BACHELOR OF ARTS (HONOURS) IN POLITICAL SCIENCE

SEMESTER-IV

CORE-VIII: Political Process and Institutions in Comparative Perspective

CREDIT: 6

BLOCK: 1,2,3 & 4

AUTHOR

Dr. Badrinath Das

CORE-VIII: POLITICAL PROCESS AND INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

BRIEF CONTENTS

CENTRE FOR DISTANCE AND ONLINE EDUCATION, UTKAL UNIVERSITY, BHUBANESWAR

Program Name: Bachelor of Arts (Hons.) in Political Science
Program Code: 010116
Course Name: Political Process and Institutions in Comparative Perspective

Course Code: CORE-VIII   Semester: IV Credit: 6 Block No. 1 to 4   Unit No. 1 to 22

EXPERT COMMITTEE:

Prof. Brahamananda Satapathy, **(**Chairman)

Former Head and Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar

Dr. Smita Nayak, (Member)

HOD, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, BhubaneswarDr.

Seema Mallick, (Member)

Asst.Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, BhubaneswarDr.

Swapna S. Prabhu, (Member)

Asst.Professor, Dept. of Political Science, Utkal University, Vani Vihar, Bhubaneswar

COURSE WRITER:

Dr.Badrinath Das, Faculty in Political Science, CDOE, Utkal University

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY:

UTKAL UNIVERSITY, VANI VIHAR, BHUBANESWAR

C.D.O.E.
Education For All

ABOUT THE UNIVERSITY

Founded in 1943, Utkal University is the 17th University of the country and the first of Orissa. It is the result of the efforts of Pandit Nilakantha Dash, Maharaja Krushna Chandra Gajapati, Pandit Godavarish Mishra and many others who envisioned a progressive education system for modern Odisha.

The University started functioning on 27 November 1943, at Ravenshaw College, Cuttack. It originated as an affiliating and examining body but shifted to its present campus spread over 400 acres of land at Vaniviharin Bhubaneswar, in 1962.

A number of Postgraduate Departments and other centres were established in the University campus. There are presently more than two hundred general affiliated colleges under the University. It has eleven autonomous colleges under its jurisdiction, twenty-eight constituent postgraduate departments, 2 constituent law colleges and a Directorate of Distance & Continuing Education. It boasts of a centre for Population Studies, a School of Women's Studies, an Academic Staff College, a pre-school and a high school. The University also offers a number of self-financing courses.

NAAC accredited in its 3rd cycle with A+ status in 2023. It is a member of the Indian Association of Universities and the Commonwealth Association of Universities.

**CENTRE FOR DISTANCE & ONLINE EDUCATION
UTKAL UNIVERSITY: VANI VIHAR
BHUBANESWAR:-751007**

From the Director's Desk

The Centre for Distance and Online Education, originally established as the University Evening College way back in 1962 has travelled a long way in the last 52 years. **'EDUCATION FOR ALL'** is our motto. Increasingly the Open and Distance Learning institutions are aspiring to provide education for anyone, anytime and anywhere. CDOE, Utkal University has been constantly striving to rise up to the challenges of Open Distance Learning system. Nearly one lakh students have passed through the portals of this great temple of learning. We may not have numerous great tales of outstanding academic achievements but we have great tales of success in life, of recovering lost opportunities, tremendous satisfaction in life, turning points in career and those who feel that without us they would not be where they are today. There are also flashes when our students figure in best ten in their honours subjects. Our students must be free from despair and negative attitude. They must be enthusiastic, full of energy and confident of their future. To meet the needs of quality enhancement and to address the quality concerns of our stake holders over the years, we are switching over to self instructional material printed courseware. We are sure that students would go beyond the course ware provided by us. We are aware that most of you are working and have also family responsibility. Please remember that only a busy person has time for everything and a lazy person has none. We are sure, that you will be able to chalk out a well planned programme to study the courseware. By choosing to pursue a course in distance mode, you have made a commitment for self improvement and acquiring higher educational qualification. You should rise up to your commitment. Every student must go beyond the standard books and self instructional course material. You should read number of books and use ICT learning resources like the internet, television and radio programmes etc. As only limited number of classes will be held, a student should come to the personal contact programme well prepared. The PCP should be used for clarification of doubt and counseling. This can only happen if you read the course material before PCP. You can always mail your feedback on the course ware to us. It is very important that one should discuss the contents of the course materials with other fellow learners.

We wish you happy reading.

DIRECTOR

CORE-VIII: POLITICAL PROCESS AND INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Content

BLOCK-1: APPROACHES TO STUDYING COMPARATIVE POLITICS

Unit-1: Political Culture –Meaning, Definitions and Types

Unit-2: Political Culture: Relevance

Unit-3: New Institutionalism –Meaning, Definitions and Historical Background

Unit-4: New Institutionalism: Significance

Unit-5: Political Socialization

Unit-6: Political Communication

UNIT-1: POLITICAL CULTURE –MEANING, DEFINITIONS AND TYPES

Structure

1.1 Objectives

1.2 Introduction

1.3 Meaning and Definition of Political Culture

1.4 Nature and Scope of Political Culture

1.5 Classification of Political Culture

1.6 Critical Appraisal of Political Culture

1.7 Summary

1.8 Key Terms

1.9 Self Assessment Questions

1.10 References

1.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- The meaning, definition of Political Culture

- Nature and Scope of Political Culture

- Types and Dimensions of Political Culture

1.2: INTRODUCTION

Political culture describes how culture impacts politics. Every political system is embedded in a particular political culture. Political culture, in political science, a set of shared views and normative judgments held by a population regarding its political system. The notion of political culture does not refer to attitudes toward specific actors, such as a president or prime minister, but rather denotes how people view the political system as a whole and their belief in its legitimacy. American political scientist Lucian Pye defined political culture as the composite of basic values, feelings, and knowledge that underlie the political process. Hence, the building blocks of political culture are the beliefs, opinions, and emotions of the citizens toward their form of government. Political culture has been studied most intensively in the context of established Western democracies. The classic study of political culture is The Civic Culture (1963) by American political scientists Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba. Based on surveys conducted in

the United States, Britain, West Germany, Italy, and Mexico, this landmark investigation sought to identify the political culture within which a liberal democracy is most likely to develop and consolidate. Almond and Verba's argument is based on a distinction between three pure types of political culture: parochial, subject, and participant. In a parochial political culture, citizens are only indistinctly aware of the existence of central government. In a subject political culture, citizens see themselves not as participants in the political process but as subjects of the government. In a participant political culture, citizens believe both that they can contribute to the system and that they are affected by it. Almond and Verba's work attracted the attention of generations of scholars who replicated the findings, criticized the conceptualizations, and refined the theory.

Almond and Verba's core idea was that democracy will prove most stable in societies where subject and parochial attitudes provide ballast to an essentially participant culture. This mix is known as civic culture. In this ideal combination, the citizens are sufficiently active in politics to express their preferences to rulers but not so involved as to refuse to accept decisions with which they disagree. Thus, the civic culture resolves the tension within democracy between popular control and effective governance. In Almond and Verba's study, Britain and, to a lesser extent, the United States came closest to this ideal. In both countries, the citizens felt that they could influence the government. Following the pioneering footsteps of *The Civic Culture*, American political scientist Robert Putnam argued that civic community, based on high levels of political interest, social equality, interpersonal trust, and voluntary association, leads to higher probabilities of effective governance and democracy.

Political culture is the property of a collectivity—for example, a country, region, class, or party. While most studies of political culture concentrated on national cultures, some studies focused on territorially defined units at the sub-national level, such as the political cultures of American states, Canadian provinces, or Italian regions. Other studies analyzed the cultural attributes of social groups such as the political elite, the working class, and the like.

1.3: MEANING AND DEFINITION OF POLITICAL CULTURE

The concept of political culture was adopted from social anthropology. A culture encompasses beliefs, values, behavioural norms, attitudes, usages and expressive symbols which together produce a distinct tradition or a way of life of society. In the words of E. K. Wilson, "Culture is

socially shared and transmitted knowledge, existential and normative symbolized in art and artic raft". Society and culture are inseparable and interdependent. The concept of political culture refers to a very general phenomenon which can be approached from many points of view. The concept separates the cultural aspects of politics from other aspects as well as the political culture form other forms of culture. Political culture refers to those aspects of culture, which have some impact on political traditions, behavior and institutions. In the words of Sidney Verba, it is "the subjective orientation to politics" or "the system of empirical belies, expressive symbols and values which define the situation in which political action takes place". Lucian W. Pye writes, "For the individual, political culture provides controlling guidelines for structure of values and rational considerations which ensures coherence in the performance of institutions and organizations". Almond and Powell define political culture as the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations toward politics among the members of a political system. It is the subjective realm, which underlines and gives meaning to political actions. Political culture is only one aspect of politics but, nonetheless, it is a highly significant aspect of the political system.

According to Almond and Powell (1966), Political Culture is the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations towards politics among the members of a political system. It may provide a valuable conceptual tool using which one can bridge the 'micro-macro' gap in political theory.

Samuel Beer (1974) defined it as "components of the culture and values, beliefs and emotional attitudes about how a government ought to be conducted and what it should do".

Andrew Heywood (2007) Political culture is a psychological orientation of people about political objects (political parties, government and the constitution etc), expressed in their political attitudes, beliefs, symbols and values. It differs from public opinion in that it is fashioned out of long-term values rather than reactions to specific policies, problems or personalities. Now the question arises how do people acquire their political attitudes and values? People acquire their political attitudes and values through a process of political socialisation. This may be seen either as a process of indoctrination that takes place throughout a person's life or as the transmission of values from one generation to the next, largely accomplished during childhood. The major agents of political socialization are the family, education, religion, the mass media and the government.

Political culture is a set of beliefs, values, emotions and perceptions of the people about politics, the political system the and political objects of a country. It can help the students of comparative

politics to comprehend and analyse the success or failures of any political system in the countries the of world. For instance, it can be a question like democracy or democratic institutions are successful in a few countries but in utter faith in other counties. It may be important to note here that political culture cannot answer everything that occurs in the realm of politics. The reason is, despite of same values and culture people behave differently when they encounter different types of problems or opportunities. In this regard, it is also true that cultural norms typically change slowly and reflect enduring patterns of political action. In this sense, political culture is a critical element in understanding politics across countries or across time. It helps to understand how politics unfolds itself.

1.4: NATURE AND SCOPE OF POLITICAL CULTURE

Most cultures that prevail in various contemporary societies are conglomerations of variety of both old and new beliefs and values. Cultures differ in their origins and nature. History, geography, religion, war and socio-economic factors may contribute to the development of a particular political culture in a society. Similarly, the nature of political culture differs from one society to another. In some societies like old agrarian society, we find conservative political culture referring to the irrational and tradition bound political allegiance for the political authority. This type of culture is not easily liable to change. While, in modern progressive industrial societies, political culture becomes more dominant, cohesive and stable, while in other societies, it becomes unstable, changing and heterogeneous. The main components of political culture are mainly three, such as, empirical beliefs, values preferences, and effective responses.

A degree heterogeneity with respect to most fundamental beliefs and values becomes a characteristic feature, when the society becomes pluralistic and divided on the basis of tradition, geography, ethnicity, religion etc. This type of culture is known as subculture which is not shared by all, but by a significant group of people.

Civic Culture

As mentioned earlier that political scientist developed their interest in the study of political culture during the 1950s and 1960s under the influence of behavioural studies and was trying to analyse the systems with the new techniques of behavioural analysis that were empirical in their nature. Here, Almond and Verba used opinion surveys to analyse political behaviour and political

attitudes of individuals about democracy in five countries, namely the USA, the UK West Germany, Italy and Mexico. This is presented in their classic work 'The Civic Culture (1963). Almond and Verba's attempted to understand and explain the fall down of representative government in interwar Italy, Germany and elsewhere in the world. They wanted to identify an effective political culture that could uphold democratic norms and culture (Heywood: 2007). Therefore, they identified and classified the political culture into three general types:

Parochial Political Culture

In a parochial political culture, citizens do not identify themselves with the state. That shows that there is an absence of a sense of citizenship. Therefore people do not have any idea or knowledge about the political system; hence they do not participate in politics. They identify themselves with their locality rather than the region or state. Such type of political culture can be found in tribal societies where the tribe head is all in all and tribe people follow him without questioning his authority.

Subject Political Culture

In this type of political culture people act passively. Such a kind of political culture can be seen in the colonial states where citizens cannot involve themselves in politics because they think that they cannot influence the government. But once when they acquire political consciousness they do fight for their rights and liberation and could overthrow the colonial regime.

Participant Political Culture

In this type of political culture citizens actively participate in political activities to ensure their desired outcome. They are capable of doing so because of the high level of political consciousness. The citizens are fully aware of their rights and duties and also their role the in decision-making process. For, instance such a type of political culture is popular or could be found in advanced countries like the UK and the USA.

Almond and Verba (1963) acknowledged that a participant's political culture has come closer to democratic ideals. The participation of citizens in the political process is the prime necessity for the government to govern the people. Here, they both argued that civic culture is an intermingling

of all three political cultures that they have identified after their research. They argued that political culture in advanced democratic societies is a blend of citizens' active participation or non-participation in the polity. The civic culture emphasises the input process by individuals in the polity, i.e. the participation in political activities that are concerned with their lives. It is important to note that in the civic culture, one generally relies on witnessing the prevalence of political activities highly exposed to political communications, political discussion, concern with political affairs etc.

In the civic culture, people are not only oriented to political input they are oriented positively to the input structures and the input process. In other words, the political culture and structure are congruent. It may mention here that in the civic political culture, we cannot odd out or miss the parochial and subject orientations because they are congruent with the participant orientations. This all leads to the maintenance of balance in a political culture where one can find active participation of people in political activity which shows the level of rationality in the people and also makes the balance of parochial values. Almond and Verba concluded that the UK is the best possible example the civic culture as it exhibits both participant and subject features of political culture. In the case of the USA, participant attitudes predominated over subject ones. The difficulty of building or rebuilding s civic culture was underlined by the examples of both West Germany and Italy. A decade and a half after the collapse of fascism, neither country appeared to have a strong participant culture; while the subject culture was dominant in Germany, Parochial attitudes remained firmly entrenched in Italy.

1.5: CLASIFICATION OF POLITICAL CULTURE

There are different typologies of political culture offered by different scholars based on their research studies. The understanding of some of these types will help us to distinguish the political culture of different systems. Let us examine the classification of political culture taken up two prominent political studies, one by Almond and Verba and the other by Samuel E Finer.

Almond and Verba's Classification

The Civic Culture by Almond and Verba (1963) is based on their surveys conducted during 1959-60 in the USA, Britain, West Germany, Italy and Mexico. This study which pioneered the study of political culture as a subfield has identified three pure types of political culture. These are as

follows:

Parochial Political Culture:

This refers to a political culture where citizens are only distantly aware of the existence of central government- as with remote tribes whose existence is seemingly unaffected by national decisions made by the central government. Further, there is no political orientation towards political objects. People have neither knowledge nor interest in politics. They have no orientations towards all components of politics. This type of political culture is compatible with a traditional political structure. This type of orientation is found in a passive society where there is hardly any specialization of roles, and therefore, people are indifferent towards governmental authority. Thus, in this type of political culture people have low awareness, expectations and participation.

Subject Political Culture:

In this political culture, citizens see themselves not as participants in the political process but as subjects of the government - as with people living under a dictatorship. In other words, citizens under this political culture have a passive orientation towards a political system and conceive themselves as having a minimum influence on the political process. In this type of political culture, citizens are aware of the central government, and are heavily subjected to its decisions with little scope for dissent. The individual is aware of politics, its actors and institutions. Citizens have orientations toward the output aspects of the system. People know about decision-making mechanisms. There is a political awareness but no confidence to air political views, thus there is an absence of participatory norms. This type of political culture is compatible with a centralized authoritarian structure. In this model, the people have a higher level of awareness and expectations, but low participation.

Participant Political Culture:

In this political culture, citizens believe that they can contribute to the system and that they are affected by it. They, therefore, respond positively to all political objects and have an active orientation to political activities. Here citizens can influence the government in various ways and they are affected by it. The individual is oriented toward the system towards all four components of politics, i.e., input, output, political system, and self-role. This encourages more and more participation and participation is the highest value. There is an ability to criticize the authority and hold a positive orientation towards the political system. In this model, people have a high level of

awareness, expectations, and participation.

Almond and Verba argue that there is never a single political culture. The three categories of political orientations which they have identified are not always present in a pure form; rather they are intermixed in many situations of political culture. Thus, they re-classified political culture into three sub-types. These are discussed below:

Parochial and Subject: This type of political culture represents a shift from parochial orientation to subject orientation. Here the parochial loyalties gradually get weathered and the inhabitants develop a greater awareness of the central authority.

Subject and Participant: This type of political culture represents a shift from subject political orientation to participant political orientation. In such a political culture, people generally on the one hand develop an activist tendency and participate in the process; but on the other hand, there are those individuals too who possess passive orientations and remain at the receiving end of the decision-making process.

Parochial and Participant: This type of political culture represents the parochial orientation in the individuals whereas the norms introduced require a participant political orientation. In such type of political culture, there emerges a problem of harmony between the political culture and political norm. However, Almond and Verba suggest that a participatory political culture fits a liberal democratic regime. The participant political culture is the type of political culture that is congruent with a democratic political structure and the same has been called by them as 'Civic Culture'.

Finer's Classification

Attempting to understand the phenomena of military intervention in the politics of developing countries, Samuel E Finer (The Man on the Horseback, 1962) came to relate civil-military relations with political culture. In his analysis, there are four levels of political culture:

Mature Political Culture: In this type of political culture, there is widespread public approval of the procedure for transfer of power; a belief that the persons in power have the right to govern and issue orders; the people are attached to the political institutions and there is a well mobilized

public opinion.

Developed Political Culture: In this type of political culture, the civil institutions are highly developed and the public is well organized into powerful groups but from time to time there arises a dispute on the questions of who and what should constitute the sovereign authority and how power should be transferred.

Low Political Culture: At this level of political culture, the political system is weak and narrowly organized; there is a lack of consensus on the nature of the political system and the procedures and the public attachment to the political system is fragile.

Minimal Political Culture: At this low level of political culture, articulate public opinion does not exist in the political system and the government can easily ignore public opinion; political cultures are decided by force or the threat of force. A person or institution capable of asserting itself can enforce its will and the extent of one's authority is directly related to the degree of force at one's disposal. Finer argued that developing countries with weak legitimacy are prone to experience coup detat or extreme forms of military intervention.

1.6: CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF POLITICAL CULTURE

Political culture approach, for some scholars, may never be the final word in comparative political analysis but, carefully handled, (for them) it can be a useful springboard. Like any other approach, political culture as an approach to the study of comparative politics has both its advantages and disadvantages. Here an attempt has been made to highlight some of the strengths and lacunas of the approach of political culture as pointed by different scholars:

One of the important criticisms against the political culture approach is that it cannot be described as a very precise variable for presenting a morphological study of the modern political system. The approach cannot be taken as a correct barometer of individual behaviour because of the very distinguishing and varied nature of the same.

Lucian Pye criticizes this approach by stating that in no society there is a fundamental distinction between the culture of the rulers and that of the masses. Therefore, any attempt to distinguish them may not bring any productive result.

Others argue that the approach is ambiguous. The political culture is itself a subsystem of the

culture in general. In fact, the political culture approach is a byproduct of modernization and development theories. It is not certain whether they regard it independent variable or dependent variable, a cause or an effect. As such, the whole perspective happens to become conservative, static and anachronistic. On the other hand, some others question the very assumption of the approach that a system of government continues because it is in tune with a country's political culture. Many descriptions of a political culture are often little more than an exercise in stereotyping which invariably ignores diversity within the country concerned.

In some cases, descriptions of political culture tend to be static as well as simplistic, lacking sensitivity to how a culture continually evolves in response to political experiences. The approach is not progressive but reactionary in character.

Despite these limitations, the political culture approach is not without its merits. The approach of political culture has certainly heightened the ability of political scientists to examine the psychological environment of the political system broadly and scientifically. It has codified and synthesized into a style, a welldeveloped concept, all that was studied in an abstract and crude fashion through such traditional concepts as national morale, national character, national psychology and the like.

Political culture approach has made it easier for political scientists to systematically and comprehensively analyze the social, psychological and sociological environment of the political system; thereby has contributed to conducting both micro and macro studies of political systems as well as to explain the gap between micro-macro politics. Further, through the political culture approach, political scientists can systematically explain the differences in the behaviour of different political systems, particularly the differences in the behaviour of similar political institutions working in different societies.

Political culture approach has also fortified political scientists to conduct studies in the process through which the political culture of society passes from one generation to the next generation, i.e., the process of political socialization. This can be used for analyzing the path of political development of a political system. The political culture approach has also been used by several political scientists to investigate the nature and dynamics of possible political changes, violent changes- revolutions and coups, in numerous political systems.

1.7: SUMMARY

In the above, the different dynamics of political culture as an important approach to the study of comparative politics has been discussed from where it may be derived that political culture has made Political Science a more complete branch of social science through its insistence on a combined micro-macro approach. It has focused our attention on the study of the political community or society, as a dynamic collective entity as distinct from the individual and on the total political system. Moreover, it encourages political scientists to take up the study of social and cultural factors which are responsible for giving the political culture of a country its broad shape. As an approach, its pros and cons have also been discussed where it was found that there are arguments both in favour and against its utility in understanding the dynamics of comparative politics. Whatever may the arguments but it may safely be summed up that through the application of this approach, the political processes of the different systems can best be known and compared.

The concept of political culture is very relevant to comprehend contemporary society vis-à-vis the world. The post-cold war ers witnessed the upsurge of ethnic and national differences among the nations as well as within the nations. This testifies that relevance to cultural components to bis e was taken into account to make sense of such upsurges and political realities. In addition to this, the top most agenda for political scientists is to understand the 'transition of nations from their traditional models of governance to the democratic model of governance'. Moreover to understand the process of modernisation culture is a very important variable.

1.8: KEY TERMS

- **Civic Culture**: A political culture characterized by acceptance of the authority of the state and a belief in participation in civic duties. This term was popularized by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba.

- **Political Subculture**: Groups within a larger political culture that have distinct values, norms, and beliefs. These can be based on regional, ethnic, religious, or other differentiating factors.

- **Parochial Political Culture**: Characterized by a limited awareness of the broader political system. Individuals are mostly concerned with local issues and have minimal involvement in national politics.

- **Subject Political Culture**: Citizens are aware of the political system and its policies but are mostly passive and not actively involved in political processes. They are more likely to obey than to participate.

- **Participant Political Culture**: Individuals are actively involved in the political process, informed about political issues, and see themselves as active participants in the decision-making process.

1.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by Political Culture? Discus its nature and scope.
- Discuss various types of political culture.
- Discuss the views of Almond and Verba on Political Culture.

1.10: REFERENCES

Almond, Gabrial A. and Sydney Verb. (1972). The Civic Culture. New Jersey: Princeton University Press

Almond, Gabriel and Powell, Bingham G. (1966). Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach: Boston: Little Brown and Company

Ball, A.R. (1971). Modern Politics and Government. London: Macmillan Eckstein, (1988). A Culturalist Theory of Political Change. LXXXII, 1203-1230. Formisano,

P. Ronald. (2001). The Concept of Political Culture, The Journal of Interdisciplinary History. Vol. 31, No. 3 (Winter, 2001). pp. 393-426

Heywood, Andrew. (2019). Politics. London: Red Global Press International Encyclopaedia of the Social Science. (1968). Definition of Political Culture. New York: Macmillan Marcus,

E. Ethridge, Howard Handelman. (2010). Politics in a Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science. Boston Massachusetts: Wadsworth Cengage Learning

O'Neil, Patrick. (2017). Essentials of Comparative Politics. New York: WW Norton and Company

UNIT-2: POLITICAL CULTURE: RELEVANCE

Structure

2.1 Objectives

2.2 Introduction

2.3 Meaning and Definition of Political Culture

2.4 Relevance of Political Culture

2.5 Summary

2.6 Key Terms

2.7 Self Assessment Questions

2.8 References

2.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is Political Culture?

- The relevance of the Political Culture

- Process of Political Socialization

2.2: INTRODUCTION

Culture is mostly transmitted from generation to generation through socialization process. Every political system has some structures that perform the political socialization function, shaping the political attitudes incubating the political values and imparting the political skills of citizens and elites. It is the process by which individual learns about politics. In turn, it shapes the political culture, providing the cues for continuity and change in the culture. Political socialization is the learning process by which people develop an understanding of their political identities, opinions, and behaviour. Through various agents of socialization, such as parents, peers, and schools, the lifelong experiences of political socialization play a key role in developing the traits of patriotism and good citizenship. Political socialisation is the process by which political cultures are maintained and changed. Through the performance of this function, individuals are inducted into the political culture, and their orientations towards political objects are formed." Thus, political socialisation is the process by which the ethos and behaviour of a political system are communicated from one generation to another generation. Therefore, political socialisation is a

continuous unconscious process.

Political socialization is the process by which individuals internalize and develop their political values, ideas, attitudes, and perceptions via the agents of socialization. Political socialization occurs through processes of socialization, that can be structured as primary and secondary socialization. Primary socialisation agents include the family, whereas secondary socialization refers to agents outside the family.[1] Agents such as family, education, media, and peers influence the most in establishing varying political lenses that frame one's perception of political values, ideas, and attitudes. These perceptions, in turn, shape and define individuals' definitions of who they are and how they should behave in the political and economic institutions in which they live. This learning process shapes perceptions that influence which norms, behaviors, values, opinions, morals, and priorities will ultimately shape their political ideology: it is a "study of the developmental processes by which people of all ages and adolescents acquire political cognition, attitudes, and behaviors."[2] These agents expose individuals through varying degrees of influence, inducing them into the political culture and their orientations towards political objects. Throughout a lifetime, these experiences influence your political identity and shape your political outlook.

2.3: MEANING AND DEFINITION OF POLITICAL CULTURE

The concept of political culture was adopted from social anthropology. A culture encompasses beliefs, values, behavioural norms, attitudes, usages and expressive symbols which together produce a distinct tradition or a way of life of society. In the words of E. K. Wilson, "Culture is socially shared and transmitted knowledge, existential and normative symbolized in art and artic raft". Society and culture are inseparable and interdependent. The concept of political culture refers to a very general phenomenon which can be approached from many points of view. The concept separates the cultural aspects of politics from other aspects as well as the political culture form other forms of culture. Political culture refers to those aspects of culture, which have some impact on political traditions, behavior and institutions. In the words of Sidney Verba, it is "the subjective orientation to politics" or "the system of empirical belies, expressive symbols and values which define the situation in which political action takes place". Lucian W. Pye writes, "For the individual, political culture provides controlling guidelines for structure of values and rational considerations which ensures coherence in the performance of institutions and organizations". Almond and Powell define political culture as the pattern of individual attitudes

and orientations toward politics among the members of a political system. It is the subjective realm, which underlines and gives meaning to political actions. Political culture is only one aspect of politics but, nonetheless, it is a highly significant aspect of the political system.

According to Almond and Powell (1966), Political Culture is the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations towards politics among the members of a political system. It may provide a valuable conceptual tool using which one can bridge the 'micro-macro' gap in political theory.

Samuel Beer (1974) defined it as "components of the culture and values, beliefs and emotional attitudes about how a government ought to be conducted and what it should do".

Andrew Heywood (2007) Political culture is a psychological orientation of people about political objects (political parties, government and the constitution etc), expressed in their political attitudes, beliefs, symbols and values. It differs from public opinion in that it is fashioned out of long-term values rather than reactions to specific policies, problems or personalities. Now the question arises how do people acquire their political attitudes and values? People acquire their political attitudes and values through a process of political socialisation. This may be seen either as a process of indoctrination that takes place throughout a person's life or as the transmission of values from one generation to the next, largely accomplished during childhood. The major agents of political socialization are the family, education, religion, the mass media and the government.

Political culture is a set of beliefs, values, emotions and perceptions of the people about politics, the political system the and political objects of a country. It can help the students of comparative politics to comprehend and analyse the success or failures of any political system in the countries the of world. For instance, it can be a question like democracy or democratic institutions are successful in a few countries but in utter faith in other counties. It may be important to note here that political culture cannot answer everything that occurs in the realm of politics. The reason is, despite of same values and culture people behave differently when they encounter different types of problems or opportunities. In this regard, it is also true that cultural norms typically change slowly and reflect enduring patterns of political action. In this sense, political culture is a critical element in understanding politics across countries or across time. It helps to understand how politics unfolds itself.

2.4: RELEVANCE OF POLITICAL CULTURE

Political culture is a concept that refers to the shared beliefs, values, attitudes, and norms that

shape the political behavior of individuals and communities within a particular society. It plays a significant role in understanding political dynamics, governance, and the functioning of political institutions. The role of political culture for regime stability and prospects of regime change is significant. Political culture is significant when confronted with other factors like socio economic development, institutional setting and foreign intervention. The popular perception of regime legitimacy plays a role for regime change and stability. Political culture matters in different regime. Political myths offer proposals for the power of interpretation, which function as basic patterns of awareness and evaluation for political results. Political myths contain statements about the political community, the components of the regime and authorities. In recent years, much research has been conducted on political culture & public opinion in democratic and nondemocratic regime. There are specific patterns of attitudes towards democratic regimes in south East Asia. The political change is responsible for change in regime & government including political stability. There is hybrid culture in some political regime. Political participation is linked with political culture. Regime change may hold via domestic processes like revolution, coup and reconstruction. It can also be imposed on a country by foreign actors via invasion and interventions. Regime change may entail new trends of political culture. Regime change refers to the overthrow of a government treated illegitimate by an external force and its replacement with a new government. There is economic and cultural consequences of regime change. A hybrid regime is a type of political system often created as a result of an incomplete democratic transition from an authoritarian regime to a democratic regime. Hybrid regimes are categorized as having a combination of autocratic features with democratic trends. Hybrid regimes are generally found in developing states with plenty of natural resources .

There has been rise in hybrid regimes since the end of cold war. The third wave of democratization from the 1970s onward has led to the emergence of hybrid regimes that are neither fully democratic nor fully authoritarian. There is peculiar cultural politics of hybridity. The political culture of an electorate across post authoritarian competitive authoritarianism affects regime turnover via elections. There is mixed political culture in hybrid political regimes. Political culture is congruent with the regimes form in stable democracies and autocracies. Hybrid regimes are unstable by nature and the relationships between political culture and regime legitimacy remains ambiguous. It is critical and complicated to extend diffuse support for democracy influence the vote for the governing party in a hybrid regime. The state in India is a hybrid one which diverges from the western state in the importance it accords to pre modern

political forms.

The political culture is the attitude that a majority of the population has towards the nation's political institutions. It also refers to the mindset of individuals towards political activities. Indian politics are accurate. Since independence, there have been many changes, and the political process is still ongoing. Indian politics have formed its own gradual patterns with strong political culture and diversity. There is impact of Advance Technology upon Indian Culture. The National Digital Health Mission has aspired to bring health records and I.D Cards for its citizens. There is effect of liberalization, privatization and globalization upon Indian Political Culture. Social trends make possible for people to voice their demands through their leaders. The regulatory constraints have made the democratic political culture and political systems survive in the state with Right to Information and PIL. India has witnessed many political trends like rise of state parties, rise of ST-SC politics and rise of Hindutva. The Mass media is crucial to Indian Politics because it shapes Indian public opinion and helps identify and address concerns. The mass media in India covers a wide range of historical and contemporary topics that are crucial to Indian democracy. The new and special trend of Indian polity is coalition politics. Youth influence on institutions can occur at several levels. Indian Political Culture is not merely a reflection of community life style. It is the link between historical experiences of politics and model identities. Indian political culture becomes not only a national idiom, but also a cultural vector diet gradually entering the community's life style as a powerful force of social change. The contemporary political culture in India consists of many stands, each with its own psychological problems of adaption and their typical cultural expressions. Indian democracy is facing major crisis of peculiar & complicated political culture with diversity. There are several elements in the crisis of political culture ranging from caste-based politics to the reemergence of nation state. The hegemony of the Indian states and the near absence of other actors including the civil society is challenge of Indian Political Culture. Indian Political System is in great distress as the political class lacks a strong ideological commitment which lead to venality, corruption, defection and party hopping. Indian politics is crippled by caste and communal considerations & affects every aspect of politics like voting, candidate selection, minister selection and untied fund. The problem lies with the Indian Political Culture in which the Indian voters make their choices based on communal, caste and money considerations.

2.5: SUMMARY

In conclusion, political socialization is a fundamental process through which individuals develop their political identities, beliefs, and behaviors. This lifelong journey is shaped by a myriad of influences, including family, education, peers, media, religion, significant political events, socioeconomic factors, and cultural norms. Understanding political socialization helps explain the diversity of political opinions and behaviors within a society, as well as how these perspectives are passed from one generation to the next.

The interplay of these influences ensures that political socialization is a dynamic and continuous process, evolving with changing social, economic, and political contexts. Recognizing the factors that contribute to political socialization is crucial for comprehending how citizens form their political attitudes, how they engage with the political system, and how democratic participation can be fostered and sustained. Ultimately, political socialization not only shapes individual political consciousness but also contributes to the broader political culture and stability of a society.

Political socialization is a very powerful tool to mould political cultures. The various agents of political socialization can even help create an entirely new set of values and attitudes. Its importance is growing in today's world where the traditional structures of a village or tribal community are breaking down. As the world shrinks, political systems are borrowing more from each other. The citizens learn as they move ahead in life. Any event, be it in the social, religious, or economic sphere can influence the political system of a state. Thus, political socialization has to be healthy and positive. It can be moulded in totalitarian regimes as well as in developing countries. In the former, it is controlled while in the latter it is general and diffused. Both situations are dangerous and need to be handled carefully by the few eternal, vigilant citizens within the political system.

2.6: KEY TERMS

- **Peer Groups**: Friends and social networks that can influence political views and discussions.

- **Political Ideology**: A coherent set of beliefs about politics, public policy, and public purpose, which helps give meaning to political events and suggests appropriate responses.

19

Examples include liberalism, conservatism, socialism, and libertarianism.

- **Civic Education**: The education aimed at preparing citizens to be informed and active participants in the political process. It often involves teaching about government structures, political rights, and responsibilities.

- **Primary Socialization**: Early childhood socialization mainly influenced by family and close social contacts.

- **Secondary Socialization**: Ongoing socialization influenced by schools, peers, media, and other social institutions during adolescence and adulthood.

2.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the meaning of Political Socialization?

- Discuss the relevance of Political culture.

- Discuss the relevance of political culture in Indian context.

2.8: REFERENCES

Dawson, Richard E. & P. Kenneth, 1969, Political Socialization, Little Brown & Co, Boston, Paperback.

Greenstein, F. I ., 1972, "Political Socialization", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, (ed) David L. Silly, Vol. 13, Macmillan Co. and the Fress Press, New York.

Hyman, Herbert. H. 1972, Political Socialization, Amerind Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., Indian Edition.

Ranston, S. A. (ed), 1977, Handbook of Political Socialization – Theory and Research, The Free Press, New York.

rush M. and P. Althroff, 1971, an Introduction to Political Sociology, Nelson, London.

Siegel, R. S. (Ed), 1970, Learning About Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization, Random House, New Delhi.

UNIT-3: NEW INSTITUTIONALISM: MEANING, DEFINITION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Structure

3.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- Meaning and Nature of Institutionalism

- The origin and development of Institutionalism

- The development of New Institutionalism

- The Old Vs. New Institutionalism

3.2: INTRODUCTION

Neo institutionalism is an approach to the study of institutions that focuses on the constraining and enabling effects of formal and informal rules on the behavior of individuals and groups. New institutionalism traditionally encompasses three major strands: sociological institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism, and historical institutionalism. New institutionalism originated in work by sociologist John Meyer published in 1977.

The study of institutions and their interactions has been a focus of academic research for many years. In the late 19th and early 20th century, social theorists began to systematize this body of literature. One of the most prominent examples of this was the work of German economist and social theorist Max Weber; Weber focused on the organizational structure (i.e. bureaucracy)

within society, and the institutionalization created by means of the iron cage which organizational bureaucracies create. In Britain and the United States, the study of political institutions dominated political science until the 1950s. This approach, sometimes called 'old' institutionalism, focused on analyzing the formal institutions of government and the state in comparative perspective. It was followed by a behavioral revolution which brought new perspectives to analyzing politics, such as positivism, rational choice theory, and behavioralism, and the narrow focus on institutions was discarded as the focus moved to analyzing individuals rather than the institutions which surrounded them. New Institutionalism was a reaction to the behavioral revolution.

Institutionalism experienced a significant revival in 1977 with two influential papers by John W. Meyer and Brian Rowan on one hand and Lynn Zucker on the other. The revised formulation of institutionalism proposed in this paper prompted a significant shift in the way institutional analysis was conducted. Research that followed became known as "new" institutionalism, a concept that is generally referred to as "neo-institutionalism" in academic literature. Another significant reformulation occurred with Paul DiMaggio and Walter W. Powell's paper on isomorphism. The three papers had in common that they explained the practices of organizations not in terms of efficacy and efficiency, but in terms of legitimacy. The functions of an organization did not necessarily reflect rational or optimal ends, but were instead myths, ceremonies and scripts that had a veneer of rationality.

The following decade saw an explosion of literature on the topic across many disciplines, including those outside of the social sciences. Examples of the body of work in the decade which followed can be found in DiMaggio and Powell's 1991 anthology in the field of sociology; in economics, the Nobel Prize-winning work of Douglass North is a noted example.

More-recent work has begun to emphasize multiple competing logics, focusing on the more-heterogeneous sources of diversity within fields and the institutional embeddedness of technical considerations. The concept of logic generally refers to broader cultural beliefs and rules that structure cognition and guide decision-making in a field. At the organization level, logic can focus the attention of key decision-makers on a delimited set of issues and solutions, leading to logic-consistent decisions that reinforce extant organizational identities and strategies. In line with the new institutionalism, social rule system theory stresses that particular institutions and their organizational instantiations are deeply embedded in cultural, social, and political environments and that particular structures and practices are often reflections of as well as responses to rules, laws, conventions, paradigms built into the wider environment.

3.3: MEANING OF INSTITUTIONALISM

Kathleen Thelen and Sven Steinmo contrast New Institutionalism with "Old Institutionalism", which was overwhelmingly focused on detailed narratives of institutions, with little focus on comparative analyses. Thus, the Old Institutionalism was unhelpful for comparative research and explanatory theory. This "Old Institutionalism" began to be undermined when scholars increasingly highlighted how the formal rules and administrative structures of institutions were not accurately describing the behavior of actors and policy outcomes. Political communication is the 'production and impact of persuasive political messages, campaigns, and advertising, often concerning the mass media.' It is an interdisciplinary field that draws from communication, journalism and political science. Political communication is concerned with ideas such as: information flow, political influence, policy making, news, and the effect on citizens. Since the advent of the World Wide Web, the amount of data to analyze has increased and researchers are shifting to computational methods to study the dynamics of political communication. A key theorised system within political communication in advanced economies is the concept of the propaganda having the capacity to be organically spread, via self selection systems in democratic capitalist countries via the propaganda model. In recent years, machine learning, natural language processing, and network analysis have also become key tools in the field. The field also includes: the study of the media, the analysis of speeches by politicians, those that are trying to influence the political process, and conversations among members of the public. Today many universities offer courses in political communication.

The study and practice of political communication focuses on the ways and means of expression of a political nature. Robert E. Denton and Gary C. Woodward, via their work in Political Communication in America, characterize it as the ways and intentions of message senders to influence the political environment. This includes public discussion (e.g. political speeches, news media coverage, and ordinary citizens' talk) that considers who has authority to sanction the allocation of public resources, who has authority to make decisions, as well as social meaning like what makes someone American.

David L. Swanson and Dan Nimmo define political communication as "the strategic use of communication to influence public knowledge, beliefs, and action on political matters." They emphasize the strategic nature of political communication, highlighting the role

of persuasion in political discourse.

Brian McNair provides a similar definition when he writes that political communication is "purposeful communication about politics." For McNair, this means that this not only covers verbal or written statements, but also visual representations such as dress attire, make-up, hairstyle or logo design. In other words, it also includes all those aspects that develop a "political identity" or "image".

According to Harald Borgebund, the author of Political Communication and the Realities of Democracy, "Political communication is essential in a democratic polity."

3.4: ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE INSTITUTIONALISM

Institutionalism plays a significant role for the individual, organization, system and politics. Through communication, man interacts with other persons and with the environment; communication has also got implications for the organization. Deutsch says, "it is communication, which is the ability to transmit messages and to react to them that makes organizations". Likewise, in a political system, neither inputs nor outputs can take form, exist, or be related and affect the polity at large without the thread of communication. With respect to policies-national and international both enactment and enforcement is through the network of communication channels. Robert C. North writes, "Politics could not exist without communication, nor could wars be fought. In these terms, a modern nation state may be viewed essentially as a decision and control system which relies upon the exchange of messages in both its domestic affairs and its foreign relations".

Political communication is a critical component of modern governance and democratic processes. It encompasses the ways in which information is transmitted and exchanged among political actors, institutions, the media, and the public. Here are some key reasons why political communication is important: Political communication provides citizens with the information they need to make informed decisions about policies, candidates, and governance. This is essential for a functioning democracy, where the electorate must understand the issues at stake to participate effectively in elections and civic life. Through political communication, various viewpoints and opinions are shared, allowing for public debate and deliberation. This process helps to clarify issues, challenge assumptions, and develop a more nuanced understanding of complex topics. Healthy debate is crucial for the development of sound public policies and for holding leaders

accountable. Effective political communication encourages political participation by engaging citizens in the political process. This can include voting, attending town hall meetings, participating in protests, or engaging in online discussions. When people feel informed and heard, they are more likely to participate in political activities. Political communication plays a significant role in shaping public opinion. Politicians, interest groups, and the media use communication strategies to influence how the public perceives issues and candidates. This shaping of public opinion can have a direct impact on election outcomes and policy decisions. Through mechanisms such as the free press and public discourse, political communication helps to hold leaders accountable. Journalists, watchdog organizations, and citizens use communication to expose corruption, incompetence, and abuses of power, ensuring that leaders are answerable to the people. Transparent and honest political communication helps to build trust and legitimacy in political institutions. When citizens feel that they are being truthfully informed and that their voices are heard, they are more likely to trust their government and its institutions. In times of crisis, effective political communication is vital for managing public perception and maintaining order. Clear, accurate, and timely communication from political leaders can provide reassurance, prevent panic, and mobilize resources efficiently.

Political communication is key to mobilizing support and resources for political campaigns, policy initiatives, and social movements. It helps to rally people around a cause, generate funding, and coordinate actions among supporters. Effective communication helps to explain and promote policies, ensuring that the public understands their purpose, benefits, and implications. This understanding is crucial for the successful implementation of policies, as public support and cooperation are often needed. The landscape of political communication is continually evolving with advancements in technology. Social media, for instance, has transformed how political messages are disseminated and received. Understanding and leveraging these changes are crucial for effective political engagement in the digital age.

3.5: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE NEW INSTITUTIONALIM

In order to understand the theory of communication, Deutsch has used several basic concepts such as, information, load, lag, distortion, gain, feedback, learn and lead. Through the use of all these terms, Deutsch explains how communication helps the system to get information, to interact with

the environment, to cope with the environment through feedback process, as well as to think ahead about the future. In a perfect communication system, anything that happens at any point is transmitted fully to the other points. But in the real world, such type of perfect communication is very rare, as in most cases, information becomes added with influence.

