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MODULE 1

GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

GROWTH OF POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A DISCIPLINE

The term Political Science is intimately related to the Word “Politics”, which itself is derived from the Greek word “Polis”-that means a city-state, the general form of political organisation in ancient Greece. The study of political science in the western tradition is first visible in ancient Greece. The discipline had aspects such as moral philosophy, political philosophy, political economy, history and other fields concerned with normative determinations of what ought to be and with deducing the characteristics and functions of the ideal state.

While the study of politics can be traced back to ancient times, its rise as a discipline has a late arrival in the 1870’s. The study of politics in the western tradition in first found in ancient Greece. However, the discipline has a clear set of antecedents such as moral philosophy, political philosophy, political economy, history, and other fields concerned with normative determinations of what ought to be and with deducing the characteristics and functions of the ideal state. In each historic period and in almost every geographic area we can find someone studying politics and increasing political understanding.

Political Science is normative because it deals with the theory of the state. It is philosophical in orientation. The advent of political Science as a university discipline is evident in 1860s by the naming of university departments and chairs with the title of Political Science. Integrating political studies of the past into a unified discipline is ongoing and the history of Political Science has provided a rich field for the growth of both normative and positive Political Science with each part of the discipline sharing some historical predecessors. The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903 as an effort to distinguish the study of politics from economics and other social sciences. In the 1950’s and the 1960’s, a behavioural revolution stressing the systematic and rigorously scientific study of individual and group behaviour swept the discipline. At the same time the political Science moved toward greater depth of analysis and more sophistication, it also moved toward a closer working relationship with other relationship, especially sociology, economics, history, anthropology, psychology and statistics.

Increasingly, behavioralism have used the scientific method to create an intellectual discipline based on the postulating of hypotheses followed by empirical verification and the inference of political trends and of generalisations that explain individual and group political actions. Since early 1970’s with the advent of post behaviouralism, the discipline has placed an increasing emphasis on relevance, or the use of new approaches and methodologies to solve political and social problems.
Major schools of political analysis

Classical political theory

Classical political theory starts from 6th century B.C. and covers the political ideas of a large number of Greek, Roman and Christian thinkers and philosophers. Plato and Aristotle are the two great giants of the classical period who had enormous influence in their own times and on later thinking. Classical political theory included I) politics, ii) the idea of theory, and iii) the practice of philosophy. Politics referred to participation in the public affairs, theory referred to the systematic knowledge gained through observation, and philosophy referred to the quest for reliable knowledge - knowledge which would enable men to become wiser in the conduct of collective life. Thus political theory was a ‘systematic inquiry to acquire reliable knowledge about matters concerning public affairs’ Classical political theory has certain specific characteristics. Firstly, it was dominated by philosophy. The great philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle were great because of the comprehensiveness and scope of their thought. They were more than political thinkers. The dimensions of political theory included description, explanation, prescription and evaluation. Secondly, there was no clear distinction between philosophical, theological and political issues. Political theory was not an autonomous subject as it is today. Thirdly, political theory was concerned with probing into issues, asking important questions and serving as a sort of conscience keeper of politics. Fourthly, classical tradition believed that political theory dealt with the political whole - the theory must be all-comprehensive and all-inclusive. It included ruling, warfare, religious practices, economic problems or relations between the classes and also beliefs such as God, justice, equality etc. The quest for an absolutely best form of government was also an important preoccupation of classical political theory. Fifthly, since classical tradition believed in the ultimate good, political good was a part of it.

State was a part of the moral framework of man’s earthly living. State was considered as a natural institution and prior to the individual because ‘the individual when isolated is not self-sufficing and therefore he is like a part in relation to the whole’. State was also an educational institution which made man a good citizen, sensitive to the recognition of law and virtue of civic obedience. The end of the state was the promotion of good life. Though there has been a debate about which comes first - the common good or the individual good, but the classical tradition believed that the common good was the good of the individuals as part and member of the society and sought by them precisely as members of society. The common good was more complete than the private good of the individual and it was this completeness ‘which determined the greater excellence of the common good’. And lastly, an important theme of classical political tradition was the search for an ideal state and the most stable system of government functions of assigning material and non-material goods. The search for an ideal state provided an invaluable means of practicing theory and of acquiring experience in its handling. The trend of an idealist state as set by classical political theory had clear reflection on later political thinking.

The classical political tradition -a tradition usually considered to include eighteen or so centuries sandwiched between Plato and Machiavelli was considerably richer and more varied. But even more important differences and variations were yet to come. With Renaissance, Reformation and industrial revolution, new ideas and events shook the foundation of Western world. During this period a new school of political theory was born, which was later known as liberalism.
Liberal political theory

The long spell of Plato, Aristotle, S. Augustine, Cicero and other thinkers of classical age was broken in a variety of ways after the twin revolutions of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe from 15th century onwards, coupled with the industrial revolution later on. Renaissance produced a new intellectual climate which gave birth to modern science and modern philosophy and a new political theory known as liberalism. This new political theory found classical expression in the writings of Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Jeremy Bentham, J.S. Mill, Herbert Spencer and a host of other writers. Whereas classical political theory considered the moral development of individual and the evolution of the community as co-terminus, the liberal political theory developed the concept of sovereign individual. The central theme of this political theory was Individualism. It started with the belief in the absolute value of human personality and spiritual equality of all individuals and in the autonomy of individual will. Secondly, it believed in individual freedom in all spheres of life - political, economic, social, intellectual, religious etc. Freedom meant as freedom from all authority that is capable of acting arbitrarily and freedom to act in accordance with the dictates of ‘right reason’. Thirdly, it brought in the concept of individual rights - that man is ‘endowed by his creator with certain inalienable rights’ commonly known as the natural rights of ‘life, liberty and property’. Since man and his rights exist prior to the establishment of state, these cannot be bargained away when the state is established.

Fourthly, the new theory declared that state is not a natural institution but comes into existence by mutual consent for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the individual rights. The relation between state and the individual is contractual and when the terms of the contract are violated, individuals not only the right but the responsibility to revolt and establish a new government. The state was not a natural institution as claimed by classical political theory but a machine devised by men for certain specific purposes such as law, order, protection, justice, and preservation of individual rights. The state is useful to man but he is the master. Social control is best secured by law rather than by command - the law which was conceived as being the product of individual will and the embodiment of reason.

Fifthly, the new political theory dismissed the idea of common good and an organic community. Instead it gave the idea that ‘government that governs’ the least is the best’ and the only genuine entity is the Individual. Political theory during this period was not searching for an Ideal State or a Utopia but was preoccupied with freeing the individual from the social and economic restraints and from the tyrannical and non-representative governments. In this context, it redefined the concept of state, relations between the individual and the state, and developed the concepts of rights liberty, equality, property, justice and democracy for the individual’.

Marxist political theory

Liberal-individualistic political theory was challenged by Marx, Engels and their subsequent followers in the later half nineteenth century by their ‘scientific socialism’. While socialism extends back far beyond Marx’s time, it was he who brought together many ideas about the ills of society and gave them a great sense of urgency and relevancy. No political theory can ignore the study of Marxist history, politics, society and economics. The knowledge of Marxism
has put us in a better position to analyse the socio, economic developments. Marxism introduced a new concept of philosophy conceived as a way to the liberation of mankind. The task of knowledge, according to Marx, is not only to understand the world but also to change the material conditions of human life. He insisted that the salvation is to be found by man in this world itself and it laid in the revolutionary reconstitution of the present society and the establishment of a socialist society. His complaint against liberal capitalism was that it was a civilization of property, inequality and family fortune for a few and most degrading conditions for the vast number of people. Socialism was an attempt to secure the necessary, if not sufficient, conditions for the realization of emancipation of mankind. It is the establishment of a society on rational basis—a society in which ‘man shall not be exploited by man’, a society in which men will have the full opportunity to develop their potentialities and personality, a classless and stateless society in which ‘the free development of each shall be the condition for the free development of all’.

Marxist political theory is a theory of social change and revolutionary reconstitution of society. In this context, Marxism consists of three inter-related elements: I) An examination and critique of the present and past societies. This is known as Dialectical materialism and historical materialism; ii) the notion of an alternative model against a society based upon exploitation and divided among classes. The new society is based on the common ownership of the means of production in which human potential will be allowed to freely develop its manifold facets. Such a society will be classless and stateless; iii) how to being about such a society’. Though there was a general agreement that capitalist system was unstable and crisis-ridden but the advent of socialism required a revolutionary action by the proletariat, whose growing impoverishment will lead to revolution, and establishment of a socialist state and society.

The central themes of Marxist political theory are mode of production, class division, and class struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination. Marxism also examined the nature of rights, liberty, equality, justice and democracy but came to the conclusion that in a class divided society, they are the prerogatives of the propertied class. Real liberty and equality can be achieved only in a classless and stateless society. Thus whereas liberal political theory was associated with the establishment of modern liberal capitalist democratic state, Marxist political theory preoccupied itself with the establishment of a socialist state through revolutionary action.

Marxism as the economic, social and political theory and practice originating in the works of Marx and Engels, has been enriched by a number of revolutionaries, philosophers, academicians and politicians. It has also been subject to a variety of interpretations. In the twentieth century, the prominent contributors to the Marxist thought have been Lenin, Bukharin, Stalin, Rose Luxemburg, Gramsci, Lukacs, Austro- Marxists, the Frankfurt school, Herbert Marcuse, the New Left theorists, Euro-communists, Mao Tse Tung and host of others. Up to the First World War, Marxism was highly deterministic and represented a philosophy of socio-political changes which culminated in the Russian revolution. However, during the inter-war period and the post-second world war, Marxism developed more as a critique of present socio-economic and cultural conditions than a philosophy of revolutionary action. Known as contemporary Marxism, it has been more concerned with the problems of superstructure, culture, art, aesthetics, ideology, alienation etc.
Empirical-scientific political theory

There is another kind of political theory developed in America popularly known as the Empirical-Scientific political theory. The study of political theory through scientific method (instead of philosophical) and based upon facts (rather than on values) has long history but the credit for making significant developments in this connection goes to the American social scientists. In the early twentieth century, Max Weber, Graham Walls and Bentley gave an empirical dimension to the study of political theory and advocated that its study should be based upon ‘facts’ only. Another writer George Catlin emphasized that the study of political theory should be integrated with other social sciences such as sociology, psychology, anthropology etc. However, it was during the inter-war period and after the Second World War that a new theory was developed by the political scientists of Chicago University (known as the Chicago School) such as Charles Merriem, Harold Lasswell, Gosnell, and others like David Easton, Stuart Rice, V.O. Key and David Apter. The new political theory shifted emphasis from the study of political ideals, values and institutions to the examination of politics in the context of individual and group behaviour. The new approach advocated that the method of studying should be through the behaviour of human beings as members of political community. The task of political theory is to formulate and systematize the concept of science of political behaviour in which emphasis is placed on empirical research than on political philosophy. A political theorist should clarify and criticize systems of concepts which have empirical relevance to political behaviour. According to Easton, ‘systematic theory corresponds at the level of thought to the concrete empirical political systems of daily life’.

Empirical-Scientific theory is different from the classical tradition in many respects. Firstly, the scientific theory believes that the political theory is to order, explain and predict the phenomena and not to evaluate it. Nor is it concerned with the creation of grand political Utopias. What is worth noting is that the relation with philosophy is completely severed. Political theory is meaningful to the point or degree it is verifiable. Secondly, the study of political theory should be value free; it should concern itself with ‘facts’ only. The task of theory is to analyze the present political phenomena and not with the evaluation of what is happening and what should happen. The concern of political theory should not be with ‘who rules, should rule or why?’ but with only ‘who does rule and how’. It should focus attention on the study of political behavior of man, group and institutions irrespective of their good or bad character. Thirdly, practical theory is not only concerned with the study of the state but also with the political process. Fourthly, scientific theory does not believe in critical function, that is, it should not question the basis of the state but should be concerned with maintaining the status quo, stability, equilibrium and harmony in the society. Fifthly, it developed many new concepts borrowed from other social sciences such as power, elite, decision-making, policy-making, functioning of structures, political system, political culture etc.

Because of too much stress on science, value-free politics, methods and its failure to study the pressing social and political issues, empirical political theory began to attract criticism after 1960s. The ‘Behavioural Revolution’ announced by David Easton laid less emphasis on scientific method and technique and showed greater concern for the public responsibilities of political
theory. The debates in 1970s resulted in the frank admission that there are segments of human life relating to values or purposes embodied in any political structure that were either ignored or overlooked by the behavioural studies. The core issues of political theory such as liberty, equality, justice were taken up once again by John Rawls, Robert Nozick, Habermas and others which signaled once again the revival of normative political theory. This new revival is termed as contemporary political theory.

**Contemporary political theory**

Since 1970s, there has been a revival of interest in political theory in USA, Europe and other parts of the world. At the heart of this renaissance has been the emerging clash of values on the one hand and the changes in the humanities and social sciences, on the other. Moreover, the passing away of the shadows of Second World War, reemergence of Europe, and crisis in the ideologies of socialism and Marxism brought about a new fluidity in political ideologies. Whether it is Marxism or socialism, liberalism or democracy - all stand challenged and new powerful social movements are seeking to redraw the issues in political theory. During the era of domination of behaviouralism, political theory was overpowered by political science. Theory was denied the status of a legitimate form of knowledge and inquiry. Though the hold of empiricism did not last long, yet it left an enduring legacy in the development of political and social sciences particularly in North America in the form of ‘scienticism’.

The encouragement for the regeneration of political theory came from many sources. While a number of thinkers (such as Thomas Kuhn) challenged the whole model of what is science, there were others who felt that there are distinctive problems of understanding the social sciences and social issues which could not be grasped by the model of a unified science. This is because of two factors: Firstly, the object of social sciences is the self-interpreting social being and different thinkers interpret the social issues differently. Secondly, political theory cannot be limited to a systematic account of politics; it must also perform its critical role, i.e., its capacity to offer an account of politics which transcends those of lay men. As a result of the great debates, a number of important innovations in the study of political theory followed.

Though it is not possible to give a detailed account of these developments, a few distinctive features of the contemporary political theory can be summarized as follows : (1) An important feature of empirical theory was its break with history. Contemporary political theorists believe that political theory must not be disassociated from history. Political theory has once again been renewed as history of political thought.(2) All knowledge about human activities involves interpretation and the interpretation can lead to different conclusions. Hence the idea of political theory being neutral and value-free is wrong.(3) Political understanding cannot escape the history of tradition. Knowledge is a part of the tradition and the process of understanding aspects of the world contributes to our self understanding. However, the process of self-understanding is never complete. ‘History does not belong to us but we belong to History’. There is no final truth. As such there can be no such thing as ‘the only correct or the final’ understanding of the political phenomena. The meaning of a text on political theory is always open to further interrelations from new perspectives.(4) Political theory is concerned with
conceptual analysis. This involves seeing political theory as a systematic reflection upon the meaning of the key terms and concepts like sovereignty, democracy, right, liberty, justice etc. (5) there is a revival of normative element. Contemporary political theory is concerned with the systematic elaboration of the underlying structure of our moral and political activities, as well as examination and reconstruction of the principal political values such as justice, liberty, common good, community living etc. (6) Theory is concerned with both abstract theoretical questions and particular political issues. This is due to the belief that consideration of political concepts without detailed examination of the condition of their realization may not be able to bring out the actual meaning of the concept. Political theory should be problem-oriented and should probe issues like democracy, market, equal opportunities in such contexts. Political theory is a theoretical aspect of political science, trying to construct a theory on the basis of observation.

In short, according to David Held, contemporary political theory involves four distinct tasks: Firstly, it is philosophical, i.e. it is concerned with the normative and conceptual framework; secondly, it is empirical, i.e., it is concerned with the problem of understanding and explanation of the concepts; thirdly, it is historical, i.e., it is concerned with the examination of the key concepts of political theory in historical context; and finally, it is strategic, i.e. it is concerned with an assessment of the feasibility of moving from where we are to where we might likely to be. It is only through the combination of these elements that the central problems of political theory can be solved.

The extent and nature of political science can be studied from different angle and from different perspectives. These are mainly on-

**Observation** – Observation reflects on sense experience alone and rules out supernatural or metaphysical causation.

**Generalisation**- Generalisation is particularly based on observation of regularities leading to establishing the relation and correlation between different factors or variables. This may be either being obtained by the inductive method or by deductive method.

**Explanation**- Explanation consists of giving reasons for the general rule; for without such reasoning any observation of co-relation might be a more will make particular events, situations or tendencies effective.

**Predictions and Prescriptions**- It means the known facts can be judged and general rules can be effected and higher efficiency, stability, satisfaction could be suggested.

**Clarifications of Concepts**- The clarification of concepts in political science involves three related purposes. These are-analysis, synthesis and improvements of concepts.

**Meaning and Definition of Political Science:**

Many books have been written on Political Science by the eminent writers and different definitions have been given.
The Oxford English Dictionary defined Political Science as “the science and art of government, the science dealing with form, organisation and administration of the state or part of one with the regulation of its relation with other States”.

This diversity in defining Political Science is due to the varying scope of Political Science in different times. Since its emergence as a scientific study, Political Science has been growing in its scope. Hence the old definitions of Political Science cannot suit the twenty-first century version of Political Science. One may further examine some standard definitions of Political Science, given by eminent political scientists.

Gettell: “Political Science deals with the associations of human beings that form political units, with the organization of their governments and with activities of these governments in making and administering law in carrying on inter-state relations.”

Caitlin: “For the text books, politics means either the activities of political life or the study of these activities. And these activities are generally treated as activities of the various organs of government.”

Bluntschli: “Political Science is the science which is concerned with the State, which endeavours to understand and comprehend the State in its fundamental conditions, in its essential nature, its various forms of manifestations, its development”.

Seeley: “Political Science investigates the Phenomena of Government as Political Economy deals with wealth. Biology with life, Algebra with numbers and Geometry with space and magnitude”.

Paul Janet: “Political Science is that part of science which treats of the foundations of the State, and principles of government.”

Laski: “The study of politics concerns itself with the life of man in relation to organized States.”

David Easton: “Political Science is concerned with the authoritative allocation of values for a society.”

Bottomore: “Political institutions are concerned with the distribution of powers in society.”

Garner: “The meaning of the term “politics” is confined to that of the business and activity which has to do with the actual conduct of affairs of the State.” In short, political science begins and ends with the state.

From these and other definitions, one may conclude that the “state” is the central theme of Political Science. Political Science studies about the State, its origin, its nature, its functions and so on.

As Rousseau once said, “Man is born free but everywhere he is in chains”. How to free man from chains and bondages is also a subject matter of Political Science. Hence, Political Science may be defined as ‘a science of liberty’.

**DIFFERENT VIEWS ABOUT THE NATURE OF POLITICS**

Though efforts have been made to give the definition of Politics above, yet it will be difficult to understand the real meaning of Politics until we understand various points of view regarding the nature of politics. All the points of view from the ancient Greek to the present day philosophers have been given below: (1) Ancient Greek view.(2) Traditional view.(3) Modern view.(4) Behavioral view.
**Ancient Greek view**

Systematic study of Politics started with the Greek philosophers. Plato and Aristotle provided it with a definite basis. Aristotle named his book itself as Politics. It is a derivative of a Greek word 'Polis' which means a city-state, which is called states now-a-days. We may compare the Greek city-states with the big villages of India because no city state had a population of more than a few thousand citizens. Not only this, many persons in those city-states did not have the rights of citizenship because, according to their rules and traditions, the slaves, foreigners and women did not have the rights of citizenship. The remaining ten to fifteen per cent persons had the rights of citizenship and these citizens ran the administration of their city-state. In such conditions, the Greek philosophers put forth their ideas of politics which are being discussed, in brief, below.

1. Greek philosophers did not make any distinction between state and society. Greek city-states can be very well compared with the Indian villages. There seemed to be no difference in the social, political, ethical and individual life. Because of it, the Greek philosophers did not differentiate between the state and society and both of them were conveniently used for each other. Aristotle said that 'Man is a social animal' and because of his nature and necessities man lives in such a state which is an association of villages that has an ideal and self-sufficient life. According to his point of view, the state has an independent identity and that is natural and has not been created by man.

2. State is moral organisation and individual can realise the ideal of moral life in the state, maintained the Greek philosophers. The aim of the state is to develop moral qualities in citizens and to do their welfare.

3. Greek philosophers wanted an ideal state. Greek philosophers were idealistic and they produced an idea of the establishment of an ideal state. They not only discussed the nature of an ideal state but also produced a complete plan for its establishment. They did not explain the nature of state and society, but discussed as to what the state should be, they were busy in factually establishing an ideal state.

   According to Plato, the actual state did not allow the individual to become fully moral. Therefore, it is only in an ideal state that the individual can live a moral life.

4. Aristotle adopted scientific method. He gave scientific basis to politics and named it the Master Science. His idea was to understand the environment around us and to solve the problems, it is essential to study politics scientifically. He drew very significant conclusions by comparing his contemporary constitutions.

**Traditional view**

Traditional View of politics means that view which the political thinkers adopted up to the decades in the beginning of the 20th century. During this long period, efforts have been made to define Politics with reference to the various institutions of political life. That is why, the thinkers of this period— Plato, Hobbes, Rousseau etc.—kept their study limited to the state, the government and the political institutions concerned with them. Therefore, their view became narrow, formal and institutional. This very view is called the Traditional View. From this point of view, political thinkers kept their study limited to the following three institutional bases and named politics as Political Science:
(a) Relation of political science with state.

(b) Relation of political science with the government.

(c) Political science as a study of institutions concerned with state with government.

(a) Political Science is concerned with the state. With the rise of nation-states, the writers of Politics started studying various aspects of these states under the name of Political Science. According to Bluntschli and Garner the pivotal point in political science is the state. According to Bluntschli, Political Science is the science which is concerned with the state in its fundamental conditions, in its essential nature, in its various forms of manifestation, its development. Similarly, Garner says that Political Science begins and ends with the state.

(b) Political Science deals with Government. The tradition of keeping the scope of political science limited to the study of government and various institutions related with it is very popular. Even now-a-days, the traditional writers of many countries support this point of view. Seeley and Leacock have mainly supported this point of view. According to the English writer, John Seeley, Political Science investigates the phenomena of government as Political Economy deals with wealth, Biology with life, Algebra with numbers and Geometry with space and magnitude. Further, Leacock upholds that "Political Science deals with government."

(c) Political Science deals with general problems of state and government. Considering the above given two points of view as partial and narrow, some traditional writers have maintained that Political Science studies both—state and government. In fact, when we study state, government is automatically studied because government is not only a main part of state, but we come to know form of state through government. Without the study of government, the study of state is meaningless. Similarly, government is studied as an agent of the state. According to the French writer Paul Janet, Political Science is that part of social science which treats of foundations of the state and the principles of government. Gettell says that "It (Political Science) is thus a study of the state in the past, present and future of political organisation and political functions of political institutions and political theories. According to Gilchrist, Political Science deals with the general problems of state and government. Demock says that Political Science is concerned with state and its instrumentality—Government.

Characteristics of the Traditional View. After discussing the above given ideas regarding the traditional view, we may now discuss its characteristic features.

1. It studies the state and the associations concerned with it in institutional form. Therefore, the subject matter of its study includes state, government, political institutions etc.

2. Most of the writers of this view were influenced by ethics and philosophy. Therefore, they ried to fix the aims of the individual and the society. For example, the Greek thinkers put forth the aim of achievement of ethical life; the Medieval Christian thinkers imagined the establishment of a theological state, the Idealists put forward the ideal of realisation of the reason.

3. The traditional thinkers neglected the scientific method normally. Their approach is subjective and they adopted the deductive method.
4. A characteristic of the traditional ideas was that they were not only concerned with politics but with many social sciences. That is why, Plato, Aristotle, Rousseau, a Marx etc. are concerned with other social sciences also.

5. Traditional thinkers used mainly historical and descriptive methods.

6. Traditional thinkers did not try to intermingle political science with other social sciences and, Consequently, their study could not become interdisciplinary.

**Modern View**

The liberals limited the study of politics to state, law and the topics concerned therewith because of which this study remained partial and limited. In the 20th century, emphasis was laid on the modern point of view of politics and it was set free.

Therefore, many basic activities, which were beyond the scope of state, began to be studied in politics which, thus far, were not its subject matter. The Modern View of Politics may be discussed, in brief, as under. (1) Allocation of scarce resources is politics. Resources here do not mean only material resources, but human and spiritual resources are also included in them. According to David Easton, Politics is the process by which scarce resources (human, material and spiritual) are allocated within a social unit for the purpose of providing for human needs and desires. In fact, the individual makes hectic efforts to get the material and non-material resources which include the political position and offices of profit. Those resources are limited and are not easily available. Therefore, there is competition to achieve them. Struggle is unavoidable for achieving these scarce and priceless resources. Various types of efforts are made by individuals and their groups to achieve them. As a result of these efforts, the process of allocation of these resources is called Politics. Discussing this fact about resources, H.D. Lasswell, using some different words, says "Who gets what, when and how?".

(2) The study of Politics is wider than the study of State and Government. The traditionalists had limited Politics to the study of various institutions concerning State and Government but the proponents of the Modern View say that Politics is concerned with everything which is related with political life of the individual, and, which may not be directly related with state or government. Therefore, associations, society, labour organisations, political parties, pressure and interest groups are also included in the subject matter of politics. According to Lipson, like other human associations, state also is born in the society and is a part of it. State is that association through which the process of politics is organised and set in order. According to Lipson the idea of state is much more limited than politics. He, further, says that wherever state exists, there is also politics. But the converse is not true—that wherever politics exists so does state. We can rightly speak of international politics but we know that there is not yet a supranational state. We can talk of politics within churches or corporations or trade unions, although, none of these is a state.

(3) Politics is the art and practice of Government of human societies. The conclusions can be drawn from this definition of Politics given by Robert. Firstly, Politics is an art and the behavior of the individual is studied in it, i.e. the study of political activities of man is Politics.
Secondly, here government means the organised power, i.e., where the activities concerning issuing of orders and establishing of control take place. Thirdly, Politics is concerned with the whole human society and not with a limited association like state. Thus, Politics is concerned with those activities of human society also which are not related with the state.

(4) Politics is the study of power. Now-a-days, there is an agreement about the study of state as power. According to Lasswell, Politics is the study of the influence. He further says that Politics is the "study of shaping and sharing of political power". Defining power, Wiseman has said that it is the "ability to get one's wishes carried out despite opposition." Thus, in view of such writers power is Politics. They study the questions like as to what is Power in politics, how is it achieved, how is it maintained, what are its aim, its ideals, its scope and bases and how is it lost? This point of view has been studied in this chapter elsewhere.

(5) Politics is an effort to bring about the rule of order and justice. Politics is normally viewed as a conflict and struggle and it is said that Politics is that struggle in which those who have power try to maintain it and make use of it and those who are out of power try to get it by controlling the government. But it is only one aspect of power. The other aspect is that Politics is an effort to establish law and order and justice in the society where balance is maintained in the interests of the society and the individual and the common interest is secured. Thus, there are two aspects of Politics. First, Politics protects the privileges of minority and, secondly, Politics teaches about the organised unity of individuals as society. In fact, politics is concerned with both the aspects discussed above. However arbitrary a ruler may be, he has to work for common interest also and law and order has to be established in society. Thus, Politics is also an effort for the establishment of law and order and justice in the society.

**Behavioral View**

In Politics, Behavioralism started in the 20th century. Its roots can be seen in the ideas of Graham Wallas etc., before the First World War, and, it was developed by the American writers after the Second World War. The pivotal point of behavioralism is the political behaviour. These thinkers study the attitudes, motivations and perceptions of man through political behaviour with the help of which political processes etc. may be studied in a scientific way. For this they adopt new scientific methods and techniques which have been borrowed from other social and physical sciences.

The birth of behavioralism is based on the dissatisfaction with the achievements of traditional political science. They felt that the methods—historical, philosophical analytical etc.—used in the traditional analysis were not adequate. So, they tried to search the new scientific methods.

Krikpatrick mentions the following four characteristics of behavioralism:

(i) It is a study of the individual behaviour. In behavioralism, the behaviour of the individual, instead of the political institutions, is analysed. This is its main characteristic.
(ii) It is inter-disciplinary. Behavioralism can be studied only in relation with other disciplines. In the absence of the knowledge of other social sciences, Politics cannot be studied. Therefore, they lay emphasis on interdisciplinary method.

(iii) For analysis, it lays emphasis on the scientific method. Behavioralism emphasises the collection of statistics, instead of facts, and their evaluation with scientific methods.

(iv) The behavioralists want to establish systematised pragmatic theory.

Major Tenets of Behavioral View. In the recent past, many Western writers—David B. Truman, Robert A. Dahl, David Easton, Heisz Eulau, Kriikpatrick, Malford Q. Sibley etc.—have thoughtfully analysed this movement.

There are many writers of behavioralism and all of them are not unanimous on every point but on the point of behavior almost all of them agree. Sonit and Tenenhans have explained the following main bases of bahavioralism in their essay named "The Behavioral Traditional Debate in Political Science".

(i) It is capable of predicting. Behavioralists agree that if a student of politics adopts strictly analtyial method for organised development of political knowledge instead of wholly explanatory method, politics can be made capable of making predictions.

(ii) Politics should concern itself primarily with observable behaviour. The main topic of the study of politics should be that behaviour of the individual or the group which can be observed, only that should be studied which is said or done by individual or a group.

(iii) Data should be quantified. Every behaviour should be collected in such statistics which can be measured and their conclusion may be drawn from various sides. To base one's conclusions of study of such statistics is correct.

(iv) Its values are beyond the scope of measurement. The topics of political science, which are related with values, e.g. democracy, liberty, equality and justice, are beyond the limit of legitimate enquiry because such values cannot be established as true or false on the basis of science.

(v) Political Science should be more inter disciplinary. Study of politics is not possible in a limited field. The study of the political activities of the individual is possible only in the social atmosphere. Therefore, it is essential for a political scientist to achieve the knowledge of the other social sciences. Moreover, he is dependent on other sciences for scientific technique of enquiry. Therefore, the behaviouralists lay emphasis on inter-disciplinary study.

The inter disciplinary approach to the study of political Science gives a broader perspective and thus enables to understand problems more thoroughly and more fruitfully. The study of political Science as a social process provides ample scope for an Inter-disciplinary approach. The inter-disciplinary is based on the assumptions that the social reality is one and different disciplines study different aspects of this reality for the sake of convenience. A comprehensive understanding of this reality requires combined efforts of all disciplines.
GROWTH AND EMERGENCE OF POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

Political sociology seeks to understand the process of interaction between government and society, decision making authorities and conflicting social forces and interests. It is the study of interactions and linkages between politics and society; between a political system and its social, economic and cultural environment. It is concerned with problems regarding the management of conflict, the articulation of interests and issues, and political integration and organisation.

Political sociology is a connecting bridge between sociology and political science. It believes in a two-way relationship between sociology and political science, giving equal emphasis on social and political variables. Take for example the party system. Here, political sociology does not explain the working of party system only in terms of its response to and reflection of the socio-economic scene, but also investigates how the society is as much conditioned by the party system. To give an Indian illustration, while sociology of politics analyses Indian politics in terms of its caste-ridden society, political sociology adds to that enquiry how politics in India has affected the Indian caste system, giving rise to what is called 'politicisation of caste'. This distinction between the sociology of politics and political sociology would help us in understanding the meaning of political sociology.

Since the Second World War there started a tendency among the western scholars, especially the American scholars, to undertake empirical research of various political phenomena with a touch of sociology in it. The more and more this type of research activity expanded the wider and wider was made room for Sociology in it. It was realised that these novel research findings were neither pure politics nor pure sociology and, therefore, they were eventually placed under the new rubric called Political sociology.

Political Sociology, however, was not born by accident. A good many factors worked behind its emergence the most important among which was a growing dissatisfaction with the nature of traditional Political science. There are two reasons for their dissatisfaction, firstly, was about the long tradition of political science being steeped in highly normative prescriptions. After the second world war, when fantastic scientific progress and technological advancement had greatly scientised the general intellectual atmosphere, political scientists in the west finally decided to adjure the a priori political speculations and began looking into political realities in the light of hard scientific empiricism. Secondly, traditional political science had always viewed the state as its star attractions. The traditional political science had refused to accept two-way relations between state and society. Since the fifties western social scientists started heading towards the unifications of social sciences with the aid of an inter-disciplinary approach. This was also contributing towards the development of political sociology.

Both Lipset and Runchimen have fixed the timing of the birth of political sociology at about the middle of 19th century when under the impact of industrialised revolution the traditional European social order gave in to modern society. Their thesis is that the emergence of modern society in Europe abundantly exhibited the difference between state and society when political sociology originated.
Political sociology is as a child from the marriage between Sociology and Political science and as in human issues, cannot be solely characterized by its parental qualities alone. Political science is essentially a study of the state, the development and organization of state power, the way it operates through a network of political institutions, the manner of its affecting the individuals life by means of manifold functions are the things political science enquires and explains. Sociology focuses its attention exactly on the area ignored by political science. Society being its central concern, Sociology searches the pattern and operation of interactive social relations, looks into the growth and working of social institutions and attempts at an evaluative description of social power and social progress. In other words, the distinction between political science and sociology clearly corresponds to the distinction between state and society.

Political science starts with the state and examines how it affects society, while political sociology starts with society and examines how it affects the state. Political sociologists came to argue that the state is just one of many clusters of social institutions and clusters of institutions are the subject of sociology in general, and that the relationship between political institutions and other institutions is the special province of political sociology. Political sociologist like Lipset and Bendix argued two features of political sociology, first, that political sociology studies the relation between the social and the political, and second that the political cannot be understood unless it is related to the social the whole argument amounts to this definition of political sociology: political sociology is a discipline that tries to understand political phenomena by necessarily relating them to their social determinants.

Political sociology believes in a two way relations between sociology and political science, giving equal emphasis on both the social and political variables. Essential features of political sociology are: (1) Political sociology is not political science since, unlike the latter, it is not a state discipline or a study of the state craft. (2)Political sociology concerned with not only with social but with the political as well. (3) Political sociology revolves round the belief that there exists an identify of form between the social process and the political process. Political sociology tries to resolve the traditional dichotomy between state and society.

Political sociology may, therefore, be defined as the product of cross-fertilization between sociology and political science that studies the impact of society on politics and also the reverse, a through viewing the substance of politics in a social form. Political sociology ensure the stability of the democratic political system, stretches this analysis to the political sphere and claims that the process is as much valid since it also works in terms of the natural social process in as far it as well wedded to the goal of bringing in consensus out of conflicts.

Political Sociology is primarily concerned with the evolution of the political community, which political science assumes as existent, and with the development and functioning of all the organs of social control, of which the state is only the most prominent among many. It is also immediately interested in the modifications effected by the organs of social control, among them the state, in the structure of society. It also concerned with the struggle of contending social interests and the adjustment which they seek and secure through the political institutions of society.
Political sociology provides a new vista in political analysis. The perspective of political sociology is distinguished from that of institutionalism and behaviouralism. The institutionalists have been concerned primarily with institutional types of political organisation, and their study has been characterized by legality and formality. The behaviouralists have focused on the individual actor in the political arena their primary concern namely, motives, attitudes, perceptions and the role of individuals. The task of political sociologist is to study the political process as a continuum of interactions between society and its decision makers, and between the decision making institutions and social forces.

Ever since the birth of sociology, the analysis of political processes and institutions has been one of its most important concerns. Sociologists argue and many political scientists agree that it is difficult to study political processes except as special cases of more general psychological and sociological relationships. The term "Political Sociology" has come to be accepted both within sociology and political science as encompassing the overlap between two sciences. However, the political scientist is primarily concerned with the dimension of power and factors affecting its distribution. The sociologist, on other hand, is more concerned with social control, with the way in which the values and norms of a society regulate relations. His emphasis is on social ties, rather than on formal structures and legal definitions. According to A.K.Mukhopadhyaya “political sociology is the child from the marriage between sociology and political science and as in human issues, cannot be solely characterized by its parental qualities alone”. According to Robert.E.Dowse and John.A.Hughes; “political sociology is the study of political behaviour within a sociological perspective of framework”. Michal Rush and Philip Althoff in their combined work ‘An introduction to the study of Political Sociology’ have attempted to define political sociology when they wrote that political sociology is the interactions and linkages between society and polity, between social structure and political structure and between social behaviour and political behaviour. In the opinion of As Smelser N. J. says, "Political Sociology is study of the interrelationship between society and polity, between social structures and political institutions". Political sociology is not solely the study of the social factors condition the political order.

Scope of political sociology

Political sociology is concerned with the way in which political arrangements depend on social oragnisations and cultural values. This subject is in fat less concerned with the formal aspects of government and law than with the underlying support of these institutions. Political sociologists are also interested in studying the participation of individuals in politics. The discipline is concerned with why and how an individual’s vote has public opinion, from and belongs to political associations and groups that support political movements. The scope of the discipline also includes different types of organised groups in politics and the interactions among them, and the influence of parties and movements in changing or bringing about stability in the political system. An important concern of political sociology is the decision-making process through public means. In this process, it takes into account not only the social forces but also includes the economic factors that are regulated by forces such as money, market and other resources scarcities. Political sociology also analysis whether the person occupying the decision-making process has enough grip over the people on whom they are exercising authority.
Political sociology also includes the concept of political system, which introduces dynamism in political analysis. It not only stress on the study of the major structures of the government such as legislature, courts and administrative agencies, but also embassies on all the structure in their political aspects such as caste groupings, kinship groups and formal organisations such as parties and interest groups. The political system deals with the political phenomena in any society without taking into account its size, culture and degree of modernisation. Political sociology deals with the analysis of the functions of various political structures in the political system from a structural functionalist perspective.

Political sociology concentrates on the phenomenon of power and its related aspects. Power is a universal and an important aspect of social interaction, which is necessary in shaping the relationship between individuals and members of a group. Political sociology also deals with the study of elites and their leadership styles. These elites govern the masses as well as provide them leadership. The discipline also concentrates on the patterns and styles of leadership exhibited by the elites, which are necessary to maintain their positions of power.

The study of the political process is also the domain of political sociology. Political process refers to activities of those underlying propensities in society that give meaning and order to the political system. Another major concern of political sociology is to study the impact of the political culture on the political system. The concepts of political culture refer to those underlying propensities that accelerate or retard the pace of performance of the political system.

Political participation and political mobilization also from the scope of political sociology. Another important aspect that is covered by political sociology is social stratification. It studies different social stratification systems, such as class, caste, gender and status, and analysis their impact on organized politics. Political sociology also analysis the political dynamics, which consists of the study of political parties, pressure groups, interest groups, public opinion and propaganda that influences and manipulate the attitude and political behavior of individuals. The process of change, which in the social dimension refers to ‘modernisation’, is also another focal point of political sociology. Political development is an important area of discussion in political sociology. It refers to a process through which a political system acquires new roles and value in a society.

Contemporary political sociology

Contemporary political sociology is concerned with cultural politics as what we might call the “politics of politics.” From this perspective, what events mean to those who interpret and act on them is what matters. Contemporary political sociology is also concerned with cultural politics in a wider sense: what is made “political” is not simply confined to what takes place within government, political parties, and the state. The perspective of cultural politics also helps us make sense of how the meanings of social relations and identities are consistently challenged wherever they are framed as unjust, exclusionary, and destructive of the capacities of individuals and groups.
“politization” across the social field has not typically been the subject matter of political sociology until fairly recently. Political sociology has never been easily distinguishable as a field of research from others in the discipline of sociology. Orum’s broad definition: political sociology directs attention toward “the social circumstances of politics, that is, to how politics both is shaped by and shapes other events in societies. Instead of treating the political arena and its actors as independent from other happenings in a society, [political sociology] treats that arena as intimately related to all social institutions”. Political sociologists would be interested in power as at least a potentiality in all social relations, and to have elaborated a conception of politics as an activity conducted across a range of social institutions. Dowse and Hughes argue political sociologists have concerned themselves principally with the ways in which society has affected the state.

Over the last couple of decades, political sociology has shifted away from this focus on how society affects the state. The contemporary political sociology had new paradigm of thinking like in Comparative Politics, Public administration. Political Sociology also thinks issues like third world development approach. So the Political Sociology has shifted away from this focuses on how society affects the state. Contemporary Political Sociology discussed economic, political, and cultural globalization means that what the state is and does is now itself in question.

Though action taken in the “name of the state” is often very effective, and with the “war on terror” following 9/11, state violence has become more visible in some respects, state action must now almost invariably take into account institutions, processes, and actors in relation to which states were previously considered sovereign and autonomous.

At the same time, the class formations around which national political parties were organized have become fragmented and the political concerns associated with class-based political parties Problematized. The fragmentation and pluralization of values and lifestyles, with the growth of the mass media and consumerism and the decline of stable occupations and communities, all mean that previously taken-for-granted social identities have become politicized.

