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ABSTRACT

Purpose: The present study aimed at understanding the intersections of democracy and mental health of people with reference to urban people of Solapur city.

Theoretical Framework: The theoretical framework integrates insights from political understanding and social determinants of mental health to explore the nexus among democracy and mental health in Solapur city’s citizens. Study assess how individual perceptions and perspectives of democracy, including political efficacy and trust in social institutions, intersect with social factors such as access to resources, political power, to influence mental health outcomes.

Research Method: The study has incorporated mixed method approach. The sample consisted of 231 adults (117 male and 114 female), in the age range of 18 to 65 years. The participants were administered the Democracy indicators developed by National Democratic Institute, Iraq (2007) after voluntary oral consent.

Findings: The result of percentages shows that less than two-fourth of respondents opened that they have more democratic state, more than two-fifth said they have less democratic state, less than one-tenth of them opined that they have least and most democratic state respectively. It has found that the opinions are not associated with their age, gender, and earnings. However, the study tried to explore intersections of democracy and mental health of people in the context of eleven subscales of democracy index.

Research Practical and Social Implications: The article intends to raise the debates and deliberations around democracy and mental health. They article pave the way for future in depth study on understanding the democracy and mental health with a larger sample size and in transnational study areas.

Originality/value: Mixed research on mental health and democracy is need of the time and it’s become crucial to study democracy and mental health in different nations democratic nations.
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EXPLORANDO A LIGAÇÃO DA DEMOCRACIA E DA SAÚDE MENTAL: UM ESTUDO DOS POVOS URBANOS NA CIDADE SOLAPUR

RESUMO

Propósito: O presente estudo teve como objetivo compreender as interseções da democracia e da saúde mental das pessoas em relação aos habitantes urbanos da cidade de Solapur.

Estrutura Teórica: A estrutura teórica integra percepções da compreensão política e determinantes sociais da saúde mental para explorar o nexo entre democracia e saúde mental nos cidadãos da cidade de Solapur. Estudo avalia como as percepções individuais e perspectivas da democracia, incluindo eficácia política e confiança nas
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instituições sociais, se cruzam com fatores sociais, como acesso a recursos, poder político, para influenciar os resultados de saúde mental.

**Método de Pesquisa:** O estudo incorporou abordagem de método misto. A amostra foi composta por 231 adultos (117 do sexo masculino e 114 do sexo feminino), na faixa etária de 18 a 65 anos. Os participantes receberam os indicadores de Democracia desenvolvidos pelo Instituto Nacional Democrático do Iraque (2007) após consentimento oral voluntário.

**Constatações:** O resultado das porcentagens mostra que menos de dois quartos dos entrevistados abrirem que têm mais estado democrático, mais de dois quintos disseram ter menos estado democrático, menos de um décimo deles opinaram que têm menos e mais estado democrático, respectivamente. Descobriu que as opiniões não estão associadas à sua idade, gênero e rendimentos. No entanto, o estudo tentou explorar interseções de democracia e saúde mental das pessoas no contexto de onze subescalas do índice de democracia.

**Investigação Implicações Práticas e Sociais:** O artigo pretende levantar os debates e as deliberações em torno da democracia e da saúde mental. Eles preparam o caminho para futuros estudos aprofundados sobre o entendimento da democracia e da saúde mental com uma amostra maior e em áreas de estudos transnacionais.

**Originalidade/valor:** A pesquisa mista sobre saúde mental e democracia é uma necessidade do tempo e se tornou crucial estudar a democracia e a saúde mental em diferentes nações democráticas.

**Palavras-chave:** Saúde Mental, Democracia, Interseção, Direitos Sociais.
1 INTRODUCTION

Man, being most developed species have discovered almost everything he needs. It can be seen in the development of medical science, pharmaceuticals, technology, communication and knowledge creation etc. But what will happen to you when you get a thought that ‘Do you have a control of your life, choices? Are you living the way you want to live? Some of you may respond negatively and experience that these kinds of questions lead to introspection and need variety of discussions and deliberations because this matters to your overall well-being which rightly reflected into the World Health Organization report (2007) on social determinants of health is become vital for many reasons to shift conceptualization of health from biology to environment.