When communication takes place within small groups, and is characterized by discussion between known persons, it is known as private communication. Here the audience is limited and the speaker knows to whom he is delivering the communication message. But in public communication, there is no limited audience. The communicator can not know the audience in person with whom he is communicating.

Political communication is a multifaceted field that encompasses various theories explaining how information, media, and political processes interact. Below are some key theories in political communication:

1. **Agenda-Setting Theory**:

   - **Origin**: Developed by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw in the 1970s.

   - **Core Idea**: Media may not tell people what to think, but it is very effective in telling them what to think about. The media's focus on specific issues influences the public agenda and what topics are deemed important.

2. **Framing Theory**:

   - **Origin**: Rooted in the work of Erving Goffman and expanded by Robert Entman.

   - **Core Idea**: The way information is presented (framed) by the media influences how people interpret and understand that information. Different frames can lead to different perceptions and interpretations of the same issue.

3. **Priming Theory**:

   - **Origin**: Related to agenda-setting and derived from cognitive psychology.

- **Core Idea**: Media exposure can influence the criteria by which people evaluate political leaders and issues. Frequent media coverage of specific topics can prime audiences to focus on those issues when making political judgments.

4. **Spiral of Silence Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann.

- **Core Idea**: People are less likely to express their opinions if they perceive themselves to be in the minority. Media can create a perceived majority opinion, leading to a spiral where minority opinions become even less visible.

5. **Cultivation Theory**:

- **Origin**: Proposed by George Gerbner.

- **Core Idea**: Long-term exposure to media, especially television, shapes people's perceptions of reality. Heavy viewers of television are more likely to perceive the world in ways that reflect the most consistent and repetitive messages of the media.

6. **Two-Step Flow Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet.

- **Core Idea**: Media effects are indirectly established through opinion leaders, who initially consume media content and then interpret and pass on information to others. This creates a two-step flow of communication from media to opinion leaders to the broader public.

7. **Uses and Gratifications Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Elihu Katz, Jay Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch.

- **Core Idea**: Focuses on why and how individuals actively seek out specific media to satisfy specific needs. It emphasizes the role of the audience as active participants in the communication process, rather than passive receivers.

8. **Propaganda Model**:

- **Origin**: Introduced by Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky.

- **Core Idea**: Media serves the interests of elite groups and corporations. It operates through five filters: ownership, advertising, sourcing, flak, and anti-communism/ideological control. This model suggests that media content is often shaped by these filters to serve powerful interests.

9. **Public Sphere Theory**:

- **Origin**: Associated with Jürgen Habermas.

- **Core Idea**: A democratic society requires a space where citizens can discuss and debate issues freely and rationally. The media plays a crucial role in facilitating or hindering this public discourse.

10. **Media Systems Dependency Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Sandra Ball-Rokeach and Melvin DeFleur.

- **Core Idea**: The more a society depends on media for information, the more influence the media will have on that society. This dependency affects individuals' perceptions and behaviors as they rely on media for understanding their social environment.

These theories collectively illustrate the complex interplay between media, political processes, and public perception. They help explain how media shapes political reality and how individuals and groups use media to influence political outcomes.

3.6: OLD VS. NEW INSTITUTIONALISM

The most primitive form of communication structure is the face contact between persons. This is the most informal and interpersonal communication structures. This makes a direct link between the communicator and the recipients of the communicated messages. With the development of other forms of communication media, though face to face communication structures is being less used, but its importance even today is recognized.

Family, peer groups, religious, institutions to play a prominent role in communicating message to the individuals. They are informal, interpersonal but organizational communicating structures playing an important role particularly in developing societies.

Political output structure such as legislature, bureaucracies and courts are formal and organizational communication structures in a political system and they constitute a particularly important channel of information. The information communicated by these communication structures becomes more reliable and authentic to the people.

Political input structures, such as trade unions, interest groups, pressure groups, political parties constitute yet another significant information channel. These are political, formal and organizational

communication structures disseminating political information to the people and to the leaders as well. They link the citizens with the political leaders through dissemination of information to both. mass media, including newspaper, magazine, books, films, radio and television constitute the most specialized communication structure in modern progressive society. Technological revolution has brought internet information through satellite communication. Mass media are capable at low cost and with minimum distortion.

Political communication involves the dissemination and exchange of information, ideas, and messages intended to influence political decisions, public opinion, and the behavior of individuals and groups. Various agents facilitate political communication, each playing a critical role in shaping the political landscape. Here are the key agents of political communication:

1. Media

- **Traditional Media:** Newspapers, television, radio, and magazines are crucial in informing the public, providing analysis, and framing political issues.

- **New Media:** Digital platforms, including news websites, blogs, and podcasts, offer diverse and often more immediate channels for political communication.

- **Social Media:** Platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube have become significant for real-time political communication, grassroots mobilization, and direct interaction between politicians and citizens.

2. Political Parties

- Political parties are primary agents in organizing political communication. They create and disseminate policy platforms, campaign messages, and mobilize supporters.

- Party leaders and spokespersons act as key communicators, articulating party positions and responding to political developments.

3. Government and Public Institutions

- Governments communicate through official statements, press conferences, public service announcements, and official websites.

- Public institutions, including legislatures and courts, provide information about their activities, decisions, and public services.

4. Politicians and Political Leaders

- Politicians at various levels (local, regional, national) engage in direct communication with the public through speeches, interviews, social media, and public appearances.

- Political leaders' personal communication styles and charisma can significantly influence public perception and political outcomes.

5. Interest Groups and Lobbyists

- Interest groups, advocacy organizations, and lobbyists communicate to promote specific causes or policies.

- They use various strategies, including media campaigns, direct lobbying, public demonstrations, and grassroots mobilization, to influence public opinion and political decisions.

6. Civil Society and NGOs

- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society groups play a vital role in political communication, especially in advocating for social issues, human rights, and environmental concerns.

- These organizations use research, reports, campaigns, and public events to communicate their messages and influence policy.

7. Academia and Think Tanks

- Scholars and think tanks contribute to political communication by conducting research, providing expert analysis, and publishing reports and policy briefs.

- They often serve as independent voices, offering data-driven insights and recommendations on various political and policy issues.

8. Corporations and Business Leaders

- Corporations and business leaders engage in political communication through lobbying, public statements, and corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives.

- They may also influence politics indirectly through funding political campaigns and supporting policy advocacy.

9. Public Opinion Pollsters and Research Organizations

- Polling organizations and research firms gather and analyze data on public opinion, providing insights into public attitudes and trends.

- Their findings are often used by media, political parties, and policymakers to shape and adjust communication strategies.

10. Cultural and Religious Organizations

- Cultural institutions, religious groups, and community organizations often communicate political messages related to their values and beliefs.

- These organizations can mobilize support and influence public opinion on moral and social issues.

3.7: SUMMARY

New institutional economics (NIE) is an economic perspective that attempts to extend economics by focusing on the institutions (that is to say the social and legal norms and rules) that underlie economic activity and with analysis beyond earlier institutional economics and neoclassical

economics. It can be seen as a broadening step to include aspects excluded in neoclassical economics. It rediscovers aspects of classical political economy. Major scholars associated with the subject include Masahiko Aoki, Armen Alchian, Harold Demsetz, Steven N. S. Cheung, Avner Greif, Yoram Barzel, Claude Ménard (economist), Daron Acemoglu, and four Nobel laureates—Ronald Coase, Douglass North, Elinor Ostrom, and Oliver Williamson. A convergence of such researchers resulted in founding the Society for Institutional & Organizational Economics (formerly the International Society for New Institutional Economics) in 1997. In conclusion, political communication is essential for the functioning of modern democracies. It facilitates the exchange of ideas between the government and the governed, shapes public policy, and influences political behavior. The evolution of media, particularly the rise of digital platforms, has significantly impacted how political communication is conducted, presenting both opportunities and challenges. As the landscape continues to change, the principles of transparency, accountability, and ethical communication remain critical to fostering informed and engaged citizens.

Democracy is a government by public opinion, because, public policies are being made on the basis of opinion which people hold at a particular time. Public opinion is often understood as some sort of aggregate of opinions of a whole population. James Bryce (Modern Democracies) defines public opinion as "the aggregate of views men hold regarding matters that affect or interest the community". A. V. Dicey (law and public opinion) defines it as "short way of describing the belief or conviction prevalent in a given society that particular laws are beneficial",

V. O. Key (Public Opinion and American Democracy) defines public opinion as "those opinions held by private persons which government fined it prudent to head". An opinion is an act of expressing what a person believes, values and expects with respect to specific objects, specific behavior and specific issues which has got public concern. This act may be a vote, verbal statement, written document or even silence.

Public opinion is not something vague. It has got some contents relating to some even or issue. It may appear as mass opinion, group opinion or popular opinion. But, it is very difficult to define "public" in quantitative terms.

Communication is the key to public opinion. The question arises who are the communicators who influence public opinion. Public officials are one of the most important groups of communicators

32

who help in constructing public opinion. Public officials may be elected officials like ministers, members of local governing bodies etc. or appointed official like bureaucrats, judges etc.

Another group of persons who creates public opinion are the politicians. They influence and direct the peoples in forming opinion about political matters. the activities also play a significant role in creating and changing opinion of the people about political matters. With the advent of technological revolution, mass media impart political message to a large number of people within a very short period and thus, help in creating public opinion about political matters. In one sense, the media help to create public opinion not so much by telling people what to think, but what to think about.

3.8: KEY TERMS

- **Public Sphere**: The arena in which citizens come together to discuss and debate societal issues, often facilitated by the media.

- **Agenda Setting**: The process by which the media prioritize issues, shaping the public's perception of what is important.

- **Framing**: The way information is presented to emphasize certain aspects over others, influencing how audiences interpret issues and events.

- **Spin**: A form of propaganda where information is manipulated or presented in a biased manner to favor a particular perspective or interest.

- **Campaign Communication**: The strategies and methods used by political candidates and parties to convey their messages, mobilize supporters, and persuade undecided voters.

- **Social Media**: Digital platforms that allow users to create, share, and interact with content, increasingly important in modern political communication for mobilizing support and spreading information.

3.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss meaning and nature of New Institutionalism.

- Discuss the origin and development of the Institutionalism.

- Discuss the growth of the New Institutionalism.

- Discuss the similarity and differences among the Old and New institutionalism.

3.10: REFERNCES

Almond and Powell, Comparative Politic: A Developmental Approach.

Blondel, J., An Introduction to Comparative Government.

Charlesworth, James C., Contemporary Political Analysis.

Deutsch, Karl W., the Nerves of Government.

Halmos, Paul, 1969, the Sociology of Mass Media Communications.

Keele, Staffordshire, University of Keele.

Katz, Ellu and Paul F., Lazrsfed, 1955, Personal Influence, New York: The Free Press, Glencoe.

Merrill and Lowenstein, 1971, Media Message and Men, Ney York, David Mc Kay & Co. INC.

Nimmo, Dan, Political Communication and Public Opinion in America.

Pye, Lucian W., Aspects of Political Development.

Wright, Charles, 1959, Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective, New York, and Random House.

UNIT-4: NEW INSTITUTIONALISM: SIGNIFICANCE

Structure

4.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- Meaning and Definition of New Institutionalism

- Emergence of the New Institutionalism

- The significance of New Institutionalism

4.2: INTRODUCTION

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, political science did the obvious. It commenced by describing and mapping the formal institutions of government and the modern state, both within specific countries and on a comparative basis. In tandem with constitutional research by students of law and studies in public administration (a sub-field within political science), the emphasis in this kind of 'old' institutionalism in political science was on charting the formal-legal and administrative arrangements of government and the 4 public sector. From today's perspective, the old institutionalism displayed little interest in cumulative theory building. The main emphasis was on description, not on explanation or theory building. Studies were also often constructed on an evaluative framework which attempted to assess how well certain institutions measured up to democratic norms or the principals of responsible government. Old institutionalism is not dead, however. Description of institutional arrangements is still an important aspect of research in politics and formal-legalism is still prominent in fields such as

constitutional studies and public administration. When old institutionalists did turn to explanation it was assumed that political behaviour was more or less scripted by the formal rules or procedures of the institutional setting. On this front, there is some overlap between the old and the new institutionalism. In the post-World War II era, a second major school in political science developed (especially in the United States). This rejected or at least watered down the focus on institutions and argued instead that political behaviour and the sources of political power were derived primarily through informal relationships within and beyond the institutions of government. In particular, attention shifted somewhat away from the state and the formal organisations of government towards a more 'society centred' focus, with an emphasis on the socially embedded nature of pressure group politics, individual political behaviour and informal distributions of power. It was argued that the best way of explaining behaviour was not through reading the rule book but through the direct observation of behaviour itself: hence the term 'behaviourism' as the label for this school (Krasner 1984: 229; Rhodes 1995: 48-50). Not surprisingly, the institutional landscape tended to recede under this style of political analysis. In this regard, March and Olsen highlight several central aspects of behaviourism. First, it was 'reductionist'. Explanations of political phenomena were reducible to the aggregate consequences of the behaviour of atomistic individuals and hence behaviourism was less inclined to 'ascribe the outcomes of politics to organisational structures and rules of appropriate behaviour'. As Shepsle (1989: 133) argues, institutions were assumed to be 'empty shells to be filled by individual roles, statuses and values.' Second, March and Olsen argue behaviourism was 'utilitarian' in that action was seen 'as the product of calculated self-interest' rather than the product of actors 'responding to obligations and duties'.

4.3: MEANING OF NEW INSTITUTIONALISM

Political recruitment refers to the methods and processes through which individuals are chosen for political positions. This can include elected offices, appointed roles, and other significant positions within political parties and government structures. The importance of political recruitment lies in its influence on the quality and diversity of leadership, policy direction, and democratic representation.

Effective political recruitment ensures that capable, ethical, and representative individuals are selected to lead. It affects the responsiveness and accountability of political institutions and can

influence public trust in the political system. Moreover, it shapes the pool of talent available for addressing societal challenges and steering national and local governance.

In 1919 Max Weber's influential lecture "Politics as a Vocation" was published; in America bench-mark studies such as those of Gosnell (1935; 1937), Salter (1938), and Zink (1930) followed, using vignettes to show how the careers of ethnic-group leaders, legislators, or city bosses could be made or wrecked by turns of luck quite as much as by either merit or maneuver. In the 1950s and 1960s studies like those of Schlesinger (1957), Eulau and Sprague (1964), and Milbrath (1963) used more rigorous measuring instruments and more extensive samples of evidence in order to identify changing skill patterns, organizational screening devices, and shifting power bases as aspects of political recruitment.

In 1930 Lasswell's clinical case studies of the motivational factors underlying self-recruitment into politics were formulated in terms of how "private motives" could be displaced onto "public objects" and later endowed with "public purposes." Thirty years later in work like that by Gabriel A. Almond, Robert E. Lane, and David C. McClelland, predispositional categories were being differentiated and methods devised for measuring the complex psychological dynamics that underlie political career aspirations.

4.4: EMERGENCE OF NEW INSTITUTIONALISM

The process in political recruitment discussed below.

1. **Identification of Potential Candidates:**

   - **Self-recruitment:** Individuals express their own interest in political positions.

   - **External recruitment:** Political parties, interest groups, or other entities identify and encourage individuals to enter politics.

2. **Selection Mechanisms:**

   - **Party Primaries and Conventions:** Parties often hold internal elections or conventions to select candidates for various offices.

   - **Appointments:** Some positions are filled through appointments by higher authorities, such as a president or prime minister.

- **Nomination Processes:** Formal procedures where potential candidates are vetted and nominated for election.

3. **Promotion and Campaigning:**

- Candidates engage in activities to gain visibility, support, and votes, including public speaking, debates, and advertising.

- Political parties and supporters play a significant role in promoting candidates.

4.5: SIGNIFICANCE OF NEW INSTITUTIONALISM

Certain factors contributed to the emergence of the new institutional approach in the later part of the twentieth century. The New Institutionalism argues that public institutions are not neutral and that institutions, loosely defined as the human-created constraints on interactions between individuals, really do matter. In fact, institutions shape individuals wants and preferences, as well as their behavior. Let us briefly look at some of them in the following.

• **Contextual factors:** With decolonization and emergence of newer states in erstwhile colonies, it appeared that the role of the state could be very crucial in shaping political behaviour. In the third world, the state – both in terms of the government and the coercive forces – was seen as the prime locus of all kinds of development. Further, in the developed world too, the emergence of the 'welfare state' changed the focus of academic studies. The emergence and working of centralized command economies in the communist world and some of the postcolonial countries offered a further push to take states seriously within the discipline of politics. The sweeping wave of democratization between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s also boosted the interest in institutions. Requirements of stable and effective democracy brought in a number of new political institutions, leading to further interest in studying them. The international politics of the time also contributed to this increasing interest in the institutions. The politics of Cold War showed that states and institutions are important actors, and a study of politics cannot be complete without adequate focus on them.

• **Debates within the discipline:** Within the discipline of political science, the state has occupied an elusive space. While the study of politics began with a study of the state, a later generation of

political scientists like Easton and Almond, perceived the state to be a too vague concept to be employed in attempts to understand real political operations of society. Due to this reason, they talked of replacing the concept of the state with that of the concept of political system. While the 'systems analysis' talked of institutions as components of the political system, they focused more on the behaviour of various actors and the interaction between actors and institutions, to explain political phenomena. The historical developments however, made the political scientists rethink the place of the state and other political institutions in organizing political societies. A strand of thought that emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s talked of the state as an autonomous actor. Another strand of literature, which we can trace to writing of JP Nettl in 1968 and Abrams in 1977, and in more recent times, to that of Timothy Mitchell in the 1990s, argued that while the state may be an elusive concept that does not mean that it is any less an important concept. Instead, due to this very reason, we need to study the state very carefully, to understand how it influences and gets influenced by the various operations of society. Such a conceptual orientation towards the state has also led to increased interest in institutions as a key to understand political processes. Neo-institutionalism studies the features of the economy institutional structures that facilitate the development of the peoples. According to Burgos Silva (2002), the neoinstitutionalism economy analysis, defines the artificial institutionalism and economy development, it questions rights as instruments of the economy development and it recognizes the informal institutions and promotes institutional mechanisms considered as good. The neo-institutionalism theory argues that the importance of the normative reference framework and the behavior rules to guide, constrain, and create power within the organizations, those that are considered, consist of cognitive structures, activities, normative and regulative that give meaning to the social behavior. The analyses in political science from the perspective of the new institutionalism starting off from the rational election of the individuals, to the incentives that they offer the institutions, understood as the rules that prescribe, outlaw and allow the behaviors. The role of the values is central to the old institutionalism but the neo-institutionalism is guided more towards the cognitive processes. Greenwood and Hinings (1996) summarize this change pointing out that the old institutionalism emphasizes the topics of influence, coalitions and the competition values were central, together with the power and the informal structures and the new institutionalism that emphasizes the genuineness, involvement of the organizational fields and the centrality of the classification, routines, scripts and outlines. The new institutionalism assists the organizational fields as analysis units. The institutional processes can give certain stability to the

organizational fields, although these are always evolving and they are not static, solving by means of socially negotiated consent the interpretation differences. The model of institutional design sustained in the neo-institutionalism theory, (Barley and Tolbert, 1997) and the adapted human agency of the structuring model, argue that the actors can consciously choose to revise more than to reply the existent institutions. New institutionalism is based on a methodological individualism that is based in the principle that, all the results of the human actions are explained by the individual action whose interactions in the structures, legitimate the institutions. This methodological individualism tends to motivate the individuals in function of their actions. The neo-institutionalism seeks to order the public sphere under an outline of institutions guided more to the private classification that annihilates all pretense of economy, social and political equality, starting off from the supposition that they have already been obtained by the democratic régime. Between the neo-institutionalism focus and that of democratic regulation, emerges the governability concept as an existent relationship between the processes of free market and the processes of democracy. Neo-institutionalism is based more on deductive reasoning and is expressed in two big focuses: in the election of the governance structures of the private actors' deprived in a certain environment, that becomes the object of economy analysis and in the institutional change in function of the effects that the different institutional environments have in the economy and in the development of institutions with the support of shared mental models and ideologies.

4.6: SUMMARY

Political recruitment is a vital aspect of political life that directly impacts governance and democratic representation. By understanding the mechanisms and challenges of political recruitment, we can work towards more inclusive, fair, and effective political systems. Ensuring a diverse and capable pool of political leaders is essential for addressing contemporary issues and fostering public trust in political institutions.

Political recruitment is a vital process that underpins the functioning and sustainability of any democratic system. Through the identification, selection, and development of potential leaders, political recruitment ensures that fresh ideas, diverse perspectives, and innovative solutions are continuously brought into the political arena. This process not only helps in maintaining the dynamism and responsiveness of political institutions but also in reflecting the changing

demographics and values of the society they represent.

Effective political recruitment requires a balanced approach that includes both the nurturing of grassroots participation and the provision of opportunities for emerging leaders from diverse backgrounds. It must strive to be inclusive, transparent, and merit-based to foster public trust and legitimacy. This entails addressing systemic barriers that historically marginalize certain groups and implementing policies that promote equal access to political opportunities.

Moreover, political recruitment is not an end in itself but a means to achieving good governance. By prioritizing the recruitment of individuals who are not only capable and knowledgeable but also ethical and committed to public service, political systems can enhance their accountability and effectiveness. In the age of globalization and rapid technological change, the adaptability of recruitment processes is crucial, ensuring that political institutions remain relevant and equipped to tackle contemporary challenges.

Political recruitment is a cornerstone of democratic resilience and effectiveness. By continuously evolving and improving the ways in which political talent is identified and nurtured, societies can ensure a steady influx of capable leaders dedicated to the public good, thereby strengthening democratic governance and fostering societal progress.

4.7: KEY TERMS

- **Candidate Selection**: The methods and criteria used by political parties or organizations to choose individuals to run for public office.

- **Political Elite**: A small group of individuals who hold significant political power and influence, often playing a crucial role in the recruitment of new political actors.

- **Party Primaries**: Elections within a political party to select candidates for a subsequent general election.

- **Political Patronage**: The use of state resources to reward individuals for their electoral support, often playing a role in recruitment and loyalty building.

- **Political Campaigns**: Organized efforts to influence the decision-making process within a specific group, crucial for recruiting candidates and mobilizing voters.

4.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is New Institutionalism?

- Discuss various factors responsible for the growth of the ne institutionalism.

- Discuss the significance of New Institutionalism.

4.10: REFERENCES

Norris, Pippa (2004). *Political recruitment : gender, race, and class in the British Parliament*. Cambridge Univ. Press. ISBN 0-521-46558-3

Fox, Richard L.; Lawless, Jennifer L. (2004). "Entering the Arena? Gender and the Decision to Run for Office". *American Journal of Political Science*. 48 (2): 264–280.ISSN 0092-5853.

Lawless, Jennifer; Fox, Richard (March 2013). "Girls Just Wanna Not Run: The Gender Gap in Young Americans' Political Ambition" . *School of Public Affairs, American University*.

Krook, Mona Lena (2010). "Beyond Supply and Demand: A Feminist-institutionalist Theory of Candidate Selection". *Political Research Quarterly*. 63 (4): 707–720. ISSN 1065-9129

UNIT-5: POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Structure

5.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is Political Socialization?
- Process of Political Socialization
- Forms and stages of Political Socialization
- Various Agents of Political Socialization

5.2: INTRODUCTION

Culture is mostly transmitted from generation to generation through socialization process. Every political system has some structures that perform the political socialization function, shaping the political attitudes incubating the political values and imparting the political skills of citizens and elites. It is the process by which individual learns about politics. In turn, it shapes the political culture, providing the cues for continuity and change in the culture. Political socialization is the learning process by which people develop an understanding of their political identities, opinions, and behaviour. Through various agents of socialization, such as parents, peers, and schools, the lifelong experiences of political socialization play a key role in developing the traits of patriotism and good citizenship. Political socialisation is the process by which political cultures are

43

maintained and changed. Through the performance of this function, individuals are inducted into the political culture, and their orientations towards political objects are formed." Thus, political socialisation is the process by which the ethos and behaviour of a political system are communicated from one generation to another generation. Therefore, political socialisation is a continuous unconscious process.

Political socialization is the process by which individuals internalize and develop their political values, ideas, attitudes, and perceptions via the agents of socialization. Political socialization occurs through processes of socialization, that can be structured as primary and secondary socialization. Primary socialisation agents include the family, whereas secondary socialization refers to agents outside the family.[1] Agents such as family, education, media, and peers influence the most in establishing varying political lenses that frame one's perception of political values, ideas, and attitudes. These perceptions, in turn, shape and define individuals' definitions of who they are and how they should behave in the political and economic institutions in which they live. This learning process shapes perceptions that influence which norms, behaviors, values, opinions, morals, and priorities will ultimately shape their political ideology: it is a "study of the developmental processes by which people of all ages and adolescents acquire political cognition, attitudes, and behaviors."[2] These agents expose individuals through varying degrees of influence, inducing them into the political culture and their orientations towards political objects. Throughout a lifetime, these experiences influence your political identity and shape your political outlook.

5.3: MEANING AND DEFINITION OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Greenstein, in the Encyclopedia of social sciences analyses political socialization in two sense. In a narrow sense, it is a deliberate inculcating of political information of values and practices by instructional agents, who have been formally charged with this responsibility. In a wider sense, it is all political learning formal and informal, deliberate and unplanned, at every stage of the life cycle including not only explicitly political learning but also normally non-political learning of politically relevant personality characteristics.

Hyman (1972) laid emphasis on the perpetuation of political values across generations, through the learning process through which norms and behavior patterns acceptable to the political system are being transmitted. Almond and Powell (1966) define political socialization as a process

through which an individual is inducted into political culture. It is the process through which political culture are shaped, maintained and changed. Political socialization is thus a process of developmental learning through which persons acquire political orientations and patterns of behavior.

According to Almond and Verba "Is the process by which political culture are maintained and changed."

According to Robert Sigel "The foal of political socialization is to train or develop individuals, that they become well-functioning members of a political society and survival after all, is a prime goal of the political organism just as it is of the individual organism."

The most comprehensive definition of political socialization has been given by Dr. S. Bhatnagar. He says Political socialization means all political learning, formal or informal, deliberate, unplanned, latent or manifest, diffuse or specific, at every stage of the life cycle, including not only explicit political learning but also apparently non-political learning of the general culture which affects political behavior.

5.4: PROCESS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Socialization is a process which continues throughout the life. It involves consistency and continuity in culture. It begins from the age of three to four years when the child first perceives some political objects like policeman in the street or the Prime Minister on the T. V. Screen. Without knowing the role functions of these institutions, he becomes acquainted with the figures, which are different from his or his parents. When he comes to school, he tries to learn more general and abstract things like power and functions of the Prime Minister, political parties, legislature etc. This is known as the primary stage of socialization.

Secondary stage of socialization starts with the individual entering into his adolescence particularly after he lease the school and this stage continues till his death. At this stage, the individual becomes identified with and involved in the political process. As man grows in age, he tries to be more evaluative of the system, the process and the policy. As man is a political persons, his socialization process continues throughout his life. However, though the process of attitude formation is a lifelong one, early experiences may be of great importance or a person. They can initiate a process of continuous socialization that will consistently push individuals to a

predictable set of orientations. It is true that early experiences may change to a large extent, as man grows in age and confronts challenges in life. But, the impact of early experiences on the change of political ideas or formation of new ideas can not be overruled.

5.5: FORMS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

There are two types of Political socialization– (i) Manifest Political Socialization, (ii) Latent Political Socialization.

Manifest Political Socialization can be explained when there is explicit communication of values, information or feelings towards political objects or political systems. It involves imitation of the political orientations and behaviour of others. In simple words, political socialization is manifest when certain beliefs or feelings towards the political system are put into the minds of others directly and in clear terms. Good examples are when students are taught about the merits of democracy in schools in countries following the western type of democracy. Similarly, in the Defunct – USSR, children were taught about Communist Paying as the only vehicle of positive change in society. In the erstwhile Soviet Union, the compulsory courses of MarxismLeninism are examples of manifest political socialization. Lectures, then e use of mass media formal education in educational institutions, are ways of bringing about political stability for maintaining status-quo. These can also be used for bringing about gradual political change. In today's world Internet is one of the most effective ways of manifestation socialization. Personal experiences like the struggle of Palestinians in Israel, the terrorist activities in Punjab in the late 1980s, the attack on the World Trade Centre on September 11, 2009, the Mumbai blasts in the recent past etc. are all examples of manifest political socialization. What role one desires to play in the system helps one acquire certain traits that become a part of manifest political socialization.

Latent Political Socialization: It is the transmission of non-political attitudes which affect the orientation of people towards the political system. It is an unconscious process. This works automatically and might even go unnoticed but can be equally effective as manifest political socialization. As Almond and Powell state that it involves many of the most fundamental characteristics of the general culture which may, in turn, have e great effect on the political sphere. Its impact on the political system can be seen gradually. The process includes personal experiences which might not be expressed but would have an impact. For example, joining some organisation which has some affiliation or ideology, the family's leanings toward a political party

and the subsequent discussions over dinners, the voting behaviour of the elders in the family etc. Political Socialization is how political culture can be changed, sustained or slightly modified. Political socialization can be manipulated by the leadership if it wants a change in the political culture. Sometimes, the leadership might have vested interests but at other times, it might not find the political culture healthy or conducive to the growth of the Nation. We have the example of the Communist Regimes in different countries which used political socialization to change the political culture across Continents.

Besides manifest and latent political socialization, we have specific political socialization in which specific values and beliefs are imparted. The Communist Parry in the defunct USSR presents China as an example. In particularistic socialization, an individual is taught only one role. The examples of the role of the old and the young in the tribes are explanatory. Even Plato indirectly talked about this socialization by advocating an education system where people would be sent to jobs best suited to their capabilities contrary to this is the universalistic socialization in which a cosmopolitan outlook is developed. The individual is encouraged to imbibe several roles and skills. Affective socialization is used by all regimes to stress loyalty to the political system and its leadership. Instrumental socialization is pragmatic because its emphasis is on bargaining and deriving the maximum benefit from the political system. It believes in calculating strategies to benefit from the system. Political socialization has different stages. First, the individual gets absorbed in the general culture and then in the political culture of the country. Childhood is the first stage when the thermistors work on the dren and influence them. As the child grows, educational institutions exert their influence on their thoughts and behaviour regarding their environment, especially the political environment. As the citizens look for employment, other factors like job availability, the employer-employee relationship and the political system's role, all add to the moulding of the former's participation in the political system.

5.6: STAGES OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

There are various stages in the lives of citizens when they are influenced by various factors, both external and internal.

Early childhood- Children are more observers than participants in the initial years of their growth. They absorb from their surroundings and imbibe whatever is doled out to them. And that sets the foundation for a lifetime. The children at this stage learn maximum from their immediate

family members. If the family is very active in the political sphere then the children of the family also have a natural inclination towards politics. Their interest in politics stems from their roots-their families. They imbibe values as are practised around them. Their bent towards the political system is natural for it is talked about more often. On the other hand, if some families talk negatively about the political activities in a political system then the children growing up in such families might have a natural disdain towards the latter.

Late Childhood or Teenage- This is the time when the children's thoughts as well as their notions can change. They become more aware of their rights, their life and their future. They might also realize that the political system is the source of giving them a good life. So, some, who were earlier indifferent about the political system might start taking interest in the politics going on. They would start participating in the political system or at least start pondering the various decisions taken by the political system. They would not only be interested in the decisions taken but also in the process of decisionmaking. This stage decides the extent of future participation of the individual.

Adulthood- This is the stage when the individual becomes a citizen with firm views and beliefs. The process of political socialization continues and the individual might change a little bit, but his/her biases and decisions are clear. As individuals move ahead in life and have personal experiences with the political system they decide their participation. The employment opportunities, the chances to fulfil their aspirations and finally the extent to which their goals are fulfilled decide the individuals' orientations. The process is political socialization and it moulds the adult citizen's thoughts towards the political system.

5.7: AGENTS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Political socialization, like all learning, is a process of interaction between the learner and certain elements of his human environment called socializing agents. These agents can be divided into four groups namely, inter-personal agents, organizational agents, mass-media agents, and structural agents. Family nuclear or joint is the most powerful single socializing agent. It is the first human group of which a child becomes aware, from his birth and during his childhood, he is in closer contact with it than with any other group or social influence. With respect to the content of family socialization, the emphasis is upon acquiring orientations towards group belongings, national identity and the creation of a political self. If in a family, there is frequent discussion

about the state of nation, political party and political functionaries, the child naturally becomes more aware of these political phenomena than the children of those families, where there are less of such discussions. Apart from childhood socialization, the family also plays the role of educator for an individual even in his adolescence.

In addition to parents, people outside the families who are approximately of the same age and share similar statuses, problems and concerns functions as socializing agents. Schoolmates work associates, neighbours fall within this group to influence the political attitudes and behavior of the people. Even it has been found that in the modern industrial society, peer groups are more important than the family members, so far as socialization is concerned.

Children are required to attend school during their adolescence period and the schools provide the most effective direct channel for shaping the citizen's political attitudes and behavior while they are young. Formal education is certainly powerful in developing children's political selves. Educated persons are always found to be more aware about politics than the uneducated people the level of education of its citizens. The civil course, particularly in the elementary and secondary classes assign importance to topics dealing with the political system, personalities, institutions and processes. A child learns about these from reading the civics in the school as well as through discussions with the teachers. Teachers in the school have also an influential role in socializing children.

In India the temples, and in Western countries, the churches also play the role of socializing agents, as the Pundits and the clergy, through their preaching also discuss about politics, nuthouse who visit these places become aware of political objects. However, the impact of secularization has lessened the role of the religious places as agents of the socialization, as has the impact of the many diverse messages to which a modern individual is exposed. Nevertheless, the religious places in the villages in developing countries like India are still playing the role of socializing agents very effectively.

For adults, work places play a significant role for their exposure, learning and involvement in politics, work-place, sometimes, change the political behavior and attitude of the individual. An individual may sometimes get inspiration from the work place to bring changes in the political system. Exchange of ideas with fellow beings may give new information and knowledge to the

individual about politics.

The modern progressive societies, the role of mass media as socializing agents can not be overestimated. With the increase of education level and affluence of the people, mass media communication's importance is increasing day by day. Mass media include newspaper, radio, television, film and published literature which help to shape public opinion and its expression. They constitute a major factor in increasing citizen's awareness of the issues, leaders and policy alternative available in a society.

Interest groups and political parties as political input structure always try to involve individuals in political activity. They also keep the citizen in contact with the political phenomena. They articulate and aggregate the demands of the people as well as make people aware of the political issues, personalities and processes.

There are out put structures of the government which socialize the people about political phenomena. Deliberations in the Houses of the Legislature make people aware about the state of the nation, as well as about political issues and the governmental programmes give political knowledge to the people. Similarly, the court decisions also impart knowledge about the existing laws, their implementations and their interoperations into the minds of the citizens. These structural socializing agents create cognitive and evaluative orientations among the citizens.

5.8: SUMMARY

In conclusion, political socialization is a fundamental process through which individuals develop their political identities, beliefs, and behaviors. This lifelong journey is shaped by a myriad of influences, including family, education, peers, media, religion, significant political events, socioeconomic factors, and cultural norms. Understanding political socialization helps explain the diversity of political opinions and behaviors within a society, as well as how these perspectives are passed from one generation to the next.

The interplay of these influences ensures that political socialization is a dynamic and continuous process, evolving with changing social, economic, and political contexts. Recognizing the factors that contribute to political socialization is crucial for comprehending how citizens form their political attitudes, how they engage with the political system, and how democratic participation can be fostered and sustained. Ultimately, political socialization not only shapes individual

political consciousness but also contributes to the broader political culture and stability of a society.

Political socialization is a very powerful tool to mould political cultures. The various agents of political socialization can even help create an entirely new set of values and attitudes. Its importance is growing in today's world where the traditional structures of a village or tribal community are breaking down. As the world shrinks, political systems are borrowing more from each other. The citizens learn as they move ahead in life. Any event, be it in the social, religious, or economic sphere can influence the political system of a state. Thus, political socialization has to be healthy and positive. It can be moulded in totalitarian regimes as well as in developing countries. In the former, it is controlled while in the latter it is general and diffused. Both situations are dangerous and need to be handled carefully by the few eternal, vigilant citizens within the political system.

5.9: KEY TERMS

- **Peer Groups**: Friends and social networks that can influence political views and discussions.

- **Political Ideology**: A coherent set of beliefs about politics, public policy, and public purpose, which helps give meaning to political events and suggests appropriate responses. Examples include liberalism, conservatism, socialism, and libertarianism.

- **Civic Education**: The education aimed at preparing citizens to be informed and active participants in the political process. It often involves teaching about government structures, political rights, and responsibilities.

- **Primary Socialization**: Early childhood socialization mainly influenced by family and close social contacts.

- **Secondary Socialization**: Ongoing socialization influenced by schools, peers, media, and other social institutions during adolescence and adulthood.

5.10: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the meaning of Political Socialization?

- Discuss the agents of Political Socialization.

- Discuss Stages of the Political Socialization.

- Discuss various forms of Political Socialization.

5.11: REFERENCES

Dawson, Richard E. & P. Kenneth, 1969, Political Socialization, Little Brown & Co, Boston, Paperback.

Greenstein, F. I ., 1972, "Political Socialization", International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, (ed) David L. Silly, Vol. 13, Macmillan Co. and the Fress Press, New York.

Hyman, Herbert. H. 1972, Political Socialization, Amerind Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., Indian Edition.

Ranston, S. A. (ed), 1977, Handbook of Political Socialization – Theory and Research, The Free Press, New York.

rush M. and P. Althroff, 1971, an Introduction to Political Sociology, Nelson, London.

Siegel, R. S. (Ed), 1970, Learning About Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization, Random House, New Delhi.

UNIT-6: POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

Structure

6.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- Meaning and Nature of Political Communication

- Importance of the Political Communication

- Theories and Agents of Political Communication

6.2: INTRODUCTION

Political communication is one of the important links of politics, which was missed for a long time in the theory of politics. The science of communication is found in the theory of cybernetics, which was first used as a technical term in natural science, physics and engineering. The meaning of the term "cybernetics" is the steersman, which put emphasis on "steering" and "control", . Karl Deutsch was the first to use the communication approach to the study of politics was the first to use the communication approach to the study of politics. He pointed out that cybernetics, the science of communications, represents a shift in the centre of interest from "drives" to "sterling". When applied to politics, this puts more emphasis on decisions control and communication, rather, than power.

Political communication can be defined as the connection between politics and citizens and the interaction modes that connect these groups. Whether the relationship is formed by the modes of

persuasion, Pathos, Ethos or Logos. The political communication Approach, a relatively recent and fast-moving development in the field of scientific analysis, leans heavily on the fundamental orientations of cybernetics- the science of control and communication system. It has received great impetus from the revolutionary developments "that occurred after the second world war in the Spheres of engineering and technology. In keeping with the tradition of borrowing perspectives and frames of references extensively from other branches of knowledge, whether belonging to social or natural sciences, a good number of empirical political scientists like Karl W. Deutsch, in particular, have developed a new approach in the discipline of comparative politics whereby the analysis of political phenomena is made based on communication and control system. The main purpose of social theorists subscribing to this approach is that the development in the new science of communication "has led to a diminution in importance of the difference for analytically proposes, between the behaviour of living things and that of social organization. There has, consequently, he would also in the method's argument, been at least a lessening in the gulf between the methods used by natural scientists, on the one hand, and social scientists on the other. Concepts and methods drawn from analysing the behaviour of organisations and Deutsch see that the new sciences can now without fear of being misleading be used to state, as well as other types of political systems as fundamentally, types of the organisation".

6.3: MEANING AND NATURE OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

Political communication is the 'production and impact of persuasive political messages, campaigns, and advertising, often concerning the mass media.' It is an interdisciplinary field that draws from communication, journalism and political science. Political communication is concerned with ideas such as: information flow, political influence, policy making, news, and the effect on citizens. Since the advent of the World Wide Web, the amount of data to analyze has increased and researchers are shifting to computational methods to study the dynamics of political communication. A key theorised system within political communication in advanced economies is the concept of the propaganda having the capacity to be organically spread, via self selection systems in democratic capitalist countries via the propaganda model. In recent years, machine learning, natural language processing, and network analysis have also become key tools in the field. The field also includes: the study of the media, the analysis of speeches by politicians, those that are trying to influence the political process, and conversations among

members of the public. Today many universities offer courses in political communication.

The study and practice of political communication focuses on the ways and means of expression of a political nature. Robert E. Denton and Gary C. Woodward, via their work in Political Communication in America, characterize it as the ways and intentions of message senders to influence the political environment. This includes public discussion (e.g. political speeches, news media coverage, and ordinary citizens' talk) that considers who has authority to sanction the allocation of public resources, who has authority to make decisions, as well as social meaning like what makes someone American.

David L. Swanson and Dan Nimmo define political communication as "the strategic use of communication to influence public knowledge, beliefs, and action on political matters." They emphasize the strategic nature of political communication, highlighting the role of persuasion in political discourse.

Brian McNair provides a similar definition when he writes that political communication is "purposeful communication about politics." For McNair, this means that this not only covers verbal or written statements, but also visual representations such as dress attire, make-up, hairstyle or logo design. In other words, it also includes all those aspects that develop a "political identity" or "image".

According to Harald Borgebund, the author of Political Communication and the Realities of Democracy, "Political communication is essential in a democratic polity."

6.4: IMPORTANCE OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

Communication plays a significant role for the individual, organization, system and politics. Through communication, man interacts with other persons and with the environment; communication has also got implications for the organization. Deutsch says, "it is communication, which is the ability to transmit messages and to react to them that makes organizations". Likewise, in a political system, neither inputs nor outputs can take form, exist, or be related and affect the polity at large without the thread of communication. With respect to policies-national and international both enactment and enforcement is through the network of communication channels. Robert C. North writes, "Politics could not exist without communication, nor could wars be fought. In these terms, a modern nation state may be viewed

essentially as a decision and control system which relies upon the exchange of messages in both its domestic affairs and its foreign relations".

Political communication is a critical component of modern governance and democratic processes. It encompasses the ways in which information is transmitted and exchanged among political actors, institutions, the media, and the public. Here are some key reasons why political communication is important:

1. Informs and Educates the Public

Political communication provides citizens with the information they need to make informed decisions about policies, candidates, and governance. This is essential for a functioning democracy, where the electorate must understand the issues at stake to participate effectively in elections and civic life.

2. Facilitates Public Debate and Deliberation

Through political communication, various viewpoints and opinions are shared, allowing for public debate and deliberation. This process helps to clarify issues, challenge assumptions, and develop a more nuanced understanding of complex topics. Healthy debate is crucial for the development of sound public policies and for holding leaders accountable.

3. Enhances Political Participation

Effective political communication encourages political participation by engaging citizens in the political process. This can include voting, attending town hall meetings, participating in protests, or engaging in online discussions. When people feel informed and heard, they are more likely to participate in political activities.

4. Shapes Public Opinion

Political communication plays a significant role in shaping public opinion. Politicians, interest groups, and the media use communication strategies to influence how the public perceives issues and candidates. This shaping of public opinion can have a direct impact on election outcomes and policy decisions.

5. Holds Leaders Accountable

Through mechanisms such as the free press and public discourse, political communication helps to hold leaders accountable. Journalists, watchdog organizations, and citizens use communication to expose corruption, incompetence, and abuses of power, ensuring that leaders are answerable to the people.

6. Builds Trust and Legitimacy

Transparent and honest political communication helps to build trust and legitimacy in political institutions. When citizens feel that they are being truthfully informed and that their voices are heard, they are more likely to trust their government and its institutions.

