LIBERAL ETHOS AND DEMOCRACY IN INDIA

Dr. Krishna Roy

Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, Shirakole Mahavidyalaya, Shirakole, South 24 Parganas (West Bengal), Pin: - 743513

ABSTRACT: *The liberal ethos is foundational to Indian democracy, embedded in the Constitution through fundamental rights, the rule of law, and institutional checks and balances. However, the application of this ethos is continuously debated and balanced with India's unique social realities, a blend of Western principles, indigenous values, and the need for social justice. India's democratic framework incorporates key liberal principles to ensure individual autonomy and limit state power. The principles are:- a) Fundamental Rights- Part III of the Constitution guarantees essential civil liberties such as freedom of speech, equality before the law, and religious freedom. These rights serve as a crucial check on potential majoritarianism, b) Rule of Law- This principle ensures that the law applies equally to all citizens and government officials, safeguarding against arbitrary governance, Independent Judiciary ,c) Judicial Review- The judiciary acts as a guardian of the Constitution, with the power to review and strike down unconstitutional laws, thus maintaining the balance of power and protecting rights, d) Separation of Powers- Power is distributed among the legislature, executive, and judiciary to prevent its concentration in a single branch, and e) Sui Generis Approach: Indian democracy also incorporates "home-grown" or "Bharatiya" traits shaped by local factors, such as the emphasis on Dharma (ethical responsibility) and a balance of individual rights and collective duties.*

A significant aspect of India's approach is the integration of liberalism with social justice. Thinkers like Dr. B.R. Ambedkar emphasized that political democracy was insufficient without achieving social and economic democracy for all citizens, especially marginalized communities. a) Directive Principles of State Policy (DPSPs): These principles, though not legally enforceable, provide moral guidance to the state to promote the welfare of the people and ensure equitable distribution of resources, aiming to achieve social and economic equality. b) Affirmative Action: The Constitution includes provisions for reservations and safeguards to empower historically disadvantaged sections of society, balancing the abstract principle of equality with the practical need for equitable outcomes.

The relationship between the liberal ethos and Indian democracy is dynamic and faces ongoing challenges from - Majoritarianism: Critics note that the rights of minorities can be threatened by dominant community politics and the rise of illiberal political formations, Institutional Strength: Debates persist about the weakening of independent institutions like the media and judiciary due to political pressure and patronage politics, Balancing Rights and Security: Issues such as state surveillance, internet shutdowns, and the use of draconian laws raise questions about the balance between individual liberties and national security or public order, From "Flawed Democracy" to "Electoral Autocracy": Various international democracy indices have downgraded India's status in recent years, citing government policies that have inflamed religious discord and a decline in civil liberties. Ultimately, the preservation of India's liberal democratic character relies not just on its constitutional text but also on embedding liberal values in its collective social and political practices, fostering a culture of tolerance, reasoned debate, and respect for diversity. (532 words)

Key Words: *Democracy, Liberalism, Plurality, Community Identities, Unity, Rights*

INTRODUCTION

Liberalism is in a strange historical condition. Everybody wants to live in liberal societies; no one is prepared to defend them. But we should be careful in thinking of a global trend too hastily. Difficulties of liberal societies appear to be a result of co-occurrence, rather than of co-causality. Its conditions of success and failure are

historically local, rather than global – probably because economic and political processes have different types of causality: they are structural in case of the global economy, but coincidental and imitative in case of politics. What kind of history has liberalism had in India? The answer will depend on what goes into the term global – ideas or institutions? To help clarify the discussion, Liberalismcan be differentiated in four levels – as an imaginary, as political theory, as institutional structure, and as everyday practice. Clearly, liberalism cannot exist seriously and continuously as practice, if it does not exist at the other levels. But, in non-Western contexts, the presence of liberalism in these other levels can hardly be taken for granted.

