

A Study on Comparative Politics: India and America

Dr. Ashok Kumar Tyagi*

Abstract – 'Compare' is the instinctual propensity of the individual to assess his own actions vis-à-vis the others. He's really involved in learning how people work, interact and act around him. Contemporary political science is key to a thesis on international politics. Consequently, comparative policy has been an field of growing interest in all nations. New Social Sciences lately have expanded our capacity to track and routinely analyses the analytical universe of reality surrounding us and to make conceptual calculation and rational and quantitative interpretation equal to numerical facts and processes. The behavioral sciences have also presented us with much new, loosely validated knowledge about how individuals internally and as a group think, behave, interpret and conduct. We will first describe the word comparative and then legislation before we try to establish 'compare' regulation.

Key Words: India Politics, America Politics, India and America Politics

----- X -----

INTRODUCTION

Comparative measures refer to actions, structures, procedures, theories and principles in many nations. It seeks out these regularities and patterns, the similarities and the differences among several nations that aid in clarifying the fundamental nature of regimes, their working conditions, and their faith. Comparative politics explores a larger variety of democratic practices, from government and their organisation and certain modes of association not explicitly associated with the central government. Comparative measures apply to philosophy as well as approaches as political science. 'Theory applies to a collection of generalizations that are routinely related, and the Approach includes the methods and resources utilized in the inquiry, training, checking and assessment of theory.' The rules, basic values and meaning driving democratic behavior are often discussed by comparative politics. In the context of comparative politics, country and its democratic structure are systemically and comparatively studied. The first thing to consider in reality is comparative politics, which involves explaining similitudes and disparities. Comparative legislation defines the natural world and creates classifications and typologies on the basis of these definitions. They define various forms of voting schemes, for instance. There are reasons for similarities and disparities. Why have social revolutions been taking place, not in Germany and Japan, in France and Russia? Whereas in all other western democracies there is no socialist party in the US? Why is political turnout so much lower in the United States and Switzerland than in any other democracy? We formulate hypothesis, like in all scientific fields, that

attempts to explain (to regulate variation) these differences and use empirical evidence to check them to verify whether or not the hypothesis is true. This approach can be used to establish causality, generate generalizations and build and strengthen hypotheses. This is empirically valid for example that proportional representation (PR) appears to build more partly decentralized structures.

GROWTH OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

In the 1950s the work of comparative politics became increasingly significant as a number of leading US policy scientists tried "to turn the field of politics" by taking this topic into analysis from a international to a comparative political trend and "from government studies to political system science." The history of this subject can however be placed in approximately three unopharmed, sophisticated and more sophisticated phases. The contributions of major leaders such as Aristotle, Machiavelli, de Tocqueville, Bryce, Ostrogorski and Weber to the study of politics form part of the first phase, which simply used the comparative method in order to gain an understanding of the work of political organisations. Such scholars adopted what was dubbed "the comparative process, which was intended to" assemble a particular body from which researchers could pick, evaluate and remove the appropriate forms and the revolutionary powers of political culture by the analysis of current politics or those in the past. "They have adopted this methodology. Within the second step, the insights of some of the significant recent authors such as Samuel H. Beer, M. Hass, Bernard Ulam and Roy C. Macridis should be

mentioned, who have utilized the comparative approach to view themselves in a more effective manner with a clear self-awareness and conscious attitude. We work with numerous methods for comparative field research, conngurative techniques, structural and practical comparisons, task-orientated methodology, conceptualization of specific qualitative challenges, developing accepted reference criteria, question relevance, crosscultural issues and accessible evidence. The inputs by David Easton, Edward Shils, Harry Eckstein, David Apter, Lucian W. Pye, Sidney Verba Myron, Weiner and several others, may be taken into account during the final process. The authors of this period employed interrelated terms in order to frame their argument on the basis of qualitative study, while they equipped themselves with a specialist vocabulary. As Roberts says: "If Easton talks of inputs, outputs, demands, gatekeepers, supports and stresses, environment, feedback, values, critical ranges and political authorities; Almond offers a set of input and output functions; Deutsch borrows a cybernetic language which applies to political systems the concept of feedback of various types- autonomy, memory, load, lag, lead and gain, receptors, communication, selective screening of information and so on. Almond's 'universality' criterion sums up the reason for choosing these languages – they are broad enough to cover every political entity, regardless of their scale, length, gradation, or other elements..

