

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan and India

Shoukat Ali

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Arfan Latif

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Jafar Riaz Kataria

University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

ABSTRACT

The current study intends to find out the quality of democracy in Pakistan and India. Both the countries freed from British rule at the same time and have similar culture and background. The study is based on eight quality indicators to see the quality of democracy in both countries developed by Leonardo in 2001. Apart from a heavy literature review the study used in-depth interviews to analyze the quality of democracy. For doing so professors of Political Science and History professors were interviewed from public sector colleges of Lahore. 20 professors were selected for this purpose. Both pro-determined and emergent themes were used to analyze the data of the study. The study concluded that democracy is in good shape in India as compared to Pakistan. Civil- military relationship proved to be a determining factor for the establishment of democracy in Pakistan. On the other hand corruption, bureaucracy, accountability, electoral system and other indicators were found to be in firm standings in India compared to Pakistan.

Key Words: Democracy, Pakistan, India

Introduction

South Asia is an important region of the world in the regard of the various dimensions. The most important dimension is that in this region there are two nuclear powers out of a few nuclear powers of the world. South Asia includes eight member countries Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Afghanistan. It is considered very populous region due to its huge ever increasing population. India alone has population crossing one billion and it is the second populous country after China. All of the members of South Asia have experienced the British rule so the British legacy has enriched the political system of South Asia. Today, in this modern stage of life, democracy is considered the most suitable form of government. Democracy is a political system that includes the active political participation of the civil society. Every state declares it as a democratic country but in reality there is very weak form of democracy in practice because the role of civil society, equality, and rule of law is not actually being practiced. Democracy may be fruitful if the citizens are educated and they are aware and conscious about their rights and duties. It is the main reason that in some developed countries like Switzerland democracy is being practiced in very

effective way. But on the other hand, the population is not much educated to have sense about their rights and duties. A majority of these countries is uneducated and they are being exploited by the politicians who visit to them only during the election days in order to get their votes. Pakistan and India are two major countries of South Asia. They are considered two big powers of this region because both of them have nuclear power and they are bitter enemies of each other. According to the global media representation, India is booming its economy but actually there is a vivid difference in theory and practice. There are many issues in India like, religious issues, ethnic problems, regional tussles, and caste conflict and separation movements. Both of the countries, Pakistan and India have many issues and challenges with the regard of democracy.

Defining Democracy

It is very difficult to define the term “Democracy” in a single word. Democracy has many basic principles that help to measure the basic form of democracy. So, different thinkers, philosophers and political scientists define democracy differently. Here are some important definitions of democracy.

The term democracy is derived from Greek words, “Demos” the people and “Kratos” power, thus it means power of the people. Definitions of democracy as a form of government are various and differ in their content and application (Kapur, 1993).

“Democracy is a system of governance, based on popular will” (Chand. S.).

“Democracy is a procedure for taking decisions in any group, association or society, whereby all members have an equal right to have a say and to make their opinion account” (Beetham. D, 2006).




Figure No: 01 Basic Principles of Democracy

Source: Prepared by the researchers

Democracy and Oligarchy

Democracy and oligarchy are two opposite concepts to each other. The oligarchic system of ruling is totally contrary to the principles and demands of a democratic form of government. In democratic rule, the public offices are open to all members

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

of society while in oligarchy rule, these offices are attributed only to a few particular members. In the democracy, the selection of the members is done by a democratic rule of election but on the other hand, the selection is done by appointments without any election by the masses. In democracy, it is mentioned clearly that there will be active participation of the masses and civil society that makes the government very accountable and responsive but contrary to democracy in oligarchic form of government there is not any involvement of the civil society in the political and governmental matters. Only a group of family members defines the destiny of the whole population of that country. These are some basic concepts that differentiate the democratic and oligarchic rule.