In Liberal democracy all the adult citizens have right of voting irrespective to race, gender or property ownership, Historically, however, some countries regarded as liberal democracies have had a more limited franchise and some do not have secret ballots. The liberal democratic constitution describes the democratic character of the state (Kaviraj, 2011:56). The purpose of a constitution is frequently observed as a limit on the authority of the government, Liberal democracy highlighted separation of powers, independent judiciary, a system of checks and balances between branches of government. Liberal democracies are probably to highlight the importance of the state being a richest at that follows the principle of rule of law. Governmental authority is legitimately worked out only in agreement with written, publicly disclosed laws adopted and enforced in agreement with established procedure. Liberal democracy is known as constitutional democracy. It is a common form of representative democracy, according to the principles of liberal democracy, elections should be free and fair, and the political process should be competitive. Liberal democracy has set India on strong base but faces many challenges, such as caste, corruption and terrorism. Since Independence, Indian democracy has been in continuous clash with the quasi-feudal structure of society(ibib). Caste-based hierarchies are undemocratic, unscientific and unethical, gnawing relentlessly at the foundations of our democracy.

POLITICAL LIBERALISM IN THE WEST

According to Kavirajwe the Indians or the liberal scholars do not want to reprise the history of emergence of political liberalism in the West: its history and its stages are too well known. But, for us who look at it from its historical outside, the important fact is that it is a result of endogenous historical conflicts – a series of protracted struggles for power between segments of the nobility, between the aristocratic classes and the 'third estate', and the established bourgeois coalitions and the rising proletariat. Refinement and elaboration of the ideas of liberalism emerged through the course of these historical conflicts – in which ordinary people were always involved. Political theory – in the forms of high, abstract thinking like Hobbes, Locke, Kant or Mill – were intimate participants in political upheavals involving all social groups in society (Kaviraj,2011: 78-79). Instruction in political theory was an historical 'ordinary' process, not an esoteric learning of principles from some other historical universe. Indian learnt liberalism in three different ways – (i) through modern education that produced a learned familiarity with political history of the West – particularly England; (ii) through highly selective and cautious introduction of some representative institutions by the colonial state: we should not believe the comic theory of colonialism as a school of democracy so beloved of the British in the twentieth century; but these representative institutions introduced new types of political action, mobilization, and persuasion into Indian political life; but most importantly, (iii) through the political experience of the nationalist movement – which contested colonial claims of legitimacy of imperial power primarily on the grounds of liberal doctrine of self-determination. An intriguing question here is whether pre-modern Indian traditions of thought contained anything that assisted and provided justification for liberal institutions. Two plausible constructions of Hindu thought (ibid)can directly contradict each other: the first suggests that the tolerance for intellectual pluralism makes Hinduism a supportive environment for liberal-democratic institutions; the second claims that a social structure so utterly steeped in hierarchy is not conducive to democratic life.

CLASSICAL LIBERALISM IN INDIA

Tocqueville's idea of a providential march of democracy through modern history can only be seen as an argument on the level of a political-social imaginary. His claim that democracy as a social logic – the collapse of aristocratic privilege – once introduced can never be reversed – seems to apply to India. Also, through the

protracted history of the nationalist movement, the two questions of freedom of the nation and freedom of individuals were closely intertwined in Indian debates on political theory. But some significant differences of emphasis can also be seen among its great figures: early liberals and Tagore seemed to argue in favor of a classical form of political liberalism; but Nehru and socialists emphasized the need for economic freedom through reduction of poverty, while Ambedkar stressed the requirement of a breakdown of the caste order by forceful intervention of state legislation. Liberal thinking in India – when we get into details – is quite distinct in its concerns and arguments from standard European liberal thought. SudiptoKaviraj finds the second more plausible, and do not expect liberalism to get much help from the historical tolerance of Hindu religion (Kaviraj, 2011:97).

Liberal Democracy is a modern notion based on three distinct sets of rights i.e. property rights, political rights and civil rights. Property Rights contain freedom to acquire, own and dispose property legally without any external interference. Political rights deal with not only the rights of citizen to participate in electoral process but also influence the policy followed by government of the day. Civil Rights are very vast but majorly deals with freedom of speech and expression and rule of law.India held all these rights dear to her heart during struggle for independence and strove to provide these rights to her citizens by inclusion most of them in fundamental rights. But from the start of independent journey property rights were the most contested between the elite and government day largely because of the welfare of masses. In present time a new trend arose in which property rights of farmers and poor is more in jeopardy, for example the case of land bill. Neither at the time of independence nor now India was able to provide property rights to her citizen (ibid).

