

B.A (Arts) POLITICAL SCIENCE (HONOURS)

AS PER CBCS MODEL SYLLABUS

POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Core-VIII
Fourth Semester

Author
Prof. Amareswar Mishra



ଦୂରନିରନ୍ତର ଶିକ୍ଷା ନିର୍ଦ୍ଦେଶାଳୟ, ଉତ୍କଳ ବିଶ୍ୱବିଦ୍ୟାଳୟ
DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE & CONTINUING EDUCATION
UTKAL UNIVERSITY

SYLLABUS

UNIT-I: Approaches to Studying Comparative Politics

- (i) Political Culture –Meaning, Types &relevance.
- (ii) New Institutionalism –Meaning, Background, Significance

UNIT-II: Election& Party System

- (i) Definition and procedures: Types of election system (First Past the Post, Proportional Representation, Mixed Representation)
- (ii) Party System -Evolution, Theories and types

UNIT-III: Nation-state

- (i) Nation-state; Meaning and Evolution in West Europe
- (ii) Nation and State; Debates in Post-colonial contexts

UNIT-IV: Democratization in Post- colonial societies

- (i) Democratization in Post-authoritarian countries and in Post-communist countries
- (ii) Federalism: Meaning and Features, Federation& Confederation: Debates around territorial division of power.

Unit – I

POLITICAL CULTURE

- 1.0 Concept of Political Culture
- 1.1 Meaning of Political Culture
- 1.2 Scope
- 1.3 Nature of Political Culture
- 1.4 Sub-Culture
- 1.5 Functionality of Political Culture
- 1.6 Dimensions of Political Culture
- 1.7 Types of Political Culture
- 1.8 Civic Culture

Concept of Political Culture

1.0 Introduction:

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 artistic raft”. Society and culture are inseparable and interdependent.

1.1 Meaning of Political Culture:

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 from 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 beliefs, 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.

1.2 Scope of the Study:

Hence, the study of political culture of a society centers round a number of queries as follows. What are the major beliefs, values and attitudes that prevail within a society? To what extent, do political subcultures exist within the national political culture and how do they accommodate in the society? Finally, how do the cultures change in a society?

1.3 Nature 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.

1.4 Sub- Culture:

The political consequences of subculture may be significant because beliefs and values, not being shared by all, may create conflict with other subcultures and national culture. Hence, subcultures are to be accommodated, ignored to create an effective national identity along with the sub-cultural difference. If the subcultures will not be accommodated, they will create a sense of alienation from the common traditional culture, which will lead to succession and division of the nation.

1.5 Functionality of Political Culture:

In every society, prevailing political culture functions in a number of interrelated roles. It legitimized governmental actions, public policies and political system. Political leadership gets support form the attitude, belief, orientations and value system possessed by the people. Political culture relates to larger issues of political development. The stability of political system depends upon the cohesive nature of the political system. A political culture produces three kinds of orientations that affect attitudes and behavior towards the political objects. These orientations are namely cognitive, affective and evaluative. Cognitive orientation refers to the

knowledge about roles, institutions, process and the political system. Affective orientation relates to an individual's feeling or attachment to, involvement in or identification with the political system. Evaluative orientation entails the assessment with the political system on the basis of the individual's beliefs or values. These three dimensions are interrelated and may be combined in a variety of ways, even within the same individual as he considers various aspects of the political system.

1.6 Dimensions of Political Culture:

The nature and extent of these three orientations vary from society to society and thus created varied dimensions and different types of political culture.

Political system and political process rest upon mutual trust of political actors. The sense of trust, a person feels towards his social peers and fellow citizens very likely determines whether he is able and willing to cooperate with them for all kinds of social, economic and political purposes. In like manner, mutual hostility is another dimension which kills the constructive purpose of political action and mars the stability of the system. Sense of autonomy is another dimension of political culture, which creates democratic climate, individual rights and identity and representative government. Sense of initiative is another dimension of political culture, which refers to an attribute of individual of participating in politics and exhibiting allegiance to the political system.

On the other, it may also revolt against an evil regime. A sense of progressiveness and industry is also another dimension of political culture which compels a government to take necessary socio-economic measures for the benefit of the future generations. Capacity of individual for choosing right person as leader of outstanding integrity. Identity-individual and collective is one of the important dimensions of political culture of a

country. If the individual will not get proper social and political identity, he may experience identity-crisis and withdraw from political activity to the extent of alienation from the system. Collective identity refers to group identity, which ultimately results in building a nation. To this, Sidney Verba has given a name of "national identity". But national identity, he refers to the belief of individuals and the extent to which they consider themselves as members of their nation state. The importance of this belief can not be over stressed. Verba further says that the first and most crucial problem that must be solved in the formation of political culture, if it is to be capable of supporting a stable yet adaptable political system, is that of national identity. Political change and development also add a new dimension to the issue of identity.

1.7 Types of Political Culture:

Based on the various dimensions, Almond and Verba went on to generate a series of political cultural types. These are as follows. Political culture may be categorized broadly into three, namely, system culture, policy culture and process culture. System culture is composed of attitudes and orientations which people in a given society develop towards the political system. In a system cultures, the citizens in the society are willing to obey the rules, because they believe that they ought to obey. this obedience to law, authority and system has got three bases, namely, traditional, rational legal and charismatic. Policy culture refers to the pattern of orientations may be objectionable or they may be procedural or both. Process culture refers to two kinds of orientations of the people towards the political process, such 1) views of one's own influence in the political process, and 2) views of relationship with other political actors. The relationship of the individual with other political actors has been shaped through two types of perceptions one of mutual trust and the other of mutual hostility. Individual views himself in the political process as parochial, subject or participant.

Hence, develop three types of political culture, namely, parochial political culture, subject political culture and participant culture.

Parochial are those citizens, who are aware of local politics and involve in those politics, but they show little interest and involvement in national issues and politics. This is a common feature of traditional and transitional society.

Subjects are those citizens who become part of the national political system and perceive its impact on their lives. They perceive themselves as subjects of governmental actions, and they never become active in shaping those actions.

Participants are those who involve themselves in the national political process. They are not only subject of governmental policies, but they take active role in making the policies.

These three types of political culture are however, only the ideal types, none of them can be found in its pure form of any society since all the individuals within a political system can not be expected to be oriented in the same way and to the same extent. Accordingly, Almond and Verba out the three mixed types of political culture, such as, parochial subject political culture, subject-participant political culture, and parochial participant political culture.

In parochial-subject culture, an individual has knowledge about a variety of governmental roles, although he is mostly unaware of the ways in which they can influence the political system. Here the citizen is moving away from purely local, some citizens are aware of local politics, while others have the knowledge about national politics. Subject-participant political culture is one where the citizens are divided into a significant number of politically aware and active people and the rest who are

relatively passive. Parochial-participant political culture is one in which some citizens participate in local politics only, while others have an active role as participants in national politics as well.

1.8 Civic Culture:

Along with these types of political culture, Almond and Verba speak of another model of political culture, known as civic culture, which is mostly prevalent in developed democracies of the West. The civic culture is a more mixed political culture in which political activity, rationality and involvement are balanced by passivity, traditionality and political indifference. The citizen is neither so deeply involved and active in politics as to destroy the ability of the government to make authoritative decisions nor so inactive and indifferent to make the rule arbitrary one. Here the subject orientations and participant orientations are equally strong. Elite culture and subject culture become more congruent and cohesive. This political culture is conducive to the maintenance of democratic stability.

References:

1. Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba, 1965. *The Civic Culture*, Little, Brown, Boston.
2. Almond, Gabriel A. and G. B. Powell, Jr. 1978, *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*, New Delhi, Oxford and IBH Publishing Co.
Almond, Gabriel A. and G. B. Powell Jr. 1978, *Comparative Politics: System, Process and Policy*, Boston, Little Brown and Co.
3. Dahl, R 1961, *Who Governs?* Yale University Press.
4. Dowse and Hughes, *Political Sociology*.
5. Kolb, Eugene J. 1978 *A Framework of Political Analysis*, Prentice Hall, INC., New Jersey, Pye, Lucian W. and Sidney Verba, 1965.

6. Political Culture and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
7. Wilson, E. K. 1966, Sociology: Rules, Roles and Relationships, Dorsey Press, Illinois.

POLITICAL SOCIALISATION

- 1.2.0 Introduction
- 1.2.1 Meaning of Political Socialization
- 1.2.2 Socialization Process
- 1.2.3 Types of Political Socialization
- 1.2.4 Agents of Political Socialization

1.2.0. 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.