POLITICAL SYSTEM

There are several sub-systems in the social system. There are other tasks to execute for each sub-system. The institutional structure is related to many social subsystems. The social and political systems are directly linked. A contemporary research is incomplete, without any doubt as to how he makes a livelihood, how he spends his period of leisure, which sort of issues bother him the most, how and when he clashes with his coworkers, to name a couple. Although all the above considerations are essential to the political observer, his fundamental concern will always be to regularize and institutionalize institutions, to take authoritative decisions, settle disputes, to mention a few facets of human behaviour, with a strong political partiality. The entity with these duties is the State and its institution effectively carrying out these duties is regarded as the Administration. However, the words 'state' and 'service' are regarded as having minimal legal meaning. Almond and powell reported that the definition of 'political structure' has "acquired a broad variety of currencies, as it focuses on the whole spectrum of political activity in society anywhere these practices that occur within society."

David M. Wood. John. "The political system becomes a set of interrelated variables that are considered political and are treated as if to be separated from other variables that are considered politically relevant and not immediately politically relevant."

S.H. Hans. A.B. and Stout. Ulam. Ulam. "As part of a wider perspective of all societal conduct, the

democratic structure has arisen. The government mechanism is a framework that has a certain role to play in culture from this viewpoint. It is the function to make legitimate policy decisions, in the fewest possible words.

Powell and Almond. The word 'control mechanism' is clarified further by the definition Almond and Powell: "When we speak about the government framework, we consider all the experiences that involve the usage or effect of legal physical force. "It often reflects on a wide spectrum of government practices in culture, anywhere they exist in society. The legal framework comprises all the systems of its constitutional dimensions, not just legislative agencies, such as assemblies, courts and executive bodies. Traditional organisations, such as parenship and caste societies, are among others. Comparative strategies investigate thoroughly and consistently various democratic structures, such as assassinations, riots, demonstrations as well as organized institutions such as governments, social groups and media. Political control, popular culture , and economy, political stability, etc., are decided by the democratic structure. Its chief feature is the policy division identified by the authority of Marion Levy, "As the transfer of control over and accountability for the actions of the actual representatives of the substantive system in question, including, on the one side, coercive measures, the severe force of which is, in one direction, accountable and systemic unified to the representatives; Almond and Powell clarified the effect of the political system: "The political system produces a certain contribution to society: valid policy decisions. The attempts to be explicit and programmatic, or only loosely and broadly speaking. Many or none of them will tolerate them quickly or reticently. However, calling them political decisions means stressing that they have social consequences, and noting their legitimacy means drawing attention to the key characteristics that make them political. The democratic structure determines and executes social goals by valid political decisions."

Role of Bureaucracy in Developing Countries

These former colonies had been to try to develop in their respective societies after the Second World War. The aims of accelerated economic growth had to be paired with political democratic progress. Growth meant the development, production, prosperity, independence, and peace and sovereignty of nations. The imperial administration has taken root in these areas. Colonial administration features include concentrated control, authoritarian, general officers, and neutrality. The system in question was elitist, patriarchal, and paternalistic. Any organisation, like a colonial bureaucracy, cannot play a role in the development process effectively. Thus, in general, Max Weber's logical legal bureaucratic institution established by colonial masters for policing and collecting income became the efficient resource for

growth. However, some academics cautioned these countries to try to improve organized, effective and influential bureaucracies if the economic and political growth challenge was to be accomplished. The strong bureaucracy is considered necessary to resolve artificial political boundary disintegration pressures and the competing powers of family and tribal systems, the challenge of organising and funding political parties, the population's low energy capacity, and the public's propensity to waste money on a consuuv basis, according to Joseph La Palombara Powerful bureaucracy is only essential evils in developed countries which one must learn to accept and hope for the best in a democratic manner.

Bureaucracy in USA

The first US president, George Washington, stressed integrity in assignments. The Democratic Party growth shifted the situation in later years. Political considerations start to be seen as significant. Whenever a new president comes to office, his party filled the void. This system was called the system of spoils that was brought into existence by an 1810 Convention Act. The rules had to be reduced to four years in terms of the district lawyers, collectors, customs agents, Naval Officers, paymasters and several other staff. It opened the way for the transition in government to switch office. The spoil scheme in the United States created ineffective red tape. Many politicians begin to talk of changes seriously. The Pendleton Act entered into effect in 1883. It has set up a Commission for the civil service and paved the way for an efficient bureaucracy. Subsequently, several measures of Congress were enacted to change the recruiting practices of government departments. Today approximately 80% of government positions are covered through open tests and the president's political choices. The most critical aspect of the American government structure is administration in the country's decision-making phase. The secret of this is that the officers are decision-makers. The administrator is responsible for enforcing the laws. Since bureaucrats are the lower tier, what is rather surprising to a political student at this moment is the reality that, like Britain, bureaucracy plays an significant part in the running of the democratic system is that it's connected to the president and his secretaries who make up the government's high tier. The partnership between the President and bureaucracy is in two forms, as far as manipulating one another is concerned. It has a definite effect on the decay process. The President will impose his demands on the bureaucracy in a variety of ways. In the control of the presidente, he is willing to exert power over the organisation of the executive branch and to conduct skilful promotions, skilfully using the distinctions and penalties and his right to create key decisions. As wise is the partnership between parliament and the legislature, as a double-way flow, where each has its own power and regulation. Before determining, the administration always has to ask itself