7. Crisis Management

In times of crisis, effective political communication is vital for managing public perception and maintaining order. Clear, accurate, and timely communication from political leaders can provide reassurance, prevent panic, and mobilize resources efficiently.

8. Mobilizes Support and Resources

Political communication is key to mobilizing support and resources for political campaigns, policy initiatives, and social movements. It helps to rally people around a cause, generate funding, and coordinate actions among supporters.

9. Promotes Policy Understanding and Implementation

Effective communication helps to explain and promote policies, ensuring that the public understands their purpose, benefits, and implications. This understanding is crucial for the successful implementation of policies, as public support and cooperation are often needed.

10. Adapts to Technological Changes

The landscape of political communication is continually evolving with advancements in technology. Social media, for instance, has transformed how political messages are disseminated and received. Understanding and leveraging these changes are crucial for effective political engagement in the digital age.

6.5: THEORIES OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

In order to understand the theory of communication, Deutsch has used several basic concepts such as, information, load, lag, distortion, gain, feedback, learn and lead. Through the use of all these terms, Deutsch explains how communication helps the system to get information, to interact with the environment, to cope with the environment through feedback process, as well as to think ahead about the future. In a perfect communication system, anything that happens at any point is transmitted fully to the other points. But in the real world, such type of perfect communication is very rare, as in most cases, information becomes added with influence.

When communication takes place within small groups, and is characterized by discussion between known persons, it is known as private communication. Here the audience is limited and the speaker knows to whom he is delivering the communication message. But in public communication, there is no limited audience. The communicator can not know the audience in person with whom he is communicating.

Political communication is a multifaceted field that encompasses various theories explaining how information, media, and political processes interact. Below are some key theories in political communication:

11. **Agenda-Setting Theory**:

    - **Origin**: Developed by Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw in the 1970s.

    - **Core Idea**: Media may not tell people what to think, but it is very effective in telling them what to think about. The media's focus on specific issues influences the public agenda and what topics are deemed important.

12. **Framing Theory**:

    - **Origin**: Rooted in the work of Erving Goffman and expanded by Robert Entman.

    - **Core Idea**: The way information is presented (framed) by the media influences how people interpret and understand that information. Different frames can lead to different perceptions and interpretations of the same issue.

13. **Priming Theory**:

- **Origin**: Related to agenda-setting and derived from cognitive psychology.

- **Core Idea**: Media exposure can influence the criteria by which people evaluate political leaders and issues. Frequent media coverage of specific topics can prime audiences to focus on those issues when making political judgments.

14. **Spiral of Silence Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Elisabeth Noelle-Neumann.

- **Core Idea**: People are less likely to express their opinions if they perceive themselves to be in the minority. Media can create a perceived majority opinion, leading to a spiral where minority opinions become even less visible.

15. **Cultivation Theory**:

- **Origin**: Proposed by George Gerbner.

- **Core Idea**: Long-term exposure to media, especially television, shapes people's perceptions of reality. Heavy viewers of television are more likely to perceive the world in ways that reflect the most consistent and repetitive messages of the media.

16. **Two-Step Flow Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet.

- **Core Idea**: Media effects are indirectly established through opinion leaders, who initially consume media content and then interpret and pass on information to others. This creates a two-step flow of communication from media to opinion leaders to the broader public.

17. **Uses and Gratifications Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Elihu Katz, Jay Blumler, and Michael Gurevitch.

- **Core Idea**: Focuses on why and how individuals actively seek out specific media to satisfy specific needs. It emphasizes the role of the audience as active participants in the communication process, rather than passive receivers.

18. **Propaganda Model**:

- **Origin**: Introduced by Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky.

- **Core Idea**: Media serves the interests of elite groups and corporations. It operates through five filters: ownership, advertising, sourcing, flak, and anti-communism/ideological control. This model suggests that media content is often shaped by these filters to serve powerful interests.

19. **Public Sphere Theory**:

- **Origin**: Associated with Jürgen Habermas.

- **Core Idea**: A democratic society requires a space where citizens can discuss and debate issues freely and rationally. The media plays a crucial role in facilitating or hindering this public discourse.

20. **Media Systems Dependency Theory**:

- **Origin**: Developed by Sandra Ball-Rokeach and Melvin DeFleur.

- **Core Idea**: The more a society depends on media for information, the more influence the media will have on that society. This dependency affects individuals' perceptions and behaviors as they rely on media for understanding their social environment.

These theories collectively illustrate the complex interplay between media, political processes, and public perception. They help explain how media shapes political reality and how individuals and groups use media to influence political outcomes.

6.6: AGENTS OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

The most primitive form of communication structure is the face contact between persons. This is the most informal and interpersonal communication structures. This makes a direct link between

the communicator and the recipients of the communicated messages. With the development of other forms of communication media, though face to face communication structures is being less used, but its importance even today is recognized.

Family, peer groups, religious, institutions to play a prominent role in communicating message to the individuals. They are informal, interpersonal but organizational communicating structures playing an important role particularly in developing societies.

Political output structure such as legislature, bureaucracies and courts are formal and organizational communication structures in a political system and they constitute a particularly important channel of information. The information communicated by these communication structures becomes more reliable and authentic to the people.

Political input structures, such as trade unions, interest groups, pressure groups, political parties constitute yet another significant information channel. These are political, formal and organizational

communication structures disseminating political information to the people and to the leaders as well. They link the citizens with the political leaders through dissemination of information to both. mass media, including newspaper, magazine, books, films, radio and television constitute the most specialized communication structure in modern progressive society. Technological revolution has brought internet information through satellite communication. Mass media are capable at low cost and with minimum distortion.

Political communication involves the dissemination and exchange of information, ideas, and messages intended to influence political decisions, public opinion, and the behavior of individuals and groups. Various agents facilitate political communication, each playing a critical role in shaping the political landscape. Here are the key agents of political communication:

1. Media

- **Traditional Media:** Newspapers, television, radio, and magazines are crucial in informing the public, providing analysis, and framing political issues.

- **New Media:** Digital platforms, including news websites, blogs, and podcasts, offer diverse and often more immediate channels for political communication.

- **Social Media:** Platforms like Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube have become significant for real-time political communication, grassroots mobilization, and direct interaction between politicians and citizens.

2. Political Parties

- Political parties are primary agents in organizing political communication. They create and disseminate policy platforms, campaign messages, and mobilize supporters.

- Party leaders and spokespersons act as key communicators, articulating party positions and responding to political developments.

3. Government and Public Institutions

- Governments communicate through official statements, press conferences, public service announcements, and official websites.

- Public institutions, including legislatures and courts, provide information about their activities, decisions, and public services.

4. Politicians and Political Leaders

- Politicians at various levels (local, regional, national) engage in direct communication with the public through speeches, interviews, social media, and public appearances.

- Political leaders' personal communication styles and charisma can significantly influence public perception and political outcomes.

5. Interest Groups and Lobbyists

- Interest groups, advocacy organizations, and lobbyists communicate to promote specific causes or policies.

- They use various strategies, including media campaigns, direct lobbying, public demonstrations, and grassroots mobilization, to influence public opinion and political decisions.

6. Civil Society and NGOs

- Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society groups play a vital role in political communication, especially in advocating for social issues, human rights, and environmental concerns.

- These organizations use research, reports, campaigns, and public events to communicate their messages and influence policy.

7. Academia and Think Tanks

- Scholars and think tanks contribute to political communication by conducting research, providing expert analysis, and publishing reports and policy briefs.

- They often serve as independent voices, offering data-driven insights and recommendations on various political and policy issues.

8. Corporations and Business Leaders

- Corporations and business leaders engage in political communication through lobbying, public statements, and corporate social responsibility (CSR) initiatives.

- They may also influence politics indirectly through funding political campaigns and supporting policy advocacy.

9. Public Opinion Pollsters and Research Organizations

- Polling organizations and research firms gather and analyze data on public opinion, providing insights into public attitudes and trends.

- Their findings are often used by media, political parties, and policymakers to shape and adjust communication strategies.

10. Cultural and Religious Organizations

- Cultural institutions, religious groups, and community organizations often communicate political messages related to their values and beliefs.

- These organizations can mobilize support and influence public opinion on moral and social issues.

6.7: SUMMARY

In conclusion, political communication is essential for the functioning of modern democracies. It facilitates the exchange of ideas between the government and the governed, shapes public policy, and influences political behavior. The evolution of media, particularly the rise of digital platforms, has significantly impacted how political communication is conducted, presenting both opportunities and challenges. As the landscape continues to change, the principles of transparency, accountability, and ethical communication remain critical to fostering informed and engaged citizens.

Democracy is a government by public opinion, because, public policies are being made on the basis of opinion which people hold at a particular time. Public opinion is often understood as some sort of aggregate of opinions of a whole population. James Bryce (Modern Democracies) defines public opinion as "the aggregate of views men hold regarding matters that affect or interest the community". A. V. Dicey (law and public opinion) defines it as "short way of describing the belief or conviction prevalent in a given society that particular laws are beneficial",

V. O. Key (Public Opinion and American Democracy) defines public opinion as "those opinions held by private persons which government fined it prudent to head". An opinion is an act of expressing what a person believes, values and expects with respect to specific objects, specific behavior and specific issues which has got public concern. This act may be a vote, verbal statement, written document or even silence.

Public opinion is not something vague. It has got some contents relating to some even or issue. It may appear as mass opinion, group opinion or popular opinion. But, it is very difficult to define "public" in quantitative terms.

Communication is the key to public opinion. The question arises who are the communicators who influence public opinion. Public officials are one of the most important groups of communicators who help in constructing public opinion. Public officials may be elected officials like ministers, members of local governing bodies etc. or appointed official like bureaucrats, judges etc.

Another group of persons who creates public opinion are the politicians. They influence and direct the peoples in forming opinion about political matters. the activities also play a significant role in creating and changing opinion of the people about political matters. With the advent of

technological revolution, mass media impart political message to a large number of people within a very short period and thus, help in creating public opinion about political matters. In one sense, the media help to create public opinion not so much by telling people what to think, but what to think about.

6.8: KEY TERMS

- **Public Sphere**: The arena in which citizens come together to discuss and debate societal issues, often facilitated by the media.

- **Agenda Setting**: The process by which the media prioritize issues, shaping the public's perception of what is important.

- **Framing**: The way information is presented to emphasize certain aspects over others, influencing how audiences interpret issues and events.

- **Spin**: A form of propaganda where information is manipulated or presented in a biased manner to favor a particular perspective or interest.

- **Campaign Communication**: The strategies and methods used by political candidates and parties to convey their messages, mobilize supporters, and persuade undecided voters.

- **Social Media**: Digital platforms that allow users to create, share, and interact with content, increasingly important in modern political communication for mobilizing support and spreading information.

6.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss meaning and nature of Political Communication.

- Discuss various theories of Political Communication.

- Discuss the various agents of Political Communication.

- Why Political Communication is important. Discuss.

6.10: REFERNCES

Almond and Powell, Comparative Politic: A Developmental Approach.

Blondel, J., An Introduction to Comparative Government.

Charlesworth, James C., Contemporary Political Analysis.

Deutsch, Karl W., the Nerves of Government.

Halmos, Paul, 1969, the Sociology of Mass Media Communications.

Keele, Staffordshire, University of Keele.

Katz, Ellu and Paul F., Lazrsfed, 1955, Personal Influence, New York: The Free Press, Glencoe.

Merrill and Lowenstein, 1971, Media Message and Men, Ney York, David Mc Kay & Co. INC.

Nimmo, Dan, Political Communication and Public Opinion in America.

Pye, Lucian W., Aspects of Political Development.

Wright, Charles, 1959, Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective, New York, and Random House.

BLOCK-2: ELECTION & PARTY SYSTEM

Unit-7: Election: Meaning, Definition and procedures

Unit-8: Types of election system (First Past the Post,

Proportional Representation, Mixed Representation)

Unit-9: Party System -Evolution, Theories and types

Unit-10: Party system in India

Unit-11: Pressure Groups

Unit-12: Civil Society & Its Role

UNIT-7: ELECTION: MEANING, DEFINITION AND PROCEDURES

Structure

7.1 Objectives

7.2 Introduction

7.3 Meaning and Definition of the Election

7.4 Electoral Procedures

7.5 Summary

7.6 Key Terms

7.7 Self Assessment Questions

7.8 References

7.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able know:

- Meaning and definition of the election
- The electoral process
- Various phases of election

7.2: INTRODUCTION

An election is a formal group decision-making process by which a population chooses an individual or multiple individuals to hold public office. Elections have been the usual mechanism by which modern representative democracy has operated since the 17th century. Elections may fill offices in the legislature, sometimes in the executive and judiciary, and for regional and local government. This process is also used in many other private and business organisations, from clubs to voluntary associations and corporations. The global use of elections as a tool for selecting representatives in modern representative democracies is in contrast with the practice in the democratic archetype, ancient Athens, where the elections were considered an oligarchic institution and most political offices were filled using sortition, also known as allotment, by which officeholders were chosen by lot. Electoral reform describes the process of introducing fair electoral systems where they are not in place, or improving the fairness or effectiveness of existing systems. Psephology is the study of results and other statistics relating to elections (especially with a view to predicting future results). Election is the fact of electing, or

being elected. To *elect* means "to select or make a decision", and so sometimes other forms of ballot such as referendums are referred to as elections, especially in the United States .

7.3: MEANING AND DEFINITON OF ELECTION

Elections were used as early in history as ancient Greece and ancient Rome, and throughout the Medieval period to select rulers such as the Holy Roman Emperor (see imperial election) and the pope (see papal   election).   The Pala King Gopala (ruled c. 750s –   770s CE) in   early medieval Bengal was elected by a group of feudal chieftains. Such elections were quite common in contemporary societies of the region. In the Chola Empire, around 920 CE, in Uthiramerur (in present-day Tamil Nadu), palm leaves were used for selecting the village committee members. The leaves, with candidate names written on them, were put inside a mud pot. To select the committee members, a young boy was asked to take out as many leaves as the number of positions available. This was known as the *Kudavolai* system.

The first recorded popular elections of officials to public office, by majority vote, where all citizens were eligible both to vote and to hold public office, date back to the Ephors of Sparta in 754 BC, under the mixed government of the Spartan Constitution. Athenian democratic elections, where all citizens could hold public office, were not introduced for another 247 years, until the reforms of Cleisthenes.[9] Under the earlier Solonian Constitution (c. 574 BC), all Athenian citizens were eligible to vote in the popular assemblies, on matters of law and policy, and as jurors, but only the three highest classes of citizens could vote in elections. Nor were the lowest of the four classes of Athenian citizens (as defined by the extent of their wealth and property, rather than by birth) eligible to hold public office, through the reforms of Solon. The Spartan election of the Ephors, therefore, also predates the reforms of Solon in Athens by approximately 180 years.

Questions of suffrage, especially suffrage for minority groups, have dominated the history of elections. Males, the dominant cultural group in North America and Europe, often dominated the electorate and continue to do so in many countries. Early elections in countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States were dominated by landed or ruling class males. However, by 1920 all Western European and North American democracies had universal adult male suffrage (except Switzerland) and many countries began to consider women's suffrage. Despite legally mandated universal suffrage for adult males, political barriers were sometimes erected to prevent fair access to elections .

Our modern understanding of revolutions dates back to the French Revolution of 1789. Since the idea of revolution as best means of change has been spread to many parts of the world. Indeed, the 20th Century has become the age of revolution, and most of the revolutions have taken place in undeveloped areas of the world like Asia, Africa and Latin America. While analyzing the French Revolution, de Tocqueville pointed out two important sages the first part related to the concept of "Liberty" and the second phase was concerned with the idea of 'Equality'. These two together attracted the mass to revolt against the despotic rule of Rench dynasties. In the middle of 19th century Marx, Tocqueville. Marx saw in history certain pattern of development through four major stages- Primitive Communism, Feudalism, Capitalism, and Socialism. To him communism would follow after the said four stages, and only after a revolution a new class-less society will emerge.

Today, there is a tendency to view revolution as a disturbance in the political order. It is conceived that when the factors maintaining stability and tranquility are disturbed there will be a situation for revolution. When the social base and political superstructure do not harmonies, they will be wrenched apart by revolution. According to Talcott Parsons, "as systems al societies have some basic tasks to perform". These tasks may be categorized into the following four types: (1) Society must create conditions for the fulfillment of the physical and spiritual needs of the people, and maintain the pattern of life: (2) Society shall ensure that the community must adopt itself to the environment through economy and work: (3) The people must be satisfied that their community has a good purpose to fulfill, and (4) society must be organized towards the ends which it thinks proper. to Parsons, while these four requirements remain fulfilled there is unlikely to be any disturbance in the society. A society may find itself in a state of 'disequilibrium' when the balance is disturbed. And in order to find balance, the society must again undergo some sort of reorganization. As such, a Parson has given us a mechanical theory of change.

Most people, however, regard the overthrow of an established order as a consequence of ideas rather than of a purely mechanical disturbance, as Parsons puts forth. Scholars who ascribe to the aforesaid view explain that it is difficult to conceive of the Pritan revolution in England during 17th century without considering the influence of bible upon the revolutionaries. It is difficult, also, to think of the French revolution without the associated ideas of liberty, equality and fraternity. We can not think of Russian or Chinese revolutions without remembering the impact of the Communist Manifesto. It should, therefore, be noted that revolutions are important social and

cultural therefore, be noted that revolutions are important social and cultural phenomena when they are connected with a movement of ideas.

7.4: ELECTORAL PROCESS

Electoral procedures and systems are the comprehensive constitutional process and systems voting that change the vote into a political decision. The procedures for an election vary depending on the type of election and the specific laws and regulations of the country or organization conducting it. However, there are common elements in many electoral processes. Here are the general procedures:

1. Setting the Date: A date is chosen for the election to take place. This is often determined by legal requirements or the expiration of a term in office.

2. Nomination of Candidates: Individuals interested in running for office must typically go through a nomination process. This may involve gathering a certain number of signatures, paying a fee, or meeting other eligibility criteria.

3. Campaigning: Candidates engage in campaigns to promote their ideas, policies, and qualifications to the voters. This often involves rallies, debates, advertisements, and other means of   communication.

4. Voter Registration: Eligible voters need to register in advance to participate in the election. This ensures that only qualified individuals cast their votes.

5. Voting: On the Election Day, registered voters cast their ballots. This can be done through various methods, including in-person voting at polling stations, mail-in voting, or electronic voting, depending on the jurisdiction.

6. Counting and Tabulation: After the voting period, the ballots are counted, and the results are tabulated. This process is typically conducted by election officials to ensure accuracy and transparency.

7. Declaration of Results: The official results are announced, and winners are declared. In some cases, there may be a runoff election if no candidate receives a majority.

8. Transition of Power: Elected individuals take office, and power is peacefully transferred from the outgoing officials to the newly elected ones. It's important to note that the specific procedures and regulations for elections can vary widely across different countries and regions. Legal frameworks, electoral systems, and cultural factors all contribute to shaping the election process in a particular context.

There are different types of ballots like simple single choice ballots and multiple choice-ranked ballots. There is various counting system. There are two types of ballot system like ballot box and electronic voting machine. Election systems can be also classified into proportional representation, majority and mixed. There are different types of proportional representation like party-list PR, single winner plural voting and two round system. Mixes methods is combination of P.R and majority method. Many states have developed electoral reforms which pleads for systems like approval voting, single transferable vote, instant runoff and Condorcet process. Accountability and openness are important aspect of democratic process. The secret ballot system is modern innovation. A Secret Ballot is a kind of election system in which choices of voters are anonymous. Secret ballot method checks bribery and intimidation. According to the French Constitution all elections should be conducted by secret ballot. The secret ballot was first applied in England on 15th August 1872 in a by-election. The original ballot sealed in wax with stamp is kept in a special room. A secret ballot is a voting method in which each citizen's vote is not open rather personal. In secret ballot system each voter writes. Choice or fix stamp on the side of the symbol or name of the candidate. Generally, in election for lower house and municipal election (India/Odisha) party symbol are printed along with the name of candidate. But in Panchayat elections party symbols are not used. In secret ballot system confidentiality is safeguarded. Secret Ballot is also called the Australian ballot. Proxy vote means ballot cast by a single individual on behalf of the original voter in case of blindness, super physical disability and old age. In presidential election of India name, one has cast vote to all candidate according to choose and MPs and MLAs have different coloured ballot papers. Electronic Voting Machine is voting using electronic means for voting. An EVM have two units namely the control unit and balloting unit, joint together by cable connector. The control unit is with the Presiding Officer whereas the balloting unit is located inside the voting compartment meant for voters. The Polling Officer press the Ballot Button and permits the voter list of the names of the candidates and symbols are

reflected on the EVM with a blue button next to the name of candidate. None of the above or NOTA has been given as option to Indian Voters in different elections since 2009. In this system a person can choose not to vote for any candidates. The System of NOTA option was first applied in the year 2013during Assembly election in Chhattisgarh, Mizoram, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh and Delhi. NOTA have secured more votes than the victory margin. NOTA give chance to a voter to express their inability to vote for candidates. Even if, in any extreme case, the number of votes against NOTA is more than number of votes secured by the candidates, the candidate who secures the largest number of votes among the contesting candidates shall be elected. Postal voting is a method of election in which ballot papers are given to voters and returned by post. Postal vote is allowed in case of inability to travel to a designated polling station. Voters have to apply for postal voting. Postal votes should be mailed back before the Election Day. Generally, the presiding officers and polling officers cannot cast vote in their original booth. In this case postal vote is helpful. There is electronically transmitted Postal Ballot System (ETPBS) for Service Voters. In some cases, polling officer and presiding officer can cast vote in ballot paper in advance at the Offices of Returning Officer or Sub Collector or Collector or B.D.O. The Election Commission of India had given a suggestion in the year 1983 that a procedure should be evolved to hold elections to Lok Sabha and Vidhan Sabha could be conducted in same time. Frequent conduct of elections leads to huge expenditure and use of various resources for two times. The necessary of simultaneous election of Upper House of Indian Parliament and State Legislative Election was felt seriously. The Law Commission of India in its 170th Report on Reform of Electoral Laws had proposed for election in same time to Loka Sabha and state vidhan sabhas as separate election was expensive. According the Parliamentary Standing Committee, simultaneous election can decrease the huge expenditure incurred for managing separate elections every year or once in five years. Frequent and repeated elections lead to imposition of Model Code of Conduct. Elections conducted frequently may create disruption of ordinary public life. The period of disruption may be limited, if elections are held at same time. The term of the Lok Sabha should normally start and end on a particular date. In the case of Vidhan Sabhas, the event of no-confidence motion should be and same time there should be move a confidence motion to form an alternative government. Conducting two elections at same time led to the large-scale purchase of Electronic Voting Machine and Voter Verifiable Paper Audit Trail machines. The Standing Committee proposed an alternative and practicable method which includes holding of elections in two phases. The Election Commission can notify the elections to Lok Sabha and State Vidhan

Sabha six months prior to the end of the natural terms. Training for Presiding Officers and Polling Officers are essential before sufficient time of election. A Polling agent is appointed by election agent of a candidate to observe conduct of poll. The basic objective of appointing a polling agent is to help in detection of personation. Polling agents are appointed after the period when nominations are made. Only one polling agent for one candidate is permitted to stay at polling station. Some polling agents unlawfully act as tellers, identifying those who had not yet voted and passing information from inside polling place to party workers. Anyone who can be voter can also become candidate in elections. The candidate should be a minimum 25 years of age. Every person who wishes to contest an election has to fill up a nomination form and give some money as security deposit. For contesting an election as a candidate, a person must be registered as voter. If a person is convicted of any offence and sentenced to an imprisonment of 2 years or more, this will be a disqualification to contest elections. A government employee in service cannot contest election. Votes are counted under the supervision of the Returning Officer in the presence of counting agent. In case of controversy and complaint there may be recounting of votes. If election result is declared as illegal or improper there may be re-election. Election Management Bodies have always had to cope with natural hazards, but the threat posed by such phenomenon has become more apparent in recent years. The number of natural disasters, including floods and cyclones, has tripled in the last four decades. Electoral crisis may disrupt the functioning of democracies. Natural disasters may affect election results since voters can update preferences and expectations on policies and politician performance following the catastrophe. The occurrence of natural disasters reduces the support for the incumbent politician if his response is perceived as inadequate. A Government prepares Police Services in Democratic Regimes to support the electoral process. In any election, authorities take steps to ensure that voters, candidates, poll workers, observers, and other actors involved in an election experience the process free from fear or harm and to ensure that sensitive election materials are kept secure. Police and military staff are being deployed during election for safety and security. Electoral violence is being controlled by the state police organisation. The security plan for a given election must take into account the implications of deploying armed personnel. An election exit poll is poll of voters taken immediately after they have existed the polling stations. A similar poll conducted before actual voters have voted is called an entrance poll. Pollsters – usually private companies working for newspapers and TV Channel conduct exit polls to gain an early indication as to how an election has turned out, as in many elections the actual result may take hours to count.

7.5: SUMMARY

The theory of revolution explores the dynamics and underlying causes of profound political and social upheavals that result in the radical transformation of existing structures and systems. Understanding revolution involves examining a range of factors including economic conditions, social inequalities, political oppression, cultural shifts, and the actions of key individuals and groups. Various theoretical frameworks, from Marxist to sociological to psychological, provide different lenses through which to analyze the phenomena of revolutions.

Marxist theory, for example, posits that revolutions are the inevitable result of class struggles, driven by the contradictions between the forces and relations of production. Structural theories focus on the breakdown of state institutions and the role of economic crises, while social movement theories emphasize the agency of collective action and the mobilization of resources.

Despite these differing perspectives, common themes emerge. Revolutions are often catalyzed by a combination of systemic crises and the perception among significant segments of the population that change is both necessary and possible. Leadership, ideology, and the capacity for mass mobilization play critical roles in determining the trajectory and outcome of revolutionary movements.

Revolutionary theory also contemplates the outcomes of revolutions, which are not always predictable and can lead to a range of possibilities from the establishment of new forms of governance to the re-entrenchment of authoritarian regimes. The success of a revolution is often measured not only by the immediate change it brings but also by its long-term impact on society and its ability to address the underlying grievances that sparked the revolt.

In conclusion, the theory of revolution provides a multifaceted framework for understanding how and why revolutions occur, the factors that influence their success or failure, and their lasting impacts on societies. While revolutions can lead to significant and often tumultuous change, they are also complex processes influenced by a myriad of economic, social, political, and cultural factors. The study of revolutions continues to evolve, offering insights into the ongoing struggle for justice, equity, and systemic transformation in societies around the world.

7.6: KEY TERMS

- **Revolution**: A fundamental and relatively sudden change in political power and political

organization, often accompanied by social, economic, and cultural transformations.

- **Insurrection**: A violent uprising against an authority or government, typically more localized and less organized than a full-scale revolution.

- **Radicalization**: The process by which individuals or groups adopt extreme political, social, or religious ideals and aspirations that reject or undermine the status quo.

- **Mass Mobilization**: The process of involving large numbers of people in a social movement or political action, crucial for the success of many revolutions.

- **Ideology**: A system of ideas and ideals that forms the basis of economic or political theory and policy. Revolutionary ideologies often promote radical changes in society.

- **Propaganda**: Information, especially biased or misleading, used to promote a political cause or point of view, often utilized by revolutionary groups to garner support.

7.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by change?

- What is Election?

- Discuss various steps in electoral process.

- What are basic needs for an election.

7.11: REFERENCES

Downs, WM, 2011. Electoral System in Comparative Perspective, RHB, London.

Farrell, D, 2001. Electoral System – A comparative Study, Macmillan, London

Gallagher M, 2005. The Politics of Electoral System, Oxford, London.

Herron ES, 2018, Electoral Systems, Oxford, London.

Heywood, Andrew, 2013, Politics and Election, Macmillan, Palgrave

Skocpol, Theda (1979). States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-22439-0.

Goldstone, Jack (1980). "Theories of Revolutions: The Third Generation". World Politics. 32 (3): 425–453.

Grinin, Leonid; Grinin, Anton; Korotayev, Andrey (2022). "20th Century revolutions: characteristics, types, and waves". Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 9 (1): 1–13.

Fukuyama, Francis (1992). The End of History and the Last Man. Penguin. ISBN 978-0-14-013455-1.

UNIT-8: TYPES OF ELECTION SYSTEM

Structure

8.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- Different types of election
- What is the first, past and post election
- The Proportional Representation
- Mixed Representation

8.2: INTRODUCTION

Elections are held in a variety of political, organizational, and corporate settings. Many countries hold elections to select people to serve in their governments, but other types of organizations hold elections as well. For example, many corporations hold elections among shareholders to select a board of directors, and these elections may be mandated by corporate law. In many places, an election to the government is usually a competition among people who have already won a primary election within a political party. Elections within corporations and other organizations often use procedures and rules that are similar to those of governmental elections.

In political science, a revolution is a rapid, fundamental transformation of a society's state, class, ethnic or religious structures. A revolution involves the attempted change in political regimes, substantial mass mobilization, and efforts to force change through non-institutionalized means

(such as mass demonstrations, protests, strikes, or violence).

Revolutions have occurred throughout human history and vary widely in terms of methods, success or failure, duration, and motivating ideology. Revolutions may start with urban insurrections and the collapse of a regime or they may start in the periphery through guerilla war or peasant revolts. Regimes may be vulnerable to revolutions due to military defeats, affronts to national pride and identity, repression and corruption. Revolutions may prompt counter-revolutions that seek to prevent a revolution or reverse the course on an ongoing or successful revolution.[5]

The international system may diffuse ideologies and models of governance, such as nationalism, self-determination, republicanism, liberalism, democracy, fascism and socialism, that inspire revolutions.

8.3: TYPES OF ELECTION SYSTEM

An electoral or voting system is a set of rules that determine how elections and referendums are conducted and how their results are determined. Electoral systems are used in politics to elect governments, while non-political elections may take place in business, non-profit organisations and informal organisations. These rules govern all aspects of the voting process: when elections occur, who is allowed to vote, who can stand as a candidate, how ballots are marked and cast, how the ballots are counted, how votes translate into the election outcome, limits on campaign spending, and other factors that can affect the result. Political electoral systems are defined by constitutions and electoral laws, are typically conducted by election commissions, and can use multiple types of elections for different offices. Some electoral systems elect a single winner to a unique position, such as prime minister, president or governor, while others elect multiple winners, such as members of parliament or boards of directors. When electing a legislature, areas may be divided into constituencies with one or more representatives or the electorate may elect representatives as a single unit. Voters may vote directly for an individual candidate or for a list of candidates put forward by a political party or alliance. There are many variations in electoral systems. The most common single-winner methods all fall under the plurality-with-runoff family, which includes first-preference plurality, two-round, ranked-choice runoff (RCV), and plurality-with-primaries. Many countries combine two or more electoral systems in superposition.

The mathematical and normative study of voting rules falls under the branches of economics called social choice and mechanism design, but the question has also engendered substantial contributions from political scientists, analytic philosophers, computer scientists, and mathematicians. The field has produced several major results, including Arrow's impossibility theorem (showing that ranked voting cannot eliminate the spoiler effect) and Gibbard's theorem (showing it is impossible to design a straightforward voting system, i.e. one where it is always obvious to a strategic voter which ballot they should cast). Revolutions generally undergo four important phases. While analyzing the Western revolutions that occurred in England, America, France and Russia; Crane Brinton says that at the beginning there is a Pre-revolutionary condition. This is most important and crucial phase of any revolution. There are always signs of collapse of revolution, in this phase. Because there takes place a conflict over distribution of wealth, and conflicts between groups and classes. Such conflicts probably grow worse when classes and groups gain equal strength and resources. Further, if there is no agreement on the fundamental objectives, the situation moves towards total breakdown. Severe trouble sometimes arises if the remise is faced with a revolt amongst intellectual groups pre- revolutionary condition. In the Reformist phase attempt is made to draw up a suitable new constitution. For example, in France a Constituent Assembly was set up in order to draw a constitution which aimed at legitimization of the new order. The second phase is characterized by a moment towards extremism. During this state there is bitter argument over the nature of the revolution. People wonder about the purpose of the revolution. Fear and suspicion develop in all quarters, and the revolution plunges into more extreme course of action, and possibility into a 'region of terror'. The third phase involves reaction. After some time seeking for 'purity, and the removal of 'counter revolutionaries', the leaders of the revolution, at this phase, tend to be removed themselves.

These phases provide a general framework for understanding the dynamics of revolutions, although each revolution has its unique characteristics and trajectory.

8.4: THE FIRST, PAST AND POST

FPTP, also known as a winner-takes-all or plurality voting system, is a simple and widely used method in which voters cast their vote for a single candidate in their constituency. The candidate who receives the most votes, even if it is not an absolute majority, wins the seat. The focus is on individual candidates rather than party representation. First-past-the- post voting is a procedure of

election in which voters give vote for one candidate. Plurality block voting is for multi winner contests. The metaphor of FPTP is obtained from horse racing. FPTP is one of the easiest electoral methods and has been applied to elect House of Commons of England. Its application spread to USA, Canada and India. A country is divided into geographic constituencies. It may create disproportional results, as a winner take all method. This generally suit the largest party and parties with strong regional support. Some states apply FPTP alongside proportional representation in a parallel election system, the PR element not compensating for but added to the disproportional of FPTP. FPTP is used to elect head of state. Countries using first past the post include the United Kingdom, Canada and USA. The first Past the Post method is also treated as the simple majority system or plurality method. Examples of FPTP in India include direct elections to the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies. In the election race, the candidate who is ahead of others and crosses the winning post first is the winner A first past the post-election method include one winner and a ballot system through which votes can mark single option from the given candidates' list. In the system of FPTO, the first preferences are important. No ranked preferences system can meet all the criteria which narrate desirable features of a method. The phrase first-past-the-post is British metaphor obtained from horse racing. FPTP is plurality voting procedure meaning the largest part of the whole. The FPTP is also treated as the simple majority system and plurality method. In this voting method, the candidate with maximum votes in a constituency is declared elected. Instances of FPTP in India are direct elections to the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies. The winning candidate need not get a majority rather 50%+1 is needed. A party may get more seats than votes in legislature. This method usually gives the largest party or coalition some extra bonus seats, which is more than their share of votes would allow. Heads Angola, Bosnia, Cameroon, Congo, Guinea, Gambia, Honduras, Iceland, Kiribati, Malawi, Mexico, Nicargua, Palestine, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Rwanda, Singapore, South Korea, China, Tanzania and Venezuela are elected by FPTP. Legislatures of Antigua, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Canada, Dominica, Dominican Republic, Eritrea, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, India, Jamaica, Kenya, Liberia, Malyasia, Malawi, Maldives, Micronesia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Palau, Poland, Qatar, Saint Kitts, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent, Samoa, Soloman islands, Tonga, Triniad, Uganda, United Kingdom, USA, Yemen and Zambia are elected by FPTP. Subnational legislatures of New Zealand, US Virgin Islands, Bermuda, Cayman Island and British Virgin Islands are elected by FPTP. In FPTP, the candidate with the most votes wins, and there is no

requirement for a candidate to secure an absolute majority (more than 50% of the votes). It often leads to a two-party system, and smaller parties may find it challenging to gain representation. Each electoral district typically elects a single representative. Simple and easy to understand, tends to produce strong, single-party governments.

8.5: PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

Proportional Representation is an electoral system designed to ensure a closer proportionality between the votes cast and the resulting distribution of seats in a legislative body. PR systems aim to allocate seats to political parties based on their share of the total votes received. There are various PR methods, such as party-list proportional representation, mixed-member proportional representation, or single transferable vote. PR systems aim to ensure that the distribution of seats in the legislative body reflects the proportion of votes received by each political party. There are different methods of PR, including party-list PR and single transferable vote (STV). Parties are allocated seats based on their overall share of the vote. This system is often used to ensure that smaller parties have a chance of gaining representation. Provides more accurate representation of the diversity of political opinions within the electorate, encourages the formation of multi-party systems. Proportional Representation is a type of electoral method in which subgroups of an electorate are shown proportionately. All votes cast-contribute to the result. All votes cast contribute to results. Each representative in an assembly is elected by a roughly equal number of voters. The seats are allocated in proportion to the vote share each party receives. P.R can be also applied to mean fair represent by population as applicable to regions and states. PR methods are typically proportional to both populations. The most popular methods of P.R system are partylist PR, used in 85 countries, mixed member PR used in seven countries.All PR methods need multi member voting districts. Perfect proportion is rarely possible due to various factors. Proportional Representation is an electoral system where the distribution of seats linked with the proportion of the total votes cast for each party. Proportional Representation is further divided into single transferable vote and list system. Proportional Representation system always have to allow for multiple winners. There needs to be more than one seat in each district. Elections for a single president based on proportional representation is difficult. Party list PR is the most commonly used version of proportional representation. Voters cast votes for parties and each allocated seats based on share Some party list PR systems use overall country wide vote counts; others count vote shares in separate part of the country. The single transferable vote is an older method and

does not need to formally involve party in election process. Candidates run by name, each voter marks preferences for candidates, with marked preferences used to place the vote, and votes cast for the candidates determine the winner. This is done using a preferential ballot. The ranking is used to instruct election officials of how the vote should be used in case it is placed on an un-electable candidate. Under STV, an amount that guarantees election is set, which is called quota. In the first count, the first preferences of all the voters are counted. The President of India is elected through an Electoral College system, wherein the votes are cast by national and state level lawmakers. The electoral college is made up of all the elected members of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and Vidhan Sabha. A vote cast by each MP or MLA is not calculated as one vote. The fixed value of each vote by an MP is 702. The vote value of each MLA differs from state to state based on calculation that factors in its population according to the number of members in its legislative Assembly. The value of each MLA's vote is determined by dividing the population of the state by the number of MLAs in its legislative assembly and the quotient achieved is further divided by 1000.While counting, The EC totals up all the valid votes cast by the electoral college through paper ballots to win, the candidate must secure 50 % of the total votes cast +1. The voters of the electoral college write the names of candidates on the ballot paper in the order of preferences. The Indian President's election is held in accordance with the system of proportional representation by means of the single transferable vote and voting is by secret ballot. The first preferred candidate with lowest vote is eliminated and the votes in his favour are transferred to the remaining candidates. Proportional Representation system tries to resolve the unfairness of majority and plurality voting method in which the largest parties receive an unfair seat bonus and smaller parties are disadvantaged. However, PR system with high electoral result are not necessarily much fairer. Plurality-majority methods also benefit regional partis that win many seats in the region. The use of multiple-member districts enables a great variety of candidates to be elected. The dominant parties in prurality-majority methods, often looked on as coalition. The election of smaller parties gives rise to one of the principal objections to PR method, that they almost always result in coalition governments. Plurality method generally results in single party majority government because generally fewer parties are elected in large numbers. As there are fewer wasted votes, voters aware that their vote can make no difference. Proportional systems reflect greater political efficacy. PR methods due to larger and fewer multiple member districts, are less prone too gerrymandering. Mixed member systems are susceptible to gerrymandering. A particular advantage of plurality electoral method is the alternative vote, the geographic link

between representatives and their constituents. PR system would give minority parties and independent candidates a better chance of winning seats in Parliament. PR ensures that the parties would have to appeal to the core of supporters. The PR system delivers fairer treatment ofn minority parties and independent candidates. Under PR system fewer votes are wasted and more people's preferences are taken into candidates. PR system potentially offers greater and more representative choice for voters. PR may encourage turn-out and reduce apathy. P.R rarely produces an absolute majority for one party; however, PR ensures greater continuity of government. Proportional Representation can potentially provide a route for extremist to force their way into political flow. PR creates weak coalition governments. PR can reduce accountability to voters. The PR system weaken the link between the elected representatives. PR allows can put voters off voting. This system presents a true reflection of popular votes. PR system gives representation for all groups of a community. This system is democratic in nature. Minority groups are protected in PR system. PR system provides voters broader choice to make in a multi member constituency. It avoids wastage of surplus votes. But the PR system is complicated and confusing. Also, this system is expensive in nature. PR system encourages multiplication of political parties which may create election violence. This system can lead to political instability. There may be manipulation of political parties in this system. It is problematic on part of the election officers to conduct this type of election. Eighty-five countries of the world apply proportional representation for filling national elective organ. Countries using P.R system are Albania, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Armenia, Aruba, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, East Timor, Ecuador, El Savador, Guinea, Estonia, European Union, Faroe Islands. Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greenland, Guatmela, Hondras, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Kosovo, Latvia, Lebanon, Liechtenstein, Lesotho, Luxembourg, Macedonia, Malta, Maldova, Montenegro, Mozambique, Namibia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nepal, Norway, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Rwanda, San marino, India, Serbia, Sint Maarten, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey and Urguay. Proportional Representation system is also applied in election for Legislative Council of various states in India. In India Rajya Sabha MPs are elected by the electoral college of the elected members of State Assembly with a system of proportional representation by a single transferable vote. There is no system of formal elections for House of Lords in England. In Indian

University system some syndicate members are being elected by the non-teaching and teaching members of the senate by single transferable vote in accordance with the system of proportional representation. In election for Senate of Indian University every college become polling booth. In this election all teaching staff of all degree Colleges are voters and they can also contest. One voter has to select more than five senate members.

8.6: MIXED REPRESENTATION

Mixed electoral systems attempt to combine the positive attributes of both plurality/majority (or other) and Proportional Representation electoral systems. In a mixed system, there are two electoral systems using different formulae running alongside each other. There are two types of Mixed representation systems. Their name with detailed description as follow

Mixed Member Proportional Representation-Mixed-member proportional representation (MMP) is mixed or "hybrid" because it combines elements of proportional and single-member plurality systems. Combining elements of FPTP and PR, MMP has two vote components: one for a political party and another for a candidate in a specific constituency. Seats are then allocated proportionally to parties based on the overall vote share. Some representatives are elected through FPTP in singlemember constituencies, while others are chosen from party lists to ensure proportional representation. Maintains a link between constituents and local representatives while ensuring a degree of proportionality in the overall composition of the legislative body. Voters have two votes: one for a candidate contesting the election from their constituency, and a second for a party or a candidate on a party list. Voters have two ballot papers. On the first is a list of candidates who want to be the local Member of Parliament (MP). On the second ballot paper is a list of parties who want seats in parliament. Each party will publish a list of candidates in advance. A vote for a party is a vote to make more of their list of candidates into MPs. Hence, MMP provides constituencies with individual representatives for part of the seats in the House. The rest of the candidates are elected from a list that each party prepares before the election.

Parallel systems- Parallel systems also use both Proportional Representation (PR) and plurality/majority components, but unlike Mixed Member Proportional Representation systems, the PR component of a parallel system does not compensate for any disproportionality within the plurality/majority districts. In a Parallel system, as in MMP, two separate ballot papers, one for the plurality/majority seat and one for the PR seats, as is done for example in Japan, Lithuania, and Thailand. Parallel systems have been a product of electoral system design over the last decade

and a half—perhaps because they appear to combine the benefits of PR lists with those of plurality/majority representation. The choice of an election system can have a profound impact on the nature of representation and the functioning of a political system, influencing factors such as party competition, the likelihood of coalition governments, and the representation of diverse political views. Different countries employ various systems based on their specific political contexts and

8.7: SUMMARY

The conclusion of a revolution is a multifaceted process that marks the transition from the upheaval of established systems to the establishment of new structures. This phase is critical as it determines whether the revolution's goals will be achieved and how the new order will be stabilized. The end of a revolution is not merely the cessation of conflict but the beginning of a complex and often challenging journey towards building a new and improved society. The success of this phase hinges on effective leadership, meaningful reforms, reconciliation, economic stability, and the lasting institutionalization of revolutionary ideals. The true measure of a revolution's success lies in its ability to create a sustainable, just, and equitable society that reflects the aspirations of its participants.