1.2.1 Meaning 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.

1.2.2 Socialization Process:

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 leave 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.

1.2.3 Styles or types of Political Socialization:

There are mainly two styles of political socialization. They are manifest and latent political socialization. Political socialization is manifest it involves the open communication of information, values, of feelings towards political objects. For example, when the President of information values or feelings towards political objects. For example, when the President delivers a speech for the people of the nation, or father discusses with his child about the election, it becomes an instance of manifest political socialization. Latent or indirect socialization is the transmission of non-political attitudes that affect attitude toward similar roles and objects in the political system. For example a child's non-questioning obedience to parents, teachers and individual about the obedience to political authority without any question.

1.2.4 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.

References:

1. Dawson, Richard E. & P. Kenneth, 1969, Political Socialization, Little Brown & Co, Boston, Paperback.
2. Dowse and Hughes, Political Sociology.
3. 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.
4. Hyman, Herbert. H. 1972, Political Socialization, Amerind Publishing Co. Pvt. Ltd., Indian Edition.
5. Ranston, S. A. (ed), 1977, Handbook of Political Socialization – Theory and Research, The Free Press, New York.
6. rush M. and P. Althroff, 1971, an Introduction to Political Sociology, Nelson, London.
7. Siegel, R. S. (Ed), 1970, Learning About Politics: A Reader in Political Socialization, Random House, New Delhi.

POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

- 1.3.0 Introduction
- 1.3.1 Importance of Communication.
- 1.3.2 Theories of Communication
- 1.3.3 Agents of Communication
- 1.3.4 Mass Communication
- 1.3.5 Communication and Democracy
- 1.3.6 Conclusion.

1.3.0 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.

1.3.1 Importance of 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".

1.3.2. Theories of 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.

1.3.3 Communication Structures or Agents:

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.

1.3.4 Mass Communication:

When communication message is transmitted through mass media to general public cutting across all structural division in society such as, race, occupation, religion, sex, etc. it is known as mass communication. The audience of mass communication has got no boundary and it includes persons of all ages, sexes, educational levels, income groups etc. In mass communication, the message becomes communicated very rapidly and its contents rare short-lived. The overall consequences of mass communication on society are paradoxically both centripetal as well as centrifugal. Mass communication affects the social organizations. The social order greatly depends upon the communicator, the recipients and the contents of communication message. Socialization and social mobilization, to a great extent, depend upon mass media and communication contents. On the political process, mass communication has got two consequences, namely, demand and policy formation, and second, control over the rulers. However, the effectiveness of mass media upon the political system depends upon the degree of autonomy they enjoy. In an authoritarian system, mass media perform limited functions, that is, "downward information flows". They come government channels of

communication to transmit information downwards, that is, from the government to the people. They do not perform the functions of articulating the demands and stating the demands of the people before the political authority. Hence mass media enjoy minimal autonomy and perform limited functions in an authoritarian system.

1.3.5 Communication and Democracy:

A democracy, on the other hand, thrives upon the autonomy the mass media enjoy. Autonomy means freedom from all sorts of control from political authority. These controls may be legal control, economic control and political control. Legal control means restriction over press writes and other media publicity. Laws are made to restrict the press and other media what to publish and what not to publish. In case of disobedience of these medial laws, severe penalties are being imposed upon media starting from dragging media to courts to the extent of cancelling their license. Economic control means the government will impose severe restrictions of production and distribution of newsprint, no press can thrive and communication of selected message will be made in order to get government subsidies and patronage. Political control refers to the restrictions over the news to be published, broadcast or telecast by mass media agencies. Every news becomes censored and restrictions are imposed upon their publicity. The party that is in power naturally wants to publicize only that news which will favour it and restricts other news which go against the interest of the party. If all these controls will be too severe, autonomy of media will be accordingly less, and the performance of media functions will be less efficient. This is a cruse for a democracy. However, autonomy is to be reconciled with national security, governmental stability and leadership crisis.

1.3.6 Conclusion:

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 find it prudent to heed”. 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 event 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 officials 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.

References:

1. Almond and Powell, Comparative Politic: A Developmental Approach.
2. Blondel, J., An Introduction to Comparative Government.
3. Charlesworth, James C., Contemporary Political Analysis.
4. Deutsch, Karl W., the Nerves of Government.
5. Halmos, Paul, 1969, the Sociology of Mass Media Communications.
6. Keele, Staffordshire, University of Keele.
7. Katz, Ellu and Paul F., Lazrsfed, 1955, Personal Influence, New York: The Free Press, Glencoe.
8. Merrill and Lowenstein, 1971, Media Message and Men, Ney York, David Mc Kay & Co. INC.
9. Nimmo, Dan, Political Communication and Public Opinion in America.
10. Pye, Lucian W., Aspects of Political Development.
11. Wright, Charles, 1959, Mass Communication: A Sociological Perspective, New York, and Random House.

POLITICAL CHANGE: POLITICAL REVOLUTION

UNIT – II

- 2.0. Introduction
- 2.1. Meaning of Change
- 2.2. Greeks on Political Change
- 2.3. Medieval Thought on Political Change
- 2.4. Modern views on Political Change
- 2.5. Meaning of Revolution
- 2.6. Causes of Revolution
- 2.7. Aspects and Theories of Revolution
- 2.8. Phases of Revolution
- 2.9. Functions of Revolution
- 2.10. Capacity of Revolution

2.0. Introduction:

Change is a natural process. Change occurs in society because of a number of factors-socio-economic, cultural and political. Due to rapid technological advancement, industrialization, urbanization and a modernization society is experiencing new process that result in multifaceted changes. Consequently, new environments have come to stay. The political system, as such, is bound to face these new circumstance, and prepare itself to regulate the challenges that might aim at disturbing its normal functions. It is more true when political factors bring changes in the political field. Hence is the need of the study of political changes and factors responsible for promoting such changes.

2.1. Meaning of Change:

For centuries writers are trying to understand the laws of changes. Many of them have been change as essentially political that is related to the way in which a country is ruled. However, it should be noted that society can change in many ways, but the simple replacement of one set of rulers by another may have little or no effect. It is immensely difficult to isolate the cause and effect of change, as these are often connected. At the outset we should examine what has already been said on the issue of political changes.

2.2. Greeks on Political Change:

The Greeks thought that political change came about when forms of government tended to be immoderate to lack balance or to become insensitive to the concern of the governed. Other wise the Greeks accepted the political system as fixed and immutable and unchanging. This is true chiefly with Plato. Plato and Aristotle both in their writings give the motion, "Nothing in excess". In the Eighth Book of Republic, Plato says' even the highest form of state can degenerate, and a state ruled by an elite of specially trained people may given way to a 'timocracy' or military deposits. According to Plato, in the timocratic state the rule of reason is under attack. The love for wealth rather than justice becomes common to all. Consequently, wealthy people come to dominance and give way to Oligarchy. Gradually, the rule of wealthy is resented and the rule of masses ensures.

Thus comes tyranny. On the other hand, Aristotle's version of political change is more specifically about eh end of government when he depicts the change of government from Monarchy to Aristocracy, Aristocracy to Tyranny, and Tyranny to democracy. He is the first political

theorist to argue that political changes derive from a feeling of equality or inequality. To his, when people find a difference between the political order and the social order, there is a revolutionary situation. Later on the idea of change was more accepted with the writings of Hegel. With Hegel, reality is viewed as a 'process' when he explains change through the dialectic-Being-not being and Becoming. Thus we find new Marx analyses change through the theory of dialectic materialism.

2.3. Medieval Thought on Political Change:

It should be noted that during the medieval period a theory of revolt developed. But it was based on the theological view that the state was sinful it was believed that if the theological and political goals were in conflict, then the change will occur with the supremacy of the theological concepts. With the nation of 'Constitutionalism', during the modern period, the idea of 'higher law' or of a higher moral standard came into being. And political change has now been associated with alteration of the constitution.

2.4. Modern views on Political Change:

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 Britan 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 phenomena when they are connected with a movement of ideas.

2.5. Meaning of Revolution:

Revolution may be defined as overthrow of a legally established political system and its constitution by a social class or movement with the aim of altering society through the political structure. Revolution aims at bringing a fundamental change. The idea of revolution in Europe, 150 years back meant a move back as well as a move forward. Today, revolution means a movement onwards. It is now frequently associated with the idea of progress. Crane Brinton, in his essay 'Anatomy of Revolution' says that revolutions require an economically advancing society, an idea of progress, the human ability to produce social changes and the realization of the fact that these things appear to be associated with a comparative market economy.