Democracy in Pakistan

Pakistan came into being on 14th august 1947. Pakistan got independence after a long struggle. Sir Sayyed Ahmad Khan was the first pioneer who struggled for the welfare and well being of the Muslims of Subcontinent. He indirectly introduced the idea of two nation theory (Malik, 2001). Sir Sayyed Khan was the mentor who carefully established a social, educational and political system in order to make the Muslims sure that they cannot compete with the others especially the Hindus if they do not get education. This was the first phase that laid down the foundation of partition of Subcontinent (Waseem, 2010). With the passage of time, the two nation theory and Pakistan movement got suspense and after a long time of freedom fighting, at last Pakistan came into being. The Hindus and the British were bewildered at the performance of Jinnah that how well a single person fought and got the independence for the Muslims with a new born country Pakistan on the globe (Waseem, 2012).

Pakistan has to face demise on the death of the founder of Pakistan. Unfortunately, Jinnah died in 1948 soon after the inception of Pakistan. After that Pakistan faced a political chaos and to date it is being faced by politics of Pakistan. A smooth political consensus could not be run in Pakistan. All the political parties collapsed with the advent of first martial law. And again and again martial laws were imposed by different puppets (Sultana, 2012). After a long time of Musharraf era in 2008, the government was handed over to a democratic system and further in 2013, one democratic government was transferred to another democratic first time in the history of Pakistan. It was the first time, that one democratic government fulfilled its tenure and another is about to complete its time.

Civil and Military Rules in Pakistan

If you want to study the democracy of Pakistan, it is necessary to throw a glance to the different political rules of Pakistan. The political institution of Pakistan is not so stable. There are military interventions in the political system of government. A short picture of civilian and military forms of government in Pakistan is as follow.

Civilian Political Governments

- August 1947 to October 1958
- December 1971 to July 1977
- December 1988 to October 1999
- March 2008 to the present

The above mentioned are the major civilian government rules in Pakistan. In the first part, from 1947 to 1958, there could not be set up any stable government. The second phase of the civilian government was prominent by the Bhutto era. After the long era of military intervene, Bhutto rose as the hope of the people. He set up a new political party known as Pakistan People's Party. He politically activated the people and in returns the people selected him as the prime minister of Pakistan. In the third phase, Pakistan People's Party and Pakistan Muslim League (N) were the major political parties. But unfortunately none of the political party completed its full tenure. Lastly, in 2008, Pakistan People's Party got the throne and completed its full tenure first time in the history of Pakistan despite PPP faced many hardships and problems. After that PML (N) was selected and present by running the government of Pakistan. It is also about to complete its tenure. Its tenure will end in 2018.

Direct Military Rule

- October 1958 to June 1962
- March 1969 to December 1971
- July 1977 to December 1985
- October 1999 to November 2002

First of all, Field Marshal Ayub Khan enforced first martial law in the history of Pakistan. In 1958, the first ever martial law was imposed in Pakistan and it lasted until the general elections held by Ayub Khan. Secondly, Yahaya Khan imposed second martial law. The second martial law lasted from 1969 to 1971. It was very bad experience for Pakistan that during this era Pakistan has to face very serious problems and the most crucial incident was the separation of the East Pakistan in the name of Bangladesh (Waseem, 1992). Thirdly, Zia Ul Haq imposed third martial law in 1977 that lasted until 1985. The major purpose of this martial law was to reduce the improving power of PPP and to establish other political parties. PML (N) and MQM were the creations of Zia. Lastly, General Pervez Musharraf imposed emergency in 1999 and arrested the major politicians. PML (N) was at his hit list. The Musharraf's emergency lasted till 2002 and furthered up to 2008.

Causes of Declining Democracy in Pakistan

Pakistan's democracy deficit cannot be explained in single factor. There are a number of factors causing for the failure of the democracy deficit in Pakistan. Some of the important factors are following.