8.8: KEY TERMS

- **Revolution**: A significant change that usually occurs in a relatively short period of time, often involving the overthrow of a government or social order in favor of a new system.

- **Insurrection**: A violent uprising against an authority or government, often a precursor or component of a broader revolution.

- **Rebellion**: An act of violent or open resistance to an established government or ruler.

- **Uprising**: An act of resistance or rebellion; a revolt.

- **Regime Change**: The replacement of one government regime with another, typically through political, military, or revolutionary means.

8.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is a Election system?
- Discuss different types of electoral system.
- Discuss the mixed representation system.
- Discuss the first and past election system in India

- Discuss the proportional representation system.

8.10: REFERENCES

Downs, WM, 2011. Electoral System in Comparative Perspective, RHB, London.

Farrell, D, 2001. Electoral System – A comparative Study, Macmillan, London

Gallagher M, 2005. The Politics of Electoral System, Oxford, London.

Herron ES, 2018, Electoral Systems, Oxford, London.

Heywood, Andrew, 2013, Politics and Election, Macmillan, Palgrave

Skocpol, Theda (1979). States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-22439-0.

Goldstone, Jack (1980). "Theories of Revolutions: The Third Generation". World Politics. 32 (3): 425–453.

Grinin, Leonid; Grinin, Anton; Korotayev, Andrey (2022). "20th Century revolutions: characteristics, types, and waves". Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 9 (1): 1–13.

Fukuyama, Francis (1992). The End of History and the Last Man. Penguin. ISBN 978-0-14-013455-1.

UNIT-9: PARTY SYSTEM: EVOLUTION, THEORIES AND TYPES

Structure

9.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is Party system?

- Evolution of Party system in India.

- Various theories of Party System

- Different types of party system

9.2: INTRODUCTION

A party system is a concept in comparative political science concerning the system of government by political parties in a democratic country. The idea is that political parties have basic similarities: they control the government, have a stable base of mass popular support, and create internal mechanisms for controlling funding, information and nominations.

The party system concept was originated by European scholars studying the United States, especially James Bryce, Giovanni Sartori and Moisey Ostrogorsky, and has been expanded to cover other democracies. Party systems can be distinguished by the degree of political fragmentation, proportionality of seats-to-votes ratio and barriers to entry to the political competition. A social movement is a loosely organized effort by a large group of people to achieve a particular goal, typically a social or political one. This may be to carry out a social

change, or to resist or undo one. It is a type of group action and may involve individuals, organizations, or both. Social movements have been described as "organizational structures and strategies that may empower oppressed populations to mount effective challenges and resist the more powerful and advantaged elites". They represent a method of social change from the bottom within nations. On the other hand, some social movements do not aim to make society more egalitarian, but to maintain or amplify existing power relationships. For example, scholars have described fascism as a social movement.

Social movements are universal found in all societies in the past and present. Their nature, scope and frequency vary. In the early period of political formations social movements shaped the state – its functions, responsibilities as well as accountability and also its political boundary. They also played an important role in distribution of power among various segments in society. In modern times they have played a very important role in challenging the Church and feudal authority, foreign rules and authoritarian regimes. French and Russian revolutions, Indian freedom movement, various peasant movements have profound impact on our life. The fascist movement in Germany, Islamic movement in Middle east, Hindutva movement in India or Tamilian movement in Sri Lanka have not only influenced political system but also value system of the people. Their legacies influence us all in a variety of ways. In the contemporary times their occurrences are in all the states. They often though not always play decisive role in all political systems – democratic and authoritarian. They make and unmake political institutions, norms of social and political behaviour and also nature of regimes. Social and political conflicts as well as expectations of the people get reflected in movements.

9.3: THE CONCEPT OF PARTY SYSTEM

A party system is an important concept in political theory and comparative politics. Political parties control the government and have strong base of mass popular support. The concept of party system was originated by James Bryce, Giovanni Satori and Moisey, Astrogorsky. A political party is an organized body for coordinating candidates to compete in elections. It is general for the members of a party to keep similar ideas. Political parties are treated as collective entities for organizing competition for political offices. Political party is treated as organised group of likely minded people that recruit candidates for election. Parties should have specific aims and objectives with ideology & rules-regulations. Political Party can be defined as an

organised group consist of cross sections of human beings try to control government. A political party is an organized group of people or bodies who seek to capture political power through an election in order to run the governmental affairs of a country. A group of people who come together to hold power and form government by contesting and winning elections is treated as political party. Political Parties constitute the main instrument of interest-aggregation. There are three components of a political party namely the leaders, the active members and the followers. The common features of a political party are to obtain power, faith in ideology, prepare a general agenda, to form government and present demand of people. A political party contests elections by putting up candidates. It shapes public opinion. Parties offer access to government machinery and welfare schemes. Sectional interests are being united, geographical differences are bridged and cohesion induced by political parties. Political parties assist and coordinate the actions of public officials. A political party work as a watchdog of the government's policy. There are three ways in which political parties shape the public opinion. Different social, political and economic issues are being raised and highlighted by political parties.

9.4: EVOLUTION OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

The First Party System was the political party system in the United States between roughly 1792 and 1824. It featured two national parties competing for control of the presidency, Congress, and the states: the Federalist Party, created largely by Alexander Hamilton, and the rival Jeffersonian Democratic-Republican Party, formed by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison, usually called at the time the Republican Party (which is distinct from the modern Republican Party).

The Federalists were dominant until 1800, while the Republicans were dominant after 1800. Both parties originated in national politics, but soon expanded their efforts to gain supporters and voters in every state. The Federalists appealed to the business community and the Republicans to the planters and farmers. By 1796, politics in every state was nearly monopolized by the two parties, with party newspapers and caucuses becoming effective tools to mobilize voters.

The Federalists promoted the financial system of Treasury Secretary Hamilton, which emphasized federal assumption of state debts, a tariff to pay off those debts, a national bank to facilitate financing, and encouragement of banking and manufacturing. The Republicans, based in the plantation South, opposed strong executive power, were hostile to a standing army and navy,

demanded a strict reading of the Constitutional powers of the federal government, and strongly opposed the Hamilton financial program. Perhaps even more important was foreign policy, where the Federalists favored Britain because of its political stability and its close ties to American trade, while the Republicans admired France and the French Revolution. Jefferson was especially fearful that British aristocratic influences would undermine republicanism. Britain and France were at war from 1793 to 1815, with only one brief interruption. Official American policy was neutrality, with the Federalists hostile to France, and the Republicans hostile to Britain. The Jay Treaty of 1794 marked the decisive mobilization of the two parties and their supporters in every state. President George Washington, while officially nonpartisan, generally supported the Federalists and that party made Washington their iconic hero.

The First Party System ended during the Era of Good Feelings (1816–1824), as the Federalists shrank to a few isolated strongholds and the Democratic-Republicans lost unity. In 1824–28, as the Second Party System emerged, the Democratic-Republican Party split into the Jacksonian faction, which became the modern Democratic Party in the 1830s, and the Henry Clay faction, which was absorbed by Clay's Whig Party.

9.5: THEORIES OF THE PARTY SYSTEM

Social movements are complex entities that involve various components working together to promote social change. Here are the key components of social movements:

1. **Leadership and Organization**:

   - **Leadership**: Effective leaders are crucial for inspiring, organizing, and sustaining a movement. They articulate the movement's goals and strategies and mobilize resources.

   - **Organization**: This includes the structures and networks that coordinate the activities of the movement, ranging from formal organizations to informal networks.

2. **Ideology and Goals**:

   - **Ideology**: A coherent set of beliefs and values that defines the movement's vision and provides a framework for action.

- **Goals**: Specific objectives the movement aims to achieve, which can be short-term or long-term, and may evolve over time.

3. **Mobilization Resources**:

   - **Human Resources**: Activists, supporters, and volunteers who participate in and sustain the movement.

   - **Material Resources**: Financial support, facilities, equipment, and other tangible assets necessary for organizing activities.

   - **Social Capital**: Networks and relationships that facilitate collective action, including alliances with other groups and access to influential individuals or institutions.

4. **Collective Identity**:

   - A shared sense of belonging and common purpose among members, which strengthens solidarity and commitment. This identity is often built through symbols, rituals, and narratives.

5. **Framing**:

   - The process of constructing and promoting a particular interpretation of issues and events to gain support and motivate action. Effective framing aligns the movement's goals with broader societal values and concerns.

6. **Political Opportunity Structures**:

   - The external environment in which the movement operates, including the political context, social structures, and cultural norms. This component considers how opportunities and constraints within the environment impact the movement's strategy and success.

7. **Tactics and Strategies**:

   - **Tactics**: Specific actions taken to achieve goals, such as protests, demonstrations, lobbying, civil disobedience, and social media campaigns.

- **Strategies**: Broader plans that guide the movement's activities over time, often involving a mix of confrontational and cooperative approaches.

8. **Communication and Media**:

- The methods used to disseminate information, raise awareness, and recruit members. This includes traditional media (newspapers, television) and new media (social media, blogs, websites).

9. **Countermovements and Repression**:

- Responses from opposition groups and the state, including countermovements that challenge the goals of the original movement and repression efforts aimed at limiting the movement's activities.

Understanding these components helps to analyze how social movements form, evolve, and achieve their objectives. Each component plays a vital role in the overall effectiveness and sustainability of the movement.

9.6: TYPES OF PARTY SYSTEM

Main classification of party systems is using the number of parties. Counting the "effective number" of parties is somewhat tricky since the decisions need to be made as to which parties shall be included into the count. Including all parties usually makes little sense: for example, in the 2005 United Kingdom general election 16 entities run candidates and 12 got seats in the parliament, however, no researcher would argue that UK at the time had a 16- or 12-party system. The practical choice would be between a two-party (Labour won 35% of the vote, Conservatives 32%), or three-party system (Liberal Democrats got 22%). Some researchers suggest to exclude parties with low percentage of votes (for example, Alan Ware recommends a 3% threshold), others, like Giovanni Sartori, suggest looking at the history of participation in the governments. The 2005 UK example will yield 3 parties if Ware's definition is used and 2 parties if Sartori's definition is chosen, since the Liberal Democrats almost never influenced the government formation.

The classification is based on the typology originally proposed by Jean Blondel (1968):

- One-party system: a system in which a single political party has the right to form the government, usually based on the existing constitution, or where only one party has the exclusive control over political power. Example: China

- Dominant-party system: a system where there is "a category of parties/political organizations that have successively won election victories and whose future defeat cannot be envisaged or is unlikely for the foreseeable future". Example: Russia

- Two party system: a system where only two parties or alliances, typically placed either side of the center, have a realistic chance of forming a majority. Other parties are very minor or solely regional. Example: United States, United Kingdom

- Two-and-a-half party system where each of the two major political parties that stand apart on the political spectrum needs a coalition with a smaller "half" party for political control. Example: post-war Federal Republic of Germany until the end of the 20th century[9]

- Multi-party system: a system in which multiple political parties have the capacity to gain control of government offices, separately or in coalition. Example: Sweden, Ireland

- Non-partisan system: a system of government or organization such that universal and periodic elections take place without reference to political parties. Example: Micronesia

Sartori splits the original Blondel's "one-party" category into true one party (no other ones exist), "hegemonic" (other parties exist, but there is no practical competition), and "predominant", where competition exists, but one party on a regular basis gets over 50% of the votes. He had also split the multiparty system into "moderate pluralism" (3-5 "relevant" parties) and "extreme pluralism" (6-8 parties) and introduced an "atomized" party system, where the political system is so fragmented that adding one more party does not affect the political process at all. The functioning of the moderate pluralism resembles the two-party rule: there are two camps separated in the political spectrum with established electorate, the competition occurs for the voters in the political center, the political forces are cetripetal. The "polarized pluralism" is different: "anti-system parties" position themselves at the fringes of the spectrum are detached from the center, so the parties in the center are left without a credible election threat. This results in deep political divisions, "centrifugal forces", and "irresponsible oppositions" that do "outbidding" secure in their knowledge that they will not have to govern and thus can safely over-promise. Sartori declares

that the 5-party threshold between moderate and extreme pluralism is not a cause of change, but a result of the process of elite accommodation in the moderate case and lack thereof in the extreme pluralism.

9.7: SUMMARY

The political party, we mean an organized group of citizens who profess to share the same political views and who by acting as a political unit try to control and influence the government. The salient features of party system are common political views, national interest, constitutional methods, attainment of political power, party level decision making and strong ideology. The main functions of political parties are to work as a tool of democracy, formulates public policies, educates public opinion, provides political stability and helps recruit the leaders. Parties are classified as one-party system, bi-party system and multi-party system. Political parties have come into existence due to several factors that include human distinct of combativeness, temporal differences, dynamic leadership, social and political changes like limitations imposed on the monarchy and extension of universal adult suffrage as also divergent interests of the people. While one party system is usually treated as anti- democratic bi-party and multi-party systems have advantages and disadvantages. In bi-party system there is political stability but multi-party system may lead to frequent political instability and defection before and after elections. The political culture of a country determines the suitability of a particular kind of party system for that country. Some parties run the government are known as ruling party and those others in the legislature who do not join the government form the opposition. The opposition represents the legitimate dissent of the electorate. By pointing out the lapses and failures of the government it makes it responsible. The negative role of political parties may pollute the very essence of democracy. Regional political parties operate in regions or sate which is the product of regionalism. Communist and socialist parties known as leftist parties.

9.8: KEY TERMS

- **Social Movement**: A collective, organized effort by a large group of people to bring about or resist social change.

- **Collective Action**: Actions taken together by a group of people whose goal is to enhance their status and achieve a common objective.

- **Activism**: The policy or action of using vigorous campaigning to bring about political or social change.

- **Mobilization**: The process by which a group goes from being a passive collection of individuals to an active participant in public life.

- **Repression**: Actions taken by authorities to diminish or eliminate social movements, often through the use of force, legal action, or other means of suppression.

- **Nonviolent Resistance**: The practice of achieving goals through symbolic protests, civil disobedience, and other nonviolent means.

- **Radical Movement**: A social movement that aims for fundamental change in the structure of society, often advocating for revolutionary changes.

- **Countermovement**: A movement that arises in response to another movement, aiming to counter its goals and progress.

9.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is a party system?
- Discuss the evolution of the Party System.
- Discuss various theories of the party system.
- Discuss difference types of party system in the world.

9.10: REFERENCES

Lavy Pattrica, 2012. Political Parits, Oxford, London.

Michels Robert, 2018. Sociological Study of Political Paerties, Bookscape New Delhi.

Mule Rosa, 2018. Political Parties – Games and Redistribution, Bookscape, London.

Tiwari Rakesh Kumar, 2015. Political Parties and Elections in India, R.P, Dispur.

Tripathy Arun Kumar, 2009. Seminar Paper on the Changing Role of Political Parties, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Utkal University.

Ware Alan, 2005. Glimpses of Political Parties in World, Hardback, London .

UNIT-10: PARTY SYSTEM IN INDIA

Structure

10.1 Objectives

10.2 Introduction

10.3 Definition and Meaning of Party system

10.4 Classification of the Party System in India

10.5 Features of the Party system in India

10.6 Summary

10.7 Key Terms

10.8 Self Assessment Questions

10.9 References

10.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is a Party System?
- Classifications of the Party System in India
- Various features of the Party System in India

10.2: INTRODUCTION

In a democratic political system, they are important tools in strengthening democracy. And their characteristics consist of organizations, leaderships, ideologies, policies and programmes, support bases and patterns of mobilization of support. Party system indicates number of political parties in a political system, and nature of coalition which political parties forge before and after elections, and in forming governments. You also have read in unit 2, about political parties and their types in India. This unit will explain how the political parties in India can be grouped in terms of political systems. The contemporary party system in India originally developed in the context of the struggle for freedom. The purpose of political parties changed after Independence. Before Independence, the political parties were part of national movement with the main purpose of achieving Independence. After Independence, their purpose shifted to gain power and form government. For this purpose, they competed. Consequently, the party system in India underwent transformation from the dominance of a single party to emergence of multiple parties. Although

India has a multi-party system, the party system has gone through many phases. For instances, in the first two decades of independence the country had one dominant party vs multiparty system. The concept of the multi-party system and coalition government at the centre became popular after 1989. Political parties and party system in India have been greatly influenced by cultural diversity, social, ethnic, caste, community and religious pluralism, traditions of the nationalist movement, contrasting style of the party leadership, and clashing ideological perspectives.The Indian Constitution has established a parliamentary form of government both at the Centre and at the State. The members of the Lok Sabha and VidhanSabha are elected through elections by citizens of the country. Therefore, the political parties which contest the elections become part and parcel of the political system (party system) of the country. The party system is a link between people and the government.

Protest groups tend to be single issue based and are often local in terms of the scope of change they wish to effect. In contrast, NSMs last longer than single issue campaigns and wish to see change on an (inter)national level on various issues in relation to their set of beliefs and ideals. A NSM may, however adopt the tactic of a protest campaign as part of its strategy for achieving wider-ranging change.

Examples of those new movements include the women's movement, the ecology movement, gay rights movement and various peace movements, among others.

10.3: DEFINITION AND MEANING OF PARTY SYSTEM IN INDIA

The Party System in India implies a multi-party system in which various political parties fight democratically for power. They are organized groups and voluntary associations of individuals with a shared political ideology that tries to gain power and rule the country through constitutional means to promote national interests. The different political parties in India under this system are recognized at the national and state levels by the Election Commission of India if they meet the relevant criteria in the general elections of the State Legislative Assembly or Lok Sabha. As per the latest statistics, the total number of registered political parties in India is 2858. Of these, there are 54 state parties, 8 national parties, and 2796 unrecognized parties. New social movements (NSMs) are a form of social activism that emerged in the latter half of the 20th century, focusing on issues beyond traditional economic and political concerns, such as identity, culture, and lifestyle. These movements address a wide array of topics including environmentalism, gender equality, LGBTQ+ rights, peace, civil rights, and more. They are

characterized by their decentralized, participatory structures, emphasis on cultural and symbolic change, and utilization of new communication technologies. Unlike traditional social movements, which primarily centered around class struggles and economic inequalities, NSMs seek to transform societal norms, values, and practices through both local and global actions.

The new social Movement results from sustained collective action and the intuition of a leader who can structure the protests and bring the members together. The members of the Movement should have shared ideologies to work toward the same goal.

The New Social Movements (NSM) are not directing their collective action to state power. They are concerned with individual and collective morality. Andre Gunder Frank and Marta Fuentenes find that NSMs "share the force of morality and a sense of (in)justice in individual motivation, and the force of social mobilisation in developing social power. Individual membership or participation and motivation in all sorts of social movements contain a strong moral component and defensive concern with justice in the social and world order."

There is a provision for a bicameral legislature consisting of an upper house, the Rajya Sabha (Council of States), which represents the states of the Indian federation, and a lower house, the Lok Sabha (House of the People), which represents the people of India as a whole. The Constitution provides for an independent judiciary, which is headed by the Supreme Court. The court's mandate is to protect the Constitution, to settle disputes between the central government and the states, to settle inter-state disputes, to nullify any central or state laws that go against the Constitution and to protect the fundamental rights of citizens, issuing writs for their enforcement in cases of violation.

There are 543 members in the Lok Sabha, who are elected using plurality voting (first past the post) system from 543 Single-member district. There are 245 members in the Rajya Sabha, out of which 233 are elected through indirect elections by single transferable vote by the members of the state legislative assemblies; 12 other members are elected/nominated by the President of India. Governments are formed through elections held every five years (unless otherwise specified), by parties that secure a majority of members in their respective lower houses (Lok Sabha in the central government and Vidhan Sabha in states). India had its first general election in 1951, which was won by the Indian National Congress, a political party that went on to dominate subsequent elections until 1977, when a non-Congress government was formed for the first time in independent India. The 1990s saw the end of single-party domination and the rise of coalition

governments. The latest 18th Lok Sabha elections was conducted in seven phases from 19 April 2024 to 1 June 2024 by the Election commission of India. The results bought in the NDA (National Democratic Alliance) to form in the next government

In recent decades, Indian politics has become a dynastic affair. Possible reasons for this could be the party stability, absence of party organisations, independent civil society associations that mobilise support for the parties and centralised financing of elections. According to the V-Dem Democracy indices India in 2023 was the 19th most electoral democratic country in Asia.

10.4: CLASSIFICATION OF THE PARTY SYSTEM IN INDIA

Single/One-Party System: A Single-party state or One-party system is a political system in which only one political party controls the affairs of the government. In this kind of system, there is no democracy or rule of law because powers are concentrated in the hands of one person or group of people. Some examples of countries that still practice this political system include North Korea, Cuba, China, etc. Conversely, the dominant political party is usually referred to as a 'de facto one-party state'.

• **Two-Party System** In government structures, a two-party system means that only two political parties receive a majority of the votes that are cast for representatives. Only one party or the other can win a majority in the government. A two-party system can also be used to describe a system where two major parties dominate an election and work together to form a majority ruling coalition, even if neither party won an outright majority on their own. For example The United States, and Great Britain.

• **Multi-Party System** The multi-party system is a political system in which more than two political parties are allowed to exist and compete for gaining political power and governing the country. This type of party system is an extension of a two-party system as one party seldom wins a clear-cut majority of seats in the parliament to enable it to form the government

10.5: FEATURES OF THE PARTY SYSTEM IN INDIA

The Indian party system has the following characteristic features:

Multi-Party System: The continental size of the country, the diversified character of Indian society, the adoption of universal adult franchise, the peculiar type of political process, and other

factors have given rise to a large number of political parties. In fact, India has the largest number of political parties in the world. On the eve of seventeenth Lok Sabha general elections (2019), there were 7 national parties, 52 state parties and 2354 registered - unrecognised parties in the country. Further, India has all categories of parties–left parties, centrist parties, right parties, communal parties, non-communal parties and so on. Consequently, the hung Parliaments, hung assemblies and coalition governments have become a common phenomena.

One-Dominant Party System: In spite of the multiparty system, the political scene in India was dominated for a long period by the Congress. Hence, Rajni Kothari, an eminent political analyst, preferred to call the Indian party system as 'one party dominance system' or the 'Congress System'. The dominant position enjoyed by the Congress has been declining since 1967 with the rise of regional parties and other national parties like Janata (1977), Janata Dal (1989) and the BJP (1991) leading to the development of a competitive multi- party system

Lack of Clear Ideology: Except the BJP and the two communist parties (CPI and CPM), all other parties do not have a clear-cut ideology. They (i.e., all other parties) are ideologically closer to each other. They have a close resemblance in their policies and programmes. Almost every party advocates democracy, secularism, socialism and Gandhism. More than this, every party, including the so-called ideological parties, is guided by only one consideration–power capture. Thus, politics has become issue based rather than the ideology and pragmatism has replaced the commitment to the principles.

Personality Cult: Quite often, the parties are organised around an eminent leader who becomes more important than the party and its ideology. Parties are known by their leaders rather than by their manifesto. It is a fact that the popularity of the Congress was mainly due to the leadership of Nehru, Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi. Similarly, the AIADMK in Tamil Nadu and TDP in Andhra Pradesh got identified with MG Ramachandran and NT Rama Rao respectively. Interestingly, several parties bear the name of their leader like Biju Janata Dal, Lok Dal (A), Congress (I) and so on. Hence, it is said that there are political personalities rather than political parties in India.

Based on Traditional Factors: In the western countries, the political parties are formed on the basis of socio-economic and political programme. On the other hand, a large number of parties in India are formed on the basis of religion, caste, language, culture, race and so on. For example Shiv Sena, Muslim League, Hindu Maha Sabha, Akali Dal, Muslim Majlis, Bahujan Samaj Party, Republican Party of India, Gorkha League and so on. These parties work for the promotion of

communal and sectional interests and thereby undermine the general public interest.

Emergence of Regional Parties: Another significant feature of the Indian party system is the emergence of a large number of regional parties and their growing role. They have become the ruling parties in various states like BJD in Orissa, DMK or AIADMK in Tamil Nadu, Akali Dal in Punjab, AGP in Assam, National Conference in J&K, JD(U) in Bihar and so on. In the beginning, they were confined to the regional politics only. But, of late, they have come to play a significant role in the national politics due to coalition governments at the Centre. In the 1984 elections, the TDP emerged as the largest opposition party in the Lok Sabha.

Factions and Defections: Factionalism, defections, splits, mergers, fragmentation, polarisation and so on have been an important aspect of the functioning of political parties in India. Lust for power and material considerations have made the politicians to leave their party and join another party or start a new party. The practice of defections gained greater currency after the fourth general elections (1967). This phenomenon caused political instability both at the Centre and in the states and led to disintegration of the parties. Thus, there are two Janata Dals, two TDPs, two DMKs, two Communist Parties, two Congress, three Akali Dals, three Muslim Leagues and so on.

Lack of Effective Opposition: An effective Opposition is very essential for the successful operation of the parliamentary democracy prevalent in India. It checks the autocratic tendencies of the ruling party and provides an alternative government. However, in the last 50 years, an effective, strong, organised and viable national Opposition could never emerge except in flashes. The Opposition parties have no unity and very often adopt mutually conflicting positions with respect to the ruling party. They have failed to play a constructive role in the functioning of the body politic and in the process of nation building.

10.6: SUMMARY

If politics means struggle for power and grabbing power by all possible means in Hobbesian sense of the term, our party system has certainly been politicized in recent years. With the decline of the ideological content sheer opportunism has cone to stay as a determinant of a political party. However, the nature of Indian party system is in itself Indian, because some of its features are found in India only. Indian party politics was synonymous with coalition politics between 1989 and 2004, following decades of Congress party dominance at national level; but for that quarter century, no single party was strong enough to earn a parliamentary majority on its own, relaying

instead on dozens of pre and post election allies to form a governing coalition.

10.7: KEY TERMS

- **Identity Politics**: The focus on the politics of identity and the representation of marginalized groups, such as ethnic minorities, LGBTQ+ individuals, and women.

- **Cultural Politics**: Emphasis on changing cultural norms and values rather than just policy or economic conditions. This includes efforts to influence public perceptions and cultural practices.

- **Grassroots Activism**: A bottom-up approach to social change, involving local community engagement and participation rather than top-down leadership.

- **Decentralization**: Organizational structures that are non-hierarchical and decentralized, often relying on networked forms of communication and decision-making.

- **Direct Action**: The use of immediate, often confrontational, actions to achieve social or political goals, such as protests, sit-ins, and demonstrations.

10.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by a Party system.
- Discuss about party system in India.
- Discuss various types of Party System in India.
- Discuss the features of the party system in India.

10.9: REFERENCES

Singh, Mahendra P., and Kyoung-Hee Koh. (2010). "Transformation of the Indian Party System", in Achin Vanaik, and Rajeev Bhargava (eds.) Understanding Contemporary India: Critical Perspectives. New Delhi: Orient Blackswan, pp.325-343.

Sridharan, Eswaran. (2002). "The Fragmentation of the Indian Party System, 1952- 1999: Seven Competing Explanations", in Zoya Hasan (ed.) Parties and Party Politics in India. New Delhi: Oxford University Press, pp.475-503.

Wallace, Paul. (2003). "Introduction: The New National Party System and State Politics", in Paul Wallace, and Ramashray Roy (eds.) India's 1999 Elections and 20th Century Politics. New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp.1-21.

Ware, Alan. (1996). Political Parties and Party System. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wolinetz, Steven. (2006). "Party Systems and Party System Types", in Richard S. Katz, and William Crotty (eds.) Handbook of Party Politics. London: Sage Publications, pp.51-62.

Diana Kendall, Sociology In Our Times, Thomson Wadsworth, 2005, ISBN 0-534-64629-8

Pichardo, Nelson A. (1997). "New Social Movements: A Critical Review". Annual Review of Sociology. 23: 411–430

UNIT-11: PRESSURE GROUPS

Structure

11.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What are Pressure Groups?
- Features and Functions of the Pressure Groups
- Types of the Pressure Groups

11.2: INTRODUCTION

A pressure group is a group of people who are organised actively for promoting and defending their common interest. It is called so, as it attempts to bring a change in public policy by exerting pressure on the government. It acts as a liaison between the government and its members. The pressure groups are also called interest groups or vested groups. They are different from the political parties, as they neither contest elections nor try to capture political power. They are concerned with specific programmes and issues and their activities are confined to the protection and promotion of the interests of their members by influencing the government. The pressure groups influence the policy-making and policy implementation in the government through legal and legitimate methods like lobbying, correspondence, publicity, propagandising, petitioning, public debating, maintaining contacts with their legislators and so forth.

Pressure groups are only one of several types of political groups as well as one form of interest groups. The group theory of politics seeks to analyze three related terms-groups, interests and activities. It draws our attention to the 'real forces' in 'political processes'. It directs focus to all those groups which have mutual interaction with political groups of men in any way. Pressure politics is regarded as a particular kind of tactics by which some political interest groups in every modern democratic nation pursue their objectives. It is the forms of their existence and working that constitute the criterion of classifying contemporary political regimes. One may say that now it is not the party system but the interest and the pressure groups that exhibit the true nature of a political order.

11.3: MEANING AND DEFINITION OF PRESSURE GROUPS

Pressure groups, also known as interest groups or advocacy groups, are organizations that seek to influence public policy and decision-making without seeking political office themselves. They play a crucial role in democratic societies by representing the interests of specific segments of the population, promoting particular causes, and ensuring that diverse viewpoints are considered in the legislative process.

Pressure groups, also known as interest groups, advocacy groups, or lobby groups, are organized collections of individuals or organizations that aim to influence public policy and decision-making. These groups operate without seeking political office themselves, focusing instead on advocating for specific issues or representing particular segments of society.

1. **General Definition**:

   - Pressure groups are organizations that seek to influence government policies, decisions, and actions to benefit their interests or promote specific causes without attempting to gain political power.

2. **Academic Definition**:

   - According to political scientists, pressure groups are structured associations of individuals or organizations that actively attempt to influence public officials and policymakers to adopt, modify, or reject policies in accordance with their specific interests or objectives.

3. **Functional Definition**:

- Functionally, pressure groups can be defined as entities that mobilize resources, including people, information, and funds, to exert pressure on policymakers through lobbying, advocacy, and public campaigns.

11.4: FEATURES OF THE PRESSURE GROUPS

Pressure groups, also known as interest groups, advocacy groups, or lobby groups, are organizations that seek to influence public policy and decision-making without seeking to hold political office themselves. Here are some key features of pressure groups:

Based on Certain Interests: Each pressure group organises itself keeping in view certain interests and thus tries to adopt the structure of power in the political systems.

Use of Modern as well as Traditional Means: They adopt techniques like financing of political parties, sponsoring their close candidates at the time of elections and keeping the bureaucracy also satisfied. Their traditional means include exploitation of caste, creed and religious feelings to promote their interests.

Resulting Out of Increasing Pressure and Demands on Resources: Scarcity of resources, claims and counterclaims on the resources from different and competing sections of the society leads to the rise of pressure groups.

Inadequacies of Political Parties: Pressure groups are primarily a consequence of inadequacies of the political parties.

Represent Changing Consciousness: For instance the increase in the food production or industrial goods does bring a change in the way individuals and groups look at the world. The stagnation in production leads to fatalism but increase in production leads to demands, protests and formation of new pressure groups.

Voluntary Membership: Pressure groups are typically formed by individuals who voluntarily come together to pursue a common interest or cause.

Shared Interests or Objectives: Members of a pressure group share specific interests or objectives, such as environmental protection, business interests, civil rights, or labor issues.

Organized Structure: These groups usually have a structured organization with a leadership hierarchy, membership guidelines, and sometimes a formal constitution.

Non-Political Office Seeking: Unlike political parties, pressure groups do not aim to capture political power or run for elections. Instead, they seek to influence those who are in power.

Influence Public Policy: The primary goal of pressure groups is to influence public policy, legislation, and government decisions in favor of their interests.

Use of Various Tactics: Pressure groups employ various methods to achieve their goals, including lobbying, public campaigns, media engagement, research and reports, direct action, and litigation.

Expertise and Information: They often provide expertise and detailed information to policymakers, helping to shape informed decisions. They may conduct research, publish reports, and submit evidence to legislative bodies.

Advocacy and Public Campaigns: Pressure groups engage in advocacy by raising awareness, organizing public campaigns, and mobilizing public opinion through demonstrations, petitions, and media campaigns.

Lobbying: Lobbying involves direct interaction with policymakers and government officials to persuade them to support the group's objectives.

Non-Partisan: While they may support specific policies or politicians, pressure groups are generally non-partisan and focus on issues rather than party politics.

Funding and Resources: They rely on various sources of funding, including membership fees, donations, grants, and fundraising activities, to support their activities.

Diverse Forms and Sizes: Pressure groups can vary widely in size and form, ranging from small local community groups to large international organizations.

Public vs. Private Interest Groups: Some pressure groups represent public interests (e.g., human rights, environmental groups), while others represent private interests (e.g., business associations, professional bodies).

Legitimacy and Accountability: Their legitimacy often depends on their representativeness,

transparency, and accountability to their members and the broader public.

Dynamic and Adaptive: Pressure groups are often dynamic and adapt their strategies in response to changing political, social, and economic environments.

These features enable pressure groups to play a significant role in the democratic process, providing a means for citizens to collectively advocate for their interests and influence government policy and decision-making.

11.5: FUNCTIONS OF THE PRESSURE GROUPS

Pressure groups perform political activities through different modes. Through their organizations, lobbying, working inside political parties, electioneering, mass propaganda, demonstrations, strikes and boycotts, civil disobedience and violence they conduct their activities. However, their success greatly depends on their size, social status, cohesion, leadership and the political and governmental environments.

Pressure groups play a dominant and positive role in the political process, of a country. They have effective role in relation to the elections, legislature, executive, bureaucracy, judiciary and public opinion. During elections they avail the opportunity of supporting their own men into the administrative agencies. As such; pressure groups become active at various stages of the election process like nominations, campaign, election and post-election period. They also have more important role at the policy formulation stage. In a two-party system like Britain, these groups work in a more disciplines manner. But in the U.S. due to decentralization, the pressure groups get more freedom for their activities. They are more influential in the legislative committees of the U.S.

They also influence the Executive at the time of Budget-making, appointments etc. In a responsible government, pressure groups seek to influence the executive through the legislature. they promote their interest through the various departmental committees as well. Further, an effective onslaught of public opinion is a very shrewd tactic in the hands of the pressure groups to influence the judicial process from a distance. the creation of healthy public opinion becomes a democratic way of lobbying the judges.

Pressure groups, also known as interest groups or advocacy groups, play a vital role in the political and social landscape of democratic societies. They are organized groups of individuals or organizations that seek to influence public policy and decision-making without seeking electoral

office themselves. Here are some key functions of pressure groups:

1. **Representation**: Pressure groups represent the interests and concerns of their members or a specific segment of society. They provide a voice for individuals and communities that may not be adequately represented in the formal political system.

2. **Influence on Policy**: One of the primary functions of pressure groups is to influence government policy and legislation. They do this through lobbying, providing expertise and information to policymakers, and mobilizing public opinion.

3. **Public Education**: Pressure groups play a crucial role in educating the public about specific issues. They raise awareness, disseminate information, and help to inform public debate, contributing to a more informed citizenry.

4. **Expertise and Information**: Pressure groups often possess specialized knowledge and expertise on specific issues. They provide valuable information and analysis to policymakers, helping to shape informed and effective policies.

5. **Policy Monitoring and Accountability**: Pressure groups monitor government actions and policies to ensure they align with their interests and the public good. They hold governments and institutions accountable for their decisions and actions.

6. **Participation and Engagement**: By encouraging political participation and engagement, pressure groups enhance democratic processes. They mobilize citizens, organize campaigns, and facilitate grassroots involvement in political and social issues.

7. **Articulation of Interests**: Pressure groups articulate the interests and demands of their members or the public on specific issues. They help to channel individual concerns into collective action, making it easier for these concerns to be addressed by policymakers.

8. **Policy Development**: Some pressure groups engage in the development of new policies or the refinement of existing ones. They contribute ideas, conduct research, and propose solutions to public problems.

9. **Balancing Power**: Pressure groups can act as a counterbalance to the power of the state and large corporations. By representing diverse interests, they contribute to a more balanced and pluralistic political environment.

10. **Providing Services and Support**: In some cases, pressure groups offer services and support to their members or the public, such as legal advice, counseling, or community programs.

These functions highlight the importance of pressure groups in promoting democratic values, enhancing public participation, and contributing to the development and implementation of public policies that reflect the diverse interests of society.

11.6: TYPES THE PRESSURE GROUPS

There are different types of pressure groups, namely, Business, Labour, Agriculture, Professions, Veterans, Religious Denominations, Ethnic, Reform, Protest and Administrative pressure groups. let us discuss in brief on each of such groups.

There are chiefly two types of such pressure groups. One type speaks for the interest of business as a whole like the National Association of Manufactures and the Chamber of Commerce in the U.S.A., Federation of British Industries, etc. The other types speaks of the interests of particular industry, for instance, the British Iron and Steel Federation. In general, these groups work for such policies as keeping government expenditures and taxation as low as possible, limiting government regulation of business etc. Conflicts between employees and employers over the matter like wages, hours of work and working condition etc. I have given rise to the organization of Labour pressure groups. Trade Union is the basic form of such pressure groups.

In many modern democratic countries farmers have established two main types of pressure groups. One type claims to speak agriculture as a whole. And other type claims to be special 'commodity' pressure groups. Examples of the first type are the American Farm Bureau federation and National farmers 'Union in England'. On the other hand, America Soybean Association is an example of the second type of such pressure groups.

Professional like doctors, lawyers, architects and teachers have organized pressure groups in most of the democratic countries in order to defied and promote their economic and other interests. For example, the American Medical Association and the All India Teachers Federation etc.

Veterans are most powerful groups of their own times. They articulate their interests so strongly that the political system mostly takes notice of their cause and accordingly favorable decisions are made. For an example, the American Legion founded after the World War – I.

Many religious denominations are deeply concerned with such political issues as religious insurrection in public schools, censorship or books, news papers, magazines etc. For example the Legion of Decency, the National Catholic Welfare Conference in the U.S.A.

A number of minority ethnic groups, particularly in the U.S. have established pressure groups to push policies protecting them against hostile attack, and establishing full economic, social and political equality with all other ethnic groups.

There are also various groups who urge the adoption of a number of governmental reforms. For examples, the Anti-Saloon League in the

U.S. founded in 1893, the present American Civil Liberties Union, the Fabian Society of Britain etc.

In a sense all pressure groups are protest groups. But in common usage 'protest groups' generally means organizations distinguished by two traints – (1) claiming to speak for specially 'disadvantaged' and powerless segments of society, and (2) placing heavy reliance on tactics like demonstrations, civil disobedience, riots etc. For examples, in the U.S. Women's rights organizations like the National Organization for Women, Students for a Democratic Society, National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam etc.

In the governmental organizations, its staff also organize pressure groups either to push particular policies or to oppose. They put pressure from within the political system. They are found to be very powerful.

11.7: SUMMARY

In conclusion, pressure groups play a critical role in the democratic process by influencing public policy, representing diverse interests, and promoting political participation. Their activities contribute to a more informed and engaged citizenry, allowing for the articulation of a wide range of views and concerns that might otherwise be overlooked by elected officials. Through lobbying, advocacy, and mobilization, pressure groups can effect significant change and hold government accountable. However, the influence of pressure groups also raises concerns about equality and fairness, as well-resourced groups may exert disproportionate influence, potentially skewing policy decisions in favor of specific interests over the common good. Balancing the positive contributions of pressure groups with the need for transparency and equitable representation

remains a key challenge for modern democracies. As such, ongoing scrutiny and regulation are necessary to ensure that the influence of pressure groups enhances rather than undermines the democratic process.

11.8: KEY TERMS

- **Advocacy**: The act of arguing in favor of a particular issue, policy, or cause. Advocacy is a central activity of pressure groups as they seek to influence public opinion and government policy.

- **Lobbying**: The process by which pressure groups attempt to influence legislators and government officials to enact or reject legislation. Lobbyists often meet with policymakers, provide research and policy recommendations, and testify at hearings.

- **Policy Agenda**: The set of issues that are prioritized by policymakers. Pressure groups aim to shape the policy agenda to include their interests and concerns.

- **Think Tank**: An organization that conducts research and provides expertise and advice on specific political, social, or economic issues. Think tanks often support the efforts of pressure groups by supplying data and policy analysis.

- **Coalition Building**: The process of forming alliances with other groups to strengthen advocacy efforts. By working together, groups can pool resources and amplify their influence.

11.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What are the pressure groups? Discuss its features.
- Discuss the functions of the pressure groups.
- Discuss various types of the pressure groups.

11.10: REFERENCES

Heywood, Andrew (2007). Politics. London: MacMillan. p. 305.

Sarah F. Anzia; Olivia M. Meeks (May 2016). "Political Parties and Policy Demanders in Local Elections" (PDF). University of Maryland-Hewlett Foundation Conference on Parties, Polarization and Policy Demanders.

Avnon, Dan (16 November 2007). "Parties laws in democratic systems of government". The Journal of Legislative Studies.

John Anthony Maltese; Joseph A. Pika; W. Phillips Shively (2020). American democracy in context. Sage. p. 182. ISBN 978-1544345222

UNIT-12: CIVIL SOCIETY AND ITS ROLE

Structure

12.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is civil society?
- Role of Civil Society
- Problems faced by the Civil Society

12.2: INTRODUCTION

Civil society can be understood as the "third sector" of society, distinct from government and business, and including the family and the private sphere. By other authors, civil society is used in the sense of 1) the aggregate of non-governmental organizations and institutions that advance the interests and will of citizens or 2) individuals and organizations in a society which are independent of the government.

Sometimes the term civil society is used in the more general sense of "the elements such as freedom of speech, an independent judiciary, etc, that make up a democratic society" (Collins English Dictionary). Especially in the discussions among thinkers of Eastern and Central Europe, civil society is seen also as a normative concept of civic values.

The term 'civil society' can be traced back to the works of classical Greek and Roman philosophers like Aristotle and Cicero. As a matter of fact, Aristotle is credited with the very first usage of the term. The term, which at that period of time was taken, as synonymous to political

institution, has developed a completely opposite meaning in today's discourse and is referred to, as an autonomous body, distinct from the state.

The modern idea of civil society saw its genesis in the Scottish and Continental enlightenment era of the late eighteenth century. An idea of civil society being parallel but distinct from the state was developed by the political theorists' right from Thomas Paine to George Hegel. According to them, civil society was a domain, where association of citizens takes place in accordance with their interests, desires, and wishes. Reflections of this changed school of thought could be seen in the changed economic realities like rise of bourgeois, private properties, and market competition.

But in the middle of the 19th century, the term was deserted because the attention of the political philosophers turned to the social and political repercussions of the industrial revolution. But, the term revived during the Second World War, when the Marxist theorists Antonio Gramsci3 resuscitated the idea of civil society in order to represent civil society, as an exclusive centre of independent political activity against tyranny. Gramsci ideas were a source of influence for the persons fighting against dictatorship in central Europe and Latin America in 1970's and 1980's. Even "Czech, Hungarian, and Polish activists wrapped themselves in the banner of civil society, endowing it with the heroic quality, when the Berlin Wall fell". It was in 1990's that the phrase 'civil society' became the buzzword in the global arena with every one right from political scientists to an average citizen using it, as a 'mantra' (key) and became a significant constituent of the 'post-cold-warzeitgeist.' Elena Triffonova has mentioned post-cold-war-zeitgeist in that all the European countries worked towards reconstructing civil society. Since 1990s, NGOs have emerged, as an important force working to democratize the decision making process, protect human rights, and provide essential l services to the most needy. The civil society is conceived, as an essential condition of democracy.