Empirical changes would not be sufficient, however, to create a new approach to political sociology if there were not also new theoretical tools with which to make sense of them. There has been a paradigm shift in political sociology away from state-centered, class-based models of political participation, or non-participation, toward an understanding of politics as a potentiality of all social experience. It is in this sense that contemporary political sociology is concerned with cultural politics, understood in the broadest possible sense as the contestation and transformation of social identities and structures. Contemporary political sociology and explain why the concept of “cultural politics” is so useful to understanding “politics of politics” today. The substantive issues of contemporary political sociology fall into six major areas: (1) State, citizenship and civil society, (2) social cleavages and politics, (3) protest movements and revolutions, (4) surveillance and control, (5) state-economy relations, and (6) the welfare state.

1. **State, Citizenship, and Civil Society:** The modern nation state emerged from the demise of feudalism and was coincident with the rise of industrial capitalism. Political sociologists examine this process to understand state structures and processes of state transformation. Post modernisation theories of change emphasize the significance of warfare and state consolidation of
control over territory and people, especially in seventeenth- to nineteenth-century Europe. In addition to the importance of geopolitical conflict, resource extraction, and power consolidation, these developments helped form a civil society with a public sphere. They also contributed to expanding citizenship, including franchise expansion.

2. **Social Cleavages and Politics:** Since the classic era, political sociologists examined how social cleavages get expressed politically, and class was the most salient cleavage with the “democratic class struggle thesis”. They retain an interest in social class but also examine other social cleavages. They argue that class remains important but has changed form and is not alone in affecting voting. Thus, increased female labor force participation generated a new gender effect on voting, new religious cleavages appeared, professionals and managers differ in voting, and racial differences are salient. Several political scientists argue that social class is no longer relevant, and it has been replaced by cultural divisions (e.g., religion, no materialist values such as environment or health) and status differences (e.g., gender, race, ethnic group). The debate over class versus cultural cleavage effects on voting appears at an impasse. New inquiry has moved in several directions. One considers nonvoters; another reconceptualizes class and other social cleavages; and a third examines the effect of class on no electoral forms of political mobilization.

3. **Protest Movements and Revolutions:** The study of collective behavior changed as studies on movements merged with political sociology. By the 1970s, collective protest was understood to be a political phenomenon, and the resource mobilization approach explained movements in terms of their ability to acquire and use key resources. An offshoot of resource mobilization theory, the “political process model”, placed movements firmly within political sociology. It looked beyond internal movement organization to include micro mobilization processes, follower identity transformation, and the broader political environment. Others conceptualized environmental conditions as “political opportunity structures”. The political opportunity model was expanded to account for waves or cycles of protest over time and to more closely tie the study of movements to historical processes. A symbolic-cognitive dimension was added with cognitive liberation and movement frames. Later research synthesized movement frames, political opportunities, and organizational forms. Some studies examined “new social movements”—that is, movements focused more on cultural issues or identity affirmation than traditional political protest. The significance of media attention, police responses to protests, and “spillover” from one movement to another highlighted movements’ dynamic-interactive politics.

4. **Surveillance and Control:** Political sociologists examine surveillance and social control to understand how state authority penetrates into and regulates many spheres of social life, including activities to count, monitor, and regulate its population. Traditionally, criminal justice was treated as an apolitical, technical-administrative field, but political sociologists see the legal system and the criminalization of behaviors as mechanisms of domination and tactics deployed in power struggles. They consider targeting certain social sectors for criminalization, historical and international patterns of imprisonment, felon disenfranchisement, and political ideological agendas that shape crime policy. The tension between politicized legal criminal issues and technical-scientific processes is itself an issue.

5. **State-Economy Relations:** The state’s relationship to the class of investors/capital owners and market operations has been an ongoing political sociological concern. Studies examined how political-institutional arrangements (e.g., laws and taxes, property ownership, investment and regulatory policy) and business political activism shaped corporate capitalism’s expansion.
included noting how institutional arrangements, including their idea systems, shape economic outcomes. Others examined how defacto industrial policy and business regulation in specific areas, including military-industrial expansion, altered economic affairs and politics. Related studies looked at corporate welfare as an alternative to industrial policy in the United States and, specifically, at the U.S. savings and loan bailout. After the dissolution of communist regimes’ command economies, neoliberal ideology and state-economy arrangements diffused in a post-Cold War environment, and political sociologists shifted to discussing “varieties of capitalism.” They examined alternative structural state economy arrangements among the advanced capitalist nation-states that form integrated. Alternative arrangements and state policies developed historically and reinforced specific patterns of corporate capitalism with implications for economic expansion, interstate relations, and domestic labor relations and business practices.

6. **The Welfare State**: Measured as total social spending, the percentage of the population covered, or range of different programs, the welfare state expanded in all advanced capitalist democracies. This became a major area of comparative research and the focus of competing theoretical explanations.

   As political sociology advances into the twenty first century, four lines of inquiry are posed for further development: (1) legitimacy and identity, (2) governmentality, (3) politics beyond the nation-state, and (4) a synthesis of new institutionalism, rational choice, and constructionism.

   Political sociologists examined legitimacy since the nineteenth century, but issues of social identity and culture are increasingly a concern. Racial-ethnic, sexuality, life-style, religious, and other value-based cultural identity affirmations are potential sources of political division that can be triggered under certain conditions. The ways such identities evolve, get expressed, and overlap take place within political structures and involve power/dominance relations. Nation-states and other political structures try to regulate and prevent conflicts among the identities to uphold their legitimacy. This suggests reviving or adjusting Gramsci’s notion of hegemony. Repressive social control and state surveillance continue to interest political sociologists. Their attention has shifted to more subtle forms of domination and coercion, such as that captured by Bourdieu’s concept of symbolic violence or Foucault’s of governmentality. There is also a shift from treating the state apparatus as the sole site of concentrated power and domination to examining how power gets accumulated and exercised throughout numerous social institutions and relationships. In addition to examining the state’s policing, taxing, and other powers, interest is turning to how coercion and power are embedded in the relations of a workplace, courtroom, classroom, shopping mall, hospital, television programming, religious community, and so forth. This moves attention to the symbolic-cultural-idea realm. It includes how collective memories, communication messages, and institutional arrangements impose social-ideational dominance and constrain free and autonomous public sphere for open participation and discourse, an idea elaborated by Habermas.

   Few political sociologists expect the nation-state to disappear in the twenty-first century, but they expect changes and greater salience for non state politics. New global political structures are arising from accelerating cross-national border flows of information, investments, culture, and people in governments and nongovernment institutions (e.g., corporations, NGOs, social movements). New local multicultural or hybrid forms are emerging both in cities and small-scale units as well as in global institutions larger than the nation-state.
Module-II

MODERN APPROACHES IN POLITICAL SCIENCE AND POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY

POLITICAL SCIENCE: Behavioural, Post-behavioural and Marxian Approach

BEHAVIORAL APPROACH

Behaviouralism, is regarded as a turning point in the history of political science, thought and analysis. It has been widely acclaimed as a great revolution which has transformed the goals, nature, scope, methodology, and theoretical formulations of political science. Emergence of behavioral studies reflects the determination of new scholars to derive their findings on the basis of direction or indirect observation of human behaviour. It is to be regarded as a first real attempt to make political studies as a ‘science of politics’.

Behaviouralism is an intellectual tendency and academic movement. It has so many facets: a revolution, a reform movement, a mood, an approach and an attitude. It has been adopted because of its objectivity, observability, value-neutrality and verifiability. Behaviouralism maintains that there are certain fundamental units of analysis relating to human behaviour of which generalisations can be formed. These generalisations offer a common base on which a ‘science of man’ can be Appropriately built.

Behaviouralism in political science not only concerned with behavior but also concerned with its perpetual, motivational, and attitudinal components making for man’s political beliefs, values and goals. In sum, it involves external aspects of behaviour and the affective, contiguous, and evaluative processes engrossed through it.

Behaviouralism, as an academic movement in political science first began in the United States after the Second World War. Growth of behaviouralism is the outcome of varied reasons marked mainly by a dissatisfaction with prevailing historical descriptive, legal-formal, and normative perspectives. In 1908, Graham Walls (Human nature in politics) and Arthur F. Bentley (The process of government) advocated psychological and group oriented approaches Walter Lippmann (Public Opinion) in 1922 took up the study of public opinion and political attitude-formation. In 1951, David B. Truman revived Bentley’s neglected orientation in his (The governmental process). But the pioneering efforts were made by Charles E. Merriam (New Aspects of Politics in 1925) His efforts came out in the form of famous ‘Chicago School’ which produced a host of political scientists, such as Harold F. Gosnell, Harold D. Laswell, V. O Key, Herbert A. Simon, Gabriel Almond, etc.

So far behaviouralism remained only a ‘movement of protest’ against traditional methods of analysis. After the Second World War, the movement came out in the form of an academic revolution. Evaluation of behaviouralism has witnessed certain trends also. In its first phase (1920-30), it paid more attention to qualitative aspects and less on substantive and theoretical problems. In its second phase, up to 1950, behaviouralists moved in both substantive and non-substantive areas. After that, they began to specialise in various directions: multi-methodologism, behavioural theories, behavioural positivism and watsonian behaviouralism. Behaviouralism can be also being broadly divided as (a) pure behaviouralism, and (b) applied behaviouralism.
Pure behaviouralism aims at contributing to theory and techniques of the discipline, and remains ready to study any problem. It purpose is 'pure research', or knowledge for the sake of knowledge, seeking generalisations on the basis of technical judgments. Applied behaviouralists take up problems of important social consequences and collaborate with several disciplines to solve them. Often they behave like social reformers, administrators or engineers and have some consideration towards persons and situations.

In the field of political Science, the origins of this approach can be traced to this approach can be traced to the writings of Graham Walls and Arthur Bentley. These two writers in the early twentieth century, laid emphasis on the importance to political process in the analysis of politics. Charles E. Merriam and G.E.G Catlin in the 1920’s and Harold D. Lasswell in the 1930’s stressed this approach. It gained popularity with the work of American Political Scientists after the Second World War. David Easton laid the foundation of the behavioral movement with certain assumptions and objectives.

Easton’s concept of Behaviouralism is regarded as the intellectual foundation stone of behaviouralism. It contains principles is known (1) Regularities- These are certain discoverable uniformities in political behavior of human beings that can be expressed in generalisations or theories capable of explaining and predicating social phenomena. (2) Verification- The validity of such generalisation must be tested and verified in principle by reference to relevance to relevant behavior. (3) Techniques- Appropriate techniques should be used for observing, recording, acquiring, analyzing or testing and interpreting the data. (4) Quantification- Ample care should be taken by a researcher not merely to collect data but also to measure and quantify the same. Quantification and measurement are the essential ingredients that determine the scientific method. (5) Values- Facts and values may be studied separately. Ethical evaluation and empirical explanation should be kept analytically distinct and it should be value free or value neutral. (6) Systematization- It means that research in the field of political science should be systematic. Attempts should be made to build systematic theories on the basis of logically interrelated body of concepts and propositions. (7) Pure Science- The behaviouralists contented that both theory and its application are parts of scientific method and must be closely linked. (8) Integration- The study of political Science should be integrated with other social sciences and inter-disciplinary approach should be adopted. It will facilitate cross fertilization of ideas and results in more generality and validity of political studies.

The behavioral approach originated due to dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches. It was opined that the traditional approaches laid emphasis on organized formal institutional structures which made political Science functionally irrelevant as it lacked an insight into operational dimensions. Many developments in other social sciences like sociology, psychology and anthropology influenced the behaviouralist to restructure the study of political science.

The behavioral approach focuses on political behavior. It calls on political behavior. It calls for the study of acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of man in the political context. It lays emphasis on the collection and examination of facts relating to actual behaviour of man as a social and political being. Thus, behaviouralism shifts its focus from study of politics, from formalism and normative orientations of the legalistic and philosophical schools to political behaviour, i.e., the behaviour of actual actors in the political field like power-holders and power-seekers as well as voters.
Characteristics of behavioural approach

Movement of protest: - Behaviouralism primarily sort of protest movement against the inadequacies of conventional political science mainly led by the American political scientists. They are highly dissatisfied with the achievements of conventional political science because of its inadequacies. The conventional political science confined its study only to the state and government and he did not take into account the political phenomena and the behavior of men. Therefore, behaviouralism has shifted its emphasis from the ideal state, government and political institutions to the day today political problems of the citizens. Consequently new methods of study and research have developed in political science.

(1) Focus on behaviour: - Behaviouralism is a sort of protest movement against traditional approaches in political science; therefore, behaviouralism has made the individual as centre of attention in the study of political phenomena. Behaviouralists are concerned with the individual’s political behaviour as a member of group and institutions.

(2) Scientific outlook and objectivity: - Behaviouralism stress the special importance of the scientific outlook and objectivity. Behaviouralists overlook the ethical values because they cannot be studied scientifically and objectively. Instead they advocate value free science of politics. They emphasize empirical values which are arrived at after a lot objective study and scientific investigation.

(3) Methodological revolution: - Behaviouralism brought about altogether a new approach in the study of political research. Consequently, some scholars regard behaviouralism as nothing but a methodological revolution in political science. Whereas the traditional political scientist employed philosophical, historical or comparative methods for thief study, the behaviouralists emphasis such techniques are observation, interviews, survey, research, case studies, data collection, statistical analysis, quantification etc., the behaviouralists have drawn frequently from natural sciences such as Mathematics, Statistics, Physics, Biology etc.

(4) Inter-disciplinary study: - The political behaviour of an individual is a part of the total social behaviour of all the individuals. In order to get a proper understanding a modern researcher in political science has to take the help of various social sciences or different disciplines like Sociology, History, Economics and Anthropology and so on. Great anthropologists and sociologist like Durkheim, Malin Dwaki, Tallcot Parsons. Edward Shills have made unique contribution to systems theory and the structural-Functional approach. The modern political scientists have also started studying the works of the above famous sociologists and anthropologists because the behavioral method cannot be understood fully without studying deeply other disciplines (social sciences).

(5) Invention of scientific theory: - The main aim of the behaviouralists is to build a scientific theory with the help of observation and experimentation, which may be able to predict things and be applied universally.
Achievements of Behaviouralism

The behavioral approach has widened the scope of political and came to dominate the political science for its higher degree of reliability instead of a higher degree of generality. Thus it focused on micro-level situations rather than attempting macro-level generalizations.

The achievements of behaviouralism can be traced in two fields, theory building and techniques of research or research methodology. (1) Research methodology: the behaviouralists made significant achievements in the development and refinement to the tools and techniques of research. Developments in the fields of (i) content-analysis, (ii) case-analysis, (iii) interviewing and observation, and (iv) statistics are particularly remarkable. They also use the most sophisticated quantifications and measurement techniques in their empirical research projects. (2) Theory Building: the contribution of the behaviouralists towards the theory building is not laudable because they are mainly concerned with the individual’s and group behaviour. They focus their less and less on state. The behavioral science developed a good deal more revolutionary in the realm of technique than in that of validated and expanded theory. The greatest contribution of the behaviouralists in regard to theory has been in the field of voting behaviour.

Criticisms of behavioural approach

Though behaviouralism made a breakthrough in the field of political Science, it has been criticized on many fronts. Some of its weaknesses have been identified as follows:

1) Behaviouralism concerns more with Techniques than Results: Behaviouralists attach too much importance to the techniques and methods and do not worry at all about the theoretical importance of the subject. While doing the research, the behaviouralists have chosen only such topics for research in which better techniques are available and they have ignored the rest. Besides that they have not bothered about the results.

2) Behaviouralism emphasis the importance of behavioral effect at the cost of institutional effects: it should be noted particularly that American behaviouralists have altogether neglected the effects of the institutions upon the society and concentrated their efforts only at the behavioural aspect of the individuals and groups confined mainly in America.

3) Study of politics can never be value-free: the critics of behaviouralism contend that politics can never be value free as held by the behaviouralists. In politics very selection of subjects for investigation is determined by values.

4) Behaviouralism emphasis static rather than current situation: Behaviouralists have been concentrating their study mainly on the static subjects rather on the current problems. In the beginning behaviouralists justified they were filling the gap left by the institutionalists but now it cannot be justified as the burning problems such as threat of nuclear war, hunger, famine, undernourishment etc. The behaviouralists have so far ignored all these urgent problems because that does not suit their study.

5) Difficulties in studying ever changing behaviour: it is very difficult to study the ever changing behaviour of man because the emotions, ideas and thinking go on changing continuously. Therefore, absolutely no correct predictions can be made about the
behaviour of man. Moreover, it is very difficult to measure the role of various factors governing the behaviour of man.

(6) **Behavioral research depends too much on other sciences**:- political science is depending upon other social sciences particularly sociology and anthropology and borrowing so much from them that it is apprehended that the very identity, integrity and autonomy of political science may be lost. Inter-disciplinary approach can be helpful in understanding many political problems but it cannot solve all the complexities about human behaviour.

Despite the criticism, the contribution of behavior revolution to political science needs to be acknowledged. Certain specific areas in political science for example study of voting behaviour, enquiry into political process etc, have been benefited greatly by the new approach. The salutary results of behavioral movement may be summed up as new awareness about the needs of scientific research greater degree of empiricism and an increasing use of new analytical technique.

**POST-BEHAVIOURALISM**

Post-Behaviouralism is the next step or reform movement of behavioral revolution. Like behaviouralism, it was again propounded by David Easton in his presidential address to the American Political Science Association in 1969 which relied on relevance and action? It laid new emphasis on ‘values’, on issues of justice, freedom and equality. David Easton pointed out that post-behaviouralism was future oriented, seeking to propel political science in new directions, and to add rather than deny its past heritage. It was both a movement and an intellectual tendency. Post-behaviouralism emphasis on the facts as well as values. It is a reform movement within the discipline of political science. The two basic motivation of post-behaviouralism is relevance and action. Relevance means the development of such theories which can be utilized for the good of the society. The research techniques are good but emphasis should be on using these research techniques to make theories which will answer the problem of the society.

While behaviouralism was a movement against traditionalism, the post-behaviouralism was also a movement against behaviouralism itself but instead of condemning either of the two methods of thought, it was synthesis between the two contending schools of thought. Behaviouralism was not a new discipline; rather it was just a new technique, a new approach, with a new focus in view for the study of political science.

The behavioral approach was trying to convert the study of politics into a discipline based on the methodology of natural sciences. Mathematics was making its way in political science to the extent that it began to look more of mathematics than a science related to the realities of social life. In their efforts at research and application of scientific methods. The behaviouralists had gone for away from the realities of social behaviour. In this way political science again lost touch with the current and contemporary world.

The behaviouralism which failed to solve any practical problem of the world even after spending cores of rupees on research in regard to developing new methodology and techniques. Therefore post-behaviouralism arose as a protest-movement against behaviouralism.
The action part involves bringing about changes in the society by social action. David Easton who had once enumerated eight main characteristics of behaviouralism and call them the ‘the intellectual foundation stones ’ of the movement, now came out with seven major traits of post-behaviouralism and described them as the ‘credo of Relevance’ or ‘a distillation of maximal image’ they can be summarized as follows:

1. **Substance must have precedence over the technique:** it may be good to have sophisticated tools of investigation, but the more important point was the purpose for which these tools were to be applied. Unless the scientific research was relevant and meaningful for the contemporary urgent social problems, it was not worth being undertaken. To the slogan raised by the behaviouralist that it was to be wrong than vague, the post-behaviouralist raised the counter-slogan that it was better to be vague than non-relevantly precise.

2. **Political science should not lose touch with brute realities of politics:** political science, during the behavioral movement, had broken itself from the brute realities of politics. With its enormous wealth and technical resources, and a fantastic rate of increase in man’s material comforts, the western world was, at the same time, moving towards increasing social conflicts and deepening fears and anxieties about the future. If it was not the responsibility of the political scientists to reach out to the real needs of the humanity, of what use political science was to society.

3. **Political science must not be value force:** behaviouralistts had put much emphasis on scientism and value-free approaches. This was a very unhappy situation. It was on value premises that all knowledge stood and unless values were regarded as the propelling force behind knowledge, there was a danger that the knowledge was to be used for wrong purposes. Values played an important role in politics, and research. They should not be thrown out from political science in the name of science.

4. **Political Science should aim for social change and not for social preservation:** Contemporary political science should place its main emphasis on social change and not on social preservation as the behaviouralists seemed to be doing.

5. **Political science should preserve the human values of civilization:** The post behaviouralists anted to remind the political scientists that, being intellectuals, they had a role to play in the society. It was responsibility to do the best to protect the humane values of civilization.

6. **There is a need for action in place of contemplative science:** if the intellectuals understood the social problems and felt themselves involved in them they could not keep themselves away from action. Knowledge must be put to work. As Easton point out, “to know is to bear the responsibility for acting and to act is to engage in reshaping society”. Contemplative science might have been all right in the nineteenth century, when there was a broader moral agreement among the nations, but it was completely out of place in the contemporary society which was sharply divided over ideals and ideologies. The post-behaviouralists ask for action science in place of contemplative science.
7. **There is an urgent need to politicise the profession:** once it was recognized that the intellectuals had a positive role to play in the society and this role was to try to determine proper goals for society and make society move in the direction of these goals, it became inevitable to draw the conclusion that the polarization of the profession of all professional associations as well as universities- became not only inescapable but highly desirable.

The post-behaviouralists reply to the argument that science had some ideal commitments of science and that behaviouralism shared these ideal commitments of science, is that if science led its votaries to close their eyes in the face of urgent social problems the very image of sciences should change. The post-behaviouralists did not deny the importance of technical technician proficiency, but they did not agree that the search for basic understanding and reliable knowledge necessarily implied that the scientists should not cut him adrift from the practical concerns of society, nor did they believe that values could be kept out of all scientific pursuits. Research according to the post-behaviouralists was to be related to urgent social problems and was to be purposive. If the present crisis in society arose out of deep social conflicts, these conflicts had to be resolved. If the resolution of the conflicts needed breaking up of the existing political order, the political scientists should fairly and boldly ask for that, and he must not only rest content with suggesting reforms or, if need be revolution, but also contribute his best to the reshaping of society in the direction in which it could serve the desired goal more effectively.

To conclude, post–behavioral approach does not mean a new wave of methodological innovations. It signifies stock-taking and re-appraisal. There is a noticeable trend back to the vital aspect concerning value-preferences, identified with the normative approach. The post-behaviouralists did not deny the importance of technical proficiency, but they did not agree that the search for basic understanding and reliable knowledge necessarily implied that the scientist should not cut himself adrift from the practical concerns of the society, nor did they believe that values could be kept out of all scientific pursuits. It was the duty of the political scientists to find out solutions to contemporary problems. If the present crisis in society arose out of deep social conflicts, these conflicts had to be resolved. If the resolution of the conflicts needs breaking up of the existing political order, the political scientists should fairly and boldly ask for that, and he must not only rest content with suggesting reforms but also contribute his best to the reshaping of society in the direction in which it could serve the desired goals more effectively. Thus it can be concluded that from the traditional approaches to the post-behavioral approach, there is not only change but also continuity.

**MARXIAN APPROACH**

In the entire history of political thought both on influence in criticism, few political theorists can match Karl Marx. He was truly the last of the great critics in the western intellectual tradition. His ideas exerted a decisive influence on all aspects of human Endeavour and transformed the study of history and society. He was the first thinker to bring together the various strands of socialist thought into both a coherent world view and an impassioned doctrine of struggle. Along with Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), with whom he shared an unparalleled partnership, Marx dissected 19 the century capitalism as scientific socialism or communism. Marxism is not only a critical appraisal of capitalism but also a viable or credible alternative to it. Marxism is at once an orientation, programme of action and a working class movement.
Marx’s principal doctrines were not new; but he greatly amplified and systematized older ideas, putting them into new and effective combinations. He attempted to show that a socialist programme must be based upon a systematic interpretation of social evaluations and a critical analysis of the existing system of production and exchange. His design was to show how a socialist community is to be built upon capitalist foundations. Marx described his socialism as scientific.

Marx inherited and integrated three legacies, German philosophy, French political thought and English economics in his theoretical foundation. From the German intellectual tradition, he borrowed the Hegelian method of dialectics and applied it to the material world. From the French revolutionary tradition he accepted the idea that change motivated by a messianic idea was not only desirable, but also feasible. He applied his method with a view to bringing about largescale change within the industrialized capitalist economy of which England was the classical model in the 19th century. He used the English classical economists to understand the dynamics of capitalism and the Industrial Revolution.

Marx was born on March 5, 1818 in the predominantly Catholic city of Trier in the Rhineland in a Jewish family. He embraced Christianity during his childhood. Marx studied law at the University of Born in 1835, and at the University of Berlin 1836. He changed his course to philosophy under the influence of the young Hegelians. He completed his doctorate in philosophy in 1841. Marx married his childhood friend Jenny, six years older than Marx.

Marx has written so extremely on various issues of Philosophy, Economics, Politics and society. During his student days Marx was attached to Hegelian Idealism but he soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. The books, articles, pamphlets of Marx were written during three decades from the early forties to the early seventies. The important works of Marx include Critique of Political Economy the Communist Manifesto, Das Capital. The basic principles of Marxism can be summarized as follows: (1) Dialectical Materialism (2) Historical Materialism (3) Theory of Alienation 4) Theory of surplus value (5) Class struggle (6) Dictatorship of the proletariat (7) Vision of a communist society.

The Marxist political theory also known as scientific socialism, Marx pointed out a scientific philosophy of the working class and an ideology for social change. Marx subjected the capitalist system to scientific analysis. He laid bare its exploitative character. The Marxist approach has unique place in the study of politics as it is different from both rational and modern approach. The analysis is based up on economic orientation up on social and political issues. Marxian analysis is rooted in dialectical and historical materialism. According to which history progress through a conflict between two classes in which society is perpetually divided.

According to Marx ‘All Past history’ with the exception of its primitive stages, was the history of class struggles. These working classes are the products of the modes of production and of exchange. History is the record of class conflict between those who own the means of production and other who do not and this class conflict is the central theme and motive power in politics.

Marx identified five broad stages through which society has evolved. Marx presented in detail five stages of historical development. Primitive communism is the first stage where the modes of production involve hunting, fishing and food gathering. At this point, the classes have not yet emerged. The second stage is the slave system where the modes of production are animal husbandry along with domestic agriculture and small industry, with masters and slaves as the
classes in society. Feudal system is the third stage where agriculture on a large scale is the mode of production. The dominant classes are the landlords and the serfs. This stage is succeeded by the capitalist system where the modes of production are large industry. The class structure has capitalist system where the mode of production is large industry. The class structure has capitalist and workers. Finally, there is the socialist system where though the modes of production are the large industry, there are no classes; all the citizens belong to one class known as workers.

According to Marx: ‘the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle’. A Marx believes that, class is determined by the modes of production. In the capitalist society, there are two classes, viz., the ‘haves’ and ‘have not’s. Marx holds that the struggle between classes with antagonistic interests such as of the workers and the capitalist under capitalism is inevitable. It is oblivious that change is always sought by the oppressed and the exploited, class which has nothing to close except its chains in contrast, the classes which are dominant, have a definite interest in preserving the existing order or the statuesque. Marxism holds that the interest of the antagonistic classes cannot be reconciled, nor change possible by reconciling class interests. Class struggle is an inevitable product of the contradiction of the productive forces and relations of productions. It is indeed the driving force of social and historical change.

When the contradiction between the prediction relations and forces of productions reaches a climax is defeated and new class takes over. Thus a revolutionary or qualitative change comes about when one modes of production is replaced by another mode of production. Consequently, the process of transformation of one mode of production of one mode of production into another involves social change. Such change is revolutionary rather than evolutionary. It indicates change not within the system, but of one system into another. Class struggle is the driving force of such change, and revolution the midwife.

Marxian social theory is based on class struggle, which according to Marx, is the driving force of social and political change. Classes are the fundamental categories of social organization. The concept of Marxian concept of class has a specific meaning. It is defined in terms of the relations. It has with the prevailing modes of production. Marxian concept of class, Marxism does not define class in terms of work functions, income or consumption, caste or religion etc., it defines class in terms of the class structure of the society and their relations with the means of production.

Criticisms of marxian approach

Karl Marx is undoubtedly one of the most influential philosophers of modern times. His ideas and doctrines have acquired the status of a powerful ideology and a programme of action. His ideas on Dialectical Materialism, Historical Materialism, Surplus Value, Class Struggle, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Alienation, communism etc have been extensively discussed, debated, modified and sometimes even rejected and criticized by his followers and adversaries.
Marxism has been subjected to severe criticisms from various corners. Along with Plato and Hegel, Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society. Marxism claimed to have studied the laws of history on the basis of which it advocated total sweeping and radical changes. Not only was it impossible to have first hand knowledge based on some set of laws that governed society and human individuals, but Karl Popper also rejected Marx’s social engineering as dangerous for it treated individuals as subservient to the interests of the whole. Popper rejected the historicism, holism and utopian social engineering of Marxism. In contrast, he advocated piecemeal social engineering, where change would be gradual and modest, allowing rectification of lapses and errors for it was not possible to conceive of everything.

Popper claimed that Marx’s scientific socialism was wrong not only about society but also about science. He claimed that the capitalism that Marx described never existed. He wrote thus: Marx misled cores of intelligent people by saying that the historic method is the scientific way of approaching social problems” Further Marx made the economy all important, ignoring factors like nationality, friendship, religion, sex etc. Society was far more complex that what Marx described. As Popper has rightly mentioned “Marx brought into the social science and historical science the very important idea that economic conditions are of great importance in the life of society ……… There was nothing like serious economic history before Marx”.

Marx did not foresee the rise of Fascism, totalitarianism and the welfare state. His analysis of capitalism was, at best, applicable to early 19th century capitalism, though his criticisms of capitalism as being wasteful unequal and exploitative was true. However, his alternative to genuine democracy and communism seemed more official to realize in practice, for they did not accommodate a world which was becoming increasingly differentiated, stratified and functionally specialized. Popper’s critique of Marxism on the basis of falsification was equally true and difficult to refute, for Marxism constantly adjusted theory in the light of reality.

Marx’s vision of a new social order in which there will be neither alienation nor exploitation no classes, no class antagonism, no state is highly fascinating and because of this attraction Prof. Sabine called Marxism a ‘Utopia but a generous and humane one’. Harrington portrayed the contemporary radical view of Marx as being an excellent critic of capitalism but unable to provide a detailed alternative to it. A democratic system was totally alien to his temperament in spite of his plea for democratization of social forces. Marx dismissed liberty as a purely bourgeoisie ideal and was openly scornful of democracy as a bourgeoisie invention designed to deceive the people. As a prophet of revolution, Marx failed to analyze human nature correctly. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that the true and the false together in him constitute one of the most tremendously compelling forces that modern history has seen.

The collapse of communism proved the serious shortcomings of Marxism both in theory and practice. It, at best, remained a critique rather than providing a serious alternative to liberal democracy. In spite of Marx’s utopia being truly generous, it displayed a potential for being tyrannical despotic and arbitrary. Centralization of power and absence of checks and balances on absolute power were themselves inimical to human freedom and liberation.
Marxist approach claims to be scientific and progressive. It also assumes normative character. But the weakness in this approach lies in conforming to an ideology with utmost rigidity. It has been criticized for culminating in the ‘pseudo scientific of generated Marxism’.

Marx placed too much emphasis given to the economic factor in explaining social and order change culture seemed to be explained solely as derived from the economic “substructure”. However it has a degree of “autonomy” for example it is difficult, to explain the advent of gay liberation in terms of productive or economic relations.

Marx theory of history contradicted by the fact that industrialized countries have not moved closer to revolution. But on country the recent revolutions have been in peasant’s societies- such as china, Russia. Capitalist societies seem to have become more secure from threat of revolution throughout the 20th century. In other words, no socialist revolution of 20th century has occurred according to the Marxist model, all successful revolutions have occurred in relatively backward, non-industrialized nations.

Anarchist criticized Marx, according to them Marx fails to grasp the unacceptable dangers in their readiness to taken an authoritarian-centralist approach. Marxist is willing to use the authoritarian state to run society after the revolutions and to be ruthless in this. This is extremely dangerous; those in control can’t be trusted and are very likely to become an entrenched dictatorship.

Marx placed undue emphasis on the progress of history through class antagonism, and conceived of no moral or political values independent of the class interest. Interests or ideas not conforming to his logic of dialectical materialism became matters of false consciousness.

The Marxist approach is based on a logical view of economic determinism, but it ignores non-economic and culture movements in the development of history. Orthodox Marxism also ignored the forces of nationalism and of national; polity as the dominant factor in modern politics. Marxism not only reduces politics to the dependent status of epiphenomenon, but by ignoring religion, language, ethnicity and above all, nationalism, it fails to provide an understanding of political developments, whether in the first, second and third world.

Whatever may the shortcomings and limitations of Marxian principles, it is beyond dispute that Marx would be remembered as a critique of 19th century capitalism and politics. He was the first socialist who stressed the importance and increasing role of the proletariat. Marx was the first political thinker to offer a systematic exposition of scientific socialism or communism. He made unique contribution in political analysis.
POLITICAL SOCIOLOGY: Marxian and Weberian

Karl Marx

Marx was a world-renowned social philosopher, sociologist and economic historian. He made remarkable contributions to the development of various social sciences including sociology. He contributed greatly to sociological ideas. He introduced key concepts in sociology like social class, social class conflict, social oppression, alienation, etc. Marx, like Comte, argued that people should make active efforts to bring about societal reforms. According to Marx, economic forces are the keys to understimating society and social change. He believed that the history of human society has been that of class conflict. He dreamed of, and worked hard towards realizing, a classless society, one in which there will be no exploitation and oppression of one class by another, and wherein all individuals will work according to their abilities and receive according to their needs. Marx introduced one of the major perspectives in sociology, called social conflict theory.

Concept of Social Change

In their struggle against nature, and to gain their livelihood through associated labor, men create specific forms of social organization in tune with specific modes of production. All these modes of social organization, with the exception of those prevailing in the original stage of primitive communism, are characterized by social inequality. As societies emerge from originally undifferentiated hordes, the division of labor leads to the emergence of stratification, of classes of men distinguished by their differential access to the means of production and their differential power. Given relative scarcity, whatever economic surplus has been accumulated will be preempted by those who have attained dominance through their expropriation of the means of production. Yet this dominance never remains unchallenged. This is why "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles." Free men and slaves, patricians and plebeians, barons and serfs, guild masters and journeymen, exploiters and exploited have confronted one another from the beginning of recorded time. Yet Marx, insisted on the principle of historical specificity, that is, he thought it essential to note that each particular class antagonism, rooted in particular productive conditions, must be analyzed in its own right. Each stage in history is conceived as a functional whole, with its own peculiar modes of production, which give rise to distinctive types of antagonisms between exploiting and exploited classes. Class antagonisms specific to each particular mode of production led to the emergence of classes whose interests could no longer be asserted within the framework of the old order; at the same time, the growth of the productive forces reached the limits imposed by previous productive relations. When this happened, the new classes, which represented a novel productive principle, broke down the old order, and the new productive forces, which were developed in the matrix of the old order, created the material conditions for further advance.

Relations of Production

Relations of production are a concept frequently used by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their theory of historical materialism, and in Das Capital. It is first explicitly used in Marx's published book The Poverty of Philosophy, although the concept is already defined in The German Ideology. Relations of production are the sum total of social relations which human beings establish among themselves in the production of their material lives.
Forces of production" is a central idea in Marxism and historical materialism. In Karl Marx and Frederick Engels's own critique of political economy, it refers to the combination of the means of labor (tools, machinery, land, infrastructure and so on) with human labour power. All those forces which are applied by people in the production process (body & brain, tools & techniques, materials, resources and equipment) are included in this concept. Human knowledge can also be a productive force. Forces of production refers to the physical means and techniques of production to which laborers add value and transform capital into products for sale. Forces of production include instruments of production and raw materials, as well as the productive faculties of producing agents manifested by strength, skill, and knowledge.

**Mode of Production**

Mode of production includes everything that goes into the production of the necessities of life, including the "productive forces" (labor, instruments, and raw material) and the "relations of production" (the social structures that regulate the relation between humans in the production of goods. Marx used the term mode of production to refer to the specific organization of economic production in a given society. A mode of production includes the means of production used by a given society, such as factories and other facilities, machines, and raw materials. It also includes labor and the organization of the labor force. The term relations of production refers to the relationship between those who own the means of production (the capitalists or bourgeoisie) and those who do not (the workers or the proletariat). According to Marx, history evolves through the interaction between the mode of production and the relations of production. The mode of production constantly evolves toward a realization of its fullest productive capacity, but this evolution creates antagonisms between the classes of people defined by the relations of production. According to Marx, the combination of forces and relations of production means that the way people relate to the physical world and the way people relate to each other socially are bound up together in specific and necessary ways. People must consume to survive, but to consume they must produce, and in producing they necessarily enter into relations which exist independently of their will.

For Marx, the analysis of social order and the causes of social change must be discovered in the specific mode of production that a society has. He further argued that the mode of production substantively shaped the nature of the mode of distribution, the mode of circulation and the mode of consumption, all of which together constitute the economic sphere. To understand the way wealth was distributed and consumed, it was necessary to understand the conditions under which it was produced.

Normally a mode of production shapes the mode of distribution, circulation and consumption, and is regulated by the state. New productive forces will cause conflict in the current mode of production. When conflict arises the modes of production can evolve within the current structure or cause a complete breakdown.

The major types of modes of production are as follows:


**Primitive communism**

Human society is seen as organized in traditional tribe structures, typified by shared values and consumption of the entire social product. As no permanent surplus product is produced, there is also no possibility of a ruling class coming into existence. As this mode of production lacks differentiation into classes, it is said to be classless. Paleolithic and Neolithic tools, pre- and early agricultural production, and rigorous ritualized social control have often been said to be the typifying productive forces of this mode of production.

**Asiatic mode of production**

This is a controversial contribution to Marxist theory, initially used to explain pre-slave and pre-feudal large earthwork constructions in China, India, the Euphrates and Nile river valleys. The Asiatic mode of production is said to be the initial form of class society, where a small group extracts social surplus through violence aimed at settled or unsettled band communities within a domain. Exploited labour is extracted as forced curve labour during a slack period of the year. Exploited labour is also extracted in the form of goods directly seized from the exploited communities. The primary property form of this mode is the direct religious possession of communities and all those within them. The ruling class of this society is generally a semi theocratic aristocracy which claims to be the incarnation of gods on earth. The forces of production associated with this society include basic agricultural techniques, massive construction and storage of goods for social benefit.

**Feudalism**

The feudal mode of production is usually typified by the systems of the West between the fall of the classical European culture and the rise of capitalism, though similar systems existed in most of the earth. The primary form of property is the possession of land in reciprocal contract relations: the possession of human beings as peasants or serfs is dependent upon their being entailed upon the land. Exploitation occurs through reciprocated contract. The ruling class is usually a nobility or aristocracy. The primary forces of production include highly complex agriculture with the addition of non-human and non-animal power devices.

**Capitalism**

The introduction of the capitalist mode of production spans the period from Mercantilism to Imperialism and is usually associated with the emergence of modern industrial society. The primary form of property is the possession of objects and services through state guaranteed contract. The primary form of exploitation is wage labour. The ruling class is the bourgeoisie, which exploits the proletariat. Capitalism may produce one class (bourgeoisie) who possess the means of production for the whole of society and another class who possess only their own labour power, which they must sell in order to survive. The key forces of production include the overall system of modern production with its supporting structures of bureaucracy, and the modern state, and above all finance capital.
State capitalism and corporate capitalism, is a universal form encompassing all recent actually existing economic forms based on the nation state and global process of capital accumulation, whether avowedly capitalist or socialist, which was known only in its more or less pure capitalist forms in Marx and Engels time. Fredrick Engels hypothesized that state capitalism would emerge as the final form of capitalism before the contradictions reach a point where capitalism cannot sustain itself and socialism emerges as its successor.

**Class and Class Conflict**

For Marx, the analysis of social class, class structures and changes in those structures are key to understanding capitalism and other social systems or modes of production. In the *Communist Manifesto* Marx and Engels comment that the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles. Analysis of class divisions and struggles is especially important in developing an understanding of the nature of capitalism. For Marx, classes are defined and structured by the relations concerning (i) work and labour and (ii) ownership or possession of property and the means of production. These economic factors more fully govern social relationships in capitalism than they did in earlier societies. The main classes in capitalism are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat.

However, other classes such as landlords, petty bourgeoisie, peasants, and lumpenproletariat also exist, but are not primary in terms of the dynamics of capitalism. A. Bourgeoisie. The bourgeoisie or capitalists are the owners of capital, purchasing and exploiting labour power, using the surplus value from employment of this labour power to accumulate or expand their capital. It is the ownership of capital and its use to exploit labour and expand capital are important here. By employing workers, industrial capital created the surplus value that could take on the various forms such as profit, interest and rent. b. Proletariat. The proletariat are owners of labour power and mere owners of labour power, with no other resources than the ability to work with their hands, bodies, and minds. Since these workers have no property, in order to survive and obtain an income for themselves and their families, they must find employment work for an employer. This means working for a capitalist-employer in an exploitative social relationship. This exploitative work relationship recreates or reproduces itself continually. If the capitalist-employer is to make profits and accumulate capital, wages must be kept low. This means the proletarian is exploited, with the surplus time worked by the worker creating surplus products. While the worker produces, the products created by this labour are taken by the capitalist and sold – thus producing surplus value or profit for the capitalist but poverty for workers. This occurs each day of labour process, preventing workers from gaining ownership of property and recreating the conditions for further exploitation.