2.6. Causes of Revolution:

Revolution occurs because of many reasons. According to Brinton, revolutions have certain primary signs which may be called as preliminary causes. These preliminary signs can be categorized as government deficits, complaints over taxation, governmental favouring of one set of economic interests over another, administrative entanglements and confusions, desertion of intellectuals, loss of self-confidence among many members of the ruling class and conversion of many members of that class to the belief that their privileges are unjust, or harmful to society;

intensification of social antagonisms, the separation of economic power from political power and social distinction etc. If the aforesaid conditions are present in a society, there is every possibility of a revolution. However, according to Brinton, the actual revolution is always a surprise.

While analyzing the causes of a revolution Apter says that revolutions vary considerably in their causes. Revolution may be because of general dissatisfaction with the government; deep economic crises; ethnic conflicts; or religious conflicts. Max Weber, on the other hand, suggests that either class or 'charisma' is necessary for revolution. Some writer belief that revolutions have their own momentum, almost a separate existence. Revolution, for them, is an end in itself. According to Karl Marx, economic inequality and exploiting of the poor by the rich are the chief reasons of revolution.

2.7. Aspects and Theories of Revolution:

Historians make a useful distinction between 'Primary' and 'Secondary' aspects of revolutions, that is, the immediate and the deeper-seated causes. It should be noted that a revolution has an occasion and a fundamental cause. The immediate cause of a revolution is mostly financial, or economic. If a country has chronic long term problems, they are likely to provide revolution in the fullness of time. But they do not influence the timing of the exact moment of outbreak. The deep seated conflicts which may lead to a revolution include such things like conflict between country and town, a foreign occupation, unfair exploitation of one class by another, etc. Revolutions often finally involve war. The French Writer Sorel said, "a revolution has need of a war to complete it".

Peter Calvert, in his book "A Study of Revolution:" points out that there are certain common features of a revolution. First, it is process in which the political direction of a state becomes increasingly discredited. Secondly, it implies a change of government at a clearly defined point of time; and thirdly, it signifies a more or less coherent programme of change in either political or social institutions, or both. It should be remembered that revolution is not merely concerned with the overthrow of the established order; it is also concerned with the establishment of a new one. As such, revolution begins with the challenge to the existing system and continues until a new order is installed.

2.8. Phases of Revolution:

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 is followed by the following three phases:

1. The constitutional or Reformist phase
2. Extreme phase, and
3. Phase of Reaction.

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.

2.9. Functions of Revolution:

Functions of any revolution are manifold, which can be seen through the analysis of the consequences of the revolution. First, revolutions particularly in their crosses periods, may place certain persons in the rank of position and eminence, who might not have achieved this in normal time. It has been found that a great revolution has even put idealists in possession of power. Special talents also get scope because of a revolution, to rise. Revolutions probably insure a bit more public attention chronic rebel and complainer, may be for a little while.

2.10. Capacity of Revolution:

Capacity of a revolution can not be predicted. It depends on the organization of the leaders, permanent action, the socio-economic and political conditions, literacy level, the environment, etc. if the revolutionaries have a strong organization and vast number of activities who are constantly engaged in their work; the capacity of a revolution to achieve its goals is found to be more. When a revolution is led by efficient

strong leaders, it becomes more effective. A society, with high literacy, higher cohesiveness and greater degree of civic engagements, makes the revolution more capable. However, revolution has the capacity to change the political order, to change the socio-economic condition, change the ideology as well as philosophy, and to create a national consensus.

References:

1. Peter B. Harris: Foundation of Political Science.
2. Eckstein and Apter, Eds., Comparative Politics – A Reader.
3. Peter Calvert, A study of Revolution.
4. Greenstein and Polsby, Eds., A Hand Book of Political Science.

MODERNIZATION AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

UNIT – III

- 3.0. Introduction
- 3.1. Meaning of Modernization
- 3.2. Features of Political Modernization
- 3.3. Classification of Social Systems on the basis of Modernization
- 3.4. Models of Modernizing Nations.
- 3.5. Political Democracy
- 3.6. Tutelary Democracy
- 3.7. Modernizing Oligarchy
- 3.8. Totalitarian Oligarchy
- 3.9. Meaning of Political Development
- 3.10. Features of Political Development
- 3.11 Almond's Views
- 3.12. Lucian Pye's Views
- 3.13 Eisenstadt's Views
- 3.14 Rigg's Views
- 3.15 Huntington's Views
- 3.16 Stages of Political Development
- 3.17 Marxian Approach
- 3.18 Dependency Model
- 3.19 Conclusion

3.0. Introduction:

Modernization is a process which involves change in all areas of human thought and activity. It aims at the socio-economic and political transformation to achieve progress of development. The process of modernization dates back to the age of Renaissance and Reformations

which resulted in changes in science, literature and religion fields as well as in order walks of life. However, when because of the French Revolution, it is now being brought about in a planned way by the Third World countries. It is the social eagerness that has prompted modernization in the developing countries.

3.1. Meaning of Modernization and dimensions:

Modernization 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.

3.2. Features of Political Modernization:

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. As such in brief, political modernization includes.

- A) Increase in the capacity of the political system to find the utility of the resources of the society.
- B) Increase in the need for coordinated social action to solve all kinds of problems that a political system may face, and
- C) Increase in political participation.

3.3. Classification of Social Systems on the basis of Modernization:

So far political modernization is concerned; social systems of the world may be divided into three types-Primitive and backward social systems; Developing social systems. The primitive system includes highly backward societies having traditional responses, customs and usages. Such societies are far away from democratic ideas. Hardly have they accepted any change towards competitiveness and progress. There is lack of national integration due to ethnic conflicts and civil wars. Developing systems are eager to accept, or extension changes. But such changes are found to be critical, descriptive in nature. Everything is in a process of transition from the traditional agrarian type of politico-economic structures to a modern style of life. According to Edward A. Shills, there is a degree of agreement within these developing states both on the general of

change and on the actual objectives sought. In his book, *Political Development in the New States*, Shills writes that “the desire to be free of dependence on the West’s the universal aspiration away contemporary states”. According to him, more positively their good is to be modern, that is dynamic, concerned with the people, democratic and equilibrium, scientific, economically advanced, sovereign and influential. Such countries have certain characteristics which help to distinguish them as a group. These are:

- 1) Their indigenous machinery of government is of quite recent origin;
- 2) Their social structures and cultures are on the whole highly traditional and
- 3) Significant sections of their elites are concerned to modernize their social structures, their culture and their political life.

The political systems of the developing states are invariably subject to the dichotomous pull of tradition on the one hand, and modernity on the other.

Developed political systems, on the other hand are those which are highly industrialized and urbanized. In these countries institutional arrangements are such that decision-makers are either elected by the people at a large or are legally answerable to and act on behalf of those who are representatives of the people. These systems are well committed to the observance of democratic norms and thus they are far more advanced than the developing systems.

3.4. Models of Modernizing Nations:

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.

3.5. 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, congenial 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.

3.6. 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 tries 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.

3.7. 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) Dependency of Judiciary is never maintained.

3.8. Totalitarian Oligarchy:

Unlike the Modernizing Oligarchy, Totalitarian Oligarchy believes 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
- 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 be noted that none of the aforesaid alternatives 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 Kautsky 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 divide it as underdeveloped, developing and developed political system. In brief, political modernization aims at political development.

3.9. Meaning of Political Development:

Political Development is a very comprehensive and multifaceted subject that can hardly be precisely defined. Its definition depends on the nature of growth modernization and progress of the developing states. However, definition given by a fairly known scholars deserve our attention Rostour and Pye write that Political Development is the “growth of institutions and practices that allow a political system to deal with its own fundamental problems more effectively in the short run, while working towards more responsiveness of the regime to popular demand in the long run”. According to Almond, it is “the acquisition of the new capability, in the sense of a specialized role structure and differentiated orientation which together give a political system the range of problems” for Eisenstadt, Political Development is the ability of a political system to sustain continuously new types of political demands and organization. Alfred Diamond regards it, as “a process which creates is institutional frame work for soling an ever widening range of social problem”.

3.10.Features of Political Development:

A careful analysis of various definitions of “Political Development” presents certain common features of it, which according to All-round are –

- 1) Presence of clearly differentiated structures;
- 2) Unending process of change in the pattern of political life towards progress.
- 3) Specialization of rules, and
- 4) Ability of the political system to regulate new challenges.