12.3: CONCEPT OF CIVIL SOCIETY

The concept of civil society refers to the realm of organized social life that is neither state-controlled nor purely individualistic. It encompasses a wide array of organizations, institutions, and associations that operate independently of government control and are formed by individuals to pursue shared interests, values, and goals. Civil society includes non-governmental organizations (NGOs), community groups, advocacy organizations, trade unions, religious groups, cultural associations, and more.

Key characteristics of civil society include:

1. **Voluntary Association**: Participation in civil society organizations is voluntary, meaning individuals choose to join based on shared interests or beliefs rather than coercion.

2. **Autonomy**: Civil society organizations operate independently of government control, allowing them to pursue their objectives without interference or censorship.

3. **Pluralism**: Civil society is characterized by diversity, encompassing a broad range of interests, viewpoints, and affiliations. This pluralism fosters debate, dialogue, and the representation of various societal perspectives.

4. **Public Sphere**: Civil society serves as a forum for public discourse and debate on important social, political, and economic issues. It provides a space for citizens to voice their concerns, engage in dialogue, and participate in collective decision-making processes.

5. **Social Capital**: Participation in civil society organizations helps to build social capital by fostering trust, cooperation, and reciprocity among individuals and groups within society.

6. **Advocacy and Activism**: Civil society organizations often engage in advocacy and activism to promote social justice, human rights, environmental sustainability, and other causes. They play a crucial role in holding governments and other powerful institutions accountable.

7. **Civic Engagement**: Civil society encourages civic engagement by providing opportunities for individuals to participate in community activities, volunteerism, and democratic processes.

Overall, civil society plays a vital role in democratic governance by providing a counterbalance to state power, fostering civic engagement, and advancing the interests and well-being of citizens.

As per Sussane Hober Rudolph "civil society… includes the idea of a non-state autonomous sphere; empowerment of citizens; trust building associational life; interaction with, rather than subordination to the State".

Dipankar Gupta defines civil society, as "not a thing but a set of conditions within, which individuals interact collectively with the state."

To Larry Diamond , it is the "realm of organized social life that is open, voluntary, self-generating, (largely) self-supporting, and autonomous from the state, bound by a legal order or a set of shared rules. It is distinct from the 'society' in general in that it involves citizens acting collectively in a public sphere to express their interests, passions, and ideas; exchange information, achieve mutual goals, make demands on the state, and hold the state officials accountable. Civil society is an intermediary entity standing between the private sphere and the state. Civil society is concerned with public rather than private ends…civil society relate to the state in some way but do not aim to win formal power."

According to Jeffery Alexander "civil society is an inclusive, umbrella-like concept referring to plethora of institutes outside the state."

Niraja Gopal Jayal envisions civil society to cover "all forms of voluntary associations and social interactions not controlled by the state."

To Michael Bratton civil society is a "social interaction between the household and the state characterized by community cooperation, structures of voluntary association, and networks of public communication."

12.4: ROLE OF CIVIL SOCIETY

Civil society plays a crucial role in a functioning democracy and in the overall development of society. Here are some key roles:

1. **Advocacy and activism**: Civil society organizations (CSOs) advocate for the rights and interests of various groups within society, such as minorities, women, children, and marginalized communities. They raise awareness about social issues, mobilize public opinion, and pressure governments to address these concerns.

2. **Monitoring and accountability**: Civil society acts as a watchdog by monitoring the actions of government institutions, businesses, and other powerful entities. Through research, investigations, and reporting, CSOs expose corruption, human rights abuses, environmental degradation, and other wrongdoing, thus promoting transparency and accountability.

3. **Service delivery**: Many civil society organizations directly provide services and support to communities, particularly in areas where government services are lacking or

inadequate. These services can include healthcare, education, poverty alleviation, disaster relief, and social welfare programs.

4. **Bridge between citizens and government**: Civil society serves as a bridge between citizens and government, facilitating dialogue, participation, and collaboration. CSOs engage in policy advocacy, provide input into legislative processes, and represent the interests of their constituents in decision-making forums.

5. **Capacity building**: Civil society plays a vital role in building the capacity of individuals and communities to participate in democratic processes, advocate for their rights, and contribute to social and economic development. This includes providing education, training, resources, and networking opportunities.

6. **Cultural and social development**: Civil society contributes to cultural and social development by promoting diversity, tolerance, and pluralism. CSOs support cultural activities, preserve heritage, and foster dialogue among different cultural, religious, and ethnic groups, thus promoting social cohesion and harmony.

Overall, civil society serves as a vital pillar of democracy, fostering active citizenship, social justice, and inclusive development. It complements the roles of government and the private sector, helping to create a more balanced and equitable society.

12.5: PROBLEM FACING CIVIL SOCIETY

Civil society faces a myriad of challenges that vary depending on the context and location. Here are some common issues:

1. **Government Repression**: Civil society organizations often face restrictions and repression from governments that may fear their influence or dissenting voices. This can include censorship, harassment, legal constraints, or even violent crackdowns.

2. **Lack of Funding:** Many civil society organizations struggle to secure sustainable funding to support their activities. This can limit their capacity to operate effectively or expand their reach.

3. **Limited Civic Engagement:** Encouraging broad participation and engagement from citizens can be challenging, particularly in contexts where there's apathy, disillusionment, or fear of reprisal.

4. **Social Fragmentation:** Divisions along ethnic, religious, or socio-economic lines can hinder the ability of civil society to build coalitions and address collective issues.

5. **Corruption:** Corruption within government institutions or even within civil society organizations themselves can undermine trust and effectiveness.

6. **Inequality:** Economic and social inequality can marginalize certain groups, making it harder for civil society to represent their interests effectively.

7. **Technological Challenges:** While technology can enhance communication and advocacy efforts, it also poses challenges such as digital surveillance, misinformation, or the digital divide, where certain groups lack access to technology.

8. **Environmental Concerns:** Civil society organizations advocating for environmental protection face challenges such as resource exploitation, climate change denial, and vested interests in environmentally harmful practices.

9. **Globalization:** Economic globalization can lead to the dominance of multinational corporations over local interests, making it harder for civil society to hold them accountable.

10. **Security Concerns:** In conflict zones or areas with high levels of violence, civil society organizations face threats to their safety and ability to operate.

Addressing these challenges often requires collaboration, resilience, and innovation within civil society, as well as support from international organizations, governments, and the broader community.

12.6: SUMMARY

Civil society encompasses a wide range of organizations, groups, and individuals that operate outside of the government and the private sector, often driven by common interests, values, or goals. These entities play a crucial role in shaping democratic societies, fostering social cohesion,

advocating for change, and holding governments and corporations accountable. They include NGOs, community groups, advocacy organizations, religious institutions, labor unions, and more. Civil society often serves as a platform for citizen engagement, promoting dialogue, participation, and collective action on issues ranging from human rights and environmental protection to education and public health. In essence, civil society acts as a vital counterbalance to state power and corporate influence, helping to ensure a more inclusive and responsive society.

Civil society is a vast and diverse group encompassing various organizations within it. It plays significant role in representing the interests of depressed and oppressed classes, mobilization of resources, policy advocacy, and regulating and monitoring state action. It has become one of the key instruments of good governance worldwide. With involvement of stakeholders, there is always a space for inclusiveness. Prof. John Keane (founder of the Centre for the Study of Democracy in London), a British theorist stated the emerging consensus that civil society is a realm of freedom correctly highlights its basic value, as a condition of democracy. Where there is no civil society there cannot be citizens with capacities. It enables the citizens in choosing their identities, entitlements, and duties within a political-legal framework.

12.7: KEY TERMS

- **Citizen Engagement**: The active involvement of citizens in public affairs, decision-making processes, and community activities. Strong citizen engagement is essential for a vibrant civil society, as it promotes democratic governance, accountability, and social responsibility.

- **Philanthropy**: The practice of donating money, resources, or time to support charitable causes or organizations. Philanthropic efforts contribute significantly to civil society by funding initiatives, programs, and projects that address social, environmental, or humanitarian issues.

- **Social Capital**: The networks of relationships, trust, and reciprocity within a society that facilitate cooperation and collective action. Social capital is a critical resource for civil society, as it enables individuals and groups to mobilize resources, build alliances, and achieve common goals.

- **Public Sphere**: The domain of social life where individuals come together to discuss and debate matters of public interest. A vibrant public sphere is essential for a healthy civil

society, as it provides opportunities for dialogue, deliberation, and the exchange of ideas among citizens.

- **Volunteerism**: The practice of offering one's time and skills for charitable, educational, or other worthwhile activities without financial compensation. Volunteerism is a key aspect of civil society, as it fosters community engagement and social cohesion.

- **Advocacy**: The process of publicly supporting or promoting a particular cause, policy, or idea. Advocacy organizations within civil society work to influence decision-makers, raise awareness, and mobilize support for issues ranging from human rights to environmental conservation.

12.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is civil society?
- Discuss role of civil society.
- Discuss the problems faced by the civil society.
- Write an essay on the growth of the Civil Society.

12.9: REFERENCES

Bhattacharya, Mohit, 2011, New Horizon of Public Administration, Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi

Boris DeWiel, A Conceptual History of Civil Society: From Greek Beginnings to the End of Marx, Past Imperfect, Vol. 6 (1997): 3-42.

Bratton, Michael, 1994, Civil Society and Political Transition in Africa, Boston, MA: Institute for Development Research

Diamond Larry, July 1994, Rethinking Civil Society: Toward Democratic Consolidation, Journal of Democracy, Vol.5, No. 3

Gupta Dipankar, 2000, Culture, Space and the Nation State, From Sentiment to Structure, Sage Publications, New Delhi

BLOCK-3: NATION-STATE

Unit-13: Nation-State; Meaning and Definitions and Types

Unit-14: Nation-State; Evolution in West Europe

Unit-15: Nation and State; Debates in Post-colonial

Contexts

Unit-16: Theories of State

Unit-17: Social Movements

Unit-18: New Social Movements

UNIT-13: NATION-STATE; MEANING AND DEFINITIONS AND TYPES

Structure

13.1 Objectives

13.2 Introduction

13.3 Meaning of Nation State

13.4 Features of Nation State

13.5 Classification of Nation State

13.6 Summary

13.7 Key Terms

13.8 Self Assessment Questions

13.9 References

13.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is Nation State?
- Features of Nation State.
- Various types of Nation State.

13.2: INTRODUCTION

A nation-state is a political unit where the state, a centralized political organization ruling over a population within a territory, and the nation, a community based on a common identity, are congruent. It is a more precise concept than "country", since a country does not need to have a predominant national or ethnic group. A nation, sometimes used in the sense of a common ethnicity, may include a diaspora or refugees who live outside the nation-state; some nations of this sense do not have a state where that ethnicity predominates. In a more general sense, a nation-state is simply a large, politically sovereign country or administrative territory.

Nation State theory holds that as societies become more economically modernized, wealthier and more educated, their political institutions become increasingly liberal democratic. The "classical" theories of modernization of the 1950s and 1960s, most influentially articulated by Seymour Lipset, drew on sociological analyses of Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and Talcott

Parsons. Modernization theory was a dominant paradigm in the social sciences in the 1950s and 1960s, and saw a resurgence after 1991, when Francis Fukuyama wrote about the end of the Cold War as confirmation on modernization theory.

The theory is subject of much debate among scholars. Critics have highlighted cases where industrialization did not prompt stable democratization, such as Japan, Germany, and the Soviet Union, as well as cases of democratic backsliding in economically advanced parts of Latin America. Other critics argue the causal relationship is reverse (democracy is more likely to lead to economic modernization) or that economic modernization helps democracies survive but does not prompt democratization. Other scholars provide supporting evidence, showing that economic development significantly predicts democratization.

13.3: MEANING OF NATION STATE

Nation-State is multi dimensional in character; one may categories it as social dimension, psychological dimension, intellectual dimension, demographic dimension, economic dimension and political dimension. At the social level modernization has inclination to replace the focus of individuals' loyalty to family and other primary groups with voluntarily organized secondary association. It involves a change in values attitudes, orientations and norms at the psychological level. At the intellectual sphere modernization aims at an expansion of man's knowledge about his environment and the diffusion of this knowledge throughout society through increased literary and mass communication. It seeks improvements in life style mobility of the people and urbanization at the demographic level. Modernization at the economic level, involves the growth of market, agriculture, improvement in commerce, industries etc. On the other hand, modernization, at the political level refers to political development. It is otherwise known as political modernization. It involves the development of sufficiently flexible and powerful institutional frame work that would be capable of meeting the growing demands and accommodating changes.

Modernization refers to the process of adopting modern practices, technologies, and ideologies, typically to improve efficiency, productivity, and overall quality of life. It often involves updating infrastructure, institutions, and societal norms to align with contemporary standards and values. In the context of society, modernization can include advancements in areas such as technology, economy, politics, education, and culture. It's essentially a transition from traditional or outdated methods to more current ones, often driven by factors like globalization, industrialization, and

technological innovation.

S.C Dubey; "Modernization is a process that explains the change from traditional or semiconventional stage to any desired forms of technology and the nature, values, motivations and social normative rules of the social structure attached to them."

Daniel Lerner; "Modernization is a process of change which is mainly related to changes in the way of thoughts and attitudes, increase in urbanization, increase in literacy, increase in per capita income and increase in political participation."

C.E.Black; "Modernization is the process by which historically generated institutions adapt with rapidly changing new responsibilities, reflecting an unprecedented increase in the knowledge of humans with the ability to control their environment linked to scientific progress.

13.4: FEATURES OF NATION STATE

Political Modernization has its own distinct feature. It rejects the traditional authorities like the feudal lords, religion heads and community leaders. Rather it aim at the emergence of a single, secular and national authority. Secondly, modernization results in the growth of a network of differentiated and specialized political structure to face the new challenges. Thirdly, there grows identification of the individual with political system as a whole Pye and Verba call it as belongingness of the individual to the political system. Fourthly, there is increase in participation of the people in the people in the political progress through the formation of pressure groups, interest groups, voluntary organizations and political parties. Finally, greater interaction between national and international political system becomes possible.

Political modernization refers to the process by which societies adapt their political systems to cope with changing social, economic, and technological conditions. Some features of political modernization include:

1. **Democratic Governance**: Political modernization often involves the transition towards democratic forms of government, where power is vested in the hands of the people through free and fair elections, rule of law, protection of human rights, and accountability of leaders to the electorate.

2. **Institutional Development**: This involves the establishment and strengthening of political institutions such as legislatures, judiciaries, executive bodies, and electoral systems. These

institutions provide the framework for governance, ensure the separation of powers, and enable checks and balances within the political system.

3. **Citizen Participation**: Political modernization encourages increased participation of citizens in political processes, including voting, activism, advocacy, and engagement with political institutions. This participation is facilitated by mechanisms such as civil society organizations, political parties, and media.

4. **Civil Rights and Liberties**: A hallmark of political modernization is the protection and promotion of civil rights and liberties, including freedom of speech, assembly, religion, and the press. These rights are essential for fostering pluralism, tolerance, and the free exchange of ideas within society.

5. **Decentralization**: Modernizing political systems often involves decentralizing power away from central authorities to local governments or regional bodies. Decentralization can enhance governance effectiveness, responsiveness to local needs, and citizen engagement in decision-making processes.

6. **Transparency and Accountability**: Political modernization requires transparency in government operations and decision-making processes, as well as mechanisms for holding public officials accountable for their actions. This can involve measures such as anti-corruption initiatives, public disclosure laws, and independent oversight institutions.

7. **Technological Integration**: In contemporary contexts, political modernization also involves leveraging technology for governance, including e-governance initiatives, digital democracy platforms, and online civic engagement tools. Technology can enhance efficiency, accessibility, and transparency in political processes.

8. **Education and Awareness**: Promoting political modernization often involves investing in education and awareness-raising efforts to inform citizens about their rights, responsibilities, and the functioning of democratic institutions. An educated and informed citizenry is essential for sustaining democratic governance.

9. **Social Cohesion and Pluralism**: Political modernization seeks to foster social cohesion and pluralism by accommodating diverse interests, identities, and viewpoints within

society. This involves promoting tolerance, inclusivity, and respect for minority rights, as well as mechanisms for peaceful conflict resolution.

10. **Adaptability and Innovation**: Finally, political modernization is a dynamic and ongoing process that requires adaptability and innovation to respond to evolving challenges and opportunities. This may involve experimenting with new governance models, policy approaches, or institutional reforms to address emerging issues and improve the functioning of political systems.

13.5: CLASSIFICATION OF NATION STATE

In the context of political modernization, Shills postulates five models of modernizing nations which purport to characterize the responses to the problems encountered by the developing states. At the outset, he classified modern political systems into two categories, namely, Democracy and Oligarchy. Then he subdivides Democracy into Political Democracy and Tutelary Democracy, and Oligarchy into modernizing oligarchy, totalitarian oligarchy and Traditional oligarchy and Traditional Oligarchy. A brief discussion on each of the above system is required at this point of our analysis.

Political Democracy:

Edward A. Shills defines political Democracy as "a regime of civilian rule through representative institution and public liberties". Political Democracy has the following features:

1) Supremacy of legislature.

2) Political parties are considered as integral part of the system.

3) Political power is captured through election, and for a short period of stipulated time.

4) Openness in politics

5) Independence of judiciary

6) Conduct of political actors is regulated by constitutional, congenital and legal limitations.

7) Democratic self-control

8) Promotion of Political socialization

9) Coherence of intra-party relationship

10) Mutual regard and solidarity among political leaders. 11)Presence of trained and organized civil service.

12)Presence of adequate police and security forces and

13)General commitment to the values of democratic order.

Tutelary Democracy:

Tutelary Democracy according to Shills "as the result of a kind of pragmatic response by committed democrats to situations which seems to be inherently incapable of effective operating Democracy institutions". This type of political system is committed to observance of the norms and values of democracy. As such, this form of society tires to initiate the paths of nations being Political Democracy. Such form of system has the following features:

1) Political Democracy in operation is modified to give greater power to the executive. Authority under this system is maintained by a strong personality or groups of strong personalities at the centre, controlling both the dominant party and the States.

2) Powers of the executive exercises strong control over the Legislature and the channels of opposition.

3) Rule of Law and public liberties are however protected.

According to Shills, the successful operation of Tutelary Democracy greatly depends on the sincerity of elite encouragement towards the growth of Political Democracy; (b) their willingness to allow the effective operations of established institutional forms; and (c) their willingness to reduce their own powers allowing the society to grow democratically stronger.

Modernizing Oligarchy:

Modernizing, Oligarchy emerges out of the tendency of maintaining order in the society when there is a wide gap between the sophisticated demands of the polity and the apathy, parochialism and general indifference exhibited in society. Under such circumstances, there is a tendency to

turn away from a democratically based polity to more authoritarian regime. Such a regime may be drawn from the civilian, or the military sphere. However, in either case, the elites are well organized with membership relatively re-restricted and close scrutiny made of all aspirants to membership. Following are the chief features of this system.

1) Parliament is stripped of all its traditional powers. It is reduced to an acclamatory institution with merely a ratifying role.

2) Opposition is not allowed to function.

3) Political parties are not allowed, and there is censure of channels of mass communications.

4) Bureaucracy is much more strengthened.

5) Dependary of Judiciary is never maintained.

Totalitarian Oligarchy:

Unlike the Modernizing Oligarchy, Totalitarian Oligarchy believs in the absolute rule of the rightist, or of the leftist. It has as such commitment to a particular ideology. The chief features of such system are –

1) Centralization of authority in the hands of the ruling elite base on class, race or some other such nature.

2) It believes in the superiority of polity in all social matters.

3) Elites are highly disciplined and bound together by its doctrine through the institution of the party

4) Rule of law, independent Judiciary and opposition are not allowed to function. Instead rule of the party is ensured.

This system is based on a dynasty constitution associated with traditional religious beliefs. Rules emerge on the basis of Kinship alone. the chief features of this system are-

1) Legislature is not allowed to function

130

2) Political authorities work on the diversion of the ruler

3) The civil series is recruited as a part of the ruler's household retinue.

4) Feudalism grows at the local and regional levels.

5) Opposition grows at the local and regional levels.

6) Opposition does not exist.

7) Rulers claim legitimacy on the ground that they protect the tradition culture.

It may noted that none of the aforesaid alternative have been yet fully realized as there are being conceived by their various proponents. Hence, which course is to be pursued and which ideal is to be sought depend mostly on the specific circumstance or occasion as well as on the predictions and perceptions of those who are elites in a society. According to Shills, the full realization of any political ideal depends more on the "capacity of the elite for self-restraint and to deliver the goods of modernity to which it has pledged itself. To Davies and Lewis, "The case of transition from traditionalist to modernity in all spheres of social life depends to a great extent initially on the elite's ability to establish a working compromise with the claims of traditional beliefs' and through time on their ability to, as Shills' remarks, "reinterpret traditional belief, adopt them to modern needs and translate them into the modern idiom". Shill's concept, later on, has been modified by some other scholars like Kantsky and after who classify political systems on the basis of modernization. When Kautsky talks of live categories of political system, namely, Traditional, Aristocratic, Authoritarian a transitional stage of domination by the nationalist intellectuals and totalitarianism of the aristocracy, totalitarianism of the intellectuals and democracy; David Apter offers a complex theory of stages and alternative paths of political development in the large framework of political modernization. He talks of two chief developmental consequences.

A) A secular-libertarian model approaching democracy through mobilization systems and

B) A sacred

It is clear from the aforesaid discussion that modernization is a process of change towards progress. It is multidimensional in nature Political modernization refers to the growth of political systems from traditional to modernity. On the degree of change of the political system, one can

131

divide it as underdeveloped, developing and developed political system. In brief, political modernization aims at political development.

13.6: SUMMARY

The nation-states typically had a more centralised and uniform public administration than their imperial predecessors: they were smaller, and the population was less diverse. (The internal diversity of the Ottoman Empire, for instance, was very great.) After the 19th-century triumph of the nation-state in Europe, regional identity was subordinate to national identity in regions such as Alsace-Lorraine, Catalonia, Brittany and Corsica. In many cases, the regional administration was also subordinated to the central (national) government. This process was partially reversed from the 1970s onward, with the introduction of various forms of regional autonomy, in formerly centralised states such as Spain or Italy. Modernization represents a profound transformation of societies, encompassing economic, technological, social, and cultural dimensions. The process, marked by industrialization, urbanization, and the spread of education and democratic governance, has significantly altered the fabric of human life.

The economic benefits of modernization include increased productivity, higher standards of living, and improved access to goods and services. Technological advancements have revolutionized communication, transportation, and healthcare, contributing to global interconnectedness and improved quality of life. Socially, modernization promotes the spread of education and literacy, fostering a more informed and empowered populace. It also encourages the development of democratic institutions and human rights, facilitating more equitable and participatory governance.

However, modernization is not without its challenges. It often leads to environmental degradation, social inequality, and the erosion of traditional cultures. The rapid pace of change can result in social dislocation and cultural homogenization, raising concerns about the loss of diversity and identity. While modernization brings significant advancements and opportunities, it also poses complex challenges that require careful management. Societies must strive to balance progress with sustainability, equity, and cultural preservation to ensure that the benefits of modernization are widely shared and its negative impacts are mitigated. The ultimate goal should be to create a more prosperous, inclusive, and harmonious world that respects both innovation and tradition.

13.7: KEY TERMS

- **Industrialization**: The development of industries in a country or region on a wide scale, often marked by the shift from agrarian economies to those dominated by manufacturing and services.

- **Urbanization**: The process by which large numbers of people become permanently concentrated in relatively small areas, forming cities.

- **Technological Advancement**: The development and application of new technologies, driving efficiency and innovation across various sectors.

- **Economic Development**: The improvement of economic wealth and quality of life, often measured by GDP growth, income levels, and employment rates.

- **Social Mobility**: The ability of individuals or groups to move within a social hierarchy, which can be influenced by factors such as education, occupation, and income.

13.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is nation state?
- Discuss basic features of Nation State.
- Discuss various types of Nation State.

13.9: REFERENCES

Acemoglu, Daron; Robinson, James (2022). "Non-Modernization: Power–Culture Trajectories and the Dynamics of Political Institutions". Annual Review of Political Science. 25 (1): 323–339. ISSN 1094-2939.

Andrew C. Janos, Politics and Paradigms: Changing Theories of Change in Social Science. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1986, pp. 44-64; Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. "Modernity and Modernization." Sociopedia.isa. The Hebrew University of Jerusalem and Van Leer Jerusalem Institute, Israel (2000): 1–15.

Francis Fukuyama, The End of History and the Last Man . New York: The Free Press, 1992, pp.

68-69, 133-34.

Treisman, Daniel (2020). "Economic Development and Democracy: Predispositions and Triggers". Annual Review of Political Science. 23 (1): 241–257. doi:10.1146/annurev-polisci-050718-043546. ISSN 1094-2939

UNIT-14: NATION STATE: EVOLUTION IN WEST EUROPE

Structure

14.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- Meaning of Nation State
- Evolution of Nation State in Europe

14.2: INTRODUCTION

The origins and early history of nation-states are disputed. A major theoretical question is: "Which came first, the nation or the nation-state?" Scholars such as Steven Weber, David Woodward, Michel Foucault and Jeremy Black have advanced the hypothesis that the nation-state did not arise out of political ingenuity or an unknown undetermined source, nor was it a political invention; but is an inadvertent byproduct of 15th-century intellectual discoveries in political economy, capitalism, mercantilism, political geography, and geography combined with cattography and advances in map-making technologies. It was with these intellectual discoveries and technological advances that the nation-state arose. For others, the nation existed first, then nationalist movements arose for sovereignty, and the nation-state was created to meet that demand. Some "modernization theories" of nationalism see it as a product of government policies to unify and modernize an already existing state. Most theories see the nation-state as a 19th-century European phenomenon facilitated by developments such as state-mandated education, mass literacy and mass media. However, historians also note the early emergence of a relatively unified state and identity in Portugal and the Dutch Republic.

135

Eric Hobsbawm argues that the establishment of a French nation was not the result of French nationalism, which would not emerge until the end of the 19th century, but rather the policies implemented by pre-existing French states. Many of these reforms were implemented since the French Revolution, at which time only half of the French people spoke some French – with only a quarter of those speaking the version of it found in literature and places of learning. As the number of Italian speakers in Italy was even lower at the time of Italian unification, similar arguments have been made regarding the modern Italian nation, with both the French and Italian states promoting the replacement of various regional dialects and languages with standardized dialects. The introduction of conscription and the Third Republic's 1880s laws on public instruction facilitated the creation of a national identity under this theory.

Underdevelopment, in the context of international development, reflects a broad condition or phenomena defined and critiqued by theorists in fields such as economics, development studies, and postcolonial studies. Used primarily to distinguish states along benchmarks concerning human development—such as macro-economic growth, health, education, and standards of living—an "underdeveloped" state is framed as the antithesis of a "developed", modern, or industrialized state. Popularized, dominant images of underdeveloped states include those that have less stable economies, less democratic political regimes, greater poverty, malnutrition, and poorer public health and education systems. Underdevelopment per Walter Rodney is primarily made of two components, a comparative aspect as well the relationship of exploitation: namely, the exploitation of one country by another.

14.3: MEANING OF NATION STATE

Historians Hans Kohn, Liah Greenfeld, Philip White, and others have classified nations such as Germany or Italy, where they believe cultural unification preceded state unification, as ethnic nations or ethnic nationalities. However, "state-driven" national unifications, such as in France, England or China, are more likely to flourish in multiethnic societies, producing a traditional national heritage of civic nations, or territory-based nationalities.

The idea of a nation-state was and is associated with the rise of the modern system of states, often called the "Westphalian system", following the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). The balance of power, which characterized that system, depended for its effectiveness upon clearly defined, centrally controlled, independent entities, whether empires or nation states, which recognize each

other's sovereignty and territory. The Westphalian system did not create the nation-state, but the nation-state meets the criteria for its component states (by assuming that there is no disputed territory). Before the Westphalian system, the closest geopolitical system was the "Chanyuan system" established in East Asia in 1005 through the Treaty of Chanyuan, which, like the Westphalian peace treaties, designated national borders between the independent regimes of China's Song dynasty and the semi-nomadic Liao dynasty. This system was copied and developed in East Asia in the following centuries until the establishment of the pan-Eurasian Mongol Empire in the 13th century.

The nation-state received a philosophical underpinning in the era of Romanticism, at first as the "natural" expression of the individual peoples (romantic nationalism: see Johann Gottlieb Fichte's conception of the Volk, later opposed by Ernest Renan). The increasing emphasis during the 19th century on the ethnic and racial origins of the nation led to a redefinition of the nation-state in these terms. Racism, which in Boulainvilliers's theories was inherently antipatriotic and antinationalist, joined itself with colonialist imperialism and "continental imperialism", most notably in pan-Germanic and pan-Slavic movements.

The relationship between racism and ethnic nationalism reached its height in the 20th century through fascism and Nazism. The specific combination of "nation" ("people") and "state" expressed in such terms as the Völkische Staat and implemented in laws such as the 1935 Nuremberg laws made fascist states such as early Nazi Germany qualitatively different from non-fascist nation states. Minorities were not considered part of the people (Volk) and were consequently denied to have an authentic or legitimate role in such a state. In Germany, neither Jews nor the Roma were considered part of the people, and both were specifically targeted for persecution. German nationality law defined "German" based on German ancestry, excluding all non-Germans from the people.

In recent years, a nation-state's claim to absolute sovereignty within its borders has been criticized. A global political system based on international agreements and supra-national blocs characterized the post-war era. Non-state actors, such as international corporations and non-governmental organizations, are widely seen as eroding the economic and political power of nation-states.

According to Andreas Wimmer and Yuval Feinstein, nation-states tended to emerge when power

shifts allowed nationalists to overthrow existing regimes or absorb existing administrative units. Xue Li and Alexander Hicks links the frequency of nation-state creation to processes of diffusion that emanate from international organizations.

14.4: EVOLUTION OF NATION STATE IN EUROPE

There are numerous, competing theories that inform the study of development economics. We will examine three major theories. The approach will be eclectic in the sense that each theory will be examined in terms of its insights into the development process as well as its major weaknesses.

10.4.1 Classical Theory

Although there does not exist a systematic Marxian theory of development, the theory is implicit in Marx's study of the laws of motion of the capitalist mode of production in his 3 volumes of *Capital*. Marx traces the development of the capitalist mode of production from the pre-capitalist era of feudalism. Capitalism first emerged in Europe and was imposed, often violently, on other regions of the world. Earlier mercantilist forms of outright plunder and violent expropriation of land gave rise to the process of "primitive accumulation". However, Marx argues that the prospects for the development of capitalism crucially depend upon the pre-existing modes of production. He supports this thesis by comparing feudalism with what he describes as the "Asiatic" societies. Whereas the dissolution of feudalism was favourable for the expansion of capitalism in Europe, the opposite is the case in Asia. The reason for this contrast was that feudalism had already developed forms of private ownership, while the Asiatic societies were principally based upon the communal ownership of land.

In Europe, the process of primitive accumulation involved the creation of wage labour, which migrated from the rural hinterland to the industrial regions. The eventual triumph of capitalism will depend largely on the historical conditions, which either promote or retard the development of a market economy. Marx also stressed other factors: the influx of precious metals from the "new world", the slave trade and the growth of merchant capital (Braudel, 1984). The original Marxian theory had envisaged that capitalism would eventually become the dominant economic system on a world scale. The dynamic "inner laws" of capital, driven by the profit motive and accumulation, attracts into the ambit of world trade, all other pre-capitalist societies.

Marx's earlier writings on colonialism focused on British colonial policy in India. By the

nineteenth century, the British East India company had ceased to be profitable as a solely mercantilist enterprise and became a publicly-listed company. As merchant capital, its role in India was wholly destructive because it failed to create the conditions for the growth of capitalism. As soon as it became a capitalist enterprise, however, it acquired the role of industrial capital and began to sow the seeds of capitalist enterprise in India itself.

In other words, Marx argued that the introduction of capitalism in India was a necessary evil. Even though the initial impact of colonial trade was destructive for India, the growth of capitalism would eventually benefit the Indian colony. Furthermore, Marx considers the "Asiatic" mode of production as "pre-historical" in the sense that it had remained in a state of primordial animation and stagnation until contact with European capitalism.

The other major classical Marxian source on the theory of imperialism and underdevelopment is V.I Lenin's *Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism.* Lenin was influenced by the British historian, J.A. Hobson, Nikolai Bukharin's *Imperialism and the World Economy,* and Rudolf Hilferding's *Finance Capital.* Imperialism is simply defined as the "monopoly stage of capitalism" in which finance capital plays a dominant role as it merges with industrial capital. Furthermore, Lenin highlighted the crucial importance of the export of capital, the escalation of rivalries between competing monopolies and the territorial division of the world between the major imperialist powers.

10.4.2 Neo Nation Theory

The failure of capitalism to encourage economic development in the former colonial regions as Marx had envisaged, gave rise to the neo-Marxian theories of underdevelopment. Despite the diversity of views within the neo-Marxian paradigm, there is a consensus that the modern capitalist system can be divided into an advanced "centre" or metropolis, and an underdeveloped "periphery". The causes of this underdevelopment become the central focus of analysis. Lenin and Bukharin's theories of imperialism provide the initial inspiration for this revival of interest. Another important source has been Rosa Luxemburg's *The Accumulation of Capital,* in which she poses the problem of the "realisation" of surplus value from Marx's reproduction schemes in volume 2 of C*apital.* Luxemburg posed the problem in terms of the relationship between the capitalist and non-capitalist sectors of the economy and argued that capitalism required the non-capitalist sector as an outlet for its surplus in order to expand.

Perhaps the most influential of the neo-Marxian current has been Paul Baran's seminal work, *The Political Economy of Growth*. In Paul Baran's analysis, the causes of underdevelopment are attributed to the legacy of imperialism. To highlight this hypothesis, Baran compares the Indian economy, which had been dominated by British colonialism, with the Japanese experience, which had been relatively free from foreign domination. He then analyses the "distortions" caused by colonialism and argues that foreign outlets for investment were essentially governed by the problem of "surplus absorption" within the imperialist centres. Baran's analysis also prefigured the "dependency" theorists by asserting that these former colonies are condemned as suppliers of commodities for the world market. The failure to develop a domestic market and the growth of luxury consumption by the privileged oligarchy or the "comprador class," merely perpetuates this underdevelopment. Baran's central argument was that economic development was not possible under these conditions of neo-colonialism.

10.4.3 Dependency and Theory of Dualism

Dependency theorists assign a modernising role for post-colonial states to induce the process of development. Underdevelopment is viewed as an externally-induced process which is perpetuated by a small but powerful domestic elite who form an alliance with the international capitalist system. The "development of underdevelopment" is therefore systemic and path-dependent.

In the study of international political economy, the concept of "hegemony" has acquired a strategic meaning. Whether implicitly or explicitly, the term applies to one country or a group of nation-states, which form a dominant power bloc within a definite hierarchy of nation-states. In the "world system" literature this configuration is viewed as a zero-sum game between the dominant core, satellite and peripheral states. A more sophisticated theory of *Unequal Exchange* was developed by Arghiri Emmanuel (1972), who argued that the international division of labour dictates that the poorer countries produce mostly commodities but high-wage countries produce manufactured goods. Unequal exchange is not so much a consequence of differences in productivity between countries but by the fact that wages are lower *precisely because* these countries have been designated by the international division of labour to specialise in the production of commodities.

From a historical perspective, capital accumulation has been governed by the law of uneven development. The spatial dimension of economic development has been characterised by a core/periphery configuration. One of the seminal theories of this process of circular and

cumulative causation was developed by Gunnar Myrdal who argued that capital movements tend to increase regional inequality by concentrating in the more developed regions (Myrdal, 1957). These are identified as the centrifugal, "spread effects" caused by economic expansion in the core regions which diffuse technology, capital investment and a modern infrastructure to the outlying, less developed hinterlands: "In the centres of expansion, increased demand will spur investment, which in turn will increase incomes and demand and cause a second round of investment and so on. Saving will increase as a result of higher incomes but will tend to lag behind investment in the sense that the supply of capital will steadily meet the brisk demand for it" . However, the opposite logic of cumulative causation is evident in the less developed regions. These are identified as the "backwash effects" which merely reinforce the structural and socio-economic disadvantages of these regions.

14.5: SUMMARY

In conclusion, the theory of underdevelopment challenges the notion that all countries follow a linear path to development. Instead, it highlights how historical exploitation, structural inequalities, and ongoing economic dependencies create and sustain a state of underdevelopment. Addressing these issues requires a multifaceted approach that includes fairer trade practices, debt relief, technology transfer, and investments in human capital. Moreover, it calls for a rethinking of global economic policies to create a more equitable distribution of wealth and opportunities.

The theory emphasizes that development is not just about economic growth but also about transforming the structural conditions that inhibit equitable progress. Therefore, achieving sustainable development necessitates both internal reforms within developing countries and significant changes in the global economic system to dismantle the persistent inequalities that underlie underdevelopment.

14.6: KEY TERMS

- **Dependency Theory**: A theory that posits underdevelopment in some countries is a result of their economic dependence on more developed countries. Dependency theorists argue that historical patterns of colonialism and unequal trade relations perpetuate underdevelopment by extracting resources from poorer countries and hindering their development.

- **Modernization Theory**: This theory suggests that underdevelopment is a transitional

stage on the path to modernization. It emphasizes the adoption of Western institutions, technologies, and values as essential for development. Critics argue that modernization theory oversimplifies the complexities of development and neglects the cultural and historical contexts of different societies.

- **World-Systems Theory**: Developed by sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein, this theory views the world as a single capitalist system divided into core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral regions. Core countries, which are typically more developed, exploit peripheral countries through unequal exchange and extraction of resources, perpetuating underdevelopment in the periphery.

- **Structuralism**: A theory that focuses on the structural constraints and imbalances within the global economic system that perpetuate underdevelopment. Structuralists argue that factors such as unequal terms of trade, limited access to technology and capital, and institutional barriers hinder development in poorer countries.

- **Dual Economy Theory**: This theory proposes that underdevelopment is characterized by the coexistence of two distinct economic sectors: a modern, industrialized sector and a traditional, subsistence sector. Dual economy theorists argue that the lack of integration and uneven development between these sectors perpetuates underdevelopment.

14.7: SELF ASSESSMNET QUESTIONS

- What do you mean by nation state?
- Discuss the evolution and growth of nation state in Europe.

14.8: REFERENCES

Rodney, Walter; Babu, A. M; Harding, Vincent (1981). How Europe underdeveloped Africa. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press. ISBN 0882580965.

Escobar, Arturo (1995). Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World. Princeton: Princeton University Press. pp. 21–46.

McMichael, Philip (2012). Development and Social Change: A Global Perspective. Thousand Oaks: Sage. pp. 26–54.

UNIT-15: NATION AND STATE: DEBATES IN POST-COLONIAL CONTEXTS

Structure

15.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- The difference between Nation and State

- The debates between Nation and State

- Nation and State: Dichotomy

15.2: INTRODUCTION

Nation-states have their characteristics differing from pre-national states. For a start, they have a different attitude to their territory compared to dynastic monarchies: it is semisacred and nontransferable. No nation would swap territory with other states simply, for example, because the king's daughter married. They have a different type of border, in principle, defined only by the national group's settlement area. However, many nation-states also sought natural borders (rivers, mountain ranges). They are constantly changing in population size and power because of the limited restrictions of their borders. The most noticeable characteristic is the degree to which nation-states use the state as an instrument of national unity in economic, social and cultural life. The nation-state promoted economic unity by abolishing internal customs and tolls. In Germany, that process, the creation of the Zollverein, preceded formal national unity. Nation states typically have a policy to create and maintain national transportation infrastructure, facilitating trade and travel. In 19th-century Europe, the expansion of the rail transport networks was at first largely a

matter for private railway companies but gradually came under the control of the national governments. The French rail network, with its main lines radiating from Paris to all corners of France, is often seen as a reflection of the centralised French nation-state, which directed its construction. Nation states continue to build, for instance, specifically national motorway networks. Specifically, transnational infrastructure programmes, such as the Trans-European Networks, are a recent innovation.

The nation-states typically had a more centralised and uniform public administration than their imperial predecessors: they were smaller, and the population was less diverse. (The internal diversity of the Ottoman Empire, for instance, was very great.) After the 19th-century triumph of the nation-state in Europe, regional identity was subordinate to national identity in regions such as Alsace-Lorraine, Catalonia, Brittany and Corsica. In many cases, the regional administration was also subordinated to the central (national) government. This process was partially reversed from the 1970s onward, with the introduction of various forms of regional autonomy, in formerly centralised states such as Spain or Italy.

The most apparent impact of the nation-state, as compared to its non-national predecessors, is creating a uniform national culture through state policy. The model of the nation-state implies that its population constitutes a nation, united by a common descent, a common language and many forms of shared culture. When implied unity was absent, the nation-state often tried to create it. It promoted a uniform national language through language policy. The creation of national systems of compulsory primary education and a relatively uniform curriculum in secondary schools was the most effective instrument in the spread of the national languages. The schools also taught national history, often in a propagandistic and mythologised version, and (especially during conflicts) some nation-states still teach this kind of history.

15.3: THE NATION STATE: DIFFRENCES

Dependency theory originates with two papers published in 1949, one by Hans Singer and one by Raúl Prebisch, in which the authors observe that the terms of trade for underdeveloped countries relative to the developed countries had deteriorated over time: the underdeveloped countries were able to purchase fewer and fewer manufactured goods from the developed countries in exchange for a given quantity of their raw materials exports. This idea is known as the Prebisch–Singer thesis. Prebisch, an Argentine economist at the United Nations Commission

for Latin America (UNCLA), went on to conclude that the underdeveloped nations must employ some degree of protectionism in trade if they were to enter a self-sustaining development path. He argued that import-substitution industrialisation (ISI), not a trade-and-export orientation, was the best strategy for underdeveloped countries.[6] The theory was developed from a Marxian perspective by Paul A. Baran in 1957 with the publication of his The Political Economy of Growth.[7] Dependency theory shares many points with earlier, Marxist, theories of imperialism by Rosa Luxemburg and Vladimir Lenin, and has attracted continued interest from Marxists. Some authors identify two main streams in dependency theory: the Latin American Structuralist, typified by the work of Prebisch, Celso Furtado, and Aníbal Pinto at the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLAC, or, in Spanish, CEPAL); and the American Marxist, developed by Paul A. Baran, Paul Sweezy, and Andre Gunder Frank.

Using the Latin American dependency model, the Guyanese Marxist historian Walter Rodney, in his book How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, described in 1972 an Africa that had been consciously exploited by European imperialists, leading directly to the modern underdevelopment of most of the continent.

The theory was popular in the 1960s and 1970s as a criticism of modernization theory, which was falling increasingly out of favor because of continued widespread poverty in much of the world. At that time the assumptions of liberal theories of development were under attack. It was used to explain the causes of overurbanization, a theory that urbanization rates outpaced industrial growth in several developing countries.

The Latin American Structuralist and the American Marxist schools had significant differences but, according to economist Matias Vernengo, they agreed on some basic points:

[B]oth groups would agree that at the core of the dependency relation between center and periphery lays [lies] the inability of the periphery to develop an autonomous and dynamic process of technological innovation. Technology – the Promethean force unleashed by the Industrial Revolution – is at the center of stage. The Center countries controlled the technology and the systems for generating technology. Foreign capital could not solve the problem, since it only led to limited transmission of technology, but not the process of innovation itself. Baran and others frequently spoke of the international division of labour – skilled workers in the center; unskilled in the periphery – when discussing key features of dependency.