The antagonistic and contradictory nature of this system is evident as capitalists attempting to reduce wages and make workers work more intensively, while workers have exactly the opposite set of interests. Work and the labour process in the capitalist mode of production are organized so that workers remain property less members of the proletariat. The surplus products and value created by workers turns into capital, which is accumulated. While the relationship between workers and capitalists or between labour and capital may appear to be no more than an economic relationship of equals meeting equals in the labour market, Marx shows how it is an
exploitative social relationship. Not only is it exploitative, it is contradictory, with the interests of the two partners in the relationship being directly opposed to each other. Although at the same time, the two opposed interests are also partners in the sense that both capital and labour are required in production and an exploitative relationship means an exploiter and someone being exploited.

This relationship is further contradictory in that it is not just two sets of interests, but there is no resolution of the capital-labour contradiction within the organization of capitalism as a system. The contradictory relationship has class conflict built into it, and leads to periodic bursts of strikes, crises, political struggles, and ultimately to the overthrow of bourgeois rule by the proletariat. Class conflict of this sort results in historical change and is the motive force in the history of capitalism. In Marx’s view, the dialectical nature of history is expressed in class struggle.

With the development of capitalism, the class struggle takes an acute form. Two basic classes, around which other less important classes are grouped, oppose each other in the capitalist system: the owners of the means of production, or bourgeoisie, and the workers, or proletariat. When people have become aware of their loss, of their alienation, as a universal nonhuman situation, it will be possible for them to proceed to a radical transformation of their situation by a revolution. This revolution will be the prelude to the establishment of communism. It is important to recognize that Marx viewed the structure of society in relation to its major classes, and the struggle between them as the engine of change in this structure.

The key to understanding Marx is his class definition. A class is defined by the ownership of property. Such ownership vests a person with the power to exclude others from the property and to use it for personal purposes. In relation to property there are three great classes of society: the bourgeoisie- who own the means of production such as machinery and factory buildings, and whose source of income is profit, landowners- whose income is rent and the proletariat- who own their labor and sell it for a wage. Class thus is determined by property, not by income or status. These are determined by distribution and consumption, which itself ultimately reflects the production and power relations of classes. The social conditions of bourgeoisie production are defined by bourgeois property. Class is therefore a theoretical and formal relationship among individuals. The force transforming latent class membership into a struggle of classes is class interest. Out of similar class situations, individuals come to act similarly. They develop a mutual dependence, a community, a shared interest interrelated with a common income of profit or of wages. From this common interest classes are formed, and for Marx, individuals form classes to the extent that their interests engage them in a struggle with the opposite class.

At first, the interests associated with land ownership and rent are different from those of the bourgeoisie. But as society matures, capital and land ownership merge, as do the interests of landowners and bourgeoisie. Finally the relation of production, the natural opposition between proletariat and bourgeoisie, determines all other activities.
As Marx saw the development of class conflict, the struggle between classes was initially confined to individual factories. Eventually, given the maturing of capitalism, the growing disparity between life conditions of bourgeoisie and proletariat, and the increasing homogenization within each class, individual struggles become generalized to coalitions across factories. Increasingly class conflict is manifested at the societal level. Class consciousness is increased, common interests and policies are organized, and the use of and struggle for political power occurs. Classes become political forces.

The distribution of political power is determined by power over production. Capital confers political power, which the bourgeois class uses to legitimatize and protect their property and consequent social relations. Class relations are political, and in the mature capitalist society, the state's business is that of the bourgeoisie. Moreover, the intellectual basis of state rule, the ideas justifying the use of state power and its distribution, are those of the ruling class. The intellectual social culture is merely a superstructure resting on the relation of production, on ownership of the means of production.

Finally, the division between classes will widen and the condition of the exploited worker will deteriorate so badly that social structure collapses: the class struggle is transformed into a proletarian revolution. The workers' triumph will eliminate the basis of class division in property. Through public ownership of the means of production. With the basis of classes thus wiped away, a classless society will ensue and since political power to protect the bourgeoisie against the workers is unnecessary, political authority and the state will wither away.

**MAX WEBER**

Max Weber is probably the best-known and most influential figure in Sociological theory. Weber’s work is so varied and subject to so many interpretations that it has influenced a wide array of sociological theories. He entered the field of sociology through law and remained as one among the great Sociologists of the 20th century. Weber in his life earned varied experiences as a soldier, a professor, a politician, a legal expert, as a historian as an economist and also as a Sociologist. Weber is prolific writer whose work covers general philosophy, economics, comparative history, religious, law, bureaucracy stratification and so on. Weber also wrote about the cultures and religion of India, China and South East Asia. He was particularly interested in comparing western culture and society with the values of the Eastern cultures of India, China and Southern Asia.

Ideal type

To Max Weber, the term ‘ideal type’ has a distinctive meaning and there are certain underlying principles pertaining to its construction. Weber used ideal type in a specific sense. To him ideal type is a mental construct, like a model, for the scrutiny and systematic characterization of a concrete situation. Indeed, he used ideal type as a methodological tool to understand and analysis social reality.

Methodology is the conceptual and logical research procedure by which knowledge is developed. Historically much of the methodological concern in the social sciences has been directed towards establishing their scientific credentials. Max Weber was particularly concerned with the problem of objectivity in social sciences. Hence he used ideal type as a methodological tool that looks at reality objectively. It scrutinises, classifies, systematises and defines social reality without subjective bias. The ideal has nothing to do with values, its function as a research tool, is for classification and comparison. In other words, ideal types are concepts formulated on the basis of facts collected carefully and analytically for empirical research in this sense; ideal types are constructs or concepts which are used as methodological devices or tools in our understanding and analysis of any social problem.

Weber used ideal types in three distinctive ways. Indeed, his three kinds of ideal types are distinguished by three levels of abstraction. The first kind of ideal types are rooted in the historical particularities viz., Western city, the Protestant Ethics etc. In reality, this kind of ideal types refer to the phenomena that appear only in the specific historical periods and in particular cultural areas. The second kind relates to the abstract elements of social reality, for example, the concepts of bureaucracy or feudalism. These elements of social reality are found in a variety of historical and cultural contexts. The third kind of ideal type relates to the reconstruction of a particular kind of behaviour.

Social action

Weber’s idea of sociology was based on his conception of social action. The aim of social science is to arrive at a rational understanding of human action. According to Max Weber sociology is science which attempts the interpretative understanding of social action in order to arrive at a causal explanation of its cause and effects.

Weber has talked about four type’s social action. These are rational action with reference to goals, rational action with reference to values, traditional action, affective action; these are classified according to their modes of orientation. Rational action with reference to goals in classified in terms of the conditions or means for the successful attainment of the actors own rationality chosen ends. Rational action with is classified in terms of rational orientation to an absolute value, that is, action which is directed to overriding ideals of duty, honor or devotion to a cause. Traditional action types are classified as one which is under the influence of long practice, customs and habits. Affective action is classified in terms of affectal orientation, especially emotional, determined by the specific states of feeling of the actor.
Rationalisation

Rationalisation as an ideal type and as an historical force appears in much of Weber’s writings. He regards the development of rational forms to be one of the most important characteristics of the development of Western society and capitalism. Weber viewed traditional and charismatic forms as irrational, or at least non-rational. The latter may rely on religion, magic, or the supernatural as a way of explaining the social world and authority may also derive from these. These may have no systematic form of development, but may rely on personal insight, revelation, emotions and feelings, features that are non-rational in form.

Types of Rationality

In his writings, Weber used rationality in various ways. Four of the meanings of rationality are as follows:

1. **Practical rationality** involves the individual who considers ends, and on some systematic basis decide what is the best means or course of action to pursue in order to achieve these ends. This form of rationality can considered to be pragmatic in that it provides individuals with a way of pursuing practical ends.

2. **Theoretical rationality** abstract concepts form as essential part of logical reasoning or theoretical models. These attempts to describe, explain, or understand the world in terms of models that are constructed from observation and reasoning. These forms of rationality need not be associated with social action but are more a part of logical structures and theory.

3. **Substantive rationality** individuals might consider a range or possible values or actions, and attempting to make them consistent. Weber termed this substantive rationality and considered it problematic in modern society in that rationalization of social life makes it difficult for people to pursue particular values. For example, pursuit of family or religious values may be difficult in modern society, given economic pressures and dominance of bureaucratic organizations.

4. **Formal rationality** is a broader form of rationality that characterizes organizations, especially bureaucratic ones. This leads to “universally applied rules, laws and regulations that characterize formal rationality in the West particularly in the economic, legal, and scientific institutions, as well as in the bureaucratic form of domination”. Rational-legal forms or authority such as the contemporary legal and judicial systems are examples of formal rationality.

Weber’s fear was that formal rationality was becoming more dominant in modern, western society, with substantive rationality declining in importance. Weber notes that formal rationality developed as capitalistic forms of organizations emerged and its expansion is associated with the development of formal organizations and methods. This formal rationality and the organizational features associated with them, tend to crowd out other forms of rationality and limit the possibilities of creative social action.

Religion and economy

Weber was interested primarily in the systems of ideas of the world’s religions, in the “spirit” of capitalism and in rationalization as a modern system of norms and values. Much of
Weber’s historical, comparative work is focusing on the influence of religious believes on action. He was also interested in the structures of the societies in which they exist that serve to faultier or impede rationalization and the structural aspects of capitalism and rest of the modern world. Weber’s masterly work “the protestant Ethic and the spirit of capitalism (1977)” he observed a close connection between religious and economic forces. His concept of religion is more ethical than theological. Weber wanted to examine its influence on the life of people. He traced the impact of acetic Protestantism-primary Calvinism- on the rise of the spirit of capitalism. Weber undertook a massive study of the major world religions and the societies in which they were found and concluded that the answer lay in specific religious beliefs say, Calvinism and other forms of Puritanism.

Weber pointed out that modern capitalism requires rational, calculated procedures in a methodical attempt to accumulate money and it should reinvested to earn yet more capital. Modern capitalism emerged by the religious ethic of Protestantism and particularly of Calvinism. Weber observed that capitalism was growing very fast in the west. He felt that capitalism of the western type was growing more in protestant society than in others. Unlike other forms of economy for capitalism to work, capital has to be accumulated; not to be consumed, but to be reinvested in the pursuit of ever more efficient and profitable, techniques of production. The more wealth is made and the more successful the capable enterprise is, the more resources an available to improve the efficiency of production. Work is therefore an end in itself; profit to be reinvested is virtuous and brings its own reward. Weber established a correlation between a religious way of thinking in the world and an attitude towards economic activity. Weber argued other religious did not provide the same insensitive for this kind of social and economic change. Weber undertook a massive study of the major world religious systems (for example Catholicism, Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism, Islamism) that inhibit the growth of a rational economic system. Weber’s thoughts on rationalisation and various other issues are illustrated in his work on the relationship between religion and capitalism.

**Power and Authority**

In ordinary usage, the term ‘power’ means strength or the capacity to control. Sociologists describe it as the ability of an individual or group to fulfill its desires and implement its decisions and ideas. It involves the ability to influence and or control the behaviour of others even against their will. For Max Weber, power is an aspect of social relationship. It refers to the possibility of imposing on will upon the behavior of another person. Power is present in social interactions and creates situations of inequality since the one who has power imposes it on others. The impact of power varies from situation to situation. On the one hand, it depends on the capacity of the powerful individual to exercise power. On the other hand it depends upon the extent to which it is opposed or resisted by others. Weber says that power can be exercised in all walks of life. It is not restricted to a battle field, or to politics. It is to be observed in the market place, on the lecture platform, at a social gathering, in sports discussions and even through charity. Weber discuss two contrasting sources of power, (1) power which derived from a constellation of interests that develop in a formally free market, (2) one established system of authority that allocates the right to common and duty to obey.
Authority

To understand the various aspects of authority max Weber constructed. Its ideal types in terms of three types of authority. These are traditional, rational and charismatic. Traditional authority is based upon the belief in the sanctity of age old customs and rules. Rational authority is maintained by laws, decrees, regulation. Charismatic authority is characterized by exceptional virtue possessed by or attributed to the leader by those who follow him, have confidence in him and are devoted to him.

Bureaucracy

Weber pointed out that bureaucracy was the best administrative form for the rational or efficient pursuit of organizational goals (a) high degree of specialisation and clearly defined division of labor, with tasks distributed as of fiscal duties (b) hierarchical structure of authority with clearly circumscribed areas of command and responsibility, (c) establishment of a formal body of rules to govern the operation of the organisation and administration based on written documents, (d) impersonal relationships between organisational members and the clients (e) recruitment of personal based on ability and technological knowledge, (f) long term employment, promotion on the basis of seniority and merit, (h) fixed salary and separation of private and official income.

Comparison of Karl Marx and Max Weber

In many respects, the writings of Karl Marx are a logical outgrowth of the period in which he lived. The course of European thought during his lifetime was subject to a variety of currents, and it was from this very diversity that Marx was able to build his own system. What he approved of in the works of his predecessors and contemporaries, he incorporated; what he disapproved of, he rejected. From German philosophy he adopted the dialectic, but he stigmatized the metaphysical formulations in which Hegel had first cast it. From France Marx first learned about socialism, but after doing so he destroyed its previous proponents polemically for their Utopian and escapist mentalities. From the English political economists Marx gleaned a composite picture of the abuses inherent in the capitalist mode of accumulation and production, and he rejected any notion that mere reforms might ameliorate the abuses. But Marx passed beyond simply abstracting facts from others; he brought a new insight to bear on the pressing questions of his age.

A fundamental difference between the orientations of Marx and Weber that helps reveal the nature of their thought is that Marx concerned himself with discovering the patterns of uniformities that underlie every period of history. Weber, for his part, viewed European capitalism as the culmination of European history considered as a single civilization. In this sense, every period in European history is important for its uniqueness (which in turn provides insight into the uniqueness of capitalist civilization) rather than for its regularity (which causes difficulty when trying to explain the difference of other civilizations, e.g Chinese culture). Both systems of historical conceptualization, however have gained utility in the comparative study of government and politics.
Module-III


**SYSTEM ANALYSIS**

The genesis of system analysis can be traced back to the writings of Ludwig Von Betrallanfy a biologist in the 1920’s. After the second world war that a good number of writers in various disciplines began to write about the need for the unification of science. In 1952 a group, holding a meeting in university of Chicago, which reflected multi disciplinary concerns and consisted of scholars from history, political science, economics, sociology, psychology, social psychology, anthropology, mathematical biology and medicine, started discussion with a view to finding out how the study of political science could be made scientific.

The most prominent among these are a number of systemic approaches which stem from the general system theory. The system theory had its origin in the natural sciences but generally speaking, the theory originated in movements aimed at the unification of science and scientific analysis. The proponents of the theory sought to find unifying elements which would offer a broader perspective for creative analysis. In the period after the Second World War, this crystallized around the concept of systems, which Von Betrallanfy, the German biologist, defined as a set of “elements standing in interaction”. This concept is based on the idea that objects or elements within a group are in some way related to one another and in turn, interact with one another on the basis of certain identifiable processes. The term “system” is useful for organizing ones knowledge about many social objects and the use of the system approach to politics allows one to see the subjects in such a way that “each part of the political canvas does not stand alone but is related to each other parts”, or that “operation of the one parts cannot be fully understood without references to the way in which the whole itself operates”.

Political and social thinkers have often proclaimed a certain conception of system to explain the phenomena of politics. Marx classified societies into system on the basis of their mode of production as feudal, bourgeois and proletarian; Weber divided societies into systems of authority: traditional, charismatic and rational -legal. Unlike Marx, who thought that system change was dialectical, Weber believed that it was evolutionary. Classical writers viewed monarchies, aristocracies and democracies as political system, Almond classified political systems into primitivistic, transitional and modern. Coleman spoke of competitive, semi-competitive and authoritarian systems and later divided them into dictatorial, oligarchical and representational systems. Eisenstadt suggested a long list of primitive, patrimonial, feudal, bureaucratic, democratic, autocratic, totalitarian and underdeveloped systems. Edward Shills classifies modern systems into political democracies, titular democracies, modernising oligarchies, totalitarian oligarchies and traditional oligarchies. Classifications of systems reveal a variety of interpretations. The emergence of many new nations, the amassing of new data and technological advances has increased the complexity of this subject. Many social scientists now use system as the basic concept of their political analysis. Different systems, such as political, economic, social, and cultural-psychological. The analyst abstracts from the whole society some
elements which are more coherent and call them a system. Conceptually measurable amounts are called variables, constant elements are termed parameters. The variables of a political system may consist of structures, functions, roles, actors’ values, norms, goals, inputs, outputs, response and feedback. These terms will be explained below as we analyze the concept of political system.

**Genesis and orientations of the systems' approach**

The genesis of the Systems approach can be traced to several, different sciences. Lilienfeld has mentioned in this connection the fields of biology, cybernetics and operations research. This approach is also indebted to anthropology, economics and sociology. Ludwig Von Burtalanffy and others founded the Society for General Systems Research and also a journal Behavioural Science. They said that the goal of the Systems theory was the cybernetics integration of “the various sciences, natural and social". Norbert Weiner believed that his concept of cybernetic control through feedback could be a model for legitimizing governmental operations in a political system. Operations Research applied the Systems approach to the use of radar installations during the Second World War. It was used to forecast military outcomes on the basis of strategy, tactics and the design of weapons. Later, in times of peace, operations research becomes synonymous with systems analysis in natural and social sciences.

Among the social sciences, economics was first to make contributions to systems theory. Economic techniques and computer simulation were used along with input-output analysis to analyse relation among various segments of an economic system. Input-output analysis is generally static in nature. In Political Science, it is generally used in qualitative assessments of a system.

Game theory has been used in political analysis of electoral strategies and external relations of political systems. Political scientists have used it in the testing and implementation of the rational choice this theory assumes that individuals tend to use actions that bring them the best results.

Sociology also alludes to "ways of guiding human thinking in systematic fashion." We often refer to the "Planning-Programming-Budgeting System" used by the American government. David Singer distinguished between two different orientations consisting of (i) systems analysis and (ii) general systems. In his view, systems analysis suffers from abstraction and lacks a dynamic and historical perspective. He opted for the phrase, general systems, which should study regularities in various systems. P.G. Casanova suggested a somewhat similar distinction. The first type was represented by Talcott Parsons and is rooted in 19 century positivist theories. The second type is called systems analysis, which stresses on the decision-making and has benefited from mathematical applications and operations research. Casanova studied the history of changes in modern systems. His emphasis on history and policy-oriented research enabled him to put forward a radical reinterpretation of both systems - analysis and functionalism.

Ronald Chilcote has identified three principal trends in the literature of Systems Theory: One trend, sometimes called Grand Theory, is non-historical in orientation. It grew from the natural sciences. It culminated in the writings of David Easton. The impact of Easton was wide-ranging and had a profound impact on both comparative and international politics; Karl Deutsch, Morton Kaplan, and Herbert Spiro were deeply influenced by him.
Another trend, known as structural-functionalism, tries to be holistic but drifts towards a non historical and middle-range analysis. It has grown from two academic traditions. In the first tradition, we can place the works of Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown, and Talcott Parsons. In the second traditions, we can refer to the works of Arthur Bentley and David Truman. Both these traditions have converged in the contributions of Gabriel Almond, whose structural-functional approach made great impact on comparative politics.

A third trend is a radical and Marxist critique and reinterpretation of Systems Theory. It raises substantive issues of public policy and argues that the study of political system must investigate them in order to make our knowledge socially relevant and meaningful. In addition, "the radical re-interpretation recasts system in terms of state and looks to the theories of the capitalist state."

DAVID EASTON: GENERAL SYSTEMS THEORY

Karl Mannheim offered "systematic sociology" in his study of society. Following him, Charles Merriam wrote about “systematic politics”. This search for a systematic interpretation of society and polity was continued by David Easton in his application of general Systems Theory to the study of political systems. The following discussion will include, first, a statement of Easton conceptual framework; second, influences shaping approach; third, application of his ideas; and lastly, a critique of Easton methodology.

Easton Conceptual Framework

Easton conceptual framework evolved in three phases. The first phase is represented by the Political System published in 1953. The second and third phases are represented by ‘A Framework of Political Analysis’ and a ‘System Analysis of Political Life’, both published in 1965, one after another.

His conceptual framework was based on four assumptions:

i) The empirical search for knowledge requires the construction of systematic theory i.e the highest order of generalisation.

ii) Political scientists must view the political system as a whole rather than concentrate on solutions for particular problems. They must combine factual knowledge and empirical data.

iii) Research on the political system draws from psychological data and situational data both by personalities and motivations of the participants and the influences emanating from the natural and social environment.

iv) Political life is generally in a condition of disequilibrium, a counter-tendency to equilibrium, which is never realised in practice.

Easton rejected the concept of the state by referring to confusion and variety of its meanings. He regarded power as a significant concept which shapes and carries out authoritative-politics in society. It rests on the ability to influence actions of others. A policy, therefore, "consists of a web of decisions and actions that allocate values."
The concepts of power, authority, decision-making and policy are important in Easton concept of political life as the authoritative allocations of values for a society. He identified the following Attributes of political system:

1) Units and boundaries
2) Inputs and outputs
3) Differentiations within a system and
4) Integration within a system.

**INPUT OUTPUT ANALYSIS**

David Easton “is the first major political scientist who has developed a systematic framework on the basis of systems analysis approach for the study of politics instead of merely adapting it from anthropology or sociology”. He has selected political system as the basic unit of analysis and concentrated on the intra-system behaviour of various systems as principal areas of social science research and investigation. He has defined political system as ‘a set of interactions’ and politics as ‘making authoritative allocation of values’. He has been exploring the utility of the system as the major unit, focusing on political life as a system of behaviour operating within and responding to its environment as it makes binding allocation of values.

Easton’s treatment of political systems as both open and adaptive and his primary emphasis on the nature of the exchanges and transactions that take place between a political system and its environment, naturally, bring in the concepts of systemic boundaries and boundary conditions. But a political scientist has to concentrate mainly on the processing and converting of a variety of influences- what Easton calls, “the life process of political systems”.

David Easton’s system analysis is also known as input-output analysis or conversion process. The input-output analysis of Easton has three main variables in the form of demands, supports and feedbacks. The most important feature of input-output analysis is, the conversion of the inputs into output by the system. For him political system absorbs the inputs in the form of demands on authorities and supports from institutions and the political community and produces outputs in the form of policies and decisions.

Easton’s concept of political life is that of a “system of behaviour embedded in an environment to the influences of which the political system itself is exposed and in turn reacts”. This means that outside and beyond the political system there are other systems and environments-physical, biological, social, psychological, etc. Easton defines a political system as “that system of inter-actions in any society through which binding or authoritative allocations are made and implemented”. As such, it is the making of binding or authoritative allocations which distinguishes the political system from other systems both within and outside the over-all society that from the environment of the political system. Easton has taken note of what he calls Para-political systems- internal political systems of groups and organizations- but he concentrates his analyses on the “political system” dealing with political life in the most inclusive unit. The society, though the methodology would according to Easton, be as applicable to the study of Para-political systems at the national level. Input-output analysis therefore, systematizes the study of relationships between system and its total environment.
The environment in which a political system operates may be put into two parts: (i) intra-societal, i.e., one consisting of systems in a given society other than the political, and (ii) extra-societal or the one including all those systems that lie outside they give society itself. Intra-societal systems include sets of behaviour, attitudes and ideas like the economy, culture, social structures and personalities, the extra-societal systems are functional components of an international society, a ‘super system’ of which any single society is a part. It is these two classes of systems—the intra-societal and the extra-societal—that comprise the total environment of political system and it “is from these sources that these influences arise that are of consequences for possible stress on the political systems”.

Easton divides the basic components of his model of the political system into ‘inputs’ consisting of ‘demands’ and ‘supports’ and ‘output’s’ connected by ‘feedback’.

**Environment**

**Inputs**

Inputs which give the political system its dynamic character and furnish it both with the raw material or information that the system called upon to process and the energy to keep are of two kinds—demands and supports.

**Demand**

Easton defines demand “as an expression of opinion that an authoritative allocation with regard to particular subject matter should or should not be made by those responsible for doing so”. It means that the people as ‘actors’ make demands upon their political system that sub serve their specific interests. The demand may be following four types:

i. Demands for allocation of goods and services such as wage, educational opportunities, housing and medical facilities etc.

ii. Demands for regulation of behaviour such as control over markets; provision for public safety; rules relating to marriage, health and sanitation etc.

iii. Demands for participation in the political system such as right to seek election, to hold office to organize processions, to petitions public officials etc., and
iv. Demands for communication and information such as communication of policy intent from political elites or display of the power of the political system in period of threats or on ceremonial occasions.

There are several major types of stress inherit in the demand segment of the political cycle. Thus the political system undergoes ‘demand stresses’. Sometimes, the weight of the stress is considerably enhanced either on account of quantitative excesses what Easton calls ‘volume stress’ or due to the burden of qualitative elements what he terms ‘content stresses’. However, both situations create what he designates the ‘overload’. The function of the structures of the political system thus becomes to convert these demands, correctly stated as ‘inputs’, into authoritative decisions, correctly stated as ‘outputs’. Thus, there occurs the conversion process in which some demands are fulfilled, some are weeded out also. Since the political system has to operate in a way that its stability is maintained, it becomes essential that there should be four regulatory mechanisms. First, there should be structural mechanisms ‘to play the role of ‘gatekeepers’. It means that certain structures of the political system should look towards the regulation of demands making their weight on the makers of the decisions. Second, there should be ‘cultural mechanisms’ in the shape of firm beliefs and attitudes of the people in their political system in order to establish influential criteria of appropriateness for the articulation of demands. Third, there should be ‘communication mechanisms’ in order to keen the ‘actors’ informed of the decisions of their ‘rulers’ and of the latter about the nature and intensity of the demands made by their peoples. Finally there should process of ‘reduction mechanisms’ having specific procedures for the collection and combination of compatible demands, intra-system gate keeping procedures, and the requirement that general demands be converted into specific issues for purposes of political processing.

Supports

Supports are those structures or process which gives the political system the capacity to cope with the demands made upon it. Support means giving obedience and showing loyalty to a political system. It refers to expression of willingness to accept particular value allocation or the process by which allocations are made. In other words it refers to remaining input transaction between system and its environment after demands have been subtracted. Support may be classified as overt support and covert support. Overt support refers to actions that are clearly and manifestly supportive while covert support refers to supportive attitude or sentiments. A political system receives considerable support from the environment without which it cannot survive. Supports are of the following four types:

i. Material supports, such as the payment of taxes or other levies, and the provisions of services such as labour on public works or military service;

ii. Obedience to laws and regulations;

iii. Participatory support, such as voting, political discussion, and other forms of political activities;

iv. Attention paid to governmental communication and manifestation of deference or respect to public authority, symbols and ceremonials.
Out puts of the political system

A political system, therefore, maintains itself partly through its own regulatory mechanisms and partly through the support, specific as well as defused, which it can generate the society. The main test of its effectiveness lies in what it does for society. Here comes in Easton’s concept of outputs. An output of a political system is a political decision or policy. Easton points out that out puts “not only help to influence events in the broader society of which the system is a part, but also, in doing so, they help to determine each succeeding round of inputs that finds its way into the political system”.

Feedback

Easton tells us that the out puts of a political system are the authoritative decisions and actions of the system’s leaders that bear on the allocation of values for it. These out puts not only help to influence events in the broader society of which the system is a part, but also in doing so, they help to determine each succeeding round of inputs that finds its way into the political system. There is a feedback loop, the identification which helps us to explain the process through which the system may cope with the stress. Though it, the system may take the advantage of what has been happening by trying to adjust its feature behaviour. The idea of feedback means that if the actions of the authorities are taken to satisfy demands or create conditions that will do so, information must be fed back, at least those authorities, about the effects of each round out puts. Without information feedback about what is happening in the system, the authorities would have operated in the dark. Easton, further, says that the feedback loop itself has a number of parts worthy of detailed investigation. It consists of production outputs by the authorities a response by the members of the society to these out puts, the communication of information about the responses to authorities and, finally, possible succeeding actions by the authorities. Thereby a new round of out puts, response, information-feed back, and reaction by the authorities is set in the motion, forming a seamless web of activities. What happens in this feedback thus has a profound influence on the capacity of the system cope with stress and persist.

Criticisms

However, David Easton’s model of input output analysis has been subjected to following criticisms:

1. It is said to be too abstract and too far from empirical reality. His analysis confine to the question of location and distribution of power in the political system. But its capacity to deal with a wide variety of political phenomena is severely restricted. Oran Young, thus, rightly points out that “system approach does not have much to offer for studies dealing with the political aspects of such matters as perception, expectation, formation or cognition”. Even Eugene Meehan points out that “Like Parson, Easton does not think of a theory in terms of explanation but in terms of the creation of conceptual framework. The result is highly abstract structure that is logically suspected, conceptually fuzzy and empirically almost useless”.

2. Easton’s Input-Output analysis attaches importance to the questions concerning persistence and adaptation of the political system and the regulation of the stress, stability and systems equilibrium, it has also charged from time to time with harboring a status quo bias.
3. Moreover, Easton’s Output analysis contains comparatively little material concerning goals and values beyond the question of persistence.
4. Young points out that Easton’s “Input-Output analysis, has little to say about the politics of decline disruption and breakdown in political system”.
5. As Easton’s Input-Output analysis is concerned with the present and has no perspective of future and no sound study of the past, it is called as anti-historical. It has, therefore, completely ignorant of the complexities of social conflicts and class relationship.

**EVOLUTION OF STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONAL APPROACH**

Structural Functional approach is a form of systemic analysis which looks at political system as a coherent whole which influences and is in influenced by their environments. A political system is held together by the presence of legitimate force throughout the system. It has three characteristics: comprehensiveness, independence and existence of boundaries. The interactions that take place within a system are not between individuals but between the roles which these individuals adopt. Lastly, the political system is an open system and is involved in communications with systems, beyond its boundaries.

**Gabriel Almond’s Conceptual Framework**

Gabriel Almond's conceptual framework evolved through three phases. He wrote an article in 1956 in which he said that system is an "inclusive concept which covers all of the patterned actions relevant to the making decisions." For him, system was more important than process because system implied totality, interactions among units within the totality and stability in these interactions, which he described as "changing equilibrium".

Almond relied upon Max and Talcott Parsons in the political system's actions and turned to concepts like structure and role replacing the legal vocabulary of institution, group or organisation. Lastly, he introduced the concept of political culture which is embedded in a particular pattern of orientations to political action. These patterns generally extend beyond the boundaries of the political system.

In 1958 and 1959, Almond and his colleagues at Princeton University focused on the politics of developing countries. They applied their concepts of structures and functions to changes taking place in these developing countries avoiding the examination constitutions and formal government institutions. Later Almond and Coleman edited and published a book entitled Politics of Areas on this subject.

Almond and his collaborators introduced new concepts of comparative politics. The concept of political system replaced the state and its legal apparatus. Structure replaced institution; role took the place of substituted for power. Almond suggested that all political systems have four characteristics:

Almond and his collaborators introduced new concepts of comparative politics. The concept of political system replaced the state and its legal apparatus. Structure replaced institution; role took the place of substituted for power.
Almond suggested that all political systems have four characteristics:

i) All political systems have structures.

ii) The same political functions are performed in all political systems.

iii) All political structures are multifunctional.

iv) All political systems are mixed in the cultural sense.

Almond then outlined his own functional categories classifying them into inputs and outputs:

**Input functions:**

*Political socialization and recruitment*

The function of political socialisation and recruitment are performed usually by the political structure, political parties. The child is socialized by the political parties, educational institution, family, organizations, etc. And they are recruited directly to the political parties by its senior members. These two are the primary input functions performed by the structures.

*Interest articulation*

Interest articulation means the identification and coordination of different interests of the people by interest groups or pressure groups. Based on these interests later the demands are prepared by them for its implementation. Caste, educational, business, farmers, laborer’s interest groups perform their role in society to bring out their interests.

*Interest aggregation*

After interest articulation, the necessary demands from the groups were communicated to the political parties for its aggregation. This process is called as lobbying. The political parties then accept or reject the various demands and formulate it in the form of a proposal for law.

*Political communication*

The final input function is political communication. In this function the aggregated demands or interests are communicated to the political system by the political parties for it acceptance. Usually the people’s representatives in the legislature, who are the members of different political parties, perform these functions. The political parties have the responsibility to inform the public about respective legislative proposals and they work as the channel of communication. After political communication, the output structures start to carry out their functions.

**Output Functions**

*Rule making*

Rule making is the primary output functions performed by the political structure, legislature. After the political communication the political system receives necessary demands from the environment or society, and starts the conversion process, i.e., the transformation of different demands into formal rules and regulations.
Rule application

The function of implementation of the rules is done by the executive wing of the government or political system, the other political structure. Through its various Ministries and departments the executive enforce the laws prepared from the legislature.

Rule adjudication

Rule adjudication is the final output function performed by the judiciary. The laws once implemented by the executive went to the hands of judiciary for interpretation. Judiciary interprets and judges in all cases reached before it.

The outputs are functions and correspond to the traditional legislative, executive and judicial functions. They show a bias towards American and European conceptions of government showing traditional orientation of comparative politics. Almond, however, argued that input functions are crucial in characterizing the political systems of developing countries.

These input functions constitute the ingredients of the system: who recognises, deliberates and resolves problems and issues. Spiro called this a process of flow "and interpreted it as consisting of demands and supports for action. Almond says that political socialisation takes place through the family, school, church, trade union, party and even government agencies. It also involves recruitment of people from different social groups into political parties, civil service etc.

Interest articulation is the expression of political interests and demands for action. Interest aggregation is the combining of those interests and demands which are articulated by interest groups and political parties. Political communication helps all these political functions. Political socialisation, recruitment, articulation and aggregation occur through communication.

Gabriel Almond says that political culture is dualistic, not monistic. Political systems may be represented as modern and traditional, developed and underdeveloped, industrial and agrarian. Political systems have evolved through stages of development. Structures become more differentiated as systems reach higher stages of growth. Almond divided them into primitive, traditional, transitional and modern systems.

Less developed systems display 'traditional' styles of diffuseness, particularism, and ascriptiveness. The more developed systems display 'rational' styles of specificity, universalism, achievement and affective neutrality. Yet this process of modernisation is never complete. Almond called his theory as theory suggesting "that political systems may be compared in terms of the probabilities in performance of specified functions by the specified structures”.

Almond's framework was further elaborated in the third phase when he, in collaboration with Powell, published Comparative Politics - A Developmental Approach in 1966. He now put forward the concept of conversion processes, which allow for the transformation of the demands and supports that flow into the political system. Out of that system flows extraction, regulation and distribution into society.

He argued that his conception of political system deals with interdependence which does not mean harmony. He claimed that his theory was dynamic as it conceived of "developmental patterns". He connected his framework of system with his concept of political development.
A second level consists of capability functions: regulation, extraction, distribution, and symbolic response. These activities relate to the environment. Almond said that in democratic systems, "outputs of regulation, extraction and distribution are more affected by inputs of demands from groups" and these systems therefore have "a higher responsive capability." Totalitarian systems are less responsive to demands, regulate behavior through coercion, and extract maximum resources their people. Symbolic capability relates to the symbol flow from a particular into the informational environment i.e. its image in the community of nations.

A third level of functions is related to maintenance and adaptation of political system. They include political and recruitment. According to Almond, a theory of the political system can be based on the understanding the relations among these three levels and the relations of the functions at each level.

In 1969, Almond reviewed his conceptual framework and proposed a research design "intended to draw us a little closer to a systematic exploitation of historical experience using a causal scheme which combines system-functional analysis, aggregate quantitative analysis and rational choice analysis at appropriate points in the explanation of developmental episodes." This approach retained his structural-functional formulation but combined it with other approaches to make it empirically more fruitful.

**Shaping Almond's Approach**

The influences that shaped Almond's approach are similar to those which influenced System analysis. His perspectives also emanated from the works of Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski and the writings of Parsons and Easton. Because of Almond's concern with the whole system, it can be called a pattern of macro-structural functionalism. Another influence on Almond's thought relates to the traditions of pluralism and liberalism exemplified by the works of Arthur Bentley, David Truman and Robert Dahl. Because of its concern with a plurality of interests within the system, it may be called a pattern of micro-structural functionalism.

Although Almond restated Parsonian concept of functionalism, two aspects of Parsons' scheme have influenced Almond's own formulation. Those are the theories of action and social system. Besides, like Parsons, Almond was also interested in the topics of personality and culture. Almond used the concept of "pattern variables" proposed by Parsons. These were Affectivity vs. Affective Neutrality (2) Self-orientation vs. collectivity orientation,(3)Universalism vs. Particularism, (4) Achievement vs. Ascription,(5)Specificity vs. Diffuseness. Almond used them to relate political culture to political system.

The idea of interaction and equilibrium was inherent in the middle-range theory of Almond's structural functionalism; the association of pluralistic process and equilibrium was proposed early in Arthur Bentley's Process of Government and restated in David Truman's work in the Governmental Process. Almond assimilated pluralist theory into an explicitly functionalist framework. This reduced Almond's approach to the status of partisan apologists, an ideological interpretation of Western liberal political system.
Criticism

Almond's structural functionalism has been criticized on three grounds: (1) Conservative Ideology; (2) Conceptual Confusion; and (3) Operational Limitations.

1. Conservative Ideology

Critics have found that structural functionalism is based on a deterministic, conservative and restrictive ideology. Don Martindale pointed out four defects of functionalism: the conservative ideological bias and preference for status quo; a lack of methodological clarity; an overemphasis on the role of closed systems in social life, and failure to deal with social change.

C. Wright Mills criticized the conservative bias in the writings of the advocates of functionalism, which was a grand theory that neither related to facts nor reached a level of theory. Barrington Moore, Alf Dahrendorf and Andrew Hacker also criticized its conservative bias. Spiro considered Almond's work as ethnocentric and Lijphart considered its emphasis on stability as reflecting Anglo-American liberal, capitalist norms. Sanford made a similar charge against Almond.

Other critics accuse functionalists of "a liberal bias" who believe that any interference with freedom of the market-place leads to inefficiency and limits on the system's natural benefits. Charles Powell saw in Almond's methodology a reflection of "American cultural mythology". His interest group approach was based on "classless view of a society stratified by religious and ethnic distinctions...the state withers away as a nonpartisan reference....into a framework of functionalist conflict resolution." He concluded that Almond's structural functionalism is "establishmentarian, non-operational, formally inadequate......the pluralistic neutralism of structural-functionalism.....renders it useless as a theory."

2. Conceptual Confusion

J.C.Jurcie argued that "functionalism is limited by its lack of explanatory power, its satisfactoriness in explanation and the constricting effect of its assumptions, about the nature and working of social systems." Groth's criticism of Almond's theory had three points against it: ambiguity in terminology, difficulties in determining political relationships, and confusion in the use of facts and values. Malamson and Kind also criticized his obsession with empirical detail detached from theory and obscurity of his languages.

Mackenzie thought structural functionalism as a mere jargon which mystified truth. He said, "Almond's terms are in one sense no better than the old terms because they offer no better definitions." S.E. Finer said about the vocabulary of Almond's political system: "What Almond has to say could have been said without using this system approach and it would have been said more clearly." Finer hated the use of "modish" concepts. He thought that Almond's conception of "political" was misconceived and that his notion of system, with its inputs and outputs was "otiose and confusing".

Hempel argued that functionalism is illogical, Sherman Roy Krupp thought that it has tendency to exaggerate the cohesiveness of systems and to obscure goals resulting in vague description and lack of analysis.
3. Operational Limitations

Structural functionalism has a methodology where ideal situations are often confused with the observed situations of systems. Terry N. Clark complained about the structural functional overemphasis of institutionalised political behaviour. Other critics said that "structural functionalists have not taken the enormously step of refining, operationalising and testing hypotheses." They attributed these failings to the limitations of the writers, early stage in the evolution of the theory and the deficiencies of functionalism itself.

According to Holt and Turner, Almond viewed the modern system are structurally differentiated and secular but they found limitations with this formulation. They said “it is difficult to apply on a broad basis to include both historical and contemporary cases. The formulation also tends in effect to equate the modern political system with modern Anglo-American democratic system. Its definitions employ too many dimensions, and it neglects the problem of variation in the societal functions of government."

They gave an example, According to Almond; there was no modern system in the Soviet Union. Its structure lacked differentiation and autonomy. Thus it was, in Almond's view, traditional. Holt and Turner refuted this description by referring to the variety of interests that were expressed, particularly during the post-Stalin period. Almond's categories become too rigid and specific cases do not relate to his conceptual scheme. Other critics, however, suggest that functional theory, if handled with care, could produce empirically testable hypotheses and prove useful in research.