Role of Leadership

At the birth of Pakistan, Muslim League assumed the sole power of leadership in Pakistan. But with the sudden death of Jinnah and later Liaqat Ali Khan's assassination the situation changed. After the death of two main leaders of Muslim League, there was created a huge gap between the remaining leaders of Muslim league. The main politicians who participated in Pakistan movement belonged to East Pakistan. On the other hand, in the West Pakistan, leadership was held by the new comer feudals. They were more powerful and strong in the regard of the material affluences as compared to the East Pakistanis. So this leadership crisis became a major reason in the way of smooth democracy in Pakistan.

Security Threat

Unfortunately, the creation of Pakistan faced so many problems. With the creation of Pakistan, the Hindus were unhappy and they started to create problems for Pakistan since its first day. Basically Pakistan emerged as a security state. The Hindus and the Sikhs started to harm and even kill the Muslims as they started to move from India to Pakistan. The Amritsar massacre is very dreadful dream for the Pakistanis. Due to Kashmir issue, the first Indo-Pak war started in 1948. Pakistan had to give importance to military institution that cannot be ignored. Every government put its major concern to military due to security threat. The importance of military is also another factor in the walk of democracy because now in Pakistan the military institution has become more powerful as compared to political institution.




Figure No: 02 Causes of Declining Democracy in Pakistan

Source: Prepared by the researchers

Deficiency of political consensus

There is not a political consensus throughout the history of Pakistan. The reason is that who came into power became the lord rather than a politician. Later on, till today the same type of politics is being practiced whether this is Nawaz Sharief, Asif Ali Zardari or so on. Everyone is committed to his own benefits not for the national benefits. With such thinking, the progressive way of democracy is unable to practice because the democracy is somehow totally different form the wishes of our Mughal politicians. There is not political consensus even between the members of same political parties.

Restrictions on Political Parties

The periodic restrictions on the political parties is another factor that led to democracy deficit in Pakistan. Many times the political parties were banned or

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

stopped to work. Firstly, Ayub Khan banned political parties and put restrictions on political leaders for six years. Secondly, Yahya Khan placed restrictions on political parties. Thirdly, Zia-ul-Haq enforced restrictions on political activities strongly targeted PPP. Fourthly, Musharraf did not ban political activities but targeted PPP and PML (N).

Islam and Democracy

Pakistan articulates its national identity with the reference to Islam. It raised the issue of compatibility of democracy with Islam. Religious scholars are against the western rule of democracy. They totally rejected the notion of democratic state. Most of the Pakistanis favor a relationship between Islam and political system. General Zia-ul-haq used the concept of Islam in government. Being a Muslim, we are mostly against the practice of democracy in Pakistan because we wish to apply Islamic laws of politics in our society.

Absence of Democratic Culture

Democratic norms and values are must for democracy. To follow the democracy it is required that there should be the basic priorities regarding the democracy. There must be a trend of democratic culture in Pakistan. In Pakistan, authoritarian orientations at family and society level are being practiced. It creates tensions among people that in practical form they are authoritarian and how they might be democratic. Civilian rulers showed impatience towards masses that is also another reason to unstable the democracy and most of the Pakistanis do not rely on the civilian form government. They only favor the military rule in Pakistan.

Future of Democracy in Pakistan

Road track to democracy is poor in Pakistan. Bureaucratic and military roots in politics have been emerged. 2013 is the year of transformation of democracy form one democratic government to another democratic government. The future of democracy is threatened by poor governance; there is a clear gap between federal and provincial governments. The troubled economy, declining internal stability and harmony, religious and cultural intolerance are also the reasons for the democracy deficit in Pakistan. Some people are in the favor of democracy while some in military rule.

