

DEMOCRATIC DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA: LESSONS FOR PAKISTAN

RAJA QAISER AHMED¹

¹Lecturer at Department of Defense and Diplomatic Studies,
Fatima Jinnah Women University, Rawalpindi Pakistan
rajaqaisherahmed@gmail.com

ABSTRACT. *This paper attempts to unleash the structural components which differed in changing the frame of rule of the states that came into the map of the world on exactly the same day named India and Pakistan. Having shared values, culture, colonial experience, same structure India managed to procure a robust democracy while in Pakistan democracy is still perceived as a mean of conducting procedural balloting. India secured functional institutions while in Pakistan still the coordination of powers among the institutions is missing. The paper attempts to strategize the solutions of the predicaments which the state of Pakistan is facing in the light of India's experiences. It highlights the different loopholes of democratic rule in Pakistan that remained unsettled at its inception. The paper in detail examines the state and polity of both states in post –independence era and tries to trace out the factors that enable India in procuring a substantive frame of governance. The lessons and precedents that the state of Pakistan should follow from India's democratic development have also been elaborated exhaustively.***Purpose:** Purpose of the paper is to explore and identify the diverging structural patterns within the comparative politics. **Methodology:** Explanatory research methodology has been taken up along with qualitative data analysis. **Terminology:** India in its beginning succeeded in paving a way towards the institutionalization of the political processes that resulted in the consolidation of democratic norms in India whereas on other hand Pakistan can learn from India's experiences to make democratic rule more participative and functional. **Significance:** The study is extremely relevant as Pakistan apparently is a primary victim to the fragile political rule. **Key Words:** Secularism, regionalism, praetorianism, ethnicity, extremism

1. Introduction. The subcontinent always remained a center of attention for the major powers since 16th century onwards. Starting with Portuguese and ending it up with perpetuation of British the colonial rule in India remained persisted. Though the impetus behind all this territorial annexation was mercantilism, yet this India was special in different ways. It never had a centralized rule throughout its history. There remained empires, presidencies, sub-presidencies, kingships and Rajwaras that characterized the fragmented governance in a loosely integrated India. India lacked territorial coherence. Its boundaries remained undefined and unregulated. Different rulers in different times went for the extension of its boundaries, so it made India diverse but with flexible boundaries. This inclusion of the regions brought issues of different types. It modified the leadership pattern and strengthened the class structure. The crumbling power of Mughals in India and the advent of British Raj brought dramatic changes not only in administrative realm but in thinking

patterns as well. This British rule was a new experience for India itself as it was never governed in a style which Raj introduced. Historically the darbar was the symbol of the rule in India. The Raj defined it as an altruistic concern to uplift the masses that were divided and segregated into caste, religion and are illiterate (Stephen, 1883).

That was why just after 24 years of local bodies act Indian National Congress was founded having aimed at the representation of all Indians. It was a major development in Indian polity and a breakthrough as well that for the first time in its long history a political party was setup. Muslims surprisingly kept themselves aloof from INC with a view that it is a Hindu dominated body and Muslims are in position to contend Hindu influence in it. Feeling deprived of the representation the Indian Muslims forged ahead to craft a party of their own named All India Muslim league. The major success that AIML owned was the securement of separate electorates and separation of Bengal in Hindu dominated and Muslim dominated areas. The reforms of 1909 were extremely significant in this regard. The nullification of Bengal's separation was bitterly detested by the Muslims' representatives of that time.

The next major political development was the introduction of reforms in 1919. It ensured the self-government at local and provincial levels but left the center firm in the hands of British. It was the second and last time after the mutiny of 1857 Muslims and Hindus showed level of cooperation with one another. Muslims were all hands together in their struggle to safeguard the Ottoman Empire in the wake of World War 1. In post cooperation phase Muslims felt like being stabbed in their back by Hindus and after they never came unanimous on a single point agenda. The 14 points of Jinnah was a political move that streamlined Muslim's further way of action. Before this Jinnah had attempted the Hindu Muslims amity having inked Lucknow pact. These points were the delineation of the demands of the Muslims of that time.