what the Congress response is going to be because of three reasons: (1) Congress' powers to purse penalties against different departments; (II) the general authority to approve and modify the plan of congress; and (III) the structure of the committees of which the senior mmmbers of the federal legislature take part. Unguarded officers could have their funds cut off unexpectedly if they have failed to create a good deal with a certain representative and have scorned so many demands of Congress. It should be shown if the bureaucratic structure offers certain resources to an interest group or controls other interest groups. The task of interest group representatives is generally to promote the bureaucratic sub-system, support to build a united front against red tape as budget reductions or other constraints hinder the programme. The numerous pressure groups controlling big corporations focus on executive departments' strategies and programmes.

Bureaucracy in India

Nevertheless, since ancient times, public services have not operated in an structured way. Advent of the East India Corporation, a community of men identified as factors that carried out its business was the Civil Service. The Civil Service often started to perform administrative duties with the shift of focus from trading to administration. Variow improvements were addressed between 1765 and 1853 under different legislation in the civil service. Since 1858 when Indian administration came directly within the Crown, recruitment to the civil service by employers was replaced by open competition. The British government has named various commissions to address the increasing demand of Indians to secure public sector jobs. While there have been some improvements, they have been viewed by the Indians as insufficient. In a form or other bureaucracy has developed since ancient times. The numerous categories of courtiers established bureaucracy in Ancient India, when the monarchy was the prevailing government structure. The People's Republic of China (PRC) is associated with progressive administration in the sense that a variety of citizens are selected into an transparent public competitive review carried out by an autonomous, legislative agency. In India, the system that we know today is associated with Lord Cornwallis. Initiated by the Indian Civil Service (ICS), the steps culminated. The Indians had only lower levels of this service and branches of the colonial bureaucracy, first. Currently, they were not permitted to occupy higher roles. The doors to the upper classes were opened for Indians from the 1850s on, all of whom were numbered. Names like Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, K.P.S. Menon Senior, T.N. Kaul, and others that have made an ICS distinction can be quoted. In fact, some of them have also played an important role in post-independent India. Nevertheless, the ICS was basically a imperial invention built for imperialist purposes. While the Indians in the ICS often sympathized with the 'Local citizens' (the tribal

masses), they usually pursued the line of their colonial masters. That is the explanation why the revolutionary leadership who battled for freedom from the British rule opposed the position the 'steel system of the British Empire' – the common name of the ICS (also regarded as the heavenly born service) performed. In fact, Jawaharlal Nehru was her resolute opponent. In India, colonial bureaucracy conducted mostly so-called restoration roles, such as law and order protection, tax collection / income recovery, etc. There was no understanding about the idea about construction management then. Basically, it was a system for the gathering of police and taxation, so it was far from a people oriented government. The British regularly hired the imperial establishment to shut down the free movement. At the time of Freedom, this was the large picture.

COMPARATIVE STUDY OF INDIAN FEDERALISM WITH USA

Federalism applies to separate ties of political authority under the same regional framework between governments. To the sense that a mutual partner is reinstated by the state governments, constitutional federalism has grown. Federalism is thus building the forms in which different jurisdictions control and separate each other concurrently. The government's most important aspect is the use of power, especially for democracies, because governments are the official force for all decisions that have an impact on individuals, values and resources. Federalism is thus the organizational instrument through which governments manage power¹. It is one of the characteristics of State sovereignty to enter into treaties and agreements with foreign authorities. In terms of international affairs, economy, climate, technology, biodiversity and finance, after the end of the Second World War no state will escape the rest of the planet. Thanks to globalization and the immense developments of connectivity and IT, autonomous States have been interdependent. Unfortunately, given the essential significance of the Treaty-making force, it has gained relatively little publicity in our nation. Furthermore, because of the experience of the World Trade Organisation, it cannot be ignored specifically. There is so much documentation in the Treaty on the Rights of Intellectual Property, Commerce, Food and Services that certain aspects of such deals sincerely feel are harmful to our national interests. There should be no question that the right to enter into arrangements, deals, deals and conventions has a positive or detrimental effect in certain situations on our citizens' markets, stability, lives and livelihoods. It is a power of high efficiency. Through the context of the Uruguay Round of Trade negotiations, there are several agreements which include provisions that have adverse effects on our economy.

