EIILM UNIVERSITY
SIKKIM

COMPARATIVE POLICIES: ISSUES AND TRENDS

Subject: COMPARATIVE POLICIES: ISSUES AND TRENDS   **Credits: 4**

SYLLABUS

Comparative Politics: Nature, Significance and Evolution, Comparative Approaches and Methods: System, Structural, Public Policy, Comparative Approaches: Political Economy, Dependency and World Systems

Theories of State, State in Developing Societies: Asian, African and Latin American Experiences, Civil Society and the State, Globalization and the State, Regional Integration and State, International Organizations and State, Transnational/Multinational Corporations and State

Nationalism Approaches, Forms of Nationalism, Colonialism and Anti-colonial Struggles, Nationality and Self Determination, State Building and Constitutionalism, Ethnicity Politics and State

Rights and Citizenship, Ethnic Movements, Political Regimes, Bureaucracy, Military in Politics, Federalism: Patterns and Trends, Parties and Party Systems, Interest Groups, Pressure Groups and Lobbying

Poverty and Human Development, Gender and Development, Environment, Science, Technology and Politics, Decentralization and Participation, Human Rights

Suggested Reading:

1. Doing Comparative Politics: An Introduction to Approaches and Issues by Timothy C. Lim

2. Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction : Todd Landman

3. Doing Comparative Politics: An Introduction to Approaches and Issues : Timothy Lim

CHAPTER 1
COMPARATIVE POLITICS: NATURE, SIGNIFICANCE

Learning Objectives:

- To understand the meaning of nature and scope of comparative politics
- To understand relationship between comparative politics and comparative government

Topics:

- Meaning, Nature and Scope
- Comparative Politics and Comparative Government

More recently, modern social science also has increased our powers to observe and compare systematically this empirical world of facts around us and to subject many of these facts and processes to quantitative measurement and logical and mathematical analysis. At the same time, the behavioural sciences have given us a good deal of new and part information as to how people think, feel, perceive, and act, individually and in groups.

The subject of comparative politics virtually constitutes a study in the direction of the 'expanding horizon of political science' wherein we seem to have emerged from the 'plains of doubts and darkness' to a 'higher plateau' to see what our- passionate endeavours, particularly of the skeptical decade of the 1950's and the 'determined decade' of the 1960's, "have produced, in which the earlier high points of the discipline have lost some of their erstwhile importance or at least are now seen in a new light, and those whose significance suffered by neglect, have emerged in our perspective and awareness in the value of political knowledge, which contains both rushing torrents (i.e., political process as a whole) as well as limped pools (i.e., speculative political thought)". What has played the role of a motivating force in this important direction is the quest to study 'political reality' by means of new techniques and approaches in a way so that the entire area of 'politics' may be covered. As a result, not a study of the 'government' but of the 'governments' has become the central concern that implies the taking of 'decision "in the United Nations, or in a parish council, in trade union or in papal conclave, in a board room,, whether or in a tribe. Comparative politics has appeared as a subject of momentous significance on account of this vital reason that a great deal of experimentation "is now going on with new approaches, new definitions, and new research tools. Perhaps the main reason for the present intellectual ferment is a

widespread feeling of disappointment and dissatisfaction with the traditional deceptive approach to the subject."

Comparative Politics: Meaning, Nature and Scope; Emergence of the 'New Science of Politics'

Politics is a continuous, timeless, ever-changing and universal activity having its key manifestation in the making of a decision to face and solve a 'predicament'. It "flows from a special kind of activity, a form of human behaviour." It refers to the making or taking of a decision in which some political action is involved. It is a different thing that political scientists define and interpret the term 'political action' in their own ways that ascribes them the title of being a conservative, or a traditionalist, or a modernist. It is for this reason that while Oakeshott defines political activity as "an activity in which human beings, related to one another as members of a civil association, think and speak about the arrangements and the conditions of their association from the point of view of their desirability, make proposals about changes in these arrangements and conditions, try to persuade others of the desirability of the proposed changes and act in such a manner as to promote the changes"; David Easton treats it as an action for the 'authoritative allocation of values'; Harold Lasswell and Robert Dahi describe it as 'a special case in the exercise of power'; and Jean Blonde lays emphasis on the point of 'decision taking'; However, a fine interpretation of the term 'political activity' thus given by Oakeshott who says: "In political activity, then, men sail a boundless and bottomless sea; there is neither harbour for shelter nor floor for anchorage; neither starting place nor appointed destination. The enterprise is to keep afloat on an even keel; the sea is both friend and enemy..."

In the field of comparative politics, the term 'politics' has three Connotations—political activity, political process and political power. As already pointed out, political activity consists of the efforts by which conditions of conflicts are created and resolved in a way pertaining to the interests of the people, as far as possible, who play their part in the 'struggle for power'. The reduction of tensions or the resolution of conflicts naturally takes place through the operation of permanent mechanisms of tension reduction as well as, from time to time, by the introduction of further 'reserve' mechanisms designed to reduce the amount of tensions and conflicts in emergencies. If politics means the authoritative allocation of 'values', some measure of conflict is bound to arise between 'values' as desired by the people and 'values' as held by the men in power. Thus arise conflicts that demand their solution and what leads to efforts in this regard constitutes political activity. It is the government that has

to solve these conflicts by whatever means are at its disposal, the only limitation being that in so doing it must prevent the break-up of the polity. Politics ceases where secession, and indeed civil war begins, as, at that point, there is no longer an authoritative allocation of values, but two sides allocating their values differently". It should, however, not be inferred from this statement that there is nothing like political activity during the days of civil war or some revolutionary upheaval, it simply means that as such an eventuality "constitutes a high point of tension in the life of a community, the role of political action must consist of preventing the community from reaching such a point."

Politics not only connotes 'political activity', it also implies a 'train of activity', i.e,, efforts directed towards creating the conditions of tension and having their resolution until the point of 'spontaneous unanimity' is achieved. Political activity emanates from a situation of 'predicament'—a form of human behaviour in which the interests of persons, more than one, clash or interact for the purpose of having an allocation of binding values in their respective favours. The moment a voice is raised in a group or a community of people for a common rule or policy on any issue whatsoever, a predicament, is created in the sense that even to decide against the demand requires to take a decision. The matter does not stop there. Further problem arises when the members of a group or a community advocate mutually exclusive policies. The result is clash of interests and the stage of resolution of conflicts can be achieved either by peaceful means of reasoning, persuasion, adjustments, diplomacy or compromise or by the violent means of force and coercion. While, in the former case, competing agents may come piecemeal to abandon a part of their demands in order to have a mutually acceptable solution, in the latter case, the policy of one section may, wholly or largely, prevail over the desires of another. The former position may be called the state of 'spontaneous unanimity', the latter as imposed consensus The common point is that political activity stops at the point of 'political rest'., "So, just as a situation of political rest does not start up any political activity, it also closes down a cycle of political activity."

Political process is an extension of the sense of political activity. Here the case of all those agencies figures in that have their role in the decision-making process. The study of politics is thus broadened so as to include even 'non-state' agencies. A study of the way groups and associations operate shows that they are not free from the trends of struggle for power; they have their internal 'governments' to deal with their internal conflicts and tensions. What is particularly important for our purpose is that these 'non-state' associations influence the government of the country for the sake of protecting and promoting their specific interests.

Thus, there occurs a very sharp process of interaction between the groups inter se and between the groups and the government of the country. Finer is right in saying that clearly a private association's hope of success in its competition with other groups is maximised if the full power of the state, as mediated through the government, is put behind it. And so it is that, once such competition takes place within the framework of the state, what would otherwise have to be a private and intermittent struggle of one group against another now becomes a public competition with other groups, either to get the government to espouse its policy and enforce it, or else to go forward and become the government. And the set of procedures whereby the private associations existing in a state seek to influence the government,, or 'participate in policy formation by the government or become the government, is the 'political process'.'

Since comparative politics includes all that comes within the scope of political activity and political process, it is said to 'drown' the national governments "among the whole universe of partial governments which exist in any community. It is needed that the study of the government (as an element of the state) should be made vis-a-vis the 'governments' of non-state associations that operate in a way so as to influence the government of the country and also be influenced by it in some way or another. As Blonde says: "Government is the machinery by which values are allocated, if necessary by using compulsion: what is, therefore, important is to examine the three stages of the operation by which these values are allocated. Firstly, we must see the way in which the values come to be formulated and government is made aware of them. Secondly, we must see how the machinery of government digests' and transforms these values into decisions applicable to the whole community. Thirdly, we must see how these decisions come to be implemented down the level of governmental command. The whole operation of government thus takes the form of a two-way operation, or, perhaps more appropriately, of a machine which receives signals and transforms these signals into others."

Finally, the scope of comparative politics includes the subject of 'political power'. The term 'power' has been defined by different writers in different ways. For instance, while Carl & Friedrich describes it as 'a certain kind of human relationship. Tawney regards it as 'the capacity of an individual, or a group of individuals, to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups in the manner which he desires.Referring to the role of power in the matter of decision-making, Lasswell says: "The making of decision is an interpersonal process: the policies which other persons are to pursue are what is decided upon. Power as

participation in the making of decisions is an interpersonal relation." Politics thus connotes a special case in the exercise of power—an exercise in the attempt to change the conduct of others in one's own direction. To define the term precisely, one can say that power "is taken to denote the whole spectrum of those external influences that, by being brought to bear upon an individual, can make him move in a required direction."

It is the study of the subject of politics from the standpoint of power that has widened the scope of comparative politics so as to include a study of the infra-structure of the political systems. It is on account of this that politics "cannot be studied properly without identifying the ruling class, or the governing and non-governing elites, and measuring their respective roles. Politics also functions, by and large, within groups, though as we -have seen earlier, however important in themselves the group may be, neither the individual nor the society can be left out." The subject of 'authority' becomes the handmaid of power. The rulers in a democratic system try to justify their authority by means of haying the title of 'consensus', those of a totalitarian system resort to the naked use of power for achieving the superficial title of legitimacy. Thus, it becomes a celebrated principle of comparative politics: "Where consensus is weak, coercion tends to be strong, and vice versa."

It is on account of these important connotations, that the term 'politics' has come to have its peculiar definition in the realm of comparative politics. Here politics has been made free from the shackles of normative dimensions and restated in empirical terms. The result is that it is not merely a study of the state and government, it is a study of the 'exercise of power. As Curtis Well says:

"Politics is organised dispute about power and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interests and demands. The study of politics is concerned with the description and analysis of the manner in which power is obtained, exercised, and controlled, the purpose for which it is used, the manner in which decisions are made, the factors which influence the making of those decisions, and the context in which those decisions take place.

Growth of Comparative Politics: From Unsophisticated to Increasingly Sophisticated Directions

The study of comparative politics became highly significant in the 1950's when a good number of leading American political scientists sought to 'transform the field of politics' by taking the study of this subject 'from foreign to comparative political phenomenon' and

'from the study of the governments to the study of the political systems'? In broad terms, the transformation which "has taken place has been from a field which would most appropriately be labelled 'foreign governments' to one which might most adequately be called comparative political systems. However, the historical development of this subject may be roughly put into three phases — unsophisticated, sophisticated, and increasingly sophisticated.

The contributions made to the study of politics by great figures like Aristotle, Machiavelli, de Tocqueville, Bryce, Ostrogorski and Weber belong to the first phase who simply utilised the comparative method for the primary purpose of better understanding the working of the political organisations. These writers employed, what was called, the comparative method that "aimed through the study of existing policies or those which had existed in the past to assemble a definite body of material from which the investigator by selection, comparison, and elimination may discover the ideal types and progressive forces of political history. John Stuart Mill undertook to show that the comparative method "may assume several forms, the 'most perfect' of which is the process of difference by which two polities, identical in every particular except one, are compared with a view to discovering the effect of the differing factor. Lord James Bryce adopted comparative method and designated it as scientific by adding: "That which entitles it to be called scientific is that it reaches general conclusions by tracing similar results to similar causes, eliminating those disturbing influences which, present in one country and absent in another, make the results in the examined cases different in some points while similar in others.

The contributions of some important recent writers like Samuel H. Beer, M. Hass, Bernard Ulam and Roy C. Macridis may be included in the second phase who made use of the comparative method with a good amount of self-consciousness and also with a deliberate mood to present a more useful study of different political institutions. As a matter of fact, the writers belonging to this category, unlike political thinkers and writers belonging to the first, applied the instruments of institutional comparisons in a quite rigorous manner to present a better (in the sense of realistic) study of the governments what they desired to address as 'political systems'. This may be called the 'sophisticated' phase in the growth of the subject of comparative politics inasmuch as these writers "were concerned with the various strategies of comparison: area studies, configurative approach, institutional and functional comparisons, a problem-based orientation, and with various methodological problems: conceptualisation, the establishment of agreed categories for comparison, validity as a problem, cross-cultural difficulties and the availability of data."

The contributions of David Easton, Gabriel A. Almond, James C. Coleman, Karl Deutsch, G.B. Powell, Harold Lasswell, Robert A. DahI, Edward Shils, Harry Eckstein, David Apter, Lucian W. Pye, Sidney Verba, Myron Weiner and a host of others may be included in the final phase. It may rightly be described as the model of an increasingly sophisticated phase in the growth o comparative politics. The writers belonging to this phase have made use of inter-related set of concepts for the sake of presenting their contributions on the basis of comparative analyses, though they have provided a specialised vocabulary in their own ways. As Roberts says: "If Easton talks of inputs, outputs, demands, gatekeepers, supports and stresses, environment, feedback, values, critical ranges and political authorities; Almond offers a set of input and output functions; Deutsch borrows a cybernetic language which applies to political systems the concept of feedback of various types—autonomy, memory, load, lag, lead and gain, receptors, communication, selective screening of information and so on. Almond's aim of 'universality' sums up the purpose for the choice of such languages— they are sufficiently general to be applicable to any political unit, regardless of size, period, degree of development or other factors."

The subject of comparative politics as developed, in the latest phase, has these main characteristics: empirical method adopted by the writers belonging to the latest phase "has definitely enlarged the field of our enquiry as it has cleared up the mist in which many helpful distinctions within the framework of political studies lay obscured. "Eckstein has referred to the late decades of the nineteenth century as a period in which Political Science, influenced by a 'primitive positivism'" effected a divorce between its normative and its descriptive concerns." He further says that in the realm of 'comparative government', more and more writers "turned from a concern for the evaluation of governmental forms to a pure description. By and large they retained the analytical categories developed by their predecessors, but began to shape their meanings to fit descriptive rather than normative purposes. Thus, for example, a pure ideal-type democracy, while it continued to be a tool employed in normative political theory, no longer had utility for specialists in comparative government, and the definition of democracy was loosened to permit inclusion of a congeries of actual governmental forms and socio-political conditions."

Study of the Infrastructure: The study of comparative politics is not confined to the formal structures of government as was the trend with the traditional political scientists. Here a student is concerned 'with inquiry into matters of public concern, with the behaviour and acts

that may concern a society as a totality or which may ultimately be resolved by the exercise of legitimate coercion." Instead of remaining concerned with the formal structures of government alone, he "has to be concerned with crystallised patterns of behaviour, with 'practices' since these are parts of the living structures of government." If instead of 'government' the term 'political system' is used, naturally it becomes a part of the entire social system and the 'input-output' process includes all those forces of the 'environment' that have their effect on the decision-making process. Thus, the role of political parties and pressure groups, for example, becomes as significant as the role of legislatures and executives in the study of modern political systems. As Blondel says: "Structures of government exist they have to exist because this is the way in which tension is reduced and delayed and thereby tension decreases and the polity is maintained. But structures change gradually and in a complex fashion. Thus, if we are to understand how governmental systems operate, we have to note that the 'law' (in the general sense of the rule of procedure) is an indispensable element of the life of governmental systems; it makes political life possible and maintains politics."

Emphasis on the Study of Developing Societies: What has added more to the significance of the study of comparative politics is the emphasis of more writers on the 'politics of the developing areas'. It has occurred as a result of the realisation that the subject of comparative politics must include all governments along with their infrastructures that "exist in the contemporary world and, where possible, references to governments throughout time." The study of comparative government is no longer a study of the selected European or American governments; it is as much a study of developed' western governments as those of the developing political systems of the poor and backward countries of the Afro-Asian and Latin American world.

However, what is of striking importance in this regard is that more and more attention is being paid to the study of the. politics of developing societies both for the reason of making this a subject of universal study and for building theories and models so that the 'system of democracy' prevailing in these countries could be saved from being subverted by the forces opposed to it. As Wood says: 'One could not help being aware of the fact that there existed in the recent political experiences of dozens of countries a veritable labouratory in which to test propositions about the way governmental systems behave under stress and the factors which bring about changes in political forms. What was more, there were appearing on the scene or waiting close by in the wings dozens more of the formerly colonial Countries of Asia and

Africa, for which political institutions were being carved out with or without concern for the well-catalogued experiences of their older brethren. Political scientists were worried about he preservation of democracy as the dominant form of government in the world or simply about the best way of assuring that the newly emerging fragile systems would have the best opportunity for stable development. They found ample reason to build theory to help find answers to the problems immediately at hand, because they found themselves woefully bereft of a body of theory upon which to draw for adequate leverage over the question of how to provide new nations with stable democracy."

Focus on Inter Disciplinary Approach: What has really enriched the field of comparative politics and, at the same time, made it a 'complex subject' is the focus on inter-disciplinary study. Writers have made more and more use of tools that they have borrowed from the disciplines of sociology, psychology, economics, anthropology and even from natural sciences like biology. For instance, systems analysis with its two derivatives in the form of structural-functional and input-output approaches owes its origin to the discipline of biology that has been borrowed by the leading American political scientists like David Easton from sociologists like Robert Merton and Talcott Parsons. The result is that comparative politics has come to have much that makes it look like political sociology and political psychology. A study of new topics like political development, political modernisation, political socialisation, political acculturation, political change, political leadership and the like shows that now political science has become the 'application of 'sociological and psychological analysis to the study of the behaviour of government and other political structures." A modern political scientist interested in the subject of political development "has learned that he cannot treat this topic without looking for the conditions of social mobilisation men cannot become citizens in political sense without changing their values and personality orientations." A well-known writer in the field of comparative politics has thus pointed out that classical political theory "is more a political sociology and psychology and a normative political theory than a theory of political process. What goes on inside the black box of the political system and its consequences are inferred from the ways in which the social structure is represented in it." It is certainly on account of the adoption of this inter-disciplinary approach by the Writers on comparative politics that the subject of political science is said to have 'undergone a revolution of sorts.

Value free Political Theory - Finally, the subject of political science has lost its normative aspect and assumed empirical dimensions in the sphere of comparative politics. The result is

that value-free political theory has replaced value-laden political theory. The concern of the students of comparative politics is not with the things as they ought to be in their ideal forms; it is with what they are. There is hardly any place for the rules of history or ethics in the subject of comparative politics as the entire field has been covered by the rules of sociology, psychology and economics. There is thus hardly any place for a man like Leo Strauss in the field of comparative politics who, while sticking to the traditions of Plato and Aristotle, contends that political theory cannot eschew 'values' and thus a value-free political science possible. It should, however, be made clear that the use of the term 'values' by Easton (when he defines politics as 'the authoritative allocation of values') or of 'value system' by Almond (when he identifies it with a. system of ideas and. beliefs) has an empirical, and not a normative connotation. We may say that the term value is used by the writers on comparative politics in the sense of a 'price' or 'worth' that a thing gets after it is recognised by the policy-makers. There is no value in a thing unless it is allocated by those who are in authority. Political science, thus becomes inter alia a study of the distribution by persons in authority of things which are valued, or the attribution by such persons of value to things, or the deciding by such persons of disputes relating to things which are valued.

In fact the study of comparative politics in its latest form includes significant contributions of those recent writers who have broadened the scope of this subject by taking into their areas of study more and more countries of the world, particularly of the Afro-Asian and Latin-American regions better known as the 'world of developing areas'. These- writers, in a way, have paid their sincere heed to the counsel of Lord James Bryce who once said that 'the time seems to have arrived when the 'actualities' of government in its various forms should be investigated." The eminent writers on comparative politics have not only endorsed but also improved upon the observation of James T. Shotwell that as "we pass from France to Italy, Switzerland, Germany and USSR, there is no common thread, no criterion of why these particular countries were selected and no examination of the factors that account for similarities and diversities."

Comparative Politics and Comparative Government: Case of Identities and Similarities in Basic Implications

Although the two terms 'comparative politics' and 'comparative government are used loosely and interchangeably but there is a point of distinction between the two. While the latter covers a comparative study of different political systems with special emphasis on their institutions and functions, the former has a broader scope so as to cover all that comes within

the purview of the former and, in addition to that, all else that may be designated as the study of 'non state' politics. In other words, the scope of comparative politics is wider than that of comparative government despite the fact that the search for making comparisons is central to the study of both. The concern of a student of comparative politics does not end with the study of rule-making, rule-implementing and rule-adjudicating departments of the political systems or even with the study of some extra constitutional agencies (like political parties and pressure groups) having their immediate connection, visible or invisible, with the principal departments of state activity. In addition to all this, he goes ahead to deal, though in a particular way, with even those subjects hitherto considered as falling within the range of economics, sociology, psychology and anthropology. As Sidney Verba concisely suggests"look beyond description to more theoretically relevant problems; look beyond the formal institutions of government to political processes and political functions; and look beyond the countries of Western Europe to the new nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America."

The meaning and nature of comparative politics as distinguished from that of the 'comparative government is well brought out by Curtis in these words: "Comparative politics is concerned with significant regularities, similarities and differences in the working of political institutions and in political behaviour Meaningful analysis requires explanatory hypotheses, the testing of sentiments, categories and classification by the collection of empirical data, observation, experimentation if at all possible; and the use of research techniques such as sampling, and communications data to increase knowledge" CurtiS, however, makes it quite obvious that the inquiry into similarities and differences is not a search for certainty or predictability, nor does it start from the premise that what is not 'scientific' is not knowledge. Systems classification and categories are always tentative: they cannot claim finality. Politics cannot be reduced to a series of involuntary and automatic responses to stimuli. Sometimes, the most significant political phenomena are those changes in the mood of the times that are impossible to quantify.

From the above, it infers that the term 'comparative politics' should be preferred to the term 'comparative government' as the scope of the former is wider and more comprehensive to include all the essential characteristics that we have discussed under the preceding section. One may, however, agree with the observation of Bloridel that the term 'comparative government' has two aspects horizontal and vertical and this term may be identified with 'comparative politics' if both the aspects are taken into account. Vertical comparison is a

comparative study of the state vis-a-vis other associations and groups that have their 'political character' and cast their impact upon the functioning of a political system; horizontal comparison is a comparative study of the state vis-a-vis other national governments. Blondel may be justified to some extent in saying that comparative government becomes comparative politics when both the vertical and horizontal aspects of comparisons are taken into account that lead to this definition: "Comparative government can thus be defined in a preliminary fashion as the study of patterns of national governments in the contemporary.

Though one may, or may not, fully agree with the view of Blondel, it may, nevertheless, be added that it is always safer to use the title 'comparative politics' in preference to 'comparative government'. Perhaps, it is for this reason' that Edward Freeman makes an attempt to bring out a distinction between the two in these words: "By comparative government I mean the comparative study of political.

Review Questions:
1. Explain the concept of Comparative Politics as the emergence of the 'New Science of Politics'
2. Explain the growth of Comparative Politics from unsophisticated to increasingly sophisticated directions

CHAPTER 2
COMPARATIVE APPROACHES

Learning Objectives:
- To understand the meaning and nature of comparative approaches
- To understand systems analysis

Topics:
- Meaning and Nature of Approach
- Traditional Approaches
- Systems Analysis

But whatever the approach or the origin of its ideas, we can say that political science as a discipline is concerned with the problem of ends; the goals of the good society; the means of governing in such a manner as to realise the good society, the activities of the ruled (the public), especially political actions personified in voting, public opinion and attitude formation; and the underlying connections between society and government. Its key concern is with power, how it is shared through participation and representation and how it is affected by growth and change.

What really makes the study of comparative politics significant as well as interesting, even perplexing, to a new student of this subject is the use of different approaches, methods and techniques to understand and explain 'political reality'. A host of leading writers on this subject hold divergent points of view and adopt varying ways with the result that different terms like approaches, methods, techniques, models, paradigms, strategies and the like seem to be either inter-related or synonymous. It therefore leaves a definite impression that in the study of politics, existence and utilisation of several approaches may be discovered. Moreover, while different approaches "have, from time to time, seemed to be predominant, their time has also passed as some other way of going about the study of politics has come to the fore." An attempt to discuss different approaches to the study of politics is called for in view of the fact that the difference between them "has been significant and the heat generated by the partisans of each way battling to prove the supreme virtues of their approach has been great."

Meaning and Nature of 'Approach': Similarity and Distinction with Related Themes

An approach, in simple terms, may. be defined as a way of looking at and then explaining a particular phenomenon. The perspective may be broad enough to cover a vast area like world as a whole in the study of polities, or it may be very small embracing just an aspect of local, regional, national or international politics. Besides, it also covers within its fold every other thing related to the collection and selection of evidence followed by an investigation and analysis of a particular hypothesis for an academic purpose. Thus, an approach "consists of criteria of selection criteria employed in selecting the problems or questions to consider and in selecting the data to bring to bear; it consists of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data."

It is for this reason that approaches to the study of politics are so many. As the criteria for selecting the problems and data or questions seeking answers to some questions are determined by the standpoint that a scholar adopts or makes use of, so there may be several approaches. However, when a scholar seeks to channelize his, efforts into a presentable form, the same approach leads to the utilisation of a particular method. Approaches and methods, in this way, become closely inter-related themes. The latter becomes, the integral counterpart of the former. Thus, Van Dyke observes: "In brief, approaches consist of criteria for selecting problems and relevant data, whereas methods are procedures for getting and utilising data."

However, with a view to bring out a subtle line of distinction between an approach and a method, we may say that the latter is commonly used either to denote epistemological assumptions on which the search for knowledge is based, or the operations and activities that occur in the acquisition and treatment of data.' It is the use of varying methods generally borrowed from other social and natural sciences that modern political science looks like moving closer and closer to the domains of other disciplines as economics, psychology, sociology, biology and anthropology, It is all done to fit better the specific problems of data collection and interpretation faced in political studies. As a result of this, political science "seems to some like history or sociology or economics applied to political data." If so conceived, a method may also be called a technique. However, the difference, if any, between the two is that the latter "may be more susceptible to routine or mechanical application and more highly specialised, depending less (once they are mastered) on imaginative "

While the term 'approach' may be identified with other related themes like 'method' and 'technique', it is certainly distinguishable from a 'theory'. An approach is closely related to a

theory in view of the fact that its very character determines the way of generalisation, explanation, prediction, and prescription—all of which are among the main functions. of a theory. But a line of difference between the two may also be drawn. The term 'theory' is so vague that its real meaning is often indeterminable. It may be identified with anything like thought, idea, trend, tendency, conjecture, hypothesis, speculation, explanation, even interpretation, of some kind. Different is the case with an approach that may be defined as the creator or precursor of a theory. An approach "is transformed into a theory if and when its function extends beyond the selection of problems and data about the subject under study."

With a view to highlight the meaning of different related themes used in the sphere of modern political analysis, Apter defines some of them in the following manner:

1. Paradigm: It is a framework of ideas that establishes general context of analysis. Fundamentally, paradigms combine a mixture of philosophical assumptions and criteria of valid know- ledge. The resulting combinations are sharply distinguished from each other.

2. Theory: It is a generalised statement summarising the real or supposed actions of a set of variables, whether dependent, or independent, or intervening. Parameters represent the conditions within which independent variables operate. A theory may be macro or micro dealing with large or small groups or units. Moreover, it may be abstract, or formal or notational, or concrete.

3. Method : It is a way of organising a theory for application to data. Thus, methods are known by the name of conceptual schemes. They may be of many types like comparative, configurationally, historical, simulative and experimental.

4. Technique : It links method to the relevant data. It represents various modes of observation and ways of recording empirical in- formation. As such, techniques vary in appropriateness, sampling, public opinion testing, scaling and testing.

5. Model : It is a simplified way of describing relationships. It can be constructed from a paradigm, a theory, a method, a technique. It may be typological, descriptive, formal, mechanical, organism, biological etc.

6. Strategy : It is a peculiar way of applying one or any combination of the above type to a research problem. It is required that quality and integrity should be combined in a strategy. A good strategy fits together problem, theory, methods and techniques in a systematic and coherent way.

7. Research Design: It converts strategy into an operational plan for field work or an experiment. It is a prospectus or an out- line from which research is carried forward. It is a final stage in professional research preparation.

It may, however, be added at this stage that in the field of comparative politics most of the related themes, as briefly defined above have become synonymous for the sake of presenting in empirical study of politics. Herein lies the reason of the use of a new methodology in the field of politics. The real purpose is to adopt new techniques for acquiring knowledge, new criteria for judging the validity of claims to the possession of knowledge, and new analytical tools for refining the meaning of the terms and raising the level of precision and logical inference, all of which were introduced more or less concurrently."

Traditional Approaches: Emphasis on Value-Laden Study of Politics

Approaches to the study of politics may be broadly classified into two categories—normative and empirical. While the former is said to be value-laden, the latter is known for being 'value-neutral'. In other words, while normativism is the hallmark of the former, empiricism is that of the latter. Fact-value relationship is, therefore, the basis of our classification in this regard. On this basis, we may say that while traditional approaches lean to the side of 'values', the latter do the same for 'facts'. The result is that 'fact-value dichotomy' becomes the determining factor. The traditional approaches have a historical-descriptive and prescriptive character with a dominating place for values and goals. Their different varieties may be discussed as under.

1. Philosophical Approach: The oldest approach to the study of politics is philosophical that is also known by the name of ethical approach. Here the study of state, government and man as a political being is inextricably mixed with the pursuit of certain goals, morals, truths or high principles supposed 'to be underlying all know- ledge and reality. A study of politics, in this field, assumes a speculative character, because the very word 'philosophical' "refers to thought about thought; a philosophical analysis is an effort to clarify thought about the nature of the subject and about ends and means in studying it, Put more generally, a person who takes a philosophical approach to a subject aims to enhance linguistic clarity and to reduce linguistic confusion; he assumes that the language used in description reflects conceptions of reality, and he wants to make conceptions of reality as clear, consistent, coherent, and fulfil as possible. He seeks to influence and guide thinking and the expression of thought so as to rnaximise the prospect that the selected aspect of reality (politics) will be made intelligible."

It is for this reason that thinkers and writers subscribing to the philosophical-ethical approach look like advising the rulers and the members of a political community to pursue certain

higher ends. Thus, works of Plato, More, Bacon, Harrington, Rousseau, Kant, Green and Bosanquet, ' Nettleship, Lindsay and Leo Strauss take the study of 'politics to a very high level of abstraction and also try to mix up the system of values with certain high norms of an ideal political system. Here normativism dominates arid empiricism as contained in certain classics like those of Aristotle, Machiavelli, Eodin Hobbes, Locke and Montesquieu looks like integrating the study of politics either with ethics, or with history, or with psychology, or with law respectively just in an effort to present the picture of a best-ordered political community.

The philosophical approach is criticised for being speculative and abstract. It is said that such an approach takes us far away from the world of reality. For this reason, it is accused of being hypothetical. At the hands of Kant and Hegel, it culminates in the exaltation of state to mystical heights. Politics, therefore, becomes like the handmaid of ethics or metaphysics. The case of things as they 'are' is dominated by the norm of things as they 'ought to be.' However, great protagonists of such an approach like Leo Strauss affirm that values are an indispensable part of political philosophy and they cannot be excluded from the study of politics. He says: "If this directedness becomes explicit, if men make their explicit goal to acquire knowledge of the good life and of the good society, political philosophy emerges."

2. Historical Approach: The distinguishing feature of this approach is focused on the past or on a selected period of time as well as on a sequence of selected events within a particular phase so as to find out an explanation of what institutions are, and are tending to be, more in the knowledge of what they have been and how they came to be, what they are than in the analysis of them as they stand." It may also be added that here a scholar treats history as a genetic process—as the study of how man got to be, what man once was and now is a study of politics with such a point of view also informs him to look into the role of individual motives, actions, accomplishments, failures and contingencies . in historical continuity and change.

The historical approach stands on the assumption that the stock of political theory comes out of socio-economic crises and the reactions they leave on the minds of the great thinkers. Thus, historical evidence has an importance of its awn. The conditions of ancient Greece created Piato and Aristotle; Likewise, the conditions of seventeenth century England produced Hobbes and Locke; the capitalist system of the nineteenth century created Mill and Marx. Obviously, in order to understand political theory, it is equally necessary to understand

clearly the time, place and circumstances in which it was evolved. The political philosopher "may not actually take part in the politics of his times, but he is affected by it and, in his own turn, he tries vigorously to affect it is Sabine well takes note of this fact when he observes that all great political theories "are secreted in the interstices of political and social crises."

It may, however, be added at this stage that the historical approach to burning political questions differs in many ways depending upon the range of choice that a scholar adopts for his purpose. If Machiavelli could make use of history for exalting the record of the Romans and thereby exhorting his people to restore the 'glory of Rome', Oakeshott associates it with the trend of conservatism. It is contained in his treatment of politics as the "activity of attending to the general arrangements of a collection of people who, in respect of their common recognition of a manner of attending to its arrangements, compose a single community." That is, a political activity mainly springs neither from instant desires, nor from general principles, but from the existing traditions of behaviour themselves. As he says: "In any generation, even the most revolutionary, the arrangements which are enjoyed always far exceed those which are recognised to stand in need of attention, and those which are being prepared for enjoyment are few in comparison with those which receive amendment; the new is an insignificant proportion of the whole" Again: "What we are learning to understand is a political tradition, a concrete manner of behaviour. And for this reason, it is proper that, at the academic level, the study of politics should be an historical study.""

The historical approach has certain weaknesses. For instance, as James Bryce says, it is often loaded with superficial resemblances. As such, historical parallels may sometimes be illuminating, but they are also misleading in most of the cases. Likewise, Prof. Ernest Barker holds: "There are many lines—some that suddenly stop, some that turn back, some that cross one another; and one may think rather of the maze of tracks on a wide common than of any broad king's highway." That is, a scholar subscribing to this approach adheres to a particular path of his choice in making use of historical data and then offering his explanation so much so that other important aspects are virtually ignored. It is also possible that he may play with his emotions or prejudices while making use of this approach as we may find in the cases of Machiavelli and Oakeshott.

Nevertheless, the value of the study of political theory in the context of its historical evolution and growth cannot be so lightly dismissed. Works of G.H. abine, R.G. Gettell, W.A. Dunning, C.C. Maxey, T.l. Cook, R.J. Carlyle, G.E.G. Catlin, C.E. Vaughan etc. have

an importance of their own. Such an approach has its own usefulness in understanding the meaning of eminent political thinkers from Plato and Aristotle in ancient to St. Augustine, St. Thomas and Marsiglio in the middle and thereon to Machiavelli, Bodin, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, Mill, Marx and Laski in the modern ages. If political theory has a universal and respectable character, its reason should be traced in the affirmation that it is rooted in historical traditions.

3. Institutional Approach: Here a student of politics lays stress on the study of the formal structures of a political organisation like legislature, executive and judiciary. This trend may be discovered in the writings of a very large number of political scientists from Aristotle and Polybius in the ancient to Bryce and Finer in the modern periods. However, the peculiar thing about modern writers is that they also include party system as the 'fourth estate' in the structures of a .political system, while contemporary writers like Bentley, Truman, Latham and V.O. Key, Jr. go a step further by including numerous interest groups that constitute the infrastructure of a political system. That is why, institutional approach is also known by the name of structural approach.

The institutional or structural approach may be visualised in the works of several English and American writers. We may refer to the works of Walter Bagehot, F.A. Ogg, W.B. Munro, Herman Finer, H.J. Laski, Richard Neustàdt, CF. Strong, Bernard Crick, James Bryce, Harold Zink, Maurice Duverger and Giovanni Sartori. The striking feature of their works is that the study of politics has been confined to the formal, as well as informal, institutional structures of a political system. Moreover, in order to substantiate conclusions comparative study of major governmental systems of certain advanced countries of the West has also been made.

This approach has been criticised for being too narrow. It ignores the role of individuals who constitute and operate the formal, as well as informal, structures and sub-structures of a political system. It is because of this that behavioural approaches have over- shadowed the significance of this approach. Another difficulty is that the meaning and range of an institutional system vary with the view of the scholar. "Those who have conceived governmental institutions, offices and agencies have been inclined to teach and write about government accordingly, organisation charts being suggestive of much of what they have done. Under this conception, the study of politics becomes, at the extreme the study of one narrow, specific fact about another." Finally, the students of this approach "have also tended to ignore international politics. Since for long there were no world institutions analogous to

the state or government, there seemed to be nothing in this area for political scientists to talk about."

4. Legal Approach: Finally, in the realm of traditional approaches, we may refer to the legal or juridical approach. Here the study of politics is mixed up with legal processes and institutions. Theme of Jaw and justice are treated as not mere affairs o jurisprudence, rather political scientists look at state as the maintainer of an effective and equitable system of law and order. Matters relating to the organisation, jurisdiction and independence of judicial institutions, therefore, become an essential concern of a political scientist. Analytical jurists from Cicero in the ancient to Dicey in the modern periods have regarded state as primarily a corporation or a juridical person and, in this way, viewed politics as a science of legal norms having nothing in common with the science of the state as a social organism. Thus, this approach "treats the state primarily as an organisation for the creation and enforcement of law.

In this context, we may refer to the works of Jean Bodin, HugoGrotius and Thomas Hobbes of the early modern period who propounded the doctrine of sovereignty. In the system of Hobbes, the head of the state is the highest legal authority and his command is law that must be obeyed either to avoid punishment following its infraction, or to keep the dreadful state of nature away. The of Bentham, John Austin, Savigny, Sir Henry Maine, and A.V. Dicey may be referred to in this connection. The result is that the study of politics is integrally bound up with the legal processes of the country and the existence of a harmonious state of liberty and equality is earmarked by the glorious name of the rule of law.