Now a day’s people are experiencing, internalizing the intersections of different aspects of life and they are demanding interdisciplinary perspectives to address their issues. India’s New Education Policy (2020) also strongly asserts interdisciplinary studies in education and practice. Many health scholars, voluntary organizations, people from civil society organization are promoting that health should be looked beyond the biology. Because genes may transfer biologically but they largely grow in each environment; and environment is associated with a lot of things. Though, health is still dominated by biological perspective for some individual and corporate reasons, largely people are accepting (Foucault, 1967; Porter, 1989) that health is widely get influenced by political system, technological advancements, communications, human rights, accountability, transparency etc.

Democracy is not only related to our voting’s, political parties and parliament; it’s about common people and how they can control their lives and how they want to be controlled by. Therefore, it involves almost every aspect of human life i.e., how we work, how we communicate with each other, how we travel, how we spend our money, how we choose, how we produce, how we use our leisure time, in a nutshell how we live. Roads, Prices, taxes, education, industry and what not is controlled by respective governments? Therefore, it is quite necessary for human development to have an environment where he/she will get every opportunity to grow and develop. And if such environment is not provided then we knew that there will be surely increase in mental health issues of people. Therefore, it becomes must for
everyone to understand the intersections between democracy and mental health of people. In the words of Sahni (2005) today, the youth in India from one of the most vulnerable groups, who on the one hand are expected to be the leaders to determine the destiny of India, and on the other hand, are an exploited and confused group. Marilyn Wise and Peter Sainsbury (2007) published their paper with so promising title Democracy: the forgotten determinant of mental health where they explained how democratic environment is necessary to achieve better mental health indicators.

The present study aims at studying the perceived notions of adults about state of democracy they feel they have in a country and try to locate the intersections of democracy and mental health dimensions. The study also intends to investigate whether age, gender and income of the respondents have anything to do with their perceived level of democracy. The results are discussed in the context of mental health spectrum.

To conceptualize something generally the researchers go for reviewing the available literature related to the topic. Researcher has also tried to reach available literature and previous research related to democracy and mental health. It is found that most of the studies have used different dimensions of mental health and tried to connect it with one or other facet of democratic experiences of people (Tsai, 2006). Though, the study does not attempt to reflect on the mental illnesses and disorder’s part, but it does reflect the well-being of individual, society and nation and their participation in democracy. Popular participation is the very backbone of democracy. It is the key concept of self-governance, because in one democracy, decision making process begins and ends with the people (Faheem, M. 2023). Therefore, study has enough potential to explore the intersections of democratic experiences and mental health components.

2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework integrates insights from political understanding and social determinants of mental health to explore the nexus among democracy and mental health in Solapur city’s citizens. Study assesses how individual perceptions and perspectives of democracy, including political efficacy and trust in social institutions, intersect with social factors such as access to resources, political power, to influence mental health outcomes.
3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 SAMPLE

The sample of 231 participants (117 male and 114 female) are selected on voluntary basis. The respondents from almost 10 different urban parts of Solapur city have taken part in the study. They are all educated adults and expressed their will to participate in the study. Participants are selected on non-probability sampling method and sample drawn by purposive sampling technique. Their age ranged from 20 to 65 years.

Tools Employed were the Socio-demographic Data Sheet (self-constructed) to elicit information regarding socio-demographic profile of the participants. And, the Democracy indicators developed by National Democratic Institute, Iraq (2007). It included eleven indices of democracy, namely- Civil Rights, Economic and Social Rights, Civil and Political Participation, Political Parties, Free and Fair Elections, Rule of Law, Military and Police Control, Government Accountability, Corruption, Media, and Government Responsiveness. It consists of 60 items indicating above said indices of democracy. The score has four layers from least democratic to most democratic country based on the individual score divided by 60. Original scale is in English, but it is well translated in local language and pre-tested in 20 participants for necessary editions and making it more user-friendly.

Procedure applied was that the participants selected for the study were administered in small groups. After explaining the purpose of the study, they were requested to read the instructions carefully and requested to provide personal data about themselves. Each participant has given enough time to fill the questionnaire along with assistance to articulate the understanding they have to put their scores. Personal queries of the respondents after finishing Democracy Indicators have also entertained to make them clear. The data is analysed by using PSPP (free software) by gnu.org.

