

PEOPLE'S POWER IN THIRD WORLD DEMOCRACY

Khurshed Alam*

Introduction

There is wide and occasionally stern criticism from different quarters that people in particular in the third world democratic countries are insensitive to critical political events even in cases of anti-people acts of the government.¹ Such criticism emanates not only from the academicians or politicians but frequently enough also from the members of the civil society. The issue, therefore, surfaces as to what extent that is true, and if it is true, what reason(s) is underlying there for such unwarranted behavior of the people.² Can anyone describe it as a natural or a conditional behavior of the people? Indeed, these are some of the points that deserve to be analyzed critically, which may give relief to the millions of democracy loving people of the newly democratic societies of the world, who otherwise, may accuse the critics for 'blaming the victim'. An attempt, therefore, has been made here to look for answers of all these questions, taking into account relevant theoretical and conceptual points so far developed by the different social scientists.

Fidel Valdez Ramos, the former president of the Philippines, based on his recent experience, also raised another critical issue where he mentioned that "The political challenge for people around the world today is not just to replace

* Chief Executive, Bangladesh Institute of Social Research (BISR), Dhaka

1 Indeed there are two groups where one blames the people for their insensitiveness, while the other group blames the politicians for their irresponsible behavior and anti-people activities etc. Remarkably each group makes other responsible for their poor performance or low achievement, for example, politicians blame people and vice versa. The whole debate starts from the notion of required behaviour rather than the actual behaviour. Also Bhuiyan says, 'The political culture of the rural masses may be characterized as parochial or apathetic.' See M. Sayefullah Bhuiyan, "Political Culture in Bangladesh", *Social Science Review*, Vol. VIII, No. 1 & 2, June and December, 1991, p. 74.

2 Whatever is the case that view essentially emanates from the notion of *required behaviour* considering the context of the situation rather than actual behaviour.

authoritarian regimes by democratic ones. Beyond this, it is to make democracy work for ordinary people.”³

Thus, in these days, there is a debate which has two dimensions: one group argues that the third world societies are not ready for adopting democracy as those are not developed enough for adopting and exercising democratic rights, while the other group claims that even if the democracy is introduced still people cannot derive best out of it. While a group of the people in developing societies is fighting for democracy to acquire their freedom, the other group is continuing their fight for making the democracy effective, not merely limiting to keep that as ritual or occasionally useful for them. The challenge, therefore, of the day, is not to have ceremonial win of democracy itself rather equally and perhaps more prominently to make the effective use of democracy for amelioration of the dismal condition of the common people.

Needs for democracy

These days the importance of democracy has been reiterated in a somewhat different context where earlier the issue got central importance mainly from the political perspective taking into account the forms of political system, while currently it has drawn attention from the development perspective with the increased expectations to have more meaningful life of the people.⁴ For example, Karl Popper raised the issue somewhat in derivative terms in the following words: “Man has created new worlds – of language, of music, of poetry, of science; and the most important of these is the world of the moral demands for equality, for freedom, and for helping the weak.”⁵

Despite having such importance of democracy, there is wide criticism that the poor people in general do not care for civil and political rights. Arguing against that Sen claims, “the evidence is entirely against that.”⁶ People also value

3 Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom*, (London, Oxford University Press, 2000). Identifying the cause of such failure another social scientist Saroti, mentioned, “The effectiveness of democracy depends first and foremost on the efficiency and skill of its leadership.” See Giovanni Saroti, “Democracy”, in *International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, (The Macmillan & The Free Press 1972), p. 119.

4 There are at least two types of debates what may be called debate for democracy and debate on democracy. The present paper mainly deals with debate on democracy rather than debate for democracy.