The legal approach, applied to the study of national as well as international politics, stands on the assumption that law prescribes action to be taken in a given contingency and also forbids the same in certain other situations; it even fixes the limits of permissible action. It also emphasises the fact that where the citizens are law-abiding, the knowledge of law provides a very important basis for predictions relating to political behaviour of the people. A distinguished student of this approach like Jellinek advises us to treat organised society not as a mere social or political phenomenon but as an ensemble of public law rights and obligations founded on a system of pure logic or reason. it implies that the state as an organism of growth and development cannot be understood without a consideration of those extra-legal and social forces which lie at the back of the consideration and, for this reason, are responsible for many of its actions and mutual reactions. It may, however, be pointed out that this approach has a

very narrow perspective. Law embraces only one aspect of a people's life and, as such, it cannot cover the entire behaviour of the political actions. As the idealists can be criticised for treating state as nothing else but a moral entity, so the analytical jurists commit the mistake of reducing every aspect of a political system to a juridical entity. "Determination of the content of law through legislative power is a political act, ordinarily to be explained on the basis of something other than a legal approach."

The traditional approaches may be said to have four main varieties as discussed above. Their outstanding feature is that value- laden system dominates. Normativism assigns to them a peculiar and distinctive character. As a result of this, political theory is said to have become abstract, hypothetical, speculative, even metaphysical. On the whole, normativism lays stress on the significant discussion. It looks to the establishment of a moral criterion of political conduct and asks questions about the nature of the state and its ends, the limit of one's obligations to obey the commands, the basis and content of the individual's rights and freedom, the form of good life and so on."

Modern Approaches: Emphasis on Fact-Laden Study of Politics

From the above, it is evident that the study of politics in the context of philosophical-ethical, institutional-structural, historical and legal perspectives cannot assign to it the character of, what modern behaviour lists like David Easton call, a 'pure science'. Thus, normativism should be replaced by empiricism. Modern approaches are, therefore, marked by empirical investigation of the relevant data. They have arisen from the realisation that "a search for fuller integration was not thought of or even hinted at by the political scientists belonging to the old order and, for this reason, the positivism of this science was not dreamt as posing a challenge to the already age- worn methods of study and approach." Hence, in this direction, we may refer to the following important approaches:

1 . Sociological Approach: The sociological approach to the study of politics has become very popular and now eminent writers like R.M. Maclver, David Easton and GA. Almond subscribing to this approach have taken into recognition the essential fact that ample data is available in the realm of sociology so as to lay clown certain empirical rules of political behaviour. They have accepted the view of leading sociologists like Comte, Spencer, Ratzenhofer, Weber, Parsons, Merton and a host of others that state is more of a social than that of a political institution. That is, social context is necessary for the understanding and explanation of political behaviour of the individuals. It is the social whole in which we may

find the individuals having a status and playing a role. The role is determined by certain traits acquired by the individuals. This process of transmission of values from one generation to another is called 'political socialisation.'

Another term which this approach has popularised is 'political culture' that "refers to the totality of what is learned by individuals as members of a society; it is a way of life, a mode of thinking, acting, and feeling." A scrutinised study of the rise and fall of a political system shows that its causes may be traced in the domain of wrong political socialisation whose objective manifestation is the political culture of the people. Thus, sociological approach has its own place in the twin doctrines of political development and political decay. Besides, as society is a network of numerous associations and groups which play their own part in the operation of the politics of a country, this approach automatically suggests an investigation of the study of interest groups that constitute the infrastructure of a political system. As such, sociological approach has many sub-varieties? If its own and, for this reason, some writers prefer the term sociological approaches'.

2. Psychological Approach: Political science has moved very close to the discipline of psychology in recent times particularly at the hands of Graham Wallas, Charles Merriam, Harold D. Lasswell, R.A. Dahi and Eric Fromm. In early modem times, Machiavelli and Hobbes stressed the point of security of life and material possessions as a motivating force and held that the desire for it was inseparable from the desire for power. Recently a good number of political scientists have borrowed material from the writings of eminent psychologists like Freud, Jang, Eyesenck and McDougall to lay down certain valid rules of political behaviour. A study of politics has, for this reason, been made so as to display the role of emotions, habits, sentiments, instincts, ego etc. that are the constituent elements of human personality.
.
The concept of 'power' has, therefore, gained its own importance. A recent writer like Prof. WA. Robson has frankly treated political science as a study of power. "It is with power in society that political science is primarily concerned—its nature, basis, premises, scope and results. The 'focus of interest' of the political scientists is clear and unambiguous; it centres on the struggle to gain or retain power, to exercise power or influence over others, or to resist that exercise" Likewise, Fredrick M. Watkins says: "The proper scope of political science is not the study of state or of any other specific institutional complex, but the investigation of all associations in so far as they can be known to exemplify the problem of power.-" Its most

succinct interpretation may be seen in the views of Harold Lasswell who identifies the term power with 'influence' and then defines politics as the study of 'the influence and the influential. It is, therefore, known by the name of 'power approach'.

3. Economic Approach: Matters relating to the production and distribution of goods have an economic character. But as their regulation is done by the state, they are very much involved in the political process. The prominent schools of liberalism, socialism and communism emerge because of the divergent interpretations of the role of the state in regulating economic matters. Eminent political scientists like Mill, Marx, Mitchell, Schumpeter, Friedman and host of others have written volumes having a relevance of their own in the domain of political economy. However, in this regard the most outstanding name is that of Karl Marx who has built his political theory on the basis of the criticism of the prevailing capitalist system. It is contained in his well-known assumption: "The mode of production of the material means of existence condition the whole process of social, political and intellectual life" So says Engels:"The ultimate cause of all social changes and political revolutions are to be sought not in the minds of men—but in changes in the mode of production and exchange; they are to be sought not in the philosophy but in the economics of the period concerned."

4. Quantitative Approach: Also known by the name of statistical approach, it stands for the use of numerical data so as to impart exactitude to the process of describing and analysing a political phenomenon. Mere descriptive or prescriptive analysis is not enough. The subscribers to this approach demonstrate their conviction in an old saying that 'there is safety in numbers' and, as such, we may prove scientifically the validity of a proposition by making use of tables, charts, graphs etc. For instance, a study of electoral behaviour, questions asked by the members and answers given by the ministers in the legislature, organisation, achievements and failures of a government department or of a public undertaking, voting and cross-voting records of a public institution, constructive and destructive aspects of the politics of defection, rise and fall of a political party and the like can be well analysed with the help of quantitative data.

Several important writers and agencies have added to the stock of comparative politics by making use of this approach that, in a real sense, is a methodology. The names of Dr Gallup. Charles Merriam, Harold Gosneil, Paul Lazarsfield and Samuell Lubell in the United States may be referred to in this connection. They have developed sophisticated -ways to study the electoral behaviour of the people. Similarly, in Britain, the Nuffleld College election surveys

shave tried to show the votes shared by each party in a general election and its representation in the House of Commons. Men like R.S. Mime and H.C. Mackenzie have produced works by making election surveys of different constituencies. It may, however, be pointed out that this approach need not involve any special thematical expertise. It requires the habit of exposing in numerical terms every generalisation to simple tests relating to the number of people and their way of doing in some political activity. The subscriber is not expected to rely exclusively or heavily on the mathematical data, rather "a happy balance has to be struck between ignoring statistics and using them to excess."

5. Systems Approach: This approach has become very popular in recent times. As the very name of this approach suggests, here the focus is on systems that are defined as 'bounded regions in space-time, involving energy inter-change among their parts, which are associated in functional relationships, and with their environments." Borrowing from the discipline of biological, sciences, the sociologists like Parsons thought in terms of a social system. From them the idea came to new political scientists like David Easton who developed the idea of a political system. The purpose of general systems theory, as it is known, is to reduce multiplication f efforts by integrating all knowledge and treating all systems as inter-related. Not only this, even parts of a system (called sub-systems) should be treated not as separate and isolated units but organic parts of the same system. Thus, the intention is that the theory "should be relevant to many or all kinds of systems, from the 'smallest sub- systems of an atom to the systems composed of galaxies."

In this way, the emphasis is on cross-cultural studies with an inter-disciplinary focus. Every discipline is like the sub-system of a general system. There is a natural system and all natural sciences like physics and chemistry are its sub-systems, though each sub- system is a system in its own place. If so, politics, economics, psychology, ethics etc. are all sub-systems of a social system, though each is a system in its own right. For this reason, we should use new terms like a political system, an economic system, a psychological system, an ethical system and the like. Not only that, since every system has its own structures and sub-structures which function with the help of inputs, with inputs, throughputs, outputs and feedbacks, so two more approaches have emerged as derivatives of the systems approach.

The 'structural-functional approach' lays emphasis on the structures and functions of every part ad sub-part of a system and its functional aspect. Functions may be latent or manifest. In case some structure or sub-structure is dysfunctional or malfunctional, it should be repaired

or soon replaced. The 'input-output approach' is a corollary to the same in the sense that here emphasis is laid on certain forces that come from the 'environment' and play their part in the decision-making process, while decisions taken by the 'men in authority-roles' are called 'outputs'. The 'feedback' process plays its own part in connecting the inputs and outputs with the result that the political system remains like an 'ongoing concern'. Easton calls it 'a flow model of the political system'. One may easily form an impression here that systems theory with its two derivatives in the forms of structural-functional and input-output approaches seeks to make the study of a political system too mechanical. Human beings are not lifeless like machines. As such, human behaviour can- no!: be explained with the laws of mechanics. Thus, Alfred Adler has denounced this approach as "a huge mis-step in the right direction— the direction of systematic empirical analysis."

6. Simulation Approach: That contemporary political scientists have borrowed much from natural sciences as well as from cybernetics and mathematics may be studied in this direction. Simulation means a study with the help of image-construction or model-building. We may take note of this fact in the study of political communication, decision-making and game theory. The political communication approach, as popularised by Karl Deutsch, lays emphasis on how one part of a system affects another by sending message& or transmitting information with the result that other parts function and in turn, do the work of sending messages and transmitting information to each other because of the 'feedback' process. Thus, according to this approach, politics and government "appear in essence as processes of steering and co-ordinating human efforts towards the attainment of some set of goals."

Decision-making approach is another variety of the simulation approach. Here a scholar lays focus on the characteristics of decision-makers, on persons or groups who might exercise influence over the decision-makers though not being in the capacity of taking a decision themselves, on the situations under which a decision is actually taken and the like. Allied with it is the approach of game theory where social scientists, like mathematicians, look like developing a conceptual design that will help the decision-makers to choose a strategy whereby they may make the best possible bargain out of the competing or conflicting situations. Here the simplification "is reflected in such assumptions as following: that there are only a very few alternatives among which to choose; that the criteria of the judgment of all parties (i.e., the ends that each party pursues) are known to all; and that each party is thoroughly rational. Since certain games— e.g., poker—involve simplified decision-making

situations, study of the problems has tended to focus on games and the subject has come to be called game theory."

From a critical standpoint, it may be added -that, like systems approach, simulation approach also is too mechanistic, even abstract. It tries to imply the behaviour of real decision-makers by taking them as fully rational beings. Social sciences ma not be converted into natural sciences, nor sciences of numbers and cybernetics may help in understanding and explaining entire political reality A mechanical engineer or a mathematician may have a very simplified way of studying his subject. but a social scientist has to take into consideration the complexities of human life that beset all fixed and definite calculations. For instance, decision-makers are living human beings who act rationally in few and irrationally in most of the given situations. As such, decision-making approach or the use of game theory cannot be applied to explain their behaviour in a thoroughly successful measure.

7. Behavioural Approach: Modern empirical approaches have found their best manifestation in the trend of behaviouralism where a host of leading American writers have laid emphasis on the collection and examination of 'facts' relating to the actual behaviour of man as a social and political being. This approach has emerged on the scene in the midst of a large amount of turmoil and controversy within the profession widely lauded by the protagonists as a 'revolution' in the realm of political science. E. Kirkpatrick, the Executive Director of the American Political Science Association, explained its meaning thus: "Between World War II and the mid-fifties, the term 'political behaviour' represents both an approach and a challenge, an orientation and a reform movement, a type of research and a rallying cry, a 'hurrah' term and a 'boo' term. Debate about behavioural techniques and methods was often accompanied by vituperation; discussions were more often aimed at vanquishing adversaries than at clarifying issues."

Simply stated, the behavioural approach bears the following important characteristics: (i) It specifies as the unit of object of both the theoretical and empirical analysis the behaviour of persons and social groups rather than events, structures, institutions, or ideologies. (ii) It seeks to place theory and research in a frame of reference common to that of social psychology, sociology and cultural anthropology. (iii) It stresses the mutual interdependence of theory and research. Theoretical questions need to be stated in operational terms for purposes of empirical research. And, in turn, empirical findings should have a bearing on the

development of political theory. (iv) It tries to develop rigorous research design and to apply precise methods of analysis to political behaviour problems.

Since David Easton is regarded as the leading light in this direction, we may refer to the 'intellectual fundaments' of this trend, as enumerated by him, in the following manner:

(1) That regularities exist which are discoverable and which can be expressed in generalisations.

(ii) That such generalisations must be testable with reference to human behaviour.

(iii) That means for acquiring and interpreting •data cannot be taken for granted; they are problematic and need to be examined self consciously.

(iv) That measurement and quantification are necessary, but only where such measurement makes sense in terms of other purposes.

(v) That ethical evaluation and empirical explanation should be kept separate.

(vi) That research ought to be systematic; research, untutored by theory may prove trivial and theory unsupportable by data futile. (vii) That understanding and explanation of political behaviour should precede application of this knowledge.

(viii) That material from the various social sciences should be integrated. It is true that,-as a result of the utilisation of this approach, the scope of political science has widened and the nature of the discipline improved in understanding and explaining 'political reality.' However, it may be criticised on these grounds:

1 . It is based upon a false theory of knowledge. It takes facts alone as real. On the contrary, 'universals are as real as facts' and facts can have meaning only in connection with the unjversals.'

2. It is based on a false conception of scientific method. Even after collecting facts and doing their measurement and quantification, the writer cannot free himself from the limitations of subjectivity or his own sense of value-judgment while making some observation on their basis. Thus, fixity and definiteness of a natural science cannot be infused in the discipline of a social science.

3. It circumscribes the scope of political science by advising us to study only those aspects . of political life that are amenable to measurement and quantification. In this way, the significance of speculative political theory is sacrificed at the altar of a dry and barren craze of 'mad scientism'.

4. Finally, it makes political science a handmaid of sociology by laying down that all political activity and institutions reflect the nature of society and are determined and patterned to a large extent by divisions within society.

By way of clarification, it may, however, be added that leading subscribers to the modern approaches have not repudiated the foundations of their counterparts in toto whose names are well known in the realm of 'traditionalism'. They have only sought to understand the limitations that flowed from the necessarily subjective, descriptive and prescriptive mode of theorising and analysis. For this reason, they have experienced the difficulty of formulating a method of analysis or approach that may be of universal acceptance. Surprisingly, even the arch-priests of behaviouralism realised the shortcomings of their own obsessions and a great figure like David Easton himself veered round to the point that 'mad craze for scientism' should be abandoned. In this way, the era of post-behaviouralism was ushered in that designated the mood and programme of the new dissenters. Reaffirmation of norms and values demonstrated that rigid behaviourlists had conceded to the existence of fact- value dichotomy. In other words, they realised that fact-value distinction had encouraged 'an undesirable foreshortening of vision and a moral insensitivity' and that some sort of reconciliation of facts and values may be possible, if necessary.

8. Marxian Approach: : In this direction, Marxian approach has a place of its own that may be regarded as basically different from both the traditional and the modern approaches in several important respects, though we may discover certain points of resemblance with both as well. The astonishing feature of this approach is that here 'state' being the central theme of political science, is conceived as an inevitable consequence of class contradictions. As such, the system of Marxian dialectics culminates in the justification of •a stateless condition of social life that would come into being as the final stage of social development. Moreover, economics dominates the scene so much so that all other disciplines like history, sociology, psychology and ethics become its offshoots. Politics becomes integrally connected with the basic economic structure finding its manifestation in the forces and relations of production. Thus, it is stressed that in the real world, "economic and political forces and factors are constantly interacting and are extremely hard to disentangle one from the other."

The significance of the Marxian approach is traceable in the fact that its utilisation calls for a deeper scrutiny of the meaning and nature of politics. Instead of keeping the focus of study confined to the formal structure and sub-structure of a political system, it lays emphasis on

going at the roots. Thus, it holds that the economic system determines the class structure and as there is a change in the means of production, distribution and exchange, so there is a corresponding change in the relations of the masters and the slaves, the feudal lords and the serfs, the capitalists and the workers—the dominant and the dominated classes. Struggle for power constituting the bedrock of politics should, therefore, be studied in the context of the conflict between two antagonistic classes. This state of contradictions can end only in the establishment of a socialist society.. Obviously this approach not only lays stress on the fact of social contradictions, it also discovers their resolution. In this way, it assumes a deterministic character.

If so, the Marxian approach becomes like an ideology. It stands on a particular set of propositions that are not open to question and that call for a concerted action for the sake of their realisation and implementation so as to change the world and not merely interpret it. it not only exposes the inherent weaknesses and defects of the existing capitalist system, it also informs the exploited . and the oppressed class of the workers, peasants and toilers to unite so as to break the chains of slavery and win the whole world. Thus it treats state as an instrument of exploitation and oppression by one class over another and—lays down that class character of the state can- not come to an end until the classless society is culminated in the stateless condition of life. As Marx in his German Ideology says in a communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity, but where each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another thing tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, to fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming a hunter, fisherman, shepherd or critic."

Since the subject of comparative politics throws special focus on the study of the Third World countries, the Marxian approach endeavours to study the politics of the undeveloped and developing areas in the context of imperialistic exploitation that has for centuries kept a very large number of the Afro-Asian countries in a state of political subjugation and economic exploitation and is still making efforts for the retention of the same in the garb of neo-colonialism. In this way, not the state but the 'class' remains the main actor even in the realm of international politics and the entire class of the workers of the world is informed to break the hold of the imperialist powers. Thus, Lenin calls imperialism the 'final stage of capitalism' and • Maurice Dobb says: "Capitalism has grown into a world system of colonial oppression, and of financial strangulation of the overwhelming majority of the population of

the world by a handful of 'advanced' countries. And this 'booty' is share between two or three powerful world marauders aroused to the teeth...who also involve the whole world in their war over the sharing of their booty.

Viewed in this context, a study of the politics of a poor and backward countries of the world should be made in the context of extra-societal forces operating in the international environment. In- stead of making superficial comparisons between the political processes and institutions of the rich and advanced countries of the world like the United States, Britain and France on the one hand and the newly independent countries of the Third Word like Zaire, Zimbabwe and Kampuchea on the other, we should study the working of the political system of the poor and backward countries of the world in the light of 'inputs' coming from the environment and the 'outputs' being the result of the same.

Systems Analysis

The study of politics has fluctuated between two poles ever since men began to think about the nature of the polity. At one end were those who focused on the political institutions as key agendas of social control and social change. They regarded the behaviour of the state, and the intentions of the prince as the most important aspects. Conversely, others stressed how much extra-political factors or conditions affected political events and institutions. In a real sense, these two emphases differed about whether society or the polity is the primary. Since the study of non-political institutions ultimately constituted the content of various social science disciplines, anthropology, sociology, economics and psychology, the issue of the relations between the study of politics and the other social sciences has existed from the start of intellectual interest in such matters.

A study of the latest contributions made particularly by recent American writers to the subject of Political Science leave an impression that it "has undergone a revolution of sorts in the definition of its mission, problems and methods." It is this startling development in this subject that has been designated by Heinz Eulau as 'Behavioural Persuasion' and as 'Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest' by Robert A. Dab!. It is, however, a matter of serious academic debate whether the story of new developments in the sphere of Political Science should be lauded as a revolution or a counter- revolution; it is, nevertheless, certain that it has within its fold much that should be described as a revised version of the tradition. political theory; it has also much that may be designated as momentous as the original foes feared or the doughty band of revolutionists hoped. Systems analysis in social sciences finds

a very significant place in this regard that draws its main inspiration from natural sciences flowing through the discipline of sociology inasmuch as it argues that all social phenomena "are part of discernible, regular and internally consistent patterns of behaviour."

Systems Analysis in Political Science: Growth and Implications

The introduction of the systems analysis in social sciences owes its genesis to the realisation of some leading American writers like David Easton, G.A. Almond and Morton A. Kaplan who have react- ed against the traditional tendency of rigid compartmentalisation of any discipline belonging to the world of social sciences like economics or politics, psychology or sociology, that, in their views, has resulted in nothing else than a reduction of the cross-flows between various sister fields of study. These writers have realised that uni-dimensional studies in social sciences have not only caused duplication, triplication and even multiplication of efforts, but also impeded the patterns of a scientific analysis by creating conditions hostile to the tendency of unification of all knowledge. With this realisation they have veered round to the point that important opportunities would be available to the students of one discipline in case they take the help of analogous disciplines for the study of their analogous problems, as far as possible, in the interest of meaningfully integrating their knowledge of the subject under a scientific investigation and explanation.

These new social scientists, in this direction, have drawn inspiration from the contributions of natural scientists like Ludwig von Bertallanfy who pioneered the movement of unification of all natural sciences. The line shown by this biologist in the third decade of the present century became quite prominent after about a gap of some twenty years. Several important conferences were held in leading American educational institutions to explore 'the possibilities of scientific research towards a unified theory of human behaviour. How- ever, the setting up of the Society for the Advancement of the General Systems Research in 1956 makes a very important event under whose auspices annual year-books appeared to throw special focus on the areas of general systems theory? The introduction of general systems theory thus became a matter of fashionable study. As Young says: "with such an orientation, it was natural that people interested in this movement, should begin to search for a body of concepts, lending unity or organisation, to have study undertaken in a variety of disciplines and making insights and theoretical advances from individual disciplines widely available. The central and guiding notion that they developed in this quest was the concept of systems, which has since become the basic conceptual asset of general systems theory."

The word 'system' has been used and defined differently by differ- ent writers belonging to different disciplines. Ludwig von Bertallanfy describes system as "a set of elements standing in interaction" Hall and Fagen define system as "a set of objects together with relations between the objects and between their attitudes." Collin Cherry says that a system "is a whole which is compounded of many parts—an ensemble of attitudes." According to Morton A. Kaplan, "A brief and non-technical description of the object of systems analysis would include: the study of a set of interrelated variables, as distinguished from the environment of the set, and of the ways in which this set is maintained under the impact of environmental disturbances."

According to David Apter, we may then restate the characteristics of systems as follows:

1.   Systems have boundaries within which there are functional inter-relationships mainly based on some of the communications;

2.   Systems are divided into sub-systems, with exchanges existing between the sub-systems (as, for example, between a city and or a state and the national government); and

3.   Systems have a capacity for coding—that is, they take informational inputs; are able to learn from inputs. and translate inputs into some kind of output.

In short, in a system there is a relationship between information and the use of energy. The relationship between coding and the use of energy—outputs—is transformational. The result is a general systems paradigm which can be applied to different system levels, each with its own boundaries: cells, organs, individuals, groups, societies, or whatever. The general system model, then, uses energy and information input control mechanisms, memory banks, checking instruments, and outputs which generate new energy and information.

An examination of various definitions shows that while each one of them "embodies the idea of a group of objects or elements standing in some characteristic structural relationship to one another and interacting on the basis of certain characteristic processes"," points of controversy hinge in regard to the ; problem of empirical operationalisation. Thus, the following points should be kept in mind while dealing with a proper definition of the term 'system' in social sciences:

1.   A system is not be taken as a mere random aggregation of elements; it is composed of elements all at a level of inter-dependence that can be located with some precision both in time and in space. The elements of a system may be concrete entities or the intellectual /

constructs of aspects or attributes of concrete entities. While the former makes physical, the latter makes an analytical system. A social scientist is concerned with the. latter and not with the former system.'

2. A system may have two constructs—homological and interlocking- While the former; also known as isomorphism, signifies 'one-tone correspondence' between objects, in different systems which preserves the relationship between two objects, the latter refers more directly to scale effects and to the vertical or hierarchical association of systems. This line of distinction between the two revolves on the point that whereas systems may differ in terms of size, time, scale and specific substances, they may yet, resemble one another closely in regard to certain basic structures and processes and may also have significant subsets of such structures and processes that interlock.

3. A study of systems analysis thus forms a significant part of multi- disciplinary or, more correctly stated, an inter-disciplinary approach. The basic implications of both—the isomorphism and interlocking constructs of a system—"suggest very strongly that there are important concepts and, propositions that are meaningful over a significant range of specific systems and that it is possible to develop in conceptual terms a small number of general systems. These notions together with the fundamental concept of systems now form the heart of the campaign aimed at breaking down the compartmentalisation of disciplines and moving towards the unification of science. General systems theory constitutes a record of efforts to elabourate basic principles relevant to a wide range of systems and to develop techniques for applying these principles to the specific and concrete systems of interest to various fields of research."

4. Systems theory in its particular aspects relating to natural sciences like those of physics and biology is fundamentally different from the general theory of all systems where we find serious attempts to conceptualise a framework based on certain hypotheses and concepts that may be roughly applicable to various branches of social sciences. That is, systems theory as applied to the field of natural sciences is not to be taken as a general theory of all systems. Even though general systems theory does not make an attempt to distinguish between different types of systems and also to establish a framework within which similarities between systems can be recognised despite differences of subject matter, different kinds of systems require different theories for the sake of furnishing scientific explanations. Moreover, the systems theory : iS not only different from general systems theory, rather it makes an improvement upon it by sticking to the additional questions of looking into the how and why of efforts that failed or became likely to fail and thus laid down a law that any user of systems theory will have to look for different theories for an explanation of different types

of systems. Such a point has its special significance for the student of a social science like politics who, for the sake of a correct application of this theory, would prefer to move away from a general theory to a comparative theory.'

5.   The use of systems theory in social sciences should be made with certain precautions. As social objectives lack the fixed and definite character of the natural objects, social sciences must like- wise avoid extreme particularisation in social and political formulations. That is, we cannot construct models coping faithfully with the particular objects. of the real world. What we can do at the most is to draw some points of analogy or to make certain exercises in the direction of resemblances in order to have the character of empirical explanations to our social and political theories. Moreover, we shall be aware of the danger that the more we go ahead in the direction of making our model complex, the more there are the chances of allowing room for them entry of subtle variations either in loop directions or in the rates of the flow. Thus, highly complex models "run the risk of being artefacts". That is, slight variations that we could neither detect nor measure in the real world might — and highly likely world produce major differences in outcomes and in behaviours. Such highly particularised models lack both generality and relevance to any specific problems of social science."

6.   The researcher of a social science should, for this reason, adopt the golden mean or the middle course. He should bank upon the models of a natural science; he should also be aware of the limitations of a social science. What he should do, therefore, is to act like what Kaplan says, 'a balancer'. Thus, he should make use of the comparative method and thereby stick to the point of saying different things about distinguishable systems rather than the same thing about every system. As Kaplan says: "If the viable that are treated in the comparative systems theories have sufficient importance for selective aspects of the real world behaviour, they should then constitute reasonable first order approximations that are useful for exploring these realities. At this level of generality, the fact that even analogous and counterfactual assumptions are sometimes employed does not contraindicate the validity of the enterprise". Advocates of systems analysis believe that there are a number of things common to various disciplines and that if only they can be put in an abstract form, a general theory can emerge that might help each discipline to understand its problems better and which each discipline use as a broad conceptual guideline in its general perspective before it enters into a more detailed research. Obviously, this approach is against far too rigid compartmentalisation of disciplines which "had led to a reduction of cross-flow between various fields of research, and was obstructing progress in each specific field. This tendency on the part of each discipline to concern itself with specific phenomena and detailed studies in its own field to

the exclusion of abstract and general theoretical considerations, while a definite gain in one discipline, could not be of much use in the understanding of similar problems in either discipline, and each discipline had to Start from a scratch and build up its own theoretical concepts, generalisations, and abstractions."

General Systems Theory: Certain Concepts and Their Implications

We have already seen that the idea of systems analysis has been taken over from biology and adopted by certain social scientists to the study of their subject matter so that it assumes the form of an empirical investigation. It is for this reason that systems analysis has its own set of specific concepts that should be understood before grasping its nature. The basic concepts used in the elaboration of the general systems theory may be put into three categories — concepts of descriptive nature or those which can also be used as tools of classificatory variables, concepts that relate to the regulation and maintenance of a system, and concepts that throw light on the forces that bring about change in a system.

1.   Concepts in the nature of primarily descriptive and classificatory variables: In this category we can include concepts that lay down the lines of differences between various kinds of systems like a democratic or open and a non-democratic or closed system, or an organism and a non-organism system; we may also refer to concepts that. show hierarchical levels like systems and sub- systems, orders of interaction and scale of effects; we may also make use of the terms to understand the working of the internal organisations of the systems through the degrees of integration, differentiation, inter-dependence and centralisation; the systems also interact with their environment and that leads to the introduction of the terms like boundaries, inputs and outputs; finally, there may be concepts relating to the various paths that systems follow over time such as state-determinedness and equi-finality.

2.   As a matter of fact, this category constitutes the key part of the general systems theory as the real stress of this theory is on the regulation and maintenance of the systems. Thus here we find several important concepts that have their relationhip with the forces that play their role in the regulation or maintenance of a system. Here are introduced the notions of stability, equilibrium and homeostatic. Connected with this are the concepts of feedback and processes in the forms of repair, reproduction and entropy. Every system must have a state of equilibrium that may be unstable like a ball on a ridge, or static like a ball on the surface, or stable like a ball in a valley.

3.   Concepts in the nature of forces causing dynamics: Change is the law of nature, but this change can be both disruptive and non- disruptive. A non-disruptive change can be

brought about through responses to altered conditions of the environment; non-disruptive changes can be either reversible or irreversible. While changes in the reversible directions include adaptation, learning and growth and purposes, goals and teleology, change towards irreversible directions covers disruption, dissolution and breakdown, - crises, stresses and strains and overload and decay leading to the application of. the law of positive entropy: quite large number of conceptual patterns and the proposition is built upon them constitute the body of general systems theory. However, two points should be borne in mind in this connection. First, the general systems theory "appears as an integrated and generalised set of concepts, hypotheses and validated propositions with hope of establishing an integrated set of high level theoretical principles dealing with all, or almost all, the significant elements of a small number of inclusive general systems and applicable to important phenomena in a wide range of disciplines. On the other hand, it may be studied as ,a set of techniques and as a framework for systematic process of analysis. In this instance, it is not so much, the specific principles and propositions of the theory that are of ultimate interest, rather it is the suggestion that the theory offers for analysing and organising data, the insights derivable from the use of the notion of isomorphism, the richness of the concepts, and the value of framework of systems theory for purposes of coding large amounts of data which are significant."

4.   General Systems Theory -and its Application to Political Analysis It may be asked as to how the principles of the general systems theory, originally developed in the spheres of natural sciences should be applied to the study of politics with certain transformations made first by the anthropologists and then by the sociologists. It is a fact that general systems theory in its extended and well-integrated form "has very rarely been applied to the analysis of political phenomena." The reason for this should be traced in this explanation that the terms of general systems theory are of such a nature that they can be applied with rigour and that deters a social scientist to move ahead with the help of this theory. It is a different thing that the concepts of general systems theory have become quite popular in recent years, even then it cannot be asserted that modern writers on different social sciences can make use of the concept freely and in a well-understood style. Realising this fact fully, Easton observes:

"In most cases, it is just a handy notion, popular and apparently simple, to refer to the range of phenomena that in earlier days might have roused a different terminology, such as politics, government and the state."

It is true that the propositions of the systems theory, in particular, are somewhat scattered, it does support a rather impressive analytical super-structure that is made all the more ambitious by the objectives of general systems theory in developing a set of basic principles applicable to a wide range of empirical systems. Undoubtedly, the use of this approach is of great value in sorting out a large quantity of data and in recognising the patterns and uniformities that tie the elements of a system together. Several concepts like those of inputs and outputs, stability and equilibrium, feedback and entropy have become well-accepted terms at the hands of empirical political scientists who deal with the formation and working of political systems in open and closed societies or in advanced and developing countries of the world. It well enables an empircal researcher to analyse how changes take place in the political systems and in what directions of political development or political decay. Thus, a political scientist remains concerned not merely with the growth of integration of a system, he is equally concerned with its disintegration or breakdown. Then, a study in this regard facilitates the course of inter-disciplinary investigation that may bring more useful results for a student of comparative politics. It may be used both for a macro-analysis and a micro-analysis. Finally, apart from being useful for operational research, the systems analysis may be of great benefit for normative or deductive purposes in the sensç that we may be able to lay down what remedial steps taken in time may save a system from collapse or disintegration.

It is on account of these advantages that recent political scientists like David Easton and G.A. Almond have made use of systems analysis in political science and thus contributed much to the literature on empirical political theory. itis due to this that strUctural-functional and input-output approaches have become so popular that we shall discuss them in separate lessons. Keeping all this in be said that the concepts developed by the general systems theory "open up new questions and create new dimensions for investigation into the political processes, and several of them can be used to grát advantage by political scientists in. their own analysis of political phenomena." Likewise, Young says: "The discipline of Political Science is presently at a stage where it can benefit substantially from a consideration of theoretical problems, techniques of conceptualisation, and methods of overcoming various difficulties of analysis in other disciplines, as well as from direct insights that may be wholly or partially transferred to political problems. General systems theory provides excellent channels for maximising the flow of such inter- changes even with disciplines that are sometimes considered far removed from political science in abstract terms."

Systems Analysis of David Easton: 'A New Enquiry into the State of Political Science'

The most important name in the list of recent political scientists subscribing to the use of systems analysis is that of David Easton. His monumental work A Systems Analysis of Political Life published in 1965 was appreciated by leading writers on contemporary empirical political theory as "providing an original set of concepts fo arranging at the level of theory and interpreting political phenomena in a new and helpful way." Following the course of a natural scientist like Stephen Toulmin, he set out to develop a theory that would help to explain behavioural 'reality inasmuch as political theory is but a symbolic system useful for understanding concrete or empirical political analysis. The empirical political theory of Easton has these salient characteristics:

Easton is for a unified theory of politics a theory capable of explaining the behaviour of both national and international political systems as well as for bringing out their comparisons. . He desires that same categories and propositions could be applied to all kinds of political activities whether at the national or international level and whether for the developed and developing political systems.

Easton is concerned with the issue of survival or persistence: the political system. The purpose of an empirical political scientist, according to him, is to study primarily those conditions under which political systems are maintained over a period of time.

Easton is critical of the equilibrium analysis that stops at the point of analysing factors that create stability or instability in a political system has real concern is to deal with the conditions, necessary for the existence and continuation of a political system. The purpose of Easton is to study political system in both theoretical and applied perspectives. He is critical of the Lasswellians who look to the applied side of a political stern in their study of 'power' and thus ignore the theoretical aspect of the subject that is concerned with the study of conditions necessary for the very survival of the political system. Easton rejects the approach of a sociologist like Talcott Parsons who suggested that 'political theory can be analysed in terms of a general theory of social institutions'. Such a view, Easton contends, makes politics a handmaid of sociology. The purpose of Easton is thus to keep the study of politics at an autonomous level since it is the study of the authoritative allocation of values as it is influenced by the distribution and use of power.

As pointed out above, Easton seeks to study political systems in their abstract or theoretical and as well as concrete or applied aspects. While the former, in his view, may be designated as the 'life process of the system' or a 'conceptual framework' or a 'structural analysis' of a political system, the latter is described by him as the 'persistence of politics'. In other words, while the former constitutes a theoretical study of the conditions under which a conceptual study of the political system can be made, the latter is concerned with the problems as to how political systems manage to persist through time in the face of the inevitable stress which they face. It is a different thing that the concrete aspect overshadows the theoretical one in course as the central question that Easton seeks to answer is not how a particular political system "persists in a given set of circumstances but how political systems generally persist both in a stable environment and a changing world." The study of political system in its theoretical or conceptual and practical or concrete aspects enables Easton to present a systems analysis in his several important writings whose main features may be given as under:

A political system is a set of interactions abstracted from the totality of social behaviour, through which values are allocated for a society. Easton has coined a new definition, of the terms like 'politics' and 'political system' by stressing the element of 'authoritative allocation of values'. The purpose of Easton is to study political system in both theoretical and applied perspectives. He is critical of the Lasswellians who look to the applied side of a political stern in their study of 'power' and thus ignore the theoretical aspect of the subject that is concerned with the study of conditions necessary for the very survival of the political system. It can be summarised as under:

Easton rejects the approach of a sociologist like Talcott Parsons who suggested that 'political theory can be analysed in terms of a general theory of social institutions'. Such a view, Easton contends, makes politics a handmaid of sociology. The purpose of Easton is thus to keep the study of politics at an autonomous level since it is the study of the authoritative allocation of values as it is influenced by the distribution and use of power. As pointed out above, Easton seeks to study political systems in their abstract or theoretical and as well as concrete or applied aspects. While the former, in his view, may be designated as the 'life process of the system' or a 'conceptual framework' or a 'structural analysis' of a political system, the latter is described by him as the 'persistence of politics'. In other words, while the former constitutes a theoretical study of the conditions under which a conceptual study of the political system can be made, the latter is concerned with the problems as to how political systems manage to persist through time in the face of the inevitable stress which they face. It

is a different thing that the complete aspect overshadows the theoretical one in course as the central question that Easton seeks to answer is not how a particular political system "persists in a given set of circumstances but how political systems generally persist both in a stable environment and a changing world."

The study of political system in its theoretical or conceptual and practical or concrete aspects enables Easton to present a systems analysis in his several important writings whose main features may be given as under:

A political system is a set of interactions abstracted from the totality of social behaviour, through which values are allocated for a society. Easton has coined a new definition , of the terms like 'politics' and 'political system' by stressing the element of 'authoritative allocation of values'. The word 'authoritative' signifies the decision of those who are in the environment of a political system may be intra-societal as well as extra-societal. That is, the conditions affecting the process of the authoritative allocation of values may be having their place within the political system itself or out side of it. Intra-societal forces of an environment have their place within the political system itself, extra-societal ones out- side of it. Clashes between or among the rulers on the adoption or rejection of a particular legislative or administrative measure may constitute the instance of intra-societal factors, while conditions of inflation or recession or war may be cited as the instances of extra-societal factors. However, both have their impact upon the decision-making process that results in the 'authoritative allocation of values'.

A political system always remains subject to challenges from forces operating in the environment, which it is required to cope with. Easton calls such forces as stresses that constitute the response mechanism of the political system. The stresses are of two kinds— demand stress and support stress. Demand stress may result either from the failure of the system as it exists to successfully cope with the information feedback from its original output or from the incapability of the system to deal with the particular-range of demands made upon it. It may be termed 'demand-input overload'. There may be the factor of support stress which means that the system may suffer a loss or at least an erosion of the support given to it by the members of the system itself. This may result from several factors like split or dissension in the ranks of the political elites or structural failure of the system itself and the like.