Nothing as profoundly affected the way of governance in post-independence polities in newly emerged countries as did the Indian act of 1935. It for the first time introduced democracy in India with formal elections. It effectively rendered a compact way of governance. It embittered the communal relations to the extent that led to the presentation of Lahore resolution and formation a newly state named Pakistan on the map of the world. The act of 1935 opened the prospects for the first time to get substantial power in Centre on the basis of success in provinces (Jalal, 1990). One thing here is worth mentioning that all these above mentioned developments largely addressed, affected and were concerned with the centralized areas, now parts of India. The areas which apparently constitute Pakistan were extremely secluded, so received a minimal influence of these developments. The areas which were directly concerned with these developments were developed areas of that time including Bombay, West Bengal, Madras and Indian Punjab. Sindh at that time was the presidency of Bombay. Punjab of now Pakistan sowed least activism even in independence movement up till 1946. NWFP was culturally more tilted towards Afghanistan and Baluchistan was extremely remote to get directly influenced by these major developments taking place in British India. The movement for Pakistan was even rooted largely in the areas outside the region which now comprise Pakistan up to the middle of 1940s (Waseem, 1989).

These areas largely participated in freedom movement on the name of Muslim nationalism and all this freedom movement in these areas was elite and feudal dominated. Involvement of the people was mostly on the name of sloganeering of religion and the influence of the elite of that time over their masses. It was nothing to do with democratic awareness. Most of this influential elite joined freedom movement when creation of Pakistan seemed inevitable and it was left was left with no resort but to support movement to shield its interests. Otherwise historically this all creed remained loyal to British crown and showed zero interest emblemizing for a new state. It is often said for the bifurcation of United India that it was the will of the middle Class which was grilled into the incessant communal competition. The ruling feudal elite had no concern with this movement. From the beginning the Muslims' politics was dominated by aristocratic families. Those who attended Simla deputation, only 11 out 35 were not having any title (Hassan, 1976).

All the leadership of Indian freedom movement belonged to the Middle class. The lone term deterioration of the democratic norms in post-independence period was due to the fact that the impact and influence of the elite could not get dwindled and its dominating influence persisted even today. That is why the frame of rule in Pakistan even today is called as elite dominated framework.

2. India at the beginning. India and Pakistan were the off shoot of post-colonialism. The edifice of British Empire started crumbling with the advent of World War 2. At the end of the war it became impossible for the British Empire to linger on with its colonies. This moment was effectively captured by the native masses by waging quit India movement and it became obvious that sooner or later British will withdraw from India. Now all the focus was to remap India onto the basis of religious affinity. It stirred not a major controversy but

embittered the communal relations as well.

This deterioration of the relations was one of the key factors later on in the fragile development of democracy in Pakistan. It affected Pakistan in multiple ways. The leadership that led India's camp included Gandhi, Nehru, Patel and Azad who all belonged to Congress. It was a strengthened and circumspect leadership who knew that it would have dominant hand in the case of British exit from India. On other hand Muslim camp had only one charismatic leader and that was Muhammad Ali Jinnah. Muslims were the underdogs in this struggle who were operating on two fronts simultaneously. On one hand they need to struggle to liberate India and second hand need to ensure that they must not fall prey into the hands of Hindus in post-independence period.

The leadership of All Indian Muslim League belonged to the educated Middle Class which was wary of the competition with Hindus who outnumbered them in educational and job employment opportunities. The menace of Hindu's dominance always remained at the back of the mind of the Muslim's leadership. That was why the multilateral cooperation in liberate India struggle between both the communities was out and out missing rather they were indulged in direct confrontation with one another. Muslims had a very bitter experience of congressional ministries of 1937 where they believed that they were very raucously treated by Hindus. It was nimbly manipulated by the Muslims later on when they constructed identity of Muslim League as a sole representative of Indian Muslims.

As movement for Pakistan got paced up, the rivalry among the both communities was escalated manifolds. The interim government of 1946 was the pinnacle of this rivalry when cabinet mission plan ended in the smoke. This animosity propelled Indian leadership to oppose any plan of creation of Pakistan at every forum. One of the opinions is that Pakistan came into being due to obstinate behavior of Hindu leadership otherwise Muslims were ready to cooperate in the wake of Cabinet mission plan. The plan to partition of India was announced on 3rd June 1947 where later on Pakistan won independence on 14th august 1947. The real struggle began then. Pakistan was a seceding state in this case of partition (Jalal, 1994).

