separation of powers and the independence of the judiciary whereas socialist democracies reject these principles.

Democracy and Dictatorship. History abounds in examples of powerful men rising into prominence and dictating the course to be followed by the people. Dictatorship is therefore no new thing in modern history. Modern dictatorship came as a natural and inevitable concomitant of the war of 1914-18. The post-war governments of many countries were confronted with numerous problems which they failed to solve to the entire satisfaction of their people. The new states that were created on the principle of 'self determination' of nations were not helpful to the growth of democracy on account of their lack of political training, want of adequate financial and economic strength and absence of mutual trust and goodwill among the various racial groups that still existed side by side. To these were added economic and social causes which made the situation quite unsafe for democracy. The people groaned under the heavy burden of taxation and the spectre of unemployment appeared everywhere in view. The working classes became restless. The need for a strong government was felt everywhere to cope with the situation. But unfortunately, the divergence of views among the political leaders stood in the way of forming a strong government. The Communist experiment in Russia which attained a remarkable success under the able leadership of Lenin and Stalin captured the imagination of the people of Europe. The Communist dictatorship in the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics came to be known as the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' as opposed to the 'dictatorship of capitalist class'. It had a lofty aim in this that it wanted to do away with the distinction between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots' and thus to usher in a new order of society where there would be no class exploiting for their own interest any other class, and where every socially useful worker would get adequate opportunity for self-development. The Russian dictatorship, on its practical side, showed remarkable vigour and efficiency particularly in raising the masses to a higher level of prosperity. The firmness and determination of the dictator got the upper hand over the slow and cautious policies of democracy. A good despot came to be regarded as the saviour of the people out of the miseries and stagnation of the post-war chaos. Thus quickly following the Russian Revolution dictators began to appear on the European scene in rapid succession. Italy under Mussolini, Poland under Marshal Pilsudski, Yugoslavia under King Alexander, Turkey under Kemal Ataturk, Germany under Hitler and several others in Europe, South America and even in Asia, one by one, went over to dictatorship. The course of events seemed to prove that democracy was not only on the defensive but it was on its last legs, gasping for breath.

Dictatorship may be of three different types, namely, **military, communist** and **fascist.** Military dictatorship, though a very ancient form of government, has not altogether disappeared even nowadays. A military dictatorship comes into existence when an army-general captures political power by the force of arms and also rules by the force of arms. Administration of France by Napoleon, of Spain by General Franco and in very recent years rule of Pakistan by Major General Ziaul Huq are cases in point.

The aim of the Communist dictatorship in Russia is to establish a classless society and to provide equal opportunities for all. With this end in view, communist dictatorship in Russia claims that it has replaced the dictatorship of the Capitalist by that of the Proletariat.

Fascist dictatorship believes in 'one nation, one state and one leader'.

Dictatorship is a form of government in which the whole power of the state is concentrated in the hands of one man. A dictator is generally supported by a party and all other parties are crushed by force. The dictator seeks to glorify the state by subordinating the individual to the state. In such a state, criticism of the government is not tolerated and for this purpose, the press, the radio, the educational institutions are all controlled by the state. The conception of the state has undergone important change in the hands of the dictators. The state is regarded as the highest and the best form of human organisation and as such it is absolute and omni-competent. National unity is regarded as the fundamental basis of the state and with this ideal in view, all other groups are ruthlessly exterminated. The whole nation is taught to think and move in one way. The states under dictatorship, specially of the fascist type, are imperialistic in their outlook and constantly seek expansion of their territory and hanker after power and predominance. The result is that the states preach militarism and are perpetually prepared for war. The basic principle of dictatorship is 'one state, one people, one leader'. Hence they are called *totalitarian states,* the authority of the state being absolute over every aspect of a citizen's life.

The attitude of the dictator is marked by an absolute indifference to and contempt for the democratic ideal. Individual liberty is an accepted dogma in modern democracy which regards preservation of the rights of man as its fundamental object. But in the totalitarian states, there are no human rights but only state rights. Democracy follows the ideal. "Live and let live". The different parties are allowed to exist and they are given a certain amount of freedom of opinion and organization. Democracy looks upon the state as a means for promoting social welfare, but dictatorship regards the state as an end in itself. The dictator considers himself infallible, he alone having the monopoly of all wisdom. Democratic governments admit their omissions and commissions and try to rectify them. But dictatorship breeds self-complacence and an exaggerated notion of its own powers. Thus the blunder of a dictator brings ruin not only upon himself but spells disaster to the whole nation. Nazi Germany under Hitler and Fascist Italy under Mussolini bear testimony to the fact. But dictatorship is not to be regarded as an unmixed evil. Dictatorship is welcomed by the people in times of emergency, especially in war. The progress made by democracies pales into insignificance before the achievements of the U.S.S.R, within a brief span of twenty-five years and Hitlerite Germany in ten years. This shows that dictators are men of super-human ability. But dictatorship can never be a desirable substitute for democracy simply on the ground that it is based solely on the cult of force without the sanction of law. It is dangerous to entrust so

much power to one single individual, however capable and resourceful he might be.

Main features of Totalitarianism. Totalitarianism is based on an *ideology* sponsored by the state and all citizens are required to have faith in and respect for this official creed which professes the creation of a perfect society in future. *Secondly,* totalitarianism centres round an all-powerful *leader* who is either the author or the interpreter of the official creed and it is the leader and leader alone who can speak on behalf of the people. *Thirdly,* the main prop of the totalitarian regime is a *party* composed of a very small numerical minority of the total population. The party followers though numerically insignificant have absolute faith in the leadership as well as in the official creed and this faith makes them ardent and active followers of their leader ever ready to implement measures calculated to promote the cause of their official doctrine. *Fourthly,* the means to convert the masses to their creed is *propaganda* mixed with *terror.* This feature is common to all types of totalitarianism—Fascist, Nazi and Communist—but the degree of terrorist method may vary from time to time. *Fifthly,* totalitarianism is characterised by a *monopoly of control of all communications and armed forces.* In totalitarian states the press, the platform, the radio, the cinema and all other means of communication are under the control of the government which moulds the opinion and conscience of the people. Totalitarian states are armed to the teeth with such destructive weapons that it is almost impossible to overthrow them except through the intervention of the United Nations. *Lastly,* totalitarianism enforces a *centralised economic control* by which all the means of production and the machinery of distribution are brought under state control. Totalitarian states for implementing their economic programme usually resort to economic planning. But today almost all states, democratic or dictatorial, are controlling though in varying degrees, the economic activities of their people.

Absolute Monarchy and Dictatorship

The absolute monarch has a crown on his head and claims power and prestige by divine right. His rule is absolute without any reference to the will of those whom he governs. Under an absolute monarchy there is no citizen. The monarch is the only citizen, the only patriot who determines the destiny of those placed under his care. The monarch and the State are identical terms. Under such a system monarchy is herediatry, succession to the throne being regulated by the law of primogeniture. The monarch is accountable to God and God alone and passive obedience to the monarch is the sole duty of the subjects. Monarchy for its survival depends on mercenaries and when the latter betray, monarchy collapses.