Political system may be in a steady state if there is proper balance between inputs and outputs. Inputs are the demands made upon the political system and the support of the system itself; supports are those processes or structures which give it the capacity to cope with the demands made upon it. Outputs are the results of the processing of demands. There may be within puts also or the demands made by the political elites themselves.

A political system lives in a critical range. It is possible that the inputs and outputs are properly balanced; it is also possible that the inputs have an overload and the outputs are not there in sufficient. measure to save the political system from disintegration or breakdown.

The survival of a political system requires certain structural bases that may be in the form of institutional arrangements like electoral machinery and political parties and non-institutional arrangements in the form of political beliefs and attitudes of the people. Both types of structural bases may be termed 'objects of support of the system'. The objects of the support of the political system are three political community, regime and authorities. The political community means a group of people living together with willingness, to cooperate in solving the problems of their political system. The community continues to exist even though the regime and the authorities may change from time to time. The regime or the 'constitutional order' implies written and unwritten rules of the constitution that determine the structure of the political organisation and also the values and norms on which the entire organisation of government is based. Finally, the authorities mean people who are entrusted with the work of allocating values authoritatively. In simple words, they are the rulers who convert the inputs into outputs by taking decisions in response to the impact of environmental conditions.

The political system, apart from being a system in itself, consists of sub-systems such as mediating groups that are involved in the decision-making process. There are several organisations and groups that play their part :' the political process without having the character of a political organisation.

Easton's definition of the political system is thus a consequence of his subscribing to the systems analysis. Thus, in his view, the political system can be seen basically as input-output mechanism dealing with political decisions and the activities associated with these conditions.

As a political scientist first and a political sociologist afterwards, he describes political system as having an autonomous place within the social system. His description of the political system is thus determined by his definition of 'political life a set or system of interaction defined by the fact that they are more or less directly related to the authoritative allocation of values for a society and, as such, a political system is a set of interactions abstracted from the totality of social behaviour, through which values are allocated for a society. In his view, after all in its elemental form a political system is just a means whereby certain kinds of inputs are converted into outputs.

Review Questions:

1. Explain the Meaning and Nature of Comparative Approaches
2. Explain the various Traditional Approaches of Politics
3. What are the Modern Approaches to politics with special emphasis on fact laden study of politics
4. Explain Systems Analysis in Political Science

CHAPTER 3
WORLD SYSTEMS THEORY

Objectives:

- To understand the dependency, historical and modern dependency theories
- To understand the reasons of economic development and underdevelopment

Topics:

- Dependency Theories
- Historical Dependency
- Modern Dependency
- Market-Oriented Theories
- Economic Development and Underdevelopment

World Systems Theory, like dependency theory, suggests that wealthy countries benefit from other countries and exploit those countries' citizens. In contrast to dependency theory, however, this model recognizes the minimal benefits that are enjoyed by low status countries in the world system. The theory originated with sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein, who suggests that the way a country is integrated into the capitalist world system determines how economic development takes place in that country.

According to Wallerstein, the world economic system is divided into a hierarchy of three types of countries: core, semi peripheral, and peripheral. Core countries (e.g., U.S., Japan, Germany) are dominant, capitalist countries characterized by high levels of industrialization and urbanization. Core countries are capital intensive, have high wages and high technology production patterns and lower amounts of labour exploitation and coercion. Peripheral countries (e.g., most African countries and low income countries in South America) are dependent on core countries for capital and are less industrialized and urbanized. Peripheral countries are usually agrarian, have low literacy rates and lack consistent Internet access. Semi peripheral countries (e.g., South Korea, Taiwan, Mexico, Brazil, India, Nigeria, South Africa) are less developed than core nations but more developed than peripheral nations. They are the weaker members of "advanced" regions or the leading members of former colonial ones.

Core countries own most of the world's capital and technology and have great control over world trade and economic agreements. They are also the cultural centres which attract artists and intellectuals. Peripheral countries generally provide labour and materials to core countries. Semi peripheral countries exploit peripheral countries, just as core countries exploit both semi peripheral and peripheral countries. Core countries extract raw materials with little cost. They can also set the prices for the agricultural products that peripheral countries export regardless of market prices, forcing small farmers to abandon their fields because they can't afford to pay for labour and fertilizer. The wealthy in peripheral countries benefit from the labour of poor workers and from their own economic relations with core country capitalists.

Dependency Theories

Dependency theories propose that colonialism and neo colonialism—continuing economic dependence on and exploitation of former colonial countries—are the main causes global poverty. Countries have developed at an uneven rate because wealthy countries have exploited poor countries in the past and continue to do so today through foreign debt and foreign trade.

Historical Dependency

Historically, wealthy nations have taken a great quantity of materials from poor countries, such as minerals and metals necessary to make automobiles, weapons, and jewellery. Large amounts of agricultural products that can only be grown in the hot climates of the poor countries, such as coffee, tea, sugar, and cocoa, have been exported to and manufactured in the wealthy countries. Wealthy countries would not be as rich as they are today if they did not have these materials. Wealthy countries increased their own profits by organizing cheap labour through slavery.

King Leopold II, for example, who was King of Belgium from 1865-1909, forced hundreds of thousands of men, women, and children to work as slaves in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The invention of the bicycle tire in the 1890s and later the automobile tire meant that rubber was in high demand; wild rubber vines were widespread in the Congo, earning Leopold millions. The Democratic Republic of Congo is still suffering from the plunder of natural resources, torture, and killing that was endured during Leopold's reign.

Modern Dependency

Today, poor countries are trapped by large debts which prevent them from developing. For example, between 1970 and 2002, the continent of Africa received $540 billion in loans from wealthy nations—through the World Bank and IMF. African countries have paid back $550 billion of their debt but they still owe $295 billion. The difference is the result of compound interest. Countries cannot focus on economic or human development when they are constantly paying off debt; these countries will continue to remain undeveloped. Dependency theorists believe large economic aid is not necessarily the key to reducing poverty and developing, but rather debt relief may be a more effective step.

In addition, foreign trade and business often mitigate local governments' ability to improve the living conditions of their people. This trade often comes in the form of trans national corporations (TNCs). The governments of poor countries invite these TNCs to invest in their country with the hope of developing the country and bringing material benefit to the people. However, workers' time and energy are often poured into producing goods that they themselves will not consume. For example, some of the land in Cape Verde could be planted and harvested to feed local people, but it is planted instead with cash crops for foreign exchange. Fresh produce is regularly sold or changed to a non perishable type such as tuna canned for export rather than consumed by the population.

Malnutrition and Dependency

Widespread malnutrition is one of the effects of this foreign dependency. This is common around the globe. Brazil is the second largest exporter of agricultural products, but 50 percent of its population is malnourished. Although Ethiopia has one of the largest populations of cattle in Africa, much of the population suffers from malnutrition and the government continues to export large numbers of cattle to the Middle East. Even during the peak of the infamous 1985 famine, the government was sending dried meat to Egypt.

Through unequal economic relations with wealthy countries in the form of continued debts and foreign trade, poor countries continue to be dependent and unable to tap into their full potential for development.

Market-Oriented Theories

State-centred theories of inequality emphasize the role of governmental policy and economic planning in producing economic stratification. In contrast to market-oriented theories of inequality, state-centred theories do not assert that the capitalist free-market will naturally regulate prices and wages. State-centred theories assert that intentional state policies must be aimed at equitably distributing resources and opportunities.

Socialism and Communism

Socialism and communism operate on the assumption that states can regulate (and potentially eliminate) inequality. Socialism is an economic and political system in which the state owns the majority industry, but resources are allocated based on a combination of natural rights and individual achievements. Communism operates on the principle that resources should be completely equally distributed, on the basis that every person has a natural right to food, shelter, and generally an equal share of a society's wealth. Socialism includes a combination of public and private property, while under communist systems all property is publicly held and administered by the state.

A socialist economic system would consist of an organisation of production to directly satisfy economic demands and human needs. Goods and services would be produced directly for use instead of for private profit driven by the accumulation of capital. Accounting would be based on physical quantities, a common physical magnitude, or a direct measure of labour-time. Distribution of output would be based on the principle of individual contribution.

State-cantered theories of inequality critique market-driven ones on the basis that capitalists embroiled in the free-market will act to increase their own wealth, exploiting the lower classes. Accordingly, these theories propose that states should enact policies to prevent exploitation and promote the equal distribution of goods and wages.

Economic Development and Underdevelopment

Sometime after the end of World War II social scientists began to speak of three "worlds." These worlds represented social, economic, and political categories into which contemporary societies could be placed. The First World consisted of the industrially advanced capitalist nations, which had parliamentary democratic forms of government: the United States, Canada, England, France, the Netherlands, Sweden, most of the rest of western and northern Europe, and also Australia and Japan. The Second World was industrially advanced, or at least on the path toward industrial development, but the societies of this category had

socialist economies and totalitarian forms of government. Included in this category were the Soviet Union and the Eastern European socialist states. The rest of the world, not counting primitive or preliterate societies, was the Third World. This world consisted of the poor, technologically backward, economically underdeveloped societies constituting most of Latin America, Africa, and Asia.

Having conceptualized something called a Third World, social scientists proceeded vigorously to study it. Many kinds of social scientists became involved in investigations focusing on different aspects of life in the Third World. Yet the overriding question for most investigators was why the societies of the Third World had failed to achieve the levels of technological and economic development, as well as the social patterns, so characteristic of the First World, and to some degree of the Second. They asked, putting it more simply, "Why are poor countries poor"? This question is the principal focus of the current chapter. After discussing the nature of underdevelopment, this chapter proceeds to examine the major theories that social scientists have proposed to explain underdevelopment. Then it turns to look at regional patterns of development and underdevelopment in East Asia, Latin America, and sub-Saharan Africa. The chapter also looks at the relationship between a country's position in the capitalist world-system and the nature of its state structure, paying particular attention to its level of democracy.

The Nature of Underdevelopment

Social scientists first called the societies of the Third World "backward nations," but later abandoned this expression as derogatory, adopting instead the expressions "underdeveloped societies," "less-developed societies," or "developing nations." Although these terms have also been criticized and others proposed, they have stuck and continue to be used by most social scientists. To understand exactly what is meant by underdevelopment, or by an underdeveloped nation, a useful first step is to distinguish between underdevelopment and un-development (Frank, 1966). Undeveloped societies may be regarded as those outside the framework of a capitalist world-economy that rely on pre industrial technology in the context of a pre capitalist economy. Societies surviving by hunting and gathering, horticultural, pastoral, or agrarian methods of production and having some sort of pre market economy are referred to as undeveloped. The term underdevelopment is reserved for societies incorporated into a capitalist world-economy and functioning within it in some way. Underdeveloped societies may thus be regarded as the least technologically and economically advanced members of the modern world-system.

There are a number of reasons why the underdeveloped world became an object of intense social-scientific scrutiny after World War II. For one, the Third World was seen (by antagonists on both sides) as a major battle ground in the "Cold War" between the First and Second Worlds. Another reason concerns the sheer size of the gulf that separated the First and Third Worlds. It is difficult to overstate the degree to which the lives led by average people in the First World differ from those led by the majority of the population of the Third World. A good place to start, then, is with the basic facts regarding underdevelopment.

The most commonly used measure of economic development is a nation's per capita Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which is the total value of goods and services it produces per person in a given year (a similar measure that is often used is the Gross National Product, or GNP, which is now sometimes called Gross National Income, or GNI). It can be seen that most of the underdeveloped nations have per capita GDPs that are quite low when compared to those of the developed nations. The average per capita GDP of the underdeveloped nations is much lower than the average for the developed capitalist nations, which is $26,073. There are significant differences between different regions of the less-developed world. Latin America is best off, with an average per capita GDP of $6,540; Asia is next with an average of $5,136, and Africa lags far behind at $2,065. Actually, this figure for Africa is misleading, for there are major differences in geography and culture between Africa north of the Sahara and sub-Saharan Africa. North Africa is dry, inhabited largely by Arab populations with a history of agriculture and pastoralism, and largely Islamic in religion; sub-Saharan Africa, by contrast, is tropical or subtropical and inhabited by a wide range of societies with mostly horticultural economies (although pastoral economies have been found throughout the drier parts of East Africa). These two parts of Africa belong to essentially different worlds, and their levels of economic development reflect it: North Africa's per capita GDP is $4,163, whereas sub-Saharan Africa's is a dramatically lower $1,165.

We have separated out four Asian societies that once belonged to the underdeveloped world but that have experienced so much economic development that they essentially have become recent members of the developed world: South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore. Their average GDP per capita is $20,497, obviously much closer to the rest of the developed world than to the less-developed world.

The general measure of technological advancement is number of kilowatt hours of electricity consumed per person per year (KWH), long considered perhaps the best indicator of the level of industrialization. The developed capitalist countries and the postsocialist countries in

In much of the underdeveloped world today, agriculture remains an extremely important economic activity, and, in some countries, peasants still outnumber workers of any other type. Most of these peasants farm small plots of land using techniques inherited from their ancestors thousands of years ago. Although industrialization and the formation of working classes has proceeded to some extent in all underdeveloped nations, in many it has not gone very far. In the underdeveloped nations approximately 39 percent of the labour force is engaged in agriculture (LFA); the figure is lowest in Latin America (20 percent), highest in Africa (70 percent), and in between in Asia (39 percent). By contrast, only some 5 percent of the labour force is engaged in agriculture in the industrial capitalist societies.

Underdevelopment involves considerably more than low levels of technological and economic development. It also has important social dimensions. Social and economic inequality is an especially important characteristic of underdeveloped societies. In most underdeveloped societies, wealth is enormously concentrated in the hands of a few, and tiny elites generally dominate the manufacturing and agricultural sectors of the economy. Throughout the Third World the bulk of the land is normally owned by a tiny fraction of the population. What is true of the inequality of wealth also holds for income inequality. As the data for the Gini coefficient (GIN) reveal, income inequality in underdeveloped nations is notably higher than in developed countries. In the developed countries, the Gini coefficient averages 0.306, whereas it averages 0.428 in the underdeveloped countries (0.503 in Latin America, 0.400 in Asia, and 0.384 in Africa). In the developed countries 9.2, the top 10 percent receives on average slightly more than 8 times the income of the bottom 10 percent. In the underdeveloped countries, the top 10 percent receives an average of nearly 25 times the income of the bottom 10 percent (36 times in Latin America, 13 times in Asia, and 21 times in Africa). So not only is the income pie considerably smaller in the underdeveloped countries owing to their lower per capita GDPs, but it is divided up far more unequally.

What of the standard of living of everyday people in such societies? Per capita GDP is the mostly commonly used indicator of the standard of living in a country. By that metric, we have seen that the standard of living in the developed countries is on average nearly 6 times higher than it is in the underdeveloped countries. However, we have to be careful in using

GDP as an indicator of the standard of living, because it does not take into account the very different levels of inequality in the two groups of countries, and especially the proportion of the population living in poverty. It is common practice to set poverty levels in the Third World at either less than $1 a day or less than $2 a day. As can clearly be seen, the standard of living in most underdeveloped nations is very low. On average, about 26 percent of the population in these countries lives on less than $1 a day (16 percent in Latin America, 25 percent in Asia, and 37 percent in Africa), and 58 percent lives on less than $2 a day (38 percent in Latin America, 65 percent in Asia, and 72 percent in Africa).

Far fewer people are living in poverty in the developed world. Here the average is only about 10 percent, but it is actually much less than that if we use the poverty standards applied to the Third World. This 10 percent represents the proportion of the population living on less than $11 a day, obviously a much higher level than the poverty levels set for the Third World. By Third World poverty standards, virtually no one in the developed world is living in poverty.

Underdeveloped societies also stand out because of their demographic features. They are growing at a rate some four times faster than the developed nations. The developed countries are growing at about 0.5 percent a year, whereas the less-developed countries are growing at a rate of about 2.1 percent (1.8 percent in Latin America, 2.1 percent in Asia, and 2.4 percent in Africa). This greater rate of growth is attributable to the fact that much of the underdeveloped world is still in the second stage of the demographic transition: death rates have fallen in recent decades owing to improvements in sanitation, health care, etc., but birth rates remain high. The underdeveloped nations currently constitute about three-fourths of the world's population, but because of their rapid growth rates an ever greater percentage of the world's population will live in these nations in the years ahead. Many scholars argue that rapid population growth is creating increasingly severe problems in the underdeveloped world, and for some Asian and African nations population growth has created problems of crisis proportions.

A final characteristic of the underdeveloped world involves general standards of nutrition and health. One of the most useful measures of a nation's overall nutritional and health status is its child mortality rate (CHM). Child mortality rates are much higher in underdeveloped countries. Whereas the developed capitalist nations have child mortality rates of approximately 6 per 1,000 births, the underdeveloped nations have an average rate of just

over 66 – eleven times higher. (The rates by continent are 37 in Latin America, 46 in Asia, and a huge 116 in Africa.)

Why Underdevelopment?

How can we explain not only the historical problem of underdevelopment, but the marked failure of most of the underdeveloped world to move toward the status of the developed nations? Social scientists have developed three principal theoretical approaches to the problem of underdevelopment: modernization theory, dependency theory, and world-system theory. In many ways world-system theory is a more flexible version of dependency theory, and so these two approaches are very similar. They stand sharply opposed, however, to modernization theory, and in fact originally emerged as alternatives to that approach.

Modernization Theory

Modernization theory is a broad theoretical strategy that includes a variety of complementary, but also competing, theories. The diverse theories that coexist within the modernization approach are united by two fundamental assumptions. First, underdevelopment tends to be seen as an original state, as a condition of society that has always existed in some form or another. Modernization theorists tend to conceive underdevelopment as a social and economic process that long predates the emergence of modern capitalism. Indeed, they suggest that it was only with the rise of modern capitalist societies that underdevelopment was first overcome, despite the fact that many contemporary nations have not yet been able to reach this developmental stage. For the modernization theorists, then, such societies as the Yanomama, the Aztecs, and medieval England were or are underdeveloped in much the same way that contemporary Brazil, Thailand, and Nigeria are. This view is in sharp contrast to the point made earlier about development and underdevelopment being meaningful concepts only when they are applied to nations incorporated into a capitalist world-economy.

Modernization theory also assumes that underdevelopment results from the internal deficiencies of a society. This notion is the counterpart to the claim that development results from certain special qualities of those societies having achieved it, qualities that set them apart from the rest. Three broad kinds of internal deficiencies are proposed by modernization theorists as causes of underdevelopment. One of these is insufficient capital formation. Many economists argue that underdeveloped societies have been unable to generate an amount of capital sufficient to get them to a "takeoff point": a point at which they could begin rapid economic growth.

Other modernization theorists have mentioned outdated business techniques and practices as factors preventing economic development. They suggest that underdeveloped societies commonly do not have the modern rational techniques of marketing, accounting, finance, sales, and so on, that are so common in the developed nations. The failure of such societies to adopt these modern rational business practices keeps their productivity and profit rates low and prevents significant development within them.

Finally, more sociologically oriented modernization theorists stress that underdeveloped societies generally lack the kind of consciousness or mentality – the kind of outlook on the world – that promotes development. Development is said to occur when people adopt rational, future-oriented value and ethical systems, and religions or philosophies that embody these kinds of values and ethics. It is alleged that most people in underdeveloped countries are governed by attitudes and values stressing the past and the importance of custom and tradition. Moreover, they are often caught up in religions that emphasize that human suffering can only be changed in the afterlife and that attempting to change the secular world is futile. Thus people are rendered fatalistic and generally accept their situation in life and do not make rational efforts to change it. When people remain passive in regard to changing their situation, their underdeveloped state is perpetuated.

Perhaps the best-known of all modernization theories is that developed by the economist W. W. Rostow (1960). According to Rostow, economic development involves the passage of a society through five evolutionary stages: the stage of traditional society, the stage of the preconditions for takeoff, the takeoff stage, the drive to maturity, and the age of high mass consumption. All underdeveloped societies are in the stage that Rostow calls traditional society. This is a type of society that in Rostow's view has been little touched by modern capitalism and by modern science and technology. In this kind of society people are attached to the land, to their families, and to the forces of custom and tradition. Societies begin the transition out of this stage of social and economic life when they acquire the preconditions for takeoff. The idea spreads that economic progress is both possible and desirable. Education broadens, banks and other capital-mobilizing institutions appear, as do modern manufacturing enterprises using the latest technology. The takeoff is achieved when a society has reached the point at which it can carry on sustained economic growth. The drive to maturity involves a long period of sustained economic progress during which a society attempts to apply its new technological capacity to a wider and more diverse range of economic activities. Finally,

a society becomes ready to enter the stage of high mass consumption. At this point the economy is capable of producing a wide range of consumer goods, and individuals are capable of consuming at a level that is beyond their basic needs for food, shelter, and clothing.

Although Rostow's analysis focuses more on development than on underdevelopment, there is clearly implied in his work a theoretical conception of underdevelopment. Underdeveloped societies are those that have not passed beyond the stage of traditional society. They have yet to experience those crucial stimuli that prompt people to want to reorganize their society so that self-sustaining economic growth can be realized. Underdeveloped societies lack the social patterns, political structures, and values that promote economic progress. Instead, the traditional features of these societies lead to a perpetuation of historically low levels of economic productivity.

Despite its considerable fame, Rostow's analysis of development and underdevelopment is not particularly impressive. The vast majority of his discussion is taken up with detailed descriptions of his stages, especially the last four. This sort of detailed description is of limited use. As Baran and Hobsbawm (1973) have pointed out, once a takeoff stage has been posited, the stages that precede and follow it are logically implied by it. Thus, the identification of these stages tells us little that we do not already know. Moreover, simply "pigeonholing [an underdeveloped society] in one of Rostow's 'stages' does not bring us any closer to an understanding of the country's economic and social condition or give us a clue to the country's developmental possibilities and prospects" (Baran and Hobsbawm, 1973:51) In other words, it gives us no insight into what the actual causes of development and underdevelopment are.

One of the most recent formulations of modernization theory is that of David Landes, an eminent Harvard historian. In his book The Wealth and Poverty of Nations (1998), Landes emphasizes ideas as the critical factor in development, as well as forms of property and government. Development is largely a matter of knowledge and know-how, of having new, innovative ideas. Britain led the way in capitalist development because it had not only a systematic method for finding new knowledge, but also secure private property, personal liberty, reliable contracts, and honest, ungreedy, and responsive government. China lagged because it lacked institutions for learning and finding new knowledge (despite its world leadership in technology centuries earlier). It remained, Landes says, mired in metaphysical

skepticism and speculation. A key to Japan's success was a work ethic similar to Calvinism. South Korea and Taiwan have been successful because Japan was a good colonial master.

Although Landes's book is recent, his ideas are very old and have been repeated many times. Although he is by no means totally off the mark, he seems to place far too much emphasis on science and knowledge and on other kinds of ideas. Moreover, he fails to ask why some societies have these things in the first place and others do not. The critical stance toward Rostow and Landes may be extended to modernization theory in general. By and large, it has failed to produce an acceptable interpretation of the conditions that stimulate development and of those that establish obstacles to it. One major failing of the modernization theorists lies in the concept of "traditional society." A major difficulty with this concept is its highly global character. Traditional societies include not only ancient Rome, medieval Europe, and classical China, but also contemporary Kenya, Chile, and India. These societies differ dramatically in terms of a whole range of social, technological, economic, and political patterns, yet the concept of traditional society is used to cover them all. Can a concept that is applied so globally, and that ignores crucial differences among societies, really be a useful one?

There is another crucial difference among the societies mentioned above: their relationship to world capitalism. Ancient Rome, medieval Europe, and classical China were all historic civilizations that existed before the development of European capitalism; but contemporary Kenya, Chile, and India are all nations that have been subjected, at one time or another and in one form or another, to European colonialism. This suggests another major weakness of modernization theory: its virtual neglect of the economic and political relations that have historically existed between contemporary underdeveloped nations and the nations of the developed world (Frank, 1967). It is difficult to see how social scientists can justify paying little or no attention to these relations when formulating theories of underdevelopment.

As important as these weaknesses are, the real failing of modernization theory has been its inability to predict successfully the way development can be produced. Various modernization theorists have served as advisors to governments in developed nations and have made numerous recommendations regarding methods by which development in the Third World can be stimulated. In general, they recommend closer contact between the developed and the underdeveloped countries. Greater capital investment in the Third World, or large amounts of foreign aid to poor countries, are among the most frequent

recommendations that have been made. Also, sociologically sensitive modernization theorists commonly recommend that underdeveloped countries should seek to imitate the social patterns of the advanced industrial nations. Yet despite the implementation of these recommendations, in some cases on a grand scale, most of the underdeveloped nations have not been developing all that much, at least in relation to the developed capitalist countries. The economic gap between countries is actually larger today than it was a few decades ago. While many poor countries have been getting richer, most have not been getting rich fast enough to close the gap between rich and poor countries (i.e., the rich countries have been getting richer as well). Such facts scarcely speak well for modernization theory.

Despite the severe criticism that it has received, modernization theory has never died out. Not only does it survive, but it probably is still the most widely embraced of the theoretical approaches to underdevelopment. For instance, it is precisely the type of thinking that informs the actions of those who set world development policy in important international organizations like the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization. Nevertheless, it must share theoretical attention with the approaches that came to challenge it in the 1960s, the first of which was dependency theory.

Dependency Theory

Dependency theory was first developed in Latin America and came to the attention of North American and European social scientists largely through the writings of the American-educated economist Andre Gunder Frank (1966, 1967, 1969, 1979). By the mid-1970s this approach had become very popular, especially among sociologists. In many ways dependency theory is a specialized offshoot of the Marxian theory of capitalism.

The basic underlying assumptions of the dependency approach stand in stark contrast to those of modernization theory. Rather than conceiving underdevelopment as an "original state," as something characteristic of a "traditional society," underdevelopment is viewed as something created within a pre capitalist society that begins to experience certain forms of economic and political relations with one or more capitalist societies. Underdevelopment is not a product of certain internal deficiencies, as modernization theory holds. It results not from the absence of something, but from the presence of something. Thus, dependency theory would not regard India in 1700 as an underdeveloped society. At that time it was an agrarian, pre capitalist empire. But by 1850 it was well on the road to becoming underdeveloped due to its relationship to British capitalism.

The root cause of underdevelopment in the dependency perspective is economic dependency. Economic dependency exists when one society falls under the sway of some foreign society's economic system, and when the first society's economy is organized by persons in the foreign society so as to benefit primarily the foreign economy. Economic dependency implies that there are relations of economic domination and subordination between two or more societies.

The concept of dependency as an explanation for economic underdevelopment has been developed most prominently by Frank (1966, 1979) and Samir Amin (1974). For Frank the concepts of development and underdevelopment have meaning only when applied to nations within the capitalist world-economy. Frank envisions this world-economy as being divided into two major components, metropolis and satellite. (These concepts are basically equivalent to Wallerstein's concepts of core and periphery.) The flow of economic surplus in the world-economy is from the satellite (or periphery) to the metropolis (or core), and the world-economy is organized to make this happen. The underdeveloped nations therefore have become and remain underdeveloped because they are economically dominated by developed capitalist nations that have continually been extracting wealth from them. Frank (1966) has called this process the development of underdevelopment. In this view, the development of the rich nations and the underdevelopment of the poor ones are but two sides of the same coin; underdevelopment of some nations has made development for others possible. The primary victims of this process are the vast majority of peasants and urban workers of the underdeveloped world itself. And who benefits from such a system? The members of developed nations do, since, it is claimed, their standard of living is raised substantially. But the greatest benefits go to capitalists in the metropolitan countries, as well as to the agricultural and industrial elites of the satellite countries. The latter have close economic and political ties to the metropolitan elite and play a crucial role in maintaining the situation of economic dependency.

Samir Amin's (1974) contributions to dependency theory center on his concepts of articulated and disarticulated economies. According to Amin, the developed nations have highly articulated economies, or ones whose multiple sectors closely interrelate such that development in any one sector stimulates development in the other sectors. Underdeveloped societies, by contrast, have disarticulated economies. These are economies whose various sectors do not closely interrelate. As a result, development in any one sector is commonly

unable to stimulate development in the other sectors. Those sectors that are most developed in disarticulated economies involve the production of raw materials for export to the developed countries. What is the cause of economic disarticulation? According to Amin, it is foreign control of the economy. Capitalists in the developed world have important connections with those peripheral capitalists who control raw-materials production.

What disarticulation really means, Amin argues, is that the kind of development characteristic of the advanced industrial societies cannot occur. When a society's economy becomes disarticulated due to foreign economic control, attention is directed to the development of those economic activities that benefit core capitalists. Those activities that would involve production for the overall benefit of the domestic economy are consequently neglected.

The concept of dependency can be understood more thoroughly by examining its various forms. Theotonio Dos Santos (1970) has suggested three historical forms of dependency through which the now-underdeveloped nations have passed. The first of these he calls colonial dependency. Under this form of dependency, which began as early as the sixteenth century in some parts of the world, European capitalist powers colonized precapitalist regions and established a monopoly over land, mines, and labour. Surplus wealth was extracted from these regions by means of European control over trade relations. The economic character of these colonized regions was powerfully shaped by their subordination to European nations.

A second historical form of dependency identified by Dos Santos is financial-industrial dependency. This form of dependence began in the late nineteenth century. It was characterized by the expansion of European industrial capital (as opposed to the earlier merchant capital) into the backward regions of the world. This form of dependency was part and parcel of the monopoly phase of capitalist development. Financial-industrial dependency involved heavy investment of big capitalists in the world's backward regions mainly for the purpose of producing raw materials to be exported back to the core nations.
The most recent form of dependency is termed by Dos Santos the new dependency. This kind of dependency is a post-World War II phenomenon and involves the emergence of transnational corporations that engage in extensive economic investment in Third World countries.

In addition to this concern about the forms of dependency, there is the question of how economic dependency creates and sustains underdevelopment. Dependency theorists often

disagree with respect to the particular mechanisms whereby this occurs. Several different mechanisms through which dependency induces underdevelopment have been proposed by various theoreticians, and more than one is sometimes proposed even by the same theorist. Four possible dependency mechanisms are most frequently suggested in the current dependency literature (Chase-Dunn, 1975; Delacroix and Ragin, 1981; Barrett and Whyte, 1982):

- Exploitation through repatriation. It is often suggested in dependency writings that foreign firms reinvest only a portion of their profits derived from Third World investments in the Third World itself. The bulk of these profits is shipped home (repatriated) for the benefit of the investing nation.

- Elite complicity. A common theme in dependency writings is the claim that the rich capitalists of Third World countries enter into various types of agreements with rich core capitalists to maintain the status quo of the underdeveloped country. This occurs because the elites of both countries benefit from the prevailing economic situation.

- Structural distortion. Some dependency theorists argue that economic dependency leads to a distortion of the economy in the underdeveloped nation. This distortion then creates severe barriers to economic development. This argument, for example, is the kind made by Amin when he speaks of the disarticulation of the economy that results from the dependence of Third World countries on the capitalist core.

- Market vulnerability. It is sometimes argued that the peripheral nations are especially harmed by world market conditions. World demand for the primary products of peripheral countries tends to decline over time, and this decline is aggravated by price fluctuations for primary products.

These four ways in which dependency can induce underdevelopment should not be thought of as mutually exclusive. It is entirely possible that underdevelopment could result from more than one mechanism operating at the same time, or even from the simultaneous operation of all of them.

In recent years numerous sociologists and other social scientists have conducted empirical investigations designed to test the basic claims of dependency theory. These studies generally examine a large number of the world's nations and employ the most advanced and sophisticated statistical procedures. An early review of this work by Volker Bornschier, Christopher Chase-Dunn, and Richard Rubinson (1978) examined the results of 16 such studies (cf. Rubinson and Holtzman, 1981). Most of the studies reviewed by Bornschier et al. examine economic growth from about 1960 until the early 1970s. Initial examination of the

studies indicated that some found that dependency promoted economic growth, whereas others found that dependency retarded economic growth. Bornschier et al. went on to scrutinize these studies to determine what would have produced such apparently contradictory findings. They showed that the findings of each study were closely linked to the way dependency was conceptualized and measured. By and large, the studies that showed that foreign investment promoted economic growth conceptualized and measured investment in terms of recent flows of investment capital. By contrast, those studies demonstrating that foreign investment retarded growth conceptualized and measured investment in terms of long-term stocks of foreign investment. The authors held this finding to be of great substantive significance. On the basis of it, they concluded that "the immediate effect of inflows of foreign capital and aid is to increase the rate of economic growth, while the long-run cumulative effects operate to reduce the rate of economic growth" (1978:667). Moreover, they went on to say (1978:667-668):

These results tend to confirm the hypothesis that current inflows of investment capital and aid cause short-term increases in growth due to the contribution to capital formation and demand as foreign corporations purchase land, labour, and materials and start production, while the long-run structural distortions of the national economy produced by foreign investment and the exporting of profits tend to produce negative effects over time. We conclude, then, that the effect of short-term flows of investment and aid has positive effects on growth, but that their cumulative effect over time is negative. Many of the seemingly contradictory findings of these studies can be reconciled under this proposition.

In more recent work, Bornschier and Chase-Dunn (1985) have expanded this line of inquiry to include a greater number of studies (36 rather than 16), and have reached the same basic conclusions. Moreover, using a sample of 103 nations, they have gone on to conduct new original research on the developmental effects of short-term capital flows versus long-term stocks of capital. They regard this original research as eliminating some of the flaws of the earlier studies. Once again, the same basic conclusions are forthcoming, the most important of which is that long-term penetration by foreign capital hinders a country's chances of economic development.

Unfortunately, despite Bornschier et al.'s seemingly elegant solution to confusion, things cannot be resolved quite so easily. Bornschier et al.'s conclusions have been challenged by Glenn Firebaugh (1992). Firebaugh's challenge is methodologically complex and subtle, but

his main claim is that dependency researchers have misinterpreted the results of their studies. While underdeveloped countries highly dependent on foreign investment may experience slower economic growth than countries that are less dependent, this does not necessarily mean that foreign investment dependence is the cause of slower growth. Firebuagh's analysis suggests that the most important question to ask about investment dependence is, "What would happen to underdeveloped societies if they did not receive foreign investment"? Dependency theorists argue that foreign investment is associated with a range of conditions (e.g., Amin's disarticulation) that have the effect of crowding out or displacing domestic investment that would otherwise occur (Dixon and Boswell 1996a, 1996b). Without foreign investment, they assume that domestic investment will replace foreign investment and that underdeveloped countries will start down a path of self-sustaining articulated development. However, what if the alternative to foreign investment is no investment (or, more realistically, substantially less investment)? In that case, countries will grow slower without foreign investment than with it. While foreign investment may not be as beneficial for economic growth as domestic investment, Firebaugh's research indicates that it may be better than no investment at all. Interestingly, the resolution of this debate hinges on the answers to some of the questions posed by early dependency thinkers: Do transnational corporations destroy local business and industry? Do they absorb local entrepreneurial talent into pursuits that are not optimal for the economic development of their own countries? Do they foster consumption patterns that lower domestic savings rates? In summary, to establish that foreign investment has a negative effect on economic growth in the Third World, dependency researchers will have to demonstrate more directly that investment dependence leads to the sort of erosion of domestic investment postulated by early dependency theorists. For underdeveloped countries, this debate suggests that, while there may be costs to foreign investment, there are benefits as well, and underdeveloped countries have to weigh each carefully.

World-System Theory

Despite its superiority to modernization theory, dependency theory has certain weaknesses that cannot be overlooked. By the late 1970s these weaknesses had begun to be noticed even by many of this approach's most enthusiastic supporters, and today dependency theory is regarded as a flawed, if still highly useful, perspective. Of the objections that have been raised against it, the most important are essentially as follows (Roxborough, 1979; Hoogvelt, 1982; Leys, 1982; Blomstrom and Hettne, 1984):

- In spite of its severe criticism of modernization theory's failure to place contemporary underdeveloped societies in their historical context, in its own peculiar way dependency theory is also ahistorical. While it gives great attention to the historical relationship of underdeveloped societies to the capitalist core, it tends to ignore the precapitalist history of these societies. This history is very important, however, in conditioning the way in which a particular precapitalist society will be incorporated into the capitalist system and the results of that incorporation (Chase-Dunn, 1989a; Lenski and Nolan, 1984).

- Dependency theory tends to overgeneralize about contemporary underdeveloped nations. It assumes that their dependent status renders them all essentially alike. Yet there are important differences between these nations with respect to such things as class structure, political system, and geographical and population size, and these differences play a role in shaping a nation's current development level and future developmental prospects. Another way of putting this is to say that dependency theory concentrates too much attention on the external relations between an underdeveloped society and the capitalist core, and not enough attention on the underdeveloped society's internal characteristics.

- The poverty and misery of contemporary Third World countries cannot simply be blamed on the economic intrusion of the more advanced capitalist countries (Chirot, 1977, 1986). Most of the countries and regions that fell under the economic control of the more advanced countries already had extensive poverty before they came to be dominated by these countries. While in some instances this poverty and misery may have become worse as a result of foreign influence, by and large that poverty and misery were already there from the beginning.

- Dependency theory usually asserts that the high levels of economic development found in the core have been made possible by their exploitation of the semiperiphery and periphery. But this is very unlikely. Core societies have developed largely because of their own internal economic organization, and the possession of semiperipheral or peripheral zones has probably contributed only modestly. In fact, the world's most developed society, the United States, never had any colonies at all.

- Dependency theory is too pessimistic in asserting that economic dependency makes economic development impossible. This is contradicted by the experience of a number of countries in recent decades. For example, Brazil underwent substantial economic growth between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s, and east Asian countries like Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore have experienced dramatic growth since the 1950s.

- Dependency theory's main policy recommendation for the underdeveloped countries – breaking out of the capitalist system by socialist revolution – has failed badly. Just as

modernization theory can be criticized for its failures in practice, dependency theory can as well. The vast majority of the Third World countries that have opted for socialism in recent decades have failed to generate any real developmental impetus; in fact, their record is inferior to that of numerous countries that have remained capitalist.