COMMUNICATION APPROACH

The communication analysis is chiefly attributed to the formulation of Karl Deutsch. He developed the communication framework for political analysis in his book ‘Nerves of Government’. Like Easton, he also believed that the differences between the behaviour of living things and that of social organisations have greatly narrowed down because of the new development in the communication science. Both of them regarded communication or cybernetics models as contributing to a linking of science of living things to self-regulating machines and social systems. All these systems involved can be seen as network of inter-connected parts, the patterns of the network being, in fact, patterns of information flows.

The concepts which Karl Deutch use to describe political phenomena are drawn cybernetics- a new science dealing with control of information flows or a theory of information, self-regulating system, and the physiology of the nervous system originally formulated by the Harvard Scientist Nobert Weiner. Communications or cybernetics analysis is therefore, concerned with certain kinds of apparatus are maintained through feedback devices by which the entropy of a system is counter-acted by returning some of output into input.

The communication approach looks at the task of government and politics as process of steering and co-coordinating human efforts towards the attainment of some set of goals. Within this framework the basic mechanism through which these processes manifest themselves is the decision. The communication approach is more interested in process of making decisions as contrasted with the actual consequences of the decisions. The communication or cybernetics approach focuses on decision-making as process rather than on the results of decisions.
The communication theory has two types of concepts: (a) Concepts relating to operating structures, and (b) Concepts focusing on various flows and processes.

**Concepts Relating to Operating Structures**

First Deutsch tries to evolve a model of the way in which the operating systems, which deal and receive (or in take) information from the environments-domestic as well as foreign (or external). The notion of reception covers several functions. In addition to the simple intake-like scanning operations, selection of information, data processing etc., and most systems develop a set o fairly specific operating rules for processing the flow of incoming information. Within the decision making apparatus, information is handled and acted upon by structures representing memory, value complexes and actual decision making centers. Memory relates incoming information to relevant past experiences concerning both processes and consequences. Value complexes perform the normative task relating possibilities to preferences. Finally, there are structures that operate to implement completed decisions and to face information concerning performances back into the apparatus as a new or fresh input. This is how the entire systemic process is started all over again.

**Concepts focusing on various flows and processes**

The second category of concepts concern with flows and processes. It is a communication network and consists of a patterned set of information flows which involve several kinds of other concepts, particularly channels, loads, load capacity. Out of them, load capacity is determined by the number and type of channel available for information flow. Load relates to the overall intake of information at any given time. Deutsch mentions a number of other factors to which load capacity is very intimately related. These are responsiveness, fidelity, background, noise and distortion. If the apparatus is capable of handling incoming information with deftness, it can be considered as responsive. The notion of fidelity, refers to the accuracy with which information is transmitted the various process of perception, selection and handling.

He further holds that the communication system is capable of associating, locating and bringing forward past experiences that are relevant to the analysis of the incoming information. This is the notion of recall. In other words the term recall means the ability of the communication system to associate, locate, and bring forth past experience that is relevant to the analysis of incoming information. Moreover, the capacity of the system to deal with a wide range of information inputs in such a way as to make and implement decisions with positive consequences for the attainment of goals, has been termed as ‘combinatorial capacity’. In other words combinational capacity is a measure of ability to deal with a wide range of information decisions with positive consequences for the attainment of the goals of a political system.

**Feedback mechanism—such as negative feedback; load; lag; gain and lead**

A key concept which, according to Deutsch, distinguishes his approach from the equilibrium approach is that of “feedback”. The term ‘feedback’ is a communication network that produces action in response to an input of information; and includes the results of its own action in the information by which it modifies its subsequent behavior. The feedback mechanism allows the organization to change its state if necessary in reaction to information. But equilibrium
systems simply react in such a manner as to attempt to return to its original state. The feedback concept has therefore introduced the element of dynamism in communication analysis. Deutsch also introduces sub-concepts of the feedback concept such as negative feedback concept has therefore introduced the element of dynamism in communication analysis. Negative feedback refers to process through which information about the consequences of decisions and implementing action is put back into the system. In other words “negative feedback is one which transmits back to itself information which is the result of decisions and actions taken by the system and which leads the system to change its behavior in pursuit of the goals which it has set itself”. Load, as already pointed out refers to the total amount of information which a system may possess at a particular time. It also indicates to the extensiveness of the systems activities in relation to the capacity of the channels of communication. Lag refers to the amount of delay which the system experiences between reporting the consequences of decisions and acting on the information received. In other words it refers to slowness in the response of the system to information regarding the consequences of decisions and actions, assuming that it has reached the system in time and good shape. Lead, on the other hand, illustrates the extent to which a system has the capacity to enact to predictions about the future consequences of decisions and actions. The interaction of these variables determines the consequences of the feedback processes.

Deutch also introduces the concepts of learning, innovation, growth and self-transformation. Learning is ability the of the political system to adopts its modes of action in response to the information it receives through bringing about necessary changes and readjustments in the elements of its internal structure and process. A political system goes through the process of innovation, growth and self-transformation when it moves beyond mere adaption to drastic change. It may lead not only to change in its goals, structure or process –which may be described as adaptive changes-but to changes of a fundamental nature, growth in completely new direction and even to complete transformation, the last one involving changes of such a fundamental and far reaching character as to bring about qualitative transformation in the functioning of the political system. Self-transformation, “thus, is the ability to generate sustaining process of change internally and is also doing ultimately to produce qualitative changes”.

**Criticism of communication theory**

Karl Deutsch’s communication analysis has been criticized on several grounds. The main points of the criticism are as under:

- Communication analysis has attached for greater importance to the era of pattern maintenance i.e. stability and equilibrium. But in matter of revolutionary change, this approach does not very far.

- It is far too mechanistic in nature and has tried to give an essentially engineering orientation to human behavior. It appears that something bodily has been lifted from the field of engineering to that of the social science, which is not conducive for the study of human behavior.

- In communication analysis there is not only the difficulty of applying models picked up from engineering to political science but in addition, the ‘models-building does not serve the purpose for which it is being increasingly used in social sciences. Models are built in simple terms. But in case of Deutsch, the model itself has becomes so complex that instead of helping in the understanding of the phenomena, it has a tendency of confusing it.
Moreover, the terms which have been used for the study of communication models have been lifted from engineering but have not been clarified. In fact, it is alleged that these have been carelessly used.

Deutsch’s model however, raises a number of interesting questions about the performance of governments but offers very little help in answering them.

Communication analysis of Deutsch lays more stress on decision-making processes rather than studying the consequences of those decisions.

Critics point out that this analysis provides excellent tools for studying information itself, but the study of politics is very complicated affairs and these tools help only in locating power in political system and do not in any way assist in studying the behaviour of various elite groups in handling the power.

GAME THEORY

Game theory of Political science adopted and inspired by mathematic ideology, which is dominating the more scientific-minded among the modern political scientists is the game theory. It defined as “a body of thought dealing with rational decision strategies in situations of conflict and competition, when each participant or player seeks to maximize gains and minimize losses”, game theory believes in applying mathematical models to political studies.

Another important theory is Game theory—which is dominating the more scientific—minded among the modern political scientists is the game theory, or theory of games. The game theory believes in applying mathematical model to political studies. Originally it developed in 1920s by Emil Borel, it was regarded as an interesting intellectual exercise till John Von Neuman, a mathematician developed it as an attempt to deal with the classic problem of defining the behavior of the economic man, or the “rational” actor. The theory, however, has been used more in the field of coalition behavior, judicial behavior, and conflict situation in international politics, where its main advocates are Morton A. Kaplan, William H. Riker, and Thomas C. Schelling.

Game theory is based on certain assumptions. Firstly, it assumes that the decision makers are perfectly rational. Secondly, the game, theory is not interested in man’s ethics but only situation ethics’. In other words, the player is interested in nothing but the outcome of the choice. Game theory has very limited relevance in contemporary political science as the sovereign nations do not strictly follow the rules and regulations.

The theory of games, or game theory, as it popularly called, owes its genesis to parlour games, like chess, chicken, poker or bridge, with obvious elements of conflict, decision-making and cooperation, played between two or more players, where the decision of each player are contingent upon the decisions of others, and the central point, therefore, is the inter-dependence among the decisions of the different players participating in the game. In a situation of this kind, where each player is interested in “winning” the game and two or more individuals have to make choice and have preferences, regarding the outcomes of these choices, it is necessary that they have some knowledge of the choices available to and made by, each other and of the preferences the other players have in their choices.
Game theory, therefore, becomes the “formal study of the rational, consistent expectations that participant can have about each other’s choices. A mathematical model for the study of some aspects of conscious decision-making in situation involving the possibilities of conflict and or cooperation”, writes Shubik, “it deals with processes in which the individual decision-unit has only partial control over the strategic factors effecting its environment”. The analogy between games and the use of game theory in social sciences lies in the fact that the game is usually well-defined, it has as explicit and efficient set of ruler, the information available to the players is specified at every point, and the scoring system is complete.

In the Game theory players are supposed to be engaged in choosing alternatives, here and now, which, in their view, they would be required to use in some conceived future state of affairs. These future states of affairs are described as the outcomes in a game. An outcome is usually the relationship between the players and the prize or the objective they aim at. In certain games, like chess, there can be only three possible outcomes- namely, win, lose or draw, but in other games there could be a very much larger number of outcomes. The full range of possible outcomes could be defined as prospects. The prospect of each game has a specific outlook or reward for each player. This is described as game theory as a pay-off. In chess the big pay-off is winning. The game theorist tries to analyses the strategies by which players may maximize their pay-off, that is, get as close as possible to their first preference outcomes.

Strategy is the core concept of the theory of games. It assumes rationally in the behavior of the players. The assumption behind the game theory, however, is that the player is not only thoroughly rational but completely self aware about the priorities among his purposes and has complete knowledge about the strategies available to him in pursuit of the pay-off formation or ranking of preferences. In the words of Ralph M. Goldman, strategy is an overall programme of action which a player adopts in order to achieve a desired outcome or series of outcomes under adverse or a conflict conditions”, and consist of “all the deferent contingent plans that the player has for deciding along the way how to act next.

There is, in fact, not one but several types of game theory, there could be (1) Zero-sum two person games (2) Non-aero-sum games (3) zero-sum-n-person games (4) Non zero- sum-n-person games.

Zero-sum two person games it involves, there are only two players, and the gains of one are always equal to the loss of the other. The sum of outcomes for the two players being zero. The second and third involving two persons or more persons in the contest, the players must share the division of the awards in some way, and the gain of one need not be equal to the loss of other. Such a structure will require that the pay-off is divisible and some principle of distribution is applied. In fourth, where there are three or more players, the game situation develops a large number of new features, and it becomes possible for two or more of the players to cooperate against the others by pooling their resources and making collective decisions during the play.

The game theory, we have to start with a clear distinction between its two parts. Firstly, there is the formal mathematical apparatus, which is wholly abstract, symbolic, and without any necessary relationship whatever to the empirical world. Secondly, there is the “theory” part,
which consist of the rules of correspondence that link the elements of the formal model to certain empirical phenomena. Every turn used in the discussion and every general statement or theorem has, thus, two distinct meanings- (a) within the framework of the formal apparatus, (b) within the empirical framework to which the formal model is applied. The general principle to be observed in the application of the game theory is that one should always begin with the formal model and then try to determine the precise meaning of terms within the framework supplied by the model.

**Game theory: An Assessment**

Game theory is based on certain assumptions, which may need a close scrutiny; through as applied by its leading advocates it has undergone certain changes. But the assumptions are so much of an in–built feature of the theory that it would be difficult to get away completely from them. Joseph Fletcher, the game theory is not interested in a man’s ethics but only what he calls ‘situation ethics’. The player is concerned with outcomes and not with intermediate processes, with the strategy his partner is likely to choose and not why he chooses that particular strategy.

There is the difficulty of identifying the field to which the theory is related. Whenever we talk of the economic theory or the statistical theory or the decision-making theory, we make a distinction between the theory and its field, namely economics, statistics or decision-making. But it is not clear as to which field the game theory can be referred to at the theoretical frontier.
Module-IV

Conceptual and Distributive Analysis: Power, Authority and influence-The problem of Value-Fact Dichotomy

Modern citizens follow orders and laws come from the authority not merely due to command or force but willing allegiance. When there is deficit in willing allegiance, it leads to legitimacy crisis and breakdown of political obligation. Authority is a form of power, which has a legitimate claim to exercise power. Power is legitimate when it has willing obedience from the citizens. Power without willing obedience is a brute force and can be sustained only through coercive means. According to Green, then ‘will, not force is the basis of the state’ and force cannot sustain power of the state for long. Thus it appears that power must be legitimate and more so in a democratic set-up. It accepted that power, legitimacy and authority bear relationship with each other.

POWER

Power is one of the most thoroughly discussed concepts in political Science. Power in ordinary usage is understood as an ability, strength, or capacity. In social and political theory, however, power refers to the ability to do things and the capacity to produce effects within social interaction. In this sense, power is a type of behavior and specifically derives from the existence of social relationship and organized social interactions.

Politics is inseparable from power. Catlin regards political science as the ‘science of power’. Russell has also regarded that ‘the fundamental concept in social science is ‘power’. For Morgenthau, politics is nothing but ‘the struggle for and use of power.’

The concept of power and its importance is not new. Socrates, Plato, and other political philosophers have written a lot on it. Most of them have been normative thinkers. Aristotle, Hobbes, Machiavelli and others have seen it from a realistic angle. While Treitschke has studied it from historical angle, Nietzsche analysed it on philosophical basis. Merriam, Catlin, Russell, Dahl have confined themselves to domestic aspects. In the field international theory. Catlin, Lasswell, Dahl, Shills an others are democrats. But German thinkers like Carl Lowenstein, Clausewitz, Heinemann, Vernon Van Dyke, Kaplan and others are interested in conducting academic analysis of power.

Power: nature, scope and forms

Power is normally understood as the possession of control, authority, or influence over others, a relationship in which an individual or a group is able to exert influence over the minds and actions of others. According to Arnold Wolfers, power is the ability “to move others or to get them to do what one wants them to do and not to do, what one does not want them to do.” Authority is closely connected with power. It might take various forms such as political, economic and ideological. One might say that concepts like morality, ethics, religion, customs and traditions may operate as limitation on power. Politics as ‘authoritative allocation of values’ is deeply interlinked with power and authority.
All politics is about power. The practice of politics is often portrayed as little more than the exercise of power and the academic subject is, in essence, the study of power. Without doubt, students of politics are students of power: they seek to know who has it, how it is used and on what basis it is exercised. Such concerns are particularly apparent in deep and recurrent disagreements about the distribution of power within modern society. Is power distributed widely and evenly dispersed, or is it concentrated in the hands of the few, a ‘power elite’ or ‘ruling class’ are powers essentially benign, enabling people to achieve their collective goals, or is it a form of oppression or domination. Such questions are, discussed within Political Science theory, because power is so central to the understanding of politics, fierce controversy has surrounded its meaning. Some have gone as far as to suggest that there is no single, agreed concept of power but rather a number of competing concepts or theories.

The phenomenon of power can be seen from two angles (a) broader, and (b) narrower. Machivelli, Hobbes, Graham Walls, German thinkers, the ancient Indian school of ‘Danda’ etc belong to broader view of power. They regarded power as an independent variable or element of political life. The narrower view demonstrates popular approval and commonsense. Accordingly, it is related with severe sanctions and is coercive by nature. It is often identified with violence, fear, terror, force, coercion.

Most of the researchers who analyse the concept of power often start with two propositions: that in any polity some people have more powers than others and that power is an object of desire, a ‘utility’. Power is understandably associated with honour, deference, respect and dignity. One has, of course, to distinguish the power of the man from the power of the office that guarantees authority and legitimacy. Power is social and relational. It is sociological in its origin-always attached to a person, group, or an association. Power is because of prevailing values, interaction patterns, and procedures or modes of attaining them. One can have power over others in particular areas, that too in varying degrees, and intensity.

Power in a broader and empirical sense, includes both coercive and non-coercive power. It directly involves persons, groups, organisations, and systems. A person or political system operates on various forms of power. Power is the latent capacity to apply force. It is not expressed or made visible. Force, authority, domination, etc. Are its expressed forms. They are action aspects of power. Force is employment of sanctions whereas authority is the institutionalized right to employ power. Power has two main forms: coercive and non-coercive. Coercive power is mainly related with force. Influence is non-coercive power which is mainly related with force. Influence is non –coercive power. Influence does not require coercive power, as in the case of Christ, Budha and Gandhi. Power as force may dispense with influence, as was done by Chengiz Khan, Adolf Hitler and others. But Napoleon, Lincoln, Nehru, and Indira Gandhi were persons of both power and influence.

Power can be formal or informal. Formal power is known as authority. Power is transformed into authority through the formal organisation of human associations. The right to use force is attached to hierarchical status in the organisations. Power is formally allocated not to persons but to positions or states by specified norms, rules and laws. Power, thus, is
institutionalised as a authority which can be exercised by any man occupying that position. As there are informal organisations and groups, informal power and informal authority which can be exercised by any man occupying that position. As there are informal organisation and groups, informal power and informal authority also exist. Power remains uninstitutionalised in formal organisations. It does not take the form of authority. However authority itself cannot exist without the immediate support of power and the ultimate sanction of force.

Max Weber defined a political system as ‘a human community that (successful) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory’. Lasswell and Kaplan use the word ‘power’ and attach it with severe deprivations. Almond combines concepts of Weber, Parsons, and Easton. He defines a political system as ‘that system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which performs the functions of integration and adaptation by means of the employment, or threat of employment or more or less, legitimate physical compulsion’.

**Characteristics of power**

Power has its own features and characteristics. It is something which cannot be measured because it is usually exercised behind the back. Though there may be legal sanctions behind the power, yet on the whole it is not exercised without extra legal sanctions.

Political power is something which is not absolute but relative. It is relative in the sense that it can be exercised in relation to something. In other words, there must be people who should respect power. In case there is none to obey it, it is all immaterial whether power exists or not.

Still another feature of political power is that it cannot be imaginary and unrelated to situations. Political power is given to the elites or legislators only in the hope that they will meet their unmet hopes and aspirations. In every society people have certain hopes which they feel only few can meet if they are given some power. It is in the hope of quick and satisfactory meeting of these aspirations that the power is extended and accepted.

Power is related both to circumstances as well as position. Power of a person holding a particular position may be accepted hinder certain circumstances. But the same may not be accepted when the circumstances have changed. Even if the circumstances do not change, if position of the person continued to be accepted as long as circumstances and the position person do not change.

Power is related to use as well. There may be power but that will have no meaning unless its use is effectively made. In other words power will rust, if it’s no use is made. The President of India and President of the USA both have constitutional powers. In fact, in the eyes of law the former does not use these and nobody cares for his legal and constitution powers. On the other hand the latter’s powers are always seriously and carefully studied all over the world because these are used in actual practice.
Methods of exercising power

It is always difficult to acquire power but still more difficult it is to properly exercise that. It is only judicious exercise of power which can bring honour and dignity to its holder. Non judicious use of power can result in rebellions and expression of resentment in several ways and also at the same time indicates weakness of the system as a whole.

First and simplest method of using power is that of persuasion for doing something desired to be done. In this method there is no use of force but only those of the arguments, removing misunderstanding, defining terms and phrases which have ambiguity and thus international affairs... In the national field government uses this method for satisfying agitators, demonstrators, trade unions and others. In the international field small nations try to persuade big ones of their needs and the latter of their approach to international problems for getting their support on international forums and in international bodies and organisations.

Another method of using power is that of rewards. The peoples and the nations affected know it fully well that power has capacity and position to give rewards, if its view point is accepted. Joining of military bloc or siding with a super power in the teeth of opposition by the other superpower is only in the hope of receiving rewards. Such a reward can be in the form of military aid and assistance e.g., weapons, ammunition, training facilities, providing naval and air bases, etc. Again it can be economic reward. It can be in the shape and form of giving monetary help, food supplies, medicines, technical knowhow, loans and gifts. The rewards can be both in the forms of assistance as well as loan and both on short- and long-term basis. Repayments, if any, can also be on short –or long-term basis.’

Then ‘power’ can be used as a method of punishment as well. It is called negative use of power. It is usually used by the state to check anti social and anti-national activities of the people. But in both the cases use of power comes under severe criticism by the opposition parties or groups. As already stated, in fact use of negative power is linked with weakness of the state. If reward is denied that also means punishment and negative use of power. Similarly if an enemy state is militarily so equipped that becomes a threat to the security of any other state, for the state so treated that is punishment and thus negative power.

Both in the national and international affairs, every civilized state ensures that negative Power is used only after due waning to the party concerned. It is believed that in some cases even the very threat of punishment may serve the purpose for which power is proposed to be used. Similarly it is also ensured that negative power is so used that if, need arises that can immediately be withdrawn and evil effects of its use can be reduced to the extent possible.

Last method of use of ‘power’ is that of use of force. When all other methods have failed to serve that purpose the people or group or individual which has been vested with power uses that and enforces its will with the help of force. Actual use of threatened punishment is called force. In its naked and brute form force finds expression in the shape of war. But it is avoided because the horrors of war are most heart rendering these days.

AUTHORITY

Although politics is traditionally concerned with the exercise of power, it is often more narrowly interested in the phenomenon called ‘authority’, and especially ‘political authority’. In its broadest sense, authority is a form of power; it is a means through which one person can
influence the behavior of another. Power and authority are distinguished from one another as contrasting means through which compliance or obedience is achieved. Whereas power can be defined as the ability to influence the behavior of another, authority can be understood as the right to do so. Power brings about compliance through persuasion, pressure, threats, coercion or violence. Authority, on the other hand, is based upon a perceived ‘right to rule’ and brings about compliance through a moral obligation on the part of the ruled to obey. A very different notion of authority has, however, been employed by modern sociologists.

Authority emphasizes the relationship between ‘command and obedience’. In clearly defined social settings. Social conditions which fulfill this condition are institutionalized and legitimate. Authority is a transitive relationship of power, since commands are given with the expectation that they will be carried out. Moreover, authority also rests on intransitive power, since it can only take place in a ‘common space of action’ in which the relationship of command and obedience is fundamentally accepted. Hence authority as institutionalized power requires legitimating.

Power is the ability to employ force or sanctions but not its actual employment. Authority is ‘the institutionalized right to employ power. Authority is also regarded with deep suspicion, even open hostility. It can be threat to an individual as it calls for unquestioning obedience.

In the absence of acceptance, cooperation, willingness and ideological similarity, Authority becomes nominal or formal. It is more real authority; the subordinates tend to make room in their mind for receiving the orders of communication from their superiors, and comply with them without arguing and opposition.

Authority is accepted not because it has been given by superior authorities, but on the basis of the consent of the subordinates, who often accept orders considering them right and proper. Authority of the superior person is accepted only when he issues orders in the aforesaid manner. Its basis is not sanctions, but rightness rather similarity of the goals, values and existing between them. It is direct and institutionalized right to influence the behavior of the subordinates.

Authority is exercised almost mechanically within the network of clearly defined hierarchical roles: parent-child, teacher-pupil, and employer-employee. Authority relations are institutionalized. Duties and obligations are clearly demarcated. Behavior under them is reasonably predictable.

Three characteristics of authority need to be noted:

1. Power may be a foundation of authority: power may be a foundation of authority, but authority dies not rely upon the foundation of coercion. Authority can rest on pure voluntarism too or partial voluntarism in which the coerciveness of A lurks in the background, often prominently, but not directly used.

2. Authority involves a unique type of no coercive command: Although the claim to authority may be justified by appeals to divine right, tradition, popular support, etc. A’s authoritative commands do not themselves need to justified. Hence a peter argues that authoritative commands differ from ‘moral or scientific’ commands. This characteristic highlights the important role of justifications-and even their absence-in identifying sources and patterns of authority in contemporary world politics.
3. Authority is never absolute: The strength of authority is measured by the maximum divergence between A’s commands and B’s preferences that will lead B to voluntarily. At the same time, authority is never without limit. There is always some command that A could issue that B would defy.

There are two major approaches to the interpretation of authority

The first is the ‘broad and elastic’ approach, wherein authority is perceived as any system of power or social control that is regarded as legitimate by those involved in the process. In this case, a particular type of ‘attitude’ exists among those regarding the nature of authority to which they are subject to. In this sense, authority can be constructed as a universal phenomenon, coextensive with organized society and encompassing radically divergent types of relationships. Max Webber’s classification of authority perhaps reflects this framework.

The second approach, by contrast, is widely recognized in western legal and political philosophy, especially with regard to the theories of the modern state. The nature of authority defines the specific nature of the relationship between the ‘ruler’ and ‘ruled’, and tends to disentangle the other relationship with which it tends to get confused. Such an approach is particularly reflected in the oft-quoted statement of Hanna Ardent, viz. ‘If authority is to be defined at all, it must be in contradistinction to both coercion by force and persuasion by argument.’ Talcot Parsons’ used the term ‘authority’ to cover only power relationships deemed ‘legitimate’. Such a link between authority and legitimacy is also reflected in the writings of Harold Lasswell. He perceived power as ‘participation in the making of decisions’.

Modern sociologists have approached the concept of authority from a different angle. The German sociologist, Max Weber, considers authority as a form of power, a ‘legitimate power’. He analyses it as a matter of people’s belief about its legitimacy. Although theoretically, the concepts of power and authority are treated as separate identities, empirically both tend to cross each other’s boundary. While some researchers have considered authority as an essential feature of order and stability, others have looked at it as a symbol of authoritarianism. Weber was concerned to explain why, and under what circumstances, people were prepared to accept the exercise of power as rightful or legitimate. In other words, he defined authority simply as a matter of people’s belief about its rightfullness, regardless of where that belief came from and whether or not it is morally justified. Weber’s approach treats authority as a form of power; authority is ‘legitimate power’, power cloaked in legitimacy. According to this view, a government that is obeyed can be said to exercise authority, even though that obedience may have been brought about by systematic indoctrination and propaganda.

Max Webber classifies his idea of Authority into three types. These are following: His idea are based on sources of legitimacy:

1. Traditional authority: Subjects or subordinates accept commands of their superiors on the basis of precedents, past history or divine origin such as hereditary or dynastic rule. Under this form of authority, delegation is ad hoc and arbitrary. Traditional authority is based on the belief that the society and its values are followed by age and experience.
2. Charismatic Authority: When the subordinates defer to the orders of their superior on the basis of his personal qualities and put themselves under their impact, charismatic authority occurs. A charismatic leader evokes in his followers a desire for sacrifice and devotion.
3. **Rational–legal authority:** under this form of authority, subordinates accept a rule or directive on the basis of its being in conformity with some higher universal principle which they regard as legitimate. Modern bureaucracy operates on this principle. Delegation is rational. It emanates from the political office held by an individual, where he is appointed through the prescribed procedure, such as merit based selection, and not from personal characteristics of the individual holding an office.

To Weber, these are ‘ideal types’ of authority which are essential for social analysis. Most societies according to him exhibit elements of all the three types, although any one of them is likely to be predominant at any particular point of time. In the United Kingdom for example, there is the existence of both rational-legal and traditional forms of authority. Weber argued that his classification of authority—even charismatic authority—was sociological rather than psychological. He also contended that there is no reason why traditional, charismatic and bureaucratic authority cannot be used to describe institutions and societies. Max Weber understands authority as the ‘institutionalised and legitimate exercise of power. To him, authority is based upon subjects’ ‘belief in legitimacy’. Hence he argued that ‘domination is the probability that a command with a specific content will be obeyed by a group of people’.

**AUTHORITY AND POWER**

Authority and power are related terms, but there is also a difference between the two. Bertrand Russell has defined power as the production of ‘intended effects’. In other words, power denotes the ability of a person to fulfill his desires or to achieve his objectives. It also defines, as the power of man over nature or material things, and the power of man over man. The basis of power is coercion; power is a quality of behaviour which seeks conforming acts of the others in spite of his opposition.

Authority consists of two important components: power and legitimacy. Authority is always clothed with legitimacy and thus assures compliance by others, non-compliance being visited by punishment. Therefore, authority must be contrasted with mere power. Authority is seen a legitimate means to secure compliance. It is different from a common aspect which may be backed up threat, coercion, bribery, persuasion, and so on. Power to be effective and stable must be accompanied by the capacity to secure willing obedience. Use of force or coercion or sanctions may be restored only when legitimacy fails to work. If we think power as a naked sword, authority may envisage as a sword in its scabbard. If power is based on fear or force, legitimacy is based on respect and willing compliance. Authority is therefore the most effective instrument of exercising powers in the administrative set up.

**Development of concept of authority**

The concept of authority has become a highly controversial aspect of political theory in contemporary international political system. The progressive growth of individual rights and liberties, the world-wide movement for human rights and the advance of a tolerant or permissive social ethics have encouraged social scientists to look at the concept of authority from a grassroots oriented human angle. This development in the field of social science has ensured a backlash that has encouraged the defenders of authority to highlight its importance.
Beginning from the social contract theories of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, there has been a spate of liberal literatures in the field of social science that provided a classic justification for authority. These liberal theories emphasised that in the absence of an established legal authority to ensure order and stability as well as to protect individual liberty and rights, there could be imbalance in the growth of social systems. To neutralize the authoritarian trends in society, these liberal thinkers suggested that authority could be constrained through legal rational forms of constitutional provisions as the very basis of authority arising from ‘below’, the consent of the governed.

The conservative thinker always supported idea of authority in terms of traditions, history, and experience. They perceived the society as a moral community and strongly advocated a strong government to ensure the enforcement of law and order. They advocated non-ideological and programmatic interactions between the state and the individual.

Since the 1970s, conservative doctrines have been facing strong challenges from the New Right. The supporters of the New Right believe in economic liberalism or neo-liberalism and social conservatism. Neo-liberalism is often considered a backlash of the policies of liberal, socialist and conservative governments of the twentieth century. It believes that the breakdown of social structures is a result of the growth of liberal and permissive values and is in favour of traditional values, social discipline and restoration of authority.

Conservative political philosophy has always been criticized for its support for elite groups and status quo in society. However, against this criticism, conservatives argue that as human beings are morally and intellectually imperfect, it is always preferable to depend on the wisdom of tradition, authority and a shared culture than to be obsessed with abstract principles of political theory. From their stand point, authority is an intrinsic link that ensures social cohesion and strengthens the structures of society.

The advocates of conservatism are Edmund Burke, Michael Oakeshott and Irving Kristol. The advocates of authority strongly plead that an erosion of authority would lead to authoritarianism and totalitarianism. Hannah Arendt argued that a strong traditional authority is indispensable for the growth of moral and social behaviour, and provides a sense of social identity. In her book, The Origins of Totalitarianism (1951), she suggested that the decline of traditional values and hierarchies was responsible for the advent of Nazism and Stalinism. All said and done, the concept of authority has not always been accepted without reservations by social scientists. It has been considered a threat to reason and critical understanding. Such apprehensions have been highlighted by psychological studies. William Reich (1897-1957) in his work, The Mass Psychology of Fascism (1935) presented the view that the damaging repression brought about by the domination of fathers in traditional authoritarian families could have been responsible for the origin of Fascism. Theodore Adorno and others in the book, The Authoritarian Personality (1950) claimed to have evidence that persons having strong deference for authority have fascist tendencies. This view has been further strengthened by the psychologist, Stanley Milgram (1974) in his studies on the behaviour of guards in Nazi concentration camps and the US military during the Vietnam War.
Role of Authority

No system of rule could survive long without exercising some measures of authority. To rule through power alone involves such a great expenditure of coercive resources as to be unsustainable. There are recurrent debates about the role of authority and its value. Liberals and socialists tends to view authority as instrumental, believing that it arises ‘from below’ through the consent of the governed from this perspective, authority is rational, purposeful and limited. This view reflects a preference for legal-rational authority and public accountability. Conservatives, on the other hand, see authority as arising from natural necessity, being exercised ‘from above’ by virtue of the unequal distribution of experience, social position and wisdom.

The justification for authority includes, most basically, that is essential for the maintenance of order and is the only means of escape from the barbarity and injustice of the ‘state of nature’: a society without political rule. Authority also establishes common norms and values that bind society together, and thereby gives individuals a social identity and sense of rootedness. Critics of Authority, including. Particularly, libertarians and anarchists, point out that authority is by definition the enemy of freedom. It threatens reason and critical understanding by demanding unquestioning obedience. It is psychologically, and perhaps morally, corrupting in that it accustoms people to controlling or dominating others. In the long run, they lose the sense of ‘freedom’.

INFLUENCE

Power is the capacity to produce intended behaviour. This capacity can be exercised on the basis of coercive or non-coercive sanctions. Force is based on coercive sanctions. Influence is related to non-coercive sanctions. Both are the two main forms of power. However, some regard power as a form of influence, and other treat influence as a power. They appear different when power is identified with force, and influence as unrelated to power. Influence and force, both are treated as variants of power.

Power and influence are independent variables. Influence is different from power in the sense that man voluntary submits to influence, where as power requires submission. Karl Marx and Gandhi had influence, not power. Influence in this sense does not require power. Power can exist without influence. In politics and political organizations both are found in a mixed form, as in actual practice influence also has power and vice versa, through consequences differ in nature and impact.

POWER AND INFLUENCE: DISSIMILARITIES

Here “power” has been used in a popular coercive sense. It is separate from power in general sense. Influence is non coercive power, mainly persuasive. Both can be distinguished in the following manner:

1. Power (as force) is coercive. It carries severe physical sanctions which can probably be applied in power-situations. Influence is psychological persuasive and voluntary. A person or group under influence always has alternatives while accepting a particular compliance.
2. ‘Power remains with the power–wielder in an independent manner and makes him autocratic and undemocratic, as it is exercised against the will or wishes of other person. In a way, the influencer plays a greater role than the influence. As it is accepted voluntarily, its legitimacy is implied and is totally democratic’.

3. ‘Power’ is based in fear of pain or deprivation. Influence comes out of similarities of values or ideological commonness. No need of force or coercion. Both are antithetical to each other.

4. ‘Power’ has quality of being definite. It is general by nature, in the sense whosoever holds it will be fearfully effective. Nevertheless, influence remains indefinite, fluid and fuzzy. It is interpersonal, and not-transferable.

As both can bring about change and control of human behavior, there are certain common features observable in them. Both become effective when they are legitimate. Gandhi, during freedom movement of India, Mujib during war of liberation in East Pakistan (Bangladesh) had greater effect in view of their influence over the masses then the adversaries on the basis of their power. During the middle ages, the Pope was more powerful than the Emperor.

**Role of influence in politics**

In democracies, influence has a greater role to play in ancient times, with limited functions; the state perhaps could do with small power, and through it had resorted to many other means to supplement its stock of power. Modern state with its ever increasing functions cannot confine itself within the boundaries of limited power. Therefore its politics relates to the phenomena of influence or non coercive power. International field, nations, and national politics, individuals, groups and parties remain engaged in spreading over their influence. As influence denotes a kind of ‘voluntarism’, it can be treated as ‘heart of democracy’. However, a minority or the elite can attain much influence in democracy, while the vast majority may remain dormant and without influence.

**Influence: nature, process and source**

Influence or enveloping power is a relation among individuals, groups, associations, organizations and states. Bachrach and Baratz explain, ‘one person has influence over other within a given scope to the extent that the first without resorting to either a tacit or an overt threat of service deprivation causes the second to change his course of action.

There are many sources through which influence emerges. Political influence depends upon the possessions of wealth, health, education, personal charm, etc. Apart from them, skill with which they are employed is also important. In political resources, Dhal includes money, information, food, trade of force, jobs alliances, social status, right to make and implement laws votes, etc. They are not available to all. Distributions of these resources follow the economics, social and political setup. Political influence is sought by the politically active. Some seek it for pleasure’s sake, while others treat it, as a means to determine or affect public policies. All are not equally skilful in making the use of their political resources.
Uneven distribution of influence

There are many reasons for the uneven control of political influence:

(a) Some acquire specialization in specific functions and have more information about a particular subject matter;
(b) Others inherit a lead or lag in their socio-biological attributes, physical strength, social status, political standing of their parents, forbearance etc.
(c) Variations in socio-biological inheritance together with their acquired experience produce differences in the incentives and goals of their work; and
(d) Variations mentioned above happen to create differences in values or resources. Everyone does not go to politics or becomes a political leader. Different persons seek different resources. Such variety is good for the health and life of a political system

Uneven distribution of their political influence which has an overall effect in the starting point mentioned earlier. Even political influence does not mean that there are permanent political elites or newer elites will not emerge. Older ones may disappear with the emergence of newer ones.

Measuring political influence

Everyone related with politics is interested in measuring his adversary’s political influence. Influence in politics largely depends on political sources and skill to use them. Political resources are a means by which one can influence the behavior of other persons. Dhal has suggested five ways of comparing influence. They can be taken as the basis of measuring influence:

(1) The amount or extent of change occurred in the position of the actor influenced;
(2) Subjective psychological costs of the influences while complying with an order or undergoing a hardship;
(3) The amount of difference in the probability of compliance, especially when the influencer puts the influences under his act of influence;
(4) Difference in the nature and extent of responses. Some may respond in all general matters while others may react to specific stimuli; and
(5) The number of persons responding to the situation, act, or influence.

These steps are not at all foolproof. In order to arrive at better and reliable results, one has to make use of maximum number of measures. Rowe opines that influence owing to secrecy and other factors can rarely be measured. It can only be approximately assessed in terms of (a) extent (b) certainty (c) fecundity. The last relates to the policy-sustain effects. He rightly observes that political influence is unevenly shared. It is a fact of life.

Actual and potential influence

It is always necessary to distinguish between the past and current influence of a particular actor under a given situation, and his probable or future influence. Both of them can be different from his maximum potential influence if he could make a bid to use all his existing political resources with utmost skill and wit. In politics we are mainly concerned with actual influence which should be constantly analyzed, measured and accounted for. Measurement of one’s potential influence is a luxury and can be undertaken in a leisurely manner, but it is a task not to be dropped altogether.
PROBLEM OF VALUE-FACT DICHOTOMY

The basic material of science is valid and reliable facts. Even in daily life, one remains interested in gathering facts, and associations, most of his opinion, judgments and acts, with them. In the absence of facts, one loses ground and often encounters disappointments and failures. In natural sciences, most of the facts are tangible, specific, uniform, empirical, and objective and measurable. In social sciences, facts are both tangible as well as intangible. The proportion of intangible or abstract facts is greater, such as, nation, state, caste, class, aggression etc. A fact is an empirical verifiable observation or a statement about it. Social facts are ‘physical, mental, or emotional occurrences or phenomenon, which can be affirmed with certainty and are accepted as true in a given world of discourse’. A social fact is a phase of behavior- thinking, feeling or acting which can be objectively observed. In the making up of a fact, we isolate certain limited aspects of the concrete process, activity, event, happenings or cluster of relations and interactions.

POLITICAL FACTS

Social facts are not so simple. People constantly remain curious about them- their exact nature, specifically or uniqueness, quantum, death, intensity, transistorizes, association with their facts. Facts are neither uniform nor universal. Persons concerned with the various aspects of a fact have varying perceptions and evaluate it in a manner different from others. In politics, the problem is much more difficult, for fact can have multiplying effects. In the political arena, everyone is running after actual facts. Political leaders like to know actual quantum of their popularity. Every super-power is spending millions of dollars to know everything about its rivals. The only way to come out of this impasse is to resort to scientific and empirical study of facts and facts. One great hurdle in the way of understanding facts is that of values. At this juncture, scientific values relativism comes to our rescue.

VALUES

The word ‘value’ is used in two but interrelated senses. In the first sense, it used by political actors for a desirable or undesirable things such as, democracy, justice, freedom, power etc. Easton mostly uses it in this sense. In the second sense, it is a criterion or basis of evaluation which an individual, groups or society uses it to accept or rejects some goals, means to achieve them, procedures, ideals, etc. In the later sense, values influence political behavior. As such, origin, relevance, and interrelation among various values must be studied and analysed. Various values when put together makeup the’ value system’. An individual carries them within himself either as a whole or in part. The value system can be consistent, cohesive, specific, latent or manifest. It can take the form of an ideology, policies, goals, laws, rules, ideas, and normal precepts. All of them can be directly stated as in a party manifesto. Otherwise, the values or the value system can be known by studying behavior patterns, value statements, culture- symbols or works, literary or artistic expression, institutional presentation, or language formulations. A value judgment involves a statement which connects a trans empirical value with an individual, thing or abstraction. As it is non-empirical, it cannot, therefore, be easily refuted by objective means. Most of the value judgments are formalized expressions of sentiments and emotions derived from culture and invoke men to action. One can also reach values through observation of actions or one’s culture leading to value judgments. Values are major determinants of human behavior. They become, thus, major areas of study for political science.
Normally, the term ‘value’ is used in the following sense;

1. All the economic or physical means helpful to achieve some immediate case or purpose. There are mostly called as instrumental values
2. Some express purpose or objective as aid to fulfill some other tacit or indirect purpose
3. Humans, things or tangible for which there is clash, conflict, rivalry or completion to own.
4. Pleasure- giving things activities, ideas, purposes, or desires expressed to have them.
5. Ultimate goals or ends which cannot be expressed through other aims, actions or purposes
6. Dispassionate actions involving no self-interest, such as making sacrifice for a general case.