Dictatorship also is the rule of one man with this difference that he has no crown to wear nor can he claim power and prestige by divine right. Unlike monarchy dictatorship is not hereditary. Dictatorship is mostly of the military type which comes into existence when an army-general captures political power by the force of arms and rules by the force of arms. There may be fascist and communist dictatorship but all of them at least initially rest on force. The dictator is generally supported by a party and all other parties are exterminated. The dictator seeks to glorify the state by subordinating the individual to the state in all respects. The basic principle of dictatorship is one state, one people, one leader. Hence they are called *totalitarian states,* the authority of the state being absolute over every aspect of a man's life.

Thus there is very little to choose between the two. A well-meaning monarch or a dictator may do some good to the people but what men want is neither charity nor gift but human rights which are unthinkable under absolute monarchy as well as dictatorship.

Future of Democracy. The ultra-democratic devices adopted by some states and the emergence of dictatorship during the period after the First World War certainly go to discredit the democratic ideal to some extent. There is no denying the fact that for the time being, there was a set-back in the democratic ideal, but on that account we must not think that democracy has altogether failed and that the ideal should be abandoned. The introduction of ultra-democratic devices like the referendum, initiative, etc., far from discrediting the democratic ideal, proves that governments which were so long aristocratic or oligarchic or dictatorial in essence are gradually coming over to democracy. They therefore mark the triumph of the democratic ideal. Dictatorship is a temporary phase and the verdict of history is that nowhere has it been able to stand the test of time. Even dictatorships, in the last analysis, rest on democratic principles. The success of the Communist dictatorship in Russia depends in no small measure, on the realisation in actual practice of the democratic ideals of society. The fact that the democratic ideal is far from being achieved does not prove that it has failed but it only proves that the ideal is harder of realisation. Democracy makes great demands upon its citizens and, whenever the citizens fail to come up to its ideals, there may be temporary setbacks. So long as a better substitute of democracy is not devised, so long as people believe in the dictum that 'good government is no subsitute for self-government', the democratic ideal is sure to dominate every sphere of man's life. Men once having tested power will not turn away from democracy. We may conclude with Bryce that "Popular government will flourish and decline in proportion to the moral and intellectual progress of man." It is the only ideal that can save the structure of our civilization from the onslaughts of reactionary forces.

Distinction between Ancient and Modern Democracies.

1. Ancient democracies were direct in form in which all citizens had a share in the government while modern democracies are indirect or representative.
2. The size of the ancient states was very small and the number of citizens consequently also small. The necessity for enabling every citizen to participate in the affairs of the state reduced the size of the state to a city. Modern states are big territorial states, having no bar to its expansion.
3. Citizenship, in the ancient state, was confined to a small leisured class ; the slaves, women and others being excluded from the category of citizens. It was in effect a modified aristocracy in relation to the total population of the state. The modern state has no such exacting conception of citizenship. It excludes none excepting the alien.
4. The ancient state was regarded as an end in itself ; the citizens in ancient states lived for the state ; whereas the citizens of a modern state live for themselves, and the state is regarded as a means for furthering their common welfare.
5. No distinction was made between the state and the government in ancient democracies, but in modern times, a clear-cut distinction exists between the two.

The state is a sovereign body while government enjoys delegated authority and as such its powers are limited.

6. The status of the individual citizen has considerably improved in modern times. His rights are recognised by the modern states, but the ancient states did not recognise personal rights.

SUMMARY

I. *Principle of classification* Governments are also classified into Monarchy, Aristocracy and Democracy, the principle of classification being the same as that of states.

II. *Monarchy* may be hereditary or elective or both. Absolute monarchy is the despotism of one man. Limited monarchy is a form of government in which the power of the ruler is limited by the constitution. Simplicity, efficiency and unity of administration are the merits of monarchy. But it may lead to tyranny and inefficiency as well.

III. *Aristocracy.* Literally, is means the rule of the best few. In a broad sense, it means rule by the few who are superior to the rest by reason of their wealth or social status. Rule by the best few is desirable but it is difficult to choose the best men. All modern governments are in essence aristocratic in character, for, the governing power rests in the hands of the few.

IV. *Democratic or Popular Government.* Democracy is defined as a government *of* the people, *for* the people, *by* the people. It is a government which provides equal opportunity for all citizens for the fullest development of their personality. Modern democracy implies not only political democracy but also social and economic democracy.

V. *Kinds of Democracy. Pure or direct Democracy* is that form of government in which the whole body of citizens participate directly in the work of the government. It is possible in small states where the problems are few and simple.

VI. *Indirect or Representative Democracy* is a form in which the citizens elect representatives periodically and act through them.

VII. *Strength of Democracy.* Democracy is regarded as the best form of government because it gives every citizen an opportunity for self-expression and self-government. It promotes the patriotic feeling and elevates the character of the citizens by giving everyone a share in administration.

VIII. *Weakness of Democracy.* Democracy is criticised on the ground of its inherent fragility. It is a rule by the most incompetent and the most ignorant and as such it tends to degenerate into mob-rule.

IX. *Modified Direct Democracy.* Certain states have adopted methods of direct democracy in order to increase the control of the Electorate over legislation. The methods are (a) *Referendum,* (b) *Initiative,* (c) *Plebiscite,* and (d) *Recall.* Referendum and Initiative are methods for direct legislation by the people in an indirect democracy. Plebiscite is a method for eliciting public opinion on important questions which are referred to popular vote. The system of *Recall* is employed to remove an undesirable elected officer before the expiry of his term. The working of these methods requires a high degree of intelligence and political sagacity in the people. They are impossible in big states.

X. *Conditions essential to the Success of Democracy.* In order that it may work smoothly without any hindrance, democracy requires that the citizens should be honest and intelligent. They must receive an education which will develop in them a sense of responsibility. They must also be economically independent.

XI. *Democracy and Dictatorship.* Modern dictatorship grew out of the ruins of the First World War. It came by way of protest against the incompetency and injustice of the post war democracies. The communist dictatorship in Russia came to be a model to imitate,

though in a modified form. Dictatorship in its extreme form appeared in Germany and in Italy. The characteristic common to all dictatorship is that all powers are concentrated in the hands of the leader of the single political party which ruthlessly suppresses all other parties. The state personified in the dictator dominates all the aspects of a citizen's life. Dictatorship breeds imperialism. Dictators are generally strong men of great constructive ability. The fall of the dictator spells disaster to the people.

XII. *Future of Democracy.* Democracy has a bright future inasmuch as it is the only form of government in which the citizens can feel secure and can reach their best selves. Its success depends on the character and attainments of those who work it. It will succeed with the gradual moral and intellectual progress of mankind.

XIII. *Ancient and Modern Democracies.* Ancient democracies were direct, modern democracies are indirect. Ancient states were small city-states which recognised the rights of only a leisured and capable class called citizens. Modern states are big territorial states which recognise the rights of all. The state, in ancient times, was regarded as an end in itself, whereas the modern state is regarded as a means for furthering the welfare of man.