India was able to give political rights to her citizen related to election breaking the social barriers of caste and gender. But in terms of affecting the policies of government, she legs behind many of the countries. Major reason of this can be attributed to lack of education of voters who vote in terms of caste and religion and not on development agenda.Civil Rights are dependent on government of day. Though constitution provided vast civil liberty, its enforcement on ground is missing emphasized by incidents of violence against minority and women.Indian constitution provide scope to have a liberal democracy but its achievement is dependent on various stakeholders like citizens, government, bureaucracy etc. In which direction India will move will depend on these stakeholders(ibid:99).

The standard implicit argument in pollical theory is that the evolution of liberal theory prepared the ground for institutions. In India, again, the presence of liberal theory can be contested. I have argued that modern Indian liberalism had been overwhelmed from the mid-1940s the rise of Gandhism and forms of socialism. On the other hand, some of my friends believe that the presence of liberal values and arguments has been widespread and robust: true, there were few liberal thinkers, but almost all major thinkers defended liberal values and principles. Liberal theory has had a powerful secret presence in Indian thought as an unstated consensus. Kaviraj believe that the unwillingness of conventional leftists to frontally defend liberal principles, and their constant denunciation of liberalism (ibid:102)as a deception, a sham played a large role in leaving liberal institutions undefended. Paradoxically, when Indian governments behaved in undemocratic, authoritarian ways – during the Emergency, or against Leftist activists, or in Kashmir – critics have demanded protection from precisely those principles – which, most of the time, they have regarded as unworthy of defense How can you protect principles that you do not regard as worthy of defense?

CITIZENS IN DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM

SudiptoKaviraj follow Gramsci's thinking in thinking about democracy as a constantly fluctuating form. Citizens in democratic systems have entirely unequal experience of democratic government and enjoyment of rights: between regions, between classes, and between historical periods. A great paradox of Indian democracy is shown by the fact that its procedural side functioned well when political participation was low – when democratic politics was primarily a business of the elites. As nonelite groups began to seriously enter political office from the 1970s, some of their leaders began to claim that serious power – which could be used for true social change – should not be circumscribed by democratic constitutionalist procedures. Populist leaders from the lower-castes, when charged with corruption, often protested that they could be tried only by the 'court' of

the popular verdict at the election. Institutional functioning of Indian democracy (Kaviraj,2011:90) had been seriously compromised since the 1970s – first by Indira Gandhi's Congress using spurious 'socialist' arguments for packing the bureaucracy and the courts, dismissing elected governments, through extra-judicial killings of radical activists. After the decline of the Congress, lower-caste leaders defied constitutionalist proceduralism by constant appeals to their loyal popular base, and using the argument for 'recognition' and prestige of their caste groups. Leftist governments comprehensively undermined liberal rules and principles in West Bengal, where they ruled for forty years, by using standard Marxist rhetoric against bourgeois democracy and fashioning a governing style by social coercion and occasional spurts of spectacular violence. The institutional structures of liberal democracy had been constantly edited, undermined, manipulated and circumvented by all kinds of political parties. Intellectuals, mostly aligned to the Left, 'exposed' the sham democracy of liberalism in favor of announcements of abstract superiority (ibid) of socialist principles, and complicit silence about the destruction of democratic defense of civil rights by Left administrations. In India too, we encounter the same paradox: everybody wants to live under liberal institutions; no one wants to defend them.

But it is evident that Indian democratic life is now facing a new reckoning – against a government that imperils its structures in ways that are both more violent and more subtle. It swears by the constitution in the very act of dismantling its protections. During the Emergency, the government suspended democratic procedures; the present government slowly undermines and degrades them. Suspension meant that the denial of democracy was explicit, and justified as transient. Degradation is not a transient decline: it is a slow diminution of rights for initially selected groups – like Muslims; and it is not an explicit denial or rights, but a selective reduction which other 'majority' groups often applaud. They forget that India is a society of minorities (ibid:96), and denial of rights to one minority or one kind of minority – spells danger for all others – including linguistic and cultural groups who might be reduced to an electoral minority for some time. Also during the Emergency, infractions of democratic rights were conducted by state authorities – using the police and coercive apparatuses of the state. Now such infractions are often conducted my mobs, or organized violent gangs affiliated to shadowy groups for which political parties are rarely directly responsible.