It may here point out that all values do not influence an individual and group equally. The same value may have varying influence. There is lack of consequences among scholars about that place should be accorded to values. The problem is discussed below;

**Study of values**

Early behaviouralists, with a view to developing a ‘science of politics’ by adopting the scientific method, stood for a’ value-free’ political science. The traditionalists, on the other side, always talked of ubiquitous role of values and value preferences. They had them from religion, nation, philosophical meditation, axiomatic postulates, introspection, history, law and morality. The relationship of values with the individuals was based on faith, belief, confidence, intuition, superstition or ignorance. As such, few could claim to know them or understand their implications. The rules could easily sustain themselves in power in the name of those mystic ideas. Against them, there arouse a sharp reaction banishing all values from scientific studies. The latter group of behaviouralists tried to eliminate all emotional attitudes, particularistic fallacies, force, idols, bias and prejudice, ethnocentrism, vested interests, moral values and even ideas. They wanted to mould political science in the form of physics and chemistry.

**Value-neutralism**

Scholars belonging to this school of thought are also known as positivists, behaviouralists, factualists. They want to eliminate all values that are personal preferences from the study of political science. The value neutral political scientists want to study political events, activities, groups, and organization in the way scientists study natural facts. They want to give social phenomena a specific, continuous and discrete shape. While doing so, they keep their personal value consideration from the investigation. If human or social facts are treated in this objective manner, they hope, in due course of time, to develop a value free human science. According to logical positivists, there can be no last or ultimate values, as since can prove no values as the highest or ultimate. Scientific method requires that values should be kept apart, failing which no social science, including political science, can attain the status of ‘science’. A social scientist has to remain value- free and value-neutral. Objectivity is the basics of scientifcitivity.

**Consequences of value-neutralism**

Most of their values were almost identical, and form of consensus had emerged. As such, they did not have to face conflict over values. While adopting value-neutral stance, very few were aware that they themselves had been standing on the ground of certain values. In this sense value-neutrality became a part of their scientific method. But this closed approach has proved to be a grat tragedy of twentieth century. Some of the adverse consequences are enumerated bellow.
1. Social scientists, on account of their scientific method based on value-neutralism, became unable to judge a goal or purpose superior to some goal or purpose in absolute terms.
2. They could not speak on relative superiority of some values or purposes, used as means, in view of other ultimate values or purposes.
3. All social scientists started deflecting from making any evaluations or criticizing preferences in definite terms.
4. For all these spokesman of science, all values were equal, as they, like any other assumptions, were beyond the purview of scientific method. No value was final. All values were treated as impermanent, provisional, pre-scientific and relative.
5. As all social scientists kept away from value-laden politics, they started living in ivory towers. Their output, being value-neutral, had no use for practical politics. They could now live and survive in any kind of regime, democracy or dictatorship.

Thus all values were considered as dogma, ideology or myth, and put beyond the scope of science. The main problem was not the presence of several ideologies, but to maintain that no choice can be made with the help of scientific method among various ultimate values. Every value-free social scientist considered all values as relative and dispensable.

**Possibility of study of values**

Arnold Brecht has strongly advocated the need and possibility of the scientific study of values. Science is not in a position to point out the supremacy of specific ultimate values or throw light on the source of those values. But it can analyse their nature and scope. It can also be known empirically which values are mostly preferred by a particular set of people. Non-observability or unverifiability of ultimate values does not mean that all attempts to analyses are futile, or all values are equal. Scientific analysis of values opens many vistas: (i) we can know the exact and precise nature of our value judgments; (ii) we can analyses the consequences of those values and prepare a value scale; (iii) by separating facts and values, we can understand the related problems and their reactions and implications.

Such value analysis involves the theory of ‘scientific value relativism’ propounded by Brecht. It permits to study values and facts in relation to other values. Allotment of land by a government can be studied in relation to its value of equality. In fact, its enjoins a value-neutral position to the social scientist. While adopting it, the political scientist separates his own personal viewpoint of its underlying values.

In brief, analysis of values, ideas, and activities, by scientific methods is possible only with reference to ultimate values ideas expressed about those values. For example, voting for a person or party can be scientifically analyzed only when a scholar knows the ultimate values or ideas about the values of the voter. Science cannot ‘prove’ the ultimate, highest, absolute, or standards of value. The latter are a product of mind, will, faith, inhibition, instinct or ignorance which is beyond the empirical ‘eye’ of scientific method. But it can carefully their meaning, and analyses consequences and risks involved in their pursuance. Scientific value relativism is the logical implications of scientific method; they are the two sides of the same coin. But it consistently refuses to take a stand on the choice of ultimate values.
Scientific value relativism is ‘scientific’ because it is based on scientific methods. Regarding ‘values,’ it adopts ‘relativism’, which means the scholar studies the values or purposes of an individual or group, keeping either the latter’s ultimate values or some other given value system in view. The scholar or researcher, except in assumptions of scientific method, does not involve his own personal values or ideas. He can if he likes, do so, but clearly expresses his values ideas beforehand. In that case, the appears more as an ideologues than a scholar.

**Fact-theory continuum**

Like fact and values, theory and facts also have a closer relationship. As in case of values, facts are the basic raw material of theory. Kant’s famous usage may be rephrased as, ‘fact without theory is blind, and theory without fact is empty’. In fact, there exists a continuous relationship between fact and theory, popularly known as ‘theory-data-continuum’. If theory is vital to every scientific advancement, fact is the building blocks of every science. Both remain in constant interaction. Development in facts leads to developments in theory, and vice versa. Fact, as stated earlier, is a purposeful relevant observation. From the observation of similar facts, he goes to the foundation of concepts. A concept is a shorthand representation of a variety of facts. It is an abstraction formed by generalization from particulars. It is a generalized term for a class of objects. As such, it helps in classification and measurement of facts. As a set of directions, or abstractions of certain properties or relation, it directs the researcher to pick out a particular kind of experience.

In a scientific venture, facts, concepts, generalization, and theory should be based on empirical experience. When we go upward from fact to theory, we move from validity to generality. Both rarely go together. Theoretical movement takes us higher to generality of facts, but away from validity of observation. Theory simply means the putting up of the relevant facts under the umbrella of some relation, property or abstraction. This is done on the basis of actual observation of some facts which enables the researcher to include other unobserved facts.

**Policy analysis: fact, value and theory**

Facts, values and theory are closely interrelated in the study of research of politics. They all make up the structure of political or policy analysis which itself is built of behaviouralism, scientific method, and scientific value relativism. A dynamic theory is based on that structure. A political actor or scholar analyses political decisioning or policy-making in a scientific manner. Scientific method along with scientific value relativism can help the politicians and administrators in taking value-decisions based on relevant facts it can also enlighten them on the choice of ultimate values or higher policy mattes by analyzing their various facets, and implications for them and the milieu. The political theory guides a decision-maker, if the political actors seek its help in understanding the facts, and anticipating and controlling the coming events.

Political science as a discipline can now tell what type of political action can give greater guarantee for ensuing human welfare. A polity can realize what it wants, and escape from the results which it does not like. Scientific value relativism is in a position to expose the actual meaning and possible results hidden behind populist slogans and vaguely-written manifestos. It can make out where their consequences would lead a people. It can be regarded as a weapon
against harmful political ideologies and for the defense of human freedom and values. Scientific Value Relativism and Method (SVRM) does not prohibit any person or group to learn and adopt values from religion, nature, intuition, etc.

**Levels of methodology for the study of politics**

The dichotomy and separation between two types of methodologies (empirical and trans-empirical) have so far kept them a part, making each other’s findings somewhat baseless, false and even misleading. Both of them have been claiming to accomplish what they should not methodologically claim to do. One cannot see spiritual and mental phenomena without reference to concrete situations of human living and empirical realities exist without relation to human mind and spirit. To make out methodological horizons wider and the discipline more reality-oriented, it would be appropriate if the nomenclature ‘political science’ is abandoned in preference to ‘politicology’ or ‘polilogy’.

Political science as a discipline is intermeshed with all the four forms of reality. Study of politics should have means and methods to handle all these four levels of reality. Without applying methods appropriate to data, realistic knowledge cannot be generated. Various forms of political phenomena can be studied in the following manner:

At the first tangible level, like any other social science, it has also a number of empirical methods of study and research. Politics is a worldly activity. It would make use of them.

At the second level of mental and emotional phenomena, there are methods of psychiatry, linguistic and content analysis, experiments, black box techniques and the like. At the fourth and final level, there are abstract phenomena like spirit, faith, feelings, emotions, and other mental categories such as memory, habit, commitment, allegiance and sacrifice.
ELITE THEORIES (Pareto, Mosca, Michael)

The elite can be defined as a class of people with the highest indices in their branch of activity. It emerged in the nineteenth century. Elites are the most important leaders who perform key roles in the governance of a society. Apart from making important decisions, they also influence the decision making at the national and local levels of government. The existences of political elites are common in all political systems regardless of location, time and culture. The basic assumption of the elite theory is that all are not equally capable of participating in the affairs of the state. Whatever be the form of government, it is run by a small number of people; there are different kinds of elites governing the state. It may be based on race, ancestry, age, sex, religion, military strength, culture, wealth and knowledge. Harold Lasswell defined ‘elites are power-holders of a body politic; they are the holders of high position in a given society’. Elite theory accepts a broad division of society into dominant and dependent groups. Carefully analyzing the concept of Elite theory in a workable political system, whether primitive or modern, democratic or totalitarian-can find that every society is ruled by microscopic minority. Those who possess the qualities necessary to rule or to exercise full social and political powers.

The political philosophers, from time to time, have also recommended rule by a special class to fit into, the ideal political system they prescribed. Plato’s ideal state was entrusted to a small group of the ruling elite the philosopher kings. While talking of dictatorship of the proletariat, V.I Lenin a socialistic philosopher meant actually the rule by the communist elite. So the concept of Elite theory had prominent role in the society as well as in the political system. In the seventeenth century the word ‘elite’ was referred to ‘ commodities of particular excellence’ Later on it referred to superior social groups like erack military units or the higher ranks of the nobility. But this term did not enter the vocabulary of political science in Europe until the 19th century. In other words this term did not become widely used in social and political writing until late in the nineteenth century in Europe. In the beginnings of 20th century, this term in United Kingdom and in U.S.A however began only in the thirties. The origins of the “theory of political elites” which came under active discussion of social scientists in the united states in the fifties – economist (Schumpeter), political scientists (Lasswell) as well as sociologists(C .Wright Mills) - can be traced back to the writings of a number of European thinkers in the years preceding the growth of fascism- particularly to Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca, Roberto Michaels,are known as key proponents of elite theory.

Even though this theory was first started in central and Western European countries as a critique of democracy and socialism, it was suitably adapted in the united States by a number of writers to explain political processes as they existed in their country or, for that matter, in any despotic roots of the theory, as they lay in the European origins were explained away by saying that within those who constituted the ruling class, in addition to a ruling elite, there was a counter-elite, which could be raised to power by the masses if the ruling elite lost its capacity to rule. The masses, in this way, exercised a kind of remote control over the ruling elite, but they could not be expected, by virtue of their apathy to the power game, to exercise much positive influence.
During the post-war year’s European interest in elites faded, but it quickly found fertile ground in social sciences in the United States as these theories were brought across the Atlantic by American social scientists. Through this transition in the 1940s and 1950s, several aspects of elite theory were profoundly transformed. Perhaps most interestingly, it gradually changed political orientation away from a strongly right-wing stance embraced by its initiators, becoming much more left-wing. The most sophisticated elaboration of critical elite theory from the political left came initially from C. Wright Mills. Mills argued that political decisions with the most far reaching consequences in the United States were predominantly made by a surprisingly small and largely unelected core of exceptionally influential actors: a ‘power elite’.

**Origin of elite theory**

The term ‘Elite’ was derived from French, it means ‘something excellent’. Accordingly, the elite tend to divide society into ‘excellent’ and ‘ordinary’ people who are placed in different positions. The elite theorists believe in the theory of inequality of mankind. In other words they believe that whereas all men are equal in the eyes of God, they are not equal in the eyes of men. The Elites, therefore, are the chosen element of the people, who come to top position either by their ability or economic status, control of economic and natural resources and even physical strength.

In the political sociology the concept of elite theory referred in the two broad categories: (1) the selected few, who are capable and, therefore, have the right to supreme leadership, and (2) the vast mass of people who are destined to be ruled. The term ‘elite’ is derived from fundamental and universal fact of social life. Elites may be defined ‘as persons who, by virtue of their strategic locations in large or otherwise pivotal organisations and movements, are able to affect political outcomes regularly and substantially. They consist not only of prestigious and ‘established’ leaders-top politicians, important businessmen, high-level civil servants, senior military officers- but also, in varying degrees in different societies.

Some of the theorists traced out this concept to the philosophers like Plato and Aristotle. Plato talked of the rule of a philosopher king- a person who was gifted with reason and capacity to rule. Whereas Aristotle held that some persons were fit to rule while others fit to be ruled. Elite at present consist of those persons who sit at the top of society over others by virtue of their superior qualities. It is a name given to a group emerged in every social level. In other words Elite consists of those successful persons who rise to top in every occupation and stratum of society.

The elites are, therefore, always in minority yet they take all major decisions and ensure that these are implemented. They command social respect, prestige, status, position and authority and control all the sources of distribution. Moreover each one from among the elite tries to pose that he represents the feelings of the group to which he belongs. The concept of elite is, therefore, used to describe certain fundamental features of organized social life. The basic factor is that a minority within a social collectivity-society, state, party, occupation, business, etc., exercise a preponderant influence. The political Elites are, therefore, those who come to prominence in the political field by virtue of their superior qualities.

The theories of the elitist have been a dominant theme in the history of western thought since the turn of the last century in general and in the United States in the years following the world war second in particular. They have attracted the attention of the political of the political scientists and the sociologists all over the world, especially those who are interested in the studies of distribution of power, influence and decision making authority in the society.
No single universally accepted elite theory has emerged as yet. These are therefore elite theories. Some studies mention that there is single power elite drawn from economic class which provides leadership to other elements in the political community. Other rejects this view and favor a pluralist model where power is diffused among many interest groups competing for it. Many other theories based on a fusion of the elitist and pluralist theories.

Classical texts on the elite though believe that in each society there is a single cohesive Elite group which dominate the affairs of the society and not controlled by any other group or groups. This group comprised politicians plus civil servants plus economists. In other words classical writers believed in the monistic view of Elitism i.e. a single elite group.

Contemporary writers of elite theory, on the other hand, believe that there exist many elite groups in a society and leadership emerges because of competition among them. That is there exist a competition among members of Elite groups. In simple words they believe in the pluralistic version of Elite theory.

But the common point in both of the views is that there exists a minority of people who influence decisions and control powers. It has, however, been argued that these theories are not only relevant but vital for understanding of powers structure and power processes in any country of whatever variety it might be.

The core of the elitism is that in any society there is and must be a minority of the population which makes the major decisions in the society and rule over the majority. This minority, called political class or governing elite includes the wider circle of those who influence governmental decisions as well as those who formally decide politics. This minority gains its dominant position by means beyond ordinary elections. Its influence may be due to its embodying certain social or religious values hereditary or certain personal qualities.

Theoretical interest in elites actually goes quite far back, but the work of Vilfred Pareto (1848-1923), Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941), and Robert Michels (1876-1936) represent what has to become regarded the classics of elite theory. Their efforts were the first to address systematically the role of elites in modern societies, and their work is today collectively referred to as the “Italian School” of elite theory. As for their understanding of social elites, all three claimed that the cleavage between elites and non-elites represents the most fundamental social and political division in modern societies. Consequently, they regarded this cleavage not merely as a question of hierarchical stratification separating elites from non-elites, but also as a source of social momentum, capable of driving social conflict and profound social change.

**VILFRED PARETO’S THEORY OF ELITE**

Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923), an Italian sociologist, in his ‘The Mind and Society’(1915-19) used the term ‘elite’ to indicate a superior social group, i.e. a group of people who show highest ability in their field of activity whatever its nature might be. It was a minority group which took all major decisions in society. The other part of society which fell short of this level of ability was termed as mass of the people, or masses. Masses are characterized by the lack of qualities of leadership as well as the fear from responsibility. They feel that in public life it would be safe to follow the elite.
According to Pareto the basic assumption that individuals invariably differ from one another in their basic abilities. In other words, there are biological differences which resulted in inequalities of men and thus makes inequality inevitable in the society. Some individual are, therefore, superior in their attributes while others possesses inferior abilities. The former class of superior abilities constitutes the elite. They are known for their qualities of head and heart; capacity to initiate, execute and plan; and dominate all sections of society-social, economic and political in one way or the other.

For Pareto, elite is a value free term. It includes all those who score highest on scales measuring any social value or commodity such as power, riches, knowledge etc. but by the term elite he means the strongest, the most energetic, and most capable-for all good as well evil. Though he was mostly dealing with economic and political elites, yet he was ready to extend the use of the term to religion (the most holy); to art (the most artistic) and to ethics (the most virtuous). In other words elite means all those who constitute the higher stratum in society.

He points out that the higher stratum of the society comprised of two classes- Governing Elite and Non-governing Elite. Governing Elites comprise of individuals who directly or indirectly play a considerable part on government. Whereas Non-governing Elites are comprised of the rest i.e. masses.

Pareto is convinced that the study of historical change very largely revolves round the study of Elites. He further points out that the events and decisions among the elites have more consequences for the history of a society than events and decisions among its great masses. But he was not concerned with non-governing Elites, who might have influence on the government.

In the opening chapter of his book “the Rise and Fall of the Elites” Pareto mentions several laws or propositions. Out of them first two are most important. Firstly, he points out that the great parts of human actions have their origin not in logical reasoning but in sentiments. Secondly, man although impelled to act by non-logical motives yet he ties his action logically to certain principles. That he invents a posteriori in order to justify his actions. He adds that psychologically all human actions are the combinations of ‘Residues’ and ‘Derivations’. Pareto locates six residues, which means the major motivation of action.

(1) Combination i.e. the tendency to invent and embark on adventures. In other words the quality of cunningness like that of fox. (2) Persistence of preservation i.e. the tendency to consolidate and make secure. In other words to have strength, the quality to fight, force like lion. (3) Expressiveness i.e. tendency to make feelings manifest through symbolization. (4) Sociability tendency to affiliate with others. (5) Integration tendency to maintain a good self –images; and (5) Sex tendency to see social events in erotic terms.

He is of the view that the first two residues are dominant in Elite. The main point of the discussion is that by means of the two residues i.e. combination-the quality of cunningness of fox and preservation-the lion’s like persistence or use of force, Elite keeps himself in power.

But in order to rationalise or justify his actions (or use of force) he takes recourse to derivations or myths which help him to dupe the masses.
Derivations, according to him, are the ways by which actions are made to assume the appearance of logical actions. They are expressed mostly through speeches. Pareto, has however, classified derivations in the following four categories.

(1) Assertion, (2) Appeals to authority, (3) Appeals to sentiments or principles, (4) Verbal proofs.

**MIXED RESIDUES**

Sometime first residue i.e. cunningness cannot manage the crisis and let the rule break down. Similarly, some time second residue i.e. mere use of force cannot help the ruling class to rule longer. The ruling class, therefore, make use of mixture of the two residues i.e. the quality of combination and quality of preservation to keep itself in power. Pareto, however, does not mention about the proportion of mixture.

**CIRCULATION OF ELITES**

While pointing out that “History is a graveyard of aristocracies” he has propounded his well known concept, “The Circulation of Elites”. ‘Circulation of Elites’ may refer to a process in which individuals circulate between the elite and the non-elite strata. It may also refer to process in which one elite is replaced by other elite. Pareto, therefore, not only distinguished between elites and non-elites but also suggested the idea of a circulation of elites in which one elite replaces another as aristocracies decay or regenerate. There might also be mobility from a non-elite stratum to an elite stratum or governing class of people who rule directly or indirectly. This simply means that new men of money or power replace the old ones. He has put this idea in a phrase of Marx’s dictum of history ‘the history of man is the history of the continues replacement of elites-as one asends, another declines. Pareto account for this process. He has listed among the cause of this historical change, war and differential fertility. War tends to kill a higher proportion of elites than of the general populations. Elite must sometimes embark on inviting actions and sometime on consolidating actions. When they fail to do so, they are replace by new elites.

The circulation of elites is almost always aided and accompanied by rising religions-humanitarian sentiments. In such a climate, the existing elite becomes softer, milder more humane and less apt to defend its own power. If the innovators already dominate at such a stage; it spells doom for the elites. The rising elite is also subject to speech habits justifying its drive to power (derivations) and these are also molded by the same rising religions-humanitarian sentiments. Thus the wheel takes full turn. The elite is then established and the process can start all over again.

Pareto presents another dimension of the ‘Circulation of Elite’. He regards elites as representing definite social interests. The circulation of elites, therefore, occurs with the decline of established interests and the emergence of new ones in the society. He observes, “in the beginning military, religious and commercial aristocracies and plutocracies must have constituted parts of the governing elite and sometimes have made up the whole of it’. He then mentions the rise of new elites such as industrial workers producing trade union elites.
GAETANO MOSCA’S THEORY OF ELITE

Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941), another Italian scholar, further developed the theory of Elite in his book “The Ruling Class.” According to him, it is wrong to believe that the societies are governed by majority or that majority decision or rule in any way prevails. He is of the view that every society is governed by minority either in the form of oligarchy, or aristocracy or elite. He is also of the opinion that whatever may be the form of government no state is ever governed by the masses. Similarly states are also not ruled by single individual how so ever powerful he may be, but these are always ruled by a group of people who manage to go near the centre of power or become themselves as centre of power and the others try to go near them. According to him in all societies—from societies that are very nearly developed and have barely attained the dawning’s of civilization, down to the most advanced and powerful societies—two classes of people appear—a class that rules and a class that is ruled. The first class, always the less numerous, performs all political functions, monopolizes power and enjoys the advantages that power brings, whereas the second, the more numerous class, is directed and controlled by the first, in a manner that is now more or less legal, now more or less arbitrary and violent. He further adds that the second class supplies the first, in appearance at least with material means of subsistence and with the instrumentalities at least with material means of subsistence and with the instrumentalities that are essential to the vitality of the political organism.

He, therefore, refers to two political facts. Firstly, in every political organisation, there is one individual who is chief among the leaders of the ruling class under special circumstances two or three may discharge the functions of supreme control. He or they may not hold power according to law. Secondly in every political organism, pressures arising from the discontent of the masses that are governed, from the persons by which they are swayed, exert a certain amount of influence on the policies of the ruling, the political class.

Mosca explains the rule of the minority over the majority by the fact that the former is organised, obeys single impulse and thus its domination over the unorganised minority is inevitable. It is difficult for the majority to organise. The larger the political community, the more difficult will it be for the majority to organise itself for reaction against the minority. The ruling minorities, on the other hand, are distinguished from the masses by the qualities they possess. Either they have certain material, intellectual or even more superiority of they are the heirs of individuals who possessed such qualities. They are, therefore, most influential in the society in which they live.

Mosca has also dealt with at some length how the people become a member of the elite group. Usually they come to power because either they actually have or are supposed to possess certain qualities of head and heart. It is another issue whether they actually possess certain qualities or not. Reasons for their joining elite group can be that the people may own a lot of wealth may be prominent in the religious field, may be known for their social service or may enjoy high military rank. In the primitive societies, military valor and in advanced societies wealth opened access to the political class. Wealth produces power just as political power has been producing wealth. To be rich is to become powerful. He, however, made it clear that though in the society there are two classes, but they can successfully work only when both cooperate with each other. Protection to the ruling class comes from the masses, whereas the former give guidance and direction to the latter.
Pareto makes us believe that the minority enjoys power because it is minority. It is capable of taking quick decisions and misunderstandings, if any, can be quickly removed system of communication among them is both easy and quick and communication gaps almost nonexistent. If there are any gaps it is easy to remove these. Pareto has given political formula of political elite. He says that in every society there are certain recognised beliefs and doctrines. According to this formula political elite make the masses believe that they are upholding these and for the purpose they try to give moral recognition to their actions on the one hand and the legal on the other. Ruling elite will always tries to command and exercise authority, he believes. He has also given the idea of circulation of ruling elite. According to him, changes in elite group come when the existing group loses aptitude to command and people from the masses develop that aptitude. He has also said that a change in political elite is inevitable and unavoidable when the objective for which ruling elite is brought to power and position is either fully or largely not served or thus defeated.

Mosca further points out that all political classes tend to become hereditary in fact if not in law. Political forces seem to possess a quality – the force of inertia (a Physics term). They have tendency to stabilize themselves. This is why certain families develop the quality for manning important offices and continues to be dominating for a long time. Even in democratic elections successful candidates show certain hereditary characteristics. Mosca says that a hereditary care, after gaining a dominating defacto status turns into a dejur power holder.

Like Pareato, Mosca also says that governing class justifies its actual exercise of power by resting it on some universal moral principles.

**CIRCULATION OF ELITES**

Like Pareto, Mosca also believed in the theory of the Circulation of elites. Distinguishing characteristic of the elite being “aptitude to command and to exercise political control” once the ruling class loses this aptitude and people outside the ruling class cultivate it in large numbers, there is every possibility that the old ruling class will be deposed and replaced by the new one. Mosca believes in a kind of law, that the governing elite, in course of time, is not able to provide the necessary services to the masses, or the services they continue to provide are no longer regarded as valuable, or a new religion arises, or some similar changes take place in the social forces pervading the society, and that in such cases change becomes inevitable. Mosca takes up not only the psychological reasons for the change, as Pareto had done, but also the sociological reasons. He is able to establish some relationship between the changes in social circumstances and individual characteristics. New interests and ideals are formulated in society, new problems arise, and the process of circulation of elites is accelerated. Mosca also is not as critical of idealism and humanitarinism as Pareato, and has a somewhat modest view of the use of force. He prefers a mobilise society nd change through persuasion. He prefers a mobilise society and change through persuasion. He also advises the governing elite to bring about gradual alterations in the political system in order to make it conform to changes in the public opinion.
Mosca examines more closely the composition of the elite, and recognizes the role of certain “social forces”, the expression he uses for Pareto’s ‘non-governing elites’, in balancing and limiting the influence of other ‘social forces’. Mosca also introduces the concept of the ‘sub-elite’ composed practically of the whole ‘new middle class’ of civil servants, managers of industries, scientists and scholars, and treats it as a vital element in the government of society. ‘the stability of any political organism’, he writes, “depends on the level of morality, intelligence and activity that this second stratum has attained.”

Mosca attaches a great deal of importance to what he calls the “political formula”. Mosca’s political formula is equivalent to Pareto’s “derivations”. In every society, he believes, the governing elite tries to find moral and legal basis for its being in the citadels of power and represents it as “the logical and necessary consequence of doctrine and beliefs that are generally recognised and accepted”. The political formula may not, and generally does not, embody absolute truth. It may as well be merely a plausible myth which is accepted by the people. Mosca is not prepared to accept that it is nothing but plain and simple fraud cleverly contrived by the ruling class in order to dupe the masses into subsjection. The fact that the policies of the ruling class, even though formulated in its own interests, are covered in a moral and legal grab satisfies, according to Mosca, a definite social need and gratifies a deeply felt human requirement that man should be governed on the basis of some moral principle, and not by mere physical force it also serves as a factor in the unification of political institutions, people and civilizations. Mosca would, therefore, regard it as an instrument of moral cohesion.

The political class also undergoes changes in its membership, ordinarily by the recruitment of new individual members from the lower strata of the society, sometimes by the incorporation of new social groups and occasionally by the complete replacement of the established elite by a ‘counter elite’ as exists in revolution.

Mosca, however, takes a modest view of the use of force and prefers change through persuasion. He, therefore, advises the governing elites to bring about gradual alteration in the political system in order to make it conform to changes in the public opinion.

He was also in favour of multiplicity of social forces. He also introduced the concept of sub-elites composing civil servants, manager of industries, scientists and scholars and treats it as a vital element in the society.

**ROBERT MICHEL’S IRON LAW OF OLIGARCHY**

Robert Michels—an Italian sociologist and disciple of Mosca—reveals another dimension of the elite phenomenon in his work “political parties: sociological study of Modern Democracy”.

He made a deep study of the European Socialist political parties and trade union, especially German Socialist party and found them oligarchic in their power dynamics. He argues that democracy is unconceivable without organisation. In a complex society people can, effectively voice demands only by joining together and forming organisations. But organisations are anti-thetical to democracy. Rank and file cannot take decision because issues are complex and they demand specialized knowledge which they do not possess. Decisions are, therefore, left to the
executive committee and people are left with no say except to fall in line with decision of small
groups. Organisations, therefore, invariably produce oligarchy.

This is how he calls the ‘iron law of oligarchy’. In other words, he purposes a law governing all
social organisations and calls it as “The iron law of oligarchy.”

Michels begins with the observations that ‘democracy is inconceivable without organisations.’ He
adds that not only organizational ability grants power, but even the very structure of any
organised society gives rise to elite.

He tried to test his hypothesis by examining the organisations, which would be expected to offer
an outstanding counter example to this law. He further insists that mass members cannot control
the large scale organisations of the modern age. The leadership is, therefore, technically
indispensable. He adds that at the outset leaders arise spontaneously and their functions are
accessory. Sooner after they become professional leaders and in this second stage development
they are stable and irremovable.

According to him, the following two sets of factors are responsible for the phenomenon of
concentration of power in the hands of ruling minority: (I) Organisation (II) Psychological

In organization power drifts slowly from those who are holding it to those who are skilled and
technical and this happens with the active assistance of bureaucracy. For him central principle of
elitism that power gives birth to more power and those who enjoy power usually remain
politically neutral unless involved as actual participant in political activities by interests people,
who motivate them to act in a particular direction.

Michels was of the opinion that flattery and oratory are two powerful weapons with the elites,
who tries to win over the people by justifying their actions. Even if certain laws are passed by the
legislatures to weaken their power and to keep them under control, these are not effectively
implemented simply because the people show their indifference towards such laws.

Pareto postulated that in a society with truly unrestricted social mobility, elites would consist of
the most talented and deserving individuals,

LASSWELL AND OTHERS ON POLITICAL ELITES

In addition to above mentioned thinkers there are several others who have also expressed their
views about political elites. They are Lasswell, Gasset, James Burnham and C.Wright Mills.

H.D.LASSWELL: Lasswell too points out that a society can be divided into two categories of
persons namely the masses and the political elites. For him the study of politics is the study of
“influence and influential”. According to him, elites are those who get most of he values, whereas
the rest are the masses. He has, however, said that only those few can become elite who have real
abilities and use these with sufficient tactics. It is again for him to decide how he manipulates his
environments so that those who favour him and help him in streghthing his positions continue to
extend support. He feels that political elitism is not based on ability but on power. Those who
wield power, irrespective of ability, are really elite and not others.
According to him the society on the basis of power can be divided into three categories; namely, most powerful, less powerful and least powerful. In the first category fall political bosses in the elite group; in the second fall those who are in the middle of political hierarchy whereas in the third category come the masses who are the least powerful and have no voice in political policies and decision making process.

Of course political elites can take any decision in the hope that it will be implemented only with the backing of force and not otherwise. Irrespective of the consideration of utility of the decision, no decision of political elite can be implemented unless it has solid support of the people.

Lasswell is of the view that strength, popularity and weakness of political elite can be measured in terms of acceptance of decisions taken by them. In case the people do not accept the decisions and on the other hand appreciate the views point of those who do not support their view point, it can safely be said that the group has lost power and position and a time is not far off, when new political elite group can come to power at any time.

ORTEGA Y GASSET: Gasset had somewhat different views about political elite than what these were hitherto held. He did not believe that elites come to power on account of their abilities and continue to hold that due to tactical managing of situations in their favour. He believes that people themselves decide who their leaders should be. It is the people, who after choosing those as their leader extend their support to them. It is this solid support which keeps them in power and position.

He, however, accepts that once they are picked up as leaders they govern the people and as such it can be said that only few have capacity to rule, whereas vast majority only accepts their dictates and follows them. Usually the people do not mind obeying their leaders but protest and even decide to disobey when they doubt their integrity or somehow feel that they are corrupt and while utilizing public funds serve their own interests instead of promoting public welfare.

Another important cause for disobeying political elite can be that the masses may feel that their leaders are inefficient and thus incapable of handling problems which face the nation both on national and international fronts. He has, however, said that the masses are always prepared to be rule, but what that they with is that the rulers should be by competent and efficient persons.

Gassett was of the view that it was in the interest of the nation that political elites should remain in power for sufficiency long time. He believed that once people got dissatisfied they were sure to start searching for another set of political elites. If that too does not come up to their expectation, they get still more disappointed and can bring another set of people to the fore. If dissatisfaction still continues, the alternative may not be for another set of people but revolt against the prevailing system. If the nation is not prepared to bear the strains of violent revolution, the result can be dangerous for the society as a whole.

JAMES BURNHAM: He is another political thinker who has given ideas about political elite. He has focused his attention on one important issue namely ho the people become elite. He does not contribute to the idea that the people make elite or that they come to position on account of their abilities. He also does not agree with the idea that they continue in position with mass support and that the masses can changes their political elites.
On the other hand Burnham believes that political elite come to power because they are economically powerful. They control both means of production and distribution. It is their utmost desire that they should not allow others to have a share in production and distribution. They remain in power as long as these sources remain with them. New political elite come to power when these resources go out of their control and are controlled by new group of people. It is this new group which becomes political elite.

In this way Burnham has laid stress on economic aspect while discussing the concept of political elite. Some thinkers believe that he had Marxist approach to the problem and thus brand him Marxist. In fact, he was neither Marxist nor his approach to the problem was Marxian, but what he aimed at was, that he tried to point out that our existing capitalist system was such that, in that political and economic powers were inseparable from each other.

According to him all decisions will then taken by a set of administrators who will control all administration and run that in the way lit to run it. In this system those who are at present controlling the nation with the help of means of distribution and production will be excluded from administration. He has come to the conclusion that power which is now being held by the capitalists will then be held by the administrators i.e., Bureaucrats.

C. WRIGHT MILLS: an American Sociologist offers a less ambitious theory of elite, based on distribution of power in the democratically governed U.S.A a developed his concept of Elite in his Book “the Power Elites” published in London in 1959. The period of his study was 1950s.

He does not believe in the psychological basis of elite rule but explains it in absolutely institutional terms. He also does not agree that the members of elite necessarily possess superior institutional traits. Rather he stressed that the structure of the institutions in a society is such that those occupying position in the institutional hierarchy are of key significance and those who are holding positions command in them hold power in the society. In other words he believes that power in a society is attached to institutions and defines the power elite.

Mills argues that the American society is dominated by these power elite which are of unprecedented power. Power elite make momentous decisions without any reference to the people. It is not accountable to any one and the people are subjected to ‘instruments of psychic management and manipulation’. The power Elite skillful controls the mass media and manipulates it to make man in the mass think and act what it likes.

SOCIALISTS VIEWS ON POLITICAL ELITES

The socialist believes that elitist rule is dictatorial in nature and only alternative to this is the rule of the proletariat. They are interested in establishing a classless society. But Raymond Aaron is of the view that like the rule of the elite in a democratic society there is dictatorship of the proletariat. In classless society the people will have no defense against the rule of the elite and as such elites will have more powers in socialist societies than political elites in democracies. The elites will have social, economic and political power because they control every mean of production and distribution.
Malivan Dijlas, who needs to be mentioned in this regard, has laid down the doctrine of new class. According to him even a socialist system has an elite system. In that a group has special privileges and economic preferences. His ideas are available to us in his ‘New Class’. According to him in bureaucracy there are two classes’ namely general and special bureaucrats. Whereas the former actually do administrative work, the latter are in the core of bureaucracy and hold full control over whole bureaucratic system. He is also of the opinion that in the beginning all bureaucrats use party as the weapon for coming to power but as the time passes with that they make every effort to weaken it and instead themselves try to come to power.

Many scholars have contributed to the development of the Elite Theory and wide a wide range of views have been expressed. Vilfred Pareato and Mosca- two Italian sociologists-Elite theory has become critique of Democracy and even defended of despotism. Both describe the phenomenon of circulation of Elite i.e. circulation between different categories of the governing elites itself and between elite and rest of the population also. Thus, it is not a permanent group that rules rather the membership of this group changes over period of time. Whereas Pareto examines the psychological make-up of both elite and non-elite, Mosca and Robert Michels emhasized organised organisational abilities of elites.

C.Wright Mills-an American scholar-while describing the political process of a democracy, liberated the Elite Theory from its despotic process of a depicted by Pareto and Mosca. He has also examined the position they hold, in a number of key institution within a society. In other words the hierarchical organization of societies allow the minority to capture and monopolies power.

H.D.Lasswell, however, emphasizes that as politics is the study of influence and influentials, the elites (influential’s) are those who get most of what there is to get.

**ELITE AND DEMOCRACY**

The critics of Elite theories are of the view that the Elitists doctrine is opposed to, or critical of modern democracy. They argue that upholding the idea of elitism simply means the denial of democratic ideal or the denial of democracy. They have expressed their opposition in two ways. Firstly, the insistence in the elite theories upon the inequality of individual endowment runs counter to a fundamental stand in democratic political thought that emphasis on underlying equality of individual. The Elite theories are, therefore, critical of modern democracy and socialism. Secondly, the notion of a governing minority contradicts the democratic theory of majority rule.

But the supporters of elitism do not agree with view. They believe that democracy is still compatible with elite theories. They argue that right from the day the representative democracy spread in Europe, there arose misgiving about its nature among intellectuals, conservatives and socialists. He further added that even Lincon and J.S Mill over emphasized the role of the the people and in the name of people. If democracy is regarded as being primarily a political system than in actual practice in modern mass society, government by the people is impossible in practice.
But the significance of political democracy is primarily that the positions of power in society are open in principle to everyone. There is competition for power, and that the holders of power at any time are accountable to the electorate. Other elitists thinkers also point out that political democracy envisages that the choice of personal should be ‘open and subject to negotiation and bargaining’, among the various elements of the population. Democracy, therefore, provides an opportunity to the people to choose among competing elites. It needs to be emphasize at that political competition and of equality of opportunity can be presented as corollaries of liberal or laissez-faire economic theory. Democracy will then be treated as a type of society in which the elites-economic, cultural, as well as political- are open in principle and are in fact received from different social strata on the basis of individual merit.

CRITICAL APPREISAL

The concept of Political elite has drawn sufficient attention of political thinkers and others. As an alternative to Marxism, the elite theorists have failed to offer any viable alternative to Marxian doctrine of class war. Another criticism against this theory is that elite does not provide any satisfactory alternative to the basic question of social change, elite theory has been subjected to severe criticisms from different corners.

The elitist are of the view that the elite group remains in power because the members of the groups have cohesiveness and are conscious of their existence. But again that is not correct because one finds that in every elite group there are rivalries and infightings. In each group there is also keen competition for coming to power and joining core of the group. Not only is this but in each group there desire to replace those who oppose particular leader by another who is their supporter.

The exponents of the elitist theory have come forward with the idea that elitist group is the ultimate authority in decision making process. This group has no restrictions while taking decisions. But again that is no so. As is well known several factors count while taking decision. These include a number of factors like taste and mood of the people, social and political values, pressure groups, policies and programmes of the rival groups, practicability of the decision and extent of bureaucratic cooperation and so on. The elitist theorists, do not give due weightage to all these factors and thus to over simplify a complex factor.

The elitist also argue that elite group rules because it includes the most capable person and thus by the qualities of their wisdom they can convince the people to obey their commands. But again this is not true. On the other hand the elitist rule because the masses have agreed to be ruled. As soon as they decided not be governed, this minority has no other alternative but to leave power.

To believe the elites are the most capable persons and have all the qualities of their wisdom by which they convince the masses to obey them is also not correct. On the other hand the elitists rule because the masses have agreed to be ruled. Otherwise it will impossible for them to rule or to remain in power.
Module-VI

POLITICAL LIFE AND POLITICAL MAN

A person’s political character or involvement may be defined as his habitual responses to political situation rooted at the personality level. These responses include a wide range of attitudes and traits such as apathy or interest submission or assertiveness towards authority, suspicion or trust of other groups and so on. As all of us know man is a social and political animal Aristotle in his well known work Politics wrote that “he who has unable to live in society must be either a good or beast”.

A starting point for all political theory is the fact that members of the human species live together. With few exceptions human beings do not live in complete isolation. Whatever may be the elements of instinct, habit, necessity, or choice that induces people to form societies, man has demonstrated that he is a social animal. Yet although man is a social animal, neither by instinct nor by learning is he necessarily a political animal at least not in quite the same sense. Even though he lives in a society neither participate actively in political life, nor cherish the political institutions and values in his society.