Clarity on the concept of “Political Development” would be more easier if we look into the analysis of different scholars on this problem. Of these scholars, a brief probe is made into the views of Almond and Powell, Lucian Pye, Eisenstadt, Riggs and Huntington in the succeeding paragraphs.

3.11. Almond’s Views:

For Almond and Powell, ‘Political Development’ implies four important problems, namely, State Building, National Building, Political participation and Distribution and Welfare. When ‘State Building’ refers to the creation of new structures and increased degree of differentiation in the existing structures of the state, ‘National Building’ emphasizes the cultural aspects of political growth. It refers to the process whereby people transfer their commitment and loyalty from smaller political institutions to the larger central political authority. Political participation employs the development of infrastructures and process as well as responsive attitudes and bargaining skills of the elites. It is a question of involvement opportunity’ for the people in political process. On the other hand ‘Distribution and welfare’ indicate equal distribution of values, benefits and national income, and equal opportunities to all.

3.12. Lucian Pye’s Views:

Lucian Pye gives three characteristic features of equality, capacity and differentiation that determine political development which Coleman subsequently described as developmental syndrome. For Pye, equality means demand for political participation, universalization of laws and equality in recruitment process. This is similar to Almond’s concept of political participation and distribution. By capacity Pye means two things.

1) How a political system acts, and is acted upon by the environment, and

- 2) What is the performance of the political system in terms of its scope, scale, efficiency and effectiveness?

Differentiation, according to Pye, means specialization of tasks to be performed by different structures. It again refers to Almond's concept of state-building.

3.13. Eisenstadt's Views:

Eisenstadt, while analyzing the concept of 'Political Development' Points out to the following four features.

- 1) Creation of differentiated structures with highly specific political goods.
- 2) Territorial and functional extension of the scope of the central level administrative and political activities of the society.
- 3) Continues spread of political power to groups and ultimately to individual; and
- 4) Replacement of modernizing elites instead of traditional elites, and their legitimization. In brief, Eisenstadt, emphasizes on spread of power in various groups as a distinct sign of political development. He really aims at restructuring of the political system as well as the attitudes governing it. Restructuring of the system again implies a number of things like.
 - a. Equally in social, economic, cultural and political spheres;
 - b. Recognition of merit at the of recruitment;
 - c. Participation of political parties and pressure groups.
 - d. Openness of the political system and its democratization;
 - e. Facilities for economic lettermen and social change and
 - f. Allegiance of all to the national government.

3.14. Riggs' Views:

Riggs, on the other hand, holds that a balance must be ensured between equality and capacity in order to achieve political development.

Without this balance, there will occur a developmental trap' and when the political system gets coughed in a development trap, there will be political decay. Such a balance, to him, shall result in maintenance of the level of differentiation. Differentiation in turn, brings about greater equality and capacity. Moving only in one of these directions, political system is bound to move into the condition of breakdown.

3.15. Huntington's Views:

Huntington interprets political development in terms of institutionalizations of political organization and procedures. He defines institutionalization as "the process by which organization and procedures acquire value and stability. The level of institutionalization of any political system can be defined by the adoptability, flexibility and coherence of its organizations and procedures. So also, the level of institutionalization of any particular organization or procedure can be measured by its adaptability, complexity, autonomy and coherence". According to Huntigton, what is going on in developing countries is not political development, but political decay. Because in these countries the process of modernization is so rapid that institutionalization of those lags of behind.

3.16. Stages of Political Development:

Political Development possess through different stages. A number of scholars therefore, have tried to provide a general theory to study the stages of political development. Among them Coleman, Danel Leaner, Talcott Parsons, E. A. Shils, Karl Deutsch Phillips Cutright Lucian Pye, Kenneth and David Apter are famous. An evaluation of the works of these scholars that two major models have been set forth in this respect, namely-

- a) Continuum Model and
- b) Stage Model

Continuum Model prescribes that the development of the rotations should be measured in quantifiable term as grow national products and per-capita income, percentage of the adult population, rate of participation in political processes, growth of industrialization etc.

Stage Model postulates three stages of development analyzing on the basis of transition from one stage of development to another. Accordingly, three stages like Traditional, Transitional and Modern stages have been identified by the scholars of social sciences. When Traditional Stage indicates rural society and agrarian economy with appropriate political forms. Transitional Stage is marked by the early stage of industrialization and the transformation of the political system accordingly. Modern stage on the other hand, refers to urban society and fully industrial economy with capable political system.

3.17. Marxian Approach:

A discussion on “Political Development” would be half way, if we do not point out to certain approaches like Marxian, Communists, Totalitarian and Third World approaches to the study of the problem.

Marxian theory of political development is a product of reaction against the industrialized West. Marx has given a materialistic approach to the process of development. To hi, political development is a change in the ownership of the means of production, which comes into existence because of the contradictions present in the society. Due to equality, various classes are formed in the society. Class formation finally leads to class conflicts which, according to Marx, are both normal and necessary for political development.

The communist theory adopts the ideas of Karl Marx, and under the leadership of Lenin the Communist Party is considered as the only instrument for the realization of political development. It advocated the state control by means of production and equal distribution of the productions under the control of the Communist Party. To this theory, socialism must emerge out of the conflict between the working class and the middle class.

The Totalitarian Theory of Political Development is more or less based on the ideas of Nazis and Fascists. It believes on an elaborate ideology having support of the society. Secondly, it advocates that a single mass based party under the control of one man can promote development. The ruler thirdly monopolies all means of communication and use of weapons to regulate administration. Political development, as such, is achieved through centrally controlled economy with the help of bureaucratic co-ordination.

3.18. Dependency Model:

The Third World countries like Asia, Africa and Latin America feel that the Western Models of Political Development fail to suit the peculiar problems of such development in their own countries. As such, scholars like Paul Baran, A. G. Frank, Paul Swazy and Ranni Kothari formulated their own theories of political development. They in brief suggested that development of their countries is possible only through the utilization of their own resources. The Indian School, led by Rajani Kothari; and Latin American School led by Paul Baran, G. A. Frank and Paul Swazy, therefore, advocates Dependency Model to achieve political development. When Rajni Kothari emphasized on state Building and National Building to achieve development; the Latin American model emphasizes on economic development to attain the social goals.

3.19. Conclusion:

It may be noted that no uniform universal theory of political development can be propounded as such development depends upon a number of factors, which are specific and peculiar to each country. The socio-economic, geographic, demographic and physical factor chiefly determines the political progress of a region. It also depends on the psychological orientation and adaptability capacity of the political system.

Modernization implies changes in the direction of improvement, that tool in all walks of life.

- There are different dimensions of modernization like socio-economic, Psychological, cultural and political dimensions.
- Modernization at political level leads towards political development.
- Political modernization refers to increase capacity of the political system in utilizing its resources, to solve the different problems and an increase in people's participation.
- In terms of political modernization modern political systems, according to Shills, can be classified into two categories, namely, Democracy and Oligarchy.
- Political Democracy is considered to be the most development form of political system.
- Political Development is achieved chiefly because of political modernization.
- Scholars like Almond, Powell, Lucian Pye, Riggs, Huntigton, etc. have approached the concept of Political Development on their own ways.
- When Karl Marx approaches the concept as a reaction against the industrialized West, the Totalitarians have development on their theory on the ideas of Nazis and Fascists.

- However, the Third World countries have advocated the Dependency model to explain Political Development.

References:

1. E. A. Shills, Political Development in the Neor States.
2. James C. Chavies worth (Ed.) Contemporary Political Analysis.
3. David E. Apten, The Politics of Modernization.
4. Almond and Coleman (Eds.) the Politics of Developing Areas.
5. Lucian Pye, Communication and Political Development.
6. Political Culture and Political Development.
7. Huntington, Political Development, Political Decay.

POLITICAL REPRESENTATION AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

UNIT – IV

4.1.0. Introduction

4.1.1 Meaning of Political Representation.

4.1.2 Major Concepts

4.1.3 Theories of Political Representation

4.1.4 Relationship between Political Representation and Constituency

4.1.5 Types of Political Representation.

4.1.6. Conclusion.

4.1.0. Introduction:

Political representation has been considered as the key institution of every modern democratic polity. If “Democracy” means anything, it means at least a government that does whatever a majority of the community want it to do. But democracy is only an impossible dream unless the government has some effective way of finding out what its citizens do and do not want and then translating those wishes into government action. Most political scientists believe that the chief device for this purpose is the ‘political representation’.