These criticisms have considerable force, but they apply more to some dependency theorists than to others. We need to distinguish two rather different strands of dependency theory (Bornschier and Chase-Dunn, 1985), what might be called "hard" and "soft" dependency theories. The hard version of dependency theory is associated primarily with the works of Frank and Amin discussed earlier. It sees economic dependency as always generating the development of underdevelopment, and thus as rendering development impossible (or at least extremely difficult) so long as it continues. The soft version is associated mainly with Fernando Henrique Cardoso (1982; Cardoso and Faletto, 1979) and Peter Evans (1979; cf. Bornschier and Chase-Dunn, 1985). It does not assume that dependency must always lead to the development of underdevelopment. Under some circumstances there can occur what Cardoso has called "associated dependent development," or simply "dependent development." This is a type of economic growth that occurs primarily as the result of extensive investment in manufacturing industries by transnational corporations. Soft dependency theorists insist that in recent decades a new form of dependency has grown up alongside the old form. In the older, or "classical," dependency, core countries use peripheral countries as sources of investment in raw agricultural and mineral products. But in the newer dependency, investment occurs within the industrial sector. And this form of dependency, it is argued, is not incompatible with certain amounts of economic development.

It is obvious that the soft version of dependency theory is much more flexible than the hard version, and thus largely free from the criticisms cited earlier, especially the third. Dependency and development can coexist. To the extent that a dependency perspective is an appropriate guide for our thinking, it should clearly be the softer version. Indeed, it is noteworthy that one of the two major developers of the hard dependency theory, Andre Gunder Frank, has now abandoned his original hard position and moved toward a much more flexible one. He no longer thinks that dependency is a necessary obstacle to development, and he has also come to reject the notion that the adoption of a socialist alternative to capitalism can produce anything better.

It is but a short step from the softer dependency theory to a full-blown world-system theory of underdevelopment. Wallerstein has claimed that it is the capitalist world-system as a whole

that develops, not particular societies. He acknowledges that internal characteristics of societies matter, but they exert their effects only in the context of a society's position within the world-system at a particular time in history. As the world-system evolves, there is increasing polarization between core and periphery, and it is difficult for less-developed nations to improve their status, or at least improve it very much. However, at particular historical junctures opportunities are created for some countries to move up. Wallerstein (1979) proposes three basic strategies that nations can adopt to accomplish this: seizing the chance, development by invitation, and self-reliance.

During periods of contraction of the world-economy, core countries may be in a weakened economic position. If so, peripheral or semiperipheral countries may be able to use aggressive state action to improve their position. This is the strategy of seizing the chance. Wallerstein suggests that Russia adopted this strategy in the late nineteenth century, and that it was employed by Brazil and Mexico during the 1930s.

Development by invitation, by contrast, occurs during periods of expansion of the world-economy. During these periods, "space" or "room" is created for some countries to move up because there is an increased level of demand for commodities on a world scale. Underdeveloped countries with just the right internal characteristics (especially geopolitical circumstances) may be treated unusually favorably by core countries. As a result they may be able to use the resulting economic advantages to inaugurate a developmental surge. Wallerstein suggests that Scotland followed this developmental strategy in the late eighteenth century. Perhaps the best recent exemplars of the strategy are the East Asian countries of Taiwan and South Korea.

Some countries, though, may see their best chance for economic development resting on withdrawal from the world-system and adoption of some version of socialism. The most successful employment of this strategy – self-reliance – has been by Russia (the Soviet Union), beginning in 1917. The rapid industrialization of the Soviet Union, however, came at an enormous human cost.

Despite the differences between world-system theory and classical dependency theory, it is clear that the former is only a version of the latter. Wallerstein stresses what he calls "limited possibilities" for transformation of underdeveloped countries within the world-economy. Most countries don't move up, and those that do don't move very far. They move from the

periphery into the semiperiphery, or from a lower to a higher semiperipheral position. Since most nations continue to stagnate rather than move up, and since there is increasing polarization within the system, Wallerstein is not optimistic about the fate of the underdeveloped countries within a capitalist context. For him, the only real solution to the problems of the underdeveloped world is a long-term one: the ultimate worldwide collapse of capitalism and its replacement by a socialist world-government.

Explaining Underdevelopment: Some Conclusions

World-system theory is an improvement on dependency theory, especially its harder version, but it is still not quite the theory we need. Like dependency theory, it tends to overstress external relations and underplay the internal characteristics of societies. It is also too negative about the possibilities of capitalist development in the less-developed world.

Our grand conclusion is thus that none of these theories works as well as we would like, especially for the current era in which we live. Dependency and world-system theories work fairly well in explaining patterns of world inequality and unequal development over the past several hundred years, but they work less well for the current era – the last 40 to 50 years. There has been and continues to be more development going on in the less-developed world than both dependency and world-system theory allow for. Glenn Firebaugh's (1992, 1996) research suggests that foreign investment since the 1960s stimulates more than inhibits development, and his research also suggests that polarization basically stopped in the early 1960s. Moreover, much of the periphery seems to be gradually disappearing, having moved up into the semiperiphery. Sub-Saharan Africa is the only major region of the world that is still peripheral. These findings call into question three of the most basic principles of world-system theory: foreign investment leads to underdevelopment in most of the Third World, polarization is an ongoing process within the system, and the core needs a periphery in order to develop to high levels. And yet modernization theory does not really work either. It is much too simplistic in assuming that all societies can develop equally by garnering enough foreign investment, building the right technology, and acquiring the right values and attitudes. Therefore, we still lack a solid unified theory of underdevelopment that applies to the current period as well as to the past. The construction of such a theory should be one of the major goals of development scholars in the years ahead.

Development in East Asia

Let us now turn away from theory to look at a number of actual regions and societies in the less-developed world. The greatest development is occurring in East Asia, and this region of the world is likely the harbinger of the future of the less-developed world, so let us start with it.

The Biggest Success Stories: The East Asian Tigers

Since about the mid-1950s a startling degree of economic development has occurred in the East Asian societies of Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Singapore. Before 1950 these societies were very poor peripheral countries. According to the sorts of economic and social indicators that we reviewed above, East Asia was roughly similar to present-day sub-Saharan Africa, the poorest region of the world. Today, it is among the most prosperous regions outside the capitalist core. South Korea and Taiwan have per capita GDPs in the $16,000-18,000 range, and Hong Kong and Singapore's per capita GDPs are much higher ($25,153 for Hong Kong and $23,356 for Singapore). All of these societies have extremely low infant mortality rates for non-core nations, as well as rates of population growth more similar to core than to non-core societies. Moreover, at least in Taiwan and South Korea, this development has occurred without producing the extremely sharp income inequalities so characteristic of other rapidly growing less-developed countries. These countries today have income distributions that resemble those of core nations, or that are even more egalitarian.

Collectively, these four East Asian countries are frequently known as the "Asian Tigers." It has frequently been asserted that the economic development of these countries is a fatal blow to dependency theory (Barrett and Whyte, 1982; Berger, 1986). Certainly if we are talking about the strong version of dependency theory, it is impossible to deny that assertion (Bienefeld, 1981). However, this East Asian development is not inconsistent with the soft dependency theory or with world-system theory. Indeed, it would seem that world-system theory is well suited to explain what has been happening in recent decades in East Asia. In order to show that this is so, we shall confine ourselves to Taiwan and South Korea. Hong Kong and Singapore are really city-states rather than countries, and they have only a tiny agricultural sector. Because of their unique nature, they are not particularly good tests cases for any theory of underdevelopment.

Taiwan and South Korea seem to be exceptionally good examples of Wallerstein's strategy of development by invitation (Bienefeld, 1981; Cumings, 1984), and their accomplishments

result from a unique combination of five circumstances. Some of these circumstances involve internal characteristics of the societies themselves, while others involve the larger world-economy (Cumings, 1984; Crane, 1982; Koo, 1987; Evans, 1987; Aseniero, 1994).

First, it is true that both Taiwan and South Korea have a history of economic dependency, but the dependency they experienced was unique. Around the turn of the twentieth century Taiwan (then known as Formosa) and Korea (which, of course, had not yet been divided into South Korea and North Korea) became colonies of Japan. But Japan was no ordinary colonizer, for it engaged in practices not found among European colonizers. The Japanese built up in these colonies a large infrastructure of transportation and communication, and even established heavy industries, especially in steel, chemicals, and hydroelectric power. Thus, although Taiwan and Korea became dependent, they nonetheless acquired certain technological and economic resources generally absent in other dependent countries. These resources helped establish a foundation for developmental efforts once Japanese colonialism ended.

Second, both Taiwan and South Korea undertook major land reforms after World War II. These reforms produced a much more egalitarian distribution of land. It is well known that land reform efforts have failed, or not even been attempted, in most other less-developed countries. In most of these countries land is enormously concentrated in the hands of a few rich landowners, and this uneven distribution is a major obstacle to development. But land reform in Taiwan and South Korea led to major increases in agricultural output, and industrialization efforts could therefore begin to succeed.

However, as important as these conditions were, they could never have led to significant economic development if Taiwan and South Korea had not been favored by two features of the external environment. First, there was the unique geopolitical situation these countries were in. During the 1950s the United States became the world's leading economic power, and it perceived a severe threat to its economic position from the Soviet Union and China, the latter having just had a revolution (in 1949) and become part of the socialist world. There was great fear that both Taiwan and South Korea would become part of this world, and so the United States pumped huge amounts of money, in the form of both aid and loans, into both countries. Although the United States had given aid and loans to many other countries, the amounts going into Taiwan and South Korea were unparalleled. There is no doubt that this

economic assistance played a crucial role in helping launch these countries' developmental efforts.

All of this was happening during a period in which the world-economy was undergoing major expansion. Thus, the increase in world economic demand made "room" or "space" available for some countries to improve their position. Moreover, the United States directly encouraged the upward mobility of Taiwan and South Korea by opening its own domestic markets to the products of these countries. This occurred primarily after 1960. In the 1950s the industrialization of Taiwan and South Korea was oriented mainly to producing for their domestic markets, but after 1960 it shifted toward an emphasis on selling competitively in the world market. This kind of industrialization, known generally as export-oriented industrialization, is a common developmental strategy of less-developed countries. Whether it works or not is another question. That it has worked so well for these two countries depended significantly on the protected markets that the United States carved out for them in its own territory.

Finally, the largest single investor and the largest director of economic growth in both countries was the state. This, too, was the legacy of Japanese colonialism. Both Taiwan and South Korea had structured their state apparatuses on the Japanese model and had developed the kind of highly efficient state that could, in the context of the other four conditions, lead them into significant economic development. Specifically, the state in these two countries played a major role in keeping the wages of workers down, which is essential for export-oriented industrialization because it makes products cheaper and thus more competitive on the world market. It also built up military-style discipline in the factories, thus contributing to high productivity.

Because of the success of Taiwan and South Korea, the question has naturally arisen as to whether they constitute models for economic development that other countries can imitate. Some social scientists who are especially enthusiastic about East Asian development believe that they do (cf. Berger, 1986). Yet there are reasons to question the exportability of the East Asian model. As Bruce Cumings has argued, "The developmental 'successes' of Taiwan and Korea are historically and regionally specific, and therefore provide no readily adaptable models for other developing countries interested in emulation" (1984:38). Certainly, the Asian financial crisis of 1997-2000 has taken some of the glow off the East Asian model. The role of the state in guiding development and the relationship-based financial systems of

these countries, once lauded by many analysts, are now often derided as "crony capitalism." On the other hand, the emergence of "new tigers" such as Thailand, Malaysia, and Indonesia lends some support to the optimists. As was the case with the original four tigers, these countries have experienced very rapid economic development in recent years. GDP per capita, for instance, increased by more than 100 percent in all three countries over the period from 1975 to 1999. (For reference, GDP per capita in the United States grew by 48 percent over the same period).

In summary, some extremely important things have happened in Taiwan, South Korea, Singapore, and Hong Kong since the end of the Second World War. These events are compatible with some of the claims of soft dependency and world-system theories of underdevelopment, especially world-system theory. However, some aspects of development in these countries make sense within a modernization framework as well. Therefore it would appear that no single perspective can explain their developmental dynamics over the past half-century.

The Rise of China

After the death of Mao Zedong in 1976, China spurned state socialism and embarked on a capitalist path of development, introducing market mechanisms and opening itself to foreign economic investment (Aseniero, 1996; So and Chiu, 1995; Weil, 1996; Castells, 1996, 1998). Major economic reforms began officially in 1978. Between 1980 and 1995 China was the fastest growing economy in the world, averaging approximately 10 percent growth per year in GDP. In 1995 China's GDP grew 10.2 percent, compared to only 2.0 percent for the industrialized countries and 2.6 percent for the world as a whole (Keister, 2000b). Since 1995 GDP growth has slowed slightly but is still extremely high: 8.8 percent in 1997, 8.0 percent in 2000, and 7.3 percent in 2001 (http://www.worldbank.org). Chinese development has concentrated on export-oriented industrialization, and exports have grown dramatically. They were 9.2 percent of GDP in 1990, 18.1 percent in 1992, and 23.0 percent in 1995 (Keister, 2000b). Foreign investment in China has also grown enormously. In 1990 China attracted about 2 billion U.S. dollars in foreign investment, but this increased markedly to about 20 billion in 1992, to over 30 billion in 1994, and to more than 40 billion in 1998 (The Economist, 2000). Since then it has remained at about the same level. Throughout the 1990s China was second only to the United States as a recipient of foreign investment (Weil, 1996). By far the biggest investor has been Hong Kong, which in the late 1990s was investing over

20 billion U.S. dollars a year. The other major investors are Japan, the United States, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan (The Economist, 2000).

Most of the economic development that has been occurring in China has been in Shanghai, Hainan Island, Guangdong, Fujian, Zhejiang, and other cities and provinces along China's southern and eastern coastline. There has emerged a whole megaregion adjoining Hong Kong and composed of Shenzhen, Canton, the Pearl River Delta, Macau, and Zhuhai, and it has become a huge metropolitan area (Castells, 1996). In 1995 it covered a space of more than 50,000 square kilometers and had a population in the range of 40 to 50 million people. In the words of Manuel Castells (1996:409), it "is likely to become the most representative urban face of the twenty-first century."

China's per capita GDP was only $890 a year in 2001, but this figure is very misleading because the majority of Chinese are still peasant farmers and most remain untouched by the capitalist development that is occurring. China is a huge country with great regional variation, and most of the capitalist development, as already noted, is occurring along the southern and eastern coastlines. Here per capita GDP is much higher than in the rest of China.

Since economic reforms began in China in 1978, an enormous amount of privatization of state-owned companies has occurred. In 1978 consumer goods produced by privately owned firms amounted to less than 1 percent of consumer goods produced by state owned firms. This increased to 48 percent by 1990, to 89 percent by 1994, and to a full 179 percent by 1998. This means that by 1998 almost twice as many consumer goods were being produced by private firms as by state-owned firms (http://sinowisdom.com). China has also adopted the characteristic type of large business group found in other highly successful parts of Asia. We refer to the Japanese keiretsu, the South Korean chaebol, and the Taiwanese guanxi qiye. These are uniquely East Asian economic networks dominated by a large firm and consisting of many firms who coordinate their activities closely with each other. China began to form such business groups, known as qiye jituan, in the 1980s and they have become extremely numerous and greatly increased the efficiency and profitability of Chinese firms (Keister, 2000b).

Much closer economic ties began to develop in the 1990s between the "three Chinas": Mainland China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong. These ties were strengthened after July 1997

when the British returned Hong Kong to Mainland China. So and Chiu (1995) suggest that this increasing economic integration makes the three Chinas, as a single unit, a core nation in the world-economy that can draw on the assets of each of its parts: China's abundant and cheap labour and raw materials, Taiwan's capital and technology-intensive industries, and Hong Kong's worldwide financial and trading network. This is probably overstating the case, but the point is made nonetheless. In all likelihood, these three Chinas will eventually become politically unified, and it can be expected that this unified Chinese superstate will develop even more rapidly after this point and will probably become the dominant world economic power within 50 years.

Development in Latin America

Latin America is that region of the less-developed world that has the highest level of economic development. Mexico, Argentina, and Brazil have the highest per capita GDPs of Latin American countries; they also have relatively low percentages of the labour force working in agriculture (15, 1, and 23 percent, respectively).

Latin American incorporation into the world-economy has progressed through six major stages (Skidmore and Smith, 2001):

1. Colonialism, early 1500s to 1830: Latin America was incorporated into the world-economy as a peripheral region devoted to the production of raw agricultural and mineral products. Most of it was colonized by the Spaniards, but the Portuguese had a major colony in Brazil. The Portuguese imported slaves from West Africa and put them to work on sugar plantations and in gold and silver mines; nearly 40 percent of all of the Africans imported into the New World as slaves came to Brazil. Some of the sugar plantations were huge and were often referred to as "factories in the field." Some of these plantations contained as many as 500 slaves. The Spaniards in Latin America made limited use of slavery, relying instead on other methods of forced labour (Harris, 1964). They began with the encomienda, which gave some of the conquistadores the right to tax and collect tribute from the native Indian population, as well as the right to draft labour. The encomienda was later replaced by the repartimiento. This was a similar system of forced labour but the right to tax, collect tribute, and draft labour was given to officials of the Spanish Crown and their heirs rather than to private encomenderos. Both of these systems were replaced by the famous hacienda system, which emerged after political independence in the nineteenth century. The hacienda was a system of debt peonage. Private landlords provided Indian peasants supplies of food and clothing, which threw them into debt, but their wages were set so low that the debt could

never be repaid. Since the Indians had no choice but to continue working for their hacendados for life, the landlords were guaranteed a permanent supply of extremely cheap labour.

2. Early post independence, 1830-1880: Political independence had essentially come to Latin America by 1830 with the granting of independence to Brazil. After this point, Latin American countries were gradually pulled increasingly into the world-economy as exporters of raw materials and importers of consumer goods. Britain was the hegemonic power in the world-system during this time, and as such had replaced Spain and Portugal as the European country most extensively involved in Latin America.

3. Initiation and expansion of export-import growth, 1880-1930: Near the end of the nineteenth century, economic activity expanded considerably in Latin America, and there was great prosperity for the upper classes. However, Latin American countries were still largely raw materials exporters and most of their consumer goods came from Europe. Another major feature of this period was extensive immigration from Europe.

4. Import-substitution industrialization, 1930s-1960s: After about 1930 Latin American countries made their first real move to industrialize and to develop more diversified economies less dependent on exports. Their aim was to produce their own consumer goods and stimulate internal economic growth. To do this they adopted the strategy known as import-substitution industrialization (ISI). This strategy proceeds by using high tariffs to discourage imported goods and by raising their price in domestic markets. With imported goods kept to a minimum or too expensive, domestic industry can be developed to a much greater extent and can stimulate economic growth. ISI was a relative success, especially for some of the most important Latin American countries, but economic growth had stagnated by the 1960s. This is because the ISI strategy has certain inherent limitations. First, it must rely on the importation of capital goods, such as machine tools, because producing such goods domestically is very difficult in the early stages of industrialization. This helps to maintain the dependency of the local economy on the core. Second, there are natural limitations on local demand because of the limiting spending powers of not only the masses, but even the middle classes. Only so many refrigerators or cars, for example, can be sold in a highly underdeveloped country. Third, because ISI is capital-intensive rather than labour-intensive, it is very limited in its ability to create jobs for workers. As the ISI strategy in Latin America reached these limits, a new developmental strategy was put into place.

5. Stagnation of ISI growth and a turn toward export-oriented industrialization, 1960s-1980s: The new developmental strategy was export-oriented industrialization, or EOI, which we described earlier for South Korea and Taiwan. As stated then, EOI involves producing

for the world market rather than domestic markets. Such a strategy depends on keeping wages low so that prices can be low and thus exported industrial goods can be competitive in the world market. To make this strategy work, what Guillermo O'Donnell (1973) has called bureaucratic-authoritarian states emerged throughout Latin America. These states – which emerged in Brazil in 1964, Argentina in 1966, and Chile in 1973 – crushed the working classes into order to keep wages down. As part of the EOI strategy, Latin American countries, Brazil in particular, engaged in close relationships with core transnational corporations, especially American transnationals. EOI produced a substantial amount of economic development in Latin America, but it was mostly dependent development.

6. Crisis, debt, and democracy, 1980s-1990s: By the mid-1980s EOI had begun to peter out. Large foreign debts were accumulated because of the huge sums of money that were borrowed from world financial institutions to finance the export-oriented strategy. Between 1980 and 1990 foreign debt nearly doubled; much more had to be borrowed just to pay the interest on existing loans. Economic stagnation ensued, and GDP per capita declined by nearly 10 percent. Strict economic reform policies were imposed by the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, and as a result Latin America began to pull out of its economic doldrums to some extent. Skyrocketing inflation declined, investment from the capitalist core increased, and economic growth reached 3.5 percent per year by the mid-1990s. Developmental strategies were rethought along new lines. Politically, the bureaucratic-authoritarian states collapsed and a process of "redemocratization" began.

Brazil exemplifies very well all of these stages (Skidmore and Smith, 2001). During the colonial era, as already noted, Brazil used slave labour for the mines and sugar plantations. In the 1820s sugar accounted for about 30 percent of Brazilian exports. After this time it began a long decline, accounting for only 5 percent of total exports by 1900. Sugar was replaced by coffee, and in 1900 Brazil was producing nearly 75 percent of the world's coffee. Coffee declined dramatically in the last century, accounting for only 18 percent of the world's coffee by 1978.

During the period of ISI there was a large-scale expansion of Brazil's industrial sector. At this time Brazil began to develop such heavy industries as steel and automobiles, and industrial production constituted nearly 30 percent of total GDP by 1975. However, there still remained a large rural proletariat eking out a bare living, especially in the coffee fields. After the ISI period was over, Brazil went through some 20 years of rule by several bureaucratic-authoritarian regimes, all of which were led by the military. During this EOI

period economic growth was phenomenal – approximately 10 percent a year between 1968 and 1974 – and many economists referred to this as "the Brazilian miracle." By the late 1970s EOI-produced growth had substantially faded and serious economic problems developed. One was inflation, which exceeded 100 percent in 1980. There was also a huge foreign debt, which in 1986 was $82.5 billion, the world's largest. Income inequality also increased during the EOI period. The proportion of national income going to the top income decile was 39.6 percent in 1960 but had grown to 50.9 percent by 1980. Likewise, the proportion going to the bottom income half of the population declined from 17.4 percent in 1960 to 12.6 percent in 1980.

In 1993 none other than Fernando Henrique Cardoso, the father of the "soft" school of dependency theory, became finance minister, and then in 1995 acceded to the presidency. By this time Cardoso had toned down his leftist political views considerably, and began implementing more moderate economic policies. Inflation was brought under control and the economy stabilized. However, many social problems remained and economic crises eventually returned in the second half of the 1990s. Throughout the 1990s Brazil, like all major Latin American countries, tried to restructure its relationship to the larger world-economy, with uncertain and inconsistent results. Some segments of Brazilian society became better off, but others became increasingly marginalized.

In an important recent study, James Mahoney (2003) has shown that differential levels of social and economic development in Latin American countries have been closely related to the degree of Spanish colonial penetration a country experienced in earlier times. The most socially and economically developed countries in Latin America over the past century, such as Argentina, Costa Rica, and Uruguay, have tended to be those that experienced little colonial penetration. By contrast, the least socially and economically developed countries of the twentieth century, such as Bolivia, Honduras, and Nicaragua, have generally been those where the greatest degree of colonial activity was present. As Mahoney points out, these results confirm the dependency hypothesis of Andre Gunder Frank (1978, 1979) that the regions of the Americas that became most developed were the ones subject to "benign neglect." In this sense, dependency theory applies well to the history of Latin America. However, as pointed out earlier in this chapter, because many Latin American countries have undergone a surprising amount of economic and social development in recent decades, dependency theory applies less well to its current and possible future state.

Why is Latin America as a whole the most developed region of the Third World? It may be due to the fact that Latin America was the region first colonized by Europe and the first region to gain political independence (Sanderson, 1995, 1999). Most Latin American countries became independent in the early nineteenth century, whereas independence was not gained throughout Asia and Africa until the middle of the twentieth century – a century to a century and a half later. Latin America has therefore had a longer period of time in which to develop, and this may have made the difference. Mahoney (2003) has shown, for example, that a necessary condition for social and economic development in Latin America has been the presence of an indigenous capitalist class. Other things being equal, Spanish Latin American countries that had large and vigorous capitalist classes (e.g., Mexico, Venezuela, and Argentina) developed earlier and farther than countries that had small and anemic ones (e.g., Bolivia, Peru, and Paraguay). Since the most successful Latin American countries had these classes earlier and longer than Asian and African countries, it stands to reason that the Latin American countries would have become more developed than their counterparts in the other two continents.

Sub-Saharan Africa: A Failure of Development

Before 1500 Africa was a vast continent consisting of many different societies at different levels of social evolution: hunter-gatherers, simple and intensive horticulturalists, and pastoralists in East and North Africa. Some of these societies had reached the level of civilization and the state, but, except for Egypt, they arrived at this point later and had less-developed and less-complex civilizations than found in other parts of the world. There was for many centuries a vigorous trade between parts of North Africa and parts of sub-Saharan Africa. Many sub-Saharan African societies had slave systems long before the Europeans arrived to carry off Africans for their own form of slavery.

North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa are really quite different. North Africans are predominantly Arabs and adherents of Islam, and pastoralism was the predominant mode of production prior to European penetration (and still is in some places). North Africa, although geographically African, really belongs to the cultural region of the Middle East. Most sub-Saharan Africans have been hunter-gatherers and horticulturalists and have had their own indigenous and quite varied religious and cultural traditions. This discussion focuses entirely on sub-Saharan Africa.

Samir Amin (1972) has distinguished five stages in the incorporation of Africa into the capitalist world-system. We can delineate them as follows:

1. The New World-African Slave Trade, 1500-1860: Some 40 million Africans were put on slave ships destined for the New World and the slave systems of the United States, the Caribbean, and Brazil. Only about 10 million of these actually arrived, most having perished in the horrendous conditions aboard the ships, especially during the famed "Middle Passage." Why was it Africans, especially West Africans, who provided the labour force for the New World plantations? Wallerstein (1979) says that the slaves had to be drawn from a region outside the world-economy whose workers were not being used in that region for peripheral forms of production. Since slaveowners were rational capitalists, cost considerations were paramount. Africa seemed to fill the bill best because its populations had not been peripheralized, and because Africa was geographically close to the New World. Presumably Asians – Indians and Chinese mainly – could have been enslaved, but the costs of transporting them the much greater distances from Asia to the New World would have been much higher. Some scholars have suggested that Africans were enslaved because of European racism; Africans were thought to make the best slaves because they were allegedly lower in intelligence and physically stronger. Racism might have played some role, but it is doubtful that it was more than a minor one.

2. Gradual abandonment of the slave trade and the emergence of Africa as a peripheral region, 1800-1880: Britain abolished its role in the slave trade in 1807, but there was a great deal of slave trading that occurred after that time nevertheless. During this time Africa was slowly but surely being converted into a region designed for the production of agricultural goods for export.

3. Colonization and full peripheralization, 1880-1960: Around 1880 the famous "scramble for Africa" among the European powers began. This was the only major world region that had so far not been colonized. Britain and France were the main colonizers, but Belgium, Portugal, and even a few other European countries were involved as well.

4. Decolonization and attempts at ISI development, 1950s-1975: The first African society to be decolonized was Ghana in 1957, and the last was Mozambique in 1974. Therefore all of African decolonization took place within a period of 17 years.

5. Stagnation and crisis, 1975-present: Despite the efforts at import-substitution industrialization, little headway was made. Rather than developing, most sub-Saharan African societies declined economically, and began to experience other serious problems as well, such as severe ethnic hostilities and the emergence of brutally repressive states.

Sub-Saharan Africa's economies have deteriorated alarmingly since decolonization. Its proportion of the world's export products declined from more than 3 percent in 1950 to only 1 percent in 1990, and its external debt rose from just over 30 percent of GNP in 1980 to nearly 80 percent in 1994. The World Bank reports that, of the $231 billion in foreign investment that went into the Third World in 1995, only 1 percent went to Africa. In 1991 there was only one telephone line for every 100 people in comparison to 2.3 lines for the Third World as a whole land 37.2 for the industrial countries. By the early to mid-1990s real income had declined by almost 15 percent from its level in 1965. Food production has declined markedly, to the point where many African countries cannot feed themselves. Taxes are high, inflation is rampant, and currencies are unstable. Technological infrastructure has decayed everywhere: roads have become paths and ruts, bridges are collapsing and do not get repaired, railways are in a state of decay, phones do not work, and universities have deteriorated. Hospitals are in such a poor state that patients often need to bring their own blankets and bandages (Castells, 1998; Ayittey, 1998).

In the last 20 years the continent has experienced severe ethnic hostilities, civil wars, political chaos, and massive government corruption (Castells, 1998; Ayittey, 1998). Ethnic groups engage in genocidal actions against each each other, and governments often conspire in this. For example, in 1994 ethnic conflict in Burundi and Rwanda between Tutsis and Hutus resulted in some 700,000 Tutsis being killed, and hundreds of thousands of Hutus were slain as well. This genocidal civil war led to over a million Hutu refugees fleeing into neighboring Zaire. Many countries seem to have almost completely distintegrated. As Ayittey (1998:54) has commented, "For much of 1992 Somalia lay in ruins – effectively destroyed. It had no government, no police force, no basic essential services. Armed thugs and bandits roamed the country, pillaging and plundering, and murderous warlords battled savagely for control of Mogadishu."

Dependency and world-system theories blame exploitation by the core for Africa's current problems. In the words of Andre Gunder Frank, "the lemon was sqeezed dry and then discarded." But this is very dubious. George Ayittey (1998) places most of the blame on sub-Saharan Africa's internal problems, as does Manuel Castells (1998). Both trace Africa's massive problems to what they call the "predatory" or "vampire" state characteristic of so many African societies. Dishonesty, thievery, embezzlement, and the like are everywhere. African political leaders can be compared to gangsters and crooks who have seized political power merely to advance their own interests. In fact, states as they are usually thought of

really do not exist in Africa. The political institutions that are crucial parts of states – for example, the military, police forces, the civil service, parliaments, and judiciaries – have suffered a kind of debauchery. Parliaments either do not exist or are little but charades. Political dictators have staffed each of these institutions with their own tribesmen who will be completely at their beck and call. There is little or no professionalism and accountability in any of these institutions. However, Ayittey argues that, although Africa's problems are mostly of internal origin, the West has magnified them. Western leaders, he says, have been seduced by despots. They have often supported procapitalist African dictators and supplied them with economic and military aid. Ayittey also notes that American blacks have often praised African leaders and failed to realize the horrendous actions these leaders were engaged in.

If the predatory state is the principal source of Africa's horrendous economic and social problems, then the obvious solution would be to destroy this type of state and replace it with a more democratic type. But that is much more easily said than done. As Ayittey points out, the commitment to reform has been weak in African countries. African despots have been extremely reluctant to give up power and would rather destroy their economies instead. And it is likely that the African state is not the real source of the problem, but simply another dimension of the problem. The real question is, Why do sub-Saharan African societies have such states in the first place? This is what must be explained.

World-System Position and the Form of The State

So far we have focused on the economics of less-developed countries and said little or nothing about their politics. What is the nature of political life in the Third World? Or, putting it somewhat more precisely, how does a nation-state's political structure relate to its position within the capitalist world-system?

By and large, the tradition of democratic government has become so strongly entrenched in the advanced capitalist societies that it has come to constitute an independent force in its own right. Democratic philosophies pervade the whole fabric of life in these societies. In the capitalist periphery, democracy and respect for political freedom has been very much the exception, and those peripheral societies that do have some type of democracy usually have a fairly low level of it. Political regimes based on military dictatorship are widespread throughout the peripheral capitalist world. In peripheral societies the industrial working class is usually small and politically weak and literacy rates are often low. The predominant ruling

class consists of landlords incorporating a large and often illiterate peasantry into the process of labour-repressive agriculture. As Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens (1992) have pointed out, democracy is not possible in societies with such a balance of class forces. In addition, extreme forms of authoritarianism may be necessary to maintain sheer order under conditions of severe exploitation and abject human misery and suffering. Under such conditions democracy is, in a way, a "luxury" that peripheral societies (or, more accurately, their ruling elites) cannot "afford."

In semiperipheral societies the levels of democratization and the extent of political rights are intermediate between those in core and peripheral societies. As in the case of the periphery, many societies have formal rather than true substantive democracies. Moreover, these societies have often been vulnerable to political crises in which formal democracy has collapsed back into authoritarianism. Latin America is a region of the world that can be strongly characterized in these ways. The relative absence of substantive democracy in semiperipheral societies can be explained in much the same way that we explained democracy's relative absence in the periphery: landlords continue to play a strong role in the economy, the working class remains small and politically anemic, levels of literacy are often low, and there is often much discontent stemming from very high levels of human misery. Because of the political weakness of the industrial working class, the limited democratic inroads that have been made have generally required a political coalition between the working class and the middle class (Rueschemeyer, Stephens, and Stephens, 1992). However, since the early 1980s there has been a fairly dramatic wave of democratization occurring in parts of the periphery and semiperiphery, especially in Latin America (Green, 1999; Doorenspleet, 2000; Schaeffer, 1997).

Throughout this century, politics in many Latin American countries has shown something of a cyclical alternation between more and less repressive regimes (Skidmore and Smith, 2001; E. Stephens, 1989). Given this pattern, the prediction of a long-term directional trend toward democracy may be premature. We will have to wait and see if the new democracies can sustain themselves and avoid collapsing back into some kind of authoritarianism. Undoubtedly some of them will collapse, but it is also likely that others will sustain democracy and perhaps even move toward real substantive democracy. The same prediction seems reasonable with respect to new Asian democracies. In the case of Africa, prospects are probably not as good. As we saw, many of the societies of this region are governed by extremely repressive and brutal states, and most democracy is a sham (Ayittey, 1998). African societies still are overwhelmingly dominated by agriculture and have very little industrialization and very small working classes. Literacy rates are generally

quite low. Thus the conditions for continued democratization, even of the purely formal sort, are much less favorable in Africa than they are in Latin America and Asia.

Review Questions:

1. Explain in detail the dependency theory
2. Explain how Economic Development and Underdevelopment are related to politics
3. Discuss in detail the world system theory

CHAPTER 4
GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLITICS

Objectives:

- To understand global environmental politics
- To explain Constitutional, Legal and Regulatory Framework

Topics:

- Global Environmental Politics
- Constitutional, Legal and Regulatory Framework
- Participation & Decentralization

Since the early 1970s, the environment or the ecological movement, instead of being a specific scientific doctrine or field of study, emerged as a socio-political force. It has sometimes found expression in the formation of 'green' political parties and in pressure groups. Environmentalists often express hostility to science and technology, blaming them for environmental degradation. The rise in air, water, sound, soil and municipal garbage pollution in alarming scale has sustained the continued presence of environmentalism on the political agenda; a series of very high-profile specific environmental disasters - at the Bhopal and Seveso plants and the 3-Mile Island and Chernobyl Nuclear reactors, and the Exxon Valdez Oil Tanker spillage - together with an increasingly environmentalist understanding of natural disasters have placed environmentalism at the centre stage of the public agenda.

What in general terms, environmentalists want to do is to preserve remaining wilderness areas, to restore degenerated natural environments to something like their pristine condition, to prevent further degeneration. They all realize that in order to achieve these aims they will have to press for changes in social practices and in the built environment. Their emphasis is on combining social justice with global survival, on integrating civil rights with natural rights, and on linking all the sciences with the political processes that seek to make democracy work properly. But they are not unanimous in their motives and in the means which they would be prepared to see employed in order to achieve those objectives.

T.O. Riordan maintains that at the heart of environmentalism there are three views of the world, namely techno centric, eco centric and deep green. The techno centric mode visualizes

humanity in heroic mould, capable of transforming the earth for the betterment of both people and nature. The theme of this discourse is ecological modernization. Development interventions are part of ecological modernization process. It is regarded as not only the cause of environmental destitution, but also its salvation. It is seen as the progenitor of environmentally benign technology that will ensure wealth creation to emancipate the poor from their prisons of enforced environmental and social debasement.

The eco centric view is also optimistic but recognizes the need to incorporate the limits of arrogance in the conduct of human affairs. Its aim is to make economic development more socially tolerable and environmentally sustainable. It is accommodation and its accommodation devices include sustainable development, precautionary principle, ecological economics, environmental impact assessment, and eco-auditing of industry using techniques such as life cycle analysis and environmental burden analysis. The deep green, sometimes termed as deep ecology or steady state economics, view is profoundly radical. It promotes the cause of small scale self-reliant and politically empowered communities benefiting from ultra-modern information technology, but essentially running their own affairs on the basis of local resources and local needs. It promotes the causes of pacifism, eco- feminism, and consumer rights, and animal welfare generally, and seeks to emancipate the soul from the oppression of economic and military dependency. According to this view sustainable development provides an opportunity to link social welfare strategy policies, disarmament strategies and peaceful coexistence to create a strategy for collective survival.

Today there are indications of paradigm shift. The dominant social paradigm has been referred to as the exclusionist paradigm because it excludes human beings from the laws of nature. It has also been called 'frontier economics', suggesting the sense of unlimited resources that characterizes a society with an open frontier. During 1960s there was mounting attack on dominant paradigm. An alternative view of development, against the orthodox view is gaining importance today. Those who advocate an alternative approach therefore place more emphasis on the pattern of distribution gains within global society and within individual states. Its core ideas are self-sufficiency, inherent values in nature, cultural diversity and the community- controlled commons (water, land, air, forests), human activity in balance with nature, self-reliance, voice for marginalised groups, e.g. Women, tribals, etc, local control. Its process is bottom-up, participatory, reliance on appropriate (local) knowledge and technology, small investment in small-scale projects, protection of commons.

A single most important indication of a worldwide paradigm shift was the UN conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992. 172 governments and thousands of NGOs participated in two years of discussion on domestic environmental and poverty problems and global environmental issues, especially questions of North-South inequities and responsibilities. Also completed and signed at Rio were important treaties on climate change and biodiversity. In fact environmental policies are part of international policies. International policies require global environmental institutions with trans national mandates to safeguard the protection of the global commons. The international environmental policies and institutions together constitute a diverse body of global environmental governance. Today it is emphasized that for the global environmental governance the following principles should be adhered to strictly:-

1.   The 'polluter pays' principle

2.   Prevention and precautionary principles: it seeks to prevent waste generation at source, as well as retaining some end-of-the pipe measures

3.   Economic efficiency/cost effectiveness principle: this applies both to the setting of standards and the design of the policy instrument for attaining them

4.   Decentralization principle: assign environmental decisions and enforcement to the lowest level Picture is not different in India. Here too, the techno centric environmentalism is facing tough challenge from eco centric. This is because of the early perception by few eco-brethrens of the danger posed by reversible ecological damage in the country. The nation is being predicted to be one of the worst hit by environmental degradation. This is because of counter-ecological pattern of productive growth and uprising population which is about to make the situation worst.