Baran placed surplus extraction and capital accumulation at the center of his analysis. Development depends on a population's producing more than it needs for bare subsistence (a surplus). Further, some of that surplus must be used for capital accumulation – the purchase of new means of production – if development is to occur; spending the surplus on things like luxury consumption does not produce development. Baran noted two predominant kinds of economic activity in poor countries. In the older of the two, plantation agriculture, which originated in colonial times, most of the surplus goes to the landowners, who use it to emulate the consumption patterns of wealthy people in the developed world; much of it thus goes to purchase foreign-produced luxury items –automobiles, clothes, etc. – and little is accumulated for investing in development. The more recent kind of economic activity in the periphery is industry—but of a particular kind. It is usually carried out by foreigners, although often in conjunction with local interests. It is often under special tariff protection or other government concessions. The surplus from this production mostly goes to two places: part of it is sent back to the foreign shareholders as profit; the other part is spent on conspicuous consumption in a similar fashion to that of the plantation aristocracy. Again, little is used for development. Baran thought that political revolution was necessary to break this pattern.

In the 1960s, members of the Latin American Structuralist school argued that there is more latitude in the system than the Marxists believed. They argued that it allows for partial development or "dependent development"–development, but still under the control of outside decision makers. They cited the partly successful attempts at industrialisation in Latin America around that time (Argentina, Brazil, Mexico) as evidence for this hypothesis. They were led to the position that dependency is not a relation between commodity exporters and industrialised countries, but between countries with different degrees of industrialisation. In their approach, there is a distinction made between the economic and political spheres: economically, one may be developed or underdeveloped; but even if (somewhat) economically developed, one may be politically autonomous or dependent.[11][page needed] More recently, Guillermo O'Donnell has argued that constraints placed on development by neoliberalism were lifted by the military coups in Latin America that came to promote development in authoritarian guise (O'Donnell, 1982).

The importance of multinational corporations and state promotion of technology were emphasised by the Latin American Structuralists.

Fajnzylber has made a distinction between systemic or authentic competitiveness, which is the

ability to compete based on higher productivity, and spurious competitiveness, which is based on low wages.

The third-world debt crisis of the 1980s and continued stagnation in Africa and Latin America in the 1990s caused some doubt as to the feasibility or desirability of "dependent development".

The sine qua non of the dependency relationship is not the difference in technological sophistication, as traditional dependency theorists believe, but rather the difference in financial strength between core and peripheral countries–particularly the inability of peripheral countries to borrow in their own currency. He believes that the hegemonic position of the United States is very strong because of the importance of its financial markets and because it controls the international reserve currency – the US dollar. He believes that the end of the Bretton Woods international financial agreements in the early 1970s considerably strengthened the United States' position because it removed some constraints on their financial actions.

"Standard" dependency theory differs from Marxism, in arguing against internationalism and any hope of progress in less developed nations towards industrialization and a liberating revolution. Theotonio dos Santos described a "new dependency", which focused on both the internal and external relations of less-developed countries of the periphery, derived from a Marxian analysis. Former Brazilian President Fernando Henrique Cardoso (in office 1995–2002) wrote extensively on dependency theory while in political exile during the 1960s, arguing that it was an approach to studying the economic disparities between the centre and periphery. Cardoso summarized his version of dependency theory as follows:

- there is a financial and technological penetration by the developed capitalist centers of the countries of the periphery and semi-periphery;

- this produces an unbalanced economic structure both within the peripheral societies and between them and the centers;

- this leads to limitations on self-sustained growth in the periphery;

- this favors the appearance of specific patterns of class relations;

- these require modifications in the role of the state to guarantee both the functioning of the economy and the political articulation of a society, which contains, within itself, foci of inarticulateness and structural imbalance.

The analysis of development patterns in the 1990s and beyond is complicated by the fact that capitalism develops not smoothly, but with very strong and self-repeating ups and downs, called cycles. Relevant results are given in studies by Joshua Goldstein, Volker Bornschier, and Luigi Scandella.

With the economic growth of India and some East Asian economies, dependency theory has lost some of its former influence. It still influences some NGO campaigns, such as Make Poverty History and the fair trade movement.

15.4: NATION AND STSTE: DEBATES

There are two main streams in dependency theory: The Structuralist stream, typified by the works of Prebisch, and Furtado; and the Marxist stream, developed by Baran, Sweezy, and Frank. Thus, two approaches are developed by two classes of economists. This theory was developed from a Mian perspective by Paul Baran in 1957 and is detailed in his book, The Political Economy of Growth. Dependency theory shares many points with earlier Marxist theories of imperialism. It continues to attract interest from Marxists. Celso Furtado of Brazil was one of the first economists to use the term 'dependency' and to argue that development and underdevelopment are two aspects of one economic structure. Both Keynes and Myrdal greatly influenced his thinking concerning the link between the economy and power, the crucial role of the state, and how the international economy influenced, or constrained, the development process of national economies. After a political coup in 1964, Brazil strictly followed the development strategy of industrialization which generated a social exclusion process in the country. According to Furtado, however, development should be a social process. So, he argued for the necessity of incorporating Brazil's vast population of poor workers, farmers, and marginalized people into a process of inclusive social development. In his view, industrialization can unleash new social forces and pressures which bring about a process of inclusive social development. Being the head of the National Bank of Brazil, Furtado focused on the northeast region and observed that the income gap between poor farmers and those residing in Sao Paul was greater than the income gap between the average income in Sao Paul and Europe in the 1950s. He created SUDENE

(Superintendency for the Development of the Northeast), a Brazilian government agency created in 1959, which was designed to promote industrial development and land reform in the northeast region to counteract 'internal colonialism', as manifested in the exclusion of the northeast from Brazil's economic growth. According to Furtado, the northeast faced falling terms of trade for its commodity exports, and falling terms of trade concerning its income earnings on the industrial goods bought from Sao Paul and Rio. Development and underdevelopment are one totality constantly produced within the structure of the economy. He maintained that there was a necessary link between FDI-led growth and rising internal inequality. To overcome dependence, underdeveloped nations would have to create their economic plans. Marx believed that capitalism is characterized by creative destruction. It has two effects: destruction, and regeneration. Paul Baran emphasized the destructive side of capitalism in underdeveloped countries. He did not find evidence of regeneration. Rather, the monopoly capitalism of the twentieth century, unlike the competitive capitalism of the nineteenth century, had a vested interest in maintaining backwardness and dependence in the periphery. Baran's analytical contribution led to the flowering of the pessimistic and stagnations school of dependency in Latin America and Africa. Baran'sfavourite example of the destructive effects of capitalism was that of India. He found that Indian social scientists, having experienced British imperialism, had developed concepts very similar to the dependency theorists of the late nineteenth century. Baran's theoretical point of departure was an analysis of economic surplus. He defined economic surplus as the mass of resources (actual and potential) that a society could have at its disposal, to facilitate economic growth. It is the amount that might be reinvested in productive ways to increase the future level of social output. This surplus is the residual from total income after society's basic needs for food, clothing, shelter, and human companionship have been met. But, this surplus may be grossly misused. It may be utilized to erect sumptuous and multiple residences for the rich, or it may be wasted through a variety of ways of conspicuous consumption. The military or the church may make tremendous, demands on the surplus, or it may be drained away by foreign power via plunder, or, by simple profit repatriation as a result offoreign control over less developed countries. The historical analysis made by Baran makes it clear that the sources of poverty in less developed countries are found in the extraction of this surplus under colonialism. Thus, colonialism blocked the potential for change. Backwardness and poverty are perpetuated in these regions. According to him, the oppression of the feudal lords was ruthless but tempered by tradition. It was further worsened by the domination of both foreign and domestic capitalists.

According to dependency theory, the exploitation of the people is multiplied because the oppression and violence inherited from the feudal past are combined with the rationality and intelligent rapacity of the capitalists. The fruits of capitalism were not to raise productive wealth in many countries such as India. These fruits went abroad and served to support a parasitic bourgeoisie at home. People lived in abysmal misery, and they had no prospect of a better future. Poverty and underdevelopment continued. They lost their time-honoured means of livelihood, their arts and crafts. There was no modern industry to provide new ones in their place. They were thrust into extensive contact with the advanced science of the west, yet they remained in a state of darkest backwardness. By reviewing the history of colonialism, Baran made the following conclusions

i. profit margins fall due to the worker's demand for higher wages

ii. foreign capital becomes the targeted source of increasing state revenue (by imposing higher taxes and higher royalty payments, for example)

iii. foreign exchange control is imposed to curb the funds flowing out of the country as repatriated profits

iv. tariffs on imported wage goods are imposed to protect domestic manufacturing.

Theoretically speaking, the state could break this deadlock by opting for new programmes that would make import substitution industrialization (ISI) more successful and dynamic. But the state, in the backward regions, is incapable of making the decisions needed to move forward on any front of the development ladder. Baran argued that political revolution is necessary to break this pattern. He argued that by following the capitalistic route, these countries are not expected to achieve Rostow's stage of 'high mass consumption'. Instead, these countries would head towards their economic and social graveyards. Thus, by following the socialistic route, the less developed countries could reasonably expect some relief from poverty.

There is a group of structuralist dependency theorists who are not Marxians. They reject the perspective of stagnation. Amongst them, the most reputed writer was Fernando Henrique Cardoso, an active Brazilian sociologist and Dependency Theory economist of international repute. He argued that nations on the periphery suffer from a type of 'peripheral capitalism'. One of the important features of these economies is economic stagnation, or, in the words of Andre Gunder Frank, an eminent dependency writer, 'development of underdevelopment'. Cardoso says that the dependent countries are not stagnant. The societies and economies of the periphery are continuously evolving. There are three major stages in the economic history of LDCs.

The first is the agro-export stage of the colonial period when economic dualism was prevalent. During this stage, pre-capitalist sectors of artisans, petty producers, and peasant producers accounted for the bulk of economic activity. At this stage, r some sectors, such as precious metals, minerals, and tropical products are integrated with the world market. The production of these exportables takes place in modem C and semi-capitalist enclaves.

The second is the stage of developmental alliances. After the Second World War, some LDCs experienced major transformations through import substitution industrialization (ISI). In this stage, a new social structure of accumulation is created which is based on the collective interest of industrial workers, peasants, and capitalists.

The third is a corporatist regime stage, where there are drastic curbs on democracy, unions, universities, and other areas of society where dissent might be encountered. The populist orientation of the second stage (in which social security, minimum wage legislation, public health care, and public education are expanded) is broken. There are drastic cuts in the state's budget for public services. Above all the TNCs (transnational corporations) are welcomed. They become pivotal in the new process of accumulation and are central to the growth process.

According to structuralists, one should not be surprised at some economic progress, nor should one think LDCs are powerless to shape their destiny. The third stage is not immutable either. There is no continuous stagnation. Under this new regime in which the authoritarian state and TNCs cooperate, some economic growth and development do occur. The TNCs keep costs down in the era of global competition. GDP rises, and even the standards of living of the masses may improve. There is a new process of capital accumulation which Cardoso terms 'associated dependent development'. Cardoso rejects the possibility of a political shift towards a revolution in these countries, during this stage. As the economic growth created by the new alliance between domestic capital and TNCs progress, some new possibilities for the working class, the techno-bureaucracy and the state open UP. The paradox is that the actual dependence of Caribbean countries became much more acute in the 1980s and 1990s. The heightened foreign indebtedness increased the economic vulnerability of these LDCs. It exposed them to pervasive external intrusions into domestic policy-making in the form of conditionalities imposed by Washington-based international financial institutions, and bilateral donors. The establishment of WTO, in 1994, significantly constricted the policy space previously available to developing countries. National development, which was an accepted objective in the era of decolonization, was been replaced by the mantra of global integration. The new dependency associated with globalization is

presented as interdependence to conceal the asymmetries. Thus, the wheel has come full circle from the 1960s. According to Girvan, this new orthodoxy calls for renewed critical analysis from an updated dependency perspective. These non-industrialized countries are caught in a post-colonial torpor. They continue to specialize in one, or a few raw material exports. These nations are described as dependent economies stuck on the periphery of progress. The centre-periphery relationship results in a dependent development pattern. They seemed incapable of autonomously altering their economic structures. This is characterized by the alliance of international and local capital. The state also joins this alliance as an active partner. The resulting triple alliance is a fundamental factor in the emergence of "updated dependent development".

15.5: NATION AND STATE: DICHOTOMY

World-system theory is a macrosociological perspective that seeks to explain the dynamics of the "capitalist world economy" as a "total social system". Its first major articulation, and classic example of this approach, is associated with Immanuel Wallerstein, who in 1974 published what is regarded as a seminal paper, The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. In 1976 Wallerstein published The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. This is Wallerstein's landmark contribution to sociological and historical thought and it triggered numerous reactions, and inspired many others to build on his ideas. Because of the main concepts and intellectual building blocks of world-system theory –which will be outlined later–, it has had a major impact and perhaps its more warm reception in the developing world. Where is world-system theory positioned in the intellectual world? It falls at the same time, into the fields of historical sociology and economic history. In addition, because of its emphasis on development and unequal opportunities across nations, it has been embraced by development theorists and practitioners. This combination makes the world-system project both a political and an intellectual endeavor. Wallerstein's approach is one of praxis, in which theory and practice are closely interrelated, and the objective of intellectual activity is to create knowledge that uncovers hidden structures and allows oneself to act upon the world and change it. "Man's ability to participate intelligently in the evolution of his own system is dependent on his ability to perceive the whole" (p. 10). World-system research is largely qualitative, although early on Wallerstein rejected the distinction between nomothetic and idiographic methodologies to understand the world. For

Wallerstein, there is an objective world which can be quantitatively understood, but it is, no matter for how long it has existed, a product of history. But to the most part, his methods are associated with history and with interpretive sociology. His work is methodologically somewhere in between Marx and Weber, both of whom were important inspirations for his own work.

World-system theory has been closely associated with Immanuel Wallerstein, and understanding the intellectual context in which this body of knowledge is positioned, means also understanding Wallerstein, so let us begin by talking about him. Immanuel Wallerstein was born in 1930 in New York, where he grew up and did all his studies. He entered Columbia University, where he obtained his BS, MA and PhD degrees. He remained a faculty member in Columbia's Department of Sociology from 1958 to 1971. Carlos A. Martínez Vela – ESD.83 – Fall 2001 2 His passage through Columbia occurred at a time when "[Columbia's] cosmopolitanism and rebelliousness stood in sharp contrast to the genteel established liberalism of Harvard and Yale. His primary mentor was C. Wright Mills, from whom, according to Goldfrank, Wallerstein learned his historical sensitivity, his ambition to understand macro-structures, and his rejection of both liberalism and, to a lesser degree, Marxism. While being a faculty Member at Columbia, Wallerstein got interested in Africa and along the way, he spent time in Paris. In Paris he was exposed to two major intellectual influences, the Annales group of historians, and also to what by the time were radical political ideas. Paris was the center for political and intellectual radicalism among Africans, Asians and Latin Americans, and the locus of the major challenges to AngloAmerican liberalism and empiricism. In Africa he did field work that exposed him to the Third World, and he wrote his dissertation on the processes of national formation in West Africa. Here, Goldfrank tells us, he started to build his world view of "creative selfdestruction", of rise and demise. His exposure to the third world had a great impact on his work. In his introduction to The Modern World System, Wallerstein, in a revealing statement, says that "In general, in a deep conflict, the eyes of the downtrodden are more acute about the reality of the present. For it is in their interest to perceive correctly in order to expose the hypocrisies of the rulers. They have less interest in ideological deflection."

What is a nation-state system?

For Wallerstein, "a world-system is a social system, one that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimation, and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remold it to its advantate. It has the characteristics of an organism, in that is has a lifespan over which its

characteristics change in some respects and remain stable in others… Life within it is largely self-contained, and the dynamics of its development are largely internal" (Wallerstein, p. 347). A world-system is what Wallerstein terms a "worldeconomy", integrated through the market rather than a political center, in which two or more regions are interdependent with respect to necessities like food, fuel, and protection, and two or more polities compete for domination without the emergence of one single center forever (Goldfrank, 2000). In his own first definition, Wallerstein (1974) said that a world-system is a "multicultural terirtorial division of labor in which the production and exchange o basic goods and raw Carlos A. Martínez Vela – ESD.83 – Fall 2001 4 materials is necessary for the everyday life of its inhabitants." This division of labor refers to the forces and relations of production of the world economy as a whole and it leads to the existence of two interdependent regions: core and periphery. These are geographically and culturally different, one focusing on labor-intensive, and the other on capital-intensive production. (Goldfrank, 2000). The core-periphery relationship is structural. Semiperipheral states acts as a buffer zone between core and periphery, and has a mix of the kinds of activities and institutions that exist on them (Skocpol, 1977). Among the most important structures of the current world-system is a power hierarchy between core and periphery, in which powerful and wealthy "core" societies dominate and exploit weak and poor peripheral societies. Technology is a central factor in the positioning of a region in the core or the periphery. Advanced or developed countries are the core, and the less developed are in the periphery. Peripheral countries are structurally constrained to experience a kind of development that reproduces their subordinate status (Chase-Dunn and Grimes, (1995). The differential strength of the multiple states within the system is crucial to maintain the system as a whole, because strong states reinforce and increase the differential flow of surplus to the core zone (Skocpol, 1977). This is what Wallerstein called unequal exchange, the systematic transfer of surplus from semiproletarian sectors in the periphery to the high-technology, industrialized core (Goldfrank, 2000). This leads to a process of capital accumulation at a global scale, and necessarily involves the appropriation and transformation of peripheral surplus. On the poltical side of the world-system a few concepts deem highlighting. For Wallerstein, nation-states are variables, elements within the system. States are used by class forces to pursue their interest, in the case of core countries. Imperialism refers to the domination of weak peripheral regions by strong core states. Hegemony refers to the existence of one core state teomporarily outstripping the rest. Hegemonic powers maintain a stable balance of power and enforce free trade as long as it is to their advantage. However, hegemony is temporary due to

154

class struggles and the diffusion of technical advantages. Finally, there is a global class struggle. The current world-economy is characterized by regular cyclical rhythms, which provide the basis of Wallerstein's periodization of modern history (Goldfrank, 2000). After our current stage, Wallerstein envisions the emergence of a socialist world-government, which is the only-alternative world-system that could maintain a high level of productivity and change the distribution, by integrating the levels of political and economic decision making.

15.6: SUMMARY

Nation State, pioneered in the mid-20th century, offers a compelling framework for understanding global economic disparities and power dynamics. Its central premise revolves around the notion that underdevelopment in certain regions is not merely a result of internal deficiencies or cultural factors but is largely shaped by external forces, particularly the exploitative relationships between developed and underdeveloped nations.

The theory posits that the global capitalist system perpetuates a cycle of dependency, where less developed countries are structurally compelled to serve the interests of more developed ones. This dependency is maintained through unequal terms of trade, financial domination, and technological control, which reinforce the economic subordination of poorer nations.

However, while dependency theory has provided valuable insights into the mechanisms of global inequality, it has also faced criticism. Some argue that it oversimplifies complex historical and political realities, neglects the agency of local actors, and fails to account for the diversity of development experiences among countries classified as 'dependent.'

Nevertheless, dependency theory remains relevant for understanding contemporary global dynamics, especially in the context of ongoing debates about globalization, economic development, and the persistence of poverty. Its insights continue to inform discussions on how to address the root causes of underdevelopment and promote more equitable international relations. As we navigate the complexities of a rapidly changing world, dependency theory serves as a reminder of the importance of challenging entrenched power structures and fostering genuine solidarity and cooperation among nations.

World-system theory, proposed by Immanuel Wallerstein in the 1970s, offers a comprehensive framework for analyzing the global capitalist system and the dynamics of economic and political

power within it. At its core, the theory suggests that the world is characterized by a single, integrated capitalist system, rather than a collection of separate, independent nations.

According to world-system theory, this global system is structured into core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral regions, each playing distinct roles in the production and exchange of goods and services. Core countries, typically located in the developed West, dominate the system by controlling advanced technologies, capital, and markets. Semi-peripheral countries serve as intermediaries, while peripheral countries provide cheap labor and raw materials.

The theory emphasizes the interconnectedness of the global economy and the ways in which wealth and power are unevenly distributed among nations. It highlights the exploitative relationships between core and peripheral regions, where wealth extraction from the latter sustains the economic prosperity of the former.

Critics of world-system theory argue that it tends to overlook the agency of individual nation-states and the complexities of local socio-political dynamics. They also question its applicability to non-capitalist societies and its predictive power in an era of globalization and technological change.

However, despite these criticisms, world-system theory remains influential in understanding global inequalities and the dynamics of development and underdevelopment. It provides a valuable framework for analyzing historical processes of colonization, imperialism, and globalization, and offers insights into contemporary issues such as economic globalization, migration, and environmental degradation.

World-system theory offers a powerful lens through which to view the complexities of the global order. By highlighting the structural inequalities inherent in the capitalist system, it encourages critical reflection on the mechanisms of global exploitation and the possibilities for transformative change towards a more equitable world order.

15.7: KEY TERMS

- **Core**: The core refers to the economically dominant and industrialized countries within the world-system. These nations typically have advanced technology, high levels of productivity, and significant political influence.

- **Periphery**: The periphery comprises the less-developed and economically dependent countries within the world-system. These nations often have agrarian or extractive economies and are exploited by core countries for their cheap labor and resources.

- **Semi-periphery**: The semi-periphery represents countries that occupy an intermediate position between the core and the periphery. They may have some industrialization and economic development but are not as dominant as core countries.

- **Unequal Exchange**: Unequal exchange refers to the unequal terms of trade between core and peripheral countries, where peripheral countries receive less value for their exports compared to what they pay for imports. This perpetuates dependency and underdevelopment in peripheral regions.

- **World-Economy**: The world-economy is the interconnected system of economic activities and relationships among countries, characterized by the circulation of goods, services, and capital on a global scale. World-System Theory views the world-economy as a single unit of analysis.

- **Dependency**: This term refers to the condition where developing countries are dependent on developed nations economically

15.8: SELF ASSESSSMNET QUESTIONS

- What is differences between Nation and State?
- Discuss the debates between nation and state.
- What is dichotomy of Nation and state.

15.9: REFERENCES

Snyder, David; Kick, Edward L. (1979-03-01). "Structural Position in the World System and Economic Growth, 1955–1970: A Multiple-Network Analysis of Transnational Interactions". American Journal of Sociology. 84 (5)ISSN 0002-9602.

Immanuel Wallerstein, (2004), "World-systems Analysis." In World System History, ed. George Modelski, in Encyclopedia of Life Support Systems (EOLSS), Developed under the Auspices of

the UNESCO, Eolss Publishers, Oxford, UK

Ahiakpor, James C. W. (1985). "The Success and Failure of Dependency Theory: The Experience of Ghana". International Organization. 39 (3): 535–552. . ISSN 0020-8183

Newschool, "Economic Development" Archived 14 July 2009 at the Wayback Machine, retrieved July 2009.

James, Paul (1997). "Postdependency? The Third World in an Era of Globalism and Late-Capitalism". Alternatives: Global, Local, Political. 22 (2): 205–226.

UNIT-16: THEORIES OF STATE

Structure

16.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is State?
- Various theories of State

16.2: INTRODUCTION

A state is a political entity that regulates society and the population within a territory. Government is considered to form the fundamental apparatus of contemporary states. Most often, a country has a single state, with various administrative divisions. It is a unitary state or a federal union; in the latter type, the term "state" is sometimes used to refer to the federated polities that make up the federation. (Other terms that are used in such federal systems may include "province", "region" or other terms.) For most of prehistory people lived in stateless societies. The earliest forms of states arose about 5,500 years ago. Over time societies became more stratified and developed institutions leading to centralised governments. These gained state capacity in conjunction with the growth of cities, which was often dependent on climate, and economic development, with centralisation often spurred on by insecurity and territorial

competition.

Over time, a variety of forms of states developed, which used many different justifications for their existence (such as divine right, the theory of the social contract, etc.). Today, the modern nation state is the predominant form of state to which people are subject. Sovereign states have sovereignty; any ingroup's claim to have a state faces some practical limits via the degree to which other states recognize them as such.

Definitions of a state are disputed. According to sociologist Max Weber: a "state" is a polity that maintains a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence, although other definitions are common. Absence of a state does not preclude the existence of a society, such as stateless societies like the Haudenosaunee Confederacy that "do not have either purely or even primarily political institutions or roles".The degree and extent of governance of a state is used to determine whether it has failed.

The notion of democracy has evolved over time considerably. Throughout history, one can find evidence of direct democracy, in which communities make decisions through popular assembly. Today, the dominant form of democracy is representative democracy, where citizens elect government officials to govern on their behalf such as in a parliamentary or presidential democracy. Most democracies apply in most cases majority rule, but in some cases plurality rule, supermajority rule (e.g. constitution) or consensus rule (e.g. Switzerland) are applied. They serve the crucial purpose of inclusiveness and broader legitimacy on sensitive issues—counterbalancing majoritarianism—and therefore mostly take precedence on a constitutional level. In the common variant of liberal democracy, the powers of the majority are exercised within the framework of a representative democracy, but a constitution and supreme court limit the majority and protect the minority—usually through securing the enjoyment by all of certain individual rights, such as freedom of speech or freedom of association.

16.3: MEANING AND DEFINITION OF STATE

There is no academic consensus on the definition of the state. The term "state" refers to a set of different, but interrelated and often overlapping, theories about a certain range of political phenomena. According to Walter Scheidel, mainstream definitions of the state have the following in common: "centralized institutions that impose rules, and back them up by force, over

a territorially circumscribed population; a distinction between the rulers and the ruled; and an element of autonomy, stability, and differentiation. These distinguish the state from less stable forms of organization, such as the exercise of chiefly power." The most commonly used definition is by Max Weber who describes the state as a compulsory political organization with a centralized government that maintains a monopoly of the legitimate use of force within a certain territory. Weber writes that the state "is a human community that (successfully) claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory."

While defining a state, it is important not to confuse it with a nation; an error that occurs frequently in common discussion. A state refers to a political unit with sovereignty over a given territory.[While a state is more of a "political-legal abstraction," the definition of a nation is more concerned with political identity and cultural or historical factors. Importantly, nations do not possess the organizational characteristics like geographic boundaries or authority figures and officials that states do. Additionally, a nation does not have a claim to a monopoly on the legitimate use of force over their populace, while a state does, as Weber indicated. An example of the instability that arises when a state does not have a monopoly on the use of force can be seen in African states which remain weak due to the lack of war which European states relied on. A state should not be confused with a government; a government is an organization that has been granted the authority to act on the behalf of a state. Nor should a state be confused with a society; a society refers to all organized groups, movements, and individuals who are independent of the state and seek to remain out of its influence.

Neuberger offers a slightly different definition of the state with respect to the nation: the state is "a primordial, essential, and permanent expression of the genius of a specific [nation]."

The definition of a state is also dependent on how and why they form. The contractarian view of the state suggests that states form because people can all benefit from cooperation with othersand that without a state there would be chaos. The contractarian view focuses more on the alignment and conflict of interests between individuals in a state. On the other hand, the predatory view of the state focuses on the potential mismatch between the interests of the people and interests of the state. Charles Tilly goes so far to say that states "resemble a form of organized crime and should be viewed as extortion rackets." He argued that the state sells protection from itself and raises the question about why people should trust a state when they cannot trust one another.

Tilly defines states as "coercion-wielding organisations that are distinct from households and kinship groups and exercise clear priority in some respects over all other organizations within substantial territories." Tilly includes city-states, theocracies and empires in his definition along with nation-states, but excludes tribes, lineages, firms and churches. According to Tilly, states can be seen in the archaeological record as of 6000 BC; in Europe they appeared around 990, but became particularly prominent after 1490.

16.4: VARIOUS THEORIES OF STATE

The various theories of States are discussed below:

16.4.1 Liberal Theory of State

Liberalism is a political and moral philosophy based on the rights of the individual, liberty, consent of the governed, political equality, right to private property and equality before the law. Liberals espouse various and often mutually warring views depending on their understanding of these principles but generally support private property, market economies, individual rights (including civil rights and human rights), liberal democracy, secularism, rule of law, economic and political freedom, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of religion, Liberalism is frequently cited as the dominant ideology of modern history. Liberalism became a distinct movement in the Age of Enlightenment, gaining popularity among Western philosophers and economists. Liberalism sought to replace the norms of hereditary privilege, state religion, absolute monarchy, the divine right of kings and traditional conservatism with representative democracy, rule of law, and equality under the law. Liberals also ended mercantilist policies, royal monopolies, and other trade barriers, instead promoting free trade and marketization. Philosopher John Locke is often credited with founding liberalism as a distinct tradition based on the social contract, arguing that each man has a natural right to life, liberty and property, and governments must not violate these rights. While the British liberal tradition has emphasized expanding democracy, French liberalism has emphasized rejecting authoritarianism and is linked to nation-building.[8]

Leaders in the British Glorious Revolution of 1688, the American Revolution of 1776, and the French Revolution of 1789 used liberal philosophy to justify the armed overthrow of royal sovereignty. The 19th century saw liberal governments established in Europe and South America, and it was well-established alongside republicanism in the United States. In Victorian

Britain, it was used to critique the political establishment, appealing to science and reason on behalf of the people. During the 19th and early 20th centuries, liberalism in the Ottoman Empire and the Middle East influenced periods of reform, such as the Tanzimat and Al-Nahda, and the rise of constitutionalism, nationalism, and secularism. These changes, along with other factors, helped to create a sense of crisis within Islam, which continues to this day, leading to Islamic revivalism. Before 1920, the main ideological opponents of liberalism were communism, conservatism, and socialism; liberalism then faced major ideological challenges from fascism and Marxism–Leninism as new opponents. During the 20th century, liberal ideas spread even further, especially in Western Europe, as liberal democracies found themselves as the winners in both world wars and the Cold War.

Liberals sought and established a constitutional order that prized important individual freedoms, such as freedom of speech and freedom of association; an independent judiciary and public trial by jury; and the abolition of aristocratic privileges. Later waves of modern liberal thought and struggle were strongly influenced by the need to expand civil rights. Liberals have advocated gender and racial equality in their drive to promote civil rights, and global civil rights movements in the 20th century achieved several objectives towards both goals. Other goals often accepted by liberals include universal suffrage and universal access to education. In Europe and North America, the establishment of social liberalism (often called simply *liberalism* in the United States) became a key component in expanding the welfare state. Today, liberal parties continue to wield power and influence throughout the world. The fundamental elements of contemporary society have liberal roots. The early waves of liberalism popularised economic individualism while expanding constitutional government and parliamentary authority.

16.4.2 Neo-Liberal Theory of State

Neoliberalism, also neo-liberalism, is both a political philosophy and a term used to signify the late-20th-century political reappearance of 19th-century ideas associated with free-market capitalism. The term has multiple, competing definitions, and is often used pejoratively. In scholarly use, the term is frequently undefined or used to characterize a vast variety of phenomena, but is primarily used to describe the transformation of society due to market-based reforms.

As an economic philosophy, neoliberalism emerged among European liberal scholars during the 1930s as they attempted to revive and renew central ideas from classical liberalism as they saw

163

these ideas diminish in popularity, overtaken by a desire to control markets, following the Great Depression and manifested in policies designed with the intention to counter the volatility of free markets.[14] One impetus for the formulation of policies to mitigate capitalist free-market volatility was a desire to avoid repeating the economic failures of the early 1930s, failures sometimes attributed principally to the economic policy of classical liberalism. In policymaking, neoliberalism often refers to what was part of a paradigm shift that followed the failure of the post-war consensus and neo-Keynesian economics to address the stagflation of the 1970s. The collapse of the USSR and the end of the Cold War also made possible the triumph of neoliberalism in the United States and around the world.

The term neoliberalism has become more prevalent in recent decades.[18][19][20][21][22][23] A prominent factor in the rise of conservative and right-libertarian organizations, political parties, and think tanks, and predominantly advocated by them, neoliberalism is often associated with policies of economic liberalization, including privatization, deregulation, consumer choice, globalization, free trade, monetarism, austerity, and reductions in government spending in order to increase the role of the private sector in the economy and society. The neoliberal project is also focused on designing institutions and is political in character rather than only economic.

The term is rarely used by proponents of free-market policies. When the term entered into common academic use during the 1980s in association with Augusto Pinochet's economic reforms in Chile, it quickly acquired negative connotations and was employed principally by critics of market reform and laissez-faire capitalism. Scholars tended to associate it with the theories of economists working with the Mont Pelerin Society, including Friedrich Hayek, Milton Friedman, Ludwig von Mises and James M. Buchanan, along with politicians and policy-makers such as Margaret Thatcher, Ronald Reagan and Alan Greenspan. Once the new meaning of neoliberalism became established as a common usage among Spanish-speaking scholars, it diffused into the English-language study of political economy. By 1994, with the passage of NAFTA and with the Zapatistas' reaction to this development in Chiapas, the term entered global circulation. Scholarship on the phenomenon of neoliberalism has grown over the last few decades.

An early use of the term in English was in 1898 by the French economist Charles Gide to describe the economic beliefs of the Italian economist Maffeo Pantaleoni, with the term néo-libéralisme previously existing in French; the term was later used by others, including the classical liberal economist Milton Friedman in his 1951 essay "Neo-Liberalism and its

Prospects". In 1938 at the Colloque Walter Lippmann, the term neoliberalism was proposed, among other terms, and ultimately chosen to be used to describe a certain set of economic beliefs. The colloquium defined the concept of neoliberalism as involving "the priority of the price mechanism, free enterprise, the system of competition, and a strong and impartial state". According to attendees Louis Rougier and Friedrich Hayek, the competition of neoliberalism would establish an elite structure of successful individuals that would assume power in society, with these elites replacing the existing representative democracy acting on the behalf of the majority.[44][45] To be neoliberal meant advocating a modern economic policy with state intervention.[46] Neoliberal state interventionism brought a clash with the opposing laissez-faire camp of classical liberals, like Ludwig von Mises. Most scholars in the 1950s and 1960s understood neoliberalism as referring to the social market economy and its principal economic theorists such as Walter Eucken, Wilhelm Röpke, Alexander Rüstow and Alfred Müller-Armack. Although Hayek had intellectual ties to the German neoliberals, his name was only occasionally mentioned in conjunction with neoliberalism during this period due to his more pro-free market stance.

During the military rule under Augusto Pinochet (1973–1990) in Chile, opposition scholars took up the expression to describe the economic reforms implemented there and its proponents (the Chicago Boys). Once this new meaning was established among Spanish-speaking scholars, it diffused into the English-language study of political economy. According to one study of 148 scholarly articles, neoliberalism is almost never defined but used in several senses to describe ideology, economic theory, development theory, or economic reform policy. It has become used largely as a term of abuse and/or to imply a laissez-faire market fundamentalism virtually identical to that of classical liberalism – rather than the ideas of those who attended the 1938 colloquium. As a result, there is controversy as to the precise meaning of the term and its usefulness as a descriptor in the social sciences, especially as the number of different kinds of market economies have proliferated in recent years.

Unrelated to the economic philosophy described in this article, the term "neoliberalism" is also used to describe a centrist political movement from modern American liberalism in the 1970s. According to political commentator David Brooks, prominent neoliberal politicians included Al Gore and Bill Clinton of the Democratic Party of the United States. The neoliberals coalesced around two magazines, The New Republic and the Washington Monthly, and often supported Third Way policies. The "godfather" of this version of neoliberalism was the

journalist Charles Peters who, in 1983, published "A Neoliberal's Manifesto".

16.4.3 Marxian Theory of State

Karl Marx's idea that the state can be divided into three subject areas: pre-capitalist states, states in the capitalist era and the state (or absence of one) in post-capitalist society. Overlaying this is the fact that his own ideas about the state changed as he grew older, differing in his early pre-communist phase, the young Marx phase which predates the unsuccessful 1848 uprisings in Europe and in his later work.

Marx initially followed the evolutionary theory of the state. He envisioned a progression from a stateless society marked by chaos to the emergence of organized communities as nomadic groups settled due to agricultural advancements. With settlement came the division of labor, gender roles, and territorial boundaries, sparking disputes that birthed slave societies where vanquished people were subjugated.

Subsequently, feudal societies arose, characterized by a hierarchy involving nobility, clergy, and peasantry, wherein power predominantly resided with the former two. The advent of commerce introduced a new player, the bourgeoisie, within the peasantry, catalyzing a power shift through revolutions, birthing capitalist societies. Marx's narrative anticipated the proletariat rising against capitalist exploitation, fostering a socialist society through their own revolution. Ultimately, he envisioned the dissolution of the state[paving the way for a classless, communist society to flourish. In Marx's 1843 *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right*, his basic conception is that the state and civil society are separate. However, he already saw some limitations to that model, arguing:

The political state everywhere needs the guarantee of spheres lying outside it.

He as yet was saying nothing about the abolition of private property, does not express a developed theory of class, and "the solution [he offers] to the problem of the state/civil society separation is a purely *political* solution, namely universal suffrage."

By the time he wrote *The German Ideology* (1846), Marx viewed the state as a creature of the bourgeois economic interest. Two years later, that idea was expounded in *The Communist Manifesto*: The executive of the modern state is nothing but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie.[3]

This represents the high point of conformance of the state theory to an economic interpretation of history in which the forces of production determine peoples' production relations and their production relations determine all other relations, including the political. Although "determines" is the strong form of the claim, Marx also uses "conditions". Even "determination" is not causality and some reciprocity of action is admitted. The bourgeoisie control the economy, therefore they control the state. In this theory, the state is an instrument of class rule. In the case of the nations which grew out of the Middle Ages, tribal property evolved through various stages — feudal landed property, corporative moveable property, capital invested in manufacture — to modern capital, determined by big industry and universal competition, i.e. pure private property, which has cast off all semblance of a communal institution and has shut out the State from any influence on the development of property. To this modern private property corresponds the modern State, which, purchased gradually by the owners of property by means of taxation, has fallen entirely into their hands through the national debt, and its existence has become wholly dependent on the commercial credit which the owners of property, the bourgeois, extend to it, as reflected in the rise and fall of State funds on the stock exchange. By the mere fact that it is a class and no longer an estate, the bourgeoisie is forced to organise itself no longer locally, but nationally, and to give a general form to its mean average interest. Through the emancipation of private property from the community, the State has become a separate entity, beside and outside civil society; but it is nothing more than the form of organisation which the bourgeois necessarily adopt both for internal and external purposes, for the mutual guarantee of their property and interests. The independence of the State is only found nowadays in those countries where the estates have not yet completely developed into classes, where the estates, done away with in more advanced countries, still have a part to play, and where there exists a mixture; countries, that is to say, in which no one section of the population can achieve dominance over the others. This is the case particularly in Germany. The most perfect example of the modern State is North America. The modern French, English and American writers all express the opinion that the State exists only for the sake of private property, so that this fact has penetrated into the consciousness of the normal man. With the development and accumulation of bourgeois property, i.e., with the development of commerce and industry, individuals grew richer and richer while the state fell ever more deeply into debt. This phenomenon was evident already in the first Italian commercial republics; later, since the last century, it showed itself to a marked degree in Holland, where the stock exchange speculator Pinto drew attention to it as early as 1750, and now it is again

occurring in England. It is therefore obvious that as soon as the bourgeoisie has accumulated money, the state has to beg from the bourgeoisie and in the end it is actually bought up by the latter. This takes place in a period in which the bourgeoisie is still confronted by another class, and consequently the state can retain some appearance of independence in relation to both of them. Even after the state has been bought up, it still needs money and, therefore, continues to be dependent on the bourgeoisie; nevertheless, when the interests of the bourgeoisie demand it, the state can have at its disposal more funds than states which are less developed and, therefore, less burdened with debts. However, even the least developed states of Europe, those of the Holy Alliance, are inexorably approaching this fate, for they will be bought up by the bourgeoisie; then Stirner will be able to console them with the identity of private and state property, especially his own sovereign, who is trying in vain to postpone the hour when political power will be sold to the "burghers" who have become "angry".

By the early 1850s, political events in Europe, which he covered in articles for the *New-York Daily Tribune* as well as a number of more substantial pieces, were forcing Marx to modify his theory to allow considerably more autonomy for the state. By 1851, the mid-century rebellions had all given way to conservatism and the principal countries of Europe had autocratic or aristocratic governments, namely Napoleon III in France, Frederick Wilhelm IV in Germany and in England a parliament populated mainly by members of the aristocratic class, whether Whig or Conservative. Yet at the same time, the bourgeoisie had economic power in places. For Marx, this was clearly an anomalous situation and gave it considerable attention.

His solution is what Jon Elster has described as the "abdication" or "abstention" theory. It contends that the bourgeoisie found that the advantages of wielding direct power were under the circumstances outweighed by various costs and disadvantages, so they were willing to tolerate an aristocratic or despotic government as long as it did not act too detrimentally to their interests. Marx makes several points. Regarding England, he says of the bourgeoisie that "if the aristocracy is their vanishing opponent the working class is their arising enemy. They prefer to compromise with the vanishing opponent rather than to strengthen the rising enemy, to whom the future belongs".

Marx also suggests that it would be better for the bourgeoisie not to wield power directly because this would make their dominance too obvious, creating a clear target for proletarian attack. It is

better to make the workers fight a "two front war" (Elster) against the aristocracy in government and the bourgeoisie in the economy. Among other things, this would make it difficult for the proletarians to form a clear conception of who was their principal enemy. Regarding France, he suggests that the bourgeoisie recognized that they had been better off under the monarchy (1830–1848) than during the brief period when they wielded power themselves (1848–1851) "since they must now confront the subjugated classes and contend against them without mediation, without the concealment afforded by the crown".

16.4.4 Pluralist Theory of State

Classical pluralism is the view that politics and decision-making are located mostly in the framework of government but that many non-governmental groups use their resources to exert influence. The central question for classical pluralism is how power and influence are distributed in a political process. Groups of individuals try to maximize their interests. Lines of conflict are multiple and shifting as power is a continuous bargaining process between competing groups. There may be inequalities but they tend to be distributed and evened out by the various forms and distributions of resources throughout a population. Any change under this view will be slow and incremental, as groups have different interests and may act as "veto groups" to destroy legislation. The existence of diverse and competing interests is the basis for a democratic equilibrium,[1] and is crucial for the obtaining of goals by individuals.

A polyarchy—a situation of open competition for electoral support within a significant part of the adult population—ensures competition of group interests and relative equality. Pluralists stress civil rights, such as freedom of expression and organization, and an electoral system with at least two parties. On the other hand, since the participants in this process constitute only a tiny fraction of the populace, the public acts mainly as bystanders. This is not necessarily undesirable for two reasons: (1) it may be representative of a population content with the political happenings, or (2) political issues require continuous and expert attention, which the average citizen may not have.

Important theorists of pluralism include Robert A. Dahl (who wrote the seminal pluralist work, *Who Governs?*), David Truman, and Seymour Martin Lipset. The Anti-Pluralism Index in V-Party Dataset is modeled as a lack of commitment to the democratic process, disrespect for fundamental minority rights, demonization of opponents, and acceptance of political violence.

The list of possible sources of power is virtually endless: legal authority, money, prestige, skill, knowledge, charisma, legitimacy, free time, and experience. Pluralists also stress the differences between potential and actual power as it stands. Actual power means the ability to compel someone to do something and is the view of power as a causation. Dahl describes power as a "realistic relationship, such as A's capacity for acting in such a manner as to control B's responses".