QUESTIONS

1. Estimate the strength and weakness of modern democracy as a form of government. (C. U. 1943, 1949)
2. Discuss the aims and ideals of totalitarian states. How far do those ideals differ from those of democratic states ? (C. U. 1944)
3. Discuss the merits and demerits of monarchical form of government. Is this form of government likely to disappear altogether ? (Punj. 1936)
4. What are the methods that have been adopted in many countries for removing the growing distrust in the system of representative democracy ?
5. Distinguish between direct and indirect democracy. Do you think that democracy will survive ?
6. What are the cardinal features of Democracy ? How far are these present in the U.S.A, and India ? (C. U. 1953)
7. How would you distinguish a democracy from any other form of government ? Can democracy function in a one-party state ? (C. U. Hon, 1955)
8. Distinguish between Democracy and Dictatorship. Can Democracy function in a one-party state ? Give reasons for your answer. (C. U. 1960)
9. "Democracy is not complete without Socialism." Comment. (C. U. 1954, 1975)
10. What is meant by dictatorship ? Discuss its different form. (C. U. 1987, 1988)
11. "Democracy is not complete without socialism." "Democracy is not possible under socialism." Bring out the full implications of these two statements. (C, U. Hons. 1966)
12. "Political democracy is not possible without economic and social democracy." Elucidate. (C. U. Hons. 1967)
13. Distinguish between Democracy and Dictatorship. Which of them would you prefer and why ? (C. U. 1969)
14. Compare and contrast an absolute monarch with a dictator. (C. U. 1975)
15. Attempt a comparative analysis of the basic features of Democracy and Dictatorship. Which of these would you prefer and why ? (C. U. 1981)

CHAPTER 13

FORMS OF MODERN GOVERNMENTS

Unitary and Federal Governments. In a unitary government the powers of the government are concentrated in the central government which is supreme. There may be local governments but these derive their powers from the central government and are subordinate to it in all respects. In a federal government, both the general and regional governments derive their powers from the constitution. Thus in a unitary government, there is no constitutional division of powers but only delegation of authority by the central to the local governments, but in federal government, there is a constitutional division of powers between the national or general government at the centre and the governments of local units. *Secondly,* in a unitary government, it is the general government which is supreme; in a federal government it is the constitution which is supreme. The local governments in the unitary type are mere convenient administrative units but in the federal, these are constituent members of the federal government with almost co-equal powers. *Thirdly,* the units in a federation enjoy *original* and not derived powers but in the unitary government the units enjoy derived powers which unlike the federal government are not the gift of the constitution but only the grant of the general government. *Fourthly,* a unitary government may have a written or un-written constitution which may be rigid or flexible but a federal government must have a written constitution which is generally rigid in character. *Lastly,* the most important characteristic of a federal government is the supremacy of the judiciary which acts as the aribiter of disputes between the component units and the union and between the units themselves and also as an interpreter of the constitution. The federal judiciary can declare the acts of various governments null and void when they are inconsistent with the constitution, but the judiciary in the unitary type is very seldom vested with the power of declaring laws null and void.

Federal Governments.—Two broad types. A federation is the outcome of an agreement between a number of states previously independent. The states thus united together create a common General Government for the administration of certain common affairs, while retain to themselves autonomy of action in other matters. A second type of federation may also be formed by the splitting up of a unitary state into a number of provinces and by granting autonomy to them. In the first case, federation comes into existence by the process of centralisation and in the second case, the process involved is known as decentralisation. The United States of America came into existence as a result of the union of a number of autonomous states which chose to surrender, for their common benefit, some of their powers to a newly created government at the centre, but the bulk of the powers were retained by them. To the newly created government at the centre, the constitution transferred strictly limited powers. In other words, in the American type of federation, residuary powers, i.e., powers not delegated by the constitution to the general government, were left in the hands of the governments of the component units. The competence of the general government is positively determined by the constitution, while that of the regional governments is negatively determined.

The federation in Canada represents another type which was formed by the process of decentralisation. The unitary government was broken up into a number

of autonomous units to which the constitution transferred limited powers. The bulk of the powers were left with the government at the centre. Thus in the Canadian type of federation, residuary powers rest with the government at the centre. The regional governments are authorities of enumerated powers, while the general government is one of both delegated and reserved powers. Thus "federation as a principle of governmental organisation is an effective contrivance whether used for the purpose of tightening or for the purpose of loosening a pre-existing bond." But the modern tendency in all federations is that they are, through the process of centralisation, drifting towards the unitary type. The tendency is present in the federation of the U.S.A., it is more prominent in the union of the Soviet Socialist Republics and the German Federation under Weimar constitution was so organised that the states were practically reduced to the position of local governments under a unitary state. In the New Constitution of India which came into force from the 26th of January, 1950, the centripetal tendency militates against the spirit of federalism. Apart from the 97 items on the Union List which take away the cream of power to the centre, there is a Concurrent List, but in case of conflict, the Union's jurisdiction becomes valid to the exclusion of the states.

Distinguishing marks of a Federal Union.

A federal government, according to Dr. Finer, may be distinguished from a confederation or a unitary government by the following characteristics, namely, the co-existence of two gvernments, division and distribution of legislative and administrative powers, supremacy of the constitution, special position of the judiciary, separate allocation of revenues and finally a special theory of allegiance and secession.

(a) *Coexistence of two governments.* In a federal government, there are two sets of government. The government of the whole territory called the national or the general government exists side by side with the governments of each local area into which the whole territory is split up. Both these sets of government, general and regional or local derive their powers from the same source, namely, the constitution and each of the two governments is free from the control of the other. It is necessary here to point out that the local governments of a unitary state do not enjoy any such supremacy because in the unitary type, there is one recognised government, viz., general government and the authority of the general government is supreme in all matters concerning the state.

(b) *Division and distribution of powers.* In a federal government, the totality of the governmental powers is divided and distributed by the national constitution or an organic act of Parliament creating it, between a general government and the governments of the individual states or other territorial sub-divisions of which the federation is composed. Generally, matters of common concern which require uniformity of legislation and administration, such as, Defence, Foreign affairs; Currency, Railways, Post and Telegraph, etc., are under the general government. The regional governments are given all powers affecting local interests like agriculture, education, medical relief, etc. In short, there is one government for national affairs and a number of regional governments for regional affairs. 'A federal government therefore resembles a unitary government so far as national affairs are concerned, while in respect to local affairs, it is more like a confederation government.' Besides, there is a clear-cut division of powers

between the executive, legislative and judicial departments. Thus a federal government implies both territorial and functional distribution of powers.

The most important thing to be noted in connection with the division of powers in a federation is that powers and functions of a modern government can never be clearly and precisely listed and distributed between the national and regional governments for all times to come. Spheres of activity of every government are increasing and hence every new addition to governmental power gives rise to the question of distribution of that power. In order to make provision for such future contingencies, all federal constitutions make provision for the assignment of such unenumerated powers either to the general government or to the state governments. These unenumerated powers are called *residuary powers*. In states having a strong centrifugal tendency, as in the U.S.A., residuary powers are vested in the state governments ; but in states like Canada and India, where the centripetal force is stronger, residuary powers are vested in the general government.

Again some federations have made a three-fold classification of governmental functions instead of two. In addition to the usual classification of functions into *National* and *State*, a third list of functions is made in the constitution, called the *Concurrent List*. Both the national and regional governments are empowered by the constitution to exercise their legislative and administrative authority over the concurrent list, subject to the condition that in case of a conflict between the two governments with regard to the exercise of concurrent powers federal laws will prevail over state laws. The present constitution of India has adopted this principle.