India had all the administrative legacy of the colonial rule with itself including financial and military assets. Financial assets were provided to Pakistan after many hurdles yet no complete share was given to Pakistan. So Pakistan had to start in a way when it had offices in tin sheds without type writers, pens, papers and telephone (Ali, 1967). Pakistan had no elected bodies to carry out the governance so bureaucracy was used to govern the newly independent state at local and provincial level. It led to the bureaucratic centralization of the state. The ruling elite in Pakistan was all migrated having no constituencies in Pakistan. In that nick of the time holding elections was not all possible.

The puzzling enigma is Pakistan's inability to make a transition towards democracy where it inherited more or less the same features which did India. India was facing with extreme linguistic diversity, issue of princely states and a class and caste based society, yet it went remarkably good with the amalgamation of skill and coercion and forged India ahead to become a democratic state (Guha, 2007). Indian leadership pledged for the communitarian reorientation during the freedom movement and they did it immediately in first 5 years of independence where new provinces were setup on the basis of linguistic affinity. India went for the drafting of constitution soon after independence. So for India it became easy to assign and allocate the powers to its respective institutions. The colonial experience inherited strong administrative structure, intermediaries and strengthened political elite (Jones, 1964). Nehru did not want India to indulge itself in the global arena of conflict rather he attempted to keep India side of this to let democratic practices consolidate in it. He had to consider ethnic, federal, domestic, regional and ideological imperatives. India maintained a status of a secular state that needed a strong government to protect the rights of minorities with no acclaimed religion (Cohen, 2004). The majority of single party in a democratic frame of rule is though amusing but to India it proved to be a great source of assistance as most early 17 years of independence Centre remained led by Congress having majority of states' governments of Congress as well providing overall stability to the political process. Nehru went for the institutionalization of electoral politics in India. Elections were held after successive regimes without any stint. It enabled India not only concentrate democracy at its local level but to indoctrinate the democratic norms to the public as well. Economic and political thinking at the time of independence crystallized along the securement of institutional framework based on universal suffrage and on widening the electoral base to achieve a functional parliamentary democracy (Kothari, 1970). The settlement of democracy in a post-colonial polity like India seems awkward that secured social structure based on class and caste. India the only state to secure a functional democracy even British rulers in India opine that parliamentary democracy was unsuited for the society rigorously divided into religious and class groups and where the social structure comprises of hierarchy rather than ideological basis (Brass, 1994).

India had to contend three enigmas in its initial years. Topmost of them was to sustain democracy in extremely diversified framework. Second was to affiliate with which religion as majority of the population as Hindu along with the significant minorities Muslims and Sikhs and third genuine concern was to associate itself with which economic development model and joining either power blocs? Reorientation on the basis of language was done. Even today the growing regionalism of India dates itself to the early resettlement. India became a federated democracy with a strong centre. Though majoritarianism still prevails in India but India did not accredit any official religion rather declared itself as a secular republic. India maintained poise between the centralization and decentralization of powers and as federal democracies go, India is relatively centralized state. While many critics have made this observation, the fact is that demands for decentralization only makes sense in the context of centralized authority, authority and wealth have to exist before they can be redistributed (Kohli, 2001).

3. Challenges to Democracy in Pakistan. Pakistan apparently is facing multitudinous challenges on many fronts. All the threats which Pakistan implanted at the time of partition still prevail today and Pakistan seems unable to cope up with them. Some of the problems which are at the tipping point are

3.1. Ethnic nationalism. Politics of ethnicities and groups has got deeply inculcated in Pakistan. It is a classic study of degenerative centralism and resurgence of ethnic chauvinism. Pakistan's inability in post partition era has imparted a sense of deprivation among the different ethnic groups (Malik, 2010). Ethnicity always plays an important role in the identity construction of a state but In Pakistan it has become an irking issue which at times even threatens federal rule. The criteria of ethnicity shape systems and heritages and it flows out of contorous (Amin, 1988). The resurgence of robust Baluch nationalism, issues of identity in the form of Muhajir Politics, demands for making of new provinces and regional groups and subgroups are working in parallel to the rule of centre in Pakistan.