State of Democracy in India

India is the most stable country of South Asia. The economy of India is booming up and the membership of G20 is the notion of its improving and stable economy. Both Pakistan and India got freedom from the British in 1947 but India made progress more as compared to Pakistan. India is the largest democracy of the world. There is a huge ethnicity and dissimilarities in India but being much

diversified it is able to stable the whole country under a singular central government. But there is a clear gap between theory and practice of Indian democracy if you study it very closely (Partha Chatterjee, 1986). The political stability in India is the most important factor that puts on India to the progressive track of democracy. There is no intervention of military in Indian politics. A short term of emergency was enforced in India but soon the problem was resolved (G. Austin, 1996). The democracy of India can be taken into consideration in two ways positive and negative.

Positive Side

If you look Indian democracy according to the positive side, it will explore that the India is booming up. The literacy rate of India is also very admirable as it is higher as compared to Pakistani literacy rate. The literacy rate of India is 74% while the literacy rate of Pakistan is almost 52%. The education level of India is more advanced and task oriented and they are superior to us in educational facilities. India is spending more on education sector while our government of Pakistan is spending 2% of GDP that is lower to Indian educational budget (Rajni Kothari, 2005).

Characteristics of Indian Democracy

As it has been mentioned above that India is the most stable democracy of South Asia. She is also known as the largest democracy of the world. The Indian democracy has following characteristics:

- Independent judiciary
- Freedom of press
- Supreme civil authority
- Right to information
- Right to education
- 73rd and 74th constitutional amendments (decentralization and local government).

Negative Side

Secondly, if you study the Indian democracy according to conflict perspective, you would find that India herself has become the prey of its diversity. India is divided in almost 30 states and in every state there live very different people according to their different culture, religion, social and political spheres. There are almost 22% people in India that are living below the poverty line (Devesh & Mehta, 2005).

“Rajiv Gandhi is often cited for admitting that of every rupee sanctioned for the poor, hardly 15 paise reached to the intended target”

There are almost 78 carors people who do not have toilets at home. The education and health facilities are not provided in the backward areas of India. The

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

minority areas are ignored by the government in every regard of the life. They are deprived of all the basic necessities of life. There is a clear cut security threats to the minorities of India in many states like Kashmir, Orissa, Bihar, Seven Sisters and so on.




Figure No: 02 Causes of Declining Democracy in Pakistan
Source:(Girija. K & Basavaraja, 2014)

Methodology

This section presents all the tools and procedures that were adopted during the course of the current study. The current study is qualitative in nature. The objective of the study is to find out how democracy differs in two neighboring states of Pakistan and India. The study tries to unpack how different quality indicators of democracy are prevailing in Pakistan and India. Therefore the study is based on qualitative framework as it tries to explore this phenomenon (Creswell, 2012). To see how different themes of democracy are prevailing in Pakistan and India the researchers decided to interview the expert in the field of political science and history. In order to do so the researcher decided to interview the professors of both fields from public sector colleges. Keeping in view the topic of the study and nature of the sampling unit the researcher decided use the purposive sampling technique. “The situation for purposive sampling occurs when a researcher wants

to identify particular types of cases for in-depth investigation” (Neuman; 2006, 198). A sample of 20 respondents is chosen 10/10 from each discipline political science and history. Interview guide is used as tool for data collection due to the qualitative nature of the study.

Variable construction and definition (Pre-Determined Themes)

Leonardo Morlino (2001) laid the foundations of key elements of good democracy to find out how these variables are operating across the globe. He found 8 following elements that frame and establish the good democracy.

Rule of Law

The first basic element of democracy is the rule of law which refers not only to the establishment of rules and regulations rather it implies how rules are implemented in the state irrespective of gender, race and ethnicity. Maravall (2002, p. 261), refers to the implementation of laws that (i) were enacted and approved following pre-established procedures; (ii) that are not retroactive..., but general, stable, clear, and hierarchically ordered....; (iii) applied to particular cases by courts free from political influence and accessible to all, the decisions of which follow procedural requirements, and that establish guilt through ordinary means.

Electoral Accountability

Electoral accountability is the main function and element of the democracy. Schedler (1999) suggests that accountability has three main features: information, justification, and punishment/compensation.