5.   Besides these two, there is another factor responsible for environmental deterioration in the country, which is the loss of ancient Indian values, which laid emphasis over the doctrine of 'Santosam Param Sukham' in contrast to the western concept of hedonism which emphasizes more over material pleasure in comparison to spiritual pleasure which is against the idea of sustainable development.

6.   Environment degradation in India is unfolding itself through enhanced recurrence of natural hazards particularly cyclones, severity of droughts and intensity of floods, shrinking of cooling periods, rising temperature, decline in crop productivity, loss of arable land , shifting monsoon patterns, retreat of glaciers and many more devastating consequences kept in surprise. According to a report in 2002, India suffered sharp harvest reductions because of record temperatures and drought. It is also predicted that by 2020, in some African and Asian countries (including India), yields from rain fed agriculture could be reduced by up to 50%.It

is estimated that 4.7 to 12 billion tons of topsoil are lost annually from soil erosion. From 1947 to 2002, average annual per capita water availability declined to almost 70% to 1,822 cubic meters, and overexploitation of groundwater is problematic in the states of Haryana, Punjab and U.P. Forest area cover is experiencing a net loss.

7.   According to UN climate Report, the Himalayan glaciers that are principal dry-season water sources of Asia's biggest rivers including Ganges could disappear by 2035, as temperature rises. This will further result in loss of livelihood and migration of a huge population. It is reported that biological oxygen demand (BOD) in river Ganges has already increased twice which may cause several skin diseases among human beings and animals, and is a serious threat to aquatic flora and fauna in the river. These trends combined with increasing level of corruption and criminal activities due to scarcity of resources is ready to cause havoc with the lives of common man in India. Civil conflicts involving natural resources-most notably forests and arable land-have occurred in eastern and north-eastern states.

8.   In poor and developing countries environmental deterioration causes environmental injustices and violation of human rights. This is for several reasons-

•   Firstly, the exhaustion of natural resources leads to unemployment and immigration to cities.

•   Secondly, this affects the enjoyment of and exercise of basic human rights. Environmental conditions contribute to a large extent, to the spread of infections diseases. From the 4,400 million of people who live in developing countries, almost 60% lack basic health care services, almost a third of these people have no access to safe water supply.

•   Thirdly, degradation poses new problems such as environmental refugees, who suffer from significant economic, socio-cultural and political consequences. and

•   Fourthly, environmental degradation worsens existing problems suffered by developed and developing countries.

Despite these visible signs of environmental degradation and country-wide protests and movements against environmental degradation, the socio-economic and political policies in India are nearly uninfluenced. 'Environmental protection' still seems to be a neglected area. This is because of cumulative impact of several factors. Failure to develop a full-bloom environmental jurisprudence is one of the most significant among those. to contour an in-depth analysis the emerging issues related to Global Environmental Politics

Constitutional, Legal and Regulatory Framework

Participation & Decentralization

Political decentralization aims to give citizens or their elected representatives more power in public decision-making. It is often associated with pluralistic politics and representative government, but it can also support democratization by giving citizens, or their representatives, more influence in the formulation and implementation of policies. Advocates of political decentralization assume that decisions made with greater participation will be better informed and more relevant to diverse interests in society than those made only by national political authorities. The concept implies that the selection of representatives from local electoral jurisdictions allows citizens to know better their political representatives and allows elected officials to know better the needs and desires of their constituents.

Political decentralization often requires constitutional or statutory reforms, the development of pluralistic political parties, the strengthening of legislatures, creation of local political units, and the encouragement of effective public interest groups.

Constitution, laws and regulations codify the formal rules of the game by which a decentralized system is supposed to function. Structurally, the desirable architecture of these rules is quite straightforward:

the constitutions should be used to enshrine the broad principles on which decentralization is to operate, including the rights and responsibilities of all levels of government; the description and role of key institutions at central and local levels; and, the basis on which detailed rules may be established or changed.

one or more laws should define the specific parameters of the intergovernmental fiscal system and the institutional details of the local government structure, including, key structures, procedures (including elections), accountabilities and remedies; and, a series of regulations associated with each law should interpret and describe in detail the practices and measures by which the related law will operate. Laws that deal with tasks that are shared between national and sub national governments should include sections on intergovernmental relations.

Substantially greater detail and specificity is provided in moving down this three platform architecture from the Constitution to Regulations. Conversely, greater difficulty and a higher degree of authority (e.g., Minister, Parliament and Constitutional Assembly) is required to

change the provisions when moving up from Regulations to the Constitution. These aspects of degree of difficulty and locus of authority to effect changes are important factors in determining where in the architecture particular aspects of the decentralization system are defined and the relative specificity of those definitions. The rigidities and flexibility established in this structure have important implications for the management of a decentralized system.

The placement of an item may be the result of a consensus, but often is the outcome of sometimes difficult negotiations between competing interests. Those concerned with macro stability, for example, may wish to have intergovernmental fiscal rules be a matter for regulation under the Minister of Finance, so as to give that ministry maximum flexibility in public expenditure management. Local government advocates, in contrast, may argue (as they did, successfully, in Brazil) for these fiscal distributional rules to be enshrined in the Constitution. In Uganda, the purposes and mechanisms for transfers are specified in the Constitution along with a formula for determining the minimum size of the pool from which block grants are to be distributed; the details of the distributional formulae are the subject of regulations.

As decentralization is a complex social experiment a good case may be made for there to be more flexibility in the ability to change the specificity of implementation instruments, while enshrining the political and philosophical principles in the Constitution and the operating structures in the laws. In addition to "substantive" law mentioned above, a country's "procedural" laws can have profound impacts on the success of decentralization efforts. For example, when local expenditures must be "pre-audited" by a central authority, rigidities are introduced which make the benefits of decentralization more difficult to achieve. When reviewing the legal framework for decentralization, it is not sufficient to examine decentralization specific laws -- other laws which mandate aspects of service delivery, civil service, budgeting and so one must also be considered to ensure a consistent approach.

Treatment of key issues in the legal and regulatory framework will be shaped by whether the governmental system is unitary or federal. Under some federal systems, for example, India and Canada, local governments are completely under the authority of the State/Provincial level governments. The Federal government is thereby limited in the relationships it may establish with the local level and must seek to affect local behaviour and outcomes through

the states/provinces. A decentralization policy such as India is trying to establish is significantly complicated by this factor.

Some unitary systems may exercise extremely centralized control over local governments. In Indonesia, the Ministry of Home Affairs has had the authority to appoint (and remove) mayors and even village heads. The structural impediments in designing a decentralized system in this context are few, but that does not mean that the process of instituting such a system is without critical hurdles. Indonesia has had decentralization legislation on its books since 1974; the process there remains far from completion.

As with other key aspects of decentralization, the legal and regulatory framework will be tailored to country circumstances. Nevertheless, there are a set of issues this framework may be expected to address. Those of particular interest to the work of the Bank include potentially, the classification of local governments within the tiers established under the Constitution; the broad organizational structures and their roles and responsibilities; terms of office, operating powers, procedures and limitations of the political leadership, distinct from the civil service; the degree of autonomy of personnel policies and administration of local governments; the taxing and fiscal administration authority of local governments; the borrowing authority and capacities of local authorities; the budgeting, expenditure management, accounting, auditing and reporting requirements; service provision and delivery authority; and, the mechanisms for citizen participation and voice.

The legal and regulatory framework should also be designed to recognize differences in management capacity. Assignment of functional responsibilities – for example provincial capital, designated growth centre, etc. often implicitly recognizes varying capabilities of municipalities, but a more dynamic framework which recognized "capacity" based on performance over time would be more desirable in the long run. Matching degree of autonomy and privileges to a set of performance indicators – which might include total expenditure, degree of self-sufficiency (i.e., proportion of own revenues to total), budget management performance (i.e., absence of deficits), and service delivery performance (i.e., client surveys) – would allow the legal and regulatory framework to adjust for changes in local capacity. The appropriate time period for reassessments and indicators would need to be linked to country circumstances as well as the specific details of the decentralization framework.

Among these several issues, five warning flags (selected from a potentially long list on the basis of downside risks) may deserve special attention.

Issue 1: Local governments at the same nominal level and their capacity

Issue 2: Local government borrowing and the capacity to repay

Issue 3: Local government laws inclusive to decentralized functions

Issue 4: Voting democracy versus citizen participation and voice

Issue 5: Terms of office for local political leaders and the issues of authority and accountability.

The disconnect between the formal rules and actual practice regularly observed in many countries is itself cautionary about the design and implementation of legal and regulatory systems. Ambiguity and complexity create openings for conflicting interpretation and resulting confusion. One agreed source of interpretation is essential. Particular efforts to prepare and disseminate popularized versions of the legal and regulatory system, as has been done in Uganda, must be a key part of the decentralization strategy. Complexity is often unavoidable especially at the level of instruments for implementation, however, it helps if one instrument is not asked to do too much. This facilitates communication and implementation of the policy that the instrument is intended to support as well as monitoring of the effectiveness of the instrument in that role. Adjustment to the instrument and/or the policy also may be facilitated.

Participation and decentralization have a symbiotic relationship. On the one hand, successful decentralization requires some degree of local participation. Sub national governments' proximity to their constituents will only enable them to respond better to local needs and efficiently match public spending to private needs if some sort of information flow between citizens and the local governments exist. On the other hand, the process of decentralization can itself enhance the opportunities for participation by placing more power and resources at a closer, more familiar, more easily influenced level of government. In environments with poor traditions of citizen participation, decentralization can be an important first step in creating regular, predictable opportunities for citizen-state interaction.

The symbiotic relationship between decentralization and participation leads to somewhat contradictory policy guidelines. On one hand, mechanisms for citizen participation could be considered a helpful pre-condition when evaluating the prospects for successful decentralization. Accordingly, the design of decentralization should take into account the

opportunities and limitations imposed by existing channels of local participation. On the other hand, lack of participatory mechanisms could be considered a motivation for decentralization and can help create local demand for more participatory channels to voice local preferences. This note discusses each of these dimensions -- participation as a means to successful decentralization and as a goal of decentralization.

The first section concentrates on the broad mechanisms for citizen input that are best seen as parameters of decentralization policy. These types of institutional structures, embedded in the national political environment and developed over a long period of time, cannot be altered quickly by a simple regulation. The second part shifts to the smaller, more specific avenues for citizen participation that can be created in the process of decentralization. These incremental changes can eventually evolve toward broader opportunities for citizen participation and democratic governance.

Citizen participation in some form is an essential part of successful decentralization. It is becoming a more common element in developing country political environments - 13,000 units of local government in Latin America are now elected, compared to 3,000 in 1973 - but the flow of information is by no means undistorted. Planning decentralization policies should take these informational imperfections into account and attempt to improve the depth and degree of citizen participation in local government action. Local government responsiveness, one of the main rationales for decentralizing can not be realized when there are no mechanisms for transferring information between the local government and its constituents.

Review Questions:
1. Explain Participation & Decentralization in politics
2. What do you understand by global environmental politics

CHAPTER 5
PARTY POLITICS

Objectives:

- To understand the meaning and nature of political party
- To understand the determinants and functions of political party

Topics:

- Importance of the Subject
- Meaning and Nature of a Political Party
- Determinants and Functions of a Political Party
- Party Systems

The study and analysis of political parties constitutes a new brancfh of science. It occupies an intermediate field between the social, the philosophic-psychological, and the historical disciplines, and may be termed a branch of applied sociology. In view of the present development of political parties, the historical aspect of this new branch of science has received considerable attention. Works have been written upon the history of almost every political party iii the Western world. But when we come to consider the analysis of the nature of party, we find that the field has hardly been touched.

The discussion of political parties and pressure groups forms part of a wider study of the subject of politics for the reason that it takes one beyond the traditional range of political theory and practice in its past and present forms. Much is included here what. In contravention of the traditional political theory, comes within the disciplines of psychology and sociology. In recent years this study has become so important and interesting that flaw title-of 'sociology' has come into prominence. Traditional analyses and statements of writers on the subject of party politics have mostly outlived their 'significance in view of the fact that much has come to be studied within this discipline that forms part of sister disciplines known by the names of political sociology or sociological po1itics and political psychology or psychological politics'. It reveals an uncompromising unwillingness on the part of' modern political scientists to ignore what was formerly regarded 'beyond the scope of constitutional framework'; it instead demands adoption of new approaches and techniques, though e extensively and indiscriminately borrowed from other disciplines like sociology and psychology, to understand and evaluate these socio-economic forces which influence the

mechanism of modern government and the underlying significance of their operation that naturally makes the study of formal political structures. an affair of secondary importance. It is owing to such realisation that in 1958 a great English writer like Sir Ivor Jennings regretted his inability (in the preface to the second edition of his celebrated work on Parliament)to write just a sketchy chapter on the momentous subject of party politics in his country since it required a comprehensive treatment of the complex phenomenon of 'political emotions'.

Momentous Importance of the Subject in Recent Times

Political parties have become like a common feature of our daily life. However, the puzzling, as well as interesting, point in this direction is that they "are both taken for granted and constantly criticised, continuously discussed and unsystematically assessed. Events lead us to pass judgment on the life of the parties, both at home and abroad, but always or nearly always from a Lilliputian viewpoint. If a local party takes a decision which we do not like, we are apt to generalise about 'lack of democracy'. If a Third World party is created or maintained by a strong charismatic leader, we are quick to make the point that it is merely the mouthpiece of this leader. When parties are swept away by the army, we notice that they are the means by which corrupt politicians can organise patronage. If some, event demonstrates the extent of restrictions on freedom in an Eastern country we conclude that Communist parties ar but the instruments of ruthless

It may be asked at this stage as to what factors have played their part in enhancing the importance of the study of political parties in recent times. For this, certain factors may be highlighted that have not only laid focus on the importance of this subject but also inform- ed the students of political science arid political sociology to lay down certain empirical theories on this subject. These are:

1 . At the very outset, reference should be made to the movement of behaviouralism in the United States in the post Second World War phase emphasising insistence on data and theory, use of new scientific methods and techniques and the degree of faith in the possibility of establishing more general Laws or explanations regarding political phenomena. More-over, despite some initial rigidity and excessive evangelical there has appeared ample room for a large variety of approaches, themes and methods.

2. The fact of internationalisation of the study of political parties may be described as another important factor in this connection. Prior to the second World War, the study of this subject was 'culture bound'. The lion's share of attention was devoted to the political parties of the

advanced European and American countries. An important change took place after the second World War when the students of this subject took an increasing interest in the party politics of undeveloped and developing countries of the Third World. An interesting development, in this direction, should be studied ill the role of one-party system that in the beginning looked like a contradiction in terms to the political scientists of the Western countries. Naturally, it broadened the vistas of study and these events, in the context of stricter scientific perspectives and aspirations, became both meaningful and directive.

3. The subject of party politics came to be examined in the perspectives of the rise and fall of parties. It led to the emergence of 'developmental approach' in this important direction. It informed more and more students to study the subject of party politics in the light of its integrative and disintegrative aspects. It also enthused them to study this subject in the context of increasing saliency of issues, declining hold of the parties on the legislative bodies and instead enhancing position of the executive departments.

Obviously, these factors or trends "began to combine in ways that were unanticipated and to produce both concrete events and scholarly findings that shattered key articles of the conventional wisdom and left professional observers doubtful as to how to interpret the present or forecast the future."

As pointed out above, the most attractive feature of the study of political parties now is the use of new approaches and techniques, some of which may be referred to as under:

1 Developmental Theory: Also known by the name of modernisation theory it is particularly concerned with the dynamics of party politics. Here a student is concerned with the case of systemic crises (covering the themes of nation- building, industrialisation, mass mobilisation, etc.) or with the notion of broad systemic needs and functions (as integration, legitimisation, conflict management, etc.) and, finally, with the idea of systemic loads or their burdens imposed by the order in which the system operates. However, one difficulty in the comprehension of this theory is that leading writers have taken a highly normative view of the idea of 'development', conversely that of 'decay', that creates confusion to a new student of this subject. For instance, Chambers Views development in terms of system characteristics, adaptive capacity, other capabilities, structural differentiation, maintenance of integration, etc. Myron Weiner and Joseph la Palombara take development in terms of solving crises and meeting needs of the system. But S.P. Huntington views modernisation in terms of systemic characteristics such as rationalisation of authority, differentiated structures and mass participation.

2. Cleavag Theory : As developed by eminent writers like Lipset, Rokkan and Allardt, it seeks to study party politics in terms of economic, religious, regional, urban-rural, ethnic and tribal conceptions of a legitimate authority. In other words, a student of this subject is advised to study various factors that cause cleavage in the social life of the people and have their definite impact on the operation of the party

3. Realignment Theory : As contributed by eminent writers like Sandquist and Burnham, it lays emphasis on change in the levels Of political participation, intensity and divisiveness of partisan feeling, distribution of political and economic among the elites in the character of key political institutions.

4. Spalial Theory : Mainly contributed by throws focus on issue divisions, approaching them in terms of economic assumptions and techniques of analysis.

5. Perineatioiz Theory : It examines the role of various cliques, factions, elites, etc. that operate within a political party. Maurice Duverger and Daalder have tried to highlight the role of such agencies that, in fact, permeate the institutional structures of a political system as well as the results that follow from varying degrees of success.

No doubt, the utilisation of these theories has done a lot to enrich the discipline of 'stasiology', we may also refer to some more theories on this subject contributed by the Marxist writers in particular that will add to the stock of knowledge.

Political party is not an isolated institution. It operates in an 'environment'. As such, a study of party politics requires its study in the context of all those forces, institutions and agencies that interact with each other. In other words, an empirical study of party politics requires that we must look into the interactions in which political parties are very much involved and, as a result of that, not only political but other dimensions of our collective life as well—say economic, social and cultural—are naturally affected. The reason for this can be traced in the fact that a political party can be put to almost any political or governmental purpose. It can articulate and aggregate demands and interests, recruit and remove leaders, make or unmake government policy, carry out or obstruct the implementation of a policy decision, effect adjustment or protraction of disputes, and even go to the extent of educating or coercing the people .

One may point out that not only political parties but other non- political institutions (like religious bodies, social groups, labour unions, cultural organisations, professional entities and the like), whether pib1ic or private, also perform linkage functions. However, what distinguishes political parties from all others "is their emphasis in

both by the members and by others as agencies for forging links between citizens and policy-makers. Their raison d'etre is to create a substantive connection between rulers and ruled." The reason for this should be easily traced in the fact that the existence and operation of parties "by no means eliminates selfish and unscrupulous motives. The power-seeking drives of politicians remain constant." Even if the party politician is motivated by a crude self-interest, his behaviour must depart—if the constraints of the system are operative—from the motivation.

Parties are instrumental to collective benefits of the contestants. Parties link people to government." Simply stated, the idea of linkage implies a series of connections or a chain of relationships like alignments between parties and the voters, recruitment of party leaders and legislators with the support or approval of the people or partymen and the like. It signifies a con- notation .of interaction. It is found that the elements linked thus behave differently from which four dimensions may be earmarked:

I . Units being linked : The concept of linkage, as a matter of fact, has been employed to study inter-connections among all levels of government. As J.N. Rosenau says : "It leads itself to all forms of 'across system' study or to efforts to specify how and under what conditions political behaviour at one level of aggregation affects political behaviour at another level." The analyst of linkage who is always ready to ignore long standing conceptual boundaries and think anew about interaction across different levels of aggregation is not content to presume that the parties that are lawful at the level of aggregation that interests him can be adequately explained by holding other levels constant. Thus, he is impelled to expand his explanatory net beyond the dynamics operative at the level of his dependent variables. Rosenau makes it clear that for him the term 'system' can be applied to any level of political life—local, national or inter-national—and he specifically sanctions the widest possible interpretation. Slightly different is the view of Prof. V.0. Key, Jr. to whom linkage refers to the interaction between mass opinion and public decisions—his units of analysis are thus individual citizens.

2. Units that instigate linkages : Linkage may be described as a metaphor for democracy and also as a synonym for representation. As such, it includes the case of wider political participation by the people. It refers to citizen activity in constitutive processes (like leadership recruitment, campaigning and elections) as well as in petitioning processes by organised groups. In simple terms the idea of linkage covers all units that constitute the stuff of people's role in the political process of the country.'

3. Processes by which linkages are established : Finally, we may refer to the processes by which the establishment of linkages becomes a -fact. Rosenau refers to two processes in this regard that occur by means of penetration and reaction. The process of penetration involves two situations :

(i) Governments locate their agents openly or converting citizen organisations.

(ii) Citizens place some of their members in government via electoral processes or acts of revolution thus establishing a new government altogether.

Then, it also occurs by means of reaction that involves three situations:

(i) governments engage in acts of representative response to citizens' views on policy,

(ii) governments engage in acts of coercion to which citizens must perforce respond, and

(iii) governments and citizens exchange rewards for votes.

However, an easier illustration of the same is offered by Prof.A.H. Somjee. It covers three important sections

1 . Interest Linkage : It refers to various structures in a society that interact and articulate their respective interests. Party organisations, in order to have the support of different social structures formulate programmes balancing the demands of such organisations. Parties also become the supplier of information and bring together unacquainted individuals who share political beliefs, interests and aspirations.

2. Normative Linkage : Shared normative perspectives provide necessary links between as well as within different systems. At the level of the political system itself, the ideals of common wealth are provided by the ruling elite, by the media and by the exponents of party programme. These leaders of public opinion evaluate the quality of public life, identify critical issues facing the society as a whole, and inculcate new directions to take place. They also engage in mutual criticism and evaluate competing policy proposals in terms of what would lead to an improved common welfare.

3. Operational Linkage : Those who direct their energies to the task of building and sustaining a structure of support for their party organisations is what sustains in the last analysis a system of party linkages. Most of these hard-working activists are motivated by the hope of personal benefits. They seek their reward in the form of power, status, or material benefits and without such a pay off. The linkmen involved in the operational linkage activity are the office- holders, the party activists, and the marginal.

Obviously, the whole idea of linkage refers to the study of party politics in a democratic environment where competition is open and both the individuals and their groups play a free rote in the political process of the country. We may, therefore, appreciate the view that the essence of democratic and dictatorial rule "is embodied in the daily life of the parties."

Meaning and Nature of a Political Party : Liberal Versus Marxist Interpretations

The institution of a political party has now assumed an honourable place after having a notorious past. The reason for this lies in the fact that now a political party is considered fundamentally different from a destructive body like a clique e or a faction. The views of a critic like George Washington of the United States and Voltaire of France no longer hold good who deprecated political parties in the name of 'violence of the faction' and forces 'swallowing up the republic'. A well known authority on this subject like Giovanni Sartori, therefore, holds that now the term 'party' may be interchangeable with a 'faction', if it is not 'seditious'17. He goes on to say that the difference between his lead of attending to the structure of government, many are focussing their interest upon popular participation, or what is sometimes termed the 'political process'. There is concern for political dynamics for the ways in which leaders, political parties and social groups achieve power, and a quest for the mainsprings of action unravelled by a study of more publicised normal structures of government.

Modern representative democracy has brought about party system as an indispensable factor in every political society. It may be- laid down that political party in one form or another "is omnipresent." This fact lays stress on the maximisation of political participation by enjoining upon the members of a political elite to take the people at large in confidence either for the sake of observing the myth that 'voice of the people is the voice of God', or to justify the. very legitimacy of their popular leadership and authority. It also indicates political modernisation in the sense that it calls for the involvement of more and more people into the process of, what Easton says, the 'authoritative allocation of values'. Whether it is the rule of a single person (monarch or dictator), or of the few (assembly or elite), or even of the many, the norms of party system demand sanctity to this maxim that the masses must participate in the political affairs of the country as much as possible.

Undeniable is the fact that party politics has become a universal phenomenon. Leaving aside the case of sonic tradition-ridden states like Saudi Arabia and Thailand, every state of the world has a party system of its own whether it pertains to a one-party model, or to a bi-party

model, or to a multi-party model, or to a peculiar mixture of them. Thus, in a study of party system we have to study the network of political and para-political parties and, in addition to that, all those organisations that, in the words of Maurice Duverger, play the role of 'indirect. parties'. If so, the scope of' study is widened so as to include every political party whether big or small, opera- ting at the national, regional or local level, with ideological commitment or neutrality, and the like. Giovanni Sartori has, therefore, advised us to include the following kinds of parties in a study of the party system :

1 . witness parties, those uninterested in maximising votes,

2. ideological parties, those interested in votes primarily via indoctrination.

3. responsible parties, which do not submit policies to maximising votes,

4. responsive parties, for which winning elections of maximising votes take priority, and

5. purely demagogic, irresponsible parties, which are only vote maximisers.

Obviously, such a view is broad enough to embrace every political party that has some place in the country. A study of party system is, however, beset with one difficulty: a political party "is notoriously difficult to define accurately." It "is not always easy to differentiate it from a faction, an interest group, or a parliamentary group which may have a life of its own independent of electoral opinion as in France, or from a political movement which may temporarily transcend a number of parties or groups as did the RPF in France, the Rassemblement Democratique Africaine, the National Union of Popular Forces in Morocco, the National Front in a number of system's.

Curtis goes to the extent of saying : "Essentially, party signifies a group of people who hold certain political beliefs in common or who are prepared to support the party candidates, work together for electoral victory, attain and maintain political power." One thing is clear from what we have said above. We should not be led away by just what Burke said about two hundred years ago we should also take into consideration that political parties are "specialised associations whose purpose is to secure power within a corporate group for their leaders in order to attain ideal or material advantages. They may spring up within trade unions, corporations, universities, parliaments or the state itself in which latter case they are political parties. Parties are thus specialised associations and become more complex, organised and bureaucratic as a society approaches the modern type." The central object of a political organisation is to capture power either singly; or in collaboration with others. It is this goal of attaining political power that distinguishes political parties from other groups in

the political system, although the distinction is rather blurred at times, especially In regard to pressure groups."

It is, therefore, a hard job to differentiate between a political party and a pressure group in all cases. There are certain borderline situations where we find the two being analogous to each other. For example, the Irish Nationalists in the House of Commons before 1918, or the poorly represented Welsh Plaid Cymru and Scottish Nationalist groups today display many of the characteristics of both a political party and a pressure group. The weaknesses of the party systems in most of the undeveloped countries of the world add to our difficulty in this regard. One may say that the Shiva Sena in Maharashtra is not a political party but a pressure group, or one may call it a political party in view of its 'open' political commitments and activities. The difference between a political party and a pressure group may, however, be made on a conceptual plane. It may be said that "Equally important, the distinctions ultimately established between parties and other political group e.g. factions and interest groups—are highly relative with the result that the universe of groups remains exceedingly kaleidoscopic in character." A political party is an organisation of numerous people who are openly committed on broad matters of public policy and they want to assume direct responsibility for their policies by seeking to mono or share with other parties in a position of p1itica1 power.

Contrary to this, a pressure group does the work of interest articulation and strives to protect and promote its specific interest through governmental agencies without being ready to assume direct responsibility for the same. It plays the game of hide and seek in politics. The difference between the two is thus borne out by Neumann: "Fundamentally, pressure groups are the representation of homogeneous interests seeking influence. The interest group is strong and effective when it has a direct specific purpose. Political parties, on the other hand, seeking office and directed towards policy decisions, combine heterogeneous groups. In fact, it is one of their major themes to reconcile the diverse forces within political society. Theirs is an integrative function which is not the domain of the interest groups"."

Determinants and Functions of a Political Party

Manifold are the determinants of the party structure. They vary from religious and social to economic and political. Certain political parties are associated with a religious faith like the MRP in France, Christian Democrats in Italy and Germany, Christian People's Party in Norway, Protestant and Catholic Parties in Holland, Muslim League and Hindu Maha Sabha in India and Komei

depending on ethnic or racial connection such as Tamil Federal Party in Sri Lanka, People's Progressive Party of the East Indians and People's National Congress largely composed of the Negroes in Guyana. . Some political parties may be based on sub-nationalism as Flemmish Nationalists in Belgium, or on the factor of linguistic chauvinism as Radical Party in France. In some cases, caste ma' play the role of a determinant as we find in the case of DMK and AIADMK in India. It is also found that some political parties are held together by a clique led by an attractive leader, or by patronage as Maurice Duplessis and the United National in the province of Quebec in Canada : some look largely as a receptacle for those disenchanted with other major parties such as Social Credit Party of Canada. There may also be parties like a confederation of various socio-economic groups or various regional organisations like the Mapai of Israel and the Liberal Party of Australia. Though the determinants of party structure may be different, they may be reduced to three main factors Historical, socio-economic and ideological. In the first place, historical factors are of great importance in the determination f party structures. Parties are the conditions of modern political processes and their emergence presupposes a necessary degree of urbanisation and development of mass communications. It is the extension of franchise that leads to the creation of political parties. As the organisation of political parties has a wider and still wider base. The National Union of England, for example came into being as a result of the conditions after the implementation of the First Reform Act of 1832. Thus, political parties "arise when historical changes occur -and these are not subject to scientific laws. Therefore, the development of parties is more haphazard and uneven than general classifications make apparent. Certainly particular changes are necessary such as the need for the dominant political elites to seek wider political support, and for a significant change in the political attitudes.

Second, the socio-economic factor has a significance of its own. The level of economic development influences the nature of party competition. We may find that there is a different response to urban and rural societies and to those in which class conflict is a significant aspect of the political process. In a liberal-democratic state parties with a totalitarian structure may hardly find a congenial place to live in and operate, since there is open electoral competition that allays possibilities of all such developments. Nationalism and religious divisions may be more important than those of class in following the basis of political parties. Of course, the attitudes and values prevalent in society and political culture may be of vital significance in determining the types of political parties that emerge in any society."

Last, there is the factor of ideology. It has its application in some special cases. Socialist and Communist parties are organised on the basis of a particular ideology. These parties are called 'leftist', because they struggle to change the status quo what they call 'the era of injustice' perpetrated by the class of 'bourgeois' exploiters and oppressors over the 'proletarian' class of the workers and toilers. There may be parties based on the 'rightist' ideology as Fascists in Italy, Nazis in Germany and Bharatiya Janata in India. Such parties stand for the maintenance of the status quo that goes to the advantage of the existing rulers hailing from the affluent class of the society. It is not necessary that every political party is committed to some ideology. The political parties of the United States have nothing like ideology commitment for which reason the Democrats and the Republicans have been described by Lord James Bryce 'as two bottles of wine, liquor being the same but different labels'. Hence, it is said that American political parties "are primarily electoral machines, decentralised, laying little emphasis on ideological differences, exercising little disciplinary control over their members, and recruiting many of their presidential and congressional representatives from outside the party structure."

Political parties perform several important functions in modern political systems that may be enumerated as under :

1. The parties unite, simplify and stabilise the political process.. They bring together sectional interests, overcome geographical distances and provide coherence to sometimes divisive government structures. The American Democratic Party provides a bridge to bring together the southern conservatives and northern liberals; the German Democratic Party bridges. the gulf between the Protestants and the Catholics in West Germany. In federal systems all political parties emphasise the uniting of different government structures; the extreme case being that of the USSR. In this way, political parties tend to provide the highest common denominator.

2. Political parties struggle for capturing power; they strive to form order out of chaos. They seek to widen the interests they represent and harmonise these interests with each other. Though interest articulation function is performed by the pressure groups, the work of interest aggregation is done by the parties. For instance, the Conservative Party of Britain, in spite of the nature of its internal organisation and distribution of power, depends upon the support of diverse economic, social and geographical sections in English politics. It may be said that all parties strive to extend the area of their support whether it is a bi-party system or a multi-party system of competitive electoral politics, or it is a single- dominant party system where

political process operates under the dominance of a single party and, in doing so, other parties not only reflect division in society but also tend to mitigate them.

3. Political parties provide a link between the government and its people. They seek to educate, instruct and activate the electorate. That is, they perform the job of political mobilisation, secularisation and recruitment. In a liberal- democratic system, the parties means of mass media to give political education to the people. The parties may organise and control some unions or organisations for the purpose of, what S. Hening and Pindar call, 'occupational and social implantation'. The Communist Party of France may be said to be its best example. In a totalitarian system, the party in power works for the mobilisation of support by activating the population by means of rallies, uniforms, flags and other displays of unity to emphasise the identification of the individual with the political party.

4. While increasing the scope of political activity and widening popular participation, political parties perform the important function of recruiting political leaders. Men in authority are recruited by some channel. In political systems shaving weak and ill-organised political parties, power remains in the hands of the elites that are recruited from the traditional groups like hereditary ruling families or military organisations. In totalitarian countries where only one party is in absolute power, political recruitment is made from the ranks of the same party. It is only in countries having a liberal-democratic order that competitive party system prevails and political recruitment is made from different political parties.

5. Political parties present issues; they set value goals for the society. All parties have philosophical bases, no matter how blurred and no matter how divorced from the actual political behaviour of the party they are. Though American political parties have, what Robert Dahi says, 'ideological similarity and issue conflict', they have no disagreement on the fundamental goals of the society. The two parties of Ireland (Fanna Fail and Fine Gael) are prototypes of the two parties of the United States in respect of 'ideological similarity and issue conflict' nature. Single political parties in totalitarian systems set more rigid ideological goals for society. For in- stance, the Communist parties proclaim socio-economic equality. of all after establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat.

6. Political parties serve as the broker of ideas by selecting a number of issues and focussing attention on them. In a democratic system revolutionary parties (or those hostile to the

established order as such) act not as conciliatory elements in aggregating the largest number of common interests but as focal points of discontent and organised opposition. The compromise needed in democratic political behaviour is never acceptable to them. These parties may adhere to the political left, as the Communist parties do, or to the right as done by the Fascist and Nazi parties (respectively in Italy and Germany) or the Poujadists as in France, or to revolutionary nationalism as with tile Aprista in Peru, the Revolutionary Nationalist Movement in Bolivia, or the Accion Democratica in Venezuela. In a non-democratic system, revolutionary parties may not simply be the median- ism through which the political system operates, they may be real core of the system itself with power being exercised by party leaders rather than by governmental officials.

7. In the newer and developing nations of the world where political habits and traditions are yet to grow up, political party or parties does or do the job of political modernisation. That is, they strive to give a particular shape to the government, provide the main link between different social and economic groups, constitute the chief agency for political education and socialisation, break down traditional barriers and act as the binding force in communities divided by groups based on tribal affiliation, religious denomination or national origin. The role of the Congress party in India may be said to be the best example of this type where the great leaders have played a monumental part in the framing of the constitution and running the government on the lines of parliamentary democracy.

9. Political parties also perform social welfare functions that may be termed their 'non-political activities'. The parties work for the alleviation of the sufferings of the people during days of famine, drought, epidemic, wars, etc4 They also work for the eradication of social evils like illiteracy, untouchability, ignorance, disease, etc. In Australia. citizens may lead their lives from cradle to grave within the frame of organisations linked to a party which include not only trade union and welfare groups but also stamp collecting societies pigeon clubs and weight-lifting associations. The Indian National Congress and Bharatiya Janata parties have often engaged themselves in massive activities of sociaIvel1re and public service.

While dealing with the functional aspect of the political parties, their 'dysfunctional' dimension cannot be ignored. One should also look at the distorting features of the functions of political parties. They "may polarise opinions in ways dangerous to the stability of the political system." The French Fourth Republic reached a stage of near collapse in 1957 owing

to the upper hand of the Communist and the Gaullists, for both were hostile to me constitutional framework of the country. The doom of Italy and Germany during the second World War should be attributed to the 'dysfunctional' services of the Fascist and Nazi parties respectively.

Party Systems: A Typological Illustration: A Recent Paradigm of Sartori

A typological illustration of the party systems as obtaining indifferent political systems, whether developed or developing, or undeveloped, of the world is governed by several factors like the nature of social composition, economic divisions, religious and ethnic affiliations, cultural diversities, and political differences over matters of internal and external policy of the state. Maurice Duverger's too simplistic classification is now out-model. He had formulate a simple classification of one, two and multi-party systems and there- by sought to place all the party systems of the world in one of the three relevant categories. As a matter of fact, significant developments have taken place in the realm of comparative politics keeping which j: view it may be emphasised that a typological illustration needs restatement in order to be as scientific as possible.

Single Party System: This category is characterised by the party in power either dominating all other groups, trying to absorb the political opposition, or in the extreme case suppressing all oppositions groups which are regarded as counter-revolutionary or subversive of the regime as forces dividing the national will. This principal category has two sub-categories totalitarian and democratic. The case of a single party system of the totalitarian model obtains if the party in power allows no other party or group to live or act in opposition to its authority; it is democratic in case the ruling party tolerates the existence of other parties in opposition, or it may some- times take the help of another party or parties for living in power, or there may be several parties that, even when put together, may not be in a position to wrest power from the dominant party, or there is one party absorbing all other parties within its fold. The outstanding feature is that the party in power allows other: parties and groups to exist and operate. In this situation, the party in power enjoys a dominant position. To carry the point % of categorisation further, we may say that even the totalitarian model of a single party system may be said to have two more sub- categories—ideologically committed and ideologically neutral. That is, the party in power may, and may not, be committed to a particular ideology. Moreover, even this ideological commitment may be of two types— rightist and leftist. While the ideology of the right stands for the maintenance of the status quo, the ideology of the left aims at the liquidation of the present system and its substitution

by a new one that is more equitable and just for the interests of the weaker, oppressed and exploited sections of the community.

In order to support our categorisation with the help of factual cases, we may say that while the Fascist and Nazi party systems constituted the case of a totalitarian party system committed to an ideology of the right, the communist party systems belong to the latter category where a single party system is committed to the ideology of the left. While we may put Spain and Portugal in the first category, we may place Soviet Union, China, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, East Germany, Cuba and North Korea in the second one. When referring to the category of a single party system under an ideologically non-committed party, we may cite the names of some countries like Indonesia under the Indonesian National Party before 1965 and now under the Golkar Party, Bangladesh under the Awami League before 1975 and now under Bangladesh National Party, Egypt under Arab Socialist Union and Burma under the Lanzin party.

The democratic category of a single party system has three sub- categories, namely, 'one-plus' party system where the dominant party seldom takes the help of some other party as we find in the case of Liberal Democratic Party of Japan; 'one dominant' party system where one party enjoys a position of far more influence than all other parties put together as we find in the case of 1ndia National Congress; finally, 'one-absorbing' party system where we find that one party absorbs all other major and minor political organisations . within its fold as we find in the cases of Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) of Mexico, Kenya African National Union (KANU) of Kenya and National Renovating Alliance of Brazil.