In Liberal democracy all the adult citizens have right of voting irrespective to race, gender or property ownership, Historically, however, some countries regarded as liberal democracies have had a more limited franchise and some do not have secret ballots. The liberal democratic constitution describes the democratic character of the state (Wardakar,2009:618). The purpose of a constitution is frequently observed as a limit on the authority of the government, Liberal democracy highlighted separation of powers, independent judiciary, a system of checks and balances between branches of government. Liberal democracies are probably to highlight the importance of the state being a richest at that follows the principle of rule of law. Governmental authority is legitimately worked out only in agreement with written, publicly disclosed laws adopted and enforced in agreement with established procedure.

Power of a Vote: Now days this is an admitted fact that government is the best in which people take part directly which form of government is democratic, but in modern large states establishing direct democracy (Ganguly2011). This is impossibility hence representative form of government has been evolved. The citizens elect their representatives for a fixed tenure. In India those youth completes 18 years age have right to vote. They control government on the basis of voting. Accordingly, Indian constitution no one can deny voting based on gender, religion, caste, race and color.

Rights and Freedoms: India has federal system its has three tire system like ZP, Pachayat Samiti, and Gram Panchyat India has Liberal democracies & specific limits on specific freedoms. There are various legal limitations such as copyright and laws against defamation. There may be restrictions on anti- democratic speech on attempts to undermine human rights, and on the promotion or justification of terrorism. In the United States more than in Europe during the World War, such limits applied to Communists (Chopra,2011:203-39). Now they are more commonly applied to organizations perceived as promoting terrorism or the incitement of group hate. Examples include anti-terrorism or the stimulation of group hatred. Examples include anti-terrorism legislation, the finish down of Hezbollah satellite broadcast and some laws against hate speech, Critics claim that these limitations may go too far and that there may be no due and fair judicial process. In India Liberal

democracy every citizen have to right of life and safety. Discriminatory behavior may be banned, such as refusal by owners of public accommodations to serve persons on grounds of race, religion, ethnicity & gender. According to Indian constitution every Indian has fundamental rights and freedom of speech, property, religion, occupation, culture, education and script (ibid).

Media: Critics of the role the media in liberal democracies claim that concentration of media ownership leads to major distortions of democratic processes. They argue that the corporate media limits the availability of contesting views and following the propaganda Model of Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky. Media commentators (ibid) also point out that the influential early champions of the media industry held fundamentally anti-democratic views, opposing the general population's involvement in creating policy. Ethnic and Religions conflicts: For historical reasons many states are sharp ethic and religious & cultural division. In face some groups may be actively hostile to each other. A democracy which by definition allows mass participation in decision making theoretically also allows use of the political process against "Enemy" group.

Bureaucracy & Corruption: The bureaucracy is liberal democracies is often criticizing for a claimed slowness and complexity of their decision making. The term "Red Tape" is a synonym of slow bureaucratic that hampers quick results in a Liberal democracy. Liberal democracies allow for regular changes in government. In five yrs the government will face a new election, and it must think of how it will win that election. Besides the regular review of governing body short term focus in a democracy could also be the result of collective short form thinking for example, consider a campaign for policies aimed at reducing environmental damage while causing temporary increases in unemployment. However, this risk applies also to other political system. The World Bank suggests that Political institutions are extremely important in determining the prevalence of Corruption, democracy. Parliamentary systems, Political stability and Freedom of the press are all associated with the lower corruption (ibid). The Indian right to information act has already created mass movement in the region. Specifically bringing the lethargic, often corrupt bureaucracy to its knees and changing power equations completely.