The rigid specification of powers by the federal constitution has been modified to a great extent by the adoption of the *Doctrine of Implied Powers* by the U.S.A. Supreme Court. In the U.S.A., powers of the national government are indeed very limited. But the Supreme Court of the U.S.A, by liberally interpreting the constitutional laws has helped confer more powers on the Congress which, though not specifically assigned to the Congress, yet are, according to judicial interpretation, latent in some other provisions of law. Thus judicial interpretation has been of immense help in all federations in the matter of further specification of powers not provided for in the constitution.

(c) *Supremacy of the Constitution which is generally written and rigid.* A federal government, as has already been pointed out, is the outcome of an agreement entered into by a number of parties. The terms of the agreement are formally embodied in a document which is known as the constitution. The constitution is the source of powers of both general and regional governments. It defines the powers of the state and distributes them to different bodies. Constitution is the supreme law of the land. Any law, passed either by the federal legislature or by any of the states, will be invalid if it violates any of the provisions of the constitution.

The constitution should be both written and rigid. Unless it is written, disputes may arise in future between two governments regarding their jurisdiction. Only a written constitution can define the spheres of action of the two sets of governments. The constitution should also be rigid in character so that neither of the Governments may enlarge or redistribute the powers of government differently in a way in which they already have been distributed by the constitution. If it is to be altered, it can be done only by the sovereign itself and not by any unilateral act.

(d) *The existence of an independent and impartial Judiciary.*

The supremacy of the constitution must be preserved in the interest of the stability of federal government and this is secured by the creation of a Federal Court which is an integral part of the constitution and as such stands on an equal footing with the federal executive and legislature. The federal court acts as the custodian of the constitution, which interprets its laws in case of doubt and ambiguity. It decides disputes arising out of the acts of the central or of the regional legislatures. It is vested with the power of declaring any law, national or regional, invalid which is at variance with the articles of the constitution. The federal judiciary is also the authority to expand the constitution by interpreting its implications. In short, it is the federal judiciary which helps give stability to the federal constitution by enforcing conditions of agreement upon the national and regional governments.

(e) *Double citizenship.* A citizen in a federal state owes a double allegiance—a direct allegiance to the national government in respect to matters which are the concern of that government and also an indirect allegiance to the state in which he resides in respect to matters which are the concern of the state. A citizen therefore lives under two sets of laws—national laws and laws of the state to which he belongs. But in India, there is one citizenship, namely, Indian citizenship.

(f) *Separate allocation of revenues.* The federal constitution must make provision for special revenue system. Just as powers and functions are divided and distributed, similarly provision should be made for dividing resources between the national and local governments in accordance with a definite scheme. This special revenue arrangement is necessary to enable the governments of the component states to carry on their administration, independent of the control of the general government as defined by the written constitution.

(g) *Allegiance and Secession.* A question may be asked as to whether the member states of a federation have the right to secede from the union in which they have voluntarily entered for certain advantages. A federation whether formed by the way of integration of independent states or by the way of disintegration of a big state is based upon the greatest common agreement for the greatest common good of the member states which give birth to a new state with a new national consciousness. If the union is to serve the purpose for which it is brought into existence by the greatest common agreement, the right to secede on the part of any of the contracting units seems to be incompatible with the ideal for which a federation stands. The inviolability of the federal union was firmly established both in the U.S.A. and Switzerland by refusing to recognise the right of secession to the recalcitrant states. In both the countries, the recalcitrant units were coerced to remain within the union. So it is now recognised as a universal principle that member states of a federal union are integral parts of the union and as such have no right to withdarw from the union.

The U.S.S.R. constitution was, however, an exception to this universally recognised principle. The Constitution of the U.S.S.R., recognised the right of secession on the part of the member republics. It is pointed out that the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics was a voluntary association of union republics it was only in conformity with true democratic principle that the units

should not be coerced to remain within the union against their will. They were at liberty to withdraw from the union with the same freedom with which they entered into it.

Conditions Essential to the formation and success of a Federation—"A Federal state", remarks Dicey, "is a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity and power with the maintenance of state rights." The desire for unity may be fed by what is known as *Geographical Contiguity*. It is very difficult to attain national unity where the people live widely apart from one another. The membership of a federal government implies that citizens should take an active part in common affairs which are usually administered by the general government. A federal government, it should be remembered, is a system composed of the central and local governments combined. The local governments are as much parts of the federal system as the general government is. If the citizens live in different territories, separated by long distance, they cannot be expected to participate in matters of common interest. Distance creates callousness. Besides, there is the difficulty of locating the seat of the general government. The units of the (British) Commonwealth of Nations cannot be organised into a federation for lack of geographical contiguity.

The second essential condition favourable to the formation of a federal union is the *community of race, language, religion, culture, interests and historical association*. These are the essential bonds of nationality. This feeling of nationality fed by geographical contiguity and a need for common defence creates a desire for union among men connected by locality, history, race or common economic interests.

The third essential conditions is a *sentiment of unity* arising out of the second. People must earnestly desire such union among themselves without surrendering their local rights. Hence federalism implies provincial autonomy which enables the component units to preserve that much of local autonomy which is not detrimental to national unity.

The fourth essential condition is that there should be *equality* among the units, both between themselves and in relation to outside powers. States, large or small, must have equal rights and privileges in the affairs of the general government. This equality is secured by giving equal or proportionate representation to the states on the federal organs. The absence of political equality stirs up local jealousy and makes it possible for big states to dominate the rest. The so-called German federation before the First World War was a type which was notorious for its glaring inequality among the component states. Prussia, being the largest of the Germanic states, enjoyed special rights and privileges and in course of time began to exercise dictatorial power. The German federation could not stand the test of time as it was essentially 'a compromise between a lion, half a dozen of foxes and a score or mice ;' Prussia as the lion.

The last essential condition is the *political ability* of the people. The federal government requires for its success a basis of political competence and general education among the people. A high degree of general intelligence is necessary among the people in order that they may properly discharge their duties to the national and regional governments.

How far do these conditions exist in India ? The Indian union, as reconstituted by the States Reorganisation Act, 1956, and subsequent amendments consists of twenty-three states of equal status and eight union territories. The first

essential condition for the success of a federal government is geographical contiguity. With the sole exception of the tiny islands of the Andaman and Nicobar in the Bay of Bengal and the Laccadive and Amindiv in the Arabian Sea all other parts of the Indian union are contiguous territories making it easier for the people of the different parts of the country to come frequently in contact with one another. Frequent contact and interchange of ideas and ideals promote the feeling of national unity. This geographical contiguity has also helped India to organise her defence more effectively against foreign aggression.

A second condition favouring the formation of a federal union is the presence of community of race, language, religion, interest and historical tradition which cement the bond of union between the different parts of a federation. So far as India is concerned, identity of race, language and religion, to be frank, does not exist. The people of India represent heterogenous racial elements, speaking in different dialects and professing a variety of religious faith prominent among which are Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam and Christianity. These religious and linguistic differences often strike a discordant note in the political life of the country. The different racial elements speaking in different languages and professing different faiths live so intermixed with one another that any attempt to reorganise the different states of the Indian union on linguistic or religious basis is bound to fail.