Potential power refers to the possibility of turning resources into actual power. Cash, one of many resources, is only a stack of bills until it is put to work. Malcolm X, for example, was certainly not a rich person growing up, but received money from many groups after his prison term and used other resources such as his forceful personality and organizational skills. He had a greater impact on American politics than most wealthy people. A particular resource like money cannot automatically be equated with power because the resource can be used skillfully or clumsily, fully or partially, or not at all.

Pluralists believe that social heterogeneity prevents any single group from gaining dominance.[4] In their view, politics is essentially a matter of aggregating preferences. This means that coalitions are inherently unstable (Polsby, 1980), hence competition is easily preserved. In Dahl's view, because "political heterogeneity follows socioeconomic heterogeneity", social differentiation increasingly disperses power. In this case, Hamed Kazemzadeh (Canadian Pluralist and Human rights activist) argues that organizational membership socializes individuals to democratic norms, increases participation and moderates the politics of society so that bargaining and negotiation are possible. The pluralist approach to the study of power, states that nothing categorical about power can be assumed in any community. The question then is not who runs a community, but if any group in fact does. To determine this, pluralists study specific outcomes. The reason for this is that they believe human behavior is governed in large part by inertia. That said, actual involvement in overt activity is a more valid marker of leadership than simply a reputation. Pluralists also believe that there is no one particular issue or point in time at which any group must assert itself to stay true to its own expressed values, but rather that there are a variety of issues and points at which this is possible. There are also costs involved in taking action at all – not only losing, but the expenditure of time and effort. While a structuralist may argue that power distributions have a rather permanent nature, this rationale says that power may in fact be tied to issues, which vary widely in duration. Also, instead of focusing on actors within a system, the

emphasis is on the leadership roles itself. By studying these, it can be determined to what extent there is a power structure present in a society.

Three of the major tenets of the pluralist school are (1) resources and hence potential power are widely scattered throughout society; (2) at least some resources are available to nearly everyone; and (3) at any time the amount of potential power exceeds the amount of actual power.

Finally, and perhaps most important, no one is all-powerful unless proven so through empirical observation. An individual or group that is influential in one realm may be weak in another. Large military contractors certainly throw their weight around on defense matters, but how much sway do they have on agricultural or health policies? A measure of power, therefore, is its scope, or the range of areas where it is successfully applied as observed by a researcher. Pluralists believe that with few exceptions power holders usually have a relatively limited scope of influence. Pluralism does leave room for an elitist situation- Should group A continuously exert power over multiple groups. For a pluralist to accept this notion, it must be empirically observed and not assumed so by definition.

For all these reasons power cannot be taken for granted. One has to observe it empirically in order to know who really governs. The best way to do this, pluralists believe, is to examine a wide range of specific decisions, noting who took which side and who ultimately won and lost. Only by keeping score on a variety of controversies can one begin to identify actual power holders. Pluralism was associated with behavioralism.

A contradiction to pluralist power is often cited from the origin of one's power. Although certain groups may share power, people within those groups set agendas, decide issues, and take on leadership roles through their own qualities. Some theorists argue that these qualities cannot be transferred, thus creating a system where elitism still exists. What this theory fails to take into account is the prospect of overcoming these qualities by garnering support from other groups. By aggregating power with other organizations, interest groups can over-power these non-transferable qualities. In this sense, political pluralism still applies to these aspects.

Elite pluralists agree with classical pluralists that there is "plurality" of power; however, this plurality is not "pure" when the supposedly *democratic* equilibrium maintains or increases inequities (social, economic or political) due to elites holding greatly disproportionate societal power in forms aforementioned, or by systemic distortions of the political process itself,

perpetuated by, for example, regulatory or cultural capture. Thus, with elite pluralism, it has been said that representative democracy is flawed, and tends to deteriorate towards particracy or oligarchy, by the iron law of oligarchy, for example.

While Pluralism as a political theory of the state and policy formation gained its most traction during the 1950s and 1960s in America, some scholars argued that the theory was too simplistic (see Connolly (1969) *The Challenge to Pluralist Theory*) – leading to the formulation of neo-pluralism. Views differed about the division of power in democratic society. Although neo-pluralism sees multiple pressure groups competing over political influence, the political agenda is biased towards corporate power. Neo-pluralism no longer sees the state as an umpire mediating and adjudicating between the demands of different interest groups, but as a relatively autonomous actor (with different departments) that forges and looks after its own (sectional) interests. Constitutional rules, which in pluralism are embedded in a supportive political culture, should be seen in the context of a diverse, and not necessarily supportive, political culture and a system of radically uneven economic sources. This diverse culture exists because of an uneven distribution of socioeconomic power. This creates possibilities for some groups – while limiting others – in their political options. In the international realm, order is distorted by powerful multinational interests and dominant states, while in classical pluralism emphasis is put on stability by a framework of pluralist rules and free market society.

16.5: SUMMARY

The relationship between democracy and development is a complex and multifaceted one, influenced by numerous variables that differ across contexts and over time. However, several key insights can be drawn from examining their interplay.

Democracy and development often share a synergistic relationship. Democratic governance tends to foster an environment where economic development can thrive, primarily through the establishment of transparent institutions, the rule of law, and protection of property rights. Democracies also typically encourage greater participation in the political process, which can lead to more equitable and sustainable development policies that reflect the needs and aspirations of a broader segment of the population.

Conversely, economic development can strengthen democratic institutions. Higher levels of education and improved economic conditions often lead to a more informed and engaged

citizenry, which in turn can demand more accountability and transparency from their leaders. Economic stability can also reduce the appeal of populist or authoritarian alternatives, as citizens with more to lose may be less likely to support radical political changes.

Despite the general trends, the relationship between democracy and development is not uniform across all contexts. In some cases, authoritarian regimes have managed to achieve significant economic development, leveraging centralized control to implement rapid industrialization or economic reforms. Examples include China and Singapore, where development has been achieved under non-democratic systems. These cases suggest that while democracy can facilitate development, it is not an absolute prerequisite.

Several challenges complicate the democracy-development nexus. Newly democratizing countries often face instability and policy inconsistency, which can hinder economic growth. Furthermore, entrenched interests and corruption can undermine both democratic institutions and development efforts. Therefore, the quality of governance, rather than merely the presence of democratic institutions, plays a crucial role in determining developmental outcomes.

For policymakers, these insights imply that fostering democracy and development should be pursued simultaneously, with an emphasis on strengthening institutions that promote good governance. International support for democratization efforts should be coupled with economic aid and development programs to ensure that the benefits of democracy can be realized. Moreover, the unique historical, cultural, and socio-economic contexts of individual countries must be considered to tailor approaches that effectively support both democratic governance and economic development.

While democracy and development are mutually reinforcing, their relationship is influenced by a host of factors that must be carefully navigated. Successful development strategies should not only aim for economic growth but also promote inclusive and accountable governance. In doing so, societies can build a virtuous cycle where democratic practices and developmental progress sustain and enhance each other, leading to a more prosperous and equitable future for all.

16.7: KEY TERMS

- **Electoral Systems**: The methods by which votes are translated into seats in a legislature. Common systems include proportional representation, majoritarian systems, and mixed

systems.

- **Rule of Law**: The principle that all individuals and institutions are subject to and accountable under the law, which is fairly applied and enforced.

- **Civil Liberties**: Fundamental rights and freedoms protected by law, such as freedom of speech, assembly, and religion.

- **Political Participation**: The involvement of citizens in the political process, including voting, activism, and engagement in political discourse.

- **Accountability**: The obligation of political leaders and public officials to answer for their actions and decisions, often enforced through mechanisms like elections, audits, and legal systems.

16.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is theory of State?
- Discuss the liberal theory of State.
- Write an essay on Pluralistic theory of State.
- Write an essay on Marxist theory of State.
- Discus about neo-liberal theory of State.

16.9: REFERENCES

"Democracy". Oxford University Press.

"Democracy | Definition, History, Meaning, Types, Examples, & Facts". Britannica. 16 August 2023

Dahl, Robert A.; Shapiro, Ian; Cheibub, Jose Antonio (2003). The Democracy Sourcebook. MIT Press. p. 31. ISBN 978-0-262-54147-3.

Møller, Jørgen; Skaaning, Svend-Erik (January 2013). "Regime Types and Democratic Sequencing". Journal of Democracy. 24 (1): 142–155.

Provost, Claire; Kennard, Matt (2023). Silent Coup: How Corporations Overthrew Democracy. Bloomsbury Academic. ISBN 978-1350269989.

Biagini, Eugenio (general editor). 2021. A Cultural History of Democracy, 6 Volumes New

York : Bloomsbury Academic.

Taylor, Astra (2019). Democracy May Not Exist, but We'll Miss It When It's Gone. Metropolitan Books. ISBN 978-1250179845.

Przeworski, Adam (2018) Why Bother With Elections? Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Munck, Gerardo L. (2016) "What is Democracy? A Reconceptualization of the Quality of Democracy." Democratization 23(1): 1–26.

UNIT-17: SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Structure

17.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is social movements?

- Importance of the social movements

- Components of the social movements

17.2: INTRODUCTION

A social movement is a loosely organized effort by a large group of people to achieve a particular goal, typically a social or political one. This may be to carry out a social change, or to resist or undo one. It is a type of group action and may involve individuals, organizations, or both. Social movements have been described as "organizational structures and strategies that may empower oppressed populations to mount effective challenges and resist the more powerful and advantaged elites". They represent a method of social change from the bottom within nations. On the other hand, some social movements do not aim to make society more egalitarian, but to maintain or amplify existing power relationships. For example, scholars have described fascism as a social movement.

Social movements are universal found in all societies in the past and present. Their nature, scope and frequency vary. In the early period of political formations social movements shaped the state – its functions, responsibilities as well as accountability and also its political boundary. They also

played an important role in distribution of power among various segments in society. In modern times they have played a very important role in challenging the Church and feudal authority, foreign rules and authoritarian regimes. French and Russian revolutions, Indian freedom movement, various peasant movements have profound impact on our life. The fascist movement in Germany, Islamic movement in Middle east, Hindutva movement in India or Tamilian movement in Sri Lanka have not only influenced political system but also value system of the people. Their legacies influence us all in a variety of ways. In the contemporary times their occurrences are in all the states. They often though not always play decisive role in all political systems – democratic and authoritarian. They make and unmake political institutions, norms of social and political behaviour and also nature of regimes. Social and political conflicts as well as expectations of the people get reflected in movements.

17.3: DEFINITION AND MEANING OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Mario Diani argues that nearly all definitions share three criteria: "a network of informal interactions between a plurality of individuals, groups and/or organizations, engaged in a political or cultural conflict, on the basis of a shared collective identity".

Sidney Tarrow defines a social movement as "collective challenges [to elites, authorities, other groups or cultural codes] by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interactions with elites, opponents and authorities." He specifically distinguishes social movements from political parties and advocacy groups.

The sociologists John McCarthy and Mayer Zald define as a social movement as "a set of opinions and beliefs in a population which represents preferences for changing some elements of the social structure and/or reward distribution of a society."

Anderson and Parker, social movement is —a form of dynamic pluralistic behaviour which progressively develops structure through time and aims at partial or complete modification of the social order.

Lundberg define social movement as, —a voluntary association of people engaged in concerted efforts to change attitudes, behaviour and social relationships in a larger society.

Social movements are broad alliances of people who are connected through their shared interest in social change. Social movements can advocate for a particular social change, but they can also

organize to oppose a social change that is being advocated by another entity. A social movement is a persistent and organized effort involving the mobilization of large numbers of people to work together to either bring about what they believe to be beneficial social change or resist or reverse what they believe to be harmful social change. Social movements are a type of group action. They are large, sometimes informal, groupings of individuals or organizations which focus on specific political or social issues. In other words, they carry out, resist or undo a social change.

However, the term 'social movement' gained currency in European languages in the early nineteenth century. This was the period of social upheaval. Church and authority the absolute power of the monarchs were challenged. People were demanding democratic rights and asserting for freedom and equality. The political leaders and authors who used the term 'social movement' were concerned with the emancipation of the exploited classes and the creation of a new society by changing property relationships. Their ideological orientation is reflected in their definition. Hence there is no one definition of 'social movement.' Scholars and social activists have different ideological positions on political system and expected social change. And even those who share the same meaning of social change often differ in their views on strategy and path to bring change. But one thing is certain among all conceptualisation of social movement i.e. collective action. It is about the mobilisation of the people for political action. However, collective action as such is not synonymous of social movement. Action of a mob in streets is though a collective behaviour, it cannot be called a social movement. For instance when a mob at the railway station stops a train for misbehaviour of railway staff or prefer to travel without ticket can not be called social movement. Nor riots between two ethnic groups or act of looting food grains from shops or destruction of public property can be called so. These acts by themselves are not social movements. They may be a part – one of the programmes of the social movement.

17.4: IMPORTANCE OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Throughout the years, transnational social movements have played a crucial role in global society – and they have adopted a number of strategies to promote global change. Black Lives Matter and climate change activist groups in the United States have become a prime example of using the power of social movements to influence public policy. Social movements serve as a gateway to institutions – as actors in social movements tend to put pressure on political institutions and hold them accountable. More often than not, the prevalence and health of social movements in a given

country can indicate the quality of its democracy.

Many political philosophers and leaders conceive the ideal political system and social order. They plead for a necessity and sometimes inevitability of social movements including a revolutionary movement to oppose the 'present' political regime and the system and to establish the system which they consider 'ideal' and perfect capable to resolve the problems of society. So once the 'new' or ideal social order is established social movements have no place to exist. What at the most requires is changes in institutional mechanism to resolve conflict that may arise. They find social movements not only redundant but also detrimental in the ideal social order. Often such movements are looked upon either as 'counter revolutionary' and reactionary and/or impulsive, and naïve and/or irresponsible. In this view dissent is not appreciated and even not tolerated. This is what happened in soviet Russia after the October Revolution in 1917. During the 1950s and 1960s not only several leaders of the ruling party but also political scientists in India looked down strikes, demonstrations and mass movements as disruptive and therefore 'illegal'. One of them argued: 'One can understand if not justify the reasons which led the people in a dependent country to attack and destroy everything which was a symbol or an expression of foreign rule. But it is very strange that people should even now behave as if they continue to live in a dependent country ruled by foreigners.'

The assumption that the ideal political system is ipso facto capable of resolving all conflict in society is simplistic. Such view is dangerous for democratic social order. There is not, and cannot be an end of history; the final destination and fool proof system. This is not a static concept of political system and society. Each society has its own contradictions. The system may resolve some issues but also can generate new areas of conflict among different segments of society. The leaders and the members of their class or social group leading the movements are likely to occupy seat of power and reap benefits. That situation generates conflict between the beneficiaries and the deprived. Moreover, those who dominate and occupy seat of power tend to claim to have ultimate and all wisdom for the 'good of society'. There is a tendency among the political leaders not to step down from power. Sometimes they feel that without them others would harm society. Such a tendency leads to intolerance towards dissent and opposition. Dissent is a spirit of democracy. And social movement is one form of organised dissent. Social movements provides a possibility for articulation of grievances and problems. They bring pressure on the state, keep check over the authority needed for healthy democracy. Social movement is way of

people's/segment's collective politics to express their aspirations and priorities. Without understanding politics of the people we cannot understand complexities and dynamics of political system.

17.5: COMPONENTS OF SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Social movements are complex entities that involve various components working together to promote social change. Here are the key components of social movements:

10. **Leadership and Organization**:

   - **Leadership**: Effective leaders are crucial for inspiring, organizing, and sustaining a movement. They articulate the movement's goals and strategies and mobilize resources.

   - **Organization**: This includes the structures and networks that coordinate the activities of the movement, ranging from formal organizations to informal networks.

11. **Ideology and Goals**:

   - **Ideology**: A coherent set of beliefs and values that defines the movement's vision and provides a framework for action.

   - **Goals**: Specific objectives the movement aims to achieve, which can be short-term or long-term, and may evolve over time.

12. **Mobilization Resources**:

   - **Human Resources**: Activists, supporters, and volunteers who participate in and sustain the movement.

   - **Material Resources**: Financial support, facilities, equipment, and other tangible assets necessary for organizing activities.

   - **Social Capital**: Networks and relationships that facilitate collective action, including alliances with other groups and access to influential individuals or institutions.

13. **Collective Identity**:

- A shared sense of belonging and common purpose among members, which strengthens solidarity and commitment. This identity is often built through symbols, rituals, and narratives.

14. **Framing**:

- The process of constructing and promoting a particular interpretation of issues and events to gain support and motivate action. Effective framing aligns the movement's goals with broader societal values and concerns.

15. **Political Opportunity Structures**:

- The external environment in which the movement operates, including the political context, social structures, and cultural norms. This component considers how opportunities and constraints within the environment impact the movement's strategy and success.

16. **Tactics and Strategies**:

- **Tactics**: Specific actions taken to achieve goals, such as protests, demonstrations, lobbying, civil disobedience, and social media campaigns.

- **Strategies**: Broader plans that guide the movement's activities over time, often involving a mix of confrontational and cooperative approaches.

17. **Communication and Media**:

- The methods used to disseminate information, raise awareness, and recruit members. This includes traditional media (newspapers, television) and new media (social media, blogs, websites).

18. **Countermovements and Repression**:

- Responses from opposition groups and the state, including countermovements that challenge the goals of the original movement and repression efforts aimed at limiting the movement's activities.

Understanding these components helps to analyze how social movements form, evolve, and achieve their objectives. Each component plays a vital role in the overall effectiveness and sustainability of the movement.

17.6: SUMMARY

Social movements have long played a crucial role in shaping societies by challenging established norms, advocating for change, and seeking justice. From the civil rights movement to modern environmental activism, these movements are a testament to the power of collective action. They reflect the dynamic interplay between societal structures and human agency, illustrating how organized efforts can bring about substantial social transformation.

The effectiveness of social movements often hinges on several factors, including leadership, organization, strategy, and the broader social and political context. Successful movements typically harness the power of grassroots mobilization, leverage media and technology to amplify their message, and build coalitions across diverse groups to broaden their impact. The ability to adapt to changing circumstances and to sustain momentum over time is also critical.

However, social movements face numerous challenges, such as repression, co-optation, and internal divisions. Navigating these obstacles requires resilience, strategic planning, and often, a willingness to compromise. While not all movements achieve their ultimate goals, they frequently bring important issues to the forefront of public discourse, influencing policy, and inspiring future activism.

Social movements are vital agents of change that reflect and respond to the evolving needs and values of society. They demonstrate the enduring human desire for justice, equality, and a better world. As such, they will continue to be an essential part of the social and political landscape, driving progress and fostering a more inclusive and equitable society.

17.7: KEY TERMS

- **Social Movement**: A collective, organized effort by a large group of people to bring about or resist social change.

- **Collective Action**: Actions taken together by a group of people whose goal is to enhance their status and achieve a common objective.

- **Activism**: The policy or action of using vigorous campaigning to bring about political or social change.

- **Mobilization**: The process by which a group goes from being a passive collection of individuals to an active participant in public life.

- **Repression**: Actions taken by authorities to diminish or eliminate social movements, often through the use of force, legal action, or other means of suppression.

- **Nonviolent Resistance**: The practice of achieving goals through symbolic protests, civil disobedience, and other nonviolent means.

- **Radical Movement**: A social movement that aims for fundamental change in the structure of society, often advocating for revolutionary changes.

- **Countermovement**: A movement that arises in response to another movement, aiming to counter its goals and progress.

17.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is social movements? Discuss its importance.
- Discuss various components of social movements.
- Write an essay on social movements.

17.8: REFERENCES

Skocpol, Theda (1979). States and Social Revolutions: A Comparative Analysis of France, Russia and China. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-22439-0.

Goldstone, Jack (1980). "Theories of Revolutions: The Third Generation". World Politics. 32 (3): 425–453.

Grinin, Leonid; Grinin, Anton; Korotayev, Andrey (2022). "20th Century revolutions: characteristics, types, and waves". Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. 9 (1): 1–13.

Fukuyama, Francis (1992). The End of History and the Last Man. Penguin. ISBN 978-0-14-013455-1.

UNIT-18: NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

Structure

18.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is New Social Movements?

- Characteristics of New Social Movements

- Components of New Social Movements

18.2: INTRODUCTION

The term new social movements (NSMs) is a theory of social movements that attempts to explain the plethora of new movements that have come up in various western societies roughly since the mid-1960s, which are claimed to depart significantly from the conventional social movement paradigm.

There are two central claims of the NSM theory. First, that the rise of the post-industrial economy is responsible for a new wave of social movement and second, that those movements are significantly different from previous social movements of the industrial economy. The primary difference is in their goals, as the new movements focus not on issues of materialistic qualities such as economic wellbeing, but on issues related to human rights.

Numerous social movements from mid-1960s differed from their precursors, such as the labor movement, which had previously been seen as focused on economic concerns. The 1960s were a

period of transformation in collective action, the French May (1968) probably being its most determinant moment. It is important to highlight, however, that it is currently being discussed whether this phenomenon was the first example of a new social movement or as Staricco has stated: "It did not so much open an era as close a one. It was not the beginning of a paradigm, but the end of another one. What comes after – the growing importance of new social movements both empirically and theoretically – can be understood as a consequence, but not as a continuation or progression".

The new movements instead of pushing for specific changes in public policy emphasize social changes in identity, lifestyle and culture. Thus the social aspect is seen by the NSM as more important than the economic or political aspects. Some NSM theorists, like F. Parkin (*Middle Class Radicalism*, 1968), argue that the key actors in these movements are different as well, as they are more likely to come from the "new middle class" rather than the lower classes. Unlike pressure groups that have a formal organisation and 'members', NSMs consist of an informal, loosely organised social network of 'supporters' rather than members. British sociologist Paul Byrne (1997) described New Social Movements as 'relatively disorganised'.

Protest groups tend to be single issue based and are often local in terms of the scope of change they wish to effect. In contrast, NSMs last longer than single issue campaigns and wish to see change on an (inter)national level on various issues in relation to their set of beliefs and ideals. A NSM may, however adopt the tactic of a protest campaign as part of its strategy for achieving wider-ranging change.

Examples of those new movements include the women's movement, the ecology movement, gay rights movement and various peace movements, among others.

18.3: DEFINITION AND MEANING OF NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

New social movements (NSMs) are a form of social activism that emerged in the latter half of the 20th century, focusing on issues beyond traditional economic and political concerns, such as identity, culture, and lifestyle. These movements address a wide array of topics including environmentalism, gender equality, LGBTQ+ rights, peace, civil rights, and more. They are characterized by their decentralized, participatory structures, emphasis on cultural and symbolic change, and utilization of new communication technologies. Unlike traditional social movements, which primarily centered around class struggles and economic inequalities, NSMs seek to

transform societal norms, values, and practices through both local and global actions.

The new social Movement results from sustained collective action and the intuition of a leader who can structure the protests and bring the members together. The members of the Movement should have shared ideologies to work toward the same goal.

The New Social Movements (NSM) are not directing their collective action to state power. They are concerned with individual and collective morality. Andre Gunder Frank and Marta Fuentenes find that NSMs "share the force of morality and a sense of (in)justice in individual motivation, and the force of social mobilisation in developing social power. Individual membership or participation and motivation in all sorts of social movements contain a strong moral component and defensive concern with justice in the social and world order."

18.4: CHARECTERSTICS OF NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

New social movements (NSMs) have several distinctive characteristics that set them apart from traditional social movements. Here are the key features:

1. **Focus on Identity and Cultural Issues**:

   - NSMs often prioritize issues related to personal and collective identities, such as gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and environmental concerns. They seek to transform societal norms and values rather than merely addressing economic or political inequalities.

2. **Decentralized and Horizontal Structures**:

   - These movements typically operate with non-hierarchical, decentralized structures, promoting grassroots participation and collective decision-making. This contrasts with the more centralized leadership seen in traditional movements.

3. **Emphasis on Cultural and Symbolic Change**:

   - NSMs aim to bring about cultural and symbolic shifts in society, challenging established norms, values, and practices. For example, the environmental movement seeks to change attitudes towards sustainability and conservation.

4. **Global and Local Dimensions**:

- NSMs recognize the interconnectedness of social issues across different regions and countries. They operate both locally and globally, using international networks to share information, strategies, and support.

5. **Use of New Technologies**:

- The rise of the internet and social media has significantly influenced NSMs. These platforms facilitate rapid communication, organization, and mobilization, enabling movements to reach a broader audience and coordinate actions more effectively.

6. **Diverse and Inclusive Membership**:

- NSMs often attract a diverse range of participants from various backgrounds, united by a common cause. This inclusivity helps to bring multiple perspectives and approaches to the movement.

7. **Emphasis on Rights and Social Justice**:

- Many NSMs focus on advocating for the rights and recognition of marginalized or oppressed groups. They seek to address issues of inequality, discrimination, and social justice in various forms.

8. **Innovative and Non-traditional Tactics**:

- NSMs often employ creative and non-traditional methods of protest and advocacy, such as symbolic actions, public demonstrations, and direct action campaigns. These tactics are designed to attract attention and provoke thought.

9. **Autonomy and Self-Management**:

- Many NSMs emphasize the importance of autonomy and self-management, encouraging local groups to operate independently while adhering to broader movement principles.

10. **Holistic Approach**:

- NSMs often adopt a holistic approach, addressing the interrelatedness of various social, economic, and environmental issues. They aim for comprehensive change rather than isolated reforms.

Examples of new social movements include environmental groups like Extinction Rebellion, feminist campaigns such as #MeToo, LGBTQ+ rights organizations, and global justice movements like Occupy. These movements reflect the evolving landscape of social activism and the changing ways in which people organize to address contemporary issues.

18.5: COMPONENTS OF NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS

The most noticeable feature of new social movements is that they are primarily social and cultural and only secondarily political, if at all. Departing from the worker's movement, which was central to the political aim of gaining access for the working class with the extension of citizenship and representation, new social movements such as youth culture movement concentrate on bringing about social mobilization through cultural innovations, development of new life-styles and transformation of identities. It is clearly elaborated by Habermas that new social movements are the 'new politics' which is about quality of life, individual self-realisation and human rights whereas the 'old politics' focus on economic, political, and military security. This can be exemplified in the gay liberation, the focus of which broadens out from political issue to social and cultural realization and acceptance of homosexuality. Hence, new social movements are understood as new because they are first and foremost social.

New social movements also give rise to a great emphasis on the role of post-material values in contemporary and post-industrial society as opposed to conflicts over material resources. According to Melucci, one of the leading new social movement theorists, these movements arise not from relations of production and distribution of resources but within the sphere of reproduction and the life world, as a result of which, the concern has shifted from the sole production of economic resources directly connected to the needs for survival or for reproduction to cultural production of social relations, symbols and identities. In other words, the contemporary social movements are rejections of the materialistic orientation of consumerism in capitalist societies by questioning the modern idea that links the pursuit of happiness and success closely to growth, progress, and increased productivity and by promoting alternative values and understandings in relation to the social world. As an example, the environmental movement that

has appeared since the late 1960s throughout the world, with its strong points in the United States and Northern Europe, has significantly brought about a 'dramatic reversal' in the ways we consider the relationship between economy, society and nature.

Further, new social movements are located in civil society or the cultural sphere as a major arena for collective action rather than instrumental action in the state, which Claus Offe characterises as 'bypass the state'. Moreover, with its little concern to directly challenge the state, new movements are regarded as anti-authoritarian and resisted incorporation in institutional levels. They tend to focus on single issue, or a limited range of issues connected to a single broad theme such as peace and environment. Without the attempt to develop a total politics under a single focus, new social movements set their stress on grass-roots in the aim of representing the interests of marginal or excluded groups. Paralleled with this ideology, the organization form of new collective actions is also locally based, centred on small social groups and loosely held by personal or informational networks such as radios, newspapers, and posters. This 'local- and issue-centred' characteristic which does not necessarily require a highly agreed ideology or agreement on ultimate ends makes these new movements distinctive from the 'old' labour movement with a high degree of tolerance of political and ideological difference appealing to broader sections of population.

Additionally, if old social movements namely the worker's movement presupposed a working–class base and ideology, the new social movements are presumed to draw from a different social class base, that is, 'the new class', as a complex contemporary class structure that Claus Offe identifies as 'threefold': the new middle class, elements of the old middle class and peripheral groups outside the labour market. As stated by Offe, the new middle class in association with the old one is evolved in the new social movements because of their high levels of education and their access to information and resources that lead to the questions of the way society is valued; the group of people that are marginal in terms of labour market such as students, housewives and the unemployed participate in the collective actions as a consequence of their disposable resource of time, their position in the receiving end of bureaucratic control and disability to be fully engaged in the society based on employment and consumption. The main character in old social movements, the industrial working class, nonetheless, is absent here in the class base of new social mobilizations.

18.6: SUMMARY

New social movements represent a dynamic and evolving force in the landscape of contemporary activism. They reflect a shift towards more inclusive, identity-focused, and environmentally conscious forms of political engagement. Despite the challenges they face, NSMs have significantly influenced public discourse, policy, and social norms. Their legacy lies in the capacity to redefine activism, making it more accessible and relevant to diverse populations around the globe. As society continues to evolve, NSMs will likely remain crucial in advocating for a more just, equitable, and sustainable world.

18.7: KEY TERMS

- **Identity Politics**: The focus on the politics of identity and the representation of marginalized groups, such as ethnic minorities, LGBTQ+ individuals, and women.

- **Cultural Politics**: Emphasis on changing cultural norms and values rather than just policy or economic conditions. This includes efforts to influence public perceptions and cultural practices.

- **Grassroots Activism**: A bottom-up approach to social change, involving local community engagement and participation rather than top-down leadership.

- **Decentralization**: Organizational structures that are non-hierarchical and decentralized, often relying on networked forms of communication and decision-making.

- **Direct Action**: The use of immediate, often confrontational, actions to achieve social or political goals, such as protests, sit-ins, and demonstrations.

18.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Why 'new' social movements are called 'new'?
- What are the main features of 'new' social movements?
- Find out the difference between social movements and new social movements.

18.9: REFERENCES

Arora, N.D. (2010). Political Science for Civil Services Main Examination. Tata McGraw-Hill

Education. ISBN 978-0-07-009094-1.

Steven M. Buechler, Social Movements in Advanced Capitalism, Oxford University Press, 1999, ISBN 0-19-512604-1.

Byrne, Paul (1997). Social Movements in Britain. Theory and practice in British politics. Routledge. ISBN 978-0-415-07122-2.

Diana Kendall, Sociology In Our Times, Thomson Wadsworth, 2005, ISBN 0-534-64629-8

Pichardo, Nelson A. (1997). "New Social Movements: A Critical Review". Annual Review of Sociology. 23: 411–430

BLOCK-4: DEMOCRATIZATION IN POST-COLONIAL SOCIETIES

Unit-19: Democratization in Post-authoritarian countries

Unit-20: Democratization in Post-communist countries

Unit-21: Federalism: Meaning and Features

Unit-22: Federation & Confederation: Debates around territorial division of powers

UNIT-19: DEMOCRATIZATION IN POST-AUTHORITARIAN COUNTRIES

Structure

19.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is Democratization?
- History of Democratization
- Democratization in Post-Authoritarian Countries

19.2: INTRODUCTION

Democratization, or democratisation, is the structural government transition from an authoritarian government to a more democratic political regime, including substantive political changes moving in a democratic direction. Whether and to what extent democratization occurs can be influenced by various factors, including economic development, historical legacies, civil society, and international processes. Some accounts of democratization emphasize how elites drove democratization, whereas other accounts emphasize grassroots bottom-up processes. How democratization occurs has also been used to explain other political phenomena, such as whether a country goes to a war or whether its economy grows. The opposite process is known as democratic backsliding or autocratization. A political party is an organization that coordinates candidates to compete in a particular country's elections. It is common for the members of a party to hold similar ideas about politics, and parties may promote specific ideological or policy goals.

Political parties have become a major part of the politics of almost every country, as modern party organizations developed and spread around the world over the last few centuries. Although some countries have no political parties, this is extremely rare. Most countries have several parties while others only have one. Parties are important in the politics of autocracies as well as democracies, though usually democracies have more political parties than autocracies. Autocracies often have a single party that governs the country, and some political scientists consider competition between two or more parties to be an essential part of democracy.

Parties can develop from existing divisions in society, like the divisions between lower and upper classes, and they streamline the process of making political decisions by encouraging their members to cooperate. Political parties usually include a party leader, who has primary responsibility for the activities of the party; party executives, who may select the leader and who perform administrative and organizational tasks; and party members, who may volunteer to help the party, donate money to it, and vote for its candidates. There are many different ways in which political parties can be structured and interact with the electorate. The contributions that citizens give to political parties are often regulated by law, and parties will sometimes govern in a way that favours the people who donate time and money to them.

Many political parties are motivated by ideological goals. It is common for democratic elections to feature competitions between liberal, conservative, and socialist parties; other common ideologies of very large political parties include communism, populism, nationalism, and Islamism. Political parties in different countries will often adopt similar colours and symbols to identify themselves with a particular ideology. However, many political parties have no ideological affiliation, and may instead be primarily engaged in patronage, clientelism, the advancement of a specific political entrepreneur, or be a big tent in that they wish to attract voters holding diverse views.

19.3: MEANING OF DEMOCRATIZATION

Regardless of whether the focus is on transition or integration, process-oriented scholarship does not address the first-order question of what ``democratization'' means. An examination of the extensive literature on democratization reveals that there are widely divergent interpretations of the term beyond consensus. Democracy has been conceived of as a speech, a demand, a set of institutional changes, a form of elite rule, a political system dependent on popular control, the

exercise of strongman ship, and a demand for global solidarity, but this has never been the case. It is analyzed from the perspectives of political theory, comparative politics, international relations, sociology, cultural studies, and political economy. It was seen as a series of discrete, continuous changes achieved over several years, as a series of neverending struggles, and as deep structural transformations, or as an unattainable utopia. In short, democratization, like democracy itself, is a concept that is ``inherently contested'' (Gallie 1964). Democratization, process through which a political regime becomes democratic. The explosive spread of democracy around the world beginning in the mid-20th century radically transformed the international political landscape from one in which democracies were the exception to one in which they were the rule. The increased interest in democratization among academics, policy makers, and activists alike is in large part due to the strengthening of international norms that associate democracy with many important positive outcomes, from respect for human rights to economic prosperity to security. Democratization could be understood in three phases, introduction, transition and consolidation of democracy in a non-democratic regime. In the first phase, democracy is introduced in a nondemocratic regime due to breakdown of the non-democratic government which could be linked to loss of legitimacy. This loss of legitimacy may be a result of an economic crisis or lack of loyalty of coercive arms of a state – police and the army. Second, in the transition phase, the democratic features of the given state deepen as new structures and institutions come up. Existing authoritarian structures and agencies are abolished and negotiations over a new constitution, rules and regulations for establishing competitive politics are taken up during this phase. A transition happens when the opposition desirous of democracy becomes strong enough to challenge the authoritarian regime, which is divided or weak to either co-opt for democracy or use force against the opposition. Huntington in his 1991 book, The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late 20th Century; had set the benchmark of 'two turnover test' where a democracy is consolidated if it sees through two turnovers of power. Consolidation leads to shift in political culture of a society as democracy.

19.4: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF DEMOCRATIZATION

Since the 19th century, democracy has gradually developed around the world. However, this process was neither linear nor uncontroversial. Moreover, the causes of democratization varied across time and space. So, while in the 19th century class was the driving force for democratization, in the 1980s and 1990s it was driven by a complex interplay of social conflict,

state-building, and external influences. One way he explains the expansion of democracy over time is to summarize the experience of different "waves." This suggests that there is at least a common cause for the democratization of countries connected by "waves. In 1991, Samuel Huntington suggested that waves of democratization were followed by counterwaves of authoritarianism, as some societies failed to strengthen democracy while others experienced democratic collapse. Wave theory is now a conventional part of the history of democratization. A more focused analysis of the history of democratization that began with the idea of waves. Although wave theory is useful as a metaphor, it has been argued that it cannot explain democratization. To gain a deeper understanding of democratization from both historical and contemporary perspectives, we need to go beyond the concept of waves. The Wave Theory Huntington (1991) describes a wave of democratization in the following way: A wave of democratization is a group of transitions from nondemocratic to democratic regimes that occur within a specified period of time and that significantly outnumber transitions in the opposite direction during that period of time. A wave also involves liberalization or partial democratization in political systems that do not become fully democratic. Each of the first two waves of democratization was followed by a reverse wave in which some but not all of the countries that had previously made the transition to democracy reverted to nondemocratic rule.

First Wave: For Huntington, the long first wave started at the beginning of the nineteenth century and the number of democratic governments grew gradually until around 1930. Liberal democracy was in a process of expansion during this time, although it was challenged by the alternative notion of socialist democracy, which linked the concept of popular rule to a socialist organization of society and the economy. Communism, in other words, was a persuasive anticapitalist ideology. But the most substantive challenge to liberal democracy, and indeed to Communism, came from fascism. The rise of Fascist movements across Europe and the Fascist seizures of power in Italy and Germany brought the first wave to a close. A reverse wave followed, which, according to Huntington, lasted from 1926 until 1942. During this period, democratic political systems collapsed in Italy, Germany, Spain, Argentina and some of the fledgling democracies in Eastern Europe. Fascism formed the ideological core of the dictatorships that spread across Europe in the 1920s and 1930s. Although it was eventually defeated in Italy and Germany, the dictatorships that emerged in Portugal and Spain in the 1930s survived into the 1970s.

Second Wave: The second wave identified by Huntington was considerably shorter. Its beginning

was signalled by the physical defeat of the Axis powers in 1945. The American, British and French allies were the chief architects of democratization in the occupied territories of Germany, Japan and Austria. Democracy also took off around this time in parts of Latin America. Decolonization after the Second World War further enlarged the number of democracies, initially at least, although democracy in much of Africa was both unstable and formalistic. Democratic consolidation was patchy through the 1960s and by the 1970s the developing world in particular was in the grip of harsher dictatorships than had ever before been the case. The dictatorships in Argentina and Guatemala, for example, were as violent and repressive as the Fascist regimes in Europe thirty or forty years earlier. Huntington identifies a third wave beginning with democratization in Portugal in 1974, followed quickly by Greece and Spain. In the 1980s, a number of Latin American countries began to democratize. Democratization began in 1989 in East and Central Europe, the former Soviet Union and parts of Africa. Democratic movements also emerged at this time in Asia and transitions away from entrenched authoritarian rule began in Taiwan and South Korea.

Third Wave: The third wave, he argues, is the product of five key factors (Huntington 1991):
● the deepening legitimacy problems of authoritarian systems. This was made worse by the fact that non-democratic regimes tend to depend excessively on performance legitimacy. A number of non-democratic regimes were undermined either by poor economic performance in the wake of oil-price rises in the 1970s or by military defeat;
● rising expectations following the economic boom of the 1960s, leading to demands for raised living standards and education, especially on the part of the middle classes;
● the liberalization of the Catholic Church following the Second Vatican Council of 1963–5, assisting the transformation of national churches (and individual church leaders) and making it possible for them to act as proponents of reform;
● the changing policies of global organizations such as the European Union, and of actors such as Gorbachev and the shift in US policy towards endorsing an agenda of democratization and human rights; and
● demonstration effects, or snowballing, the result of the global growth of communication networks.

19.5: SUMMARY

Dankwart Rustow argued that "'the most effective sequence' is the pursuit of national unity, government authority, and political equality, in that order." Eric Nordlinger and Samuel Huntington stressed "the importance of developing effective governmental institutions before the emergence of mass participation in politics." Robert Dahl, in *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition* (1971), held that the "commonest sequence among the older and more stable polyarchies has been some approximation of the ... path [in which] competitive politics preceded expansion in participation." In the 2010s, the discussion focused on the impact of the sequencing between state building and democratization. Francis Fukuyama, in Political Order and Political Decay (2014), echoes Huntington's "state-first" argument and holds that those "countries in which democracy preceded modern state-building have had much greater problems achieving high-quality governance." This view has been supported by Sheri Berman, who offers a sweeping overview of European history and concludes that "sequencing matters" and that "without strong states...liberal democracy is difficult if not impossible to achieve."

However, this state-first thesis has been challenged. Relying on a comparison of Denmark and Greece, and quantitative research on 180 countries across 1789–2019, Haakon Gjerløw, Carl Henrik Knutsen, Tore Wig, and Matthew C. Wilson, in *One Road to Riches?* (2022), "find little evidence to support the stateness-first argument." Based on a comparison of European and Latin American countries, Sebastián Mazzuca and Gerardo Munck, in *A Middle-Quality Institutional Trap* (2021), argue that counter to the state-first thesis, the "starting point of political developments is less important than whether the State–democracy relationship is a virtuous cycle, triggering causal mechanisms that reinforce each." In sequences of democratization for many countries, Morrison et al. found elections as the most frequent first element of the sequence of democratization but found this ordering does not necessarily predict successful democratization.

The democratic peace theory claims that democracy causes peace, while the territorial peace theory claims that peace causes democracy.

19.6: KEY TERMS

- **Party Platform:** A formal set of principal goals supported by a political party or candidate, designed to appeal to the general public and garner support during elections.

- **Ideology:** A comprehensive set of beliefs or ideals that guides a political party's policies

and positions on various issues.

- **Faction:** A subgroup within a political party, often with slightly different views or priorities from the main party line.
- **Bipartisanship:** Cooperation between two political parties, often used to describe efforts to pass legislation with support from both major parties.
- **Coalition:** An alliance between different political parties, typically formed to achieve a majority in a legislative body or to govern together.

19.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- Discuss the meaning of democratization.
- Discuss the basic features of democratization.
- Discuss the democratization in post-authoritarian state.

19.8: REFERENCES

ldrich, John (1995). "1". Why Parties?: The Origin and Transformation of Political Parties in America. University of Chicago Press.

Chhibber, Pradeep K.; Kollman, Ken (2004). The formation of national party systems: Federalism and party competition in Canada, Great Britain, India, and the United States. Princeton University Press.

Sarah F. Anzia; Olivia M. Meeks (May 2016). "Political Parties and Policy Demanders in Local Elections" (PDF). University of Maryland-Hewlett Foundation Conference on Parties, Polarization and Policy Demanders.

Avnon, Dan (16 November 2007). "Parties laws in democratic systems of government". The Journal of Legislative Studies.

John Anthony Maltese; Joseph A. Pika; W. Phillips Shively (2020). American democracy in context. Sage. p. 182. ISBN 978-1544345222

UNIT-20: DEMOCRATIZATION IN POST-COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Structure

20.1 Objectives

20.2 Introduction

20.3 Meaning and Definition of Democratization

20.4 Democratization in Post-Communist Countries

20.5 Summary

20.6 Key Terms

20.7 Self Assessment Questions

20.10 References

20.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is democratization?
- Democratization in Post-Colonial Countries

20.2: INTRODUCTION

A democracy is a political system, or a system of decision-making within an institution, organization, or state, in which members have a share of power. Modern democracies are characterized by two capabilities of their citizens that differentiate them fundamentally from earlier forms of government: to intervene in society and have their sovereign (e.g., their representatives) held accountable to the international laws of other governments of their kind. Democratic government is commonly juxtaposed with oligarchic and monarchic systems, which are ruled by a minority and a sole monarch respectively.