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1
Socio-demographic information of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 1 depicts about the socio-demographic variables of the participants. It shows that majority proportion, more than two-fourth (50.6) of the respondents are male and less than two-fourth (49.4) of the respondents are female. About age distribution, it shows that majority proportion, more than two-fourth (52.8) of the respondents are very young with age of 25 and below. A significant proportion, less than two-fifth (33.8) of the respondents are aged between 26 to 50 and a small proportion, more than one-tenth (13.4) of respondents are aged 51 and above. When level of education is concerned, it shows that majority proportion, slightly less than two-fourth (48.9) of the respondents have post-graduation level of education. Small proportion, slightly more than two-fifth (20.3) of the respondents have higher secondary level of education and a very small proportion, less than one-tenth (3.7) of the respondents have their graduate level of education. About their earnings, it is found that majority proportion, slightly less than three-fifth (59.7) of the respondents don’t have earnings and significant proportion, slightly more than two-fifth (40.3) of the respondents have their earnings.

Table 2
Perceived level of democracy by participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of democracy</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Least Democratic</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Democratic</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Democratic</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most Democratic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 show that the perceived level of democracy by the participants i.e. least, less, more and most democratic. It may be easily seen while looking at the table that the majority proportion, less than two-fourth (47.6) of the respondents have opined that they have more democratic country. A significant proportion more than two-fifth (42.0) have opined that they
have less democratic country. Only the proportions, less than one-tenth (6.1) and (4.3) of the respondents have said they have least and most democratic country respectively.

It can be concluded that majority of participants have perceived that they have more democratic country. But, here we have more than two-fifth proportion of respondent who have different opinion about country i.e., they perceived their country less democratic which may make readers to think differently about this conclusion which may lead to an effort to explore the intersections of democracy and mental health.

Table 3
Cross-tabulation socio-demographic variables with DI score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>X^2 Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>DI score</td>
<td>4.534</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>DI score</td>
<td>13.082</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.042*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>DI score</td>
<td>10.441</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earnings</td>
<td>DI score</td>
<td>1.144</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table is developed by researchers * p < 0.05.

Table 3 reveals about the cross-tabulation between socio-demographic variables of the respondents and its statistical association with their scores for democratic indicators. Its shows that variables Gender, Education and Earnings do not have significant association with the scores (X^2:4.534, df:3, P=0.209 > 0.05); (X^2:10.441, df:6, P=0.107 > 0.05); (X^2:1.144, df:3, P=0.776 > 0.05) respectively. Only a variable age of the respondent has significant association with the scores (X^2:13.082, df:6, P=0.042 < 0.05). This also clearly shows that socio-demographic variables do not have anything to do with their perceived scores for democracy indicators. It indicates something which is unexpected and unexplored.

Table 4
Comparison of perceived level of democracy by age, gender and earnings (through ANOVA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Source of variance</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DI Score &amp; Age</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.764</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>104.985</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.460</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.749</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI Score &amp; Gender</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.041</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>0.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>104.708</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.749</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI Score &amp; Earning</td>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>105.697</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.749</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DI Score &amp; Education</th>
<th>Between Groups</th>
<th>3.292</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1.646</th>
<th>3.663</th>
<th>0.027*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>102.457</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>.449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.749</td>
<td>230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table is developed by researchers * p < 0.05.

Table 4 depicts the analysis of variance to find the difference between Age, Gender and Earning of the respondents and the test results of ANOVA shows that there is no significant difference among the category of the respondents in respect to their perceived state of democracy (F value: 0.829, df: 2, p= 0.438 > 0.05), (F value: 2.277, df: 1, p= 0.133 > 0.05) and (F value: 0.113, df: 1, p= 0.737 > 0.05) respectively. A clear inference can be drawn from the table that perceived notion of the respondents about level of democracy has no relation with their demographic variables i.e., age, gender and earnings. But it is found that the only variable education of the respondent has showed a significant difference among the category of the respondents in respect to their perceived state of democracy (F value: 3.663, df: 2, p= 0.027 < 0.05).

It clearly reveals that the socio-demographic variables like respondent’s age, sex, earnings of the have nothing to do with the obtained scores of democracy indicators. There is no significant statistical association found in these socio-demographic variables with total score for democracy indicators, therefore we have to accept and respect the given sores and understand that there could be other significant variables responsible for choosing particular scores which indicate that there are other possible intersections people would like to convey or attract attention towards when they thought about and assess their level of democracy with such instruments.