In spite of these diversities, there is the redeeming feature that the different communities had for centuries lived on the common land, observed many common customs and developed some common traits of character. The present Constitution of India has also helped the growth of a vigorous nationhood in India by enforcing one citizenship for the whole country and also by throwing open equal opportunities for all citizens irrespective of caste, colour, creed or place of residence. So the possibility of the formation of a United Indian Federation is not a dim and distant one. If the people of Switzerland, home of diversities, can form a federation, there is no reason why we should be so sceptical about India on the score of her diversities.

A federation creates a new state and a new nation and it is therefore absolutely necessary that the federating units should be bound together by a common sentiment of unity. In India, this federal sentiment, though weak, still exists and it is gradually growing stronger. The different units are gradually realising the truth that none of them is self-sufficient and that in union lies their strength. The creation of zonal councils in 1956 to settle all problems arising out of inter-state relation and frequent meetings and conferences of the heads of states under the aegis of the Union Government have not only counteracted the separatist tendencies to a great extent but have also cemented the bond of national unity. The rehabilitation of refugees from East Pakistan in the different states, —even in the distant Andamans goes to prove that the rehabilitation of refugees is considered as an all-India problem.

It is again necessary that there should be equality or at least proportionate equality among the units forming a federation. If some states are bigger in size, population and resources and command greater influence by reason of their superior position, the smaller states will have little share in common affairs. Federalism implies the idea of equal partnership among the units and any deviation from this principle is likely to create suspicion and lack of confidence in the weaker units. In the U.S.A., and Canada, political equality has been secured by giving equal representation to all the component states in the upper chamber. In India, the disparity between the states in size, population and resources is so

prominent that exact equality has not been possible. The Indian states have been given full equality of status but only proportionate equality of representation on population basis.

The last essential condition is the political ability of the people. A federal government is a complex organisation which demands of its citizens a high level of general intelligence in order that the citizens may properly discharge their duties to the national and regional governments. Besides, the federating units, equal partners as they are in all affairs, must be equally politically advanced, otherwise, the complex mechanism of government would prove to be too difficult to be worked out by a people who are lacking in political training and competence. In India, during the initial stage of the working of the federal government, considerable difficulty arose due to the retirement of the bulk of the foreign civil and military servicemen from Indian civil and military services. In some of the states, offices had to be manned by recruitment from outside and not infrequently by appointing foreigners to posts of trust and responsibility. The difficulty is now almost over. The Army, Navy, and Air services have now been completely Indianised and the administrative, medical, educational, agricultural, forest and other services of both the Union and State Governments are now run by Indian personnel. Foreigners are now employed in India only as expert technicians. It will therefore not be too ambitious to claim that India possesses almost all conditions favouring the growth of a federation.

Distribution of powers in the Federal system. In a federal government the totality of governmental powers is divided and distributed and the guiding principle of distribution of powers between the general government and regional governments is that affairs which are of nation-wide importance and interest and which demand uniformity of legislation and administration are generally entrusted to the general government while matters of local interests which do not require such uniformity are left to the care of the regional governments. All states having a federal form of government follow this principle, although opinions differ as to what matters require uniformity of regulations and what do not. Thus foreign relations, war and peace, coinage, post and telegraph etc. are considered by all states as subjects requiring uniformity and hence to be placed under central control while agriculture, industry, police and prison are left in the hands of the regional government. But in some of the more recently established federations, the component states have been given some powers even in international affairs. Thus in the Commonwealth of Australia, the provincial governments can maintain direct relations with the Mother Country through their Agents-General in London. In the U.S.S.R., some of the Republics like Ukraine and Byelorussia had been accorded separate representation on the U.N. In some states again, although the component units enjoy no international status, yet they can create a good deal of difficulty in the matter of prosecuting a particular foreign policy by the general government. But great difficulty may arise in those federal systems where regional governments are authorities of residuary powers and the general government is an authority of delegated powers. Thus in the U.S.A., civil and criminal law, laws regarding marriage and divorce are local, not national as in Germany or Canada. The result has been that these and certain other matters which are national in their scope and are badly in need of uniform regulation have produced variety of legislation which has in many cases embittered inter-state relation. In some of the newly-created federations, the practice is to make a tripartite division of powers into federal, provincial and concurrent, the last named

comprising subjects over which both the national and the regional governments are competent to legislate. In case of a conflict between the laws over concurrent subjects, the federal laws generally prevail over local laws. But whatever may be the underlying principle of distribution of powers in a federal system, making general government weak or strong, it is desirable for the sake of its stability that the manner in which powers have been distributed between them should be altered only by the sovereign itself and not by either of the two alone.

Federal Control over Regional Governments. The nature of the control exercised by the national government over regional governments varies both in kind and in degree from state to state. Thus, the Constitution of the U.S.A. enjoins upon the nationl government the duty of enforcing the provision that all the component states maintain only the republican form of government. Similar was the provision in the Weimar Constitution of Germany, requiring the states to maintain a republican form of government with a cabinet system. In the Dominion of Canada, the Governor-General possesses not only the power to appoint Lt. governors for the provinces but also the power to disallow acts of the provincial legislatures. Lastly, the national government in almost all federations has the right to intervene in local affairs for the preservation of public safety and order. It need not even wait for a formal request from the state or province affected by internal disturbances, but on its own initiative, the general government may intervene to restore order and peace.

In some federal governments as in the U.S.A., Canada, the general government maintains a separate set of its own officials to enforce its laws collect revenues and to discharge other federal functions, while in Switzerland, Germany, the general government instead of maintaining a separate set of federal officials depend more on the officials of the provincial Governments for putting into execution federal laws. In India, the President may, with the consent of the government of a state, entrust to its state officers functions in relation to any matter falling within the ambit of the Union.

Reliance on provincial authorities secures economy by the avoidance of duplication of governmental machinery, but the system may prove burdensome to the provincial authorities which may not always prove equal to the task.

Merits of Unitary Government. Unitary system of Government secures the advantages of a single system of law, policy and administration throughout the country. The advantage of a unitary government is more marked in the fields of foreign policy and national defence. The administration is more simple but less expensive. A unitary government is therefore stronger than a federal one inasmuch as it can very effectively bring all the forces of government to bear directly upon the problems of administration to be solved.

Demerits. The greatest drawback of the unitary type is that it leaves little scope for the growth of local self-government. Local needs which are varying in degree and kind are neglected. Local initiative is repressed and concentration of powers in a single organ facilitates the growth of a centralised bureaucracy.

Merits of Federal Governments. A federal government, more than any other form, affords the means by which small states may unite together to form a powerful state and thereby obtain all the advantages of a big state. The states thus uniting together need not sacrifice their local autonomy in respect to matters which concern them alone. It is the only form of government which makes it possible to have uniformity of regulation throughout the country in respect to those matters where such uniformity is essential and at the same time it maintains diversity in purely local matters where diversity is desirable. The division of powers relieves the general government of a federation of the burden and congestion of work which oppress it under the unitary system. Furthermore, a federal government is the best school for training the people in the art of self-government and thus it stimulates the interests of the people in public affairs. Lastly, the federal system helps preserve the rights of the people by counteracting the tendency to the rise of a despotic centralised government.