5 Karl Popper, *The Open Society and its Enemy*, Vol. 1 (London: RKP, 1961.), p. 65.

6 Sen, *Op. cit.*, p. 149.

economic needs as well as freedom needs.⁷ He further added that the poor people support democracy as because "Democracy has to be seen creating a set of opportunities" for them.⁸ Thus, there are enough reasons to argue that people need democracy to combat severe economic needs.⁹ Arguing along that line one can claim that the more independent decision the people take, the more dependable government they may get for themselves. The higher is the people's voice; the lower is the ruler's vice.¹⁰ Keeping those points in mind it can be argued that the people need democracy for various reasons not merely for freedom itself but perhaps more importantly for development as well.

The paradox of democracy

While defining democracy in operational tune, Held says, "Democracy is generally seen as the political system which is most able to ensure political equality, protect liberty and freedom, defend the common interest, meet citizens' needs, promote moral self-development and enable effective decision-making which takes everyone's interests into account."¹¹ Nevertheless, scholars are opinion that, "Democracy today remains a powerful yet contested subject, much as it has for centuries."¹² As that is in trouble in its countries of origin – in Britain, Europe and the US, for example, surveys show that increasing proportions of people are dissatisfied with the political system.

It is observed that in traditional states, most of the population ruled by the kings or emperors showed little awareness of, or interest in, those who governed them, except dominant classes or more affluent groups who felt a sense of belonging to an overall political community, whereas in modern societies, most people living within the borders of a political system are citizens, having common rights and duties and regarding themselves as part of nation.¹³ So, there are instances where although people live in a state but may not have spirit of a nation or at least equal spirit of nation. That may be another insensitiveness

7 Sen, *Op. cit.*, p. 147.

8 Sen, *Op. cit.*, p. 155.

9 In this connection Sen, magnificently argued that, "... the economic needs adds to – rather than subtracts from – the urgency of political freedom". See Sen, *Op. cit.*, p.148.

10 Indeed, the lower is the level of awareness of the people, the higher is the exercise of authority of the ruler.

11 Anthony, Giddens, *Sociology*, (4th ed.), (London, Cambridge 2001), p. 423.

12 *Ibid.*, p. 423.

13 *Ibid.*, p. 421.

among people not only of traditional societies but also even of modern societies although it may not be of same nature. It is known that people by nature more sensitive to political disorder rather than order, and therefore, do not keenly recognize the order when do not experience any disorder.

Opinion is also there that the "dominant classes or more affluent groups felt a sense of belonging to an overall political community"¹⁴ in the traditional state, which is not always found true as many people from the downtrodden condition also support the spirit of nationalism and more participation in political affairs where another group from the affluent do not have that level of sensitiveness. Therefore, any invaders even face serious protests not only from the affluent class but also from the lower strata of the society. Their sensitiveness increases with the increased threat to their existence not only economically but even may be to the extent culturally.

However, the people in a modern society logically have to be less sensitive as political disorder is less, but since they have scope for participation in political activities more, therefore, they have some sort of sensitiveness. Question, therefore, comes: what makes many people unhappy even with the democratic government? The reason is perhaps more clearer now than ever before which have been delineated below.

As one American sociologist Daniel Bell has pointed out that the national government has become 'too small to respond to the big questions' such as the influence of globalization or destruction of the world environment but it has become "too big to deal with the small questions" that affect particular cities or regions.¹⁵ Government has little power over the giant business corporation, the main actor of global economy, which may shut down its business in one country and can go for more profit oriented business in another country making thousands of people unemployed in the departing country.

Regarding operation of democracy, for example, in Canada, research findings,¹⁶ show that although only a small minority (9 percent) expressed enthusiasm ("very satisfied"), a majority (60 percent) indicated that they were "fairly

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Giddens, *Op. cit.*

¹⁶ Allan Kornberg and Harold D. Clarke, "Beliefs About Democracy and Satisfaction with Democratic Government: The Canadian Case", *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 47, No. 3, September 1994, pp. 552-53.

satisfied". Twenty five percent expressed some dissatisfaction ("not very satisfied"), and only six percent had serious reservations ("not very satisfied"). It indicates again to the level of satisfaction as well as dissatisfaction of the people with democracy in an advanced society.