It has generated a great resentment towards centre and dominant ethnicity Punjabis. These ethnic parties have a firm belief that their underdevelopment is due to the monopoly of Punjabis in all state institutions and Punjabi and has deprived them of their rights.

3.2. Demand for New Provinces. The troubled relationship between ethnic parties and the centre has given birth to the demands of new provinces. There is great heterogeneity in Pakistan with a great polarization on the name of language. Within geographical spectrum Pakistan also seems reluctant accept and acknowledge the culturally diverse, ethnic and linguistic groups of Pakistan (Ali and Rehman, 2001). It has charged the ethnicities with anti federation sentiments and made them pursuing their identity chauvinistically. Though there exists a genuine demand if reorientation on administrative basis which has not been addressed et since independence. The demands of provinces include Secessionist movement of Baluchistan, Saraeki Soba movement, Restore the status of Bahawalpur movement, Muhajir Soba movement, Potohar soba movement and Hazara Soba movement. With the passing time these movements are getting momentum, wide acceptance and public support. It also projects the apparent cultural orientation of Pakistan which is getting dominated by fragmented identities with a great abhorrence towards centre.

3.3. Institutional Confrontationism. The stints in constitutional rule in the form of military interventions had made the powers of institutions unchecked. Judiciary, Army and parliament rather having coordination of powers often seem subsiding each other and at times even go for direct confrontation. There exists an institutional imbalance between confident military and incoherent political institutions of Pakistan (Kukreja, 2003). Historically judiciary in this interplay always favoured military regimes by granting them legitimacy but now after lawyers movement of Pakistan judiciary emerged as a strong institution which wants to extend its influence as well. The incumbent democratic government seems itself uncongenial with this judicial activism and brands it as an attempt to undermine the supremacy of parliament where judiciary believes that government is not serious enough in execution of its verdicts.

Army exists as the most powerful institution so its prevalence is quite obvious and the democratic rule seems nascent but this orthodox argument that let the system run will not probably crank out anything good because a

major rift exists between democracy and deliverance in Pakistan and the system which is unresponsive to the genuine concerns of the masses in the end becomes irrelevant (Ahmed, 2012).

This institutional confrontation is due to the fact that democratic norms and practices could not get settled down in the political framework due to the protracted military rule which has totally crumbled the democracy which never lasted in Pakistan in its true sense.

3.4. Religious Extremism. Question of religion in Pakistan has always remained a contentious issue. The emergence of concepts like political Islam and intermixing of religion with politics always stirred major controversies in Pakistan. As mentioned earlier the early phase in post-independent Pakistan was marked with an obfuscation to where place the religion? Later on weak political elite who had no constituencies in Pakistan used religion as a tool to linger on with its rule. Military regimes always remained in close nexus with these religious elements and ultimately made these forces to some extent non state actors. They always worked separately but in line with state's policies of pursuing radicalization to extend the period of rule and to combat the security threat from India (Haqqani, 2005).

4. State and Polity in India and Lessons for Pakistan

The functional institutions with which Indian framework is operating is a strengthened administration: Bureaucracy, Military & Judiciary and institutionalized electorates where Congress acts as an institutionalized political actor. The constitutionalism prevails in India and except for one occasion during Indira rule when it was being abrogated otherwise the rule of constitution is vibrantly prevalent. India is having a strong centre with its federated units. The role of centre is very important in India because authority in India flows from top to bottom. Though centre is extremely powerful yet regions enjoy their autonomy. The politics of states, regions and language affects India in multiple ways. It has generated an immense participative potential in Indian electoral behavior.

4.1. Political Culture

Indian political culture is characterized by class and caste system. The politics of class and castes had given birth to the idea of vote banks where minorities and ethnic communities maneuver and bargain for their rights and gains. India did not adopt any of system of east or west completely but it did not reject the modernity and rationality. Ingenious ideologies exist along with the modern ideologies. India is a classic hybrid of traditionality and modernism (Riaz, 2010). On one hand it projects itself as a mature civilization and on other hand follows all the trends of modern day republics. The adaptation of parliamentary democracy substantiates this point.