Demerits. A federal government is unable to conduct its foreign affairs with the same case and independence with which a unitary government conducts its foreign affairs. It may be handicapped by the whims of a particular state. The national government of the U.S.A. is often put to great difficulty in enforcing treaty obligations. The weakness of a federal government is more manifest in the administration of internal affairs which are divided and distributed between the general and regional governments. Division of powers means weakness and leads to diversity of legislation. The organization is very complex and requires duplication of governmental machinery involving increased cost of operating it. The greatest danger of the federal system is that it is liable to division into groups and factions by the formation of separate combination of states. The evils of combination are potent in the United States where any proposal for constitutional amendment may be disapproved by the combination of more than one-fourth of the states. Besides, the possibility of a conflict of jurisdiction between the national and regional authorities is always present and in the absence of a satisfactory solution, conflict of jurisdiction may lead to the break up of the union by secession or by armed rebellion. Lastly, trouble, expense and delay are inherent in a federal government due to the complexity of a double system of administration and legislation.

Federalism as a principle of state organisation. There are writers who are very critical and also sceptical about the success of federalism as a principle of state organisation. Prof. Dicey and Lowell have levelled charges against federalism which, according to them, either degenerates into a unitary state or gives rise to a loosely-jointed state divided against itself with the result that a dominant state or a combination of smaller states fight for supremacy thus sacrificing the principle of federal equality. Lowell cites the example of Germany before the First World War in support of his view and points out that federalism simply creates divided allegiance, weakens national solidarity and makes it impossible for the general government to pursue a bold policy of national progress both in respect to home and foreign affairs.

The charges are partially true and in some of the earlier federations the defects manifested themselves so prominently that the federal forms had to be dissolved. But the defects are however remediable and as a matter of fact the history of federalism proves that where the federal constitution is carefully drawn up leaving no room for quarrel among the component states, the federal form

has proved to be the most successful form of government. The prosperity and progress of the U.S.A. may be said to be due to its federal form of government. The thirteen colonies which were the original members of the federal organisation would not have counted much in their individual capacity either in world politics or in world trade if they were not united. The peace of Europe would have been disturbed many times more if the cantons of Switzerland were not organised on a federal basis.

Prof. Laski who is an ardent advocate of the federal principle boldly asserts that 'because society is federal, authority must be federal also.' He goes so far as to suggest that the federal principle which has been remarkably successful in removing friction and preventing disintegration internally should be extended externally also in the matter of inter-state relation. No nation today is self-sufficient. The political, cultural, economic and social inter-dependence of states makes it all the more necessary on the part of the states to organise them on a federal basis in accordance with the principle that 'what touches all should be decided by common agreement of states'. As in national affairs, so in the realm of international politics, the principle of federalism will go a long way not only in preventing international jealousies and conflicts but also in promoting international co-operation which is essential for the purpose of furthering the cause of peace and progress not of any nation in particular but of humanity at large. The federal principle was very feebly applied to the organisation of the 'League of Nations' and the principle, in spite of its failure in the case of the League, has been applied to the organisation of the United Nations and this time it has not proved so frail as in the previous case.

Thus on a close and careful study federalism, it appears that its advantages outweigh the disadvantages. It may be safely asserted that it is the only form of government which is in keeping with democratic principles and is specially suitable for countries with vast area and population and with diversity of race, language and religion. The only way to make the world safe for democracy or to make democracy safe for the world lies in organising the world states on a federal basis.

Modern Centralist Tendencies in Federations. A federal government implies the existence of two sets of government, namely, the general government at the centre for common affairs and regional governments in each component unit for local affairs. Although the federal constitution provides for independent spheres of activities for each of the two sets of government, the modern tendency in all federations whether of the American, Canadian or mixed type, is that the general governments have grown more powerful and the governments of the component units are gradually receding into the background. But this predominance of the general government does not mean that it has snatched away powers from the regional government nor does it always mean that the general government has gained new powers in addition to those originally conferred upon it at the time of formation of the federation. This rapid extension of powers of the general government of a federation has given rise to misgivings in many quarters which foresee the gradual transition from the federal form to the unitary one.

But the misgivings are not borne out by history. The reason for this increase in importance and strength of the general government lies in the fact that it has developed more intensively the fields of its jurisdiction which were originally assigned to it. In some federations as in the U.S.A. and India, new

powers have been conferred upon the general governments. Prof. Wheare points out that the main forces that have contributed to a great increase in the power of the general government at the expense of the units are generally four in number. They are *war, economic depression, the growth of the social services and the mechanical revolution in transport and industry.*

Modern wars are total wars, the successful prosecution of which demands the mobilisation of the entire resources of the nation under unified control. This can be effected only by the national government. War also imposes financial strains which only the national government is in a position to bear. In the same way if economic depressions are to be successfully tackled, it cannot be done on a regional basis. It is only the national government which can combat a nation-wide depression by adopting a bold national fiscal policy. Social services generally mean educational and health services which are usually under the control of the regional governments. But it is found in all federations including even the U.S.A. that a proper development of these services requires financial assistance and also guidance from the general government. The development of the means of communication has virtually removed state barriers. Inter-regional commerce and inter-regional social and cultural associations have closely knit together the people of the different regions. The problems of argiculture, industry and trade are now considered as national problems rather than as regional problems. Hence all these are tc be tackled from the broad national point of view and as such the hands of the general government must needs be strengthened.

Lastly, the modern state is a great social service organisation the whole of which is based on planning. Planning implies concentration, co-ordination and mutual inter-dependence of different parts for the ultimate success of the whole. This has also led to an increase in the power of the general governments in all federations Thus Lipson observes : "Virtually all the great driving forces in modern society combine in a centralist direction."

But this increase in the powers of the general government should not be construed to mean that the general governments are gradually usurping the powers of the governments of the regions with the ulterior motive of reducing the latter to the position of regional governments in a unitary state. The fact is that in a dynamic society, the general governments have been called upon to supplement the activities of the regional governments only to make the federal form successful.

Parliamentary or Cabinet Government. The Cabinet form of government is a system in which the real executive known as the Cabinet or Council of Ministers consists of the chosen leaders of the majority party in the legislature. The executive in this form is directly and legally responsible for their political policy and action to the legislature and through them to the electorate. The nominal executive head may be a constitutional monarch as in England or an elected President as in India but he holds a position of irresponsibility. The cabinet which is the real executive is in effect a committee of the legislature and continues in office so long as it commands the confidence of the legislature, particularly of the lower house. The essential feature of the cabinet system is the collective responsibility of the ministers to the legislature, and whenever the latter expresses its want of confidence in the ministry, they resign in a body. The ministry as a whole sail in the same boat; they float or sink together. There is no separation of powers in the cabinet system, the executive being an integral part of the legislature. The relation between the executive and the legislature is one of intimacy and inter-dependence.

The Cabinet system had its origin in England and little by little it spread to other countries. In England, the king is the nominal executive while the cabinet is the real executive. The members of the Cabinet are members of either the House of Commons or of the House of Lords. But though the Cabient with the Prime Minister at its head is representative of both the Houses, it is responsible only to the House of Commons and through it to the electorate. In England, the Prime Minister can appeal to the electorate by dissolving the lower house and can order a general election on the results of which the tenure of ministry usually depends. The Cabinet system is also in vogue in France where cabinet members need not necessarily be the members of the legislature. But as cabinet members, they have a right to take their seat in either of the two Houses and to participate in the deliberations of the legislature. The French system of cabinet government differs from the English system in other important respects as well. In England, cabinet members are also Parliamentary leaders who guide and direct the course of legislation. But in France, the ministry instead of leading and guiding the Parliament, is itself controlled by the legislature even in respect to the details of legislation and administration. The French Cabinet has, under the new constitution, only a limited right to dissolve the legislature and even this limited right it can very seldom exercise. On the contrary, it is the cabinet which is overthrown frequently upon minor questions by the legislature. In England, the legislature makes the ministry but the ministry can unmake the legislature. In France the legislature unmakes the ministry.