4.1 EXPLORING INTERSECTIONS OF DEMOCRACY AND MENTAL HEALTH OF PEOPLE

Deciding about what is mental health is a complex and continuous process and may involve wide spectrum of human experiences therefore, many scholars tend to treat it as a construct and not variable. Bhatia (1982) considers mental health as the ability to balance feelings, desires, ambitions and ideals in one’s daily living which entails the ability to face and accept the realities of life. Whereas Symonds (1961) suggests mental health is a psychodynamic unity, a personality integrating in an individual in relation to his or her environment. Therefore, it is confirmed that mental health includes bio-psycho-social elements.
The world has experienced the pace of change in almost all areas of life which was not there in past. The democracy is not only a system of governance, but it is a way of life. It is an environment in which we grow or doom. Therefore, when we think about health, mental health we also have to think about democratic experiences. Author tried to understand these intersections of democracy indicators and mental health in followings;

(a) **Civil Rights**: Our constitution provides some basic framework for operating things human and institutional. Do people have seen communal and ethnic violence in India? We have seen many things in recent years right form fake encounters to arresting journalists who try to use Right to Information Act to be downsizing social security measures to killing someone by a fanatic mob to labelling minority communities as terrorists to suggesting people what to eat and speak etc. This can be seen in recent democracy index of our country and its overall position in world rankings.

(b) **Economic and Social Rights**: In healthy democracies is it observed that people have necessities of life like adequate food, shelter and clean water to drink, they have right to adequate education. Citizen has the right to own property or establish private business without undue govt. influence, choice of residence, buying and selling products, equal opportunities etc. The past experiences of people are not supporting above said aspects of life. Vandalism, regionalism prevails everywhere, people suffer every day, inequality issues with access to health care are prominent (Radcliff, 2001; Rogers and Pilgrim, 2003). The RBI annual report (2019-20) reveals that bank frauds worth more than Rs. 1.85 lakh crore were reported, such situations may curtain the economic activities of people which is very much necessary in Democracies to grow.

(c) **Civil and Political Participation**: Have we seen the curtailment of civil society organizations? Cutting their wings financially, trap them in official gimmicks, restricting people to organize protests, demonstration, bandh or voluntary associations, favouring some NGOs with ideologies, unnecessary interference from Vice Chancellor and Governor in appointments, free and fair discussion with government, pressuring students or their organizations are some of the examples of violation of civil and political rights. The recent report on global democracy index, our country falls by ten ranks which has shown the erosion of civil liberties.

(d) **Political Parties**: Do political parties support people causes e.g., tax policy, education policy, transport policy, banking policies? Does opposition parties visible countering the decisions taken by ruling party, channelizing the people’s protests, helping govt. raise accountability? Whether a person’s political choices are free of interference by
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govt. and military institutions? Do people have faith in existing political parties? Do people feel that they can form better political parties? Do political parties accommodating the candidates those don’t have good social character?

(e) *Free and Fair Elections*: Do election commission take cognizance of people suggestions? Whether election commission try to resolve conflicts and behave objectively? Common man can thing going for contesting elections? Do people have adequate parties and candidates to choose? Do scams happen with voting machine, equal campaigning opportunities for all parties given? Do fair polling and tabulation of the ballots in sure practice? Is it possible to transfer the power without violence? What are the percentages of people voting for all the elections? Such elements matter more when people take their decisions about how they want to be governed.

(f) *Rule of Law*: Do people feel that our judiciary is free and independent form government? Do people feel that judges are favouring governments to achieve their own personal goals? Does all people treat equally by law? Whether people have confidence in their legal system to deliver fair and effective justice to all? Human Rights Report (2017) talks a lot about this. Do we have regular appointments of judges?

(g) *Military and Police Control*: Whether military and police are free from government interferences, or they are used by govt.? Whether military and police system reflect the social composition of society? Do people free from paramilitary units, private armies, and criminal mafias? Are there cases of Sedition laws, Urban Naxalites, UAPA/ AFSPA charges, abuses by military etc. The human rights report compiled by Amnesty International (2019) speaks more loudly about it.

(h) *Government Accountability*: Do we feel that there is greater accountability of government systems? Whether citizens have access to important data? Does government take data accountability? How much RTI queries are pending? Do the questions asked by opposition leaders or civil society organizations are addressed properly in both the houses? The news-minutes report (2020) reveals much of this. Transparency issue of election bonds; number of pending public interest litigations in the courts etc such issues have greater impact on individual and social life and could be consider when deciding the mental health spectrum.