CHALLENGES TO LIBERAL IDEOLOGY: COMMUNITY-CENTERED PERSPECTIVE IN INDIA

A large number of advocates of the community-centered perspective challenge the dominant assumption of liberal of ideology. While analyzing the nature of democracy in India, these votaries of the communitarian approach present three quite distinct arguments: i) an individualist ethic is not a necessary condition for the functioning of democracy. As a form of government, democracy can and indeed does exist in societies where community identities dominate over all others. ii) The existence of community identities is not an impediment to the functioning of a democracy. In India, the caste system has responded to changes in the political and economic environment by transforming itself from below and within (Rudolph and Rudolph,1969:19) and has contributed to the success of political democracy in India (ibid:23-24). iii) The central concepts of liberalism – namely individualism, secularism, the distinction between the private and the public – are either unnecessary or inappropriate for India. Secularism is inapplicable while individualism is undesirable. Besides, the quality of tolerance that is valued highly by liberals is an intrinsic attribute of Hinduism.

In different ways, each of these arguments challenge popular liberal beliefs about the nature of democratic politics. The first question the association of Indian democracy with liberalism and separates the philosophy of liberalism from democracy as a form of government. Democracy, it argues, 'specifies who constitutes the legitimate government and wields the authority inherent in the state (the elected representatives), how they acquire authority (free elections, choice between parties), and how they are to exercise it (in broad harmony with public opinion) (Parekh,1993:165). These components determine the nature of government. Liberalism on the other hand, offers a conception of the state based on the philosophical premise that the individual is conceptually and ontologically prior to society and can be conceptualized and defined independently of it (ibid:157). Taking the individual as the ultimate and irreducible unit of society, liberalism postulates that the nature of state is formal and abstract, its structure (separate from the autonomous civil society, a clear separation between public and private), its rationale (protection of the basic rights of the citizens) (ibid:165). These features of the state, according to this point of view, are the product of and designed to cope with the political problems thrown up by

the post seventeenth century individualist society (ibid:168). Hence, they are less universalizable than democracy which consists of such things as free elections, free speech and right to equality (ibid:172), In fact, in the view of its advocates, there are at least two types of societies where the relevance of liberal ideology would be considerably limited, collectivist polities like Bangladesh and multi-communal polities such as India. In both these societies the boundary between the self and another is drawn in a way that is different from the way a person is individuated in liberalism. In collective societies, for instance, the family or the community is seen as a mode of defining the self and such the community is regarded to be inseparable from the individual. Given this form of individuation, liberalism as a philosophy is applicable to these societies. However, democracy as a form of government can and in some cases does exist.

The second argument, which is perhaps the most common expression of the community centered perspective in India, challenges the liberal belief that ascriptive community identities hinder the functioning of democracy. At times, its adherents argue that political modernity contrary to broadly shared assumptions may involve ascriptive and corporate features (Rudolf and Rudolf.1969:12). However, on most occasions they follow a different line of reasoning. Analyzing the process of democracy in India, they argue that traditional corporate structures have with the advent of democracy, transformed and transvalued themselves (ibis:23). They have acquired new roles and functions. The caste system for instance has become a means to level the old order's inequalities by helping to destroy its moral basis and social structure (ibid:19). Further it has helped India's peasant society make a success of representative democracy (ibid:11). In particular, the secular integrative and ideological aspects of caste have provided a sophisticated and differentiated cultural background for receiving the modernist impacts and responding to them without either great disruption or great withdrawal or hostility (Kothari,1970:13).

Discussing the transformed nature of traditional structures in modern times, the representatives of this point of view further maintain that the caste system in contemporary India is acting like a Para community a voluntary group or an interest group (Rudolph,1969:20). It is providing an extremely well-articulated and flexible basis for organization (Kothari,1970:5). It is making available to the leadership structural and ideological bases for political mobilization, providing it with both a segmental organization and identification system on which support could be crystallized (ibid:13).