Non-Parliamentary or the Presidential Government. It is a form of government in which the executive is constitutionally independent of the legislature and the legislature of the executive in respect to their policies and powers and duration of their tenure. The government of the U.S.A. is the best example of the presidential type. The President is the executive head and is indirectly elected by the people for a specified term fixed by the constitution. He is not a member of the legislature and has no direct control over legislation. He cannot be removed from office by votes of non-confidence of the legislature. He is assisted in his executive work by ministers who are all appointed by him and solely responsible to him. They, like their chief, are not members of the legislature and are not effected by any vote of censure of the legislature. These ministers are not the colleagues of the President but only his 'Secretaries' who are individually responsible to him. The President and his Secretaries may be turned out of office by the legislature only by the cumbersome procedure of impeachment, if their conduct becomes criminal. Similarly, if the views of the legislature in respect to public policy are different from those of the executive, the latter cannot dissolve the legislature and appeal to the electorate. The distinguishing mark of the presidential type is the almost complete separation of the executive and the legislative departments.

Points of Difference between the Parliamentary and the Presidential forms of Government.

First, in the parliamentary or cabinet form of government there is, besides the real executive, a nominal executive head who is either a hereditary monarch as in Great Britain or an elected President as in India. The hereditary monarch or the elected President reigns but does not govern—the real work of governing the country being vested in a cabinet or council of ministers. In sharp contrast

to this system, the Presidential form is characterised by the supremacy of the President who is not only the titular head but also the real head of the executive.

Secondly, the council of ministers, i.e., the real executive in the parliamentary form, though it has a fixed term of office, may be removed earlier by an adverse vote of the legislature but the president of the non-parliamentary form is not affected by a vote of censure of the legislature, his mode of election and term of office being fixed by the constitution.

Thirdly, in the parliamentary form, the real executive is dependent on the legislature inasmuch as its term of office depends on the approval or otherwise of its policy by the legislature. But in the presidential form, the President is independent of the legislature. He need not count upon the support of the legislature for continuing in his office. He is virtually an irremovable executive within the term of his office.

Fourthly, ministry or cabinet is formed in the parliamentary form by the leaders of the majority party headed by a Prime Minister. All the members of the ministry are generally members of the legislature and as members of the legislature, they introduce bills, formulate policies and prepare the budget. But in the presidential form, the ministry or the cabinet, as it is called by courtesy, is not formed by the leaders of the party or parties but selected by the President himself. Party leaders are very seldom to be found in the President's cabinet. They are invariably in the legislature and play an important role in legislation.

Fifthly, cabinet members in the parliamentary form enjoy almost equal status with the Prime Minister who is an equal among equals though as the leader of the team, he has some rank and precedence. The Prime Minister can very seldom override the decision of his Cabinet colleagues and as a matter of fact, decisions are taken by a majority vote in the Cabinet. But the picture is dfferent in the presidential form where the President is the master and other Cabinet members are merely his subordinates whom he can appoint and dismiss at his will. President's voice drowns all other voices in taking decisions.

Lastly, the parliamentary form is marked by a union of powers between the executive and the legislature whereas the essential feature of the presidential form is the almost complete separation of powers between the executive and the legislature. In the parliamentary form of Great Britain, all the members of the executive cabinet must be members of the legislature and take part in law-making, formulating policies and in controlling finance. They remain in office so long as they command the confidence of the legislature. They can also dissolve the legislature. But in sharp contrast to the British System, stands the presidential system of the U.S.A. where the President is not a member of the legislature, cannot directly influence legislation and cannot be removed by the legislature. He cannot also dissolve the legislature.

Merits of the Cabinet System. The excellence of the Cabinet system lies in its harmonious collaboration between the executive and the legislative departments, thus ensuring steady and orderly progress in the work of the government. It is in effect the only form of government in which the responsibility of those who execute the laws and govern the country is effectively enforced. Cabinet government generally rests on the support of the majority party. The party-in-power is always exposed to the criticism of the opposition and hence it cannot afford to be unmindful of the real interest of the people. Again, the party system

on which it is based leads to vigorous party organisation and helps the training of the people in the art of politics. Another advantage of the system is its flexibility and elasticity which prove to be the elements of strength in times of emergency especially in war.

Demerits. In the first place, the Cabinet system of government violates the principle of separation of powers, the executive being a part of the legislature. The system also does not provide for stable government. As the government rests primarily on party support, any change in the party politics on in party organisation leads to a change in the ministry. Frequent changes in the ministry are likely to hamper political progress. In times of war and other emergencies, the system cannot work smoothly as it is very difficult to adapt itself to meet the new situation when unity of policy and action is badly needed. Lastly, the Cabinet system is criticised as a dictatorship of one man, the Prime Minister, or a small group of men who exercise their power on the support of a subservient legislature which is forced to submission by threats of dissolution.

Merits of the Presidential system. The Presidential system is more stable than the Cabinet system as both the executive and the legislature enjoy fixed terms of office. It also secures a strong and vigorous executive who can work with a singleness of purpose. The executive authority is concentrated in one hand and this greatly helps in times of war when concerted action among the executive is keenly felt. The system produces great efficiency in the ministers as they are not distracted by the necessity of frequent attendance in the legislature. In the field of legislation, the system ensures efficiency as the legislature is also free from the interference of the executive.

Demerits. The Presidential form is criticised as being autocratic, irresponsible and dangerous. It is autocratic because the executive, though a nominee of the nation, is independent of its control. It is irresponsible because the executive cannot be held accountable to the legislature for its policy and action. It is dangerous because there is no effective means by which the responsibility for the exercise of power may be effectively enforced. He may misgovern for the duration of his term, but so long as his conduct is not criminal, he cannot be removed from office either by the legislature, or by the electorate. Lastly, the absence of co-operation between the executive and the legislature consequent on a rigid separation of powers has resulted in frequent deadlocks which involve loss of efficiency and energy.

Reviewing the merits and demerits of each of the two types, it may be said that Presidential system serves its purpose better in times of war, though it is less helpful in times of peace. It is suitable for a country with vast area and population while the Parliamentary system is preferred for states of moderate size. "The Presidential system was built for safety and not for speed."

Bureaucracy.

The term 'Bureaucracy' is derived from the French word 'bureau' meaning a desk. Bureaucracy in this sense means a desk government, i.e., a government run by departments characterised by officiousness, regimentation and red-tapism.

Marx indicates four senses in which the term is used.

1. *The Guardian Bureaucracy* may be said to be a mixed type in the sense that it is honest, efficient and well-meaning but at the same time authoritarian and irresponsible. The Prussian bureaucracy was of this type.

2. *The Caste Bureaucracy* which existed in ancient India where only Brahmins and Khastriayas were eligible for high offices, had a class base. This type was also introduced into India by the British rulers, the most important feature of the system being the aloofness of the officials from the people and their extreme formalism.