According to Robert A Dhal the individuals who find themselves within the boundaries of a political system are by no means equally concerned with political life. Some people are indifferent to politics, others are more deeply involved. Even among those who are heavily involved in politics, only some actively seek power. And among power-seekers, some gain more power than others. Thus Robert A Dhal in his well known book ‘Modern Political Analysis’ has classified political man into four groups they are:

- The apolitical stratum;
- The political stratum;
- The power seekers; and
- The powerful

**The Apolitical stratum**

It has been observed that political apathy is a very widespread phenomenon in western democracies. Whether one measures, apathy by the criterion of political involvement, knowledge or activity, the number of people who satisfy the culturally defined element of participation is small. There is who consider this a serious malfunctioning of democracy. It men are to maintain control over their political destinies, they must be aware of what is going on and must take a hand in determining public policy. On the other hand, there are some political theorists who find such apathy a favourable, rather than an unfavourable. They interpret it to mean that the society is fundamentally contented, is characterised by consensus rather than by broad cleavages, and is basically stable. It we accept the view that the democratic ideal encourages political interest and participation, then the question naturally arises: What are the factors which bring about this absence of political interest and activity?
It should be noted that an exact and clear cut boundary between apolitical stratum and political stratum is not possible due to a variety of reasons. In most political systems those who show great interest in political matters are concerned and informed about politics, and are active in public affairs; do not make up a large proportion of adults. Even in countries with popular governments where opportunities for political involvements are extensive, the political stratum by no means includes all the citizens. On the contrary, in all polycharchies a sizeable number of citizens are apathetic about politics and relatively inactive: in short, they are apolitical. To be sure there are significant variations from one system to another and from time to time. Yet the failure of a considerable body of citizens to take advantage of opportunities to participate in political life seems to be a nearly universal phenomenon. Even in Greek city states which are held up as models of democratic participation, were not free from the presence of apolitical stratum. In Athens, for example the male citizens who made up the demos evenly included a sizeable apolitical stratum. It is an accepted fact despite the spread of education, universal adult suffrage, introduction of electronic voting machines etc, around 20 per cent of the electorate in advanced countries do not vote in elections. There seems to be several fundamental reasons why people do not become involved in politics. Robert A Dhal has summarised the following reasons responsible for this trend.

1. You are less likely to get involved in politics if you place a low value on the rewards expected from political involvement relative to the rewards you expect from other kinds of activity. The rewards a person any gain or expect from political activity can be conveniently divided into two kinds: direct gratification received from the activity itself and instrumental benefits brought about as a consequence of the activity.

Direct gratification from political involvement include the sense of fulfilling one’s obligation as a citizen, the pleasure of social interaction received from the activity itself and instrumental benefits brought about as a consequence of the activity.

According to Dhal, instrumental benefits expected from political activity may be divided into two kinds; some are special benefits for the particular person or his family - a job from party leaders or pay for being a poll-watcher, graft and so on. Or the benefits may be favourable government decisions. For some people special benefits provide a sufficient incentive for political participation. However, some people do not believe that they stand to benefit from these governmental activities. For some persons, the rewards of political involvement are distant and vague, whereas the rewards of other activities are more immediate and concrete.
In short, for many people the opportunity costs of political involvement are too high to make it worthwhile. These people are unwilling to forego immediate, certain, and concrete benefits or gratifications derived from non-political activities to obtain the more remote, uncertain and abstract benefits that might ensure from political participation.

2. Robert A Dhal believes that you are less likely to get involved in politics if you think that there is no significant difference in the alternatives before you and consequently, that what you won’t matter. Some people fail to vote or otherwise participate in politics because they believe the parties do not offer them a real choice. This view may be more common among Americans than among citizens of some other polyarchies.

3. You are less likely to become involved in politics if you think that ‘what you won’t matter because your cant significantly change the outcome any way. Some surveys in advanced countries demonstrated strong relationship between the confidence that what one does really matters and the extent of one’s political involvement. The confidence one has in one’s capacity to be effective in political life depends on many factors. Confidence may of course, reflect a realistic appraisal of a situation. As Robert A Dhal has rightly pointed out that “people who see an up-coming election as a completely one-sided affair are less likely to vote than those who believe that it is going to be a close.” Even people who care a great deal about the outcome of the election may decide not to vote if they believe that the election is too one-sided for their vote to make any difference. In the United States of America, political self-confidence- the sense of political efficacy – tends to increase, the higher one’s income, social standing, political experience and most of all, education probably one’s personality or charisma has some bearing on one’s sense of efficacy. Optimism or pessimism about one’s chances of influencing policy is related to deeper personality factors, such as an underlying sense of confidence that pervades a person’s entire outlook.

4. You are less likely to become involved in politics if you believe that the outcome will be relatively satisfactory to you without your involvement. A citizen who believes a particular political decision is important nevertheless might not decide will turn out well any way.

5. You are less likely to get involved in politics if you feel that your knowledge is too limited for your to be effective. In every country, it seems large numbers of people feel they do not understand politics very well. It is not surprising that some of them turn away from politics entirely.

6. Finally, the greater the obstacles placed in your way, the less likely you are to become involved in politics. When a person expects high rewards from an activity, he is willing to overcome great obstacles and incur high costs to gain them. But when he believes the reward is going to be low or nonexistent, even modest obstacles and costs are enough to discourage him.
The costs of political involvement also may vary with different activities. If greater the obstacles face for political involvement people are less likely to participate in it. Morris Roseberry in an article entitled ‘Some Determinants of Political Apathy’ made it clear that political discussion may threaten to alienate one’s friends and neighbours. Thus people may impose a powerful self-censorship on political expression in order to avoid threats to friendship, marriage relationships and group solidarity. If political discussion has a potentially divisive and interpersonal effect, then it may be avoided because of its threat to the important area of occupational success.

THE POLITICAL STRATUM

In every political system, vast majority of the people either directly or indirectly take part in the political process. All those persons who are involved in the political activities constitute the political stratum. As Robert A Dhal has pointed out, you are more likely to become involved in politics if you:

- Value the rewards to be gained;
- Think the alternatives are important;
- Are confident that you can help to change the outcome.
- Believe the outcome will be unsatisfactory if you don’t act;
- Must overcome fewer obstacles to act.

Some people are much more interested, concerned, informed and active than others. In countries with popular government where citizens are legally participate in a wide variety of political acts, the more demanding, more time-consuming, costly or difficult the activates are, the smaller are, the numbers who engage in them. Citizens are much more likely to vote, for example, than to attend a political meeting, more likely to attend a meeting than to work actively for a candidate or party. Few citizens try to influence and act of the national legislature in democratic and non-democratic regimes. In the most complete study of political participation among Americans, Verba and Nie have shown that voting in Presidential elections is the only participatory act out of rather extensive list of activities that is performed by a majority of those interviewed.

In addition, Verba and Nie in their studies in America discovered a phenomenon that there is a significant degree of specialisation within the political stratum. They found that the members of the political stratum of America can be divided into six types namely

1. The Inactives;
2. The voting specialists;
3. The parochial participates;
4. The communalists;
5. The campaigners;
6. The complete activists;

The inactive (constitute 22 %) who take almost no part in political life. They are more or less equivalent to apolitical stratum. The voting specialists (21Percent) who vote in Presidential
elections but do little else. While this single activity distinguishes them from the inactives, the fact they only vote also distinguishes them sharply from participants who do something in addition to voting. The parochial participants (4 percent) who not only vote but so make particularized contacts with government officials for special benefits. However, they engage in no other forms of participation. The communalists (20 percent) who not only vote but also engage in community action for collective benefits. The campaigners (19%) “the mirror-image of the communalists”. These citizens engage in almost no communal activity but are most active in political campaigns. The complete Activists (11Percent) who engage in all types of activity with great frequency’.

Thus, the members of the political stratum are far from a homogeneous lot. They differ enormously not only in the volume but also in the form of their participation in political life. While it is true that complete activists are a comparatively small minority, Verba and Nie findings show that half of all American citizens engage in some kind of political activity in addition to voting. Altogether, the political stratum of the United States consists of about three quarters of the adult population.

THE POWER-SEEKERS

Within the political stratum, some persons seek power much more vigorously than others. And some persons gain much more power than others. In short, within the political stratum, there is a substratum of power-seekers and a substratum of powerful leaders. According to Robert A Dhal, some members of the political system seek to gain influence over the policies, rules, and decisions enforced by the government Political influence is distributed unevenly among the members of a political system.

To seek power and to gain power are by no means the same thing. Not only are some power-seekers unsuccessful in their efforts but some people who gain power may not actually seek it—they might acquire it by inheritance. Why do some people seek power more actively than others? Why so some gain more power than others? Dhal has identified the following reasons.

1. Men seek power in order to achieve the collective good,
2. Men seek power from unconscious motive and
3. Men seek power in conscious pursuit of their self interest.

Many political philosophers right from Plato to Hobbes, have argued that leaders should seek power in order to exercise authority for the good of all. But probably no student of politics has ever really argued that this is the only reason or even the principal reason, why men do in fact seek power. Scholars like Thrasymachus, Hobbes, Bentham and Marx etc interpreted the search for power as rational and conscious pursuit of self interest.

One of the most influential contemporary explanations of power seeking is that of Harold Lasswell. According to Lasswell the power seeker pursues power as a means of compensating for psychological deprivations suffered during childhood. Typical deprivations that engender power seeking are a lack of respect and affection at an early age. The power seeker does not necessarily have much insight into why he seeks power, he rationalises his power seeking in terms acceptable to his conscious value and perhaps the prevailing ideology among those with whom he identifies.
THE POWERFUL

Not all power seekers gain power. Some men who do not seek to gain and wield power may nevertheless exercise it. Why do some people gain more power than others? In principle, if one gains more power than another it is mainly due to two possible sources of explanation—differences in the amount of resources’ used and differences in the skill or efficiency with which the resources are applied.’ Some people use more resources to gain power than others. Some people use what resources they have more efficiently more skillfully.

VARIETIES OF POLITICAL MAN

Robert A Dhal’s analysis and examination of power seekers and powerful points up the seemingly endless variety of human motivations, incentives, orientations, and even personalities at work in political life. In recent years social scientists have emphasised five factors that help to account for the variety of political man. A particular person’s orientations towards politics can be explained, to some degree in the light of

1. His personality or character,
2. The general culture or more specifically the political culture which he shares with others in his tribe, village, city, country or world region,
3. His earliest political orientations and how he acquires them this is, his political socialisation,
4. Own personal experiences and circumstances, his life situation;
5. The particular situation he confronts, or believes he confronts, at a specific historic moment,

A consideration of several varieties of political man will help one to see how these five factors interact.

DEMOCRATIC MAN AND DESPOTIC MAN

In his modern political analysis, Robert A Dhal has asked an interesting question: is it possible to specify a kind of personality or character that is especially suited to the operation of popular government? His answer is: Plato thought so in the Republic; he vividly sets out his description of “the oligarchic, democratic and despotic characters” and offers explanations of how these come about. In one form or another, Plato’s general hypothesis has been affirmed many times- by Machiavelli, among others. Among recent students of politics who deal with this question there is an extraordinary degree of agreement about the values, attitudes, opinion and traits of character that help to maintain a popular system. The most important are attitudes toward one’s self, toward other, toward authority, toward the community, and toward values. A person is said to have an authoritarian personality if he is rightly conventional; submissive and uncritical toward authority; aggressive and punitive toward people who violate conventional values. A democratic man is one who believes indignity of own self and to others, critical towards authority, flexible and adjustable to the new situations, imaginative as well as tender minded ways of thinking about the world outside:
According to Robert A Dhal, personality and character contribute less than political culture to the shaping of democratic or despotic man. This view is supported by a recent study of the relationship between self esteem and democratic orientations. Among three large samples of Americans, Paul Sniderman found that ‘there are indeed fundamental differences in psychological makeup between those who affirm the principles of democracy and those who fail to adhere as consistently to them……The democrat is more likely to have high self- esteem and less likely to be hostile.’ However, Sniderman suggests that the linkage is less a matter of motivation than of social learning.

AGITATOR AND NEGOTIATOR

Two other interesting varieties of political man are the agitator and the negotiator. The classic description of the personality of the political agitator was presented by Harold Lasswell in his work, Psychopathology and Politics. Lasswell wrote thus: the essential mark of the agitator is the high value which he places on the emotional response of the public……………. The agitator easily infers that he who disagrees with him is in communion with the devil, and that opponents show bad faith or timidity. Agitators are notoriously contentious and undisciplined. Political agitator is a political leader whose satisfactions are derived from arousing emotions in others and whose skills are greatest in this area of interpersonal contact. By contrast the negotiator is a compromiser. The negotiator is more concerned with an acceptable solution to a conflict than a just or perfect solution.
Module-VII

POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL SOCIALISATION

POLITICAL CULTURE

The concept of ‘Political Culture’ is somewhat new in the discipline of Political Science. One version is that it was in 1960’s that this concept became a part of modern political analysis. Gabriel A. Almond and Sidney Verba have pointed out that the concept of Political Culture, like other concepts in the field of Political Science, was originated between two world wars. It was first introduced by Gabriel A. Almond in one of his paper titled “Comparative Political System,” published in 1956. In his early attempts to offer a classification for comparing Political Systems. Political Culture, however, has been popularized by some of the leading American writers like Samuel Beer, Admulams and Gabriel A. Almond.

Political culture is, however, closely linked with ‘Political System’ and in fact the formal regulates the latter. Moreover, political culture is not static but changes with changing times. This concept has therefore, offered a new method of having knowledge of Political Sociology. One political system may be different from other in respect of Political culture. It is political culture which explains why in some political systems democratic or parliamentary democracy failed and replaced by military dictatorship and in others it was replaced by civilian totalitarianism. It is not only the legal framework that matters but there are something more which affects this development.

Each society, however, imparts its own characteristic set of norms and values to its people, and the people in turn have distinct sets of idea about how the Political System to work, about what the Government may do them, and about their own claims on the system and their obligation to it. This set of beliefs, symbols, and values about the Political System forms the Political culture of a nation. In the simplest words, Political culture is the Psychology of the nation in regard to Politics.

According to Sidney Verba, Political culture is the empirical beliefs, expressive symbols and values which defined the situation in which political action takes place. By empirical beliefs he means the ways people perceive and interpret the nature of political relationship. By expressive symbols, he means the ways of people feel towards political institutions and leaders; patterns of by values he means the standards used to set the general goals of the political system; standards used to evaluate political demands, processes and products. A political culture can, thus, be characterized by relative, empirically determinable levels of consensus in the sharing among people of these beliefs, symbols and values. In other words, political culture is defined in terms of political orientations and attitudes held by individual, in relation to their political system.

MEANING AND INTERPRETATIONS OF POLITICAL CULTURE

There has been a substantial effort to view culture in a political context in Political Science in general and in Political Sociology in particular. For a political scientist “the shared values of a communities or group are embodied in its political culture, which in the reflection of
its attitudes towards politics and which conditions the manner in which functions are exercised and the nature of the persons which perform those functions”. According to Dogan and Rose, the concept of “political culture is a conventional shorthand way of referring to the values, beliefs, emotions, that give meaning to political life. Rose points out that the political culture of a nation consists of the characteristic attitudes of its population towards basic features of the political system”. Waler A. Rosenbaum defines it as “The collective orientation of people towards the basic elements in the political system”. S.P. Verma points out that “Political culture includes not only the attitudes to politics, political values, ideologies, nation’s character and culture ethos but also the style, manner and substantive form of politics”.

The concept of political cultural owes its genesis to the post second world war phase where political scientists attempted to develop a number of new approaches to detach political science from tentacles of traditional approaches. It seeks to study politics by integrating outputs from psychology and sociology political culture refers to beliefs attitudes and orientation that people have towards political objects.

**Definition**

Almond and Powell define, political culture as the “sum total of individual’s attitudes, orientations, beliefs towards politics among the members of a political system”.

According to Dennis Kavanagh, “A political culture composed of the attitudes beliefs, emotions and values of society”.

Lucian W.Pye viewed ‘Political Culture’ as providing “an ordered subjective realm of Politics, which is found on two levels. For the individual the political culture produces controlling guidelines for effective political behavior, and for the collectivity it gives a systematic structure of values and rational considerations which insures coherence in the performance of institutions and organisations.”

In the opinion of Roy Macridis, “Political Culture means commonly shared goals and commonly shared accepted rules”.

Smauel Beer defines political culture as the “Values, beliefs and emotional attitudes about new government ought to be conducted and what it should do”.

**COMPONENTS OF POLITICAL CULTURE**

As political culture is the pattern of individual attitudes orientations towards politics among the members of a political system, it is the subjective realm which underlines and gives meaning to political actions. Political culture is composed of attitudes and orientations which people in a given society develop towards objects within their political system. These orientations may have three distinct dimensions which are cognitive, affective and evaluative.
Cognitive Orientation

Cognitive orientation refers to people’s knowledge, accurate or otherwise, of political objects and beliefs. In other words cognitive orientation involves knowledge about political objects and familiarity with the way the political system actually works. Thus, an individual may have relatively high degree of accurate knowledge about how his political system works, who are leading figures and what are the current problems faced by the country. In developing countries majority of people are more or less ignorant as to how political system is run and about the role of the Prime Minister, President and the Courts. Majority of them have limited contact with the political system also.

Affective Orientation

Affective orientation refers to emotional feelings of the people towards their political system. In other words it stands for subjective feelings of attachment to alienation from the political system. It also refers to the standard of criteria with the help of which the people judge their political system. Affective orientation, therefore, includes the feelings of attachment, involvement, rejection and the like, about political objects. These emotional feelings are very important because they affect the activities of the people as well as of the government.

Evaluative Orientation

Evaluative orientation refers to judgments and opinions about political objects, which usually involve applying value standards to political objects and events.

These three orientations are closely interrelated and would be found in the psyche of a single individual in different combinations. Almond and Powell have rightly observed that the orientation patterns ‘constitute the latent political tendencies, the propensities for political behavior, which are of crucial importance in explaining and predicting action in a political system.

POLITICAL OBJECTS

Orientations of the people are directed towards ‘Political Objects’. According to Almond and Powell, political objects include the political system as a whole; Particular Political structures- Parties, interest groups, legislature, executive, Judiciary – Individual or group roles President, Prime Minister, Cabinet, Ministry and specific Public Politics and issues. They also include the self as a political actor. Since the number of Political objects is very large, they can be classified under four categories.

1. System as a whole: It includes the Political System, its history, its size, location of power, constitution etc. People have knowledge of, feelings about and judgments on the political system and it is these orientations that condition the development of national identity. To develop these orientations people must not only be physically and legally members of a political system but as well be physiologically members of that system.
2. Input Processes: It includes those organizations and institutions which channel the flow of demands and supports into the political system. They affect the decision making process like Political parties, Pressure groups, Media etc.

3. Output Process: It includes the work of the bureaucracy, the courts and other institutions concerned with applying and enforcing authoritative decisions.

4. The Self: It includes the individual’s role in the Political System as perceived by individual himself. As he plays a role in the political system he certainly has knowledge of, attachment to, and also his own evaluation of their role.

**TYPES OF POLITICAL CULTURE**

Almond and Powell, in order to characterize political culture in terms of distribution of general attitudes toward the political system and toward the input and the output processes; have classified political culture into the following three ideal or pure types, namely

i. Parochial political culture,

ii. Subject political culture, and

iii. Participant political culture.

**Parochial political culture**

People who exhibit little or no awareness of the political system fall in this category. In other words it includes people who have no inclination to participate in input process and not aware of the output process. They are, thus, not interested to play any role. According to Michael Curtis, “a parochial orientation is that when the individual is not aware of nor has opinions about the system as a whole but only of the local community”.

Such type of people is found in every society. Their number is, however more in traditional societies and rare in western developed societies. There is, therefore, no specialization and no special political roles in the society which has parochial political culture. In such a society the headman or chieftain alone assesses political, economic and religious role as in African chiefdoms.

Thus, from parochial culture we mean a system in which there is low cognition of political objects. The people by and large have no awareness of national political system. The society is, therefore, by and large traditional and backward.

**Subject political culture**

People, who have high frequency of orientation towards a differentiated political system and toward the output aspects of the system but their orientation towards input objects and toward self as an active participant is zero, are included in this category.

In other words, this category includes all those individuals who are oriented to the political system or aware of various governmental roles such as collection of taxes, law making etc., and of the government good or bad, legitimate or illegitimate.
But they were not oriented to take part in output structure as they do not have any clear knowledge of the way in which they can influence the political system. They have, therefore, no inclination to play any role. According to Michael Curtis a subject orientation is that when the individual is aware of the system but is essentially passive and accepts decisions. Such type of culture is generally found in monarchical system of government. Subject political culture most prominent in the East European states and also in many of the newly independent states of Asia and Africa.

**Participant political culture**

Participant political culture is one in which the members of the society tend to be explicitly oriented to the system as a whole i.e. to both the political and administrative structures and processes. In other words members of the society of this category are oriented to both the input and output aspects of the political system. It may further said that individuals of this category may be favorable or unfavorable oriented to the various classes of political objects. They also tend to be oriented towards an ‘activist’ role of the self in the polity. However, their feelings and evaluations of such a role may vary from acceptance to rejection, people of this category are always engaged in the articulation demands on the political system and are also participating or involved in the making of public decisions. According to Michael Curtis, participant orientation is that when the individual is an active member of the polity.

This type of culture exists in highly developed societies where people take active part in the political activities by considering themselves as the active members of the polity and are well conscious of their rights and duties. Participant political culture is clearly noticeable in the British, American and Scandinavian political system.

But all the above mentioned three types of political culture are inter-dependent and one cannot replace the other. Usually all the three get mixed and combined with each other. It has also pointed out that the political cultures in different communities can be classified according to the combination of these three types of political cultures.

These three types of political culture are, however, only the ideal type; no one of them can be found in its pure form in any society since all the individuals expected to be oriented is the same way and to some extent. Accordingly Almond and Verba list out of the following unmixed type of Political Culture: (1) The parochial – Subject Political Culture (2) the subject participant Political Culture, (3) The Parochial participant political culture, lastly. (4) The civil Culture.

**Parochial – Subject Political Culture**

In Parochial – Subject Culture an individual has knowledge about a variety of governmental roles although he is mostly aware of the ways in which they can influence the political system. Further, in this cultural system the sense of self as a political force is very much vague and undeveloped and the input structure of the society relatively poorly defined.
Subject – Participant Political Culture

The subject participant type is represented by a society where some of the citizens are very much politically aware and also active and the rest are relatively passive. The former are naturally found to develop positive orientations to all types of Political objects. Here average citizen knows that he must be active and be a participant, but is given, in fact, little opportunity for sharing in decisions.

Parochial – Participant Political Culture

In the Parochial – Participant type the input institutions are relatively local like tribal or caste associations although the national out-put institutions are quite well developed. But, in any case, both the input and the output institutions are so much under the pressure of parochial interests that their performance as national participatory organs is greatly affected.

Civic Culture

Almond and Verba deal with political culture as it is found in five different nations- the USA, Britain, West Germany, Italy and Mexico. They identify the peoples orientations towards the political life as basically falling into three categories-allegiance, apathy, and alienation. On the basis of these ideas, Almond and Verba put forward their concept of the ‘civic culture’. According to them, the civic culture is an allegiance participant political culture. The civic culture is a participant political culture in which the political culture and political structure are congruent. In the civic culture participant political orientations combine with and do not replace subject and parochial political orientations. Individuals become participants in the political process but they do not give up their orientations as subjects nor as parochial. Furthermore, not only are these earlier orientations maintained, alongside the participant political orientations, but the subject and parochial orientations are congruent with participant political orientations. The concept of civic culture as comprising citizen participation, subject beneficiary and parochial roots, is a wholesome one that does away with dichotomous thinking in terms of traditional-modern or any other pure type of political culture.

The Civil Culture combines all the characteristics of the three ideal types of political culture. It represents a synthesis of directive and acquiescent, participant and passive attitudes. Here the subject orientations and the participant orientations are equally strong. The former allow the elites to function with sufficient initiative and freedom while the latter force those elites to remain subject to popular preferences. According to Almond and Verba, Great Britain and the United States reveal the closest approximation to this civic culture. Civic Culture guarantees stable democracy. People feel involved in the affairs of governance but not too involved in the issues. The decision making powers are vested in particular elite and the people do not participate directly. They express their sentiments only through their representatives who are responsible to them.
Political Sub-Culture

In addition to the above mentioned types of political culture, some of the writers talk of a few other types of political culture. One of them is political-sub-culture. They are of the view that entire population of a political system may not have the same culture. Some sections of the society may have developed participant Political culture while others may not. Political sub cultures may grow on the basis of region, religion, social class, caste, language, ethnic membership, occupation and like. When a particular set of political orientation is distinguished from the other in the same Political System, we speak of Political ‘Sub-Culture’. In developing nations, for example, Political Sub-Culture due to differences of language, religion, class, caste etc. There sub cultures sometimes play a very significant role and in case of some nations it is impossible to understand the character of political system without a thorough knowledge of these sub cultures.

Role Culture

Again, within a Political Culture one often notices a particular kind of sub culture which is styled by Almond and Verba as the ‘role culture’. In the more complex Political System there are various specialized structures of roles like bureaucracy, military, Political executive, Party, interest group, media of communication etc. These different specialized roles may represent political club cultures, giving a heterogeneous character to the political culture of the system.

Mass Culture

In every society a distinction may be drawn between the culture of rulers or power holders and the masses. In other words those who deal with power and have responsibilities for taking decision of the government, develop outlook on politics different from those of people who simply remain observer or perform marginal activities. The formal group of people exhibit elite Political-culture whereas latter group of people reflects Mass political Culture.

Elite Culture

As already pointed out that the political culture reflected in the ruler or power holder or decision maker is Elite culture. So far as Indian is concerned, it is reflected in national planners, leaders and senior beau crates it is widespread in the army also and among the English speaking intelligentsia.

FACTORS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF POLITICAL CULTURE

The Political Culture of people of political system are determined by various factors. They are:

1) History or Historical factors

Historical facts and truths do have their impacts on the general attitude, beliefs, values and behaviours of the people of a Country. For example political continuity of Great Britain is due to the fact that the old values of its people have been allowed to emerge with modern attitudes without any disturbance. Unlike France, there has been no revolution in Britain. That is why the
English people are more conservative and the French more radicals. The historical fact that the English people continued their association with India has made India to learn the values of Parliamentary democracy. Whereas people of Algeria and Vietnam have learnt from their French masters the lesson of revolutionary struggle.

2) **Geography or Geographical factors**

Geographical factors also help to fashion political culture of the people of a nation. For example Britain being an island, has been since time past from foreign invasion. In other words it political Culture has not been disturbed by the foreigners. That is why British people have as well as harmonious political culture. Whereas Indian geographical situation is such that foreign invasions and annexations were followed one after the others. As a result there was massive influx of foreign races that stayed and settled here permanently. That was why there developed the values of secularism or secular political culture.

3) **Socio-Economic Factors**

The socio-economic structure of a society is another determinant of its Political Culture. For example a predominantly urban industrialized society is a complex society. With emergence of a rapid communication, higher educational standard, group consciousness and participating in decision making process. All these may provoke a change in political values and believes with subsequent strains on political system. In this way there may be continuous development in Political Culture. But the rural society with predominantly peasant population tends to be more conservative in attitudes, beliefs and values it may not geared to the changes.

4) **Political Continuity**

It is an important determinant of political culture. In British the political culture we see today would not have been there, there been no political continuity for many countries. It has been possible for Britain to evolve in the course of several countries an unbroken set of attitudes and beliefs. Now Britain could easily adopt themselves with the changing conditions. Therefore, political continuity is necessary for merging the older values with new attitudes.

5) **Colonial domination and imperialistic control**

Colonial domination gave a particular shape to the political cultures in Africa, India, Sri Lanka, Japan, China and other countries. The political culture of India today is the result of British imperialist domination and the introduction of parliamentary institutions of the west minister variety. The political culture that emerged among the people of Congo under the short sighted Belgian imperialists was quite different from the political culture that arose in India under the comparatively broad minded and enlightened British imperialists.

6) **Symbols**

In the development of political culture symbols often play an important role. National flag and national anthem, old institutions like monarchy in Britain, political rituals like ceremonial opening of parliament, religious rituals like coronation ceremonies as in Britain, social rituals like observance of different martyrs’ days as in India-these and many other symbols are constantly made use of to evoke people’s emotional attachment to and reverence for the political system.
Critical Appraisal

Being the derivative of the political development approach, it suffers from stigma of conservation and reaction; it is not progressive but reactionary in character. The political culture approach can’t be described as very precise variable for presenting a morphological study of political system.

If the political culture is nothing else than a set of beliefs and sentiments about politics as embodies in the verbal and non-verbal behaviours of the people and depending upon the specific content of the notion of political development it is bound to be conductive or antagonistic to it.

The idea of political culture, since it is a follow-up discovery of the system analysis, remaining only in theory with regard to the political concept of the Afro-Asian nations. This inherent flow is inevitable because most of the modern approaches are studied to only western democracies.

The concept of political culture possesses comprehensiveness which other concepts lack. The political culture of a system is not static. It changes as a result of its response to new ideas, industrialisation, the impact of new leaders, population changes and many other factors. Incorporating these changes it continues from one generation to generation.

A political culture is not static; it changes as a result of its responses to new ideas, industrialisation, the impact of new leaders, population changes and many other factors. Incorporating these changes continuous from generation to generation is made possible is known as political socialization. Hence a study of political culture is incomplete without a proper understanding of the process of political socialization.

Political Socialisation

‘Political Socialisation’ is one of the key concepts in contemporary political analysis. It is primarily a psychological concept which deals with orientation of individuals towards political objects. As it is a process by which political cultures are maintained and changed, it plays a vital role in the study of political sociology. It is an important means of inter-generational and inter-continental transmission of culture. It is the way a society transmits its political culture from generation to generation and from one continent to another. This process helps societies to achieve cohesion through a shared understanding of values, norms and symbols.

It also helps in the process of establishment and development of attitudes and beliefs about political system. It may encourage loyalty to the nation, the fostering of particular values, and may increase either support for or alienation from the system. It is also particularly important in the degree of participation in political life that is expected of groups and individuals. Almond and Powell point out that the study of Political socialisation seems to be one of the most promising approaches to the patterns of political stability and development. Moreover, changes in the patterns of political culture also come about through political socialisation. Thus, process by which individuals in political system learn their political orientations and dispositions is called political socialisation. It is process, however, not confined to the impressionable years of
childhood but one that continues throughout life. The need for the study of the subject political socialisation specially felt by the newly emerging countries to instill among their citizens the support for the political community, the regime and the occupants of political roles.

While studying a political culture one would naturally like to enquire as to how this political culture comes to be what it is, that is, how do a people develop their political beliefs and attitudes and how, further, this set of beliefs and orientations is continued from one generation to another. The process by which political culture is shaped at the individual level and, at the community level is passed on from one generation to generation is called political socialisation. Indeed, one of the salient features culture is it's inter-generational continuity. The culture of a social group does not die with the extinction of existing member of the group. It continues on the strength of a willingness on the part of the new members of the group to embrace the ideas and beliefs of which such culture made. This willingness, however, is not a matter of rational choice on the part of the individuals, but is rather a matter of learnt behaviour. This learning process involving an internalisation of the existing cultural pattern is called socialization and whenever this process has clearly a political context it is known as political socialisation.

The concept of socialization related to learning, at the same time it also distinguished from mere learning. Learning as much not always have a social relevance. For example, we all learn that the earth moves and the sun does not, but this learning is no part of the process of socialization. A person understand his various obligations and roles not through any conscious effort by the ordinary course of interaction with his family and secondary groups. Learning is the result of short term actions and experience by the people. On the other hand socialization is life long process. It begins from the cradle and continues till his death. Political socialisation is, of course, a matter of learnt behaviour, but not necessarily a conscious process.

Meaning of Political socialization

Political socialisation is a lifelong process by which individuals learns political attitudes and behaviours. It is part of broader socialization process whereby an individual become a member of a particular society and takes on its values and behaviours. Social and cultural conditions mediate political socialisation.

Political socialisation is defined as the process by which individuals acquire beliefs, values and habits of thought and action related to government, politics, and society. It goes beyond the learning "facts" about how the world operates in practice, instead involving the development of a "worldwide" of how people and institutions ideally should operate.

According to Gabriel A. Almond and G.B. Powell political socialisation “is the process by which political cultures are maintained and changed. Through the performance of this function individual are inducted into the political culture, their orientations towards political objects are formed.” Thus, Political socialisation is the process by which the ethos and behaviour of a political system is communicated from one generation to another generation. Therefore, political socialisation is a continuous unconscious process. According to Robert Sigel “It is the gradual learning of the norms, attitudes and behaviour acceptable to an on-going political system.” Michale Curtis defines “Political socialisation as the transmitting of political values and norms of
the society”. Allan R. Ball regards “political socialisation as the establishment and development of attitudes to and beliefs about the political system and development of attitudes to and beliefs about the political system”. “It seeks to inculcate values, norms and orientations in the mind of individuals so that they trust in their political system and thereby keep themselves like well functioning citizens and also leave their indelible imprints on the mind of their successors”. Easton and Dennis define “political socialisation as those developing processes through which persons acquire political orientation and pattern of behavior”. According to Robert Lewin, “Political socialisation is the means by which individuals acquire motives, habits and values, relevant to participation in a political system”. In the opinion of Peter H. Merkl, “Political socialisation refers to acquisition of political attitudes and behavior patterns by members of a political system of sub-system”. Fred I. Greenstein defines political socialisation as “all political learning, formal and in-formal, deliberate and unplanned at every stage of the life cycle including not only explicitly political learning but also nominally non-political learning that affects political behaviour, such as, learning of politically relevant social attitude and the acquisition of politically relevant personality characteristics”.

The end product of political socialisation is, therefore, a set of attitudes cognitions, value standards and feeling – towards the political system, its various roles, and role incumbents. It also includes knowledge of values and feelings affecting the inputs of demands and claims the authoritative output.

Political socialisation is, however, different from socialization. Socialization, being sociological concept, is that process by which individuals learn to conform to the norms of the group and social beings establish wider and profounder relationship with one another. Whereas political socialisation deals with economic and political structures of the society. It, therefore, includes all those processes by which people acquire political orientation and pattern of behavior. Roberts Sigel also points out that political socialisation is the gradual learning of norms, attitudes and behaviors acceptable to on-going political system. While explaining the concept Waloby points out that political socialisation is a process by which people acquire political values not simply during active political participation but even before engaging themselves in political activities.

Political socialisation, therefore, includes all formal, informal, deliberate, unplanned learning at every stage of life. Political socialisation which means learning of political attitudes and social preferences is crucial to stable government.

**Types of Political socialization**

Almond and Powell has classified Political socialisation into two types, namely Direct or Manifest socialization and Indirect or Latent socialization.

1. **Direct or Manifest Socialization**

   Direct or manifest socialization refers to the process in which the content of the transmitted information, values or feelings in clearly political. Thus an individual, under the influence of his family, teachers or other some agencies learn explicitly about the pattern and functions of the
government, the views of political party or gets convinced of the superiority of particular ideology. The objects of his orientations being specifically political, these are instances of direct or manifest political socialisation.

It is manifest when it involves the explicit communication of information, values or feelings toward political objects. In other words Political socialisation is manifest when certain values or feelings or feelings towards political system are put into the minds of others directly, clearly and manifestly. It includes the process of formal instruction given in schools or colleges about the political objects.

Manifest socialization operates through imitation, anticipatory behavior, political education or political experiences. Imitation being important way of learning, naturally, is a vital component of political socialisation. Thus a rural migrant to an urban area may deliberately imitate political orientations of the urbanites just because by means of this imitation he may wish to make himself acceptable to his new associations. Or, a child may unconsciously imitate the party preferences of his parents. Again political socialisation may start through the anticipatory behaviour. Thus a student with a political ambition already begin to prepare himself for political offices even before he reaches the level of legal competence for these offices; in anticipation of holding an office he may develop mannerisms and styles associated with this office. Political socialisation comes through direct political education. Instructions in politics are given by the family; the school, the government and other political agencies and also by various groups and organizations.

Manifest socialization may also result from political experiences. An individual’s political ideas and beliefs are, no doubt, substantially shaped by his observations of and experiences in political process. His ideas mature through his continue interactions with political personalities, structures and events.

**Indirect or Latent Socialization**

Political socialisation is latent when attitude to non-political things becomes as attitude towards political things. In other words latent political socialisation is the transmission of non-political attitudes which affect attitudes toward analogous roles and objects in political system. For example the attitude of submission to the authority of the father in a family makes us to submit to the authority in one political system. It is deep rooted and usually it works unnoticed and more or less automatically. Latent political socialisation, therefore, involves many of the most fundamental characteristics of the general culture, which may, in turn, have great effect on the political sphere.

As is clear by the nomenclature, this type of political socialisation is indirect and non-manifest. This does not mean that it is always happening involuntarily. The will of the persons is also important it. It works in following three modes:

(i) **Transference:** In this type of indirect and non-manifest political socialisation, the values and thoughts of a person or persons are transferred to other person or persons. For example, the child submitting before the tyrant authority in the family adopts surrendering attitudes to the
government also. On the other hand, in democratic families, the children also develop democratic attitudes towards the political authority.

(ii) **Apprenticeship**: This includes learning of the habits and behaviour favourable to political activities. This learning is due to reward and punishment in the political field. In it the person’s own experience and not direct imitation of anyone is important. Non-political activities are learnt by them. For example, the experience of the family, the school and the job helps in learning activities favourable to many political actions.

(iii) **Generalisation**: This is the indirect non-manifest political socialisation work for generalization to reach from social values to political aims. The followers of the sceptical philosophy of life are sceptical not only of the society but also the government. The fatalist India philosophy of lie encourages surrender to the government.

In addition to these two main types of Political socialisation, there are following other types of it.

- Particularistic;
- Universalistic;
- Affective;
- Instrumental;
- Specific;
- Diffuse;

Particularistic Socialization is that process in which individual is taught only one and not more than one role. He does not learn anything about other roles. i.e., socializing an individual into Particularistic values only. In universalistic socialization cosmopolitan outlook is developed. One, therefore, learns several roles.

In affective socialization there is stress on emotional values and loyalties, viz. pride in one’s political system, loyalty to the one’s country, respect for ruler etc.

In instrumental socialization the emphasis is on pragmatic bargaining and calculating strategies i.e., the brief that a political system should be supported not for all times, but as long as one drives benefits from it.

In specific socialization, specific attitude and values are imparted by specific political structures.

There is diffused socialization where there is learning about vague things such as religion, politics, economy, society etc. It is found in such societies in which there is no differentiation between state and society.

**Functions of Political socialisation**

1. **Maintaining Political Culture**: This function is performed by communicating political culture from one generation to another generation. Under stable conditions this is an important function. But since the political field, is generally disturbed, the political socialisation does not act for maintaining political culture.
(2) **Modification of Political Culture**: Therefore, an important function of political socialisation is the modification of political culture. This aspect is clear from its relationships to change.

(3) **Creating Political Culture**: With the establishment of new political system every society needs the creation of political culture. This function is performed by the process of political socialisation.

(4) **Continuity and Change**: The above discussion shows that the political socialisation works in the directions of both continuity and change. In it change and modification is a permanent feature. In it change and modification is a permanent feature. However this change too has stability. Sometimes this process is fast and sometimes slow. Clear result in the political field may be seen by too fast or too slow political socialisation. This is also influence the policy of the state. In some states the government clearly makes efforts in this direction while in other states it is not so.

(5) **Foundation of present pattern of political system**: In open societies there are sufficient opportunities for difference of opinion and opposition. On the other hand, the totalitarian states do not accept difference of opinion and opposition. They are continually propagating in their favour. On the other hand, in democratic societies it is not so difficult to maintain traditions. Therefore, political socialisation can be imposed strictly according to the rigidity of the social systems.

**AGENTS OF POLITICAL SOCIALISATION**

Political socialisation is the process by which political culture is transmitted in a given society. It occurs at both the individual and community level, and it extends beyond the acquisition of political culture to encompass the learning of more sophisticated political ideas and orientations. Political socialisation is a lifelong process and variety of individuals and institutions contribute to its shaping effect. For example, individuals are politically socialized by such groups as their family, peers, and social class. Furthermore, they are socialized by existing laws, media, religion, education, their own gender, and more. Basically, the process is never ending and the factors which shape it are all encompassing.