Arguments are coming up from other directions as well, such as "Citizens in many democracies have little trust in their elected representatives and conclude that national politics has a diminishing impact on their lives. There is a growing cynicism about politicians who make claims about their ability to foresee or control global issue that are occurring at levels beyond that of the nation-state."¹⁷ Giddens further adds that the public opinion surveys in many Western countries reveal that politicians have a serious image problem as an increasing number of citizens regard them as self-interested and or not committed to issues of concern to the electorate.¹⁸ Some recent survey findings show that 44 per cent believe that politicians were in politics for their own benefits, thirty per cent of those born in 1958 agree that it is largely irrelevant which political party in power because there is little direct benefit for average citizens.¹⁹

It is also argued that the faith in government has dropped substantially as power of governments has shrunk²⁰ in relation to global issues, and political authorities have also become more remote from lives of most citizens of those countries.²¹

In these days the effects of the 'open information' are felt both in authoritarian and the democratic states. People live in a world where citizen and government have access to almost to the same types and amount of information. Some analysts are in opinion that citizens in democratic states have become apathetic, and are losing interest in the political process observing the fact that rates of voting have dropped in recent decades in developed countries and even membership in the main political parties has also been on the decline. Giddens further mentioned that, 'yet it is a mistake to

17 Giddens, *Op. cit.*, p. 430.

18 For detail, Giddens, *Op. cit.*, p. 430.

19 *Ibid.*, p. 430.

20 Giddens says, "Many citizens resent the fact that decisions affecting their lives are made by distant 'power brokers' – party officials, interest groups, lobbyists and bureaucratic officials. At the same time, they may come to believe that the government is unable to deal with important local issues such as crime and homelessness. The result is that faith in government has dropped substantially. This in turn affects the people's willingness to participate in the political process." See Giddens, *Op. cit.*, p. 430.

21 *Ibid.*, p. 430.

suggest that people are uninterested and have lost faith in democracy itself'. Rather opinion polls show that an overwhelming majority of residents in democratic countries cite democracy as their preferred form of government despite all their dissatisfaction.²²

Nevertheless, democracy despite having some potentials seems to have accrued some vices, for example, one vice of democracy is that it politicalizes people, and thereby reduces their impartial judgment capacity of the political and other socio-economic events. When there is exercise of democracy there is a tendency of forming opinion centering different party views and thus that makes people politicalized.

Despite all the limitations democracy still has some other advantages, for example, it washes out the vices of that political party, which was once in power but subsequently lost it due to losing confidence of the people. Once the ruling party goes in opposition, people forgive and forget its vices and enables them to come back to the power what might be called a process of purification. As there is a process of resilience in the nature, so there is resilience in the society, as society itself is broadly a part of the nature.

People's behavior in democracy

Taking into account varied situations and occasions prevailing in a democratic country it may be generalized here that there are at least three types of differential responses from the people's side to the anti-people acts of the government which include, (a) apathetic, (b) evaluative, and (c.) assertive. Details of each type have been presented below:

Apathetic response: People have their own reasons to value whatever action is there from the government side. Even in case of sensational issue also there may have some sensational reaction among a section of people or pocket area but may not necessarily be in the whole country. Politically a sensational issue may not be socially sensational, and therefore, may not have sensational reaction among all sections. People may not have access to enough information,

22 Giddens further mentioned, "... there are signs that interest in politics is actually on the rise, but is simply being channeled into directions other than orthodox party politics. Membership in civic groups and associations is growing and activists are devoting their energies to new social movements focused around single issues such as the environment, animal rights, trade policy and nuclear non-proliferation". See, *Op. cit.*, 431.

which may again cause over or under reaction among them. The situation may be different in developed countries compared to developing ones.