Bi-Party System: A two-party system may be said to exist where there are only two parties sufficiently strong to take part in the struggle for power. There may be other parties, but the alternation of power reigns between the two major ones. A two-party system may be said to have three sub-categories, namely, two-party system where alternation of power takes place between two major parties; 'two plus' party system where some other party or parties may seldom have a chance to share power with either of the two major parties; and 'two-party system in the midst of many' where parties other than the two .major ones have chances, now and then, to share power.

In order to carry our point of typological illustration further, we may say that the two-party system has its two more sub-categories— distinct and indistinct. The case of a distinct two-

party system occurs where two major parties have their policies and programmes, clearly different from each other on the basis of which they take part in the struggle for power. The Conservative and Labour parties of England find their place in this category. The case of indistinct bi party system finds its example in the United States where the Democrats and the Republicans have no 'ideological differences' or, as Dahi says, they have 'ideological similarity and issue conflict'.17 In a 'two-plus party system', there are two major parties that some- times take the co-operation of some other party or parties to run their coalition governments. The cases of West Germany and Canada may be put in this category. it may also be possible that the two major parties, off and on, take the help of other minor parties that makes it 'a two-party system in the midst of many'.' The cases of Belgium, Luxembourg and Ireland may be referred to here.

Multi-Party System: It is a system in which no party is able to obtain majority in the legislature entitling it to form government. Coalition governments are formed that may, and also may not, have a stable existence depending upon the political culture Of the country. As prevailing in many countries of the world, it is of two types—stable and unstable. It is stable where many parties struggle for power and they run the government without going to the extent of making the political system unstable.

Democrats, Liberal Democrats and Communists struggle for power without creating conditions of political uneasiness with the result that the po1iica1 system is not pushed towards its decay. Different from this is the case of France. The Socialists, Communists, Gaullists, Liberals and Republicans take matters to such an extent that the very existence of the political system becomes a matter of serious concern. Yet another example is afforded by Italy where the Communists, Socialists and Democratic Socialists follow more or less the lines of their French counterparts.

It may be pointed out at this stage that bi-party and multi-party systems are a result of certain important factors. In this direction, we may appreciate the view of Sigmund Neumann who says: "Historical precedents may suggest the following favourable circumstances for a two-party development: social homogenity, political continuity, an early sanction of responsible political parties striving for political control, and their orientation at one elective office (the U.S. presidency, the British premiership) as the desired prize. Whenever fundamental cleavages in social structure evolve arid continue to exist because of differences in nationalities, regions, religions or classes which are often fostered by outside influences like

movements and revolutionary internationals; whenever political revolutions coincide with great social transformations, as in France, Central and Eastern Europe and the Near and Far East, whenever a controlling elite, through the divide and rule device, prevents parties from fulfilling their genuinely political functions of presenting clear- cut policy alternatives, as n Bismarck's strategies, for example, whenever the political machinery of state diffuses the electorate's division by numerous choice whenever any or all of those complicating factors enter the national political scene.

A more neat taxonomic illustration of party systems has been given by Giovanni Sartori in his latest study on the subject. The notable feature of his classificatory illustration is that he has discovered several sub-varieties within the one party system and then differentiated the two-party and multi-party systems on the basis of 'pluralism' and 'atomism'. The basic touchstone of his classification is the fact of real participation in power what he terms 'competition'. If so, only two broad categories can be earmarked with the designation of 'competitive' and 'non-competitive' models. While the case of one-party system falls into the former category, the cases of two-and multi-party systems belong to the latter.

In the view of Sartori, the single-party system is one where political competition between different political parties is either non-existent, or is not very effective. The single party model may be said to have three main varieties. It is monopolistic when political power is wielded by one party alone and no other party is permitted to exist at all. A deeper study of such a party system shows that it has three sub-varieties. It is totalitarian and has the rubric of 'dictatorship' when the degree of coercion is very high; policies adopted by are highly destructive to the opponents; only official ideology is sacrosanct; no autonomy to other groups is sanctioned and the element of arbitrariness is unbounded and unpredictable. Then, it is authoritarian when the criteria of ideology is weak and non-totalistic; degree of coercion is medium; some autonomy is available to different groups; and the element of arbitrariness is within predictable limits, last, it is pragmatic when the hold of ideology is very feeble, even irrelevant; degree of coercion is quite low; sub-group independence is also. allowed; and the element of arbitrariness is limited. In other words, while the totalitarian and authoritarian parties are assumed to reflect different ideological intensities, the one party pragmatic represents that end of the continuum at which an ideology cal mentality gives way to a pragmatic mentality. One can equally say that totalitarianism and 'authoritarianism appear as different points of an ideological scale whose lowest point is called pragmatism.

Another variety of the single party system is its hegemonic position. Here we find that while the existence of other parties is allowed, only one party counts more than all. The other parties live like its 'satellites' or subordinate entities without posing any challenge to its hold. The hegemonic party "neither allows for a formal nor a dejacto competition for power. Other parties are permitted to exist, but as second class, licensed parties; for they are not permitted to compete with the hegemonic party in antagonistic terms and on an equal basis. Not only does alternation not occur in fact; it can not occur, since the possibility of a rotation in power is not even envisaged. The implication is that the hegemonic party will. remain in power whether it is liked or not."' The case of a party has two sub-varieties—ideological and pragmatic. It pertains to the former category if the ruling party is committed to a particular ideology like the Communist Party of Poland, or it is pragmatic when the ruling party has no such commitment the type of which we find in the case of PRI

Finally, we may refer to the case of predominant party system as another variety of the single party system. Here we find a power configuration in which one party governs alone without being subjected to alternation as long as it continues to win absolute majority in the elections. In this model, one party outdistances all others, for it is significantly stronger than all of them even put together. The cases of India, Japan, Turkey and Uruguay fall in this category A degree of difference between the hegemonic and predominant party models can be traced in the fact that while the latter remains submissive to the conditions no real sanction commits the former to its policy, its domination cannot be challenged. In the scheme of Sartori, the common characteristic has the following important features :

1. Different parties exist and operate including those re1evant anti-system ones that may go to the extent of undermining the legitimacy of the regime. However, character of a party or parties should not a 'revolutionary' character.
2. The existence of bilateral and multi1ateral counter-oppositions is a fact with the result may be biangular, triangular, quadrangular and the like.
3. The metrical centre of the system is occupied by one party, that faces opposition at both ends right and left. The system is multi polar in that its competitive mechanism hinges on a centre that must face both a left and a right. In this way, a centre party that attempts to outdo the parties located at its right and left will contribute, more than to anything else, to a crescendo of escalation and extremisation.

4. The degrees of ideological distance may be discovered between different parties. Cleavages are likely to be very deep, consensus is surely low, and that the legitimacy of the political system is widely questioned.

5. Centrifugal drives prevail over the centripetal ones. There is the enfeeblement of the centre, because the centrifugal that make for a responsible government, responsiveness. Whatever two-and multi-party systems. embody of 'polarised pluralism' that has the anti-system be confused with oppositions and that interaction rightist organisation like PAN (National Action Party) and a leftist one like SPP (Socialist People's Party) arid also a centrist one like PARM (Authentic Party of the Mexican Revolution).

6. Ideological patterning may also be visualised here. Polities contain parties that disagree not only on policies but also, and more importantly, on principles and fundamentals.

7. We may also find the existence of irresponsible oppositions in this model. The frustrated parties may go to any extreme. Moreover , governmental instability and' shifting or quarrelsome coalitions obscure the very perception of who is responsible for what.

8. Last, we find the politics of outbidding or over-promising. The ruling party or other ones may cause inflationary disequilibrium by making tall promises to the voters.

Despite the fact that 'polarised pluralism' is the common feature of hi-party and multiparty systems, a line of distinction between the two may be drawn. A bi-party system is one where the existence of third parties does not prevent the two major parties from governing alone and,' therefore, coalitions are unnecessary. It involves these important conditions:

(i)   two parties are in a position to compete for the absolute majority of seats,

(ii)   one of the two parties actually succeeds in winning a sufficient parliamentary majority, and

(iii)   this party is willing to govern alone, and

(iv)   alternation or rotation in power remains a credible expectation.

What is quite astonishing at this stage is that Sartori has included the case of countries having stable coalition systems (like West Germany, Belgium, Ireland, Switzerland, Denmark, Netherlands, Iceland and Norway) in this category. That is, this model is not only available in a country like the United Kingdom, it is equally applicable to one where one coalition is opposed by another coalition and the political system remains in smooth operation. Curiously, he has excluded the case of the United States from this model on the plea that this applies to a country having a cabinet government, not a presidential government where presidency and the legislature may, or may not, be captured by the same party. When it does

not synchronise, presidential government becomes basically different from a parliamentary form of government in a study of the party systems.

Finally, we come to the point of extreme polarism that is the hall-mark of an 'atomised' party system. A multi-par system having a highly fragmented character leads to the existence of highly fluid party politics. Here we find that no party is in a position to cast a noticeable effect on the other. All those parties must be excluded which have almost no place in the bargaining process and thereby represent their structured consolidation. An atomised party is fragmented leader by leader, with very small groups revolving around each leader.

One important point may, however, be mentioned in the end. A very precise, neat and water-tight classification of the party systems cannot be presented that may be of universal and eternal acceptance for the obvious reason that the subject itself is of a very complicated nature and that political developments take place so quickly as to disturb the conclusions of a serious study. One may also say that a particular country should, or should not, be placed in a particular 'category in case one is able to discover some other variable(s) in a study of the configuration. For instance, one may say that India has a multi-party system, since several other parties have had a chance to be in power as the Akali Dal in Punjab and DMK and A-IDMK in Tamilnadu and Janata, Lok Dal and Congress(S) at the Centre. One may also say that Britain does not accord the case of a two-party system, it is a case of the two-plus party system in view of the fact that the Labour Prime Minister Wilson had to run his minority government with the help of Liberal Party for some time in 1974 and now the emergence of Social Democratic Party looks like a curious development. What is however, required on the part of a student in this direction is that he should fulfil the prime qualification27—whether the one model used, in spite of inevitable anomalies, allows general conclusions to be drawn which are true and informative.

Party Systems: Western and Non-Western Paradigms

If party system is an omnipresent affair, it has varieties of its own depending upon the political culture of the people and the political system of the country. Confining attention to the major parts of the western world, two broad varieties of party systems have been earmarked to call them 'democratic' and 'totalitarian'. ft is pointed out that the 'democratic model' allows e1ements of 'opposition' leading to the existence of a big or multi-party system, while the 'totalitarian model' signifies the existence and leading role of a single political party. In the former, opposition is allowed and parties operate within the

constitutional framework so that parties and government become different institutions; in the latter case, opposition is tabooed with the result that party and government are not only identified, the latter becomes a shadow of the former.

Almond distinguishes four major categories with some sub-divisions. These are: authoritarian (with a separate sub-category of totalitarian); dominant 'non-authoritarian'; competitive two-party; arid 'competitive non-party; working and immobility. While distinguishing between the democratic and totalitarian models, Apter observes : "In Western practice a political party is a function of a 1argr system in which it operates; that is, it is a servant of the constitutional framework. Totalitarian parties are different; and to understand their role, it is necessary to examine totalitarian societies and governments. mother words the tot41ita1ian party is conterminous with the state itself." Again : In the democratic tradition political parties assume a constitutional frame- work of government and operate within its rules. In the totalitarian tradition, parties change the rules to serve their own purposes, and the state is thus subordinated to the party. In the new nations the legitimacy of the slate and the effective discipline of the party often vary independently of one another, thus causing political parties to have special responsibilities for the establishment of a constitutional framework." The same writer explains the phenomenon of party relationship and characteristics with the help of a tabular illustration given below':

However, this major division of party system into two models is further divisible into its allied varieties. True to say that democratic countries like Britain, France and the United States fall within the 'democratic model', but they have their different systems.. Both Britain and the United States are the models of a bi-party system, yet they are different in the sense that while the American political parties lack' rigid organisational discipline and clear-cut ideological commitments, the English party system represents cohesion, effective organisation and specific ideological commitments. As Apter argues : "American. political parties are not centres of passion. Today they are part-time organisations, kept alive between special election of minor ones, state and local, by patronage and by some spoils."3' In contrast to this, "disciplined parties, effective parliamentary organisation, a high standard of ethics, all these now characterise the British political party system in spite of occasional lapses from political virtue and internal cohesion."

Moreover, while the British and the American party systems are the models of bi-partyism, many other countries of' the western world (like France, Italy. Switzerland, West Germany,

and Canada) have multi-party systems. In such .a model, political parties, more than two in number, operate to fight for power and the machinery of government is run either by a single party' provided it gets the mandate of the people to make its majority, or by a coalition of parties that make up their strength for the required purpose. How- ever, this phenomenon of multi-partyism may be limited and orderly (as in Holland and Switzerland), or it may be anarchic and disorderly (as in Italy and in pre-1958 France), or it may take an intermediate situation (as in West Germany and in post-1962 France). However, by and large, the situation of multi-partyism is not appreciated for the reasons of its tendency to bring instability, disorder and anarchic trends of pre-modernisation period which sometimes establishes a line of similarity between multi-partyism and non- partyism. As Duvergerpoints out: "Multi-partyism is often con- fused with absence of parties. A country in which opinion is divided amongst several groups that are unstable, fluid, and short- lived does not provide an example of multi-partyism in the proper sense of the term: it is still in the pre-historic era of parties; it is to be situated in that phase of general development at which the distinction between bi-partyism and multi-partysm is not yet applicable because there are not yet true parties." The study of party system reveals more astonishing features when attention is paid to the cases of under-developed or developing countries of the African and Asian regions. Party system in such countries is a product of historical circumstances. While European political parties emerge as 'internally created' phenomenon in response to the growth of democratic trends like extension of franchise and parliamentary system, the political parties in a subject country came into being and developed as 'externally created' institutions. That is, parties came into existence not for the sake of running the government but for the purpose of fighting for national liberation. They had an anti-foreign character. They not only -laid stress on the significance of indigenous factors but, I n many cases, refused to cooperate with the ruling foreign power in its proposed system of parliamentary democracy. Sometimes, the anti-foreign tirade mounted so high that the colonial power outlawed a nationalist organisation and thereby forced it to operate in a clandestine or underground form.

The emergence of party system in a colonial country witnessed the coming up of some anti-nationalist organisations as well to counteract the growing force of a nationalist party. This happened either due to the policy of 'divide and rule' pursued by the colonial power or due to the resentment of certain ambitious leaders against the 'entrenched leadership' of the elite of the nationalist organisation. The case of Muslim League in India affords a leading instance in this regard that came into being as a pampered child of the British colonial genius and that obtained the leadership of Jinnah who had already developed a very critical attitude towards

the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi. As a result of this unfortunate trend of events, the force of natonalist movement became weak and the country had to suffer from the disasters of territorial disintegration. As Joseph Ia Palombara and Weiner observe: "The expansion of the League into a mass movement was clearly associated with an integrationist criss that ultimately resulted in the partition of the sub-continent. Elsewhere in Asia religious, linguistic and tribal minorities have often organised political parties in opposition to the nationalist movement and advocated special protections within the framework of •an accepted colonial rule, or else favoured the creation of several nation-states where there had previously been none."

One more characteristic feature of the party system in a subject country of Asia and Africa is that a nationalist party came into being as a small body of men determined to oppose their colonial masters or serve them in a way of their own choosing as far as possible. Here developed a situation of mutual adjustment and also of mutual tug-of-war. in case the nationalist party agreed with the constitutional gifts of the colonial power and showed its readiness to embrace parliamentary democracy, the nationalist party could not develop as a mass movement and it remained hardly anything else than a small elite nationalist organisation. However, where this elite felt dissatisfied with the achievements of its influence upon the colonial administration, it strove for the expansion of its membership more and more to have a mass base and to struggle for the availability of more and more opportunities to wrest power in its own hands. It is due to this tug-of-war between the nationalist organisation and foreign power that the nationalist leaders remained divided between moderate and extremist sections, while ultra-extremists often resorted to violent activities to overthrow the alien regime.

The historical factor exercised its impact upon the party system of the developing countries even after the advent of independence. The biggest nationalist organisation held power after the exit of the foreign colonial rule and established 'quasi-democracy'—democracy under one party's dominance. It set up its all-powerful rule without formally outlawing opposition and the specific interest groups of the country sought to operate within the framework of this nationalist organisation. However, the enjoyment of power in the absence of healthy opposition made this organisation more and more corrupt and the gradual loss of legitimacy entailed the decline and doom of the very organisation which ultimately meant the replacement of even that truncated democracy by the rule of the military elite.

Political developments of many countries (like Egypt, Pakistan, Burma, Indonesia and Bangladesh) confirm this rule The exceptional case of India where the Congress party found its rejuvenation under the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi after the great split of 1969, repeated in 1978, affords the solitary instance where the biggest nationalist party having a glorious record of its role in the freedom movement could re-emerge through the democratic process of parliamentary elections. Different is the case of several Asian and African countries where nationalist parties "often found it relatively easy to establish one-party system and place extraordinary restrictions on civil liberties precisely because no organised group in the society with any measure of popular support was committed to the maintenance of a competitive framework."

Operational Dimension of Party System : Peculiar Case of the Communist Party

Party system provides normal means of fighting political battles and its existence is universal, although some exceptions are found relating to very 'primitive' societies, or where the powerful elite employs institutionalised techniques to ruthlessly suppress structures of a party system.39 However, the cases of both 'primitive' societies and ultra-totalitarian polities are not very realistic, because there is hardly any 'primitive society' worth considering within the framework of comparative politics and that there can hardly be a regime that holds the capability of running the machinery of government without the mechanism of the party system, Even military regimes, after the consolidation of their dictatorial rule, form their own party (as Arab Socialist Union in Egypt and Golkar Party in Indonesia) and gradually seek to legitimise their held in the name of this organisation designed to establish national integration and better administration on democratic lines as far as possible. So many factors relating to the processes of social their definite impact upon the operation of party system in every country, whether democratic or totalitarian, developed or developing. It "is this ubiquitous tendency for parties to emerge in one form or other that leads us to think that there do exist conditions of technology, communication, and organisation that make the political party itself a strong probability in the contemporary world."

What strikes us at this stage is that even a dictatorial system may not uproot the structures of a party system in entirety. The party system exists even under the iron-law of dictatorship: opposition parties either live underground to work for the overthrow of the esab1ished regime, or cleverly operate like organised interest groups within the framework of the party in power. No amount of repression can terminate the existence of opposition elements.

Totally outlawed parties assume a clandestine form to hatch and prosecute conspiratorial activities (as F.L.N. in Algeria) adversely affecting • the long-range political development of a country. Moreover, any deliberate endeavour to suppress the party system totally leads to political instability and compels the powerful elite to convert itself into a party of its own so that other elements may be accommodated. Resultantly, a mono-party system emerges to force all dissident elements either to change their strategy by manipulating to sit inside the sleeve of the official organisation or drag the situation towards the mutilation of the men in power in a revolutionary upheaval. The vanguard of a party is just a shrewd device to hoodwink the people in general, or to coerce them into forced submission, or to sacrifice their opponents at the altar of 'socialism'.

However, any attempt in the direction of the 'simplification of a complex party system' cannot be identified with the case of ruthless suppression of all opposition parties. In the former case, the official party (as P.N.I. in Indonesia before 1965) tries to arrest the 'disease' of multi-partyism, though in the interest of its own power it still leaves some room for other 'dissident' elements to coalesce with others so as to manipulate their configuration and thereby operate to have their programme. In the latter case, a deliberate effort is made to efface the existence of every shade of opposition. The change in the electoral method of the President of the Republic in France in 1962 is clearly an example of the former type where the new arrangement (amounting to amendment in the Constitution without the utilisation of proper procedure) forced many small parties and splinter groups to come together and thereby reduce the gross multi-partyism of the country.

Development of the systems of communications and technology has its own impact upon the rise and growth of party system. Better services of transport and communications enable people of a country to have wider contacts. This process facilitates the task of making bigger organisations. Nettle rightly contends that knowledge evaluations, being the main criteria of cu1tira1 'evil, are meaningless except in the context of communication structure. It is owing to this that the Indian National Congress gathered more and more popularity and widened its base by including within its fold leading nationalists from all parts of the country. However, it ought to be made clear that the process of communications has a political significance of its own. While the free process of communications is the hail- mark of a democratic system, its controlled flow is seen in a totalitarian country. Free press, radio aid television communicate news to the people to enable them to form their views according to their standard of judgement, while a totalitarian order keeps monopoly over the media of communications. As

a result, totalitarian communication "directs the inflow of information to a single political structure and limits the outflow of communication to the purposes of the communist elite." Facts of leading to the emergence and operation of party system are governed by the process of modernisation Historical and political crises materialise and respond to the situations which operate in this regard to mould the configuration of party system . Since party system has an extra-constitutional character, not written -rules formulated by a constitutional convention or a legislative assembly as such, as evolution of healthy traditions is required to substantiate the phenomenon of political modernisation. In the absence of healthy conventions, party system remains vitiated by the evils of defections, counter-defections and growth of splinter groups all making the party system a baleful phenomenon of representative democracy. It would thus appear that it's the occurrence of political crises of systematic magnitude at a point in time when sufficient modernisation has taken place to provide conditions for party development that causes parties to emerge."

However, the elite in power, in the form of a junta or a clique identifying itself with the state, may not be likened with a political party for the reason of its being monolithic in orientation and hostile to any shade of opposition. It endeavours to hinge on the central point of 'total integration' and its 'arsenal of instrument for political control includes everything from mild pressure to organised terror.0 Whether the constitution specifically prohibits the formation of another political party or it keeps silent on the question though with the same intent (as in China), in such a political systems, the state itself "is an instrument of a monolithic •party which has ideological goal—the total use of power for the restructuring of the society's social and economic system." The apologists of the system claim that it serves a double purpose— single party is both an elite and a bond. Its aim is to replace the traditional elites with new elites—to create a new ruling class, to unite and to shape the political leaders capable of organising the country, for the masses cannot govern themselves. Through its youth organisations, their hierarchy, and the channels which take their members into the party itself, or by its organisation of controlled methods of entry into party after a waiting period, sponsorships and tests, the party reforms a sieve which retains the elite in its meshes. It instructs them: at the same time, it makes them capable of fulfilling their tasks: it also organises them in a permanent fashion; it gives them a structure and a hierarchy. the elite thus chosen and prepared can fulfil its role of leadership having seats everywhere, from the Council of Ministers to the smallest local or special committees;• from the Civil Service to the Trade Unions.

Critical Estimate: Party System—An inescapable necessity

The party system has its own points of strength and weakness. First, we take up the case of its merits. It is said that parties are in accord with human nature. Since people differ in respect of their ideas, beliefs and commitments, they have different political parties. The successful prosecution of democracy demands a successful party system. Far from being in conflict with—the theory of democratic government, party system is the mechanism which renders the latter feasible. "A modern democratic State without this somewhat artificial and yet essential unanimity would become a brawling chaos of individual Opifliofl.18 Party system avoids the risks of direct legislation. _ If parties "always distort public opinion in some degree, they also prevent the still larger distortion caused by sudden waves of excitement...party organisations are inclined to check political vagaries..." It is on account of the party system that elections are made easy and possible and legislative excellence is promoted. "The existence of a party of opposition, with a programme fairly within the limits of a possible public opinion, is a bulwark against the tyranny, not only of a despot. While defending the case of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Vyshinsky says : "Each organ of authority being formed by a procedure at democratic and logical, is responsible to its, electors and is bound to execute their will while at the same time it is also responsible to superior organs of authority and bound to fulfil all their orders provided. they are given within the limits of their respective jurisdiction." Bryce thus sums up the value of party system: "The parties keep a nation's mind alive as the 'rise and fall of the sweeping tide freshens the water of long ocean inlets so few people think seriously and steadily upon any subject outside the range. of their own business interests that public opinion might be vague and ineffective if the party searchlight were not constantly turned on.

The party System has its demerits too. It is described as an unnatural political phenomenon. Members belonging to different parties, as Leacock says, remain in a state of 'wilful inconvincibility with individual judgment frozen tight in the shape of the party mould. It creates factionalism as it "tends to make the political life of a country machine-like or artificial. The party in opposition, as it is sometimes called the outs, is always antagonistic to the party in power or the ins." The talent of the people is ignored on account of party politics and the interest of party is given precedence over the interests of the nation. Hollowness and insincerity get encouragement. The vision of the party members is narrowed and their individuality crushed with the result that the evils of favouritism, nepotism and spoils system are multiplied. The system of administration is de-stabilised on account of rapid changes in the position of parties. There is wastage of money, explosion of opportunity to self-seekers

and excessive pandering to the masses. Marriott rightly fears that party allegiance, if carried to excess, "may easily obscure the claims of patriotism. Concentration upon the business of vote catching may tempt party leaders and party managers to ignore or postpone the higher call of the country."

Though the subject of party system may be concluded with a brief enumeration of fts merits and demerits, two more points should be emphasised at this stage. First, the idea of 'partyless democracy' is purely utopian. It has nothing more than academic significance. Such a theory having its roots in the political philosophy of the American Federalists like George Washington and James Madison and finding its reasoned argumentation in the works and utterances of recent Indian thinkers like Mahatma Gandhi, M.N. Roy, Acharya Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan is far from the world of political reality. As Brown says: "Demands for a 'partyless democracy' are utopian. Parties are the main institutions through which responsibility of the rulers is enforced. If parties are unable to perform this function, then other institutions whose purposes are similar will likewise fail." Second, though there has appeared abundant literature on the subjects of elections and modern representative government, a standard theory of political parties 'is still lacking. As a well-known authority on this subject says: "It is at the present time impossible to give a valid description of the comparative functioning of political parties: yet it is essential to do so. We find ourselves in a vicious circle: general theory of parties will eventually be constructed upon the preliminary work of many pro- found studies; but these studies cannot be truly profound so long as there exists no general theory of parties. For native answers only when questioned and we do not yet know what questions this subject demands".

Pressure Groups

Groups are naturally the first type of structure which we en- counter in the analysis of political systems. But the study of groups raises very serious practical and theoretical problems. This is because groups are not such part of the study of politics: we are interested in groups to the Extent that they enter the political process, but not in the groups themselves. Some of them may be involved so often in politics that they cannot easily be separated from political life : but even these are not wholly in politics. Conversely, however, any group, or almost any group, is involved from time to time in the political process. Thus, we become concerned with practically all the groups which exist in society.

Recent studies of the role of pressure groups in the sphere of modern empirical political theory have appeared as a refined version of the philosophical and deductive theories of pluralism. Here the atomistic-liberalism of Lock & and the idealistic collectivism of Green that had their clear manifestation in the works of great pluralists like Figgis, Maitland, Cole and Lasici have been replaced by, what may be called analytical pluralism of David Truman, V.0. Key, Jr. and Earl Latham who have taken inspiration from Bentley's The Process of Government published in 1908. The group, theorists, as they are called, take it for granted that society is a mosaic of numerous groups living in interaction with each other. Curiously, the groups make claims on the government and the government, in turn, acts as the adjuster or the balancer of the interests of the social groups. The result is that each of the major social groups "tends to associate itself with a distinctive interpretation of politics or ideology."2 The emphasis on the dynamics as well as the processes in group theory "is essentially a criticism of the formalism and static quality of the institutional approach to political analysis that was prevalent in the early twentieth century. In addition, the tenacious insistence of group theorists on the central position of the group was a reaction not only to the atomistic individualism of the so-called classical liberals but also to a kind of simple psychologist that purported to deal with social events in terms of human ideas and ideals without a very adequate theory of perception."

Group Theory: Meaning, Nature and Functional Dimension

This theory shows a great deal of interest in the internal organisation and processes of various groups and discusses questions relating to their boundaries, size, territoriality and other forms of integration. Matters dealing with the degrees of organisation, patterns of control and fluidity of membership are also taken into consideration. Society is taken as a mosaic of groups living in interaction with each other and the government is described as a form within which the group struggle can proceed in the presence of certain over-arching boundaries and limits. According to group theorists, the government can be distinguished from other groups in terms of the mechanics and processes of adjustment they provide for the purpose of handling the ongoing struggle for political interest groups.

At this stage, a pertinent question arises as to what a group implies. In simple words, a group means a collection of individuals. However, in terms of group theory, it has a different connotation. According to Bentley the author of this theory a group "means a certain portion of the men of a society, taken, however, not as a physical mass cut off from other masses of men, but as a mass of activity, which does not preclude the men who participate in it from

participating likewise in many other group activities. "o Truman says that a group is a collection of individuals which "on the basis of one or more shared attitudes, makes certain claims upon other groups in the society for the establishment, maintenance, or enhancement of forms of behaviour that are implied in the shared attitudes. The shared attitudes constitute the interests."6 Though one may discover certain points of difference between the views of Bentley and Truman, i may be pointed out that, according to both, group "is a mass of activity directed by interest, and the social system, which consists of a large number of groups, marks the arena for the interaction of group activity."

A group, for the reason given above, has an interest of its own and it also represents a pattern of process rather than a static form. As such, a group can emerge only when the interactions among its individual members are both relatively frequent and sufficiently patterned to produce directional activity. It should be noted that groups are also different from each other as regular and coincidental or 'categoric' and the fact that the same 'individuals may belong to various groups, and they also do so, makes it amply clear that the activity particular to the group is more important than its structural composition. What binds the individuals of a group is the interest— a shared attitude concerning a claim or claims to be made by one group upon certain other groups in a social system. Bentley has laid great emphasis on the element of interest, because it leads to the 'organisation of groups'. It is because of this very element that one can imagine a large number of interests that have not found expression in any group and, for this reason, they remain unrepresented until they find such expression. Keeping this in view, we may talk of the 'potential' groups and those that are in the stage of 'becoming' so.

The group theory, thus, leads logically to a particular concept of the social system and of political behaviour and it is through the social system that the various groups seek to realise or maximise their interests. The society "is a single universe of groups which combine, break, federate, 'and form coalitions and constellations of power in a flux of rest1essaJterations and is kept going by the push and resistance between groups." Like other behaviour lists, the exponents of this theory "are interested in the fact that the society keeps going and, in order to explain how it can keep going in spite of the perpetual conflict among groups in which each is frantically pursuing its own narrow self-interest, the theory of a kind of automatic balance of power is brought in, the theory of the balance of the group pressures as Bentley has described it."

From what we have seen above, some salient features, as so elaborately discussed by Young, may be thus pinpointed :

1 . A group is seen as a mass of activity and not as a mere collection of individuals and also as a patterned process rather than a static form.

2. A group lives and acts in the midst of group interactions that are relatively frequent and sufficiently patterned to produce directional activity.

3. A group has an interest of its own that should be studied positively. The interest of a group is taken to be the sum of its policy oriented and directional activities.

4. A genuine group should be distinguished from a coincidental collection or a 'categoric' group and that the individuals hold simultaneous memberships in a number of groups with varying degrees of intensity.

5. The real core of the group approach is found in the analysis of the interaction process of the very large number of groups that make up a social system.

6. The state of society at any given time is constituted by the balance of the group pressures.

7. The strength of a group varies from others on account of several factors like number of the members, intensity of concern and forms of organisation.

8. All group activity cannot be taken as 'political'; it is non-political as well. Politics is involved only when the groups make their claims through or upon the institutions of the government.

9. The government is concerned with the establishment of regularised adjustment process for handling the struggle among political interest groups.

10. In addition to functioning as an adjuster of the over-all group struggle in society, government tends to harbour a variety-of-groups that are themselves often in conflict with each other.

According to this theory, society is made up of groups and the government is represented by them as playing the role of a mediator in the struggle among groups and the source of rules and restraints. The government "functions to establish arid maintain a measure of order in the relationships among groups." Action, according to Bentley, is always and invariably a group process—never found in one man himself, it cannot be stated by adding men to men. It must be taken as it comes in many men together b men in groups. Society, nation, government— legislation, politics, administration— all are comprised of groups of men, each group cutting across many others. Moreover, these groups are in a state of perpetual inter- action with each other, and politics "consists in the shunting by some men of other men's conduct along changed lines, the getting of forces to overcome resistance to such alterations, or the dispersal

by one grouping or forces by another grouping." The group theorists find a great stabilising force in the operation of several social groups. The competing groups that make up society are seen as participating in an unconscious balancing process. The vast mosaic of groups involved in the process of interaction and competition and the existence of the divergent lines of cànflict guarantee that all individual groups will be kept in check by the simultaneous activities of othçr ' groups. Another stabilising force also stems from the phenomenon of overlapping or cross-cutting memberships. The individuals belong to various groups and they are not prepared to give their undivided support to one particular group at the expense of their association with all other groups. Above all, the balance within a society is powerfully supported by what the group theorists call the rules of the game, or, what Bentley calls, 'habit background'. The rules of the game "are seen as unorganised though widely accepted interests that set up certain criteria of acceptability for the conduct of inter-group conflict and that are capable of active organisation in the event that these criteria are seriously violated. In formal terms, therefore, these rules are potential groups of a very powerful sort."

The study of the existence and operation of pressure groups in every political system, whether democratic or totalitarian, developed or developing, has over the last few years emerged as a subject of much interest. The writers have taken pains to highlight an 'anonymous empire' or a new dimension of relationship between the individuals organised in groups and the state. The group theorists have repudiated the contentions of political philosophers of state absolutism like Hobbes and Rousseau who idealised state authority at the expense of the role of social groups by denigrating them respectively 1as 'worms in the body politic' and 'forces of obstruction between the individual and the general will'. Indeed, this form of study has raised interesting issues for the twentieth century political organisation and enthused a number of empirical political scientists to discover hitherto obscure material in order to ex-examine the nature of politics from the standpoint of the theory of interest articulation. Finer observes: "Today, so strong and persistent are these interest groups in pressing claims for laws and administration that political scientists have almost lost sight of the millions of individuals who are not members of them.

The group theory of politics may be subjected to these lines of criticism :
1 . It is said that group theorists have used certain important terms like 'group', 'access', 'interest', 'equilibrium' etc. without giving a precise definition of all of them. It is also found that there is no unanimity among the group theorists on the standard meaning of these terms. For instance, Truman does not agree with the interpretation of Bentley that group means a

relation' between men or a process of adding man to man. It is not made clear whether a particular interest leads to the creation of the group or the group itself may have a creation of some specific interest. Though we may understand that every group tries to have access to the decision-makers, it is not clear whether the role is played by the groups outside the-government as well. How the group theorists would explain a situation in which President Nixon, for example, took a decision on the advice of his Secretary of State like Henry Kissinger: Whether Kissinger is a man or a group who influenced the actual decision-maker of the United States.

2. The group theory may be taken as half-correct and half- incorrect if we closely examine the actual functioning of a government. All decisions of a government are not taken under the pressure of groups. While some decisions are definitely made on account of the pressures exercised by the interest groups, others are not. The role of other factors like consideration for the good of the people, or feelings and ideas of the people, or character and temperament of the nation may not be entirely lost sight of. It is clear that group theorists "have tried to banish reason, knowledge and intelligence from the governmental process, which, according to them, is governed only by force, tension and pressure. While one may agree with the group theorists in holding that a great deal of politics is made up of pressure, force, intimidation and self-interest, it would be difficult to believe that reason and logic are complete strangers to the decision- making process."

3. The group theory lacks the quality of goal orientation. It simply tries to study things as they are without telling us as to what should be the goals of our social life. It also fails to tell us as to how changes take place in the social and political system. According to this theory, man is reduced to the level of a creature of material interests whose mission in life is nothing more than to struggle for the protection and promotion of certain mundane interests. Group theory, like other empirical theories, may be criticised for, what I called, 'implied reductionism'. Even its empirical character can be challenged in view of the fact that it has nothing to tell us about how changes take place in the political life. Hence, it is pointed out: "A theory lacking in the very definition of goals certainly is much less capable of explaining social change. It is surprising that while group theorists are all the time talking of 'masses of activity' and 'dynamic processes', which implies, that change is one of the fundamental facts of the group theory, there seems to be no attempt to use the theory for the understanding, explanation, or direction of any fundamental systemic changes. Changes envisaged by the

theory are primarily within the limits of stability-oriented system an4 refer, at their maximum, to the shifting balance among individual groups within the system."

4. Last, the group theory is excessively 'cultural bound' in the sense that it is, indeed, any outgrowth of the American political process. Truman had no reservation when he defined the very term 'group' as "a part of the American politics so intimately related to the daily functions of those constitutionals groups—legislature, chief executives, administrative. agencies, and even courts—that make up the institution of government and that the latter cannot be described adequately if these relationships are not recognised as the weft of the fabric."

Young thus points out : "This problem seems to be a natural outgrowth of the over-riding interests of many of the leading group theorists in American political processes: In short, the principal conceptions of group theory seem tobe peculiarly relevant to a highly differentiated, economically modernised, and largely capitalistic social system such as the United States.

Pressure Groups: Meaning and Nature

The politics of pressure groups hinges on the psychological foundation of self-interest. It is the cardinal factor of self-interest that forces men to be in unison with other 'like-minded' ones in order to enhance their position and power to the point of gaining recognition, legitimisation and realisation of their specific interest. That is, it depends upon the fact that "a man's skin sits closer to him than his shirt. And so men think more carefully, as a rule, about their immediate concern than about their general welfare; they are more likely to perceive their own interests in politics than the larger frame- work. However, the interests of a man are many and multifold. He lives not in a 'universe' but in a 'multiverse' of interests, unless he is a recluse or a man living away from the life of his community. Keeping this in view, it is noted that the study of pressure group politics must be made within the general framework of man's diverse interests and issues coming out of their interaction, inter-relation and interpenetration. As J.D.B. Miller says : "The individual is then a universe of interests; their. orbits intersect, their influences upon him vary with time and circumstances. It is the exceptional man (in a developed society) who serves only a single interest all the time."

It follows that the individuals live in a ''multiverse' of interests. They have many interests and struggle for their protection, furtherance and realisation. A social whole is a 'vast complex of gathered unjon'2 some of which are clearly organised bodies, while others are

amorphous collections of individuals having ephemeral existence or appearing only at certain times. As a member or supporter of a political party, an individual may agree to reduce his independence to the position of a cog in the machinery of a political organisation, yet he may keep himself free' to move in and join other 'para-political' organisations called pressure or interest groups for the protection and promotion of his interests. These basic divisions are inevitable and permanent, but the social system manages to accommodate them and keep them in some sort of balance, though uneasy, as the situation of balance changes its pattern from time to time. Through the interpenetration and interplay of various conflicting interests, people, in the main, "learn to live with one another, through a sense of interdependence, through a sense of what is possible, and through the intervention of the forces of law and order."