Inter-institutional Accountability

Inter-institutional accountability refers to the obligation of elected leaders and institutions to be responsible, to answer for their political decisions to other institutions or collective actors that have the expertise to control and power.

Political Participation

Political participation is the main tenant of democracy. Without political participation nothing can be made and fair democracy cannot flourish in any country. It allows women and men, as individuals or group, to create, revive or strengthen group identification or to try to influence the recruitment of and decisions by political authorities.

Political competition

It is involvement of more than one political actor in the decision making of political process. It is important frame of democracy as it makes the way of political and democratic culture. Without political competition democracy is not well developed.

Responsiveness

It is the capacity and ability of the government to satisfy people by responding to their needs.

Responsiveness is a way to see representation 'in action' through four main components in relation to: the policies at the center of public interest; the services that are guaranteed to the individuals and groups represented by the government; the distribution of material goods to their constituents through the public administration and other entities; and the extension of symbolic goods that create, reinforce, or reproduce a sense of loyalty and support towards the government (Altman, 2002).

Freedom

Empirical definition of 'freedom' should take into account such a debate and refers to the entire possible set of basic rights (Sartori 1993). It is complete freedom of thought and expression for every individual irrespective of gender, race and ethnicity.

Solidarity and Equality

Empirically it can be considered in terms of removing differences, alleviating poverty and promoting social rights, also through solidarity actions by public and private institutions.

Data Analysis

The interview guide or the data obtained from it would be analyzed by using the pre-determined themes and emergent themes. Pre-determined themes have already been mentioned, however, during the course of interviews few themes can also emerge. Primarily the data would be analyzed by using themes and impressions.

Data Analysis

As mentioned above the data was analyzed by using both pre-determined and emergent themes. The pre-determined themes were based on literature review pertaining to the study while emergent themes emerged from the data collected from the respondents. The data analysis is presented in two major sections. The

first section shows how pre-determined themes are explaining the faith of democracy. In the second section emergent themes are presented to find out how other factors are shaping the democracy in both the countries.

Following are the findings of the study based on both pre-determined and emergent themes.

Pre-determined themes

Pre-determined themes are the list of indicators presented by Leonardo Morlino (2009) to find out the quality of the democracy. The pre-determined themes have already been explained in the section of methodology. However, in the current section how indicators and themes are being operated in both India and Pakistan are presented from the point of view of political and history experts.

Rule of Law

Rule of law is the main pillar of any democracy. The respondents of the study also found that democracy rests on rule of law. However, meeting the objectives have of the study the respondents shared their valued comments. Most of the respondents pointed that in Pakistan and India rule of law is observed partially. As one respondent explored,

“In Pakistan, everything is fair and friendly for the rich people. Law does not apply on them. It applies on the poor people”.

Another respondent indicated that,

“Both of the countries are almost similar in all fields but the government of India is more progressive than Pakistan and by the same token rule of law is more applicable in India. He gave example of Salman Khan’s trial in India who has to come before court. But on other hand, in Pakistan the picture is totally changed”.

Electoral Accountability

The fruit of democracy is mainly dependant on how electoral system of the country is accountable. The election process is the main indicator how people of any country perceive the process of democratic change. Change in the power structure or change in the government is due to fairness of the electoral process.

One respondent of political science explained,

“Electoral process of the both countries was never free and fair. In India, the votes are attained on caste basis. The lower casts who have not any worth before the high casts are considered very important only during the days of election. By the same token, in

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

Pakistan, the voting is mainly based on biradri system”.

Another respondent further elaborated the same phenomenon in these words, “The people of India are poorer than the Pakistanis. It is not always right that the Indian Government is very good, if it good than why there is huge rate of poverty and different clashes. But the thing, Indian government is working well than the Pakistani. Biometric system is being used to make the electoral process free and fair. But in Pakistan, it is not being practiced”.