All that does not mean that people do not have any self-interest or national interest to protect - rather they perceive their interest taking into account their own positions and limitations as everybody else likes to do so. Common interest or collective interest always may not necessarily correspond to the self-interest.

In such cases, most people tend to believe that the political system is like that or they see that as a law of the society, as in an underdeveloped society everybody does not expect rule of law since they often see the 'might is right'. Almost always there is differential perception between the sanctioned law and the perceived law. That does not mean that such a society is an irrational society rather it has its own form of rationality, which is different from other advanced societies. People often used to make difference between the normative order and existential order and thereby they decide whether they will remain docile or make public protest. Perceptively there are at least two types of protests what may be called public protest and the private protest. People do not necessarily remain in a position to make every time public protest rather in many cases they may go for even private protest or often may remain indifferent to that. Thus, in many cases even what may appear to others as sensational or anti-people act from the government side, still people may remain apathetic to that. Reasons are primarily perceptive and subjective rather than objective in all the cases.

Evaluative response: In case of anti-people acts, people in general go for evaluative action as the issues deal with their everyday life. People also view it as risk free and in turn mostly action free. Moreover, by that they also try to form or consolidate their opinion, and thus try to make aware and inform others about that.

Evaluative action is also one kind of passive action, which sometimes leads to non-violent peaceful action. Bertrand Russell seems to convincingly pointed out that, "We suffer not only the evils that actually befall us, but all those that our intelligence tells us we have reason to fear."²³ Following that people used to make judgment whether they have any reason to fear, which may affect their property and entity. Normally people take that issue perilously which either has

23 Bertrand Russell, *Unpopular Essays*, (London, Unwin paperback 1990). p. 138.

a chance to affect their property or entity or in exceptional cases even both. Under such circumstances people usually go for resistive action.

Again it needs to be pointed out that how people evaluate the political system or functions of democracy is also pertinent to the issue raised here. Kornberg and Clarke pointed out that "... people's views of democracy influence how they evaluate the operation of their particular political system."²⁴ For example, when some students of political science were asked to evaluate the 'Bangladesh politics' they mentioned it as 'rubbish'. When asked, "Whether does it not match with the books or books do not match with the politics?" they could not decide either firmly. Rather they tend to say that books do not match with politics. That is not special to them as most of the students read more the normative theory rather than the functional theory and thereby they develop their own normative criteria to assess the functions of politics, which may not match with the theory of power game, played by the ruling class.

Assertive response: On the other hand, when people take something as sensitive and unacceptable, and thereby most of them feel to resist that then they go for protesting that. When people have reason to believe (may be spurious) that the action would be harmful to them as mentioned above, then they go for protesting that.²⁵ Such type of perceived risk may not be the actual risk but still that has essential political implications. They go for expressing their opinion in the form of protest - may be violent or non-violent in character. So, in case of all harmful actions people may not protest because they may not foresee the harms of those actions, as there may be visible as well as invisible harms or perceived and non-perceived harms. Here role of political parties lies as they may elucidate the adverse consequences of that type of action in a different way than what it may not actually entail harm to them.

In case of having less protest from the people, one more reason can be attributed which may be described as perceived deprivation vs. actual deprivation. Economists often pay attention to the actual deprivation while sociologists often tend to show interest more for both actual and perceived deprivation. And strikingly sociologists' analysis gives the understanding that the actual deprivation is not at all enough to raise voice against that. That may occur even

24 Kornberg and Clarke, *Op. cit.*, p. 538.

25 Infamous political parties try to take advantage of such situation what is called propaganda. For such incidence there are lot of examples cited by people here in Bangladesh.

without having actual deprivation in real life also when people can form some adverse notion from the perceived deprivation. When assessment of the people's behavior is made from the point of actual behavior then such ill notion can be changed. It can therefore be described as notional view rather than the rational view of the observers who look for assertive action.