It may now be possible to frame a simple definition of the term 'pressure group'. It is employed "to describe any collection of persons with common objectives who seek their realisation through political action to influence public policy. Still more simply, an interest group is any that wants something from government." Prof. McIver says : "When a number of men united for the defence, maintenance or enhancement of • any more or less enduring position or advantage which they possess alike in common, the term 'interest' is applied both to the group so united and to the cause which unites them. In the sense, the term is most frequently used in the plural, -implying either that various similar groups or advantages combine to form a coherent complex, as in the term vested interests or that the uniting - interest ; maintained against an opposing one, as in the expressions conflict of interest or balance of interests. Interests so understood usually have an economic-po1itcal character.' A pressure group has been defined as "an organised aggregate which seeks to influence the context of governmental decisions with- out attempting to place its members in formal governmental capacities." Thus, the important aspects of the pressure group activity "are that pressure groups are firmly part of the political process and that they attempt or enforce or change the direction of government policy, but do not wish, as pressure groups, to become the government. They range from powerful employer organisations and trade Unions operating at the national level to small and relatively weak local civic groups trying to improve local amenities.". A peculiarly American interpretation of the term 'pressure groups' has been given by Henry A. Turner who says: "By definition, pressure groups are non-partisan organisations which attempt to influence some phase of public policy. They do not themselves draft party programmes or nominate candidates for public office. Pressure associations do, however, appear before the resolutions committees of the political parties to

urge the endorsement of their programme as planks in the parties' platforms. They often attempt to, secure the endorsement of both major parties and thus remove their programme from the arena of partisan controversy. Many groups are also active in the nomination and election of party members to public offices.'

Pressure groups play their part in every political society. It would be worthwhile to enumerate their characteristic features to highlight their different dimensions and areas of operation in order to understand the working of a modern political system from a micro-angle of vision. An enquiry in this regard starts with the pre-supposition that practical or applied politics is a matter of continual tension, of unstable equilibrium between various conflicting interests of the people. Any attempt in the direction of considering as to how these interests take their shape to emerge in the form of political forces having their definite impact upon the nature and working of a political system naturally becomes a matter of great significance. Keeping in mind the picture 3f organised groups operating in a political system, the characteristic features of pressure groups may be enumerated thus:

1 . A specific interest is the root of the formation of a pressure group. It follows that there can be no group unless there is a specific interest forcing the individuals to actively resort to political means in order to improve or defend their positions, one against another. As birds of the same feather flock together, individuals having a common interest come together to fight for the protection and promotion of their interests. As this fight requires active participation for the sake of potential articulation, it becomes essential that the members of a group have a serious and stable base. That is, there is no group at all where a body of people take things non-seriously, or they disperse after signing a resolution or witnessing a football match. In the true sense, a particular organised group "claims to represent, not only those who are actually members of it, but also all those who are potentially members of it, by virtue of some common characteristic which they share with the groups."

2. Pressure groups play the role of hide-and-seek in politics. That is, they feel afraid of coming into politics to. .play their part openly and try to hide their political character by the pretence of their being non-political entities. It sometimes creates the problem of their political character and it becomes a matter of dispute to say whether a particular group is a political entity or not as it seems to confine its interest to the domain of economics or sociology. The part played by them for the sake of expediency leads to the problem of their role identification. It may, nevertheless, be pointed out that the role of pressure groups

dwindles between the poles . of full politicisation like that of political parties and also non-politicisation like that of economic or cultural organisations. Eckstein is very right in his assessment that pressure group politics "represents something less than the full politicisation of groups and something more than utter de-politicisation.

3. The above point leads to the issue of differentiation between a pressure group and a political party. . While the latter is a bigger organisation committed to certain principles and programs- -and plays an open role in the politics of a country, the former has a limited clientele and. strives to play the role of either a splinter group within a political party or shifting its loyalty and support from one part to another and, at the same time, pretending its aloofness from politics. However, both have a political complexion. While a political party plays politics by virtue of its profession, a pressure group does likewise for the sake of expediency. They, for this reason, resemble each other in being "informal and extra-constitutional agencies that provide a good deal of propulsion for the formal constitutional system."

4. Keeping in view the degree of political involvement, pressure groups may be termed either 'sectional' or 'cause' groups They may also be called political and semi-political groups. They are political or sectional groups when they have a long- range interest and strive to have a part in the political process for the common needs of their members which are not of a transient kind. In contrast, cause groups are formed for a very short occasion to protect or propagate a certain belief, as religious or humanitarian, and all of their activities are by no means related to the process of governmental activity. While the former "represent a section of the community" and their concern is confined to looking after the interest of their members (as farmers or labourers or businessmen), the latter represent some belief or principle (an abolition of capital punishment) and "seek to act in the interest of that cause."

Viewed in a wider perspective, pressure groups may be classified into four parts. First, there are 'institutional' groups (like government departments) which exist to perform functions and keep the govern mental process in operation. Second, there are the 'non-associational' groups based on class, kinship, religion or other traditional characteristic bases of communication being informal, or intermittent. Third, there are 'anomie' groups appearing in the form of spontaneous uprisings like demonstrations, processions, marches, riots, etc. Finally, there are 'associational' groups formally organised to represent the interests of particular persons also to enjoy the advantages that such association provides in dealing with other political structures. This fourfold categorisation of the pressure groups, as made by G.A. Almond, covers exhaustively the case of political articulation of interest groups.

Existence and Articulation of Pressure Group Politics

If politics means the reconciliation of interests by the role of group' pressures, it becomes all the more essential to examine the forces which have their impact upon the governmental process by means of their potential articulation. Believing that many pressure groups, unlike. political parties, are not solely political organisations and that they do not possess the tendency to prefer politics at every turn of time, it is yet to be admitted that they provide a significant channel of popular representation. They are, in short, second or auxiliary circuit of representation.36 A study of pressure groups after the study of party system makes a sister-analysis of the fact that while the party system provides political representation, the network of pressure groups and their operation -'constitutes the functional part irrespective of the fact that by no means do all such groups, or even a majority of them," normally have the slightest concern in what the government is up to; but at any point of time, they might be so concerned and might wish to try to influence its policy."

In order to examine the existence and articulation of pressure groups in various countries of the world, we may classify world political systems into four categories—presidential, parliamentary, presidential cum-parliamentary and totalitarian. First, we take up the case of a country having presidential system of government like the United States where the legislaturc and executive are separated from each other and, for this reason, the pressure groups have to exercise their influence upon two organs of the government separately. They have their eyes fixed mostly on the President who is the virtual ruler of the country and when they fear some frustration, they apply their potential articulation though the legislative bodies with the result that there is pressure and cross-pressure to bear upon the government. Lobbying assumes a very serious proportion to act as a counter bias to the authority of the President and thus we often notice the cases of deadlock between the President and the Congress. Even if the-legislature and executive are found to have a similar outlook going to the detriment of the interest groups, they have a resort to judicial intervention to make that executive order or legislative enactment null and void. Moreover, in the absence of a strong and well-organised party system the legislators and the President as well as his ministers do not work according to the 'official' party line which not only affords them ample freedom of action but brings about a marked line of difference between an individual's political behaviour and group action. Thus, there "is the paradoxical situation that the most popular theory is one of individualism as the correct basis of political action, whereas actual political practice depends very much upon group intervention."

The same degree of freedom of action for the interplay of pressure groups is not allowed in a parliamentary system of the British model where political parties on the basis of their numerical strength form either the Government or the Opposition and run their organisation on the basis of strict discipline. Besides, the party commanding majority in the popular chamber forms the government and thereby implements its policy and programme as given in the party manifesto or announced at the platform. And yet it does not imply that there are no pressure groups in Britain. Sir Winston Churchill once frankly admitted: "We are not supposed to be an assembly of gentlemen who have no interests of any kind. That is ridiculous. That might happen in Heaven, but not happily here."

The main point of difference between the American and British patterns of government is that in Britain, unlike the United States, the "pork-barrel is kept locked up in 10, Downing Street." The machinery of legislative process at the Westminster is propelled not by the force of pressure groups emerging in the shape of open or clandestine lobbying hut by the decision-making agency of the executive (cabinet) which formulates the policy of national administration and makes the Parliament and the entire administration run accordingly. It is a different thing that the party in power accommodates the interests of a particular group in its programme and thereby frustrates the advantages of others, as instead of legislation "depending upon pressure groups, it depends upon whether, the Government (and their civil servants) want to introduce it, and how- ever much the Government finds it convenient to consult with inter- ests affected, it insists that the policy shall be determined by itself.

In the British political system the functions of the interest groups and political parties "are sharply differentiated. Interest groups articulate political demands in the society, seek support for these demands among other groups by advocacy and bargaining, and attempt to transform these demands into authoritative public policy by influencing the choice of political personnel, and the various processes of public policy-making and enforcement. Political parties tend to be free of ideological rigidity, and are aggregative, i.e., seek to form the largest possible interest group coalitions by offering acceptable choices of political personnel and public policy. Both interest group systems and the party systems are differentiated, bureaucratised and autonomous. Each unit in the party and interest group system comes into the 'market', so to speak, with an adjusting bargaining ethos. Furthermore, the party system stands between the interest group system and the authoritative policy-making agencies and screens them from the particularistic and disintegrative impact of special interests. The party

system aggregates interests and transforms them into a relatively small number of alternative general policies. Thus, this set of relationships between the party system and the interest group system enables choice among general policies to take place in the cabinet and parliament, and assures that the bureaucracy will tend to function as a neutral instrument of the political system.

Pressure groups play a very powerful, and also a very irresponsible role in France not because her political system s quasi-parliamentary but because French people have a different temperament and their sectional interests "tend to take precedence over the national interest."13 It is, in other words, owing to the fact that this Country has never accepted the full implications of parliamentarism like the people of Britain but retained a peculiar situation of the predominant position of the National Assembly before the de Gaulle Constitution of 1958 and of the President after the termination of the Fourth Republic. However, the groups in France has a very striking feature in that while they are 'solidly organised', they "are also divided that they often fail to generate a common strategy. The multi-party system of France with traditions of violent revolutions is responsible for making the position of institutional and anomic groups more important than that obtaining in Britain. The Communist Party has its groups in the trade union organisations and certain institutional groups (like the Catholic Church) have their colonies in the political parties (like CFTC) with the result that the parties and pressure groups interpenetrate each other. In fact, the significance of institutional and anomic interest groups "is directly related to the uneven effectiveness of associational interest groups, the absence of an effectively. aggregative party system, and its fragmented or isolative political culture. Parties and interest groups in France do not constitute differentiated, autonomous political sub- systems.

This type of articulation of interest groups has resulted in blurring the borderline between social and political systems and accentuating the tendency of high incidence of anomie interest articulation, what the French people call 'poujadism'. Though a country of Europe having much of a parliamentary system of government even under the Fifth Republic, the lobbies of France "are quite similar in their methods of action to American lobbies. They give financial support to candidates; they place their spokesmen in the legislature and in the Civil Service; they have their own journals and hand out news releases in an attempt to sway public opinion to their point of view; they often exact pledges from the candidates they support and sponsor study committees in the legislatures to promote their own interests.

Almond in his paper on a comparative study of interest groups and the political process further puts: "When parties control interest groups they may, and in France do, inhibit the capacity of interest groups to formulate pragmatic specific demands; they impart a political-ideological content to interest group activity. When interest groups control parties, they inhibit the capacity of the party to combine specific interests into programmes with wider appeal. What reaches the legislative process from the interest groups and through the political parties are, therefore, the 'raw' un-aggregated demands of specific interests, or the diffuse, uncompromising, or revolutionary and reactionary tendencies of the Church and the movements of the right or left. Since no interest group is large enough to have a majority, and the party system cannot aggregate different interests into a stable majority and a coherent opposition, the electoral and legislative processes fail to provide alternative effective chokes.

The result is a legislature penetrated by relatively narrow interests and uncompromising ideological tendencies, a legislature which can be used as an arena for propaganda, or for the protection of special interests; by veto or otherwise, but not for the effective and timely formulation and support of large policy decisions. And without a strong legislature, special interests and ideological tendencies penetrate the bureaucracy, and undermine its neutral, instrumental character." A comparison of British and American pressure groups creates the impression that they "only have overweening power in parliamentary systems when the element of parliamentarism is not strong enough to withstand them." Now we take up the case of a country having totalitarian form of government. It is wrong to assume that pressure groups have their operation only in a free and democratic country. These groups do exist and operate even under a totalitarian system with the difference that they "tend not to be independent: the embodiment of the goals of the system by requires the creation of ' new associations which do not have any internal legitimacy and thus rely on the political system to grow and to be maintained." In contrast to the situation of a democratic country, pressure groups in an authoritarian system are allowed a very circumscribed role and serve merely "as instruments of the state for securing ends which are state-determined, or they may become part of the facade of government for legitimising decisions". As a corollary to the above case, we may refer to a system of one party's monolithic position in the midst of weak and disarrayed opposition. Such a political system is quite different from the totalitarian model for the obvious reason that here opposition is not forbidden. Such type of 'dominant non-authoritarian party systems' are usually to be found where nationalist movements "have been instrumental in attaining emancipation. The line of difference between a totalitarian system and a political system run by a single powerful political party lies in the fact that while

pressure groups operate in the former by means of intrigues, denunciation, passing the buck and other such oblique method they operate in the latter without facing the onslaughts of purge and suppression and discover their place within the structure of the party in power.

Finally, a reference should be made to the developing societies where pressure groups do exist though in a rudimentary and poorly organised form. The. techniques they often adopt are of a very crude type. When a serious crisis comes, the military supervenes to finish the obtaining order and establish its dictatorship., by virtue of its coherent organisation, similarity of outlook and the capacity to organise the coup. In such a society other interests "may be power- less to move because of their lack of organisation and disciplin; they will have to come to terms with the colonels, but will retain some strength, since the colonels cannot run the state without at least some co-operation from them."

Whether it is a free or a totalitarian, a developing or a developed society, the existence and articulation of interest groups cannot be ignored, though it may be manifest or latent, specific or diffuse, general or particular, instrumental or affective in style. It is manifest when it is an explicit formulation of a claim or a demand; it is latent when it takes the form of behavioural or mood cues which may be read and transmitted into the political system; it is specific when it takes the form of a request for a particular legislative measure and a subsidy; it is diffuse when it takes the form of a general note of dissatisfaction or resentment; it is general when the demands are couched n general class or professional terms and it is particular when they are put in individual or family terms; it is instrumental when it takes the form of a bargain with consequences realistically spelled out; finally, it is affective when it takes the form of simple expression of anger or gratitude etc.

Critical Appreciation

The existence and articulation of organised interest groups in every political system has been dubbed as a sinister development, an exercise in partial as opposed to total representation and the inter- play of unprincipled and corrupt forces undermining the existence of what Rousseau called 'general will'. In the politics of pressure groups it is the shrewd and corrupt leadership which enjoys a position of special advantage. Then, the behaviour of these groups is hardly democratic cither towards other groups operating in the society or even towards those which come to render their support on some occasions. The organisation of leadership and other hierarchical units operates in the hands of unscrupulous persons indulging in quite selfish and irresponsible ways. Their game of hide-and-seek in politics brings about a

situation of their difference with political parties with the result that they cannot be held to account for their policies, their leaders cannot be turned out of public office and punished at the polls. Finally, it narrow interests effectively organise, important and socially significant ones go unrepresented. The battle between producers and consumers, for example, is notably uneven.

Various pressure groups operating in a political society are viewed with moral indignation and alarm owing to their sinister penetration in the mechanism of modern representative system. It is further charged that the technique of lobbying, as practised by these groups; constitutes a whole congeries of abuses, corruption and fraud manifestly weakening people's faith in the system of popular government. While referring to the sinister interplay of pressure groups behind the legislative process in the American Congress, Woodrow Wilson discovered that the wishes of the Congress were really the wishes of the interest groups. It is also contended that any degree of appreciation of the role of pressure groups in a modern political system becomes reminiscent of the Fascist corporate state. Hence, it "may be said that the genuine representative significance of all organisations arising in connection with. men's activities within the total context of modern industrial life has become sufficiently apparent to make it necessary to reckon them as pretenders to the throne of government. Where the interests are sharply divided, certain of these groups have proceeded to take over the. government and to revolutionise it in such a way as to suit their particular needs and conceptions. Such efforts have been accompanied by dictatorial methods relapses into crude techniques of government which violate the fundamental promises of constitutional

Despite these objectionable points, the utility of pressure groups in the working of a modern constitutional system cannot be dismiss- ed. Exponents of the group theory of politics and others subscribing to the school of modern pluralism emphasise the fact that there is an organic relationship between the individual and the group owing to which the individuals - "are the heirs of the head, while the groups are limbs on which the body depends." If political parties are inevitable in the working of a modern democratic system, - pressure groups have their own significance in the political process. Any fear of contradiction between individual and group political participation can be avoided by looking upon politics as a process rather than as a simple relationship between formal structures of a political system. it is unwise to purge or finish conflicting interests, rather the task "remains of distilling the general public interest out of the often- conflicting special interests which constitute part of the whole.".

It leads to the satisfying conclusion that there is every need for keeping control over the interest groups in order existence and working to the best possible extent. It is necessary to assure that; while making their contribution to the political process of a country, the groups are not allowed to Jose their touch with their own member, or other groups of the society, or doing anything against public interest or general good. The case of public recognition of group participation carries with it the understanding that interest groups conform to the same standard of political behaviour which is expected from the individual electors.. True that the unorganised individuals at the ballot box have often become power- less to achieve anything in contrast to the highly organised lobbies with their direct access to the centre of power. but there remains nothing to prevent the state from reforming and regulating the pressure groups which exist and enjoy power without responsibility.

The real significance of pressure groups in a political society must be examined in the light of two main considerations. First, they are of numerous advantages to political parties and thereby contribute to the sustenance of the modern representative system. Power corrupts man and power alone checks power. The pressure groups thus act as a powerful check upon the arbitrary exercise of power and as they themselves are prone to abuse their share of power, it is essential that various interest groups be allowed to act as a check upon one another in order to. establish and sustain the system of 'checks and balances.' it also implies that when the groups act as a check upon the government, the latter must see to it that the activity of group politics is saved from deterioration to the extent of vitiating or destroying the political system itself. As Verney holds : "The use of the term 'pressure groups' suggests that outside interests are obtaining special favours at the expense of the public, but it is also true that groups help to prevent Governments from imposing unfair burdens on the unorganised masses. Moreover, where party programmes tend, of necessity, to be general, group policies and proposals can be usefully. specified." Second, the utility of pressure groups must be examined in the light of new approach to the meaning of politics. Politics is a struggle for power creating conflicts and tensions and then discovering and offering their solutions and adjustments. As Miller says : "Politics rests ultimately upon the conflict and accommodation of interests, brought into be ing by the manifold inequalities of a society; broadly speaking, political decision will follow the course along which it is led by the relative strength of interests.

Review Questions:

1. Explain the meaning and nature of a political party
2. What are the determinants and functions of a political party
3. What are pressure groups? Explain their meaning and nature
4. What is group theory? Explain its nature and functional Dimension

CHAPTER 6
FEDERALISM

Objectives:
- To understand the concept of federalism
- To understand the successful organisation of federal government

Topics:
- Federalism
- Meaning and Dynamic Implications
- Successful Organisation of Federal Government

Traditional federal theory for, the most part, simplified this picture into two major aspects. First, it paid little regard to the inter-dependence of the Centre and the various units, because it effectively ignored the direct influence of government's policy output on the policy outputs of other governments through persuasion, influence and bargaining, and implicitly assumed that the demands made by each electorate on its respective government were separate and independent as between governments. Second, while recognizing differences between units, it assumed implicitly that the policy outputs of the various units are, in general, sufficiently similar that the units may be regarded as a collectivity

Political systems may be classified in terms of the methods by which the powers of administration are distributed between the government of the whole country op the one hand and regional or provincial governments that exercise authority over the parts of a country on the other. On this basis, they may be designated as 'federal' and 'unitary' models, though the possibilities of a political system having a queer blending of both may not be ruled out. In a federal system, the powers of the government "are divided between a government for the whole country and governments for parts of the country in such a way that each government is legally independent within its own sphere. The government for the whole country has its own area of powers and it exercises its authority without any control from the governments of the constituent parts of the country, and these latter in their turn exercise their powers without being controlled by the central government. In particular, the legislature of the whole country has limited powers, and the legislatures of the states or provinces have limited powers. Neither is subordinate to the other; both are co-ordinate." In a unitary system, on the other hand, the legislature of the whole country "is the supreme law making body in the country. It

may permit other legislatures to' exist and exercise their powers, but it has the right, in law, to over- rule them; they are subordinate to it." As pointed. out above, there may be a political system in which the elements of both are blended in a strange way that the position of the Central government is far stronger than that of the regional governments. Such a system may be designated as 'quasi-federal'.

Federal System: Meaning and Dynamic Implications
Political systems of the world are either federal or unitary or a queer mixture of both. While countries like the United States, Switzerland, Australia, South Africa, Canada and India should be placed in the category of 'federal states', others like Britain, France, Sri Lanka and China are the examples of 'unitary states'. Different from both, some countries having a system based on the principle of the division of powers along with very high level of concentration of powers in the hands of the Central government are treated as 'quasi-federal'. The case of the Soviet Union falls in this category. It is a different matter that a great writer like Wheare places India too in this category. It is, however, certain that the elements of centralization of powers are unmistakably present in every federal system of the world and, for this reason, no political system can now be described as the model of an ideal federation. .

Federal system, according to Daniel Elazara, provides a mechanism which 'unites separate polities within an over-arching political system so as to allow each to maintain its fundamental political integrity" This mechanism is constituted by the distribution of powers between two governments, general and constituent, in a way designed to protect the existence and area of authority of both which, according to traditional norms, are considered to be 'co-ordinate.

Obviously, the basic aspect of federalism is pluralistic inasmuch as its fundamental tendency, as Max lildebert Boehm points out, "is harmonisation and its regulative principal is solidarity." If federalism signifies the existence and operation of a double set of government; it naturally requires that basic policies be made and implemented though understanding and negotiations in some form so as to ensure participation of the central and provincial governments in the decision-making and decision-executing processes. Federalism thus provides a convenient and workable arrangement to unite 'political' forces with certain 'apolitical ' forces ideological, sociological, psychological etc. which, if carried to extremes in certain situations of dissatisfaction and desperation, may become highly anarchical

demanding solution of the issues, in question, without much loss of time. It is evident that a federal system in the face of a tendency to establish 'complete Unitarianism' becomes a principle of opposition.

A penetrating study of the principle of federalism reveals its flexible and cooperative character in such a way that neither level of government "is wholly dependent on the other, nor wholly in- dependent of the other." However, a degree of difference does appear in the traditional and modern interpretations of this term. True that a total policy output in a federal system comes as a product of complex process of interaction between central and provincial governments which share decision-making and decision- executing process, the traditional interpretation of federalism, for the most part, implies an obsolete situation of inter-relationship which is hardly in tune with the latest orientation of constitutional systems.

Modern federal system falls somewhere between. a unitary government and a loose association of sovereign states. It has developed a difference of kind with a co federal model; it has brought out a difference of degree with a Unitarian system. The national and regional governments may be 'coordinate' according to traditional constituting 'independent political systems' at the general and constituent levels; according to modern interpretation, both constitute a single federal system.

 An eminent writer on the 'federal principle', K.C. Wheare, defines it as 'the method of dividing powers so that the general and regional governments are each within a sphere overlapping sub-systems. As a result of this, decision-making and decision-executing processes are influenced and determined not only by means of mutual participation of national and regional governments but also by means of the bargaining power and skill in the midst of 'supreme' position of the centre by virtue of air unmistakable tendency of centralization of powers and 'superior' capacity of the units inter se by virtue of their respective position demographic, strategic, political, economic etc. It is further inferable from the study of the latest trends that if the centre dominates the units, the units themselves dominate one another, including the Centre, in a particular situation through the mechanism of co-operative federalism by virtue of their bargaining skill and capacity in addition to their geographical size, population, natural resources, strategic situation etc. Ronald may aptly suggests that unit inequalities "are reflected in the Central government's decision-making functions in two ways. First, because of superior number and perhaps, wealth, that part of the central government's electorate which resides in the large units is likely to exercise stronger

influence over the Central government's policy output than that which resides in the small unit; second, to the extent that relative size and wealth affect the bargaining capabilities of unit governments, the government of the large unit is likely to have more\influence over the Central government's policy output than the government of the small unit. The policy output of the Central government is, there- fore, more likely to correspond to the interests of the large unit than to those of the small unit." True, both central and provincial governments exercise their powers in a way enabling them to neutralize or turn to their advantage those conditions which they find uncongenial for their purposes, but "to what extent they are able to do so will always depend upon their legal power, political influence and resources." Furthermore, the traditional theory of federalism should be restated in the light of new materials ranging from studies and interpretations of constitutional arrangements to the facts and figures covering the areas of centre-state relationship in their diverse ramifications. In other words, the study of federalism should be, while dealing with the case of a revised approach to the study of cooperative federalism in a country like India, Prof Amal Ray thus furnishes a plausible point : "Reorientation of federalism is primarily based upon cooperation between two sets of authority in the task of attaining national objectives. Increasing discussions between the centre and the units would provide basis as in India for agreement on broad policies and programmes. The units cannot claim absolute autonomy within their jurisdiction, because in the closely integrated contemporary societies, the central and state spheres defy exact demarcation, and often they overlap.'' Inter-Govern- mental Relations in India : A Study of lndian Federalism, re-interpreted as "a constantly changing process resulting from the inter-action of mass political parties, widespread bureaucracies, a large number and variety of interest groups, and elected governments with expanded functions rather than as a static model or formula for political organisation.

Essential Conditions for the Successful Organisation of Federal Government

Contra distinguished from a unitary state, a federal state is one in which a number of co-ordinate states unite for certain common purposes. As such, federal system "partakes of a character of a treaty. It is an arrangement made between certain bodies politic which wish to retain certain rights. Thus the constitution will state either the rights that are to be retained by the federating units or the rights that the federal authority takes over." Since federal state , as the character of a 'composite' state, its successful organisation requires the existence of some important conditions that may be enumerated under:

1.   Geographical Continuity: A federal state must have a geographically contiguous area. The size of the state may be very large or very small. What is needed is that the entire area of the state must be geographically contiguous. If the parts of' a state are cut off from one another by a big distance, federal system cannot be successfully worked out there. For instance, a country like Indonesia cannot have a successful federal system as she is an archipelago and her worst enemy is her geography. , Such a system operates successfully in a vast country like the United States, India and the Soviet Union for the obvious reason that these countries have the advantage of geographical contiguity. It is on account of this that a federal state expects its unit to take part not only in its own affairs but also in the affairs of the national government.

2.   Community of Interests: What provides cementing force to a federal system is the community of interests in the sphere or spheres of language, religion, culture and the like. A federal system desires, as Dicey said, a 'union' and not a 'unity'. It stands on the principle of 'unity in diversity 'It aims at forging a union and creating a 'united nations. The cases of the United States, Switzerland, Canada and India illustrate that in each one of them there are prevailing diversities that are sought to he preserved.

3.   Similarity of' Social and Political Institutions: It is required that the pattern of governmental systems should be the same both at the national and regional levels. That is, the centre and the states must have the same form of government. We find in federal countries like Canada and India that the parliamentary form of government prevails at the Centre and also iii the provinces or states. Likewise, in the United States, presidential form of government prevails at the Centre and also in the States. When we see the case of Switzerland, we find that the 'republican' form of government prevails at the national as well as cantonal levels. In the USSR, the same soviet socialist republican system prevails at the central as well as regional levels.. Whether the constitution specifies the powers of the central government and assigns residuary powers to the states (as in the United States), or it enumerates the powers of the provinces and assigns residuary powers to the Centre (as in Canada) or it clearly mentions the powers of both (as in Australia and. India), it is required that the same form of government prevails at both the levels. It is, for this reason, provided .in the constitution that the Centre may veto or invalidate any action of the regional government in case it violates the basic features of the national constitution.

4.   Absence of Marked Inequality: As far as practicable, the units of a federal state should enjoy equality of status in respect of their powers though not in respects of their territorial and demographic compositions. It is not possible that all units of a federal state are of equal size, or they have equal density of population. It is, however, essential that there

should be no inequality in matters relating to the distribution of powers, as far as possible. For instance, all the units of the, United States send equal number of representatives (2 each) to the upper house of the national legislature. Different from this is the case of India where the number of deputies sent by the State governments to the Rajya Sabha varies from I to 34. The factor of inequality creates dissatisfaction that has its harmful effects on the political behaviour of the provincial governments. Care should also be taken to remove regional economic imbalances. If one area of the state is very rich and economically advanced and the other very poor and backward, it will lead to agitations as we find in the movements for the construction of a steel plant in Andhra Pradesh or for the creation of a separate state of Telangana they do not desire to lose. his is of these social or cultural differences, riding sense of unity to bind the gather not to deny that, in spite there must be an over- diverse people to-

5.   Socio-Economic Development: A federal system cannol' work successfully unless there is social and economic development of the country. It is required that the people are educated and modernized so that they can keep themselves away from the influences of parochial tendencies. Economic development is also equally necessary. As federal system is a very expensive arrangement, it needs ample economic resources to run the double set of governments. Moreover, it is also essential that social and economic development cover the entire country. There should be no imbalance in this regard. In case the people of one part of the country are well-developed, socially and economically, others will resent it and then come out with their demands for speedy social and economic development that may culminate in their movement for seceding from the union.

6.   Political Ability: The political ability of the people has its own significant part to play. It refers to a developed political culture. Unless the people have their own ideas, beliefs and commitments to the values of their political system, no political system can work successfully. More so, in a federal state, it is required so that the people understand the meaning of their allegiance towards a double set of governments. National leadership must be in the hands of those who have national image and who can infuse the sentiments of national integration in the minds of their people.

7.   Political and National Integration: The people of a federal country should be integrated politically as well as nationally. The political map of the country should be drawn or redrawn in a way that the local urges and aspirations of the people for having a separate state of their own are reconciled with the over-all requirements of national integration. Then, people should learn that the interests of the nation as a whole over-ride their primordial loyalties. If so, then divisive movements would be arrested and the people saved from the disastrous effects of those force that balkanize a country.

8. Centre-State Co-ordination: There should be a happy coordination between the central and regional governments. Though the areas of their respective jurisdictions are specifically earmarked, it is also required that some inter-linking arrangements be devised so that the two governments remain connected with each other. Federalism should have a co-operative and not a competitive, a persuasive and not a coercive, a flexible and not a rigid and, above all, a positive and not a negative character. The annual conferences of the heads of central and regional governments may be suggested as a concrete step in this direction.

9. Reasonable Trend towards Centralisation: As already pointe4 out, centralisation of powers has become an unmistakable trend in every federal system of the world. No federal state can live. in its 'true' or classical form under modern political conditions. The regional governments must appreciate this dynamic' political truth and thus, instead of resenting, they should accept the reasonable moves of the central government, no matter they go to attenuate the scope of their authority to some extent. At the same time, it is required that the central government should not take to the course of finishing the autonomy of the states. The move of the central government must be 'reasonable', that is, it should be supported by, some plausible justification. For instance, the President of India may convert the federal system into a unitary one during times of emergency (vide Art. 352). Such a drastic step amounting tp the extinction of the autonomy of state governments can be taken only when the country is faced with the conditions of war, external aggression or armed revolt.

If these conditions are existent, a federal system can work success- fully. We may cite the leading instances of some countries like the United States, Switzerland, Australia and India. The case of a communist country, ' like the Soviet Union, is basically different where the network of the Communist Party plays its own part in making the federal system run successfully. The USSR affords the singular instance where the units have been given the power to secede from the Union. It has, however, never occurred, nor can it ever occur, as the 'leading and guiding role' of the Communist Party is always there to put its heavy hand on such a move if it ever arises.

Unitarian Federalism In view of the fact that federalism as an organisational device cannot be divorced from the requirements of the age, its classical model has been changing so as to be more and more in tune with a new pattern that is neither purely federal nor unitary. It may conveniently be designated as Unitarian federalism. It is for this reason that every constitution taking a federal premise too seriously, can hardly escape becoming anachronistic.17 A historical study of the growth of federal systems brings home the political

truth that what has happened during the last few decades is that the central governments have developed their powers more and more intensively at the expense of the areas originally allotted to the regional governments. It is due to this that the national governments "have grown in importance in comparison with the regional governments, because they began from nothing and because the' were endowed with control over most of the important matters with which regional governments have to deal. The main forces that have contributed to the growing strength of the central government at the expense of regional governments seem to have been fivefold—war politics, depression politics, welfare politics, techno politics, grants-in-aid politics and party politics. The horrible conditions of war and economic depression demand unitary control for the effective protection of national interests. They impose heavy financial burdens which the national government a1one can bear. The conditions of war and economic depression, though temporary, are detrimental to the growth and stability of a federal system. Similarly, the idea of social welfare state has enjoined upon the national government to increase its scope of activity more and more to eradicate gigantic evils of poverty, unemployment, disease, starvation, ignorance, squalor, etc. One may say that the ideal of welfare state is not inimical to the growth and stability of a federal system as social service activities are shared by the national and provincial governments. However, experience being the better guide shows that regional governments have not been able to realize the commitments enshrined in the constitution and political resolutions due to lack of economic resources• and largely corrupt and inefficient public services.-As a result, the national government has increased the area of its activity despite its telling effect upon the functional, if not structural, aspects of a federal system.

Techno politics means the study of political institutions in the light of scientific and technological developments having their impact upon the working of governmental machinery. Every government is run by the experts persons wel1-traincd in the art of public administration bureaucracy occupies a very significant position so much so that what people take as their representative government virtually becomes dependent on them. It may be discovered that not the leaders chosen by the people but the experts and the technicians stress goals of development and lay down policies and programmes. As these specialised services are mostly provided by the national government, the regional governments have to carry out the plans, programmes and instructions prepared by the technocrats working behind the rulers of the central administration. Such a role of technical experts is bound to have a reprehensible form when the public servants are recruited and controlled by the agencies of central

government while they serve and draw their salaries and emoluments from provincial governments.

The factors of war and economic depression belong to a temporary phase of national or financial emergences' and the factor of techno politics has an invisible, though not so reprehensible, role. How- ever what smacks of the highly attenuated autonomy of the component units of a federal state is the politic of grants-in-aid. The regional governments live in a perpetual condition of financial difficulties. They have meagre resources; more than that, they are forced to collect money that they cannot spend. They are also forced to spend, ii a particular way, the money that they do not collect. In many cases, the provincial governments have to stand like 'beggars' at the door of the centre. Po1itics having its own part in this regard is discover able in the policies of the shrewd leaders of the central government who either liberalize or tighten the rules and norms of financial grants to oblige, appease or punish certain regional governments.

Finally, we come to the point of party politics A political party plays the role of an extra-constitutional agency in the running of a federal system. Though a formal federal system in all respects, the very system• is reduced to a Unitarian model when. political parties run the machinery of general and regional governments' without federalizing their own character. The case of Congress party in India affords a shining case in this Command of this party (consisting of top leaders running the central government) is the final authority in matters like composition of the Union and State ministries, selection of the Prime Minister and Chief Ministers, imposition or revocation of emergency in a State under Art. 356, etc. The result is that both the Union and State Governments in India are virtually controlled by the all-powerful party. On account of this fact, our federal pattern has become a matter of form, while its spirit has become unitary under the rule of the party in power.

The relationship between federalism and party structure manifests that the organizational-structures of political parties tend to correspond to the governmental patterns under constitutional democracy. This "is very natural, since. it is one of the purposes of the parties to gain control of the government; therefore, if the government s federally • structured, parties must adapt themselves to such a structure."19 However, as seen above, this point lacks 'universal applicability. The case of India under Congress rule at the Centre and in most of the States defies the case of a comparative analysis of party systems vis-a-vis federal models. Likewise the case of a communist country stands out with the only difference that

while in a democratic country, like India, the dominance of one party is a matter of accident, in -a communist country it is a matter of normal constitutional sanction. It is because of centralisation of powers that some systems of the world have been designated as 'quantitative', 'quasi', or 'super' federalisms. The Soviet Union has been regarded as a quasi-federal state where formal division of powers between the central and regional governments has been interpreted as a method of social integration through the mechanism of the Communist Party rather than of perpetual diversification- pertaining to the development of a pluralist society. In such a political system, though federal in form, the basic stress is on cultural autonomy rather than on political self-government. Likewise, Indian federalism has been described, by a critic like Prof. Where, as a unitary system with certain subsidiary features of a federal model rather than federal model with certain subsidiary features of a - unitary state.

A word of caution may, however, be added at this stage against the wrong notion of regarding federalism as obsolescent. To say that the rights of the regional governments are 'dead', or that nobody cares for the 'finished' autonomy of the states is to misread the fact of Centre's standing like a colossus. It is a mis-argued statement that a federal system is out of date in view of the fact that it preserve hard and fast regional divisions in a world where social and economic life is becoming more and more a single whole. The fact is that federalism offers plurality to the singularity of life in a way that diverse factors are harmoniously reconciled. As political institutions must change according to the needs of the age, federalism is no exception and a term like Unitarian federalism has . been coined to represent not a unitarian model tampered with a federal process but a federal model revised in the light of new contains of the age and requirements of the people. Federal government "is still desired by some regions in all the federations. There is no conclusive evidence that federal government is to be no more than a stage in the process towards unitary government."

Co-operative Federalism

A federal system not only stands for the distribution of powers between central and regional governments, both autonomous (in the traditional sense) in their respective spheres, it also desire sincere co-operation between the two set of political organisations in order to ensure that the ideal of co-ordination and complete administration of the divided spheres is attained as effectively as possible. It is needed for the obvious reason that there is the area of inter-regional relationships disallowing any component unit to keep itself completely off from others in the interest of administrative efficiency and nationalist sentiments. Wheare rightly visualizes that if each region- al government "keeps completely to itself, many matters will

suffer from diversity of regulation, and government itself will be less efficient because the experience of other states will have been neglected."

Hence some agencies of inter-governmental cooperation have been devised in various federal systems of the world. Taking the case of the Australian federal system, we find Inter-Provincial conference and Premiers Conference, the latter being very influential by virtue of its annual meeting. In the month of May when State Premiers and Commonwealth Prime Minister meet and discuss matters of general and, particular interest, ranging from financial resources and relations to constitutional reforms. The Loan Council may be cited as another important agency in this regard with the only difference that while Premiers' Conference has its roots and record of evolution In usages and conventions, it has a statutory status. The Governors' Conference in the United States and Dominion-Provincial Conference in Canada are the cases of similar institutions in the two leading federal states of the world.