4.1.1 Meaning of Political Representation:

Political representation is the process by which members of a community can be ‘made present’ in the decision making process of government without literally being there. For centuries many of the greatest Westerns minds have considered how political representation should be understood, and what institutions and attitudes it requires. But there is little agreement among them in those matters. As such, we can

only review the principle current conceptions of 'true' representation at this stage. Because they provide, whether explicitly or implicitly, the foundations for most of the past and present disputes about how public officials should be selected and should function.

4.1.2 Major Conceptions:

There are chiefly five such conceptions, that is (1) Political representation as authorization, (2) as responsibility (3) as correspondence, (4) as symbolization and (5) as action. Let us discuss each of these in brief.

(1) Political Representation as Authorization:

Thomas Hobbes and his modern disciplines have argued that a representative is one 'authorized' by his constituents to act in their names. His action is considered the moral and legal equivalent of action by them and they must bear the consequences exactly as if they themselves had acted.

(2) Political Representation as Responsibility:

To some theorists, political representation means responsibility to the constituents. A political representative is he who is responsive to the needs or requirements of the people of his constituency. He is subject to the control of the voters. As such, a political representative is subject to recall by his constituents.

(3) Political Representative as Correspondence:

Some scholars argue that representative consists essentially of descriptive likeness between representatives and their constituents. According to this view, a legislature's representative depends upon their distribution characteristics among

representatives in the same proportions in which are distributed among constituents.

(4) Political Representative as Symbolization:

A number of theorists believe that the representative should above all personify and symbolize his constituent's notion of what a public official should be. His representatives depend on what he is. It is because of his personality, people follow him. His views are respected by the political authorities.

(5) Political Representation as Action.

4.1.3 Theories of Political Representation:

There are other theorists who reject all the above conceptions and argue that the essence of representation lies in how the representative acts. Here importance is given on 'what he does'.

One of the important problems is what should be represented. Those who have analyzed the problem say that 'interests' and 'people' are to be represented. In the most Western nations, during middle ages, the dominant idea was that the great 'estates' of the realm should be represented in the assemblies. For examples, the British Parliament, Spanish Cortes etc. In the modern terminology, the estates were the great interests of the realm. they included the Church, the feudal nobility, and the commons. Their spokesmen were, respectively, the 'Lord Spiritual', the 'Lord Temporal' and the 'Knights',. There are several present day versions of this medieval idea. For example, the American Senate, the Australian Senate etc.

Several recent theorists have advocated another modernization of the medieval idea, generally called 'functional representations'. They argue that the significant units of the modern community are not its individual citizens but rather the basic interests or 'functions' of its citizens. Many democratic nations have established certain advisory bodies directly representing various functional groups. Two authoritarian nations like Italy and Portugal, during 1926 and 1974, had introduced the principle of functional representation in their legislative bodies and thus established 'corporate states'.

The modern democratic governments provide for at least indirect representations of interests, through either the formal establishment of advisory councils or the informal operations of pressure groups. State legislatures are now mostly composed of 'people' directly located on the basis of 'one man, one vote'. Representation thus must be organized according to the principles of popular sovereignty, political equality, popular consolation and majority rule. The question is, how people should be represented. As per the fascist theory, representation is no more than the process by which the leader whips the masses into line behind the policies that he knows are in the national interest. The Communist theory of representation is most identical with the fascist theory. The communists regard the party as representative of the proletarian mass in a sense that it works only for the welfare of the masses. To them a representative system should consist of devices by which the masses are educated and their enthusiasm mobilized for policies made and enforced by the ruling elite.

On the other hand, most democrats hold that representation must be direct. That is, each citizen must have the power to elect one or more representatives. These representatives must hold office for only limited terms. At the end of their term, the voters must have the right to deny their

re-election. It should then be noted that the represented should be people, rather than areas or interests; and people should be represented directly. Thus comes the problem of selection. Some democrats prefer 'singly-member district' or majority system, whereas others gave some form of 'proportional' representation.

4.1.4 Relationship between Political Representation and Constituency:

So far as political representation is concerned, one has to study the relationship between it and the constituencies. Without proper relationship between the representatives and the constituents, the political system can not function effectively. Two important theories have been developed in regard to this problem, namely, Mandate Theory and the Independence theory.

Theorists like John Liburne and Jean Jacques Rousseau have argued that the proper function of the representative assembly in a democracy is into to initiate policy but only to register the dominant policy preferences of its constituents. William Paterson says that the representative may rightfully policy but only on the basis of a mandate from his constituents to present their views in the assembly. On the other hand, scholars like Antony Henry, Edmund Burke etc. think that the representative should exercise his own judgement on public affairs independently, without regard to what his constituents think, and act accordingly. However, it is generally agreed that both the theories have truth in their explanation. Because the man is not a representative if his actions bear no relationship to anything about this constituents, and he is not a representative if he does not act with conscience or reasoning.

4.1.5 Types of Political Representation:

Political representation may be classified into the following types:

1. Territorial Representation
2. Proportional Representation
3. Minority Representation, and
4. Functional Representation

Territorial Representation is made by dividing the whole country into certain constituencies. One candidate is elected by a majority of votes. As such, a representative is elected by the support of a fraction of the total constants. This system is present in India, France, Norway, Switzerland etc. Proportional Representation is based on the principle that the votes should be weighed, not counted. There are two types of such system, namely, single Transferable vote system and list system. For adequate minority representation, on the other hand, tertian devices are adopted. For instance, devices like second ballot system, cumulative vote system and weightage system are considered by different countries. However, among all types of representation, Territorial representation system is mostly considered better.

4.1.6 Conclusion:

A democratic political system needs adequate participation of the people in the political process without which it can not function. Because, democracy is a form of representative governments. Political representatives, elected by the people, manage administration and one the country. Mc. Closky defines political participation as "these voluntary activities by which members of a society share in the selection of rulers, and directly or indirectly, in the formulation of public policies".

W. Milbrath speaks of four modes, or types of political participation, namely, Gladiatorial activities, Transitional activities, Spektor activities and Apathetic activities. Gladiatorial activities include holding public and party offices, contenting as a candidate for public office, soliciting political funds attending strategy meeting, active membership in a political party, political campaigning etc. keeping contact with political leaders etc. Separor activities constituent having party symbol on ones' own vehicle, requesting people to vote in certain matter, initiating a political debate, exercising franchise etc. Apathetic activities on the other hand, are to remain callous towards political activities on the plea that these are useless, or politics is the business of third grade people.

A number of factors contribute to political participation. Milbrath identifies four major factors like – (1) the extent to which the individual receives political stimuli, (2) the individual personal characteristics, (3) the individual social characteristics and (4) the political environments in which the individual lives. Robert Dahi say that it depends on the rewards an individual receives because of political involvement. Individual participants in the political processes when he feels that he can achieve expected success in life. Lane, on the other hand, talk of four major merits of political participation – (1) it helps in better satisfaction of economic needs, (2) it helps in greater social adjustment, (3) it helps in pursuing particular values and (4) it helps in satisfying sub-consciousness and psychological needs.

References:

1. J. S. Mill, Representative Government
2. S. M. Lipset, Political Man
3. L. W. Milbrath, Political Participation, How and Why people get involved in politics.

POLITICAL PARTIES AND PRESSURE GROUPS

UNIT – IV

- 4.0. Introduction
- 4.1 Meaning and features.
- 4.2 Difference between Political Parties and Pressure Groups
- 4.3 Definition of Political Parties
- 4.4 Characteristics of Political Parties
- 4.5 Functions of Political Party.
- 4.6. Party Identification
- 4.7 Organization of Party
- 4.8. Major Activities of Political Party
- 4.9 Parties in Democratic and Non-Democratic Countries
- 4.10 Types of Political Parties
- 4.11 Types of Pressure Groups
- 4.12 Functions of Pressure Groups

4.0. Introduction:

Political parties are not merely appendages of modern government; they are in the centre of it and play a determinative and creative role in it. Such parties are essential part of democratic polity. Politics, on the other hand, is essentially a contest among people and groups for influence over the policies of the government. Several different types of groups engage in this contest, namely, unorganized interest groups, organized interest groups and pressure groups. Each type of group pursues its objectives by different means, and accordingly each plays somewhat different role in democratic political system.

4.1 Meaning and Features of Political Party:

Political party is a particular kind of political group. There are certain specific features that differentiate it from other forms of political organizations. These are:

1. It is an aggregation of people to whom a label is applied, like Republican, Democrat, and Communist etc.
2. Some of these people are organized; they deliberately act in concert to achieve whatever goals their party has.
3. Their right to organize and promote their party's because is regarded as legitimate.
4. Its key activities include selection of candidates to contest elections and to capture power.