Keeping that in mind let us now look for interpretation of actual behavior. There is another dichotomy what may be called in Amartya Sen's word constrained behavior (CB) versus actual behavior (AB).²⁶ The content of the constrained behavior and the actual behavior sometimes used interchangeably assuming that both may be the same. Again in case of constrained behavior there are two types – internal constraints and external constraints. By internal constraints mean person's own constraints arising out of one's own condition(s) – where by external constraints mean, which are external to one person's condition.

The more one can overcome the CB, the more the person shows the AB, which may be closed to 'rational behavior' (RB). So, the common people what they do under certain circumstances, which may be called constrained behavior, may be considerably different from their rational behavior. Again in case of rational behavior, there may be perceived rationality and actual rationality. People considering their interpretation of the situation based on their experiences may feel to behave in one way or another what may not be uniform in all cases and by all persons but understandably what may largely take a shape of rational behavior. Indeed, when other people understand the logic of behavior of a person - who is in one or other form of constrain - then they call it rational behavior.

Therefore, when people see the supporters of tyrants, it becomes difficult for others to view that as a rational behavior. But supporters of a tyrant do not necessarily mean the supporters of irrationality rather they have their own arguments or rationale for such types of behaviour. Many times, such supporters used to put arguments with the point that the tyrant has no choice but to behave like that, and in the constrained situation, in case of that person, anyone else would have done the same thing. Thus, historically there was no

26 Sen, *Op. cit.*

dearth of tyrant's supporters as noticed in Germany and Italy - where some people support Hitler and Mussolini till today.

Above discussions lead to deduce the conclusion that the people's reactions that we see in our everyday life in regard to anti-people act of the government are not unusual rather those are rational. Political parties, social campaign organizers, awareness raising groups etc. need to analyze that carefully when deciding their course of action for bringing about a planned social change through involving people.

Question still may come up as what likely to give shape to the role of the people. Alam pointed out that when there is no restriction on expression of opinion, freedom of the press, and of assembly, and where there is no visible or invisible institutional control over the instruments or facilities of communications, there people have more rational behaviour.²⁷ Thus, the election is the means of democracy, not the end of democracy. There are instances where the system may be democratic in form but authoritarian in function.

Rationality of Politicians and People

There are two indistinctive groups of people where one group often describes that the politicians do not have rational behavior in the newly democratic countries whereas the other group feels that the people do not have rational behavior either.²⁸ But interestingly, these two groups are not always distinctive and exclusive to identify rather sometimes the same group blames both sides (politicians and people) also.

The assumption of 'irrational behavior' of politicians and the people play a major part in everyday discussion of civil society including journalists where again politicians' part is widely asserted. This does not mean that the other part is not mentioned quite often but since the politicians' part are often mentioned by the competing political groups, people's part gets less prominence. Rather members of civil society and common people understandably echo the politicians' voice frequently. Of course, it does not necessarily mean that common people do not see the passive character of their fellow friends rather

27 Khurshed Alam, "Government and Politics: An Analytical Framework". *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bangladesh* (Humanities), Vol. 49, No.2. Asiatic Society of Bangladesh, 2004.

28 See also Mohammed Yunus, Bangladesh 2010, *Justice Mohammed Ibrahim Memorial Lecture 1999*, Asiatic Society of Bangladesh, 1999, Dhaka.

find an easy way and enough reasons to blame the politicians. One important reason can perhaps, be identified is that since politicians run the state and government; therefore, they get more attention to their *inability* rather than the people. It is widely claimed that neither politicians nor people spare scope to blame each other and thereby pays less attention to find remedies for the common adversaries.

Dialectics in political development

From the above discussion one can claim that the politics is a matter of interest of the politicians as well as common people. But their interests are not often mutually exclusive rather at least sometimes competitive where politicians often want to derive benefit out of the system. Politicians want to derive benefit from the politics as governing authority where the common people wish to derive benefits in the form of getting better and meaningful life. There are critical issues and time when politician's interest intertwined with common people's interest while all the time it does not match with the interest of the common people. When a large number of people have fear about the possible adverse steps of the government, even at the same time also a section of people maintain hope for getting advantage of that. So, with the change of government although fear-favour dilemma does not change perceptively, the persons' view may change contextually.