By mobilizing similar but dispersed and isolated jatis of village and locality in horizontal organizations with common identities, caste associations have contributed significantly to the success of democracy by providing bases for communication, representation and leadership. They have taught illiterate peasants how to participate meaningfully and effectively in politics. Lower castes, whose large numbers give them an advantage in competitive democratic politics, have in many areas gained influence access and power in state and society. With this at their command, they can change in their favor the allocation of resources, privileges and honors. Rather than providing the basis for a reaction, caste has absorbed and synthesized some of the new democratic values (Rudolph and Rudolph,1969:63-64).

The third argument, presented within the community centered perspective, emphasize the distinctiveness of the Indian social and cultural reality and maintains that the country is unique and needs a special approach both to understanding it and to bringing about necessary changes. This cannot be done in terms of the categories and methods borrowed from outside – the categories and methods which are inadequate in understanding the socio-religious, political and economic dimensions of the existence of Indian society (Mehta,1988:221). In particular its adherents question the applicability of the ideology of liberalism and secularism to India. In relation to the former, they assert that the liberals make no attempt to come to terms with the organic character of the social wholes in India and the individual's place in them (ibid:23). The liberals also fail to appreciate adequately the nature and depth of community relations in India(ibid:26).

T.N. Madan makes a similar point when he says that secularism is a gift of Christianity and has emerged from the dialectic of modern science and Protestantism (Madan,1987:754). Consequently, the transferability of the idea of secularism to countries of South Asia is beset with many difficulties and should not be taken for granted (ibid). Further, it is said that South Asia's major religious traditions – Buddhism, Hinduism, Islam and Sikhism – are totalizing in character, claiming all of a follower's life, so that religion is constitutive of society (ibid:751). In fact, it encompasses the secular (ibid:753). Consequently, the segregation of religion to the private or

personal sphere of activity or its subordination to the political is inconceivable in these societies. The existing state of affairs, where religion or dharma pervades society, is considered to be desirable by these communities. As politics is quintessentially the arena of public interest, without religion it would become 'debased' (ibid:752) and 'truncate' the 'personality of the citizen' (Nandy,1958:15.)

UNITY AND PLURALITY IN COMMUNITY IDENTITIES: A LIBERAL RESPONSE

The two most striking shortcomings of the community-centered perspective on democracy are that it valorizes traditional community structures and believes that the political should reflect the social. Like the secularist, the adherents of this perspective associate liberalism with individualism. Consequently, when they question the validity of liberal concepts and emphasize their non-applicability to the Indian context, they justify the continued existence and dominance of existing community structures. In fact, their writings imbue traditional community structures almost exclusively with positive features for instance the caste system is represented as a support structure prescribing merely duties and functions of each unit within the organic whole (Mehta,1988:24). The oppressive practices of the caste system on which the entire edifice of stratification and domination is based are thus relegated to the periphery of social and political discourse. What is also not recognized is that the reactivation of traditional institutions such as caste system, for political participation and modernization has also increased their influence in other domains of life. For instance, the use of caste-based institutions in the farmers movement in UP has strengthened the khap or clan structure (Gupta,1995:5). Among other things, the revival of khap royalty is being used to enforce community control and sanctions against those who deviate from accepted community practices. This is particularly evident in matters such as marriage, divorce and inheritance. Thus, even though community structures are being used for the purpose of democratic politics, the societal orthodoxies and hierarchies embedded in these structures have not been dismantled by the new context of experience. Since advocates the community centered perspective are inattentive to the ways in which caste and other traditional structures are being used for socially conservative ends, they do not consider alternative modes of political mobilization and participation.

Community centered perspective favor and defend policies that take the community as the unit of analysis. The approach best serves the interest of community centered societies (Mahajan,1995:21). While other strategies may be applicable in individualist societies of the west, they feel that in India one cannot escape from the community. Such arguments that rest on the assumption that the political should reflect the social, tend to support the status quoist elements in society. Moreover, they fail to take cognizance of the plural and changing nature of person's identity. That is by assuming that a community is a natural and pre-given unit and that it offers an unproblematic way of differentiating between categories of people, the community centered perspective ignores the fact that people have multiple identities. Membership of a particular community is only an aspect of the person's self and certainly does not embrace the whole. This view also fails to accept the simple truth that there are no natural and uncontested ways of constructing typologies. Consequently, when one employs a particular identity for categorizing people, then there is a deliberate privileging of that identity over all others. For instance, when one accords primacy to the caste identity, one necessarily pays less attention to the religious identity and when one gives centrality to the religious identity, the interests of women as a gender specific group take a backseat. Given this social reality, what needs to be emphasized, contra community centered perspective is that the existence of multiple identities necessitates the use of political strategies that take the individual and not the community as the subject of political discourse.