4.2 Difference between Political Party and Pressure Groups:

However, pressure groups resemble political parties in many respects. For instance, they often contest elections. But most of them are concerned chiefly with what government does, whereas political parties are equally concerned with who holds office. When political parties provide nominations under their own labels, pressure groups lack in it.

4.3 Definition of Political Party:

Political parties are a very useful and effective link between masses and the rulers and of course the elites of the society. As such, Neuman defines, "Political parties are the life time of modern politics". Edmund Burke defines a party, "as a group of men who had agreed upon a principle by which the national interest might be served". In other words, a political party is a body of men, united for the purpose of promoting by their joint endeavor the public interest, upon some principles on which they all agree. Duverger had defined political parties as "groups

organized for the purpose of achieving and exercising power within a political system”.

4.4 Characteristics of Political Party:

The following are the chief characteristics of the political parties.

1. There must be certain measure of agreement of fundamental principles which can join the people together as a political unit.
2. A political party is not a loosely knit organization of some persons.
3. The political parties have general policies, simultaneously and in succession.
4. They constitute an upward channel of communication to communicate the interest they possess.
5. A political party must endeavor to promote national interest as distinguished from communal interest.

Scholars like Rodee, Anderson, Christol and Greene say that membership, organization, goals and objectives and resources including funds, talent, electoral strength, charismatic candidates etc. are the important features of political parties.

4.5 Functions of Political Party:

Functions which the political parties perform generally depend upon the nature of the political system under which they operate. As such, functions of a political party in a developing system are different from those of a developed political system. The functions of a political party in totalitarian regimes can not be the same as those in democratic systems. Even within the same political system all parties may not perform the same function. For instance, national parties have broader functions than

that of the regional parties. According to Lord Bryce, will and to bring order out of the chaos of a multitude voter. Sigmund Neumann writes, political parties are brokers of ideas, constantly clarifying systematizing and expounding the party's doctrine, representatives of social interest groups; bridging the distance between the individual and the great community; Maximize the voter's education in the competitive scheme of at least of two-party system and sharpen his free choice. According to finer, the political parties form the six functions, that is, to bridge distance, wrestle with the pathy of citizens who are least endowed with or convinced of an interest in politics seek to recruit and select the leadership personnel; governmental offices; to generate the programme and policies for the government; to coordinate and control the governmental organs; to bring the societal integration through satisfaction and reconciliation of group demands or the provision of a common belief; to counter subversion and to create social integration of individuals or mobilization of support by political socialization. As such, functions of political parties can be categorized as follows:

1. Uniting sectional interests.
2. Bridging the geographical differences.
3. Inducting cohesions.
4. Recruiting the political roles.
5. Linking the people and the government.
6. Imparting political education to the people.
7. Widening political participation.
8. Formulating policies.
9. Promoting political socialization, modernization and development.
10. Checking arbitrary functioning of the government.
11. Stabilizing the government and the political system.
12. Party identification and Membership.

4.6 Party Identification:

Some sense of general attachment or belonging towards a given party is known as party identification. The identification grows stronger as the people grow older-that they exert a major influence on voting behavior, and that they are one of the most stable and powerful factors affecting the outcomes of free elections. Membership, on the other hand, implies both the assumption of obligations to the organization and guaranteed direct access to its decision-making process.

In most democracies other than the U. S. A. political parties are considered purely private organizations. AS matters like qualification for membership and admission procedures are controlled by each party, which makes and enforces rules for itself. In case of non-American parties, the usual rules are, people become party members normally of a branch organization by formally approved by a local party council, or leader. The chief privilege that they receive is participation in party activities, notably selection of candidates for public office. But in the U. S. A. it is different in each fifty states the qualifications for party membership are defined by law. Voters are to declare their party preference to a Registration official. Voters' self-designations are really the sole determinants of their membership.

Although party membership involves more than self-designation in democratic system, by no means all members of any party are equally involved, active or influential in party affairs. Some members whom we may call the party's "militants" or "activities" devote much time and energy to the party's operation.

4.7 Organization of Party:

In democracies, generally, parties organize themselves outside the government. Many parties shape their extra-governmental organization and to fit the electoral structures in which they must operate and maintain some kind of structure for each district that elects one of more major public officials. This true in the U.S.A. most democratic parties are similarly organized. The British Conservative, Labour and Liberal parties maintain organizations in the parliamentary constituencies, combine them in regional federations, hold annual conference and maintain executive committees to administer national party affairs between conferences.

European Communist parties, however, are organized somewhat differently. Carrying on the old Bishevik tradition of soviets, they continue to use the 'cell' as their basic unit. But the Communists have found it increasingly to add areas cells to the old 'workeells', to accommodate party members who are not concentrated in particular work units.

4.8 Major Activities of Political Party:

Generally, political parties are engaged in three major activities namely, selecting candidates, contesting elections and organizing government. Apart from these, they also have some ancillary activities. Let us discuss each of these in brief.

Selection of candidates is one of the important activities of the political parties. However, the selection process varies substantially from one nation to another on several dimensions, which may be categorized as centralization dimension and closure dimension. In case of centralization dimension, selection of party candidates for all elective offices is concentrated in a national party agency. On the other hand,

sometimes it is entirely dispensed among regional and local party organizations. Most centralized selection process is found in Israeli parties. In Israel, the entire nation constitutes single parliamentary constituency. National Parties of the U. S. is the example of the other extreme. Between Israeli and American systems stand those of the other nations. In case of closure dimension, it is the degree to which the rank and file, however defined as guaranteed the opportunity to participate in selecting the candidates. In one way, the selection process is controlled by small party elite operating behind closed doors. The other party members can not know the reason of such selection. On the other extreme, the process is open to all party members, and the candidate is selected publicly by majority votes of the members.

Organizing government is the most important activity of the political parties. In every modern democratic country the successful of most political parties from some kind of intra-governmental party organization. For instance, the legislators belonging to a particular party, usually join together in a 'cucus' or 'conference', select 'policy committees' and 'floor leaders', determine. Who will serve on which legislative committees and consult on matters of legislative police and strategy.

Apart from the above, many democratic parties conduct other ancillary activities they hold social affairs, establish young organizations to mobilize new voters; some parties sponsor boy-scout groups, summer camps, adult-education programme etc. Some also publish daily news papers and other periodicals.

4.9 Political Parties in Democratic and Non-democratic Countries:

Let us now discuss the political parties in democratic system and in the non-democratic or dictatorship systems.

Political parties in democratic systems have certain differences and similarities. The chief differences among the parties may be categorized as follows:

- (1) Democratic parties vary greatly in both the nature of their ideologies and the role that their ideologies play in shaping party attitudes and operations. At one extreme stand both the European and American parties of the 'missionary' type. For example, the Socialist Labour Party of the U.S. is committed to what may be called a 'Communist Marxism'. On the other extreme of the scale stand the Democratic and Republican parties of the U.S. who have ever failed to state their ideology satisfactorily. The major American parties are thus 'brokers' among the conflicting demands of interest groups. The other democratic parties of the world can be ranged along a scale between these two extremes.
- (2) Democratic parties vary in their social composition of leadership and support. When the broker tend to be cross-sections of their communities "in their leaders and who provide their electoral support", the missionary parties tend to be segments in this regard. The missionary parties tend to draw almost all their electoral support and leadership from particular segments of the community.
- (3) Democratic parties differ sharply in the distribution of intra-party power among the various organizational levels. These differences are most clearly revealed in the varying ways that nominations are controlled. From this point of view, the major American parties are the most decentralized in the world.
- (4) The democratic parties differ in their disciplinary actions. The leader of every democratic, political party has at least some disciplinary weapons, which vary in nature and effectiveness. Most of the missionary parties of Europe and Scandinavia assign to their national leaders the power to expel from the party who refuse to vote of the party line.

(5) Such political parties also differ in their legislative cohesion. A party whose legislative members vote alike on every issue is said to have perfect legislative cohesion. For instance the major British parties are among the cohesive.

4.10 Types of Political Parties:

Political scientists, generally, classify all party systems, on the basis of their competitiveness, as either one-party, two-party or multi-party systems. Recently D. W. Rae devised an ingenious index of party Fractionalization which expresses two dimensions of competitiveness, that is, the number of parties receiving shares of the popular vote and seats in the national legislature, and the relative equality of their shares. However, seven chief ideologies in most of multi-party system (1) Communism (2) Democratic socialism, (3) Christian Democracy (4) Liberalism (5) Democratic conservatism, (6) Antidemocratic Conservatism and (7) Antidemocratic Radicalism.