The study of Indian federalism reveals that while such a headline has nowhere been mentioned specifically in the text of the Constitution, it is well understood that our constitutional system has envisaged 'a series offederal institutions' that would be appropriate to the political environment. The language of Art of the Constitution is quite specific to illustrate Indian federalism as 'a Union of States'. Moreover, our constitutional system, apart from pertaining to the formal federal framework, necessitates 'a process of bargaining' between Central and State Governments in which experiment, cooperation and persuasion are requisitioned both to testify generally accepted norms and the usual procedural patterns of interaction between national and state governments.". That is, our constitutional system stands on the foundation of cooperative federalism presuming interdependence of national and regional govern ments of a federal union instead of granting them absolute independence in the allotted sphere pertaining to a classical federal model.

The fact that Indian constitutional system stands on the foundation of 'cooperative federalism,' what Morris-Jones designates 'bargaining federalism', It is traceable in the existence, formal as well as tacit, and operation of various institutional agencies (whether provided in the text of the Constitution or set up to implement its ideals as enshrined in the Preamble and Directive Principles of State Policy) as Planning Commission and National Development Council (NDC), Finance Commission, . Inter-State Council, Zonal Councils and a host of statutory bodies for the adjudication of disputes with respect to the use, distribution and control of inter-state rivers, etc. That is, the Constitution envisages the

appointment of a number of high-level commissions, both permanent and ad hoc, for the pacific purpose of reconciling diverse and conflicting interests with the co-operation of Union and State Governments. In other words, our Constitution allows experimentation with a variety of federal arrangements and devices in which inter-dependent Central and State Governments are involved. That is to say, our Constitution allows experimentation with a variety of federal arrangements and devices in which inter-dependent Central and State Governments are necessarily brought together just to make the envisaged system. a successful affair or, in negative terms, to avoid the situation of failure of a great system which has already become 'a source of enlightenment in many Asian and African countries of the world.

In the end, it ought to be kept ii view that, despite formal division of powers, a federal system, what Lees says about the American pattern is equally applicable to others also, "has never been a neat system of distinct governmental activities and functions." There has been no standard way of measuring the degree of centralisation of a particular federal polity and on that basis presenting a taxonomic representation of federal systems of the world.

Critical Estimate

Finally, we may look into the merits and demerits of a federal system. Since it is opposed to the unitary or centralized system of government, the merits of one are the demerits of another and 'vice versa. First, we discuss the case for federalism: Under a federal system, small states may unite themselves into a more powerful commonwealth and thereby obtain certain manifest advantages, both internal and external, which flow from the union without at4he same time- wholly surrendering their separate existences and sacrificing their right to govern themselves in respect to matters which concern them alone. It, thus, combines the advantages of national unity with those of local autonomy and the right . of self-government. In return for this advantage the people are reconciled to the loss of power which they attain through the delegation to the central government of the authority to regulate certain affairs of general interest to all the states composing the union. It furnishes the means of maintaining an-equilibrium between the centrifugal and centripetal forces in a state of widely different tendencies.

It is the only political system which makes it possible to have uniformity of legislation, administration and adjudication throughout the country in respect to those matters concerning which uniformity is desirable and, at the same time, makes arrangements and devices in

which inter-dependent Central and State Governments are involved. That is to say, our Constitution allows experimentation with a variety of federal arrangements and devices in which inter-dependent Central and State Governments are necessarily brought together just to make the envisaged system. a successful affair or, in negative terms, to avoid the situation of failure of a great system which has already become 'a source of enlightenment' in many Asian and African countries of the world.

Review Questions:

1. Explain in detail the federal system.
2. Discuss in detail the dynamic implications of federal system.
3. Explain the concept of Co-operative Federalism

CHAPTER 7
BUREAUCRACY

Objectives:

- To understand the concept of bureaucracy
- To understand the power concept
- To understand the concept of bureaucracy and military

Topics:

- Concept of Bureaucracy
- Liberal and Marxist Interpretations
- Nature and Essential Implications of the System
- The Power Concept
- Bureaucracy and Military

The general spirit of bureaucracy is secret, mystery, safeguarded inside itself by hierarchy and outside by its nature as a closed corporation. Thus, public political spirit and also political mentality appear to bureaucracy as a betrayal of its secret. The principle of its knowledge is, therefore, authority and its mentality is the idolatry of authority. But within bureaucracy the spiritualism turns into a crass materialism, the materialism of passive obedience, faith in authority', the mechanism of fixed and formal behaviour, fixed principles, attitudes, traditions.

The rise and growth of bureaucracy is integrally associated with the emergence of the 'capitalist' state in modern times. If the rise of a bourgeois system at the debris of a feudal order created a 'middle class', the same class swelled the ranks of a new type of executive that represented a switch-over from purely personal service of an absolute monarch to a public service of the state. In this way, the rise of capitalism not only brought about fundamental changes in the social and economic spheres, it brought with it similar transformation in the political or administrative sphere. A gradual but irresistible expansion of the sphere of state activity led to the development of an administrative class that not only served the new democrats, it also concentrated immense authority in its own hands with the result that eventually democracy or rule of the people degenerated. into bureaucracy or the rule of public servants. Growing economic progress entailing from the success of the industrial revolution and new intellectual development together dictated the necessity of

reorganizing the services on a principle and in a manner consistent with the requirements of a growing organisation rather than those of a static feudal state..

Concept of Bureaucracy: Liberal and Marxist Interpretations

Obviously, bureaucracy suggests a middle-class concept as an essential consequence of the bourgeois system. However, it has been viewed differently by liberal and Marxist thinkers. While the former have appreciated it as at best a necessary evil, the latter have frankly denounced it and suggested its replacement by a new type of public services under people's bodies or 'soviets a term used and popularized by Lenin. The leading liberal thinkers of England appreciated the new administrative class that witnessed its rapid growth with the democratisation of the House of Commons after the promulgation of the First Reform Act in 1832. Taking note of this important development, John Stuart Mill realised the necessity of the bureaucratic system in spite of the fact that it clashed with the principles of a representative government. Thus, in 1861 he wrote that the work of the government "has been in the hands of the governors by profession, which is the essence of bureaucracy" and that a bureaucratic form of government "accumulates experience, acquires well-tried and well-experienced maxims, and makes provision for appropriate practical knowledge in those who have the actual conduct of affairs."

However, a highly philosophical appreciation of the bureaucratic system found its expression at the hands of a German thinker. In his Philosophy of Right (1821), he raised the concept of bureaucracy to 'abstract heights, a transcendental entity, a mind above individual minds'. He defined it as 'state formalism', or 'state's will', or 'state's power' or a 'corporation'. Though only one social class, he considered bureaucracy to be the universal class, a synthesis uniting the particularise of civil society with the general interest of the state, the paradigm for meditation between the particular and the universal, between civil society and the state. The exercise of power, according to him, was a mission to be performed for God or society. Public officials shared in that mission by executing decisions made by the sovereign about the nature of 'general interest'."

It may, however, be added here that Hegel's attention is mostly confined to the model of Prussian bureaucracy that was adopted after 1806. In other words, he supplied a metaphysical tapestry to what was given in the Prussian code.
.

As David Beetham says: "Of all the features which Weber regarded as definitive of the modern state and its politics, his account of bureaucracy is the most familiar." Max Weber and the Theory of Modern Politics (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1974), that includes his 'five beliefs' about the foundation and structure of bureaucracy and 'eight fundamental principles' of rational-legal authority. The set of 'five beliefs' includes:

1.   That a legal norm can be established either by agreement or by imposition with a claim to be obedience on the part of the members of a corporate group or organisation. .

2.   That the law is a system of abstract rules convincing all possible cases of conduct within the organisation, the administration of Jaw being the application of these rules to particular case.

3.   The fundamental source of authority in the legal type is the authority to the impersonal order of an officer holding a specifically legitimizes status under the rules with powers to issue commands.

4.   That the person who obeys authority does so in his capacity as a member of the corporate group and what -he obeys is only the law.

5.   That the members of the corporate group, in so far as they obey a person in authority, do not owe this obedience to him as an individual but to the impersonal order. In other words, there is an obligation to obedience only within the sphere of the rationally delimited authority which, in terms of the order, has been conferred upon him.

The eight fundamental principles of rational-legal authority' include.

1.   Organisation of official functions on a continuous rule-bound basis,

2.   A specified sphere of competence and of distinct functions based on systematic divisions of labour,

3.   Principle of hierarchy a lower office under the control and supervision of a higher one.

4.   Trained personnel for the conduct of business,

5.   Complete separation of members of the administrative staff from the ownership of the means of production or administration, with a clear separation likewise in principle of the property belonging to the organisation and controlled within the sphere of office and the personal property of the official available for private use,

6.   A complete absence of appropriation of official position by the incumbent,

7.   The formulation and recording in writing of all acts, decisions and rules, and

8.   The ideal type being the purest form of legal authority or 'imperative co-ordination'..

Thus, the set of 'five beliefs' and 'eight fundamental principles of legal-rational authority' together constitute the 'ideal types' of bureaucracy applicable to all forms of modern corporate groups, whether political or not. Only such a system carries with it certain peculiar advantages like precision, speed, reliability, discipline, continuity, operational uniformity, discretion and provision for the reduction of denunciations of the bureaucratic rule and its replacement with another system of genuine public service under people's soviets ' is contained in the Marxian V view. Marx condemned modern state system as 'bourgeois' and deprecated the institution of bureaucracy as 'a middle class, bourgeois affair'. If' the state is an 'executive committee of the bourgeois class', bureaucracy is its instrument. The bureaucrats sustain the bourgeois political system by holding the power of administration in their own hands. Not only this, the bureaucrat identifies his own interest with that of the state and even• subordinates the latter to the former. V In his Critique of Hegel's Philosophy (1843), Marx said : "As far as the individual bureaucrat is concerned, the aim of the state becomes his private aim, in the form of a race for higher posts of careerism." Elsewhere he says :

"Bureaucracy identifies the interest of the state with particular private goals in such a way as to make the interests of the state into a particular private goal opposed to other private goals." The discredited bureaucratic system would find its termination in a classless society under the 'dictatorship of the proletariat. In his Civil War in France (1871), Marx says that in a socialist society there would be no place for appointed officials, because the people would hold their power in their own hands and exercise it themselves. Lenin supports the same thesis in his State and Revolution (1917) when he says that with the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, there would come to an end the rule of 'privileged persons divorced from the people and standing above the people." The management of public affairs will be in the hands of free and voluntary associations of the people and all public servants will work under them. Moreover, it will be a sort of committed public service. Keeping it in view, Prof. Misra points out : "The communist bureaucracy is thus not only a bureaucracy of public service, but also of political life, an example of administration and politics being fused together, a committed bureaucracy but a bureaucracy none the less. It presupposes the existence of a party state as an absolute condition."

Bureaucracy : Nature and Essential Implications of the System

Although called by different names, good 'and bad, like civil service,' public service, government service, magistracy, officialdom, official despotism, departmental government,

permanent executive, non-political executive etc., bureaucracy means a group of persons (not some mysterious, super-entity such as suggested by the word 'state') who "perform definite functions which the community at large considers worthwhile" These persons enjoy a permanent tenure and get promotions on the basis of merit and seniority. They are expected to be strictly 'neutral' in matters of politics of the country. It may be emphasized that as an army of 'expert' and 'efficient' public servants is indispensable in every political system, there can be no government where there . is no such agency of competent officials to manage and run the machinery of government. However, a government is said to be bureaucratic when it "is carried on largely by ministerial bureaus and in which important policies are determined and decisions rendered by the administrative chiefs of small bureaus. In a wider sense, it means any government, the administrative functionaries of which are professionally trained for the public service and who enjoy permanency of tenure, promotion within service being partly by seniority partly my merit."

In fact, the term 'bureaucracy' is used in a broad as well as narrow senses and, for this reason, it lends itself to multiple usages. In a broad sense, it refers to the totality of personnel figuring on the pay roll of the government from departmental secretaries at the top to clerks and peons at the bottom. Most of the common people are inclined to identify only those public servants with bureaucracy with whom they come in regular contact, because the highest public servants sitting in the far away-offices of the secretariat remote from their world of comprehension. In a narrow sense, the term is applied to those important public servants who occupy policy- making and supervisory positions in the system of administration. In this way, a precise definition of this term would cover "those public personnel engaged in policy and supervisory responsibilities in public administration."

While differentiating the term 'bureaucracy' with 'desk work" and yet realising the element of that ambiguity in its real implications, Prof. Misra does not appreciate the way of identifying bureaucracy with 'civil service', because the latter conveys "a restricted legal sense and its use at times to signify public servants at a higher level only does not cover as full range of public employees as does the term bureaucracy."

While appreciating the term 'desk government', F.M. Marx says that obviously it is a phrase without a terror'. It suggests "forethought and planning, analysis of facts, considered decisions, direction, and co-ordination on a rational basis, predictability or performance, and assurance of results.

.

In fine, bureaucracy is a government of permanent public officials who are neither elected by the people and nor, for this reason, responsible to them, but who play a very crucial part in the decision-making process of the country. They control the real levers of powers. As such, the narrow connotation of this term becomes really significant, because bureaucratic rule, in a political sense, becomes the rule of the elite. "Technically, a bureaucracy is an Impermeable and complex hierarchy, its emphasis being on the principles of organisation, recruitment, education, training, conditions of service, rules of business, and so on. In other words, it deals with the machine and the whole structure of rules designed to keep the machine together. Politically, on the other hand, bureaucracy is a form of government officials either acting as rulers themselves, or coexisting with elected executives, but connected conceptually in all cases with the exercise of authority as members of a class of power elites.

The Power Concept: Elitism and Bureaucracy

A study of bureaucracy not in a technical but in a political sense provides much material to the concept of 'power'. . Once again, we return to the doctrine of political elites and find that the 'iron law of oligarchy' stands substantiated. The rule of the bureaucrats provides evidence to the rule of the minority. Taking account of the actual power wielded by the bureaucrats (top policy-makers and decision- takers), we find that they constitute powerful elites in their own ways.

However, as every governmental system is managed or operated by the mechanism of party system, the role of bureaucracy, in a strict sense that of party bureaucracy, engages our attention. In this way, an attempt to prevent the formation of a single gigantic oligarchy results merely in the creation of a number of smaller oligarchies, each of which is no less powerful within its own sphere. The dominance of oligarchy in party life remains unchallenged."

Max Weber found that though in theory only an impersonal status, a bureaucracy forms at the same time a separate group with- in the state with its own special interests, values and power basis. Its separate interest "lay in the maintenance and extension of administrative positions and power; its distinctive outlook lay in a belief in its own superior objectivity in interpreting the national interest free from party bias; its , power lay in its knowledge and experience in the cloak secrecy with which it concealed its operation.

So confident is the bureaucracy of its power, asserts Weber, that in a mood of sheer arrogance, it treats its political masters like members of parliament as 'vain individual running a 'talking shop' Besides a sense of duty to their office, the bureaucrats cultivate a belief in the superiority of their own qualifications as compared to those under whom they are required to work. All this is sustained by the instrument of 'official secret'. In his view, the most decisive means of power for officialdom "is the transposition of official knowledge into secret knowledge by means of the notorious concept of the 'official secret'. This is simply a way of securing the administration against external control". Referring to the systems of Prussia and Russia, he further says that it is the bureaucracy and not monarchy that is in a position of actual command. "The monarch imagines it is he who is ruling, when in fact what he is doing is providing a screen, behind which the apparatus can enjoy the privilege of power without control of responsibility."

'In short, the whole concept of bureaucracy boils down to this fact that it is the real controller of power. And since it is a small circle of highly influential public servants, it is like a group or elite that plays the most crucial part in the management of public affairs. Proceeding from the Marxian premise that the state is no more than a mere agent of the ruling class, Mosca, Miçhels, Weber and others emphasise that the iron rule of oligarchy is irrefutable. However, differing from Marx, they justify the power-elite concept both as essential sand advantageous to the society. In this way, the start of Mosca and others from a Marxian premise is just like a superficial affair, rather at their hands the contradiction of the Marxian theory of class struggle culminating in the justification of the dictatorship of the working class is a fact. In fine, the power-elite concept of bureaucracy is an attempt to refute the basic premises of Marxism.

Bureaucracy and Military: Similarities and Differences in the Assumption of Power

From what we have said so far, it is clear that like the rule of the elite, bureaucratic government represents a system where participation in the decision-making process is denied to the people at large or to their chosen deputies. it is a body of permanent and expert officials who owe no accountability to the voters or Obviously, it contradicts the celebrated maxims of a, liberal-democratic system. And yet this system is appreciated from the standpoints of spirit, methods and professional character of the administrative personnel. In this way, bureaucratic and military rule come to resemble each other in view of the fact that "among them develop the body of professional civil servants an spirit de corps and a spirit of discipline somewhat similar to those found in a regular army."

Keeping such a point in view, a study of bureaucratic government looks like a corollary to the study of military rule in a certain perspective. Similarity between the two may be established on these grounds. First, both constitute the most literate, advanced and efficient sections of the public servants who lead a developed and westernized pattern of life and thereby become a 'class' or 'cast& by themselves. Their professionalized career and entire pattern of life makes them distinct from the life of the people at large. Second, both have a disciplined and an hierarchical organisation where the permanency of tenure is guaranteed or the promotions take place on the grounds of seniority or efficiency or both. Both are required to be strictly neutral and detached from political matters and to serve their political masters faithfully irrespective of their personal predilections. Last, both develop the tendency, even an obsession, to drag political heads under their influence and to do what the political chief has failed to secure in their judgment. That is, both constitute elite of their own. It is owing to this that some writers on the subject of comparative politics "have pointed out that the army and the bureaucracy are the alternative elites, committed to growth, utility, stability, etc., and if the politicians cannot provide these then one or both of the alternative elites must try."

On the basis of empirical findings, it is asserted that military's motives and its disposition to intervene in the politics of a country either to dictate some policy or take over national administration are not very different from the motives and dispositions of other segments of the bureaucracy. In any political system, the military establishment "tends to develop its own corporate identity and orientation based on a particular mode of life, hierarchy and the traditions and rules under which it has developed and that regulate its behaviour. The sense of identity and conceivably apartness from the rest of the body politic may be reinforced by the unique social, cultural and economic backgrounds of its leaders. Finally, while hitting at the character of the Indian Civil Service in 1945, Jawaharlal Nehru says: "In this land of caste the British and more specially the Indian Civil Service have built up a caste which is rigid and exclusive. Even the Indian members of the service do not really belong to that caste, though they wear the insignia and conform to its rule. That caste has developed some thing in the nature of a religious faith in its own paramount importance, and around that faith has grown an appropriate mythology which helps to main- tam it. A combination of faith and vested interests is a powerful one, and challenge to it arouses the deepest passions and fierce imagination."

If bureaucracy may influence the formulation of national policy, drafting of legislative measures, preparation of the budget and the like, the military in may also i.e. seen interested in demanding the stock- piling of strategic arms, prosecution or suspension of war activities, production of atomic weapons and the like. As specialists in their own field, the military leaders "may believe that they alone are competent to judge such matters as the size, organization, recruitment, and equipment of the forces. In their professional capacity, they may be impelled to establish national security as they see it economically and socially as well as militarily, in the narrow sense of the word. They may seek to convince the civilian authorities that only in the context of certain policies can they guarantee victory. Such views are all consequences of professionalism, yet they have often led the military to try to intervene in politics."

It is true that bureaucracy and military both may be describe as elites in their own ways, at the same time a Line of distinction may be drawn between the two. While military desires to keep aloof from the politics of the country as far as possible and its intervention is a consequence of certain compelling reasons (as we shall see in the next chapter), bureaucracy has an irresistible tendency to wield power. Its hunger for a position of influence in the administration or the country can never be satisfied. In other words, while bureaucracy may be designated as the regular contender for power, military's contention for power is not a rule but an exception. It is, however, a different matter that the latter is in a very strong position to win the game of power. Under any alternative, the bureaucracy itself "is likely to become from time to time an open contender for supreme power in the system. This tendency is most likely to be expressed through the armed forces. The armed forces' virtual monopoly of the means of coercion gives them an advantage over other possible power claimants."

Varieties of Bureaucratic hold: Direct and Indirect, Democratic and Autocratic Bureaucratic government has two principal dimensions indirect or negative and direct or positive. In the former case, it exists • and thrives. under the cover of political or non-permanent executive. It happens when the ministers become tools in the hands of their subordinate officials. The ministers, on account of being like a 'layman', depend upon the support and co-operation of their permanent officials who are 'experts' by virtue of their long education, training and administrative experience. Facts show that in most of the cases a person raised. to the status of a minister, though an expert in matters of politics, hardly possesses qualities of exceptional grasp, courage and ability to keep the self-organized' permanent official under his thumb; in

ninety nine out of hundred cases, he accepts the views of his subordinate and signs on the dotted lines..

The direct or positive dimension of a bureaucratic government may be either independent o coalitional. It is independent where the bureaucrats know no masters over their heads. They are supreme authority; they formulate policies, take decisions and run establishment. Even, military works under their command. In such a system the chiefs of the bureaucratic set up are like a master less man over the entire area under their jurisdiction. The whole army of subordinate public servants swears loyalty and observes accountability to them. While throwing light on the role of 'white bureaucracy' in India during the British period, Nehru says: "The Viceroy speaks in a manner such as no Prime Minister of England or the President of the United States can adopt. The only possible parallel would be that of Hitler. And not only the Viceroy but the British members of the Council, the Governors, and even the small fry who function as secretaries of departments or magistrates. They speak from a noble and unattainable height, secure not only in the conviction that what they say and do is right, but that it will have to be accepted as right whatever lesser mortals may imagine, for theirs is the power and glory."

Viewed from a different standpoint, bureaucracy has two more important dimensions democratic and autocratic. A democratic bureaucracy is one that is ultimately open to public challenge, criticism, scrutiny and the like. The people, the parties, the pressure groups and the press all may scrutinise the role of public servants -and then guilty officials may be suitably punished. Although bureaucrats may enjoy the positions of anonymity and autonomy and their conduct may not be a subject of public debate, but in case some public official commits a wrong, his action must be open to public criticism. In other words, democratic bureaucracies "are controlled by and accountable to public officials, but they are generally more thoroughly protected from direct personal reprisals by rulers.

Different from this is the case of an autocratic bureaucracy. Here bureaucracy is immune from public criticism. Its rule is so ruthless that opposition to its position of power is visited with severe tortures. The legislators, party leaders, journalists and the people in general have no right to criticize the conduct of the high public servants. Obviously, the direct dimension of a bureaucratic government finds its similar part in its autocratic counterpart. Growth is right in holding that autocratic bureaucracies "are subject to massive direct manipulation by the rulers but are far less sensitive to popular pressures from below." In this way, the line of

distinction between these two varieties of bureaucracy relates "not to efficiency or to technical competence but to accountability and control primarily "

Bureaucracy as a Pressure Group in its own right although bureaucracies are primarily regarded as organizations which execute policies assigned to them by the society, they must also be treated as sources of influence upon social policies. The nature of this influence is basically two-fold. First, the members of bureaucracy can give shape to stated policies through the exercise of choice and judgment in administering them. Second, in attempting to affect the objectives and working conditions which the society will authorise for their organisations, members of bureaucracies necessarily engage themselves in pressure politics. Naturally, our attention is engaged by the associations of the bureaucrats that play a very important role in influencing the dec4sion-making process of the government.

This fact was well assessed by Max Weber who said that bureaucracy moulds itself into a special group within the state as per its own interests. So strong is the affirmation of this German sociologist in this regard that he mentions two types of interests that the bureaucrats have relating to their prestige and power. Citing several instances from Prussian and Russian political systems, he suggests a variety of interests like those minimising the power and importance of the national legislature, by-passing parliament and co-operating directly with other organized groups, centralising the activities of local governmental institutions, maximising the secrecy of govern- mental operation, monopolising positions in government as posts for bureaucratic advancement, extending the influence and power of the state externally. All these were interests which the bureaucracy was able to pursue successfully. They are all involved in an interest in power, not merely as a mean to improve administrative performance, but s an end in itself. Hence, the explanation for the rapid development simply in its technical superiority, but also in the pressure exerted by officials in pursuit of their own special interests as a group."

A good number of recent social and political theorists like D.B. Truman and V.0. Key, Jr. have accepted the contention of Weber and then come to hold the view that since bureaucracy is concerned. With the special and limited aspects of public policy, ordinary pressure group to a noticeable extent. It "is a congregating place for individuals concerned with the same objects. Some of these interested individuals become members of the administrative agencies, while others join. groups which look to that organization as a rallying point, and that agency takes a' leading part in representing their interests. In this representative process perhaps the

bureaucracy's most important function is to promote the idea that its special area of concern is important, be it education, air power or mental health. The bureaucracy also promotes special solutions to policy problems in this area. Finally, it promotes. objectives which are of particular interest to its members as bureaucrats. These are matters such as their working conditions, status and compensation, as well as the maintenance and survival of their organization"

This can be verified by looking at a few leading situations. For instance, in the United States, the rote of bureaucracy as a pressure group can be visualised in the clandestine liaison of the departmental heads with important legislators and administrators. It can also be traced in their endeavours' to mobilize support of their own clientele as well as of other similar groups. Countries like Britain, France and Italy are no exception to it. We may refer to several cases hen the associations of. the bureaucrats' take up the issue with their ministers concerned whenever a disciplinary action is contemplated or initiated against a particular high-ranking civil servant. It may be discovered that the top bureaucrats strive to keep clan des- tine connections with important leaders of leading political parties for no other reason than to maintain or grab the positions of influence in the administrative set up of the country.

What must be stated in clear-cut terms at this stage is that bureaucracy operates the levers of power in a democratic country in very subtle and anonymous manner. The fraternity of a civil servant, whenever his colleague is entrapped in some disciplinary action, shows itself in every moment of crisis. It is on account of this fact that the civil servants "have interests, and self-projection of interests is undertaken by highly placed individual officials, and this self-projection of interests brings them into contact with the members of Parliament, especially those who can articulate their interests in the democratic system. When studied from a normative standpoint, a student of this subject may tread the traditional path and say that the concept of neutrality of public services is a very noble affair that includes within itself anything like impartiality, anonymity, obscurity and political aloofness of the public servants.

Viewed thus, bureaucracy is lauded for being a 'neutral' instrument of the power of modern state and, for this reason, one of the strongest bulwarks of democracy, essential to the system of parliamentary democracy where the political complexion of the ruling party is ever subject to periodic changes." Opposed to this is the empirical observation of a good number of recent writers who have thrown light on the politicisation of the bureaucracy. The burden of their argument is that the classical norm of 'neutrality' of public services has broken down."

The breakdown of the concept of neutrality of public services is sustained by the fact of their politicisation, no matter a critical student of this subject may discover variations in the degrees of their connection with the political leaders in different countries of the world. Everything depends upon the factor of their 'autonomy'. Relationship between the bureaucrats and their political heads is like a two-way traffic in view of the facts that both has and tries to protect and promote their interests. Keeping it in view, Prof. R.B. Jam thus defines the term 'politicised bureaucracy'. "The concept of politicised bureaucracy is one which is involved or influenced to any degree, consciously or unconsciously, by overt or by implicit actions, in the streams of the politics of the day whether of the party in power or of the party/parties in opposition. Such an involvement may mean the bureaucratic promotion of special interests of political party at the expense of national objectives. hi a more extended form, it may also be regarded as a type of bureaucracy which uses political parties in furtherance of their collective or individual objectives or which is used by political parties in the achievement of party objectives."

The fact of the politicisation of bureaucracy in developed and developing country of the world has forced us to redefine the related terms of its 'neutrality' and 'commitment'. This writer quotes G.E. Caiden in his support who observes that "political leaders could not. tell to what extent they were exercising political power without extensive feedback, ranging from personal spy systems to airing public grievances. Citizens approach public officials to intercede on their behalf before the political leaders and to seek an exercise of discretion in their favour. Public officials have never been seen as mere catalysts, ciphers. They are political actors and they are expected to be political actors. Political leaders use them for personal and party interests. Qualification for public office depends on compatibility with political leaders. In short the public bureaucracy is politicised."

In simple terms, the concept of the commitment of public services in a liberal-democratic system implies a harmonious relationship between the political chiefs who try to fulfil their electoral promises with a view to contribute their might to the realisation of a welfare state and the public servants who are expected to carry out the official policies . with . real zeal without involving themselves into the labyrinth of party politics. By all means, it is a very ideal position. It requires a new orientation to the attitude and functioning of the civil servants. One may say that it implies their dedication to the provisions of the constitution of the country. if the head of the state is under an oath to protect, preserve and defend the

constitution of the country, so must be the case with all public servants. However, if the word 'commitment' is to he shunned, then a better name of 'political responsiveness' must be used instead.

Basically different is the case of a country having a totalitarian political system where public servants are required to follow the official ideology. Here 'commitment' carries a particular connotation. The party or the junta in power has its own official line and everyone has to follow it with a sense of full dedication. The 'detractors' and the 'deviationists' are 'purged'. In a communist country, for instance, a sort of new movement (called 'cultural revolution') takes place. All public servants are commanded to implement the official policies faithfully, otherwise they are removed from the service and tortured in different ways. The top leadership also instructs its lower cadres to adopt the new 'culture'. New' courses are introduced and fresh instructions imparted that must be followed by all party men as well as by government functionaries. Not only this, all important public offices are given to the faithful elements with the result that the difference between the party cadres and government servants is virtually blurred. Those who excel in all such programmes, they constitute the supreme aristocracy of the party. "Obviously a system so highly organised is possible only under a single party regime when the selection of leaders for the party is tantamount to choosing the leading political strata of the state."

Bureaucracy and the 'third World Perspective

What we have said above, by and large, applies to the advanced countries of the West. A question arises as to what should be said the undeveloped and developing countries of the Afro-Asian and Latin American regions. If bureaucracy is ubiquitous in functional terms, no country of the world study offers a new perspective when we compare the cases of the Third World countries with their developed counterparts in the Western world. The 'ideal types' of Max Weber hardly apply when we study the bureaucratic system a most of the backward countries of the world where bureaucracy is largely a gift 'of the colonial system and, as such, it is not prepared to change its' ways after the advent of independence when authority has fallen into the hands of the native leaders chosen by the people. The undeveloped and the developing countries of the world are faced with a dilemma: clash between the 'new culture' adopted by the political leaders so as to usher in a new socio-economic revolution in the country under the aegis of a democratic constitution on the one hand and the 'old culture' represented by the obdurate bureaucracy not prepared to appreciate the light of change on the other. Not only this, bureaucrats strive to capitalise on the weak position of the party leaders.

The fact of unstable governments is a god-send opportunity for them with the result that bureaucratic hold eats into the vitals of a democratic system. The result is an unholy alliance between bureaucracy and military in certain cases. The failure of democratic experiments in a country like Indonesia, Burma, Pakistan and Bangladesh may be illustrated in this very regard. Prof. C.P. Bhambhri takes note of this fact when he says: "In all political systems, the various centres of power are, involved in competition against each other, with a view to exercising more power than legally belongs to them All centres and sub- centres of political power are keen to extend their zones or influence in the corridors of the government. This kind of competition is very commonly found between the political leadership and bureaucracy. .

If political leadership is weak or is uncertain about its base of support, under such circumstances, the bureaucracy becomes either a victim of indecision or arrogates more powers to itself than form- ally it is entitled to have. The hypothesis is that in a struggle for power between public bureaucracy and political leadership (elected representatives), the former thrives if the leadership authority is weak. Closely connected with it is also the hypothesis that the bureaucracy gets immobilised if political leadership is sharply fluctuating or unstable."

Such a situation forced the democratically elected leaders of India to invoke the notorious appellati6n of the commitment of public services in the country. Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi criticised the character of the public services in the name of their obstructionist attitude towards ushering in a socialist order in the country. While addressing a meeting of the Congress Parliamentary Party on November 16, 1969, she desired that the public servants in our country must be committed to the ideals of democratic socialism as enshrined in the Directive Principles of State Policy incorporated into Part IV of the Constitution of India. She expressed the view that the country would fall into a rut if it followed the British system in which' civil servants were not supposed to be concerned about which political party was in power, nor its ideology. Likewise, Jagjivan Ram, the President of the New Congress, in his address at the Bombay session of- the Indian National Congress repeated the call for a committed bureaucracy in the country. The implications of such utterances were widely criticised. However the real motives of the Prime Minister could be understood after some time when it became clear to all that her purpose was not at all to invoke the model of a communist country rather than to see a fundamental change in the attitude of the public

weight of this observation of Mrs. Gandhi that "only a committed bureaucracy in place of the old, indolent, passive, apathetic and political one could possibly bring out the desired change in the country."

We may say that in all developing countries of the Third World, the constructive role of public services is ardently desired. If the trend of their 'politicisation' cannot beavoided, at least this much can be stressed that their role must be informed by a sense of dedication to the cause of the teeming millions. Keeping it in view, Prof. R.B. Jam has advanced these important points:

I . The processes of policy-decision making are no longer confined to the political executive; they spread over the entire fabric of government, resulting in inescapable delegation and zones of such policy, where the political executive doe and need not come into the picture at all and yet e decisions presumably reflect the ethos of the party in power.

2. The leadership role of public bureaucracy is explicit in all political systems, but it is more pronounced in the setting of developed countries with a democratic constitution. In the context of a large-scale welfare scheme programme under- taken by them as part of modernising process — neutrality is neither possible nor desirable. A certain commitment to the goals and objectives of the State policy is inescapable; neutrality can not be allowed to degenerate into disinterestedness; nor political sterilisation allowed to slip into political desensitisation.

3. In the sphere of policy advice and execution, modern bureaucracy can not afford to remain aloof without involving itself in the prevailing politics. Quite often, as has been pointed out, practical and political considerations are in- distinguishable. In the legislative sphere particularly, the area of demarcation between what is political and what is non-political becomes extremely tenuous.

4. At the top levels, even the performance appraisal of public bureaucracy is done by political heads and an element of political assessment is bound to creep into such rating.

5. As a human being no civil servant can be psychologica1l neutral on issues and problems which confront him; he is a child of his time with a certain degree of subjective bias which simply cannot be eradicated from his judgements.

In fine, in the developing countries of the Third World, the bureaucrats have to find "a reconciliation of a public office holder's dual roles of citizen and official."

Critical Estimate

Following important impressions may be gathered from what we have discussed in the preceding sections:

1. A bureaucratic government is criticised for creating 'red- tapism' by maintaining punctilious exactitude in the observance of rules and regulations of the department, for developing tendency of 'self-aggrandisement' by feeling contempt for the 'amateurs' (ministers) who insist upon meddling in departmental affairs to the great chagrin of their permanent officials, and for sharpening the danger of 'departmentalism' by splitting up the work of each department into a number of isolated and self-dependent sections, each pursuing its own ends without any adequate correlation with the rest.' It all causes undue delay in the discharge of departmental functions and, at the same time, it strengthens the evils of corruption and maladministration.

2. The bureaucrats do not care for the liberties of the individuals. They remain concerned with the grabbing of power in their own hands. They want their own initiative in all matters of policy-making and decision-taking. The will of the people, as eulogised by Rousseau, thus stands dishonoured. "The dependence upon superior authorities characteristic of the average employee suppresses individuality and gives to the society in which employees predominate a narrow petty-bourgeois and philistine 'stamp. The bureaucratic spirit corrupts character and endangers moral poverty. In every bureaucracy we may observe place-hunting, a mania for promotion, and obsequiousness towards those upon whom promotion depends; there is arrogance towards inferiors and servility towards superiors."

3. Bureaucratic government is a very sinister affair. However, more sinister than this is the government where we have a combination of bureaucratic and military rule. Here is a partnership of mutual give and take. The civil servants lack the capacity to rule; the military leaders need an expert and efficient steel-frame of administration run by loyal servants.

When the two coincide, there comes a situation where political authority is shared by both, though the military oligarchs sit at the higher pedestal. As Dowse says : "The reason for this is simple. On the one hand, the army does not have the expertise or the numbers to run a country and if they did run it, it might cease to be an army. On the other hand, he bureaucracy cannot bring down a government : that is the army's task. But when the government has been

displaced, the bureaucracy is still necessary and hence by no means powerless. Thei must be a coalition of sorts, and hence an accommodation between the partner; whatever the conditions of the coalition, the fact of its existence is a certainty."

4. Both bureaucracy and military rule have an insecure range of life when they exist apart; they have a stable and secure duration of existence when they combine to make a coalitional adjustment in the political system. When this civilian- military coalition government comes into being, the bureaucracy remains not merely an instrumental agency but assumes a position what "may be called a power situation in which it has to cast its influence and to generate processes of power on its own behalf and in which it is under pressure from different centres of power in the society which would control it." So, the military leaders reap their part of the dividend. They have a steel-frame of administration to run the machinery of government as smoothly as it is done by a party in power on the mandate of the people. While referring to the peculiar case of Sudan, it is commented that experience "has shown that the authoritarian rule of the military, in con junction with a civilian bureaucracy, is not necessarily the ephemeral arrangement; indeed, it may be a substitute for party government."'
It is undeniable that a bureaucratic government creates red- tapism. and inculcates the feelings of self-aggrandisement in the minds of the permanent officials. It leads to official gangsterism called 'new despotism' by Justice Lord Hewart Bury of England. However, if the bureaucratic government may be denounced for its self-aggrandisement, its weak and docile character like that of a stooge of the minister is equally condemnable. Both situations of extremes are 'unhealthy' either when the minister blindly defers to the views of his secretary, or when the secretary becomes a 'stooge' of the minister. It is also very unfortunate when the civil service becomes the 'handmaid of the politicians'. A pure bureaucratic government is a curse, a bureaucratic government in coalition with the rule of the military elite is a bigger one. The civil service must operate within a liberal- democratic framework in sincere co-operation and harmony with the norms of a social welfare state. What Laski wrote for the parliamentary government of England is a workable ideal for others to emulate those most successful cabinets "have always been those in which a number of dynamic personalities have been balanced by secondary men of this kind."

Review Questions:
1. Explain the concept of Bureaucracy
2. Discuss in detail the power concept of Elitism and Bureaucracy
3. Explain the similarities and differences in the assumption of power

EIILM UNIVERSITY

S I K K I M

Jorethang, District Namchi, Sikkim- 737121, India
www.eiilmuniversity.ac.in