Democracy is generally associated with the efforts of the ancient Greeks, whom 18th-century intellectuals considered the founders of Western civilization. These individuals attempted to leverage these early democratic experiments into a new template for post-monarchical political organization. The extent to which these 18th-century democratic revivalists succeeded in turning the democratic ideals of the ancient Greeks into the dominant political institution of the next 300

years is hardly debatable, even if the moral justifications they often employed might be. Nevertheless, the critical historical juncture catalyzed by the resurrection of democratic ideals and institutions fundamentally transformed the ensuing centuries and has dominated the international landscape since the dismantling of the final vestige of the empire following the end of the Second World War.

20.3: DEMOCRATIZATION IN POST COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

Modern political philosophy has attempted to find the best form of government to govern human communities. Rousseau argued that popular sovereignty could not be achieved without participation. James Madison advocated institutional limits on popular sovereignty to protect the rights of minorities from the collective will of the majority. DE Tocqueville and Montesquieu proposed a relationship between political culture and a country's political system. Democracy is widely considered to be the best form of government in Western countries. Democracy leads to the institutionalization of people's power, and therefore democratization is the process by which this happens. Simply put, democratization is the process by which a political system moves from non-democratic to democratic. Former United Nations Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali, in his speech to the United Nations General Assembly on 20 December 1996, defined democratization as a process leading to a more open, participatory and less authoritarian society. A closer look at Ghali's definition reveals that democracy is not only a form of government or state, but also a social condition and way of life. It is important to note that democratization is a multifaceted and complex concept.The idea does not belong to any particular academic field, but includes fields such as political science, sociology, economics, international relations, cultural studies, and political economy. This also suggests that there may be more than one way to understand democratization. As a process, democratization can be understood in three stages: the introduction, transition, and consolidation of democracy in non-democratic regimes. In the first stage, the collapse of a nondemocratic government is accompanied by the introduction of democracy into the nondemocratic regime, which may result in a loss of legitimacy. This loss of legitimacy may be due to an economic crisis or a lack of loyalty by the state's coercive instruments, the police and military. Second, during the transition stage, the democratic character of each state deepens through the emergence of new structures and institutions.

Russia can be regarded as a very early post-totalitarian regime, whose leaders had enormous

power in contrast with the authoritarian regimes in Southern European countries. Today the social structure of Russia is made up of fragmented social and political groups which provide a very unsure footing for the growth of democratic political institutions. Civil society is also unorganized and its further development faces various problems, such as the low level of political participation and the readiness of the people to give up liberty for the sake of order. In today's conditions there is a tendency to label Russian society as an oligarchy, or rule of the few. Vladimir Shapentokh also defines in his article5 the four aspects of today's Russian society as oligarchic, criminal, authoritarian and liberal. By oligarchic, he refers to the wealthy, including the heads of some powerful financial groups and oil and gas monopolies, who have important relations with both the government and the criminal organizations. He describes the organized crime and shadow economy as important dimensions of criminal Russia. By authoritarian aspect, he stresses the tendency and intention of the leaders and bureaucracy to rule the country in an authoritarian sense. On the other hand, he designates the desire of a segment of the establishment for parliament, independent courts, free media and private property in Russia as the liberal aspect of Russian society. He insists on the weaknesses of the liberal aspect and sees today's Russian government as a product of the compromise among the largest economic groups over the distribution of the power. Thus, according to him, the existing Russian government does not work efficiently due to corruption and Yeltsin's need to balance the existing power relations and his frequent personnel changes. To predict the possibility of a consolidated democracy in Russia, we must first assess the presence or absence of a political culture compatible with the emergence of a stable democracy. In this respect, Edward Keenan asserts the persistence of Muscovite political folkways which involve political orientations based on traditional patterns of centralisation, bureaucratisation and risk avoidance, even in today's Russia. Stephen White also lists the distinctive characteristics of traditional Russian political culture as the absence of institutions for communicating popular demands, and the highly centralised and unlimited authority, and stresses the continuity in Russian political culture. This continuity is still valid since even today Russians are ready to transfer all power and authority to a strong leader. We also do believe some aspects of the continuity thesis in the Russian case that emphasises the importance of Russian history, political culture and the effects of a Marxist-Leninist ideology in the creation of today's Russian civil society and argue that, with its unorganised complex organisations and associations, today Russian political society

very much resembles a movement society such as described by Steven Fish. Also due to the

characteristics mentioned above, it is much easier for Russia to initiate a transition period than to build a viable democratic system. There were various short-lived attempts at democratisation in Russia in 1905 and 1906. Concerning this problem, together with all other approaches, the modernisation theory is also used to explain the Russian case. However, Richard Sakwa stresses the inefficiencies of this theory because, according to him, Russian modernisation is not identical to the Westernization of the country. He says the problem in Russia is not underdevelopment but misdevelopment, both in economic (causing great environmental damages through production; having inappropriate technology and wasting resources) and political (having bodies that carry the same name as those in the West, like political parties with a very different content) spheres. Thus, Russia should modernise its society to adapt itself to changing conditions. However, since modernisation includes the destroying of the old, this destructive aspect then could undermine the support for democracy and make the consolidation phase in Russia more difficult. On the other hand, as one of the characteristics of post-totalitarian regimes, the absence of organised pluralism in Russia hindered this kind of "pacted transition." After the collapse of the USSR, the rules of the game were not defined. Thus, almost everything was open to criticism. The non- existence of a consensus on the organising principles of society and the economy further fostered uncertainty and impeded consolidation of the democratic system. In this sense, according to Michael Mc Faul's observation, Russian transition can be regarded as a revolutionary transition in which the rules of the game are not pacted and consensus on the organising principles and civil society does not exist. The political parties in Russia also have some problems in contributing to the democratic consolidation. Although there are many political parties in Russia, a viable multi-party system has not been established yet. The lack of confidence in any party structures, the legacy of the authoritarian culture, the lack of party traditions, the existence of rivalry and jealousy between the existing party leaders, the lack of strong parties rooted in economic and professional interests hinder the emergence of a viable multi-party system. The media also cannot play its real role in the consolidation of democracy since it is not free enough to do so. Due to economic difficulties, newspapers have to get financial support from the state, which forces them to favour one side or to give up their objectivity. On the other hand, the direct control of the oligarchs over most of the TV channels and newspapers and the structures set up by the political leadership that aim at censorship also restrict their contribution to the establishment of a stable democracy. The second variable is the problem of simultaneity which signifies the multi-dimensionality of the democratic consolidations. There are also some differences between authoritarian and posttotalitarian systems

in this respect. In authoritarian regimes, due to the existence of a civil society, a state bureaucracy operating within professional norms and a relatively high degree of market economy, only the establishment of the democratic institutions are required.

However, in post-totalitarian regimes transformation of both political and economic systems are needed. In Russia, as some sort of a post-totalitarian regime, democratic consolidation is also complicated by the fact that Russians have to restructure their economy and change their political system simultaneously, in contrast with Southern European countries that had to deal with the creation of new democratic political institutions only. In contemporary Russia, the deterioration of the economy is causing instability, the attempt to change everything simultaneously leading to various problems. Most of the time, the creation of representative government based on popular sovereignty and rule of law contradict the challenge of economic modernisation. Since the economic conditions affect every person in Russia on a daily basis (increase in unemployment rate and cost of living and decrease in the availability of consumer goods), the support for the regime, and its survival, are highly dependent on the performance of the economy. Thus, the consolidation of democracy in Russia does not depend solely on its political transformation but to a large extent on its economic performance. Within this context, the persistence of economic problems like inflation, increase in the unemployment rate, the delayed wage and pension payments and the decline in social welfare system can undermine the popular support for democracy. The third variable is the question of stateless which is connected with the questioning of the legitimacy of the state. According to Linz, Stephen and Gunter, who listed these factors in their analysis of transitions, if there is a group which seeks to establish its own nation-state, and if there is some degree of ethnic complexity within the concerned state, then the consolidation of democracy becomes a very complex problem. In this context, we all fully aware of Russia's growing centre-periphery problems. The conflict between central authority and the regions stem from some economic (share of tax revenues, subsidies to Moscow and conflicts over pricing of goods) political (making policies and power-sharing) and ethnic (territorial disputes and traditional hostilities) problems. Thus, the absence of a clear national identity is still creating tension between democracy and order. The democratic consolidation is also weakened by these nationalist aspirations because most of the Russians indicate that they prefer national unity and the maintenance of order over democracy. For the fourth variable, the strength of hierarchical and non-hierarchical military, we can simply saythat in Russia the military lacks the legitimacy to intervene directly in politics Although the USSR was regarded as a highly militarized state, the

military was always under civilian control. Thus, the USSR never had any military interventions, in contrast with most of the Latin American countries. Today almost the same civil-military relations scheme is valid in Russia, which can be regarded as an advantage in the emergence of a stable democracy. However, the increase in the dissatisfaction of both the officers and the soldiers with the government in solving their problems may create various problems between the Army and the government in the near future.

For the fifth variable, concerning the group or leaders who initiate and control the transition, we can say that the role played by the political elite has been substantial in initiating the changes in Russia. There are also official attempts to consolidate democracy in the country. Most of the time, all these activities are even labelled as democracy from above. In assessing the style of constitution making in Russia, we can start from the establishment of a Constitutional Commission in June 1990. Together with the drafts that were prepared by that Commission there were also other alternative drafts, with one prepared by the Communists, one by a group of legal experts from the Saratov University Law Faculty, one by Sergei Shakharai, Yeltsin'sthen legal adviser, and one by both Sobchak, mayor of St. Petersburg and Sergei Aleksev from 1990 to 1992. In the end, no compromise was reached and the President put forward his own more presidentialist constitutional draft in April 1993, just before the referendum. However. the Constitutional Commission rejected it in May 1993. Communists then prepared another version of their constitution. The main problem here was over the power sharing between the parliament and the President. In the end, the problem was solved when Yeltsin dissolved the legislature and suspended the existing constitution. Then the Constitutional Assembly was reorganised and prepared a new draft constitution establishing a strong presidential system. This version was approved by Russians at the December 1993 referendum and became Russia's first Constitution. Thus, to conclude, we can argue that constitution making became an instrument in the struggle between the reformers and the conservatives. Concerning the political institutions (form of government), the 1993 Russian Constitution creates a strong presidency without any division of responsibilities and competencies and without checks and balances that could prevent the abuse of executive power. The Constitution also does not provide any effective government in which the problems that could arise due to the struggle between the parliament and the president could be solved. The Constitution also has some features that contrast with the federal structure of Russia. In this sense, the Russian Constitution is regarded as a mixture of the American and French models, neither a pure presidential system as in the USA, nor a quasipresidential system as in

France. Thus, in Russia, the presidency was strengthened to create a strong executive role in the implementation of reforms. Here, although the aim was to undermine the old social and political structures to create a framework for the growth of democratic institutions, the result became the emergence of some sort of an authoritarian democracy. Concerning the judicial aspect, there were two attempts in the 1993 Constitution which could contribute to the consolidation of democracy in Russia; the recreation of the Constitutional Court as a supreme organ to review legislative and constitutional matters and the introduction of trial by juryin some limited number of regions of Russia. However, Russia still needs a real improvement in the operation of its judicial system. For the effects of international influences, as in all other countries, the democratisation process in Russia is not merely a domestic process. In the post-cold war period, international actors and structures played an even more important role in the Russian case. Whitehead, has talked about different methods through which the international actors could affect the democratization processes of other countries, including the conclusion of international treaties, increased economic and trade relations and the activities of NGOs. In this sense, he also defines three types of action in the promotion of democracy in another country; pressure on the existing government to Democratise themselves, support for the existing democratic elements to consolidate and the maintenance of a firm stance against antidemocratic forces. The international actors, ranging from individual countries like the USA and most of the Western countries to many international organizations like EU, WTO, the IMF and NGOs, by using the above-mentioned methods, affect the democratisation process in Russia. Especially in the institutional democratisation process, they exported their experience concerning the establishment of democratic institutions and elections. They also contributed financially in both economic and political transformation through debt relief and rescheduling, trade credits, humanitarian assistance and direct investment. Their influence appears to be greater in the economic and technical fields, but no one can underestimate their support for Yeltsin in political matters. They supported Yeltsin in nearly all cases that seemed to aim at democratisation in Russia. Even when Yeltsin disregarded the Soviet Constitution and disbanded the Soviet Union in December 1991, when he suspended the Russian Constitution and dismissed Parliament, when the army had bombarded the White House and when he suspended the Constitutional Court, he could get the approval of the West for the sake of consolidation of democracy in Russia. Thus, together with the support of the West, a special Russian route to democracy was established. To conclude then, we can argue that for a Russian transition the international scheme is more than supportive. On the other hand, Russia today is a

member of the Council of Europe and tries to enter into contractual relations with the existing international and regional Economic Organisations like IMF WTO and EU, which forces Russia to adopt its standards to international ones. From the analysis of all these variables, we can conclude that, although the Russian transition is a rapid and non-violent process, its consolidation seems to be lengthy, since the problems which were outlined by the scholars mentioned above, as obstacles to the consolidation of democracy, still exist in Russia. Although it is too early to talk about the establishment of a stable democracy in Russia, the achievements of Russia in this process should not be underestimated. Today we can all argue that Russia is now more free and more democratic than it had been earlier. Up to the present, there have been efforts at completing the building of democratic institutions and two presidential, two parliamentary and a series of regional elections were held in accordance with international standards. Thus, according to Rustow's distinction, Russia tried to complete the preparatory and decision phase in its transition but still has some difficulties in the habituation phase. However, these difficulties are not serious enough to turn Russia into a totalitarian regime, both due to the obligations imposed by the international community in general, and Western countries and the USA in particular, and due to its internal dynamics.

20.5: SUMMARY

In conclusion, Anthropologists have identified forms of proto-democracy that date back to small bands of hunter-gatherers that predate the establishment of agrarian, sedentary societies and still exist virtually unchanged in isolated indigenous groups today. In these groups of generally 50–100 individuals, often tied closely by familial bonds, decisions are reached by consensus or majority and many times without the designation of any specific chief.

These types of democracy are commonly identified as tribalism, or *primitive democracy*. In this sense, a *primitive democracy* usually takes shape in small communities or villages when there are face-to-face discussions in a village, council or with a leader who has the backing of village elders or other cooperative forms of government. This becomes more complex on a larger scale, such as when the village and city are examined more broadly as political communities. All other forms of rule – including monarchy, tyranny, aristocracy, and oligarchy – have flourished in more urban centers, often those with concentrated populations. David Graeber and David Wengrow, in *The Dawn of Everything*, argue in contrast that cities and early settlements were more varied and unpredictable in terms of how their political systems alternated and evolved from more to less

democratic.

The concepts (and name) of democracy and constitution as a form of government originated in ancient Athens circa 508 BCE. In ancient Greece, where there were many city-states with different forms of government, democracy ("rule by the *demos*", i.e. citizen body) was contrasted with governance by elites (aristocracy, literally "rule by the best"), by one person (monarchy), by tyrants (tyranny), etc.

20.6: KEY TERMS

- **Advocacy**: The act of arguing in favor of a particular issue, policy, or cause. Advocacy is a central activity of pressure groups as they seek to influence public opinion and government policy.

- **Lobbying**: The process by which pressure groups attempt to influence legislators and government officials to enact or reject legislation. Lobbyists often meet with policymakers, provide research and policy recommendations, and testify at hearings.

- **Policy Agenda**: The set of issues that are prioritized by policymakers. Pressure groups aim to shape the policy agenda to include their interests and concerns.

- **Think Tank**: An organization that conducts research and provides expertise and advice on specific political, social, or economic issues. Think tanks often support the efforts of pressure groups by supplying data and policy analysis.

- **Coalition Building**: The process of forming alliances with other groups to strengthen advocacy efforts. By working together, groups can pool resources and amplify their influence.

20.7: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is democratization?
- Discuss the process of democratization in Post-Colonial Countries.

20.8: REFERENCES

Heywood, Andrew (2007). Politics. London: MacMillan. p. 305.

Sarah F. Anzia; Olivia M. Meeks (May 2016). "Political Parties and Policy Demanders in Local Elections" (PDF). University of Maryland-Hewlett Foundation Conference on Parties, Polarization and Policy Demanders.

Avnon, Dan (16 November 2007). "Parties laws in democratic systems of government". The Journal of Legislative Studies.

John Anthony Maltese; Joseph A. Pika; W. Phillips Shively (2020). American democracy in context. Sage. p. 182. ISBN 978-1544345222

UNIT-21: FEDERALISM: MEANING AND FEATURES

Structure

21.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is Federalism?
- Various types of Federalism.
- Federalism in India
- Features of Federalism in India

21.2: INTRODUCTION

Federalism is a mode of government that combines a general government (the central or federal government) with regional governments (provincial, state, cantonal, territorial, or other sub-unit governments) in a single political system, dividing the powers between the two. Johannes Althusius is considered the father of modern federalism along with Montesquieu. Althusius notably exposes the bases of this political philosophy in *Politica Methodice Digesta, Atque Exemplis Sacris et Profanis Illustrata* (1603). In *The Spirit of Law*, Montesquieu for his part sees

examples of federalist republics in corporate societies, the *polis* bringing together villages, and the cities themselves forming confederations. Federalism in the modern era was first adopted in the unions of states during the Old Swiss Confederacy.

Federalism differs from confederalism, in which the general level of government is subordinate to the regional level, and from devolution within a unitary state, in which the regional level of government is subordinate to the general level. It represents the central form in the pathway of regional integration or separation, bounded on the less integrated side by confederalism and on the more integrated side by devolution within a unitary state.

They are created and/or enacted on behalf of the public typically by a government. Sometimes they are made by nonprofit organizations or are made in co-production with communities or citizens, which can include potential experts, scientists, engineers and stakeholders or scientific data, or sometimes use some of their results. They are typically made by policy-makers affiliated with currently elected politicians. Therefore, the "policy process is a complex political process in which there are many actors: elected politicians, political party leaders, pressure groups, civil servants, publicly employed professionals, judges, non-governmental organizations, international agencies, academic experts, journalists and even sometimes citizens who see themselves as the passive recipients of policy."

21.3: MEANING OF FEDERALISM

In the narrow sense, federalism refers to the mode in which the body politic of a state is organized internally, and this is the meaning most often used in modern times. Political scientists, however, use it in a much broader sense, referring instead to a "multi-layer or pluralistic concept of social and political life." The first forms of federalism took place in ancient times, in the form of alliances between states. Some examples from the seventh to second century B.C. were the Archaic League, the Aetolic League, the Peloponnesian League, and the Delian League. An early ancestor of federalism was the Achaean League in Hellenistic Greece. Unlike the Greek city states of Classical Greece, each of which insisted on keeping its complete independence, changing conditions in the Hellenistic period drove many city states to band together even at the cost of losing part of their sovereignty. Subsequent unions of states included the first and second Swiss Confederations (1291–1798 and 1815–48), the United Provinces of the Netherlands (1579–1795), the German Bund (1815–66), the first American union known as the Confederation of the United States of America (1781–89), and second American union formed as the United States of

America (1789–1865).

The term "Federalism is obtained from the Latin word 'Foedus' means treaty, pact or covenant. The political principles that animate federal systems gives importance on the principle of bargaining and negotiated coordination among several power centres. The emphasised upon the virtues of dispersed power centres as a means for securing individual and local liberties. Federalism is the compound mode of two governments. That is, in one system there will be a mixture of two governments. Federalism is treated as dynamic and systematic theory of nation and state building. Usually, it is a developed theory on political cooperation and collective coexistence. According to Daniel Elazer federalism is self-rule plus shared rule. Federalism is based on the principle of living together. Federalism is linked with Multiculturalism. Federalism has three important factors as state building mechanism like formation of states, distribution of federal powers and institutions for shared rule. The norm of competence, division and distribution have been developed. Fernandez Segado has given hints on integral competence, exclusive-limited competence, shared competence, concurring competence and Indistinct Competence. Federalism have been evolved as policy science.

21.4: KINDS OF FEDERALISM

Usually there are two kinds of federation namely Holding Together Federation and Coming Together Federation. In the system of holding together powers are titled towards the central government. India is an instance of holding together federation. In the process of Coming together states enjoy more autonomy. Its example is U.S.A. Federalism or Federation can be divided into three types or kinds namely Cooperative Federalism, Competitive Federalism and Interdependent Federalism. In the system of cooperative federalism, the Centre and states share a horizontal relationship where they cooperate in general interest. In Competitive federalism the relationship between the Central and state governments is vertical and between the states is horizontal. In this process States need to compete among themselves and also with the Centre. In the system of interdependent federalism two governments are neither fully independent nor fully dependent. Federalism can be also divided into two kinds namely Dual Federalism and Quasi Federalism. Dual Federal set up is a system where both Central Government and State Government have equal power like USA having dual constitution and double citizenship. Quasi Federalism means an intermediate form of state between a unitary state and a federation. It mixed the features of a

federal government and features of unitary government or federal in structure but unitary in spirit. India is a quasi-federal state.

The division of powers are defined by the constitution and the legislative powers are divided into three lists:

Union List

Union List consists of 100 items (earlier 97) on which the parliament has exclusive power to legislate. This includes: defense, armed forces, arms and ammunition, atomic energy, foreign affairs, war and peace, citizenship, extradition, railways, shipping and navigation, airways, posts and telegraphs, telephones, wireless and broadcasting, currency, foreign trade, inter-state trade and commerce, banking, insurance, control of industries, regulation and development of mines, mineral and oil resources, elections, audit of Government accounts, constitution and organisation of the Supreme Court, High courts and union public service commission, income tax, customs and export duties, duties of excise, corporation tax, taxes on the capital value of assets, estate duty and terminal taxes.

State List

State List consists of 61 items (earlier 66 items). Uniformity is desirable but not essential on items in this list: maintaining law and order, police forces, healthcare, transport, land policies, electricity in the state, village administration, etc. The state legislature has exclusive power to make laws on these subjects. In certain circumstances, the parliament can make laws on subjects mentioned in the State List, but to do so the Rajya Sabha (Council of States) must pass a resolution with a two-thirds majority that it is expedient to legislate in the national interest.

Though states have exclusive powers to legislate with regards to items on the State List, articles 249, 250, 252, and 253 mention situations in which the Union government can legislate.

Concurrent List

Concurrent List consists of 52 (earlier 47) items. Uniformity is desirable but not essential on items in this list. The list mentions: marriage and divorce, transfer of property other than agricultural land, education, contracts, bankruptcy and insolvency, trustees and trusts, civil

procedure, contempt of court, adulteration of foodstuffs, drugs and poisons, economic and social planning, trade unions, labour welfare, electricity, newspapers, books and printing press NS stamp duties.

Other (residuary subjects)

Subjects not mentioned in any of the three lists are known as residuary subjects. However, many provisions in the constitution outside these lists permit parliament or state Legislative assembly to legislate. Excluding the provisions of the constitution outside these lists per Article 245, the power to legislate on such subjects, rests with the parliament exclusively per Article 248. Parliament shall legislate on residuary subjects following the Article 368 procedure as constitutional amendments.

In case the above lists are to be expanded or amended, the legislation should be done by the Parliament under its constituent power per Article 368 with ratification by the majority of the states. Federalism is part of the basic structure of the Indian constitution which cannot be altered or destroyed through constitutional amendments under the constituent powers of the Parliament without undergoing judicial review by the Supreme Court.

Executive powers

The Union and States have independent executive staffs controlled by their respective governments. In legislative and administrative matters, the union government cannot overrule the constitutional rights/powers of a state government except when presidential rule is declared in a State. The Union's duty is to ensure that the government of every State is carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution as Article 355 and Article 256. The State governments cannot violate the Central laws in administrative matters. When a State violates the Constitution, Presidential rule can be imposed under Article 356 and the President takes over the State's administration with *ex post facto* consent of the Parliament per Article 357.

Financial powers

Article 282 accords financial autonomy in spending financial resources available to the states for public purpose. Article 293 allows States to borrow without limit without consent from the Union government. However, the Union government can insist upon compliance with its loan terms when a state has outstanding loans charged to the consolidated fund of India or a federally-

guaranteed loan.

The President of India constitutes a Finance Commission every five years to recommend devolution of Union revenues to State governments.

Under Article 360, the President can proclaim a financial emergency when the financial stability or credit of the nation or of any part of its territory is threatened. However, no guidelines define "financial emergency" for the country or a state or union territory or a panchayat or a municipality or a corporation.

An emergency like this must be approved by the Parliament within two months by a simple majority and has never been declared. A state of financial emergency remains in force indefinitely until revoked by the President. The President can reduce the salaries of all government officials, including judges of the supreme court and high courts, in cases of a financial emergency. All money bills passed by the state legislatures are submitted to the President for approval. He can direct the state to observe economy measures.

Disputes Resolution

States can make agreements among themselves. When a dispute arises with other states or union territory or the union government, the Supreme Court adjudicates per Article 131. However, Article 262 excludes Supreme Court jurisdiction with respect to the adjudication of disputes in the use, distribution or control of interstate river waters.

Under Article 263 the President can establish an interstate council to coordinate/resolve disputes between states and the Union. States have their own jurisdiction.

21.5: FEDERALSIM IN INDIA

The Constitution of India establishes the structure of the Indian government, including the relationship between the federal government and state governments. Part XI of the Indian constitution specifies the distribution of legislative, administrative and executive powers between the union government and the States of India. The legislative powers are categorised under a Union List, a State List and a Concurrent List, representing, respectively, the powers conferred upon the Union government, those conferred upon the State governments and powers shared among them.

This federalism is symmetrical in that the devolved powers of the constituent units are envisioned to be the same. Historically, the state of Jammu and Kashmir was accorded a status different from other States owing to an explicitly temporary provision of the Indian Constitution namely Article 370 (which was revoked by the Parliament in 2019). Union territories are unitary type, directly governed by the Union government. Article 1 (1) of the constitution stipulates two tier-governance with an additional local elected government. Delhi and Puducherry were accorded legislatures under Article 239AA and 239A, respectively.

21.6: FEATURES OF INDIAN FEDERALISM

Dual government polity: The existence of both central and state governments. Federalism or dual polity means the existence of two governments, i.e., the central and state governments. For example, in India, there is a Union at the centre and many state governments at the periphery. Each is endowed with sovereign powers to be exercised in the respective fields assigned to them by the Constitution. A federal state is the union of several unit states that share common interests, with each unit states retaining autonomy in other areas. The Union government is in charge of national issues such as defence, foreign affairs, currency, communication, and so on. State governments, on the other hand, are in charge of regional and local issues such as public order, agriculture, health, and local government.

Division of powers between various levels: India follows the principle of Division of Powers. The Constitution has distributed the powers between State and Union. Where Union works in accordance with List I, State works in accordance with List-II. Concurrent List gives power to both State and Union to make laws in the matter provided in the list.

Rigidity of constitution -The Constitution has provided a federal structure for India and rigid constitution is one of the main features of the Indian Constitution, because the procedure of amendment is not very easy. The jurisdictions of the centre and state have been defined and separated. Both the centre and the states have been authorized to exercise powers independently. In many matters Amendments can be made only with the consent of both the Centre and the States. A special majority of the Union Parliament, i.e., a majority of not less than two-thirds vote is required to amend the Constitution. Thus the Indian Constitution enjoys the advantages of a combination of flexibility and rigidity.

Independence judiciary – An independent and impartial judiciary can establish a stable rule of

law. Independence of judiciary means, the power of upholding the rule of law, without any fear or external influence, and maintaining effective control over the actions of the government. The independence of the judiciary is part of the basic structure of the Constitution.

Dual citizenship – The federal system of the government provides dual citizenship to the people of the country. In a Federal state, a person is not only the citizen of the country but also of the particular state to which he belongs.

Bicameralism – A federal state has two kinds of governments having different interests and rights. There is, therefore, a need for the protection of these rights and interests. This can be done only when there is a bicameral legislature. The two houses represent the two interests. Normally the Lower House represents the interests of the nation and the upper house represents the interests of the provinces. Normally representation in the Lower House is based on population and for the upper house the principle of parity is followed that is whether a state is small or large it will have equal number of seats. This method is followed in USA and in Pakistan. It is a system of government in which the legislature comprises two houses.

21.7: SUMMARY

Federalism is a system where governmental power is divided between central government and state government according to the written constitution. It is necessary to amend the constitution to change the powers of states. Federalism needs to clearly define powers of Union & State government with court empowerment. Presently there are 25 federal political systems. The USA was the first nation to adopt federal system. Federalism is the process regarding sharing of power between Central government and state government. In recent period, the coercive policies taken by the Central government coming on the pandemic shock have weakened the political and financial situation of state government. Frequent financial dependence of state government upon Central can weaken a federal system. Freedom and integrity are important aspect of federal state. Federalism is a form of managing and establishing a government based on several levels together. The rights and duties of various levels of government are wellpreserved with equal participation. Indian Political system is federal in structure but unitary in spirit. The main challenges to Federal system are regionalism, communalism, terrorism, caste system and globalization.

21.8: KEY TERMS

- **Policy**: A course of action or a set of principles adopted or proposed by a government, organization, or individual to guide decision-making and achieve specific goals.

- **Public Policy**: Policies enacted or proposed by governments at various levels (local, regional, national) to address societal issues and meet public needs.

- **Policy Analysis**: The systematic examination of policies to understand their objectives, effectiveness, costs, and impacts on society.

- **Policy Cycle**: The stages through which a policy progresses, typically including agenda setting, policy formulation, adoption, implementation, and evaluation.

- **Stakeholders**: Individuals, groups, or organizations affected by or involved in the policy process, including policymakers, interest groups, advocacy organizations, and the general public.

21.9: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is Federalism?
- Discuss various features of Federalism.
- Discuss various types of federalism.
- Discuss about federalism in India.

21.10: REFERNCES

Anderson George, 2018. Federalism-An Introduction, Oxford, New Delhi

Basu D.D, 2012. Comparative Federalism, Bharat Law House, Allahabad.

Dua B.D, 2015. Indian Federalism, ABP, New Delhi.

Elazar Daniel, 2016. Exploring Federalism, ABP. New Delhi.

Gagnon A.G, 2019. Understanding Federalism and Federation, RBP, Paris.

Jain S, K, 2018. Emerging Issues of Federalism, FBP, New Delhi

Johari J.C, New Comparative Government, 2017, ABP, New Delhi.

Kumar Chanchal, 2017. Comparative Government and Politics, ABP, New Delhi.

UNIT-22: FEDERTION & CONFEDERATION: DEBATES AROUND TERRITORIAL DIVISION OF POWERS

Structure

22.1: OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to know:

- What is a federation?
- What is Confederation?
- Difference between Federation and Confederation
- Debates around Territorial Division of Powers

22.2: INTRODUCTION

Confederation is different from Federal & Unitary State in structure of power and division. Usually, a confederation is formed for collective defence, safety, security and unity by sovereign

states. When a group of nations form an alliance or front it is known as confederation. Allowing each state to govern itself but agreeing to work together for common causes. The term confederation also means importation, emendation, redistribution and association. According to James Bryce a federal state is a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity and power with the maintenance of state rights. However, not all federal states have been born via union of sovereign states. Most of them were formed on the consequence of devolution of powers by a centralized authority of a National Government to the lower units. A Confederation is a loose alliance of states. It may or may not have a central authority. The central organ of a Confederating political system has limited instrumentation & work through states. The United States was a Confederation of states until 1789 and thereafter became a Federal State. A federation is a type of political System which unites separate polities to allow for maintain basic integrity. A federation is based on the concept of two tiers of government. A Confederation is Association of sovereign states to face great powers by combined strength. A Confederation may be converted into federal state. Sometimes a confederation is combined strength. India was attacked and captured by foreign powers due to absence of confederation

22.3: CONCEPT OF FEDERATION

A federation (also called a federal state) is an entity characterized by a union of partially self-governing provinces, states, or other regions under a federal government (federalism). In a federation, the self-governing status of the component states, as well as the division of power between them and the central government, is constitutionally entrenched and may not be altered by a unilateral decision, neither by the component states nor the federal political body without constitutional amendment. Sovereign power is formally divided between a central authority and a number of constituent regions so that each region retains some degree of control over its internal affairs.

Overriding powers of a central authority theoretically can include: the constitutional authority to suspend a constituent state's government by invoking gross mismanagement or civil unrest, or to adopt national legislation that overrides or infringes on the constituent states' powers by invoking the central government's constitutional authority to ensure "peace and good government" or to implement obligations contracted under an international treaty. The governmental or constitutional structure found in a federation is considered to be federalist, or to be an example

of federalism. It can be considered the opposite of another system, the unitary state. France and Japan, for example, have been unitary for many centuries. The Austrian Empire was a unitary state with crown lands, after the transformation into the Austria-Hungary monarchy the remaining crown lands of so-called Cisleithania became federated as *Länder* of the Republic of Austria through the implementation of its constitution. Germany, with its 16 states, or *Länder*, and Nigeria, with its 36 states and federal capital territory, are examples of federations. Federations are often multi-ethnic and cover a large area of territory (such as Russia, the United States, Canada, India, Brazil, Pakistan or Australia), but neither is necessarily the case (such as Saint Kitts and Nevis or the Federated States of Micronesia). Several ancient chiefdoms and kingdoms, such as the 4th-century-BCE League of Corinth, Noricum in Central Europe, and the Iroquois Confederacy in pre-Columbian North America, could be described as federations or confederations. The Old Swiss Confederacy was an early example of formal non-unitary statehood.

Several colonies and dominions in the New World consisted of autonomous provinces, transformed into federal states upon independence such as the United States, and various countries in Latin America (see Spanish American wars of independence). Some of the New World federations failed; the Federal Republic of Central America broke up into independent states less than 20 years after its founding. Others, such as Argentina, have shifted between federal, confederal, and unitary systems, before settling into federalism. Brazil became a federation only after the fall of the monarchy, and Venezuela became a federation after the Federal War. Australia and Canada are also federations. Germany is another nation-state that has switched between confederal, federal and unitary rules, since the German Confederation was founded in 1815. The North German Confederation, the succeeding German Empire and the Weimar Republic were federations.

Founded in 1922, the Soviet Union was formally a federation of Soviet republics, autonomous republics and other federal subjects, though in practice highly centralized under the government of the Soviet Union. The Russian Federation has inherited a similar system. India, Pakistan, Nigeria and Malaysia (then Federation of Malaya) became federations on or shortly before becoming independent from the British Empire. In some recent cases, federations have been instituted as a measure to handle ethnic conflict within a state, such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Iraq since 2005 as well as Somalia since 2012. With the United States

Constitution having become effective on 4 March 1789, the United States is the oldest surviving federation, while the newest federation is Nepal, after its constitution went into effect on 20 September 2015.

22.4: CONCEPT OF CONFEDERATION

A confederation (also known as a confederacy or league) is a political union of sovereign states united for purposes of common action. Usually created by a treaty, confederations of states tend to be established for dealing with critical issues, such as defence, foreign relations, internal trade or currency, with the central government being required to provide support for all its members. Confederalism represents a main form of inter-governmentalism, defined as any form of interaction around states that takes place on the basis of sovereign independence or government. The nature of the relationship among the member states constituting a confederation varies considerably. Likewise, the relationship between the member states and the general government and their distribution of powers varies. Some looser confederations are similar to international organisations. Other confederations with stricter rules may resemble federal systems. These elements of such confederations, the international organization and federalist perspective, has been combined as supranational unions. Since the member states of a confederation retain their sovereignty, they have an implicit right of secession. The political philosopher Emmerich de Vattel said: "Several sovereign and independent states may unite themselves together by a perpetual confederacy without each, in particular, ceasing to be a perfect state.... The deliberations in common will offer no violence to the sovereignty of each member".

Under a confederation, compared to a federal state, the central authority is relatively weak. Decisions made by the general government in a unicameral legislature, a council of the member states, require subsequent implementation by the member states to take effect; they are not laws acting directly upon the individual but have more the character of interstate agreements. Also, decision-making in the general government usually proceeds by consensus (unanimity), not by the majority. Historically, those features limit the union's effectiveness. Hence, political pressure tends to build over time for the transition to a federal system of government, as in the American, Swiss and German cases of regional integration. In terms of internal structure, every confederal state is composed of two or more constituent states, referred to as *confederated states*. Regarding their political systems, confederated states can have republican or monarchical forms of

government. Those that have a republican form (confederated republics) are usually called *states* (like states of the American Confederacy, 1861–1865)

or *republics* (like republics of Serbia and Montenegro within the former State Union of Serbia and Montenegro, 2003–2006). Those that have a monarchical form of government (confederated monarchies) are defined by various hierarchical ranks (like kingdoms of Iraq and Jordan within the Hashemite Arab Union in 1958).

22.5: DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FEDERATION AND CONFEDERATION

The main difference between a confederation is that the membership of states is voluntary whereas the membership in a federation is not. Sometimes confederation is mistakenly used in lieu of federation. Some states which were formed as confederation kept the word after becoming federations like Switzerland. Sovereignty is held by the member states in Confederation whereas it is held by federal government in a federation. The central authority of confederation is weak body while it is strong in a federation. There is joint foreign policy of confederation whereas foreign policy is determined by the federal government in a federation. Member states of a Confederation maintain their sovereignty while states that join a federation, agree to give up part of their powers to the Central Government. A Confederation is a political system in which some states come together for various reasons.

The power and responsibilities of the central authority vary deeply between Confederation and Federation. The ties among states are much stronger in the case of federation. In a confederation the states are united to secure common interests whereas regional similarity act as a guiding force to federalism. Units of confederation are agreed to some limitations on their freedom of action while Units of Federal state do not enjoy supreme power. States under Confederation are bound to consult with others before taking decisions whereas in case of a federation Central Government acts as the machinery to implement main policies or to supervise joint activities. Confederation allows its members to maintain Defence & Foreign Policy independently while both central and state governments enjoy administrative power but defence and foreign policy are determined by Central Government in case of a Federation. Confederation often turn into federations but Federation cannot be converted into confederation; but a Federation can be dissolved or collapsed like USSR.

22.6: DEBATES AROUND TERRITORIAL DIVISION OF POWERS

Territorial Division of Powers includes the delegation of power to regional & local sphere, where a minority group may be in majority. Territorial division of powers can be treated as the sharing of the central government's powers and duties to units. Territorial Division of power is usually applied in situations of conflicts within states where ethno-national groups are located in specific areas and seek self-determination. Different elements of territorial division and sub-division are mixed in creative and multi-layers permutations. There are critical decisions have implications for inclusion during negotiations on territorial division of power. Major issues which require decision in framing territorial division of power are i- the procedure regarding splitting of territory, the procedure of power division, demarcation of boundaries and implication for non-dominant minorities and women. Women from various groups may feel territorial division of power differently. Territorial division of powers can include conflicting parties but should consider the affectability for wider social groups. Sequencing territorial devolution of power in stages, to build incremental agreement, can assist in building support for territorial division of power for a inclusive state. A Federation involves a territorial division of powers between states. The territorial division of powers is typically imprinted in a constitution. In a Confederation centre is weaker than states and the centre depend upon the constituent units. In a confederation member units may legally quit and the centre can exercise delegated There is veto power system for member states. In a confederation centre decision bind member unit but not citizens directly. The member states have the equal powers in symmetric federation or confederation. In asymmetric federation or confederation, the bundles of powers may be different among member states. The provincial units of a federation engaged in two methods of Interlocking process., There are two process of formation of a federal political order like Coming Together and Holding Together. Interesting alternative to unitary states arises when non-territorial member units are formed by groups sharing ethnic, religious and other features. These systems are known as nonterritorial federations.

Distribution or Division of Powers in Federation: The manner of distribution of powers differs among 30 federal states of the Universe. In most of the federal state's items like foreign affairs, defence, security, transport, taxing, railways and post offices are legislated by Union or Central Legislature whereas items like health, education, culture, social development and local self-government are legislated by state legislature. In India, Canada and Australia both union and state legislatures are empowered to make law over items like health, education and agriculture of Concurrent list. Legislative Power to make law over the items those are not mentioned any List is

given to Union Legislature in India, Canada and Belgium. It is known as residuary power. Residuary power is vested with Central Legislature in case of U.S.A, Australia, Switzerland, Germany, Austria and Malaysia. Residuary power is co-shared by Union and state legislature in Spain.

Distribution and Division of Financial Powers in a Federation: Collection, sharing and revenue raising powers are divided between Central government and state government in a federation. Generally, the Central govt's power of taxation include income tax, custom and excise duties. The state powers of taxation cover taxes on agricultural income, sales tax and estate duty. Vertical and horizontal imbalances are common in federal states. There is system of fiscal transfer from centre to states in federal countries which is recommended by Finance Commission. The Australian Constitution specially provides two types of arrangements to correct imbalances. The Canadian Federation has provided several mechanisms for fiscal transfer like statutory subsidies, equalisation grants, and stabilisation payments, established programme financing and specific matching grants.

22.7: SUMMARY

The term federation and confederation seem to similar but very different concepts. In a system of confederation states united together for creation of a loose union for political, economic and administrative facilities. In confederation member states keep and maintain sovereignty. But in federation states join and agree to give up part of their powers. Members of the confederation maintain a large degree of independence and autonomous power. In a federation the balance of power between the state and central government is imprinted in a written constitution. There are both similarities and differences between federation and confederation. European Union, U.N.O, Commonwealth and SAARC are examples of confederation. Federations and confederation only exist if there is a common agreement among member states. Territorial Division of Powers includes the delegation power by centre to regional level. This division is most often used in conflicts among the states. In a federation there is constitutional division or distribution of executive, legislative powers between Central & state governments.

22.7: KEY TERMS

- **Citizen Engagement**: The active involvement of citizens in public affairs, decision-making processes, and community activities. Strong citizen engagement is essential for a vibrant civil society, as it promotes democratic governance, accountability, and social

responsibility.

- **Philanthropy**: The practice of donating money, resources, or time to support charitable causes or organizations. Philanthropic efforts contribute significantly to civil society by funding initiatives, programs, and projects that address social, environmental, or humanitarian issues.

- **Social Capital**: The networks of relationships, trust, and reciprocity within a society that facilitate cooperation and collective action. Social capital is a critical resource for civil society, as it enables individuals and groups to mobilize resources, build alliances, and achieve common goals.

- **Public Sphere**: The domain of social life where individuals come together to discuss and debate matters of public interest. A vibrant public sphere is essential for a healthy civil society, as it provides opportunities for dialogue, deliberation, and the exchange of ideas among citizens.

- **Volunteerism**: The practice of offering one's time and skills for charitable, educational, or other worthwhile activities without financial compensation. Volunteerism is a key aspect of civil society, as it fosters community engagement and social cohesion.

- **Advocacy**: The process of publicly supporting or promoting a particular cause, policy, or idea. Advocacy organizations within civil society work to influence decision-makers, raise awareness, and mobilize support for issues ranging from human rights to environmental conservation.

22.8: SELF ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

- What is Federation?
- What do you mean by Confederation?
- Discuss the differences between federation and confederation.
- Write an essay on the debates on territorial division of powers.

22.9: REFERENCES

"Federalism and Federation". The Princeton Encyclopedia of Self-Determination. Retrieved 24 January 2024.

Leonardy, U. (1992). "Federation and Länder in German foreign relations: Power-sharing in treaty-making and European affairs". German Politics. 1 (3): 119–135.

Harding, Andrew (25 January 2021). "Asymmetric Federalism and Protection of Indigenous Peoples: The Case of Sabah and Sarawak in Malaysian Federalism". 50 Shades of Federalism. Retrieved 24 January 2024.

"confederation". Oxford English Dictionary (Online ed.). Oxford University Press. (Subscription or participating institution membership required.)

Bhattacharya, Mohit, 2011, New Horizon of Public Administration, Jawahar Publishers and Distributors, New Delhi

Gupta Dipankar, 2000, Culture, Space and the Nation State, From Sentiment to Structure, Sage Publications, New Delhi