(i) *Corruption*: Do political leaders or party influence the public service offices for their own individual interest or business? Do political leaders have their own companies who get huge orders from govt? Implementation of Anti-corruption law is strict? Do business
houses sponsor or financing elections/ candidates? Does corporate interfere the policy decisions of govt.? Do people feel that they will get public services without corruption?

(j) **Media:** Whether countries media is free and independent? Do they cover all public issues without prejudices and preoccupations? Do they organize debates on issues of public importance? Do media houses are becoming agents of popular propaganda set by government? Do media is free to investigate government, political parties and powerful corporations independently? Do journalists are being harassed by abusive language and court cases? In the World Press Freedom Index report (2020) shows that country has dropped its status and achieve 140th position out of 180 countries.

(k) **Government Responsiveness:** When we think about the elected members in upper and lower house; are they represent the composition of society? How accessible the governments decisions, polices are made available on suitable public platforms for debate and discussions? Or is it happening that government is saying that they don’t have data what you are asking for? The news-minutes report (2020) speaks a lot about it. Do people feel that the public services are up-to mark; standards of such services are maintained? How elected government does responds when stress situations occur like demonetisation, Covid-19 pandemic? Do people say that their government responds well in life situations. (Krishnappa et al., (2024) Democracy is a form of government in which power is held by the people, either directly or through elected representatives.

When you consolidate the above aspects, you feel that human life is influenced and even controlled by many things and the system of governance they have i.e., Democracy plays a major role in shaping the lives of people. Therefore, health and mental health should be considered something beyond biology.

4.2 **NEED OF SOCIAL WORK INTERVENTION**

Social work is value-oriented profession which imbibed in practices which some or other way faces head-on the challenges of poverty, inequality, oppression, and processes of othering. Its mission involves addressing progressive changes in structures of society to upheld social justice, not only assist individual clientele, group to achieve better adaptation but also developing more inclusion structures (Mullay and Dupre, 2019). The International Federation of Social Worker’s (IFSW) and the International Association of Schools of Social Work’s (IASSW) global definition of social work (2014) reflects upon the promotion while defining social work as ‘a practice-based profession and academic discipline that promotes social change..."
and development, social cohesion, and the empowerment and liberation of people. Principles of social justice, human rights and collective responsibility and respect for diversities are central to social work’ (IFSW, 2021).

Social work is recognized as a profession which intervene in mental health services to engage with ‘social’ aspects in the form of perspectives, theory, values and practices to complement those of allied health professionals. The World Health Organization’s Mental Health Action Plan 2013-2020 (now extended to 2030) identifies social, economic, cultural and political factors as social determinants of poor mental health, indicating that it is caused and maintained by factors including poverty, isolation, exclusion, discrimination and stigmatization (Lorenz, 2008), promotion of human rights, social justice, community development, legal expertise (Morrison and Davidson, 2019; Stone et.al., 2021).

Social work education, research and practice considers the intersections of poverty, unemployment, housing, urbanization, human rights, social welfare, rehabilitation, lack of service provision, transport links, crime, socio-economic positionings, health inequalities, addiction, sectarianism, racism, lack of leadership and governance, lack of information systems, evidence and research etc. Designing its curricula, fieldwork practice, developing and demonstrating action research, promoting people’s participation and engagements with political systems can become an agenda for social work. Social workers are aware that only voting for every five years secretly with controversial EVM machines does not secure the kind of democracy and political structure that are needed to engage people’s involvement in the environments that monitor their health, security, rights and future wellbeing. Therefore, engaging in advocacy, community monitoring, gatekeeping peace, progressive demonstrations and movements, protecting environment, social and policy audits, socio-religious-political reforms etc. is instrumental for social workers and this is needed to have healthy democracies.

5 CONCLUSION

The study has come up with a very interesting conclusion that the notion about democracy and its various aspects are not anyway associated with the personal characteristics of participants. Therefore, political scientists, public intellectuals, policy makers, medical practitioners, technocrats, civil society organizations and mental health professional and practitioners have to consider the various intersections between democracy and mental health while designing and implementing their different interventions. Author also requests research scholars of different walks of life to take up this paradigm, involve with it and try to explore
new intersections which can develop new insights for achieving higher human development which caters the mental health needs of people. Author also asserts to shift the mental health debates, discussions and deliberations beyond medical science.
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