Inter-institutional accountability

The government or democracy mainly functions when three main pillars work in coordination with each other. Legislature, executive and judiciary must work in coordination with each other by making each accountable. If these institutions don't work in close link with each other then it becomes difficult to operate. This situation is also found to be different for both the countries. In Pakistan judiciary and executive often found to be locking horns with each other.

On the other hand in India these institutions work in collaboration with each other and do not hinder the operation of each other. This is the main fact why democracy is more in command in India than in Pakistan.

A respondent of history explored that,

“If you examine the political system of Pakistan from its inception, it would be clear that there was a little inter-institutional cohesion among different institutions of government. Due to the absence of this cohesion, a smooth track of democracy could be developed in Pakistan”.

Another respondent of political science indicated that,

“Indian democracy is very smooth and consistent due to the internal cooperation of different governmental institutions. There is not any military intervention in Indian democracy due to the active role of the institutions”.

Political participation

Political participation is at lower level in Pakistan. This is evident from turnover rate from both the countries which is lower in Pakistan as compared to India. On the other hand when it comes to women the rate of electoral participation is lower in Pakistan.

According to a respondent,

“Political participation requires the educated members of society. The educated citizens participate in political matters more than the uneducated because they have not more knowledge about the political matters. This is the main reason, that Indian people participate more in political matters than the Pakistanis”.

Another respondent explained,

“The Pakistani politics is basically consisted of the feudal politicians that restrict the masses to participate in political matters. The people of Punjab are more educated and conscious than the people of other provinces that’s why they participate more. But on the other hand, the people of interior Sindh cannot even imagine speaking before their feudal lord politicians”.

Political competition

Political competition is at the same level in both countries. Opposition and government are always contrary to each other and both work against each other. In Pakistan ruling country always faces problems from opposition. Even in the current situation the ruling government is pressurized to a greater extent by opposition. Similarly in India opposition is playing its part in making the political decisions for the country. Hence, both the countries are at the same level when it comes of political competition.

One respondent of political science indicated that,

“Both of the countries have same political, social and hereditary traits. The only difference between the people of Pakistan and India is religion. In both of the countries, there are a few families that had been ruling over the masses since many generations and they exist even today. In India, Gandhi family has very strong pressure in politics while in Pakistan Bhutto and Sharif families are the main attributers of politics”.

Responsiveness

It is very difficult indicator to measure the goodness of democracy however it is the main indicator of how government is delivering in favor of the government. Forming policies in accordance with the need of the people and addressing their needs directly is found to be good in India. Indian government forms policies with regard to the need of their agricultural and industrial set up furthermore tourism, health and education remain at top priorities for the government.

One of the respondent commented in the following words

“Indian government is framing policies for the improvement of agriculture and society on the other

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

hand government in Pakistan is lacking in this regard and often make policies that are related to their rule and how the govern the nation”.

“However, this remained at lower importance level in Pakistan. Responsiveness is at lower priority for the government. There are other reasons for not responding to the needs of the people. Military interventions, lack of education in Pakistan and personal interest hinder the way of responsiveness of the government to the people’s needs”.

“Lack of responsiveness can also be attributed to military interventions in Pakistan. The consistency in the policy remains negligible due to military interventions time and again”.

Freedom

Freedom of speech is often suppressed in Pakistan than in India. However, the situation has changed a lot in the recent years despite that there are certain restrictions on freedom in Pakistan. Even media has certain limitations and often directed.

We can see that in Pakistan media channels are often stopped of their working when they criticize the government. Similarly, people are often threatened to speak openly.

In India freedom of expression is more open and no such restrictions and limitations are observed.

Solidarity and Equality

The economic development or elevation of poverty and other social issues are also important indicator of good democracy. The situation is equal in both the countries.

Both the countries are fighting hard to cater the issues of poverty, governance, population explosion and unemployment. There are multiple reasons behind that but still these issues are same in both the countries and hampering the benefits of democracy.