3. *The Patronage Bureaucracy* which may otherwise be called the 'Spoils System' still lingers in the U.S.A. where political jobs are distributed as a reward for helping a party in winning elections.

4. *Merit Bureaucracy* has its base on efficiency and competence. Merit bureaucracy which is a product of modern democracy opens career only to talents and as such it is always at the service of the people.

Bureaucratic Government. A Bureaucratic government is described as one which comprises a class of administrators who are appointed to public service only after a regular course of study and examination which make them pre-eminently fit for the job for which they are intended. These persons remain in office so long as they are of good behaviour and retire on pensions. The public servants under this system regard themselves as a class, distinct from other classes of society and "tend to acquire an *espirit de corps* somewhat similar to that found among the soldiers of a regular army." A Bureaucratic government is characterised by 'red-tapism', i.e., extreme formalism and tends to over-emphasize administrative routine rather than fundamental principles. Burke rightly remarks that such a government tends to think more of form than of substance and as such it cannot be responsive to the public opinion of the country. The extreme example of a bureaucracy was that which existed in Prussia during the last century. But the Prussian bureaucracy combined excessive formalism with a high degree of efficiency, though responsibility was divorced from efficiency. The British system of bureaucracy in India was another example. The higher posts of responsibility were reserved for those who passed the Civil Service Examination. The officials had practically no touch with the people. The administrative machine moved so slowly in India that the system not only tired the patience of the public but also was subjected to a good deal of adverse criticism. Now that India is free, it may be reasonably expected that the public officials in the discharge of their duties, will be guided by a spirit of service to the people.

Merits and Demerits of Bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is, however, not without its merits. The officials are recruited after a rigid test of fitness for public service and therefore the system secures high skill and efficiency in officers. The permanence of tenure makes the officials efficient and experienced. The importance of the accumulated experience of administrators cannot be minimised in view of the growing complexities of modern social life.

But a bureaucracy is not free from defects. The sole criterion of a good government is not its efficiency. Responsibility can hardly be divorced from efficiency. The serious defect of bureaucracy is that it is not responsible to the people and is the least affected by public opinion. The system practically leaves no room for the education of the people in political affairs. The most serious

Marx indicates four senses in which the term is used.

1. *The Guardian Bureaucracy* may be said to be a mixed type in the sense that it is honest, efficient and well-meaning but at the same time authoritarian and irresponsible. The Prussian bureaucracy was of this type.

2. *The Caste Bureaucracy* which existed in ancient India where only Brahmins and Khastriayas were eligible for high offices, had a class base. This type was also introduced into India by the British rulers, the most important feature of the system being the aloofness of the officials from the people and their extreme formalism.

3. *The Patronage Bureaucracy* which may otherwise be called the 'Spoils System' still lingers in the U.S.A. where political jobs are distributed as a reward for helping a party in winning elections.

4. *Merit Bureaucracy* has its base on efficiency and competence. Merit bureaucracy which is a product of modern democracy opens career only to talents and as such it is always at the service of the people.

Bureaucratic Government. A Bureaucratic government is described as one which comprises a class of administrators who are appointed to public service only after a regular course of study and examination which make them pre-eminently fit for the job for which they are intended. These persons remain in office so long as they are of good behaviour and retire on pensions. The public servants under this system regard themselves as a class, distinct from other classes of society and "tend to acquire an *espirit de corps* somewhat similar to that found among the soldiers of a regular army." A Bureaucratic government is characterised by 'red-tapism', i.e., extreme formalism and tends to over-emphasize administrative routine rather than fundamental principles. Burke rightly remarks that such a government tends to think more of form than of substance and as such it cannot be responsive to the public opinion of the country. The extreme example of a bureaucracy was that which existed in Prussia during the last century. But the Prussian bureaucracy combined excessive formalism with a high degree of efficiency, though responsibility was divorced from efficiency. The British system of bureaucracy in India was another example. The higher posts of responsibility were reserved for those who passed the Civil Service Examination. The officials had practically no touch with the people. The administrative machine moved so slowly in India that the system not only tired the patience of the public but also was subjected to a good deal of adverse criticism. Now that India is free, it may be reasonably expected that the public officials in the discharge of their duties, will be guided by a spirit of service to the people.

Merits and Demerits of Bureaucracy. Bureaucracy is, however, not without its merits. The officials are recruited after a rigid test of fitness for public service and therefore the system secures high skill and efficiency in officers. The permanence of tenure makes the officials efficient and experienced. The importance of the accumulated experience of administrators cannot be minimised in view of the growing complexities of modern social life.

But a bureaucracy is not free from defects. The sole criterion of a good government is not its efficiency. Responsibility can hardly be divorced from efficiency. The serious defect of bureaucracy is that it is not responsible to the people and is the least affected by public opinion. The system practically leaves no room for the education of the people in political affairs. The most serious

limitation of bureaucracy, according to Mill, is "The disease which afflicts bureaucracies and of which they die—is routine."

Decentralisation.

Meaning. One of the main problems with which a modern government is confronted on its organisational side is how to reconcile the two almost opposite tendencies inherent in all governments, namely, centralisation and decentralisation.

Decentralisation stands for dispersal of power and authority among a number of lower or subordinate units,—it implies the process of transfer of power and decision-making authority from the top to the bottom units of government. Centralisation, on the other hand, means concentration of authority and decision-making power at the top level of the government. Decentralisation should be carefully distinguished from delegation which implies transfer of specific powers by the central authority to the local authority but the central authority retains to itself not only the power to supervise and control the local authority relating to functions delegated to them but also to revoke at any time the powers delegated. Where there is decentralisation, the central authority is altogether divested of those powers transferred to the local units. Thus decentralisation creates autonomous administrative units but delegation creates only subordinate units which act as the agents of the central authority.

These two tendencies of centralisation and decentralisation run almost parallel in every modern government. No government can be organised wholly on the basis of either of the tendencies to the exclusion of the other. There are fields of administration in every government where it is only centralisation that can make the government efficient but in certain other fields, the democratic character of the state cannot be maintained unless a policy of decentralisation is followed

Successful attempts have been made in England and in France both having a government of a centralised character to reconcile centralisation with decentralisation. In England, the principle of legislative centralisation has been linked with administrative decentralisation and in France, administrative centralisation with legislative decentralisation.

In India, the two tendencies are not only present but have been applied to the actual working of the government. The need for the rapid economic development of India and also the need for her effective defence make it imperative to have a strong central authority. But the demand for regional autonomy carrying it to the extent of Panchayat Raj illustrates the tendency towards decentralisation.

Need for Decentralisation. In support of his plea for decentralisation, Laski asserts that "the scale of the modern state requires a large measure of decentralisation if it is to do its work in a creative way." The scale and scope of the activity of a modern state have multiplied to such an enormous extent that it is neither possible nor desirable for one central authority to look after every detail of administration and legislation. Niggardliness in the matter of dispersal of power where such dispersal is essential leads to the inevitable results of delay, inefficiency and corruption in the discharge of governmental functions causing great inconvenience to the people. To avoid the evils of excessive centralisation of power and to ensure smooth working of the governmental system, Laski advances three arguments in support of decentralisation.

In the first place, he says that in a centralised state, real power resides in a ruling elite who decides everything for the common people. Thus the common