The party system of the Western European democratic nations generally rank on the high side of the fractionalize scale. In each of these nations at least three parties and even five parties regularly in enough voters and legislative seats to be called 'major' parties. Hardly even does a single party win a majority of the seats-governments are thus composed of coalitions. Most of these parties are closer to the missionary than to the broker type.

On the other hand, the party systems of the English-speaking democracies, including the U.S., Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia and Canada are generally less fractionalized than the Western-European nations. The American system comes closest to the model of a two party system. The major parties of these nations differ in various ways but they

are also very much alike in certain important respects. Among their similarities, five may be mentioned here;

1. They tend to be broker, rather than missionary.
2. They tend to draw, their leadership and electoral support from all elements of their communities, rather than form specific segments.
3. They direct their appeals for vote's at all major interest groups.
4. They are moderate parties. They try to put forth programme that will not unduly antagonize any major element of the electorate.
5. They agree generally on the basic forms of government and the general direction of public policy.

In their differences, the American parties are considerably more decentralized than their counterparts in other English-speaking nations. Otherwise, the major parties in all the less fractionalized systems are essentially similar.

Dictatorship, conducted through the medium of a singly all-powerful political party, is an invention of the 20th century. In fact, the central role played by such parties distinguishes the governments of the Soviet Union, the People's Republic of China, Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy from the older authoritarian regimes.

However, there are different degrees of dictatorship. In order of increasing Fractionalization, it may be distinguished as (1) Nonparty systems (2) Hegemonic systems (3) Dominant systems. When in Mono party system only one party is allowed to exist. In Hegemonic system several parties are allowed to exist but they do not contest elections. Rather they form permanent coalitions. On the other hand, in Dominant systems several parties are permitted to exist and contest elections but

only one regularly wings all elections, though with a small fraction of the popular votes.

4.11 Pressure Groups:

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.

4.12 Type of 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 defend 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 traits – (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.

4.13 Functions of 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.

References:

1. Austin Ranny, Governing: An Introduction to Political Science.
2. M. Duverger, Political Parties.
3. G. Sartori, Parties and Party System: A Framework For Analysis.

PUBLIC POLICY

UNIT – V

- 5.0. Introduction
- 5.1 Meaning of Public Policy
- 5.2 Agency of Public Policy
- 5.3 Phases of Public Policy-Making
- 5.4 Role of Legislature in Policy-Making
- 5.5 Role of Executive in Policy - Making
- 5.6. Role of Judiciary in Policy-making

5.0. Introduction:

Public Policy is the foremost requirement prior to every activity of the political system, and a pre-requisite for all administrative management. Public policy is purposive action of the government to cater for public ends. Its chief aim is to serve and develop man and to provide him with a conducive environment which is livable and attractive. Modern governments and their institutional design therefore are judged by what policies they make, how effectively they make them, and how well their policy-making process lends itself to the larger needs and purposes of modern government.

5.1 Meaning of Public Policy:

Public policy making is the making of decisions by a public agency. It involves a time dimension and a group process within the public agency and between the agency and between the agency and its public. Policy making, in order to be sound, requires well established procedures and means of ascertaining the nature of a problem of thinking up solutions and

of finding out if earlier measures were successful. It also requires well designed institutional framework which is tied into the representative process, and allows for consultation which is any party likely to be affected by it.

5.2 Agency of Public Policy:

A public policy may be ascribed to a specific agency or an office holder for examples the United States Inter State Commerce commission or the British Prime Minister. In practice, it is often very difficult to find out whom to attribute a particular policy. However, a particular public policy normally has a definite addressee, a person, group, agency, subject or foreign state toward whom it is directed. The policy usually derives its generic name from the addressee, such as, Labour policy, civil right policy, education policy etc. a specific policy is normally composed of a series of decisions over a period of time. Each decision is the result of a process of interaction between individuals, organized groups and various public agencies involving consultations, conferences, communications and various pressure and maneuvers by interested parties.

5.3 Phases of Public Policy-Making:

The flow of policy-making has to include certain basic in order to be fair to all concerned persons. The chief such phases are of seven in number like, (1) Taking official notice, (2) Fact-finding and consultations (3) Formulation of alternative policies (4) Public deliberation (5) Authoritative decision (6) Implementation of the Policy and (7) Feedback. Let us discuss each of these phases in brief.

Policy-making begins when the government takes official notice of a matter, a situation, or a problem. However, it depends on the interest articulation. Powerful elites, pressure groups, interest groups, political parties and the mass media generally involve themselves in the process of interest articulation. It is because of their effective articulation and pressure, government takes various problems into account.

It is the second stage in the flow policy-making. When the government takes note of the different issues, it tries to find out the real facts. This is done by the concerned authorities or departments who are involved in enquiring into the matters. They consult the interested parties, knowledgeable persons, leaders of various groups and political parties. Accordingly they conceive the validity of the issues.

The third step in the policy-making process is the formulation of alternative policies by the public agencies and often also by the interested parties. Question of alternative policies arises when a particular issue is not acceptable to the government. Under the above circumstance the interested party is forced to modify its demands. All this stage, we may say that the input information is tentatively infused with a will.

The fourth stage in policy-making is public deliberation on the proposed alternative policies. This phase largely takes place within the government institutions and according to the procedure laid down in the constitution. In fact the Legislature is entrusted to discharge this function. A policy-proposal is moved in the floor of the legislature for acceptance and discussion. A thorough deliberation is made in the House on each and every aspects of the policy before taking any final decision on it.

The fifth step of the flows of policy-making involves making an authoritative decision. When a Bill or policy is passed by both the houses

of the Legislature it is sent to the Chief-Executive for his approval. With the assent of the Chief-Executive the policy is called as a public policy and becomes ready for implementation.

Implementation of a public policy requires adequate resource or means as well as organizations. It also needs willingness to be abided by the decisions made at the higher policy-making level. Hence, allocations of funds are made in the budget for the said purpose. Accordingly finances are made available to the concerned units of the government at the field level to execute the policy.

It is the final stage in the flow of policy-making. A public policy designed to affect certain results may discover some unexpected obstacles. It is through the feedback process that the policy-making becomes aware of the short comings of the policy. Agencies like pressure groups, interest groups, political parties and mass-media communicate such information to the decision makers through this feedback. In fact, feedback is very likely to reopen the flow of policy making from the beginning, that is from the first phase to the last phase of the process. As such, policy-making is a continuing process which operates in a purposive and national way.

5.4 Role of Legislature in Policy-making:

Legislature has been conceived as the chief instrument for making/ public policy during the modern period. Today public policy is made through enactments by duly elected legislatures. Legislatures are generally categorized into two types, namely, unicameral and bicameral. Only two Western Countries, Denmark since 1954 and New-Zealand since 1950, and some stage legislatures in federal systems, like Queens and in Australia as well as most of the state diets of the West-German Republic

are the examples of unicameral system. In Odisha also we have a unicameral legislature.

On the other hand, most of the countries, as such, have adopted bicameral legislature. It has been considered as desirable to the constitutional tradition of checks and balances. However, in most of the countries the Lower House provided with more powers in comparison to the Upper House. In the U.S.A. the Senate (that is the Upper House) as well as the Australian Upper House enjoys great deal of powers over the Lower House. In case of Italy, Switzerland and Sweden the two Houses share the power of controlling the Executives.

. A public policy is initiated in the floor of the legislature as a policy proposal, particularly in a form of Bill. A large part of the introduction of new subjects of policy making occurs after the election of the legislatures. Most of these are related to the promises made by them during pre-election period. This is done by the Lobbyists for organized interest and through the channels of public opinion and party organizations outside the legislature. The executive branch of the government also articulates the interests for policy-making. For instance, majority of Bills are formulated by the Executive branch in the U.S.A.

Fact finding and consultation are in large part distributed throughout the stages of the legislative process and frequently takes place in an informal manner or during elections. However, there are formal procedures and institutions to insure the effectiveness of both the consultation with the interest groups and the gathering of information. For example, the Standing Committees of the two House of the U.S. Congress provide the concentration of experts and interest group oriented legislators at key points in the legislative process. This goes a long way towards facilitating fact finding and consultation. Information contacts between

legislators and lobbyists have become one of the most pervasive aspects of representative government everywhere the organized interests often seek to create a public climate favorable to their cause by advertising and other form of publicity of which the legislator and his constituents sooner or later become aware.