Yues Lejeune has indicated that 'federalism is, which is valid particularly in the foreign policy sector, a delicate balance between solidarity and the diversity of their components. While the Unity Doctrine of the Federal State under international law does not

contravene the establishment of foreign affairs, unique to sub-national units whether or not regulated by international law – it does, however, imply that the State fulfills its international commitments and guarantees the continuity of its external policy. The sub-national units have often preferred to link effectively to the way in which their state operates its international relations rather than claiming that equivalent legal instruments have been used for themselves. In this respect, the Federal Government has attempted to reconcile different techniques for participating in foreign policies with the formal monopolization by a central government in the administration of this policy in due consideration of specific interests of the constituent units. This takes multiple types and happens in specific countries and territories on a broad scale. In other terms, not always a clear path is taken. Although the purpose of federating foreign relations is to give sub-national entities greater autonomy in complying with their rights, it does not mean that the national state's powers disintegrate and that certain ethnic groups have a right to secession. Within the democratic framework, the national institutions concerned decide to follow certain objectives together and some independently. In specific, they decide to set up and encourage a central government to create and enforce laws in some fields and to maintain the right to generate and execute legislation in others. The Central Administration's rules refer to the federal people as a whole while those residing beyond their territories are regulated by the statutes of federal regions, districts or States or subunits, which vary from federation to federation. Ronald Watts, a prominent federalist, defines the basic elements of the federal government structure as a mixture of "general law for some and state self-regulation for others, such that no party is responsive to another within a national democratic framework."

CONCLUSION

In India over the last ten years, policy rules and regulations have been slacked, which was definitely a welcome change. We should note here that the benefits and demerits of the globalization are not addressed in this section. Within this structure, the influence of globalisation, and that too in the Indian sense, is just associated with the bureaucracy. As I have stated, the majority of policy laws have been removed in the age of globalization or alternative economic reforms, and the growth cycle has been accelerated to that degree. This is uncertain, though, whether wrongdoing resulting from the commission activities and the Bureaucrat's absence have been minimized – a mixture of officials and businessmen. Even though liberalization has culminated in economic changes, India is also among the most authoritarian countries in the world. Even as there have been frequent accounts of it. Of reality, this poses questions concerning the basic logic behind economic liberalization. Nevertheless,

the liberalization cycle in the nation is still quite active.

REFERENCES

- Arora, Balveer and Douglass V. Verny (eds.) (1995). Multiple Identities in a Single State: Indian Federalism in Comparative Perspective, Konark Publishers, New Delhi.
- Azam, Kousar J. (2001). Ethnicity, Identity and the State in South Asia, South Asian Publishers, New Delhi.
- Bhatia, K.L. (2001). Federalism and Frictions in Centre-State Relations A Comparative Review of Indian and German Constitutions, Deep & Deep Publications Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
- Bidyut, Chakrabarty (ed.) (1990). Centre-State Relations in India, Segment Book Distributors, New Delhi.
- Blindenbacher, Raoul and Arnold Koller (eds.) (2002). Federalism in a Changing World Learning from Each Other, Vol. 2, McGill-Queen's University Press, London.
- Blindenbacher, Raul and Abigail Ostien (eds.) (2005). Dialogue on Constitutional Origins, Structure and Change in Federal Countries, Vol. 1, McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Burgess, Michael and G. Alan Tarr (2012). Constitutional Dynamics in Federal Systems: SubNational Perspectives, McGill-Queen's University Press, London.
- Chand, Vikram, K. (ed.) (2006). Reinventing Public Service Delivery in India Selected Case Studies, Sage Publications, New Delhi.
- Copland, Ian & John Rickard (eds.) (1999). Federalism: Comparative Perspectives from India and Australia, Manohar, New Delhi.
- Das, Bhagirath Lal (1998). The WTO Agreements: Deficiencies, Imbalances and Required Changes (Trade & Development Issues & the World Trade Organization), Zed Books, London.

Corresponding Author

Dr. Ashok Kumar Tyagi*

tyagiak319@gmail.com