It is evident that there is always a dialectics between constrained behavior and attempt to reduce that constraint. Indeed, the history of human society is the history of struggle for overcoming that constrained behavior.²⁹ That categorically differs from the classical notion of Marxian dialectics where Marx mentioned about three stages of dialectics such as, thesis – antithesis and synthesis. In the present case dialectics rotate adhering that track but markedly following the two steps what is called constrained behavior and the attempt to overcome that constrains.

In the political arena challenge is not the prime factor but response to challenge is equally, if not more, a crucial factor. And response is heavily influenced by norms and values that a member of the society through the process of one's everyday life acquires. Response may be again in different forms what may be called resistive or docile form, as some people are oversensitive while others are

29 People always fight against natural or social constraints.

moderate or less sensitive as emotion and sentiments vary from person to person and society to society. In case of society it is again more related to prevailing values also.

The state is overdeveloped³⁰ and in turn, some people involved in managing the state affairs, overpowered in the sense that they possess more power than what they require to perform their mandated works. In that context, it is very difficult for the people to show the rational behavior as because different groups create many legal and institutional barriers what the common people need to encounter in the way to their everyday activities. It is again, in this sense, if the rational behavior of the people is desirable, still it may not be possible. It may, therefore, be argued here that when people say about democracy they mention about their rights, but when politicians say about democracy they say about their opportunities.

People's power in democracy

The general claim is that democracy's greatest gift to people is as nobody can take power for granted, and it gives people the ultimate power to decide whether a leader should return to power after finishing his term or not. But the criticality is also that, although it gives ultimate power to the people, it does not give easy immediate power to them to remove the harm-causing government from power and ultimate power does not enable the people to recover the immediate adverse affect that they may have or what even they can anticipate. In other words, they had to watch their misfortune at least for a period of time, if not for, long time. Even in the next turn instead of getting remedy they may have even worst form of government, which may add further to their injury. Thus, people's power is used pivotally for changing the master, but not always changing the power and functions of their master.

It is widely assumed that if the elected representatives do not fulfill their commitment than the types of action people would like to take mainly include defeat in the next election. Nevertheless, the risk of repeated wins by the same type of people in power is higher as because defeating a bad may go with

³⁰ The point has been articulated by Hamza Alavi which was subsequently further developed by Anupam Sen. For detail, Anupam Sen, *The State, Industrialization and Class Formations in India: A New Marxist Perspective on Colonialism, Underdevelopment and Development*, (London, RKP 1982). But the present trend does not support that idea fully as state gradually losing control over the private sectors due to globalization and increased access to information.

selecting the worst one also. The problem aggravates further because trend is there that the more educated voters are more partisan.³¹

Still question comes as what people actually chose many times goes in line with what they have reason to chose.³² Indeed, people are more aware of the fact that what people actually chose is not the same if they would have got chance to chose it differently. Indeed, they have two types of choices where one has a reason to chose, where the other has opted to chose.³³

There are increased incidences where descendants of autocratic elites also emerge as democratic elite without changing much of their attitude and activities. Nevertheless, one has reason to argue that power elite cannot remain elite unless they exercise power and common people cannot remain common if they exercise power. Therefore, it is arguably true that the common people exercise their power only in uncommon situation.

Challenge: From fragile democracy to firm democracy

Political challenge as mentioned at the outset of the paper needs further attention here. Indeed, political education is also viewed as necessary to raise the level of achievement of citizen's rights. But the argument may be the other way round also as political rights itself may contribute to political education rather than learning by doing that. There are many issues, which need to be learned rather at the collective level than at the individual level.