India is having immense political participation. 70 % people once got elected could not secure place for the next term. Indian voter is aware of its rights that is why voting turn over never declined in India. India is having strengthened elite due to Congress because it led India during the freedom movement. Congress was founded in 1885 so at the time of partition its roots were deep sunk into the Indian polity. It was one of colonial legacies mentioned above. The leadership included Gandhi, Nehru, Azad, and Patel. It was a far cognizant, educated and circumspect leadership that was aware of the changing dimensions and demands of the post independent India. Congress pledged for communitarian reorientation during freedom struggle and did it in next to no time after independence. India's ruling pattern is authoritarianism (Jalal, 1995) with centralization of powers at centre but India has maintained a thin line balance between this authority and autonomy of the states. At times these two distinct systems appear simultaneously working well in the society but in reality centre maintains its upper hand always. The states also execute their authoritarian tendencies with the prevalent majoritarian culture. India is only post colonial state having secured a functional democracy. Democracy in post-colonial states remained a perplexed question always, hallmarked with non-deliverance, fragile institutions, and procedural balloting. The democratic development in India having secured a functional democracy flabbergasted everyone. India not only sustained a strengthened democracy but also institutionalized it.

India is an offshoot of post-colonialism. So like others, India also faced the same challenges in transitional face. Post-independence India inherited political and constitutional legacy of the British Raj with immensely diverse, caste and class based social structure. However, democratic practices got settled down in such a diverse society, it seems contrary to the post-colonial trends. India was first colonized by European mercantilists in 16th century.

Portugal, the Netherlands and France in beginning ruled some parts of India later on East India Company and British crown controlled all India. Indians mutinied against the foreign rule in 1857. The attempt failed miserably and colonial rule persisted.

In 1885 Indian National Congress was founded that was the first political party in colonized India, later on in 1906 All India Muslim League was founded by Muslims with a demand of equal and separate representation for Muslims. Opposition against Raj continued. The tiring efforts of Indians made colonial rule ended in 1947 when two new states were created on the map of the world named India and Pakistan. Post colonialism is the initial time when these countries were set decolonized. Nowadays, aspects of post-colonialism can be found not only in sciences concerning history, literature and politics, but also in approach to culture and identity of the countries that were colonized.

The basic idea of this process is the deconstruction of old-fashioned perceptions and attitudes of power and oppression that were adopted during the time of colonialism. The impact of colonialism on recent development of India cannot be ignored. India inherited strong administrative structure, intermediaries and strengthened political elite in legacy of colonialism. The diversity in Indian politics was unable to be held without democracy. India imparted a partition syndrome that was a major watershed of its history. India resorted to democracy as it wanted to thwart any of such mishap in future. That's why a strong centre was opted rather making it a confederation. Political struggle in India is struggle for power, wealth and identity (Kesselman, Krieger and Joseph, 2012).

4.2. Indian Secularism. Indian secularism was the idea of Nehru who pleaded it cogently. Nehru had a very romanticized view of India. He wanted to remove the crude face of India. His ideational belief that India is a mature civilization and it must be revered was in fact fueled by this complex. Nehru introduced liberal democracy, composite culture and secularism. Religion was not rejected altogether. State had the prerogative to intervene into the religious concerns for reformist purposes. Keeping this in view Hindu family code law was amended in early years of independence where Muslim personal family was left unaltered. Nehru personally detested Hindu nationalism as in his predilection it distorts the face of Indian civilizational traits. Though Nehruvan model was based on democracy but Indian secularism remained and is based on majoritarianism. The will of majority dominates. Indian secularism has its double standards when it comes to the case of criminal prosecution (Desai, 2012). Separate electorates were replaced with joint electorates. At centre though it is secularism that operates but at state level it is the hinduization.