Emergent Themes

During the course of interviews with the political and history expert a few themes emerged that explained how democracy differed in both of the countries. These themes proved to be more fruitful to the study and helped the researcher to grasp topic in more a comprehensive way.

Civil-military relation

This came out as the most significant theme during the data analysis as almost all the respondents gave it critical importance. Civil- military relations are the core factor behind low performance of democracy in Pakistan. However, this is not the case with India. Several military interventions right from the inception of Pakistan has restricted the democracy to perform well in the country. On the other hand India has not yet witnessed any military intervention hence democracy is flourishing in India.

In India the domestic institutions and political system have repelled the Indian Army's interruption into political life. But it has never weakened the Indian civil organizations. From India's case it is evident that counterinsurgency and political repression do not inevitably lead to military politicization or intervention in domestic politics. In Pakistan's case, Pakistan inherited weak political institution and relatively strong military. Moreover, due the external threats and internal secessionist movements, military intervened in domestic politics on numerous occasions. Political institutions and election process were very weak but these institution and practices were never allowed to grow.

Bureaucracy

The second emergent theme was the performance of bureaucratic organizations for the performance of the democracy. In Pakistan the performance of bureaucracy is found to be a factor in low performance of the democracy while in India the bureaucracy is performing in a better way. In Pakistan the Weberian concepts of bureaucratic inertia and red-tapism are hindering the performance of the democracy. Similarly, bureaucracy has always been under the heavy pressure of political leaders. This situation is alarming and has restricted the bureaucracy to under-perform which ultimately became de-merit of the democracy. The performance of bureaucracy has been good during military interventions which again raised the question pertaining to the performance of bureaucracy in connection with democracy.

On the other side we see in India where bureaucracy is also under same influence but bureaucracy has handled it well and performed well for the betterment of the society and people. This in result has become a main feature of democracy in India.

Corruption

The low performance of democracy in Pakistan can also be attributed to the corruption charges that are often enacted upon political leaders and bureaucracy. The corruption charges are on lower side during the military intervention this again raises the question of democracy and democratic organization.

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

In India corruption charges are also observed but we see accountability. Many bureaucrats and political leaders are often found to be guilty and punished. This has created a culture of accountability and has led the democracy to flourish and perform well.

In the end it can be synthesized that democracy is performing far better in India than in Pakistan. All the 8 themes of Leonardo have been found to be operating in India better than in Pakistan. Furthermore, civil military relation is found to be a core factor in determining the faith of the democracy in Pakistan. Corruption and performance of the bureaucracy is also important for both the countries.

Limitations

The current study despite having a comprehensive approach contains certain limitations regarding its findings and generalizability. Following is the list of some of the limitations of the study.

- The findings of the current study are not generalizable to entire population as it has only a small sample size of 20 respondents. In addition to that the study design which is qualitative in nature restricts the findings of the study to a larger population.
- The study is primarily based on 8 major assumptions of democracy. However, there are other factors than the aforementioned 8 factors. However, by obtaining the emergent themes this limitation was controlling to a certain effect.
- The study is qualitative in nature hence does not predict the relationship between democracy and other variables.
- Furthermore, the sampling unit of the study is professors of Political Science and history to find out the expert view. However, the opinion and comments of general people are missing in the study which again limits the findings of the study.

Implications

The study is unique in its nature as it tries to examine the nature of the government by comparing it with the nature of other government or state. However, the findings of the study can be handy to a greater extent to build the trust among people regarding democracy and its fruits. Following is the list of how useful this study can be.

- The findings of the study can be used to force the government in framing the policies for the people of the country. This will help in increasing the responsiveness and to increase the trust and fruits of the democracy to the general public,
- Bureaucracy can also be trained to serve the people without indulging and facing the political pressure.

- General people can also be taught in order to sensitize them regarding the benefits of the democracy so that they can lead the way to democracy and restrict any military intervention.