The political parties often provide privilege access to the legislative process to representatives of organized interests who by campaign contributions, by consistent support or by personal friendship, have gained an inside track. British political parties for example have topical committees which in consolation with certain interest groups operate not much differently from legislative committees.

It should be noted that to help with fact finding and consultations most Western Legislatures use investigation like American investing Commons by contrast undertakes none of the investigation into lobbying and its regulation. The British House of Commons by contrast undertakes none of the investigation like American Congressional and State Legislative Committees can even summon government ministers before them.

The next step in policy-making process as elsewhere stated is formulation of alternative policies. It is difficult to isolate it as a specific step in the policy-making, because in our form or another it goes on from the beginning to the end of the process. We should remember that fact finding and consultation do not necessarily precede the formulation of policy. The initial formulation of policy normally is done in the minds of the administrators, legislators or other public figures.

Deliberation on the other hand, is that part of the legislative process for which formal constitutional law, standing orders and other codes of parliamentary procedure have been provided in detail.

There are two ways of looking at the process of legislative deliberation. One can either consider it as the careful staging of the grand drama of conflicting interest, groups and personalities on the floor of the legislature and its organs or one can follow a flow chart of the steps through which a specific measure has to pass in order to become a law. However, an evaluation of legislative procedure in different countries shows that generally a Bill undergoes three readings in the legislature before it is converted to a public policy. At the first reading, the Bill is only introduced in the House. The title of the Bill is read and then it is accepted for deliberation. In the phase of second reading, the Bill is deliberated in detail and it may refer to appropriate committees for minute analysis. At this stage amendments to the proposed Bill are also entertained. On the other hand, in the third reading phase the Bill is simply approved by a majority vote in the House. Thereafter it is sent to the Chief Executive of the State for his consent and with his consent it is designated as public policy. This is known as authoritative decision.

Authoritative decision in the legislative process is the last formal step in the policy-making. It may be noted that decisions are made at many levels with regard to a Bill. Some decisions are made even before a fully drafted version is introduced in the legislature. Some occur in the Committees and on the floor of the House. For instance in the American Congress there are several ways of voting. The most common method is by a voice vote. Another type is if one-fifth of a quorum requests there can be vote by tellers. Thirdly, there may be the roll call vote. In this system the clerk calls of the names and permanently records the votes cast by each member of the House. When policy proposal gets the majority

support of the legislature, it becomes a public policy with the consent of the chief executive.

5.5 Role of Executive in Policy-Making:

Long years ago, public policy was made exclusively by the executive. With the growth of legislature the policy-making function is now being shared by different organs of the political system. In countries with separation of powers like the U.S., executive policy-making and legislative policy-making remain theoretically separate functions but it is tied together by the fact that Congress makes laws-often proposed by the executive. In countries like Great Britain and France, introduction of parliamentary government was meant to make the executive policy-makers responsible to the elected legislative policy-makers. Consequently, both executive and legislative policy making in England are now controlled by one cohesive group of party leaders, the cabinet owing to the enormous increase in governmental functions and consequent bureaucracy, the significance of executive policy-making today is greater than ever.

The executive is now playing a vital role in the drafting, initiating and guiding legislations. However, executive policy-making can be analyzed with reference to four important aspects like, impact of the executive organization on policy-making, the areas in which executive rule-making and the varieties of executive-legislative relations in regard to policy-making.

Effectiveness of executive in policy-making largely depends on the pattern and form of the executive organizations. In presidential form of executive like the U. K., the Prime Minister of the U.K., the German Chancellor and the Prime Minister of India really decide the policies, when the British Queen, President of French Fourth Republic, President of

Germany only reign as symbols of continuity of national honour and of unity.

A second important structural aspect of executive that matters for policy-making is its specialization along the functional lines. For instances, In the U.S.A. various departments have been established and each department has within it a number of bureaus. The British ministry is composed of some 70 agencies of which about 17 or 18 make up a typical Cabinet today. The French council of Ministers has been composed of about 20 ministers, when West German Cabinet consists of some 16 to 18, Ministries. It should be clear from this comparison that executive policy-making requires the same functional division of work that has produced topical committees in the legislatures, save the U.K. It is in these individual ministries or agencies that most policies originate of worked out in detail. At this stage, the individual ministry shapes the policy as it likes. The interest groups of pressure groups also communicate their demands at this level.

Executive co-ordination plays an important role in regard to policy-making. Such co-ordination occurs generally in three ways, namely (a) political co-ordination by the executive leaders; (b) co-ordination of departmental policies by cabinet committees or councils; (c) co-ordination of the executive by centralization of budgetary powers. All these help in shaping the public policies that can cater to larger public needs.

Now the question is which are the areas that come exclusively under the executive to make policies? Although the executive drafts many of the legislative programmes which legislatures enact, there are extensive fields of executive activity in which there is very little reliance on legislature authorization.

For Example, in relation to the fields of foreign affairs and defense, most crucial decisions for the survival of country are made exclusively by executive officials. In the modern world, there are many instances of executive making rules and laws which have similar force as the legislative laws. For example, there are essentially three kinds of legal directives that can be found most Western systems of government, namely (1) general power of issuing law-like decrees or ordinances; (2) powers of filling in the details of duly enacted legislations, and (3) administrative rules relating to the management of the administration.

5.6 Role of Judiciary in Policy-making:

It is said that 'Judges maintain the whole legal order, whereas the policy-makers only amend in small ways'. Living in a human community requires adherence to certain basic rules of conduct. There are different laws like, private law and civil law, fiscal law, social insurance law etc. in the modern legal system. In this regard we are bound to refer to the Roman law and the Common law, which have much in common.

It should be noted that judges and courts of law are vital aspects of the total policies process. This point has to be emphasized chiefly because of two reasons.

- (1) Liberal democratic theory was traditionally put a premium on the necessity of protective the citizen from a top powerful state; and has therefore emphasized the impartiality of the judicial process to increase the independence of the judiciary and depend the respect and confidence with which judicial decisions are received.
- (2) Secondly, it has given importance to the different aspects of the doctrine of the separation of powers.

While discussion on the role of judiciary in policy-making process, we have to focus on the following four important areas:

- (I) The nature of law and its relationship with the political decision-makings.
- (II) The structure of the courts and the selection of personnel.
- (III) The functions of the courts and the nature of the external control and
- (IV) The relation of the citizens to the legal process.

In liberal democratic systems the legal system is said to be characterized by such concepts are impartiality, consistency, openness, predictability and stability. In such systems 'rule of law' plays a prominent role. It is argued that such features of the legal system are not present in socialist and autocratic states. But the distinctions seem to be more relative than absolute. Liberal democratic systems can grant extraordinary powers to government during emergency. And it is possible to have predictable legal rules and due processes of law in autocratic systems. For instance, the legal theories of Russian state and liberal democratic systems in 19th century Europe seem to underline the fact that the difference are of degree rather than of kind.

Legal structures on the other hand, differ according to several factors. Federalism may necessitate parallel courts adjudicating on federal and state or provincial law. In the U.S.A. for example, federal courts extend into every state alongside state court with the Supreme Court at the apex of both systems. In Britain, there are no separate administrative and constitutional courts but above the lowest courts there are, as in France separate civil and criminal courts with separate courts of appeal. And the house of Lords is the highest Court of appeal. The structure of legal systems is important for some of the functions of the courts, such as

those concerned with the increasing powers of the central government and for the protection of administrative and civil rights, but for the wider range of functions the principles underlying the selection of the judiciary have more significance.

The procedures for selecting and dismissing judges and the background of the recruits are more crucial factors in assessing the degree of independence and in evaluating the political behavior of judges. Judges may be appointed by the government elected or co-opted by fellow judges. They also vary in the extent of their legal training and in their qualification.

Functions of the Judiciary in regard to policy-making can be analyzed under four important heads, namely;

- (1) Judicial review and interpretation of the constitutions
- (2) Arbitration between separate institutions in the political process
- (3) General support for the existing political system and
- (4) The protection of individual rights. It is through judicial review and interpretation of the existing laws, the judiciary contributes to the formulation of new policies as well as in amending the existing laws. The courts, sometimes direct the Government to act in a particular way while deciding various cases. This provides wide scope to the judiciary to create situations for formulation of specific policies, and their implementation in particular manner.

It is therefore, clear that the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary have their own role in regard to the public policy-making.

Reference:

1. Peter H. Merk, Political Continuity and Change. Mitchell and Mitchell, Political Analysis and Public Policy.