Those groups and institutions which contribute to the process of political socialisation are known as the agents of socialization. On the basis of the operational period of these agents on individual life, they divided into primary agents and secondary agents of political socialisation. The primary agents of socialization are those that directly develop specific political orientations. Family, peer groups, educational institutions etc. come under the category of primary socializing agents. Whereas the secondary agents of socialization tend to be less personal and involved in the process of socialization in more indirect manner. Mass media, political parties, voluntary organizations, government etc. comes under the category of secondary socializing agents.
On the basis of nature of their operation and impact they are again been classified into formal and informal one. The formal agents are functioning with clear intentions such as schools, governments etc. The political socialisation takes places through the informal agencies are more or less indirect generally these agents do not the political ideas of views directly to the members of the society. They learn it indirectly through their personal observation and experience such as family, peer groups etc. Some of the important agents of political socialisation are:

1. Family
2. Peer groups
3. Educational Institutions
4. Secondary groups
5. Mass Media
6. Government
7. Political Party

**Family**

According to Allan R. Ball, the family should be described as the first window to the outer world for the child, it is his first contact with the authority. Family plays a key role in transmitting political culture from one generation to the next. Much of an individual’s political personality is shaped at home in the first ten or fifteen years of his life. The most of political personality of a person is determined in the family, years before his actual participation in politics. The father symbolizes authority in the family and the child’s attitude towards authority in adult life. Large scale researchers in U.S.A have confirmed that more than three-fourth children of a generation follow political values of the parents through the social and economic environments of the two generations may be widely different.

The importance of the family in political socialisation may be due to several reasons. In the first place, family holds a crucial position in the life of the child. The child need’s family love and approval, he draws from it his material requirements and is also given a status by the family. As a result, he follow the familial political beliefs and attitudes just as readily accepts the parental version of what is right and wrong, what is good and bad, what is proper and improper. Secondly children have a natural tendency of imitating their parents. The mother and father present ideal patterns of behaviour for the daughter and son respectively. With the increase of the age the importance of the parents diminishes and the child learns a lot from outside the family. But the influence of the parents is never completely wiped off from the mind, this is at least true about the less educated and less intelligent persons. Thirdly, members of a family usually live in the same environment. All the family is influenced by the same neighbours and neighbour hood, by the same friends, and the same economic forces of area and father’s occupation. The family members read the same news papers, attend to the same radio and TV programmes, listen to the same preacher and other local opinion leaders, gather the same gossip and hear the same stories. So all the members of the family should naturally carry similar political ideas, values and behavior due to residing in the same environment.
Peer groups

Besides family, there may be other groups in a society which like family, are based on primary relationships and yet differ from family in their structure and in the character of their intra-relationships. Childhood play groups, friendship cliques, small work groups, brothers and sisters, married couples are some of the examples of these groups which are known as peer groups. Inter-course among the members of a family, of course, is based on highly intimate and personal relationship; yet the members of a family do not all enjoy an equal status. The parent-child relationships are always hierarchic and each family contains at least two separate generations. In such conditions members of a family - the child and the parent - naturally claim to enjoy the same status. Peer groups on the other hand, comprise members about the same age. Hence peer groups can afford to be non-hierarchic and their members can manage to enjoy an equal status in their relation with each other. This equality is characteristic of equal age, equal functions and equal economic status. This does not mean that peer groups have no leaders, but these leaders do not enjoy authority, characteristic of the parents in the family.

Just as in the socialization of the child influence of the family is maximum, similarly the adolescent is influenced by the peer group and friend circle. In this age he needs explanation of political changes and participates in them. He attains political experience due to socialization in the upper group. This requires complex and impersonal relationships not found in the family. The family and the peer groups however, do not conflict but cooperate. As has been pointed out by Robert S. Sigel, “The more stratified or the more static the society, the less the peer group will probably conflict politically with the family.” The main reason of the importance of peer groups in political socialisation is the fact that interactions of members of upper group are spontaneous and not formal. The members naturally influence each other. They have most intimate and emotional relationships leading to socialization as it is in the case of family. However, the societies in which the control of the family upon the individual is comprehensive and durable exhibit little and less durable contribution of the peer group. According to Martin Levy, there is a tendency of accepting the majority of opinion among the members of peer groups.

Educational Institutions

As a person grows older and begins undertaking his formal education, the educational institutions - schools, colleges and universities - start working as another important agent of socialization. Schools, in fact, are close rivals to the family as the major agent of the political socialisation. Indeed, one of the main reasons why modern governments set up schools or help in founding them is that governments find in it an excellent medium through which they can hope to grow values highly congenial for their operation.

The schools socialize both directly and indirectly. Direct socialization takes place when the school curriculum, much as it is invariably imbued with nationalistic values, teachers about a country’s past, its heros and traditions and glorifies the achievements of the state, thereby helping the students develop a sense of pride about and a feeling of loyalty to their country and their governmental system.
The teachers also help in this process. The students are taught to surrender before the authority in the name of discipline in the school, a phenomenon helpful in later civic life. It goes without saying that repression in the political field will be possible only as much as will be the strictness of discipline in educational institutions. On the other hand, if the students are allowed to oppose the orders of the authorities, they do not shirk from the criticism of government in due course.

College and university education, for some students, may bring in new values and the formation of more radical political attitudes. In recent times in some western countries and, of course, in India, colleges and universities have been found to have fostered among certain students a militant political attitude and a love for confrontation with authorities.

Secondary groups

Secondary groups also work as an agent of political socialisation, however varies with the nature of societies. The more highly developed and complex society is, the greater will be the number of secondary groups and more important role they will play in the process of socialization. As the complexity and development increases in society so does increase the value of secondary groups. It is possible to identify three types of secondary groups which socialize politically in different ways. Firstly, there may be secondary groups with a distinctly political character. Political parties and political youth groups fall in this category. They are established clearly for the purpose of disseminating political values, mobilising political action and recruiting the political leaders. A second type represents those groups which are instituted for non-political purposes, but which are found to carry on political education and mobilisation along with their other activities. A labour union, students union illustrates these types. These groups aim at collective bargain in their particular field. But even these groups are led by the leaders following particular political ideologies. Some of them even active members of particular political party. They impart political education their followers and take part in active politics from time to time. The third type of secondary groups does not have any political character, nor do they ever try to impart political education to their members. But mere participation in their routine affairs gives their members opportunities to develop orientations that have political relevance. Thus a cricket club is not directly an agent of political socialisation, but a process of unintentional latent political socialisation is evident in its activities in as far as its members, while participating in its matters, very much undergo an apprenticeship for participation in the political sphere.

Mass Media

Radio, television, newspaper, and other forms of mass media also provide information about political happenings. That is why manipulation of media is often resorted to in different countries to influence, and change the political orientation of citizens. A controlled system of mass media, can, therefore, be a powerful force, in shaping political beliefs, and also can provide bases of support as important to a totalitarian status its police forces.
It is necessary to remember that mass media in most cases are not the actual originator of the messages they transmit. These messages, in fact, originate at the level of governmental officials and political leaders, secondary groups, etc. and the mass media just channelize these messages to the people. Viewed from this angle, mass media, strictly speaking, are not themselves an agent of political socialisation. Further, the mass media messages go through what Klapper calls a “two-step flow”. That is, mass media do not generally influence the people directly. The messages they transmit, at the first instance, reach a smaller number of “opinion leaders” like parents, teachers, community activities, etc., who then retransmit these messages to those over whom they have influence. Mass media reinforce the already established orientations.

**Government**

An individual’s continuous experiences of government through his direct contact with governmental functions and governmental personnel and his direct knowledge of what the government stands and works for is likely either to reinforce his ideas and attitudes acquired through the early political socialisation process or to alter them quite substantially. In some cases government directly intervenes to carry on a process of political indoctrination.

**Political Parties**

The political party is an important instrument through which people get a regular opportunity to be involved in political actions of the society. It is by way of this involvement that people are politically socialized by the political party. The political party may either reinforce the established political culture or may bring in significant changes in the pattern of existing political culture. Indeed, when a nation is aiming at radical social and political changes the political party may serve as a very useful agency for effectively disseminating ideas congruent with this change and thus may play a very great role in the process of political socialisation.

**Conclusion**

Political socialisation is, thus, a relatively new area of study, but the performs functions which are vital to the political system no less than to the individuals. This is when even a totalitarian regime is keen to monopolise the socialization process so that people develop positive attitudes towards it however, deplorable it may be from the larger humanistic stand point.

But the study of political socialisation, like political culture, has special and vital significance for the third world countries where the political culture is in flux and change and is yet to take a definite shape. The great issues of politics in the emerging nations such as political stability, political development and change can be much more meaningfully studied and discussed with the help of the concepts like political culture and political socialisation.
Module-VIII

POLITICAL PARTICIPATIONS

Democracies generally rely on the degree and level of citizen participation, both directly and indirectly. Active citizen participation is the underpinning of any democracy. The literature in political science in particular emphasizes the attribute of the individual actor to account for participation. But any attempt to understand ‘participation’ as a concept by excluding the attributes and characteristics of the ‘context’ in which an actor behaves, can be problematic. Some scholars treat participation as an instrumental phenomenon and others as a developmental phenomenon. The former emphasizes the effect of participation particularly on public policy, rather than because of its effects upon the actor. In other words, many scholars tend to perceive participation as a tool for influencing public outcomes.

Hence, by participating through the process of voting, it provides individuals a sense of satisfaction, regardless of whether their choice affects the outcome of an election or not. Participation can be issue based, ‘segmented by sector’, ‘distributed among different kinds of avenues’: ‘have different meaning’: and ‘impact within different avenues’. Active involvement and participation in public affairs require considerable time and commitment on behalf of citizens.

Meaning and Definitions

Political participation is a necessary ingredient of every political system. Although political power in every society is monopolized by just a few the incumbent of political authority in every system is found to be quite keen on ensuring some amount of political participation by the people the reason is quite understandable. By involving the many in the matters of the state, Political participation fosters stability and order by reinforcing the legitimacy of political authority. A society in which a substantial part of the population is denied any participation whatsoever is likely to be explosive. This is why even modern non democratic political systems the idea of political participation seems to be well - nurtured. A modern fascist or modern dictator, not withstanding whatever power he is free to exercise, will certainly not try to follow a go-it-alone policy; instead, he will invariably try to cloak his arbitrary decisions with the veil of a mass approval secured through some form of political participation by the people. The idea of this participation naturally, assumes greater importance in a democratic system which indeed demands it. After all, “participation is the principal means by which consent is granted or withdrawn in a democracy and rules are made accountable to the ruled”. This, however, does not mean that rates of political participation are always very high in modern stable democracies. Indeed , a democracy no mean by any accepted standard - like the USA reveals a rather poor rat of political participation in comparison with the corresponding rates in other democracies like Australia , News land , Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries. This only suggests that political participation is much too complex phenomenon liable to be influenced by a variety of variables.

Political participation denotes as series of voluntary activities which have bearing on the political process that involves issues like selection of rulers the various aspects of the formation of public policy to more specific, this activities mainly, are “(1) voting at polls, (2) supporting
possible pressure groups by being a member of them, (3) personally communicating directly with legislators (4) participation in political party activities and thus acquiring a claim on legislators and (5) engaging in habitual dissemination of political opinions through word of mouth communication to other citizens”.

Democracies generally rely on the degree and level of citizen participation, both directly and indirectly. Active citizen participation is the underpinning of any democracy. The literature in Political Science in particular emphasizes the attributes of the individual actor to account for participation. But any attempt to understand ‘participation’, as a concept by excluding the attributes and characteristics of the ‘context’ in which an actor behaves, can be problematic. Some scholars treat participation as an instrumental phenomenon, and others developmental phenomenon. The former emphasizes the effect of participation particularly on public policy, rather than because of its effects upon the actors. In other words, many scholars tend to perceive participation as a tool for influencing public outcomes.

Hence, by participating through the process of voting, it provides individuals a sense of satisfaction, regardless of whether their choice affects the outcome of an election or not. Participation can be ‘issue-based’, ‘segmented by sector’, ‘distributed among different kinds of avenues’: ‘have different meanings’; and ‘impact within different avenues. Active involvement and participation in public affairs require considerable time and commitment on behalf of citizens.

Three fundamental questions need to be raised about political participation, which this chapter will attempt to address:

1. What is participation, and why is it considered significant?
2. Why do people participate?
3. How do we explain the decline in the aggregate rates of participation?

Some definitions on political participation by various scholars are as follows:

According to Sidney Verba and Noray N.Nie, “political participation refers to those activities of private citizens which are more or less directly aimed at influencing the selection of government personnel and/or actions they take”. According to Samuel P Huntington and John N.Nelson, “political participation is simply an activity by private citizens designed to influence government decision making and action”. For example, student’s agitations for their demands. According to Rush and Althoff, “the process of political socialization provides the individuals with a perception seen through which he receives political stimuli; as a result of these stimuli, individuals involve themselves at various levels in political systems in the process of political participation”. In the opinion of Berelson Lazarsfeld and Mcphee, “political participation refers as a process to that phase of citizen’s behavior when they become actually involved in the political system”. Dr Mathews and J.W. Prontho define political participation as “all behavior through which people directly express their political opinions”. Amartya Sen speak of the freedom to participate as being a key to development. To quote Sen, “participation can be seen to have intrinsic values for the quality of life. Indeed being able to do something through political action – for oneself or for others – is one of the elementary freedoms that people have reason to value”.
Verba defined political participation is, “simply to activity that has the intent or effect of influencing government action – either directly by affecting the making or implementation of public policy or indirectly by influencing the selection of people who make those policies”

**Activities of Political participation**

According to J.L. Woodword and F. Robert, political participation involves, (1) Voting at the polls, (2) Supporting possible pressure groups by being a member of them, (3) Personally communicating directly by legislators, (4) Participating in political party activity and thus acquiring a claim on and (5) Engaging in habitual dissemination of political opinions through word-of-mouth communications to other citizens. Thus the following are the activities of political participation:

1. **Voting at the polls** - The most important participation in a democracy is the right of adult franchise. In the absence of this right democracy is not possible. Therefore in a democracy the adult males and females have a right to participate in elections. The age of participation varies in different states from 18 to 21 years.

2. **Membership of pressure groups** - An important activity of political participation is the active membership of political pressure group. This should not be curbed by law since an impediment is very much opposed.

3. **Communication by legislators** - Modern democracies are generally indirect, since the number of people is so large that they cannot directly participate in the political activities. Hence, in most of the countries the people elect members of legislatures. Before elections, the candidates contact the voters, educate them and ask for their votes. It is expected that after the elections the successful candidates to the legislatures will constantly contact with the people. The voters also maintain direct personal contact with the legislators since they have elected them for the solution of their own problems. Some of them even threaten the legislators that if they do not solve their problems they will not allow them to win future elections. Thus, the political participation of the people does not end with the elections but the political activities constantly go on between the voters and the legislators on the one hand and local leaders on the other. The legislators who fail to do so or who do not maintain public contact should not hope for victory in future elections.

4. **Participation in political party** - Every democracy has two or more political parties. Each political party has specific ideology and it constantly propagates it. This propagation is done by political workers who are active members of a political party. Some of them are whole time political workers. Most of their political parties have their network of workers in every village of the country. This is particularly true about a political party at the national level. Some political parties however, are regional in character and their workers work in their field of influence. Democracy allows people to form any political group. In comparison with the ordinary people the active members have more influence upon the legislators and political leaders so much so that they are successful in taking local problems to the legislators.
5. **Propaganda of political opinion** - Before elections and almost all the time after it every political party tries to propagate its ideology more and more. Each party has a right to propagate its ideas everywhere through newspapers and magazines, platform and other means of communication. Most of the propagation is done through the lectures by the political leaders. The above discussion makes it clear that in every state political participation is effective all the time and everywhere. Then, from time to time, political movements are waged and activities of political participation increased. No political party ever sits ideal. Those who are elected to legislature are busy in acting for their political party. Each political party has political leaders from village to national level who are always busy in political activities involving hundreds and thousands and sometimes millions of persons. This may be seen in India. Before election the speed of political participation very much increases. From time to time the local and national political issues are taken up to maintain activity. Not only the political issues but every non-political problem becomes the basis of political movements. Meetings are organized, processions taken out, memoranda submitted and demonstrations held. This political participation is going on every city in some form or the other almost all the time.

**Common forms of political participation: conventional and unconventional**

There are two forms of political participation:

1. Conventional and
2. Unconventional

**Conventional political participation:**

Conventional political participation is the ‘normal’ form of political participation in modern democracies. These forms of participation are the commonly accepted ones in the society: moreover, they follow the political system. Voting, campaigning, contacting, contacting and lobbying officials are examples of conventional forms of political participation.

1. **Electoral activity:** includes voting campaign contributions working in an election on behalf of a candidate or any other action designed to affect the outcome or the electoral process.
2. **Lobbying:** includes individuals or group efforts to contact government officials and political leaders with a view to influencing their decisions on issues that affect a significant number of people.
3. **Organizational activity:** involves participation as a member or officer in an organization that has its primary or explicit goal of influencing government’s decision-making.
4. **Contacting:** individual action directed to governmental officials and normally designed to produce benefits for only a single person or a small number of people.

**Unconventional form of political participation:**

Unconventional form of political participation does not follow the routinized institutional forms of politics; they are less ordinary and sometimes viewed as less acceptable. These forms include protest, civil disobedience, petitioning’ violence and revolution.
Civil disobedience: involves international efforts to be arrested in order to draw attention to a cause. When compared with other forms of participation such as protest, civil disobedience is considered to be an extreme form of participation.

Violence: can also be a form of political participation. This is considered to be the radical form of political participation, i.e., efforts to affect governmental decision-making by doing physical damage to persons or property. Bombings, assassinations and riots are some of other example

Types of political participations

Milbrath’s classification tends to show that political participation basically, is two types active and passive. This classification is based upon time energy and means utilization.

1. Passive – All people do not want to devote time, energy or money in political activities. They are known as passive participants. In other words they only spectators.
2. Active- Those who create the spectacle are the active political participants

Political participation may further be classified in terms of its purpose as instrumental and expressive

1. Instrumental political participation – It is essentially directed to the achievement of concrete goals like securing party victory or the passage of a bill or just a rise in one’s status or influence.
2. Expressive political participation- it does not have definite objects. It only aims at the satisfaction or the release of a feeling. Some persons vote to achieve the victory of particular candidate whereas most of the voters vote for the satisfaction or the use of their voting right.

Other types of political participation are popular / conventional type of political participation and unconventional types of political participation.

1. popular / conventional types: - This type of participation presupposes none or only small personal involvement. The example includes voting, and dissemination of political information.
2. Un conventional types: - This type of participation presupposes personal involvement and engagement, like actively being engaged for a political party or movement, running for political office, political protest activities.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION: THE CAUSAL FACTORS

Contemporary literatures on political participation focus on four major factors that influence and shape political participation, viz.

1. Resources;
2. Political values;
3. Social Capital; and
4. Institutional opportunities and constraints
Resources

A variety of issues and factors can impact on the differing levels of political participation. These include critical resource variables, like `age', `income', `gender', `education', `residence', and the `rural-urban divide'.

Political Values

A fundamental political value that influences political participation is the degree of participation. In this context, one's ideological orientations and perceptions about the `status quo' and the need for 'change' come into play. It also reflects divergent dimensions of political attitude and the extent to which they impact on political participation and behaviour.

Social and political values are often considered in analyses of the personality correlates of political attitudes and political participation. So, it is the case for the relations between subjective development goals and political participation, as well as the relationship between moral reasoning, political attitudes and political participation.

Social Capital

The terms `political participation' and `social capital' are not synonymous. Robert Putnam makes a distinction between political participation, i.e. `our relations with political institutions' and social capital, i.e. `our relations with one another'.

The fundamental questions to be raised in this context are:

1. Does social capital promote political participation?
2. How does social capital become relevant to political participation?
3. Do communities and countries with greater stocks of social capital also have high levels of political activity by their citizens?
4. Are citizens who participate in a variety of nonpolitical civic groups encouraged to engage in political activity?
5. What role do social networks play in creating and sustaining politically relevant social capital?

Robert Putnam focuses on the role of social capital in strengthening the richness of democratic experiences. Hence, he laments the decline of social capital in the United States, and its implications for American democracy, especially from the point of view of political participation. Putnam's major argument is that to promote political participation, we should be advocating all forms of social capital formation, especially volunteer activities and organizational membership.

Joseph I. Klesner argues that if higher levels of social capital do not promote greater political participation and a richer, healthier democratic experience, then one's worry about its meanings of low levels of social capital or declining stocks of social capital would be largely misplaced. Very often the declining rates of political participation are linked to the erosion of social capital within a domestic society. Hence the stocks of social capital and the rate of political participation varies both in terms of `inter-state' and intra-state' dynamics.
Coleman's concept may help to explain why citizens participate in politics when it is seemingly irrational at the individual level to do so. Coleman argues that social capital is realised through networks of political communication. He perceives social capital as an aspect of the social structure that facilitates particular forms of action and cooperation.

Anirudh Krishan has come out with the strong argument that social capital may promote political participation, though not necessarily democratically. Social capital helps maintain democracy, by impacting on the quantity and quality of political participation. A link can be drawn between membership of voluntary associations and increased political participation. Such participation in associational groups could bring about changes in people's values, preferences and capacity to act. The bonds of social capital also affect the nature and quality of political participation.

The overall thrust of politically relevant social capital is that social capital facilitates political engagement. By politically relevant social capital is meant a particular type of social capital that is produced as a consequence of political expertise and information that is repeatedly communicated within an individual's network of social relations. Politically relevant social capital is created as a consequence of political interaction/participation within these networks. As a result, it is expected that politically relevant social capital is likely to enhance political participation and engagement in politics. The major dimensions of social capital, like political expertise, frequency of political interaction and network size, all of them have an effect on the level of individual political participation and engagement. This enables citizens to participate in ways which they might not otherwise.

In terms of the nature of the participatory activities, the following are very frequently highlighted, viz. working for a party or candidate, attending meetings or election rallies for a party or candidate, donating money to a political party or candidate, actually exercising one's franchise, etc. The point to be made here is that the production of social capital tends to result in a broader repertoire of political participation.

Institutional Opportunities and Constraints

Institutional opportunities and constraints play an important role in shaping the modes of participation and the volume of that participation. Major studies of political participation have found that subjective political involvement plays a role as an intervening variable between socio-economic status and political participation. Analysts of political participation have recognised socio-economic status variables to be strong predictors of participation. Voting is perhaps the most widespread form of institutional political participation, and has been the focus of most theories of political participation, though not the only form of political participation.

Another critical element is that of system trust which refers to the individual's trust in the political system as well as trust in the politicians and political parties. Political trust and distrust were first conceptualized in political psychology by Rosenberg (1956) within sociological analyses of political ideologies and political participation. Some writers list system distrust as one of the personal factors influencing political participation and political attitudes.
Determinants of political participation

Political participation is a complex phenomenon that cannot be easily explained. It varies from country to country, from era to era, from one type of people in a society to another. Too many determinants thus work behind political participation, which, however, may be brought and some broad categories like

(1) the Psychological
(2) the social
(3) the political

Psychological factors

Political participation, indeed, tends to meet one’s psychological needs of overcoming his loneliness, unconscious conflicts and tensions and urge to power.

1. Loneliness:

In the words of R E Lane, “Common political beliefs lay the ground work for sharing equivalent emotions of anger, sympathy and distress: common interest improves the opportunities for association with others - the excuse may be politics the need may be fear of isolation”. Thus men participate politically because they detest isolation and want to have the association of others.

People participate in politics due to loneliness and since they want to meet each other.

2. Unconscious conflicts and tensions:

Political participation is determined by unconscious conflicts and tensions. Political participation is likely to provide relief to man’s intra-psychic tensions growing mostly at the unconscious level and generated either by a conflict of his impulses, on the one hand, and his mental control mechanisms, on the other the external background of this conflict being provided either the familial sphere or the social sphere.

3. Urge to power

An important determined of political participation is the urge to power. Man always seeks power because he feels happiness in being powerful. Generally, the urge to power is active on the unconscious level. Consciously or unconsciously, the ego of the political leaders seeks satisfaction from political activities. He has sense of pride and achieves social regard. Clearly, is a society where political activities are valuable, more political will take recourse to political participation

Social factors:

The most important social factors which determine political participate are education, occupation, income, sex, age, residence, mobility, religion, race and group influence

1) Education – Education is the most important social factor influencing political participation. This influence is due to the fact that education widens man's field of interests. The educated people are more conscious towards the duties and responsibilities of the citizen. He has more self confidence and ability. Therefore, he can easily propagate his ideas. Thus he has more ability of political participation
II) Occupation: The traders and the professional persons have to attend political development since their occupations are influence politics. In some occupation most of the persons have to face identical problems which bring them near each other. These people take more part in politics. For example, among occupational groups the teachers and the government servants exhibit maximum political participation in almost every country.

iii) Income: Higher income provides more leisure diminishes anxieties and gives more occasions for political contacts. Therefore, in so many countries in the west, the political leaders belong to higher income groups. However, in poor countries, the political leaders come from middle and lower classes. It is clear that the income has no proportionate relationship to political participation.

iv) Social status: Education, occupation and income together constitute a person’s status and, therefore, it is quite appropriate to say that high status persons are likely to participate more in politics than the low status people.

v) Sex and Age: In each country men participate more than women, who are found to be more conservative, less liable to heterodoxy, less well-informed about political issues and public figures, less interest in politics. As compared to minors the adults show more stability, security, ability and responsibility. Therefore, studies in US, Great Britain, France and other developed countries have shown that comparison to children, young men and old persons, the middle aged male and females have higher rate of political participation.

Vi) Residence: Another factor influencing political participation is permanent residence. It is a common phenomenon that outsiders are not allowed to lead in politics of the village, city or constituency. As a general rule, the leaders should have permanent residence within the field of his leadership. Permanent residence introduces him to local politics and extends his period of contact with the local person. His manners and habits, conduct, language, problems, ambitions and ways of thinking and behavior are according to local patterns. Therefore, he has more occasions for political participation.

Vii) Religion and race: In the west the catholic voters have been generally found to participate more in elections involving issues like legislation of birth control or matters touching the affairs of educational institutions controlled by catholic beliefs. According to Lipset, “In Germany, where the Christian Democratic Party attempts to be the spokesman of both Catholicism and Protestantism, whether catholic or Protestants attend church affects their political participation considerably”.

In the west, race has an important influence upon political participation. In the countries distinguishing between white and black races, the white people show more political participation in comparison to black persons. However, one may notice more political activity among persons opposing racism

Viii) Group: The group very much determines the political activities of the members. It provides the criterion of right and wrong in political judgment. It creates the political and social environment. Man’s status in the group determines his political status. A social leader easily become a political leader
Political factors:

Political factors are as important that of social variables in determining political participation. The most important political factors are determining political participation are political parties, Attitudes of government, Elections.

i) Political parties - Of all political influences on participation the party is surely the most important since it is very significant vehicle for conveying the wishes of the people to the government. The party draws itself such a great emotional attachment form the people that for many it acts as very powerful reference group that keeps them engaged in political activities, in some way or other. The parties also perform a number of important functions that help people in participating politically. They give people political instructions and directly encourage them to participate by constantly supplying them information about the political world and also about the technicalities involved in different forms of participation. One mainly knows through a party what the central issues are in current national politics, however judge them, who are the candidates in elections, where to find the voters register, how to search one’s name in it, which polling centre one would have to go to and what the procedure of casting one’s vote is.

ii) Attitudes of government - The rate of political participation are lower in a country where the field of politics is so vast that transport and communication between all the corners is impossible. This may see in India. On the other hand, in a country where competition for power is open the rate of political participation is high. If the rules of voting are simple, more people participate in it. If the government encourages voters to vote, they vote in larger number. On the other hand the government discourages people, the rate of political participation falls.

ii) Elections - Besides the political parties the system and process of election also influence political participation. These are being sociologically studied though no universal general principle can be derived about political participation on the basis of these studies. However, several important things have come to light by these studies. According to S. J. Elederseveld, these studies may be classified into following six types:

a) Hypothesis - testing exploratory – In such type of study – a good examples of which is Stuart Rice's Quantitative Methods in Politics. In this type of study, the researcher forms a hypothesis before starting his study. Now he gathers data about a particular election situation and examines whether his hypothesis is right or wrong. It is clear that such studies are very limited. Their scope is concerned with a particular situation in a single election. In them it is not possible to study different elections or different hypotheses.

b) Single - hypothesis study- This method of election study is better than the above mentioned method. In this method the researcher forms a single hypothesis about the explanation of a particular aspect of voting behavior. Now, in order to examine the validity of this hypothesis, he studies elections and election units for a sufficiently long time. But he never examines the validity of a single hypothesis by other alternatives.
Therefore, the validity of this method becomes less.

c) **Hypothesis – testing factorial analysis** - In this method of the study of voting behaviour, relevant data are gathered about a definite hypothesis or some definite hypothesis. This examination is limited to a particular community during the period of one or two elections. Thus, it is an effort for a continuous, systematic and deep study. It is limited to particular community for a particular period. Examples of such studies are E. H. Litchfield’s Voting Behaviour in a Metropolitan Area and D. Anderson and P. E. Davidson’s Ballot, and the Democratic Class. In this method several alternative hypotheses are examined. While it shows the nature of voting behaviour it also points out that most of it is still unknown.

d) **Comprehensive tabulation.** In this method of the study of voting behaviour, no hypothesis is made and even if it is named, it is not rigid. The researcher studies the various aspects of a particular election unit in one or more elections and gathers maximum data concerning voting. These data are gathered from the records of voting. Due to comprehensive data this method becomes important but in the absence of hypothesis it does not prove anything. Therefore, it is valuable only as a special study of a particular community during a particular period. No comprehensive generalization can be made on its basis.

e) **Comparative statistical survey.** In this type of study of voting behaviour factors influencing trends of voting in different states or nations are studied. An example of such a study is Herbert Tingstens' Political Behaviour. In this method, no hypothesis is made and therefore its value is limited and particular. No general principle can be derived on the basis of this type of studies of voting behaviour.

f) **Community dynamics.** In this type of voting behaviour study comprehensive tables and data are gathered. In this method, various connected hypothesis are made to start with. In it relationship among various variables is studied by latest methods of measurement and survey. In it the sociologists start with the view that political behaviour is a total situation in which a particular community is involved and therefore it must be influenced by several factors. This method of study of voting behaviour does not explain systematic form of voting behaviour. Therefore, the question has been raised in modern times that the voting behaviour studies maybe at the most bases of prediction, correct analysis is not possible upon them. In the words of W. G. Runciman, "A man might make his decision for some anomalous and even arbitrary reason and not for the final variable isolated by the patient experimenter." On the other hand, some sociologist tried to point out “There is nothing, in a sense, that needs to be explained about a south wales minor voting labour or an executive of general motors’ voting republican. The simplest model of rational self interests is enough to explain these cases.
ONLINE POLITICAL PARTICIPATION IN THE AGE OF GLOBALISATION

The internet has now become an important medium for political participation. Unfortunately, it has received little attention from this perspective. Participation researchers now argue: hat the internet has become a mainstream avenue for political participation, to the extent that some forms of online political participation now rival traditional forms. Moreover, the internet has increased in political importance too. It is indeed necessary to identify the factors that most powerfully influence online participation. It is also necessary to assess whether the online participants' opinions tend to reflect those of the general population, who use traditional forms of participation.

The broader political context tends to influence both online and offline participation. It is considered necessary to compare online participation and offline participation to political attitudes. The importance of assessing the representativeness of internet political participation patterns cannot be underestimated. The important criteria is to emphasize the characteristics that facilitate online participation as well as distribution of these characteristics at the level of the population. Hence internet alters the types of resources necessary for political activity and participation.

POLITICAL PARTICIPATION-DEMOCRACY LINKAGE

Patterns of political participation are determined by the institution of democracy. Participatory democracy is perceived as a relatively homogenous, cooperative and humanly fulfilling social fabric. Macpherson's book *The Life and Times* stipulates two requisites for the establishment of a participatory system within a democracy:

1. The weakening or elimination of class divisions.
2. The transformation of citizen's from private consumers and utility maximisers into public agents.

A central precondition as Macpherson asserts is a great reduction of the present social and economic inequality, since that inequality ...requires a non-participatory party system to hold society together. A second requirement according to Macpherson is a change in people's consciousness or unconsciousness from seeing themselves and acting essentially as consumers geeing themselves and acting as exerters and enjoyers of the exertion and development of their own capacities. In other words, this is a requirement not only for the emergence, but also for the operation of a participatory democracy.

Samuel Huntington has argued that the democratic upsurge especially since the 1960s have resulted in what he calls *a democratic distemper*, which has resulted in an expansion of governmental activity, and an erosion of governmental authority. This means an overload on the political system because of the excessive demands being placed on it. It has even resulted in a decline of governmental authority, and the consequent crisis of governability of democracy. It is a scenario of too much democracy leading to a decline of government authority. Hence, Huntington makes a case for maintaining a suitable balance between the governmental authority and the limits on that the authority which makes a constitutional democracy meaningful.
Giovanni Sartori, a well-known theorist of democratic revisionism, identified himself with Robert Dahl and Charles Lindblom, by co-opting the idea of a polyarchy or pluralist democracy. However, he does not fully reject the elite theory. He argued that the anti-elitists have been preoccupied with the 'horizontal' extension of democracy, i.e. 'participation', while neglecting the 'vertical' dimension, i.e. 'leadership'. Hence Sartori favors a more informed, interested, and active citizenry. He makes a strong case for more widespread participation in actual decision-making.

The United Nations Human Development Report emphasizes formal political participation and representation through political parties and electoral systems. This calls for improving governance in political parties, promoting the participation of minorities and women, building and strengthening electoral systems and limiting the distorting influence of money in politics.

GIOGLOBAL CITIZENSHIP, GLOBAL CIVIL SOCIETY AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The forces of civil society are redefining the meaning of governance and democratic participation. The theorists of cosmopolitan democracy seek a model of political participation structured around a concept of global citizenship. The increasing visibilities of human rights, financial, and environmental concerns at the global level, have led to the need to appreciate the role of the global citizen in a globalised world.

Andrew Linklater suggests that a nascent form of global citizenship is distinguished by the following factors, viz. a cosmopolitan, universal stem of individual rights, a set of duties additional to or even competing with duties to fellow nationals, and finally, an emerging worldwide democratic 'public sphere' or global civil society. He further argues that "global civil society at the global level is ethically superior to its seedbeds at the national level, for global civil society overcomes the exclusionary tendencies of Westphalian citizenship. David Held and McGrew argue that 'each citizen of a state will have to learn to become a cosmopolitan citizen'. Bhikhu Parekh argues that 'even if we reject a system of global citizenship. Some form of global-oriented citizenship is a minimal requirement. The Union is a prime example of a transnational regime that is regulating the sovereignty of the member nations in important ways, especially in terms of the 'status' of citizens. The European Union experiment has resulted in some form of multilevel citizenship in Europe, where individuals affiliate to many political authorities-region, the state and the supranational organization, simultaneously.

Contemporary notions of citizenship are also constructed globally, given the repeated usage of the term 'global citizen'. Globalization appears to have transformed the means of national citizenship and political participation, without necessarily rendering it obsolete. Global civil society can be perceived as an indication of the internationalization of the state, rather than a challenge to the nation-state per se. Hence the actions of global civil society need not necessarily act as a check on the power of the state. Along with the supranational forces and pressures, sub-national pressures from citizens also need to be factored in. The challenge is one of accommodating nationalist expressions without having to create a separate nation-state for each sub-national movement/group.
Forms of Non Participation

There are various reasons for people neither participating in politics nor in political activities such as:

**Apathy:** This can be defined as lack of interest or lack of concern for persons, situations or phenomena in general or particular. Apathetic characteristics include inability to recognize personal responsibility: to accept his own emotions and feelings: feelings of worry, insecurity and threat; and complete, unchallenging acceptance of constituted authority (social codes, parents, and religion).

**Political apathy:** This is a type of political passivity, which provides supports for the regime but enables the individuals to avoid the politicization of his whole being. According to Morris Rosenberg, there are three main reasons for political apathy:

(a) The first reason is the perceived consequence of political activity. The individual may feel that political activity is a threat to various aspects of his life. For example, the belief that it will alienate his friends and neighbors. Therefore, where the individual is faced with a controversy or cross-pressures, he may find political activity more congenial.

(b) The individual may regard political activity as futile. As a single individual, they may feel that they are totally unable to influence the course of events and that the political forces they perceive are in any case beyond the control of the individual.

(c) Finally, they consider political stimuli as important factors in encouraging political activity, and the absence of such stimuli may contribute to feelings of apathy.

In a democracy, one usually comes across two types of apathetic:

(a) In deliberate apathy: due to lack of information and some people fail to participate. Some people do not participate due to lack of opportunity. This kind of political apathy is usually found among the uneducated, the inarticulate, parochial, isolated and in societies dominated by men.

(b) Deliberate apathy: the second type, deliberate apathy is found among those who decide not to participate politically.

**Political involvement:** For some individuals, political involvement may appear to be far less rewarding than other kinds of human activity. One may tend to derive psychological satisfaction and material benefits from one’s preoccupation with family and friends.

**Political participation does not change the existing state of things:** An individual’s political participation is influenced by their sense of political efficacy. Factors such as person’s income, social standing, political experience and the level of education condition their political participation. Sometimes, the personality factor also plays an important role.

**Efficiency and efficacy of the political system:** An individual may be satisfied with the Efficiency and efficacy of the political system they belong to. The individual will be under the belief that the system will function smoothly and efficiently, no matter whether he is politically involved or not.
**Political apathy out of frustration:** Political apathy may be also due to total frustration with the system. An individual may decide to keep away from politics, due to prevailing incorrigible and corrupt practices in the system.

**Political apathy due to ideological stereotype:** Political apathy maybe encouraged by an ideological stereotype. For example, the naxalites appealed to voters to abstain from alleging that the bourgeois elections will not have any bearing on the people.

**Cynicism:** Robber Tagger defines as being ‘contemptuously distrustful of human nature.’ it suggests certain dislike for politics and politicians. Political cynicism manifests itself in a variety of ways: the feeling that politics is ‘a dirty business’, that politicians are not to be trusted, that the individuals are at the mercy of manipulating groups. The ‘real’ power is exercised by ‘faceless men’ and so on. This type of cynicism is prevalent in a political system which is generally regarded as enjoying widespread legitimacy.

**Alienation:** It suggests actual hostility. Robert Lane defines political alienation as ‘a person’s sense of estrangement from the politics and government of his society’.

**Uncertainty of political conviction:** Some people do not participate actively due to the uncertainty of their political conviction. To them politics is confused, complicated, and contradictory and political communication is mere propaganda.

**Personal factor:** Personal reasons may also account for apathy. Some individuals maybe too exhausted by other to pay much attention to it.

**Reasons for increasing importance of political participation**

The reasons for increasing importance of political participation are as follows:

1. **Functions of the government have increased:** In the modern welfare state, the functions of the state have increased dramatically. The government has become a vast cooperative service agency and a major force for social and economic activity. Individuals are expecting better quality of life and greater freedom.

2. **Increase in national consciousness:** There has been an unprecedented growth in national consciousness. And even ‘world consciousness ‘due to mass communication, mass media, and the development of common languages, ideas, goals and expectations. In third world countries, the national struggle for liberalization has not only resulted in the attainment of independence but also in increased demands for a share in the government.

3. **Mass consciousness for enjoying rights:** Democratic ideas have influenced the masses, now they are more conscious of their rights-particularly the political rights-is accompanied by the performance of duties. The concept of political rights and duties emphasize political participation.

4. **Participation in administration:** This is another important aspect of political participation. There has been a manifold increase in the functions of the state. The modern state has to provide protection, guidance and leadership. it is not widely recognized that government should make all efforts to get a consensus of citizen, for its wide acceptance of policies and decisions.
5. Implementation of government policies and decisions: This largely depends on the active cooperation of people. The failure of economic planning in our country is attributed mainly due to lack of peoples’ participation in development efforts. The motives for participation in brief are:

a) Trying to influence the government at national and local levels
b) Promoting individual or family welfare
c) Promoting neighborhood facilities.
d) Coping with effects of a natural calamity, for example flood, drought etc:

6. The politics of the emerging countries: His has been as a large increase popular participation. Mass participation means experience in a relatively wide range of organizations like political parties; trade unions; farmer’s and women’s organization; students’ organizations; state sponsored; consumers or producers; cooperatives and many more. Participating in these organizations implies that a significant part of the population learns the basic skills of political activity. This gradually increased pool of politically experienced or partly experienced personnel are likely to confront any authoritarian or military regime in their country and the shifting balance between politically mobilized and traditionally interested groups may in turn increase the chances of the civilians and the partisans of high participation to prevail.

7. Modernisation: The reasons for the increased political participation is due to industrialization, increase urbanization, spread of mass literacy and the development of the mass and communications.