Conclusion

On the basis of the findings of the study it can be concluded that the democracy is best suited form of the government for sub-continent after the colonial power. However, both the countries inherited different culture regarding government and thus facing different problems. In Pakistan the civil-military relations is the core factor of lack of good quality democracy. This relationship is at better level in India which is the cause of good quality democracy in India. Similarly electoral process, political participation, political competition is also in good shape in India in comparison to Pakistan. Bureaucracy and corruption both are found to be significant in framing the quality of the government and democracy. Both these factors remained under good conditions during military regime hence most of the intellectuals and masses of the country are in favor of dictatorship rather than democracy. This has hampered the way of democracy in Pakistan. In the end it may be concluded that democracy in India is on firm foundations as compared to Pakistan. Political institution and other stakeholders especially civil-military relationships are in good nature in India than in Pakistan. That is why Pakistani democracy is often under-performing and has always been under threat. Reasons are multiple but despite that it needed to be addressed as people and intellectuals are in favor of democracy in the best interest of the people.

References

- Altman, L(2002), "Assessing the quality of democracy: Freedom, competitiveness and participation in eighteen Latin American countries". *In democratization*, 7, 85-100.
- Beetham, D. (2006). *Democracy: A beginner's guide*. Oxford: One World Publications.
- Creswell, j. (2012). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research (4thed.)*. Upper saddle river, Pearson education.
- Devesh Kapur & Pratap Bhanu Mehta (2005). *Public Institutions in India: Performance and Design*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Girija, K. & Basavaraja. G. (2014) Contemporary Issues and Challenges to Indian Democracy in the Era of Globalization; BEST: *International Journal of Humanities, Arts, Medicine and Sciences*, 2.
- Granville G. Austin. (1966). *The Indian Constitution: Cornerstone of a Nation*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Kapur, A. C. (1993). *Principles of political science*. New Delhi: S. Chand & Company Ltd.
- L. Morlino (2001), *Rights and the quality of democracy in Italy: A research report*.

Democracy in South Asia: A comparative Analysis of democracy in Pakistan

- Malik, A. I. (2001). US-Indian Convergence of Interests: Challenges for Pakistan. *National Development and Security published by Foundation for Research on International Environment*, 10(2), 38.
- Maravall, j. A. (2002), "Surviving accountability", research paper.
- Neuman w. L (2006), "Social research methods: Qualitative and quantitative approaches" (6th Ed.)
- Partha Chatterjee. (1986). *Nationalist thought and the Colonial World: A Derivative Discourse*, Zed Books for the U N University.
- Patton M. Q. (1990), "Qualitative evaluation and research methods", USA: Sage publication Newbury park.
- Rajni Kothari. (2005). "Politics in India", New Delhi: New Delhi and Rethinking Democracy, Orient Longman Ltd.
- Sartori G. (1987), *Democratization and definition, bologna: Theory of democracy*. New York: Chatham house.
- Schedler, A., & J. Diamond E. M. Plattner, (Eds.) (1999). *The self-restraining state: power and accountability in new democracies*.
- Sultana, T. (2012). Montesquieu's doctrine of separation of powers: A case study of Pakistan. *Journal of European Studies*, 28 (2).
- Waseem, M. (1992). Pakistan's lingering crisis of diarchy. *Asian Survey*, 32 (7).
- Waseem, M. (2010). *Federalism in Pakistan. Forum of Federation Project*. German Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Retrieved: <<http://www.forumfed.org/pubs/Waseem-FedOverview.pdf>>
- Waseem, M. (2012). Judging democracy in Pakistan: Conflict between executive and judiciary. *Contemporary South Asia*, 20 (1).

Biographical Note

Shoukat Ali is Ph.D. scholar at Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.

Arfan Latif is Lecturer of Sociology at Punjab Higher Education Department, Lahore, Pakistan.

Jafar Riaz Kataria is Research Assistant at Centre for South Asian Studies, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan.