4.3. Indian regionalism. Two strict rules have been followed post independence

- 1) No secessionist movement would be entertained
- 2) No concession or recognition on religious basis

India is ready to tolerate internal factionalism up to considerable level. Through pluralistic solutions issues pertaining to the linguistic reorganization were settled. Post Nehru period regional issues have increased the level of bitterness. Reorganization was done through a commission in 1955. It is noteworthy to mention that India failed to establish homogenous nationalism. India lived up to a commitment that Central government would not reorganize groups with secessionist demands and no regional demand would be accepted on religious basis. For making a separate state predominantly spoken language would not be considered. The concern of only one group will not be entertained. Related to this some issues are irking Indian political elite even today like Mao rebels, Jai Maashtara, Khalistan, Aassam and Kashmir.

5. Conclusion. Pakistan needs to learn from these Indian experiences because both the states were having shared predicaments and paradoxes. India maneuvered nimbly and addressed the genuine issues like regionalism, communitarian reorientation, issue of religion and constitutional development where Pakistan is still facing problems in settlement of these issues. The traditional animosity must not impede Pakistan learning something positive where its counterpart state pondered on and secured a participative robust fame of rule.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ali, Mohammad. (1884). The Emergence of Pakistan. Lahore: Research Society of Pakistan.
- [2]. Askari Rizvi, Hasan. (1986). Military and Politics in Pakistan. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- [3]. Ali, Shaheen Sardar. Rehman, Javed. (2001). Indigenous Peoples and Ethnic Minorities of Pakistan. London: Routledge Publishers.
- [4]. Amin, Tahir. (1988). Ethno-national Movements of Pakistan. Islamabad: Institute of Policy Studies.
- [5]. Brass, Paul R. (1994). Politics of India Since Independence. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [6]. Cohen Stephen P. (2004). The Idea of Pakistan. Brookings Institution Press.
- [7]. Desai, Meghnad. (2011). The Rediscovery of India. Bloomsbury USA Press.
- [8]. Guha, Ramachandra. (2007). India since Gandhi: The History of the World's Largest Democracy. New Delhi: McMillan.
- [9]. Ghose, Shankar. (2006). Jawharlal Nehru, a Biography. Allied Publishers.
- [10]. Haqqani, Hussain. (2005). Pakistan: Between Mosque and Military. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.
- [11]. Talbot, Ian. (1998). Pakistan a Modern History. London: Palgrave Mcmillan Press.
- [12]. Jalal, Ayesha. (1990). The Sate of Martial Rule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13]. Jalal, Ayesha. (1995). Democracy and Authoritarianism in South Asia. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [14]. Jones, WH Morris. (1964). The Government and Politics in India. London: Hutchison and Co Publishers.
- [15]. Kohli, Atul. (2001). The Success of India's Democracy. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [16]. [Kesselman](#), Mark. [Krieger](#), Joel. [Joseph](#), William. A. (2012). Introduction to Comparative Politics. Cengage Learning Publishers.
- [17]. Kothari, Rajni. (1970). Politics in India. Orient Blackswan Printers.
- [18]. Kukreja, Veena. (2003). Contemporary Pakistan: political processes, conflicts, and crises. Indiana University: Sage Publications.
- [19]. Lieven, Anatol. (2011). Pakistan A Hard Country. BBS Public Affairs.
- [20]. Mahmood, Sayed. (1981). A History of English Education in India. M.A.O College Press, (1895), Reprint Delhi.
- [21]. Riaz, Ali. (2010). Religion and Politics in South Asia. ed. London: Routledge Publishers.
- [22]. Sayed, KB. (1994). Pakistan The Formative Phase. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- [23]. Shamsul-Hassan, S. (ed), (1976). Plain Mr. Jinnah. Karachi.
- [24]. Stephen, James P. (1883). On the Principles of British Government in India. EIP.
- [25]. Talbot, Ian. (2000). India and Pakistan: Inventing the Nation. Hodders Education Press.
- [26]. Waseem, Mohammad. (2006). Democratization in Pakistan. Karachi: Oxford University Press.
- [27]. Waseem, Mohammad. (1989). Politics and the State in Pakistan. NIHCR, Centre of Excellence, Quaid I Azam University, Islamabad.
- [28]. Waseem, Mohammad. (1994). The 1993 Elections in Pakistan. Lahore: Vanguard Publishers.