CONCLUSION

The condition of democracy in India seems to indicate to me that political theorists and academics interested in the understanding of political life ought to focus on several projects that are occluded by the dominance of Western forms and Western arguments in these fields. Study of democracy should be transformed from the analysis of a set of putative conditions and their failures to explain the 'existence' of democracy as a static constitutional form. It should be historicized to include the study of the conduciveness of prior intellectual traditions, the particular conditions of colonial dominance under which liberal institutions were formed, and a

thicker sociology moving beyond economic statistics of growth and contraction. Political theorists should get into a parallel and difficult exercise to examine the fraught relation between liberal ideal of political equality and the affective enchantment of the internally homogeneous form of the European style nation-state. That is not, as much of political theory lazily accepts, the natural political condition of humanity. It 'fits' European countries only because we ignore the history of violence that fashioned them over two centuries. It does not work anywhere else. If we learn to move beyond the latent belief that European history shows to the world the image of its inevitable future, political theorists should explore alternative models of the political community.

The partition of India represented a division between not just two states, but between two radically incommensurable imaginations of what a state should be in a society marked by radical and convex forms of diversity. Pakistan was modelled primarily on the internally homogeneous European nation-state: India sought in its constitution-making process to search for an alternative heterogenous form. No one can claim that the historical example of Pakistan has been a great success. But recent trends show that supporters of that kind of state of singularity can, given some turns in the electoral process, overwhelm the Indian experiment.Tolerance to accommodate multi-religious and multi-ethnic society is something unique to India. We are bound together by ideals of liberty, equality, fraternity, justice- social and political. This cannot be eroded easily. But this has to buttressed by timely justice to secure individual rights, involving all stakeholders in making a law, decriminalizing politics, separating politics from religion and giving precedence to the organic law of the country. In the Liberal democracy the voters should have right to voting in free & fair surrounding but at certain time they are unable voting in free and fair surrounding because of unfair conditions such as terrorism, cast violence and disturbances in law and order. In Indian democracy media is the supportive pole. Sometime media play better role but at certain time there should be limitations. We see the Indian democracy somehow voters voting to their own caste and religion. It indicates that there is no liberalism. In Indian democracy the bureaucrats become powerful because they are stable and government is unstable.

REFERENCE

[1]   Chopra,J.K, Liberal Democracy in India, Unique Publisher,Delhi, 2011.
[2]   Gupta.D, Secularization and Minoritization: Limits of Heroic Thoughts, EPW, Vol.30,no.35,1995.
[3]   http://indianexpress.com /article/opinion/columns/a-deeper-democracy.
[4]   KavirajSudipto, The Enchantment of Democracy and India: Politics and Ideas, Permanent Black Pub. Ranikhet,2011.
[5]   Kothari. R ed. Caste in Indian Politics, Orient Longman, Delhi,1970
[6]   Madan. T.N, Secularism in its Place, The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol.46, no.4,1987.
[7]   Mahajan. G, Cultural Embodiments and Histories, Sage Pub. Delhi, 1995.
[8]   Mehta. V.R, Ideologies, Modernization and Politics in India, Manohar Pub. Delhi, 1988.
[9]   Nandy. A, The Anti Secularist Manifesto, United Nations University Pub. Tokyo, 1988.
[10]   Parekh. B ed. Crisis and Change in Contemporary India, Sage, Delhi,1996.
[11]   R.G.Wardakar , Constitutional and Political process In India, Nirali Publication Delhi, 2009.
[12]   Rudolf.L, Rudolf.S.H, The Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India, Orient Longman, Delhi,1969.
[13]   SumitGanguly , "The Story of Indian Democracy", The Indian Express, June,2011