Following above-mentioned crisis the issue may come back whether the government is incapable of handling democracy, or the people mismatch with the fulfilling the needs of democracy. The general tendency is that the politicians responsible for running the country always like to claim that the people are incapable of making use of democracy, but the fact also remains that the government itself often fails to ensure the benefits of democracy to the people. To the government democracy means a way of ruling the country while to the people democracy means a way of developing the country.

There may be two types of democracy where one may be called fragile democracy where the system may not function in more intended way; and where that is not effective for the people e.g. in the society like the Philippines and

31 Mohiuddin Ahmad, *Voice Through Ballot: Election and People's Perception*, (Dhaka, CDL, 2001), p. 37.

32 Sen, *Op. cit.*, p.148.

33 Their preference may vary with their reasons for choice.

Bangladesh. The other form what may be called firm democracy where that may sustain for long time and function more intended way. As Sartori points out, "What democracy is cannot be separated from what democracy should be."³⁴

With the change in political system from autocratic to democratic, it does not necessarily mean that it would enable to change all the values and norms that emerged through the process of political development in pre-democratic regimes.

When the autocracy is abolished, people in general immediately assume that all authority lies with them but gradually realize that as an illusion.

With democracy, democratic elites likely to emerge whose interest and style of function may be very close to the fashion of rulers of autocratic regime. Moreover, there may be some elites of autocratic regime who themselves may succeed to continue in the democratic system also. Democracy can emerge almost overnight from the autocracy but does not contain all elements, which can equally faster change the autocratic values and system. Such political lag is noticed in almost all newly emerged democratic societies. Political lag as challenge does not go away with the leaders of the autocratic regime; it contributes to persist autocratic values among the people also.

The number of countries with democratic governments has rapidly increased in recent years, largely due to the effects of globalization, mass communications and competitive capitalism. But the challenge is that the "democracy is not without its problems; people everywhere have begun to lose faith in the capacity of politicians and governments to solve problems and to manage economies, and political participation in the electoral system is decreasing".³⁵

To make the fragile democracy firm there is no patent guidelines or royal road, which can lead to that, but one can easily recognize that to remove the weakness of democracy one needs to exercise more democracy. There is also wide claim that "... no modern democracy has yet succeeded until the development of a middle class bridges the gap between the populace and the state."³⁶ It is often argued that the "most important single factor in promoting democracy is the

34 Giovanni Sartori, *The Theory of Democracy Revisited*. Chatham, (NJ: Chatham House, 1987), p. 7.

35 For details, Giddens, *Op. cit.*, p. 447.

36 Sartori, *Ibid*, p. 119.

degree of education."³⁷ But observation also suggests that for establishing democracy there is no need of education, but for flourishing democracy it is needed there. One most important lesson that the people learned from practice of democracy is that in a newly democratic society people first try to select the lesser evil and then they go for greater good form of government.

Nevertheless, there are increased evidences that in some cases political contest among the parties may lead to uniformity rather than diversity, which leads to harmonization rather than confrontation in the society. That takes place remarkably in those cases where parties remain in fair contest for winning mind of the people or rather extends support to popular demand of the people. A well-operated democracy contributes to the welfare of the state through welfare of the people by making politicians instrument to that.

Conclusion

It may be concluded here that democracy is fundamentally for the civil society, enjoyed by the politicians, supported by the people. To the people democracy is what democracy does. A democratic system creates its own form of exercising authority, which may be wide pervasive than the autocratic system; which replaces the distinctive vertical line of authority by more diffused horizontal line without automatically creating much space for the common people to exercise their power in their everyday affairs.

As people depend on oxygen, so is the government on people but do not realize it unless feels shortage of it. It needs to be mentioned here that the presence of people in public meeting, public gathering and support to the statement of the government – all mean government indirectly recognizes the power of the people. Thus, an indirect authority of the people are realized and often recognized by the government what may be called invisible authority of the people. Indeed, in a democratic country government enjoys sanctioned authority while people enjoy generic authority.

37 Sartori, *Ibid*, p. 119.