AN ASSESSMENT

Political participation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon. Political participation gives the public a strong sense of public ownership. Democratic theory relies on popular participation. Citizen participation lies at the heart of a democracy. The importance of ‘participative cultures’ needs to be recognized in any analysis on political participation. Conventional wisdom about political participation also needs to be backed up by empirical validity. Different modes of participation can be explained using different variables. Among the various variables, perhaps, ‘interpersonal trust’ and ‘volunteerism’ in various walks of life are effective in promoting participation. The social capital variables provide additional explanatory power to political participation. In short, social capital is an important factor in encouraging higher levels of political participation. There is a close nexus between political development, social mobilization, economic development and political participation. Political participation often involves sending explicit messages about political issues. Unequal participation remains “democracy's unresolved dilemma”. Participation may be considered democratic if every individual affected by a decision have an equal opportunity to affect the decision. The question that is often raised in not who participates, but who possesses the characteristics that enable participation. It is perhaps equally necessary to find out whether participators' opinions distort those of the general population. Political participation helps to maintain a viable and stable democracy. The extent to which one can draw the link between the measures of political participation and the quality of an individual's life continues to be debated.
Module-IX

POLITICAL MODERNISATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Political modernisation

Modernisation is an unavoidable process. Individuals may change from time to time and this change is being influenced by the process of modernisation. There is craze for modern ways of life and the various comforts and conveniences which go with the process of modernisation. Although there was modernisation in every society at different stages of history, the process became highly accelerated after the industrial revolution in Europe. Advancement of science and technology has been responsible to bring rapid modernisation affecting almost all walks of life in society.

The concept of ‘political modernisation’ like political development is very vague. Different scholars have defined it differently. Most of the western political scientists regarded modernisation as westernization.

The term ‘Modernisation’ is, however, said to be the current term for the old process, the process of social change, whereby less developed societies acquire characteristics common to more developed society. It is a process based upon the rational utilization of resources and aimed at the establishment of modern society. For some persons, modernisation is a process of structural differentiation, functional specialization and adaptive upgrading. Modernisation in the evolutionary perspective refers to transition from primitive to traditional, to industrialized society; from religious to secular ideology, from particularism, ascription, diffuseness, self orientation to universalism, achievement, specificity, and collective orientation from extended family to nuclear family and so on.

A modern society has been identified as a society characterized by the application of technology and by extensive social interdependence. Urbanization, literacy, social mobility and many other factors also go with the concept of modern society. Modernisation implies the breakdown of traditional society. It refers to the development of a new social order “based on advanced technology and the spirit of science, a rational view of life, a secular approach to social relations, a feeling for justice in public affairs and above all else on the acceptance in the political realm of the belief that the prime unit of the polity should be the nation-state”.

Modernisation is at present an irresistible force. It has spread to the different parts of the world. This process has been described as “a diffusion of world culture”. Modernisation like the Industrial Revolution started in Western Europe and has spread to other parts of the world. Thus, industrialization, urbanization, education and media participation are the various aspects of modernisation. It refers to the change in political culture and political institutions as a result of the process of modernisation- “that is everything like economic growth, increase of gross national product and per-capita income, economic planning, greater industrialization, accumulation of capital, increasing urbanization and reduction of the proportion of those engaged in agriculture, scientific advance, improved transport and a higher rate of literacy.
Definitions

Claud E. Welch, Jr. suggests, modernisation as “the process based upon the rational utilization of resources and aimed at the establishment of a modern society”

Benjamin Schwartz describes modernisation as “the systematic, sustained and powerful application of human energies to the rational control of man’s physical and social environment for various human purposes”.

W.W. Rostow “Modernisation implies an intellectual, technological and social revolution”

A B. Smith points out “modernisation is defined as man’s increased knowledge and mastery of this environment”.

C E Black defines: The process by which historically evolved institutions are adapted to the rapidly changing functions that represent the unprecedented increase in man’s knowledge, pertaining to control is called modernisation”.

Gabriel A Almond and G Bingham Powell jr. say “the political modernisation refers to those processes of differentiation of political structures and secularization of political culture which enhance the capacity of society’s political system”

Michael Curtis points out that “ modernisation implies economic growth, the increase of gross national product and of per capita income, economic planning, greater industrialization, the accumulation of capital, increasing urbanization and a reduction in the proportion of those engaged in agriculture scientific advance, improved transport and a higher rate of literacy”.

Karl Deutch “modernisation is a process by which major cultures of old social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded or broken down the people become available for new pattern of socialization and behavior.”

Marxist scholars define modernisation in terms of consciousness as ideology or superstructure. They see modernisation as the imposition of infrastructure of domination and exploitation and interpret elements of consciousness as dependent variables i.e. an appendage of infrastructure.

According to Huntington “Modernisation is multi-faceted process involving changes in all areas of human thought and activity”.

Modernisation is a multi-faceted process and, for this reason, political modernisation is a concept having several dimensions as:

1. At the psychological level, modernisation involves a fundamental shift in the norms, values, attitudes and orientations of the people.
2. At the intellectual level, it involves a tremendous expansion of man’s knowledge about his environment and the diffusion of this knowledge throughout the society through increased literacy, education and mass communication.
3. At the demographical level, it implies improvements in the standards of living and progress towards the mobility of people and urbanization.
4. At the **social level**, it has a tendency to replace the focus of an individual’s loyalty to family and other primary groups to voluntarily organised secondary associations.

5. At the **economic level**, it involves the growth of market agriculture, improvement in commerce at the expense of agriculture, development of industrialization and widening of the economic activity.

Thus, modernisation “is regarded as a comprehensive phenomenon which brings about radical changes in the field of economic development, mainly in the direction of industrialization and material advancement, political systems and also changes in the social and psychological spheres of life”.

**Basic characteristics of Modernisation**

1. Application of technology and mechanization
2. Industrialization
3. Urbanization
4. Rise in national income and per-capita income
5. Increasing literacy
6. Political participation
7. Development of mass media techniques
8. Social mobility
9. Cultivation of national identity

**Stages of political modernisation**

The subject of political modernisation has its special relevance in the case of the developing countries of the Third World which “are damned if they do, and damned if they don’t”. Such is the dilemma before the Third World countries. The reason for this may be traced in their perennial quest for the way they should adopt to achieve the goal. The fact stands out that no country desires to relinquish the path of development or modernisation and, at the same time, most of the Third World countries fail to choose the option between liberal and socialist courses. Apter is of the view that while the liberal capitalist solution poses the problem of inequality, the Marxian socialist requires coercion. And yet the struggle for political modernisation persists because ‘development embodies hope’.

Like political development, political modernisation also takes place where it is most easily accepted or wanted. Thus, it signifies the ‘transfer of roles from metropole to periphery’. Moreover, it has its stages, each having its own predicaments. According to Apter, four stages may be earmarked in this regard:

1. **Stage of contact and control**: It began with a few hardy and enterprising individuals with a particular strong sense of mission, or greed, or zeal, or desire for adventure. They paved the way for innovation. The first stage of development represented a process by means of which the then new wealth of Europe and new technologies, by creating opportunities for trade, effected not only the settlement of trade centres but the acquisition of territory as well. It was accompanied by the belief condition of dependent peoples must be changed. A poet like
Kipling Shrewdly termed it ‘Whiteman’s burden. It was marked by the consolidation of the alien rule erection of a stable system of authority and the being of urbanization, health and schooling for and elite occurring at the end of this stage.

2. **Stage of reaction and counter-action:** it showed the effects of Western colonialism. Innovative foreign elites of the bureaucrats, missionaries, traders and the like created new urban centers or renovated the old ones and the native persons drew closer to them. The notable feature of this stage was that local and foreign elements interacted; new forms of association developed; and new interests arose. At the same time, nationalization led by elite grew. The nationalist leaders demanded more and more participation in public affairs. The colonial masters played the strategy of winning over the nationalist elites to their side and repressing those who could not be tamed for their purpose.

3. **Stage of contradiction and emancipation:** With the growth of new elites, more complex associations in politics arose. The base of the nationalist movement widened. Elites developed in the rural and semi-urban areas and the nationalist leaders sharpened the pace of their struggle. To face the challenge of the growing nationalism, the colonial powers devised the strategy of introducing their own democratic systems in degrees. Such responses, in turn, stimulated political organizations, mass movements, demands for greater independence, and other forerunners of the impending break with the colonizing power. Intellectuals fomented rebellion, providing ideological arguments and alternatives. Charismatic or near-charismatic leaders promised a new unity with independence.

4. **Stage of search for a New Generative Solution:** It occurred after the advent of independence and, as such, it was marked by the inauguration of the second revolution in the social, economic and technological spheres. Thus, the main problem before the developing countries is to use political independence to produce more viable and effective communities without becoming ensnared in ‘neo-colonialism’. This is partly a matter of prompting economic growth, partly an awakening to the predicaments or uneven change. One striking point in this stage is that the nationalist leadership of the well-known nationalist figures loses its charismatic hold and the ‘imported democratic system’ is replaced by some authoritarian model provided by the only ruling party or military junta.

We may take note of the fact that the analysis of Apter is based on the dichotomy of ‘tradition’ represented by the native forces and ‘modernity’ brought by the alien masters. The process of conflict between the two begins with the gradual establishment of the Western colonial system. At the same time, a sort of unique reconciliation develops with the passage of synthesis and contradiction flow simultaneously with the result that the natives not only emulate and imitate the ‘political culture’ of their masters, they also cry for their emancipation. When national independence is achieved, they struggle for a suitable course so as to realize the aim of establishing social and economic democracy in the country.

**Agents of modernisation**

1. Colonialism
2. Elites
3. Revolutionary leaders
4. Political parties  
5. Military  
6. Bureaucracy  

The political aspects of modernisation refer to the ensemble of structural and cultural changes in the political systems of modernizing societies. Political modernisation, therefore, refers to those processes of differentiation of political structure and secularization of political cultures which enhance the capability of a society’s political system.

**Characteristics of modernisation:**

S N Eisenstadt sums up the characteristics of modernisation as follows:

1. Social mobilization: The indices of social mobilization are exposure to aspects of modernisation life such as machinery and mass media; change of residence i.e., urbanization; change from agriculture occupation and literacy and the growth of per capita income.  
2. Social differentiation: This implies the specialization of institutional structures and recruitment based on universal achievement. Criteria and separatism between the different roles held by an individual and the disposal of rules.  
3. Economic change: Which means changes with reference to technology and development of secondary and tertiary occupation and mass consumption  
4. Political change: which includes the extension of territorial scope and the intensification of the power of the centre; the continued spreading political power to wider groups, populist and democratic politics and participation; fluidity of political support; interest oriented politics, and political institutions like political parties and pressure groups.

**Political Modernisation in Various Social Systems**

Every social system wants to achieve modernisation, where political modernisation seeks to gain the speed of social mobilisation. It wants to establish new patterns of modernisation in place of old ones. The social system delineates three types. They are as follows.

1. **Primitive and backward social systems:** In primitive and backward social systems, the traditional responses, customs and rituals still hold their own authority. These social systems did not make any serious progress for the development of political modernisation. Moreover, the common people were not allowed to participate in politics and in the process of decision making it was limited only to particular kinship and lineage groups or the same family (tribes) to share the office, but not for the common people.  

Political modernisation highlights democracy, stability, structural differentiation, achievement pattern, and national integration which have not been achieved and are yet to be achieved. Here the people love traditions so they do not accept any changes very soon. Third world countries like Nepal, Bhutan, and Indonesia come under this system.
ii. **Developing social system**: The developing social system refers to all those countries that were under colonial powers on the political, social and economic structure and on cultural institutions of these countries, yield strong notion modernity in these countries. Though they have strongholds on the traditional factors, they still have significantly developed to modernisation. The attempt is not destroy the old political institutions but to combine these with the new ones. Some of the common features of the developing social system are as follows:

(a) These developing social systems have their own indigenous machinery of government which is of recent origin.

(b) The social structure and culture are highly traditional.

(c) The pace of modernisation becomes rapid, yet the factor of tradition is not completely discarded by the signs of modernity.

(d) The significant sections of their elites are concerned with modernizing their social structure, culture and their political life and outlook.

(e) The element of continuity always remains throughout the process of change.

iii) **Developed social system**: The developed highly educated and well-urbanized, where the people are highly industrialized and modernized. These social systems do not believe in one man’s rule, so the decision-makers are elected by the people and take decisions on behalf of the masses. The UK, US, France and Canada are some examples of such countries.

**Political Modernisation in Various Political Systems**

The modern political system deals with the pattern of democratic administration in modern states. In this context, Edward Shils postulated five models of political modernisation. At the outset, he divided all the existing political systems into two groups – democracy and oligarchy. Democracy is again subdivided into political and tutelary democracy, and oligarchy into modernisation, totalitarian and traditional oligarchy. The process of political modernisation in these systems is discussed as follows:

**Democracy**

1. **Political democracy**: It is a system of civilian rules through representative and public liberties in the modern nations. In states like the UK and the US, people’s participation in political process is extremely high and the elites perform their functions for the common good of the society. Thus, the political democracy strives to achieve modern political democracy. Let us see the features of political democracy:

(a) Here, the legislature plays the supreme role; it is the final policy-making and decision-making body. It supersedes the other two-executive and judiciary.

(b) Political parties constitute an integral part of these types of social system and as such, no public policy can be formulated without its help.
(c) Political power is held comparatively for a shorter period where there are frequent changes in political authority.

(d) If there are any tendencies towards the tyrannical and arbitrary abuse of power it is always curbed by the power to keep the politics open.

(e) There exist adequately trained bureaucracies who are committed to the policies and programmes of the government.

(f) Here, there is a coherence of intra-party relationship.

(g) There is a degree of mutual regards and solidarity among the political leaders.

(h) There is independence of judiciary where it has the power to check the arbitrary domination of the legislature.

(i) This believes in the democratic self-control.

ii. Tutelary democracy: It refers to the political system in which they observe the norms and values of a democratic process. There is a tendency to imitate political democracy, but still they wanted to achieve political democracy through pragmatic response by the committed democrats. Even though it seems to be inherently incapable of effectively operating the democratic institutions. Here are the features of tutelary democracy:

(a) Political democracy is maintained institutionally, but in operation it is modified to give greater powers to the executives.

(b) The parliament's power and influence are reduced considerably by a variety of means.

(c) The political system retains safeguards of the rule of law and political liberties.

(d) The people are not so much conscious about their rights and duties, although they are very much eager to exercise their power to franchise.

(e) But most of the people do not know the process by which they can influence the public.

(f) The democratic process of elections sometimes becomes a mockery at the hands of petty politicians who indulge themselves in rigging, booth capturing, violence, and all sorts of electoral practices.

(g) Corruption, inefficiency, indiscipline and negligence of duty have been a regular feature of administration though steps have been taken to remove these obstacles in the goals of political modernisation.

Oligarchy

i. Modernizing oligarchy: Modernizing oligarchy refers to the political system which emerges out of the disparity between the demands of the polity, on the one hand, and the public apathy, on the other. In this type of political system, there is a wide gap between people's aspirations and government's assurance. The features of modernizing oligarchy are as follows:
a) The leaders of the state wield a vast array of power and rule at their own discretion without the slightest inclination towards the rule of law.

b) Freedom of speech, expression, association, and belief is controlled and regulated always by the leader.

c) Right to equality is discarded and the system establishes inequality before the law.

d) Parliament is stripped of all its traditional powers. It is, on the other hand, reduced to only an acclamatory body of institution with merely a ratifying role.

e) No opposition is allowed here, free and fair elections are never conducted, and political parties are dispensed with.

ii. **Totalitarian oligarchy**: Totalitarian oligarchy is a political system which is quite different from other political systems. It believes in the absolute rule, either of the rightists or the leftists. It includes states like the erstwhile USSR, China and Cuba where they have their own commitments to a particular ideology, and where communism has been a way of life to rule the system. The following are the features of totalitarian oligarchy:

a) There is the concentration of authority in the hands of the ruling clique based on class and race.

b) It believes in the supremacy of polity in all social matters.

c) There is a highly-disciplined and well-organized elite bound together by its ideology through the institutions of party.

d) It maintains parliamentary institutions for advertising purposes only but are actually commercial in character.

e) The concept of the rule of law, an independent judiciary, and legally constituted opposition are dispensed with.

f) Here, public opinion is not allowed to exist as an expression of judgement of people on the policies of government, so it is dictatorial in nature.

iii. **Traditional oligarchy**: Traditional oligarchy refers to a political system which strongly believes in a traditional religious dynasty. The ruler emerges on the kinship basis itself. Monarchies such as Bhutan and Saudi Arabia come under this category. The following are the features of traditional oligarchy:

(a) The legislature is not allowed to function because the political authority flows from the king and his advisers, or his relatives.

(b) The central government is absolutely weak because they are the close relations of the ruler and they are recruited not on the basis of their merit but on the basis of their loyalty, Administration is not centralized but rather de-centralized.

(c) The civil service is recruited as a-part of the ruler's household routine and their activities are very limited.
(d) No institution is maintained for the creation of public opinion.

Rulers claim legitimacy on the ground that they protect the traditional culture, where oppositions do not exist.

Thus, the process of the political modernisation is not the same in all nations; it differs from the political system of one state to that of another. It is always in a state of flux depending on the nature of political authority and its eagerness to adopt modernisation in the political arena. None of the aforementioned political systems exist today in the world in their actual form. So, these systems either amalgamate with each other with regard to their norms or pose a different nature. Modernisation always refers to urbanization, high level of literacy and a civilized way of life, to a process of vertical mobility and an advanced economy has gone beyond the take off-stage in the social process.

Some thinkers believe that modernisation in every form depends on the elite class to strike compromise with the traditionalists; otherwise, this process would either be revolutionary or difficult to achieve. The situation in developed countries today is quite different from the developing countries on several accounts-while developed countries took centuries before they reached the present stage of modernisation, developing countries have just started on this process and so the hold of tradition on them is very strong.

The rate of literacy level is widespread in both the countries; the developing countries do not have a hold in population growth. In developed countries, the government is more stable for the process of modernisation whereas in developing states there is always the problem of political instability.

All these mean that the process of modernisation has no-doubt started both in developed and developing states, though their degree of achievement differs. However, they still try to modernize themselves on the basis of the Western world though they face many difficulties.

Factors influencing modernisation in developing states

Modernisation is creating a dilemma for developing states and they could not attain modernisation to a maximum degree. So there are few factors which are responsible for influencing the process of modernisation in developing states:

**Love for tradition:** The people love their own traditions, customs, usages and conventions in developing countries which have acted as a stumbling block in the process of modernisation. Their acceptance for the new social change is quite low because of their long-cherished traditions, but they wanted both modernisation and tradition on their terms.

**Conflict over method of modernisation:** In developing states, there is always a conflict regarding the methods of modernisation. There are two methods of modernisation-revolution method and evolution method. The revolution method says that to achieve modernisation well-established old institutions have to be challenged, where changes are supposed to be drastic or revolutionary instead of being instrumental and gradual. On the other hand, liberals think that change should always be gradual and slow instead of being drastic. This would
help the people to achieve the fruits (both modernisation and traditional norms and values through evolution methods. Due to this conflict, developing countries stand at crossroad where they neither give up their old traditional values nor fully adopt or accept sudden changes in societies; therefore, these developing countries pose in standstill postures.

**Social political equality:** The modern concept of social political equality and justice is not acceptable to the people because they believe in perpetual inequality. The discrimination of the elite over the masses and that of higher caste or class over the lower class uproot the modernisation in these societies: So, the concept of high and low persist strongly in developing countries which create a problem towards modernisation.

**Ideology:** In developing states, modernisation is very much influenced by ideology. It is that ideology which bonds and holds the people tightly within a political stratum on the basis of some commonly agreed principles. An ideological conflict always exists in the modern political system and traditional political system where modernisation stands for the progressive ideology but it is constantly opposed by the existing form of ideology in developing countries.

**Absence of strong political party:** In the developing countries, modernisation is seriously affected by the existence of a variety of political parties where there are no particular single political parties which have the command over the people of a particular state. The traditional social systems are authoritarian systems (the elites) in nature; they wish to continue in power in developing countries and they want to have control over the masses and where the peoples are not allowed to participate in the process of decision-making. Even though some measures have been taken regarding people's participation in the administration in some countries, their degree of involvement is not so high when compared to developed countries. It is necessary to have a strong political party which helps in bringing people close to the political system.

**Uncontinuous development process:** Modernisation is also affected severely by the uncontinuous development process which is a regular feature of developing states. Political instability, illiteracy, ignorance of the people, heterogeneous group character and continuous clash among people are the main causes which do not yield for their developments in developing nations. As such, the national integration is affected and there occurs a breakdown in political development.

**Growing disparity over socio-economic values:** There is a high growing disparity over the socio-economic values which influence the process of political modernisation. There is always a wide gap between gross national product (GNP) and the population growth. Thus, high-population nations suffer from poverty. Illiteracy, alienation and economic disparities, so this has directly affected the developing countries for their political modernisation.

**Conclusion**

The concept of political modernisation as a companion to the concept of political development has provided better tools for the new generations of political scientists to make a taxonomic study of the modern political systems. Once again, the link of political science with sociology comes into the picture as a study of political modernisation is obviously a different form of a
political sociological analysis. The motivating consideration is that a student of politics should not keep himself aloof from sister – disciplines that provide him ample information for his purpose. Thus, political modernisation, mainly sociological and economic concepts, has come to be used as a useful tool by the new political scientists who have written extensively and thereby developed the horizon of the study of these subjects. The writers belonging to this tradition have drawn our attention to the fact that “in order to make the political system work, it was necessary that the entire social system was to be mobilized, without which the necessary political participation of the people at various levels was not possible”.

As regards modernisation, it is a multi-faceted social progress, which touches almost each and every aspect of individual life-social, economic, political, psychological; intellectual and cultural-and brings about a revolution in his ideas and actions. Political modernisation refers to the development of sufficiently flexible and powerful institutional frameworks which would be capable of meeting the growing demands and accommodating the changes that the society experiences.

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

The concept of political development that, in quite large measures, was spoken about first by the statesmen and policy makers and then by the scholars of economics and sociology has a very important place in the field of political sociology. What prompted the modern political scientists, particularly those belonging to United States, is the emergence of a large number of independent nation states in the Afro-Asian and Latin American regions which showed change from one position to another in a very rapid manner and thus informed them to refashion their tools of social investigation. The new generation of political scientist came to realize that the non-western political process, even though they were different from the western political process, could be successfully studied by them against the socio-economic and cultural background they themselves had inherited throughout the centuries in the west, and under the influence of which they had been operating now. The fact that there were different from the western political process, being rooted in, and drawing their sustenance from, different cultural backgrounds “induced them to widen their studies to the total context of the cultural and historical setting of the developing states”. In modern times the concept of political development is being used in the explanation of development in so many nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

Lucian Pye should be regarded as the leading writer “to analyse the concept of development in depth. And has kept on evolving his ideas on the subject and has left an abiding impression on the entire literature of political development”. Lucian Pye called political development as the adjustment between old patterns of life and the new demands. He emphasized that the first step towards the political development was the evolution of the nation state system which he treated as a “basic concept supporting the gradual diffusion throughout all societies of what we might call a world culture”.

At this stage, he told us that the signs of political development could be traced at three different levels – with respect to the population as a whole, on the governmental levels and in the organization of political system.
Lucian Pye presents the case of political development elaborately his aspect of political development. Before trying to furnish his own interpretation of the term ‘political development’, he discussed diverse standpoint and goes ahead after accepting some and rejecting some other parts of each definition in the following manner.

1. **Political development as the political prerequisite of economic development**:

   Political development should be taken as a result of the economic development. Political and social conditions can play a quite decisive role in impeding or facilitating the economic growth. According to this view political development is the political perquisite of economic development. Pye found following weakness in this concept of political development:
   - It has a negative character that is easier to know the ways in which performance of political system may impend or prevent economic growth and development that about how it can facilitate economic growth and development.
   - Such a concept of political development does not focus on a common set of theoretical considerations. In some cases it means that the government is not following rational economic policies, while in other situations it may be concerned about the political system and the social structure.
   - The prospects for rapid economic development do not depend so much on political development as on economic factors.
   - Most of the under developed countries are concerned with political development rather than economic growth. Therefore, political development cannot be linked to economic events.

2. **Political development as the politics typical of industrial society**:

   Some scholars like W W Rostow try to identify the process of political development as the politics of typical industrial society. Industrial life produces a common and generic type of political life. The industrial societies set certain standards of political behavior and performance. These constitute the status and determine the goals of political development. This view makes specific qualities of political development, the pattern of rational and responsible state behavior. Pye rejects it also on the ground that it ignores that it ignores the role of several other factors like forces that threaten the hold of the vested interests, an appreciation of the values of ordinary legal and administrative procedures, a stress on welfare programmes and finally an acceptance of some form of mass participation.

3. **Political development as political modernisation**:

   The scholars like James S. Coleman, Karal Deutsch and S M Lipset defined political development as the crucial character of political modernisation, characteristics of modern societies. Political development includes various aspects of economic, social and political life of the industrial nations. It means that a study of developed western and modern countries and of their ways that the developing countries are trying to emulate. It means that the advanced western and modern countries are the pace setters of political development. This view fails to distinguish between the ‘western’ and the ‘modern’ and that it ignores the fact that the backward or developing countries may have their historical traditions that they may not like to give up for the sake of merely emulating everything that is western or modern.
4. **Political development as the operations of nation state:**
   A good number of social theorists like K H Silvert, Edward A Shils, and William McCord have pointed out that political development consists of the organization of political life and the performance of political functions in accordance with the standards expected of a modern nation state. Political development is thus identified with the politics of nationalism within the context of social and political institutions that a modern nation state must possess. Rejecting this view, Pye says that nationalism is only a necessary but far from being sufficient conditions to ensure political development. Political development is identifiable with nation building and not with merely a nation state.

5. **Political development as administrative and legal development:**
   Scholars and thinkers like Max Weber, Talcott Parsons and Joseph La Palombara have laid stress on the point that political development is intricately linked to the legal and administrative order of a community. Thus the establishment of an effective bureaucracy is essential for the process of development. Administrative development is associated with the growth of nationality, the strengthening of secular legal concepts and the evaluation of technical and specialized knowledge in the direction of human affairs. Thus political development improves the administrative and legal development. Pye finds some weakness in this viewpoint’s also. It is quite possible that if administrative is over stressed, it can create imbalances in the polity that may impede political development.

6. **Political development as mobilization and participation:**
   Political development has been defined as mass mobilization and participation. It involves new standards of loyalties and the involvement of the citizens. This is found in the case of widening of suffrage in western democracies. It inducts new elements of population into the political process. It diffuses decision making and participation. However, it has been pointed out that mass participation in decision-making is never fully realized nor is desirable since it causes emotional influence.

7. **Political development as the building of democracy:**
   The thinkers like Joseph La Palombara and J Ronald Pennock are of the view that political development is the building of democracy and inculcating values of democratic order in the minds of people. Pye criticizes this view, on the other hand, pointed out that while democracy is a value laden concept development is more value neutral. Therefore, taking the building of democracy as the key to political development in fact means an effort to push western values upon others.

8. **Political development as mobilization and power:**
   James S Coleman, G A Almond and Talcott Parsons have taken the view that the concept of political development can be evaluated in terms of the level or degree of absolute power which the system is able to mobilize. Pye is critical of this view also on the plea that such an explanation is applicable to the case of a democratic political system and thus it ignores the case of development in others where the mobilization of power is deliberately kept limited.

9. **Political development as stability or orderly change:**
   Karal Deutish and F W Riggs have laid stress on the point that political development is a process that ensures stability and orderly change. Political stability is based on a capacity for purposeful
and orderly change. Any form of economic and social advancement generally depends upon reduced uncertainty and the possibility of planning. Pye differs from this approach and says that, this view however, leaves the questions unanswered and for what purpose the change should be directed.

10. **Political development as one aspect of a multi dimensional process of social change:**
Max F Millikan, Donald L M Blackmer and Daniel Lerner argued that it is unnecessary and inappropriate to try to isolate completely political development from other forms of development. They further add that for sustained political development to take place it can only be within the context of multi dimensional process of social change in which no segment or dimension of the society can long lag behind. Pye appreciates this view on the plea that here all forms of development is much the same as modernisation and it takes place within a historical context in which influences from outside the society impinge on the process of social change just as changes in the different aspects of a society the economy, the polity and the social order all impinge on each other.

11. **Political development as a sense of national respect in international affairs:**
Some writers point out that development means a sense of national respect and dignity in international sphere or refers to post nationalism era when nation state will no longer be regarded as the basic unit of political life. Pye says nothing about this view. He neither accepts it nor rejects it.

After reviewing the different connotations of political development Pye seeks to isolate the characteristics of political development which seem to be most widely held and most fundamental in the general thinking about the problems of development. He then therefore gives his on explanation of political development which bears the following three characteristics

- **Equality**: an attitude towards equality
- **Capacity**: capacity of political systems
- **Differentiation**: specialization of structures

**Equality**: The first broadly shared characteristic is an attitude towards equality. The subjects of political development do suggest mass participation and popular involvement in political activities. Participation may be either democratic or in a form of totalitarian mobilization, but the key consideration is that subjects should become active citizens. At least the semblance of a popular rule is necessary. It also means laws “should be of a universalistic nature, applicable to all or more or less impersonal in their operation “. Again, equality means that recruitment to political offices should reflect achievement standards of performance and not the ascriptive consideration of a traditional political system.

**Capacity**: capacity refers to the capacity of a political system by which it can give outputs and extent to which it can affect the rest of the society and economy. It also associates with governmental performance and the conditions that directly or indirectly influence such performance. It also includes the extent to which it is capable of execution of public policy, rationality in administrative, secular orientation towards policy and governments action to be guided more by deliberations and justification that seek to related ends and means in a systematic manner.
Differentiation: Differentiation is diffusion of specialization. It is the specialization of structure resulting in increased functional specificity of various political roles within the system. The offices and agencies tend to have their distinct and limited functions. There should be an equivalent of a decision of labour within the realm of government. But differentiation does not mean fragmentation and the isolation of the different parts of the political system but specialization be based on an ultimate sense of integration.

All the above mentioned three characteristic element of political development may or may not fit together. For example, pressure for greater equality may upset the political system. Differentiation may reduce equality. Secondary, development is not unilineal. While the characteristic of equality is concerned with political culture, the problems of capacity are connected to the performance of the government. According to Pye, “this suggests that in the last analysis the problems of political development revolve around the relationships between the political cultures, the authoritative structures and general process.”

Implications of political development

According to Nettle, the concept of political development involves the following implications.

1. **Definitional priorities:** These change according to the industrial diversities and culture constraints of different societies. They may be revolutionary or democratic in character. They may be western or oriental.

2. **Set of values:** These include terms like traditionality or modernity, free or closed societies, developed and developing social systems, which are confused and perplexing as the models are not definite.

3. **Connection between the developed and less developed world:** According to Nettle, “what this amount to be a rewriting of European, American and even Asiatic history for developmental purposes. The modern world is no longer so much a goal or a process model but a historical abstraction of functional, events which, one way or another must happens and be coped with by all countries aspiring to modernity.

4. **Rank order for development:** this implies economic order. It does not throw light upon capabilities of the political system. According to Nettle, “if development is indeed, a highly differential process according to particular societies and their goals, then rank ordering comparisons become meaningless”.

Requirements of political development

After discussing the implication of political development, Nettle points out the following requirements.

1. **Inter related world:** in order to understand the meaning of political development one should remember that the world as a whole is inter related. Thus development study is an interdisciplinary problem

2. **Stability and instability:** Political development involves both stability and instability. Therefore, in defining it one should consider not only integrating factors such as nation building national integration etc., but also disintegrating factors such as wars inflation etc.
3. **Population**: population has a direct influence upon the political system. Therefore, political development cannot be explained without reference to population.

4. **Race**: political development must include the role of race in political system.

5. **Characteristic change**: The above discussion shows the complexity and range of the concept of political development. David M Wood includes the following broad ganged changes as characteristics of political development.
   - Industrialization
   - Urbanization
   - Spread of education and literacy
   - Increasing exposure of mass media
   - Expansion of secular state
   - Growth of modern bureaucracies
   - Development of a sense of nationhood
   - Advent of political parties
   - Expansion of popular political participation
   - Increased capacity of the political system to mobilize resources for the accomplishment of its ends in the most of modern politics
   - Decline in the missionary fervor of the political development

**Problems and crises of political development**

According to G A Almond and G B Powell, the events which lead to the political development “come from the international environment from the domestic society or from political elites within the political system itself”. Development results when the existing structure and culture of the political system “are unable to cope with the problems or culture secularization”. These challenges are four (1) penetration and integration or state building (2) loyalty and commitment of nation building (3) pressure from various interest groups in the society for taking part in the decision making process or participation (4) pressure from the society to employ coercive of the state to distribute opportunities, income, wealth and honors or the problems of distribution

1. **Problems of state building**: This problem arises when there is a serious threat coming from the side of a domestic or international environment so that the very egression of the survival of the state comes into the forefront. A war or aggression occurring in the international sphere or a change in the political goals of the powerful elites may create serious threats to the very existence of the political system. State building occurs in order to solve the problem of state building the political elites creates new structures and organization in society. “According to Almond and Powell, state building is commonly associated with significant increases in the regulative and extractive capabilities of the political system, with the development of a centralized and penetrative bureaucracy related to the increase in these capabilities, and with the development attitude of obedience and compliance in the population which are associated without the emergence of such a bureaucracy”.
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2. **Problem of nation building**: This is linked with the problems of state building as the two are interrelated connected. It “refers to the process whereby people transfer their commitment and loyalty from smaller tribes, villages or petty principalities to the large central political system”. There are several cases to show that while the problem of nation building has still remained to create threatening postures for the very survival of the political system.

3. **Problem of participation**: There are various interest groups in the society that strive to have share in the decision making process. Thus, political infra structure comes into being in the form of political parties, group, cliques, factions etc. It leads to the expansion of ‘demands’ and also for participation in the process of decision making so that ‘outputs’ are favorable to the interests of the claimants.

4. **Problems of distribution**: Finally, there arises the problems as to how national income or wealth should be distributed or opportunities be given to all without any artificial discrimination on the grounds of religion, cases, creed, colour etc. Talent should be recognized and that merit should be the deciding factor in the midst of equal ‘opportunities for all’. It is also know by the name of politics of welfare or general good.

**Crises in political development**

According to Lucian Pye, the political development faces the following crises in the course of its progress.

1. **Identity crisis**: In a sound political system, the people identify themselves with it. They have keen sense of nationalism and patriotism. They identify with the national culture. Their loyalties to the nation are firm and clear. In the absence of such an identity with political system, the system faces danger to it.

2. **Legitimacy crisis**: In a sound political system the political authority must be legitimate increases identity and faith. It is hence that people make all attempts to overthrow the foreign rule. Each nation draws up a constitution to legitimize the government. Legitimacy crisis leads to changes and revolution.

3. **Penetration crisis**: In a sound political system the government should penetrate the real life of the people everywhere. A government which is unconcerned with the daily life of the people, runs into constant danger of demands explosions which it may fail to solve.

4. **Participation crisis**: In a sound political system the people participate in the functioning of the government. This does not happen in the colonies governed by the foreigners. In such colonies people constantly struggle to demands participation in the government. In democratic political system alone there is sufficient participation of the people in the government. Hence participation crisis may be solved only by developing a democratic political system.

5. **Integration crisis**: Each political system comprises of the government and the governed. In the government there are various levels of bureaucracy, various organs of the government, administrative, legislative and judiciary. Again, among the governed there are so many groups based upon region, language, religion, race, class, sex etc. in a sound political system all these must be fairly integrated. If this does not happen the political development faces integration crisis.
6. **Distribution crisis**: In a sound political system the government has suitable agencies of distribution of goods, service and values throughout the society. If these means are not available, the political system face distribution crisis. It is due this that communist revolution has been made in so many countries.

**Major factors in political development**

According to Almond and Powell, the following five major factors must be considered in any analysis of political development

1. **Nature of the problems confronting the political system**: Some problems lie at the root of the stability and instability, development and decay of a political system. These are concerned with the demands of participation, national integration, economic welfare, law and order, etc. In advanced countries these problems are solved to some extent, while in the developing countries people constantly clamour for their solution. Therefore, as Almond and Powell have pointed out a major problem in the political system of new nations, “is the cumulative revolutions they must face”

2. **Resources of the system**: The solution of the demands a upon a political system much depends upon its resources. For example, in rich countries so many economic demands are easily fulfilled while in a developing country like the demands of the poor cannot be easily fulfilled.

3. **Affects of foreign social system**: Each nation is influenced by the development in other nations. The economy of developing countries and the developed nations is interdependent. Therefore, as Almond and Powell have pointed out, thus, the existence or development of capabilities in other social system may affect the magnitude of the challenges confronting political system, keep the flow at an incremental and low intensity level, and perhaps help to avoid some of the disruptive consequences of cumulative pressure.

4. **Functional pattern of the system**: The functioning pattern of a political system is responsible for its progress and decay. While one political system easily copes with the burden of demands, another succumbs under their pressure.

5. **Response of the political elite**: A political system very much depends upon the response of the political elites. They may fulfil the demands and thus save the political system. Alternatively, they may misjudge the seriousness if the demands and fail to respond to them.

**Political Development: Model of Stages and Search for an Approach**

Broadly speaking two types of schema “have been advanced for dealing with the tremendous wealth of political and extra-political phenomena which the study of political development conjures up”. Viewed thus, two conceptual models may be framed on the basis of which general theories of political development may be erected:

i. **Continuum Model**: It “tends to view the developmental process in terms of series of discrete variables each identified by a range of possible states that national entities may be
in at various times with respect to some specific criterion”. This approach informs that the development of the nations of the world should be measured in quantifiable terms as gross national product and per capita income, percentage of the adult population, rate of literacy, number of the working people, participation in elections, growth of industrialization, multiplication of political parties and groups, recruitment and promotion of government employees, etc. Such a model of development is subscribed to by social theorists who “posit a common movement along a broad array of fronts from less modern to more modern conditions, and who see a functional relationship between social, economic, psychological and political indicators of modernisation, find this type of conceptual model an economical and highly systematic way to portray the phenomena which interest them”.

ii. Stages Model: Here the basis is transition from one stage of development to another. That is, it postulates three stages of development – traditional stage characterized by an overwhelmingly rural society and agrarian economy with appropriate political forms, transitional stage characterized by an economy embarking on the early stages of industrialization and a political system which is accordingly undergoing transformation, and modern stage characterized by a largely urban society and a mature industrial economy with appropriate political forms. Viewed thus, Wood says: “In general sense, the political system moves from (1) the traditional focus upon local concentrations of power with little articulation between the centre and the periphery to (2) the transitional stage in which structures are emerging to involve the increasingly available masses in the political system while improving upon the technical means of expanding the power of the centre into the periphery, and from there to (3) the modern state with its centrally engineered economy and its perfected institutional means of involving all members of society in the daily affairs of the individual; at the same time, the individual becomes involved in the national endeavor through whatever official means of participation that are available to him”.

It may be pointed out that both of these models have their own drawbacks. While the continuum models is inherent with the danger of the fragmentation of concerns, especially in the absence of any over-arching theory, the stages model lacks universal application in as much as it may be applied rigorously to a few but not to all countries of the world. Thus, while in the former we find a sort of tightly manipulated inter-connectedness of variables belonging to various social disciplines as economics, sociology and psychology, the latter represents a tendency to oversimplify the highly complex phenomenon and for forcing the experiences of particular countries into a mould that may not be applied to all parts of the world with the rigour of a methodology. One thing is, however, common to both that, in any event, they “are based upon an image of a largely dependent political realm and a largely independent extra-political realm, with movement in the economic, social, psychological and political realms highly interrelated”.

Marxian Model of Political Development

In other words, the Marxian view holds three assumptions: First, social class structure follows the distribution of economic forces. Second, socialism cannot emerge till the capitalist
A class exists. Third, consequently, socialism cannot be brought to the working class, but must emerge out of its conflict with the middle class. If applied to the study of the Third World countries, it signifies that a switch over from the so-called liberal democracy to the genuine people’s democracy should be treated as the mark of political development.

Though one may discover some differences of emphasis at the hands of great Marxists like Lenin, Mao, Tito, Castro, etc., all are of one view so far as the crucial issue of the overthrow of the status quo and its distribution by a new social order under the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’ is concerned. The most striking feature of this approach should, however, be traced in the fact that its protagonists “are much more concerned than most liberal democrats that history is on their side. Not only is the end of political development clear, the achievement of the end-state is to some degree beyond their control. Or at least, they must work within certain limits laid down by the Marxist interpretation of history”.

Critical Appraisal

The concept of political development, as discussed in the preceding sections, may be subjected to these lines of criticism.

1. This concept lacks a precise definition. Even after studying the enormous literature on this subject, one wonders as to what it really includes and what it really excludes it becomes, like the very subject of comparative politics, either everything or nothing.
2. Studies of the subject of political development suffer from the absence of any coherent political model of the development process and that the entire analysis is left at the point where extra political change.
3. Likewise, the Marxian approach to political development may criticize for offering a deterministic course of social evolution. The Marxists look like faced with a traditionality that confuses them and they find it very difficult to fit traditional societies into the rather rigid Marxian framework.

Although most of political scientists have studies and written about political development, yet there is no universally accepted theory of political development or any pre-determined law of development. No society in the world can claim to be its model to which others may move. The theorists, however, helped in join attention of the world to the problem of political development of Third world nations. Moreover, the scope of empirical political investigations has also widened and made broader based. Thus, the study of political development has helped considerably in orientation of several new theories in the field of investigations.

***************